



6-2003

## Embedded Co-Mentoring: Inside the National Standards for Professional Development Schools

Jane Neapolitan

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/tl-nirp-journal>



Part of the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Neapolitan, Jane (2003) "Embedded Co-Mentoring: Inside the National Standards for Professional Development Schools," *Teaching and Learning: The Journal of Natural Inquiry & Reflective Practice*: Vol. 17: Iss. 3, Article 3.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/tl-nirp-journal/vol17/iss3/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teaching and Learning: The Journal of Natural Inquiry & Reflective Practice by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

## Embedded Co-Mentoring: Inside the National Standards for Professional Development Schools

Jane Neapolitan

*This study describes how co-mentoring in a professional development school provides a basis for collaboration and a community of learners. It examines the case of an elementary school that was one of 19 professional development school sites that participated in the Standards for Professional Development Schools Field Test Project of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 1999-2001. The professional development school focused its professional development activities on performance-based assessment in order to help prepare students for the state assessment program. Data were drawn from interviews, focus groups, written reflections, and professional portfolios from mentor teachers and teacher candidates in the school. Results showed that team teaching, peer coaching, and teacher-driven professional development were types of co-mentoring that engendered adult learning and professional relationships related to student success.*

### Introduction

When educators who want to learn about school-university partnerships visit "Raven Elementary School," they are often surprised at what they see. Raven Elementary School is a large suburban school in Maryland. It is housed in its original 70-year-old building with two newer wings attached and a separate annex located behind the original building. Located on a busy commercial corridor in northwest Baltimore County, Raven Elementary School does not appear from the outside to be different from other early twentieth century schoolhouses situated amidst urban sprawl.

In 1994, however, Raven Elementary School underwent a transformation *inside* that has led it to the forefront of the Professional Development School movement. As the newly appointed leader of a school "in trouble," the principal had a vision for transforming the school by putting its emphasis on professional development to improve the quality of teaching and learning for both children and adults. He developed his vision for creating a community of learners through a collaborative partnership

with a large comprehensive state university that had a long history of partnerships in the county. Together, the principal, teachers, teacher candidates, and university partners worked together to renew the school as a professional development school that would go on to be recognized as the Outstanding Teacher Education Program in 1998 by the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) and to participate in the Standards for Professional Development Schools Field Test Project by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2001). During the eight years of its partnership, Raven Elementary School consistently improved its scores on the Maryland State Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP).

This article describes how team teaching, peer coaching, and teacher-driven professional development were types of co-mentoring (Jipson & Paley, 2000) embedded in Raven Elementary School's use of the NCATE standards. In this case, mentoring provided a medium for renewal in which the professional development school grew to be recognized by NCATE and others as a leader for its performance as a community of learners.

For more than a decade, the professional development school movement has steadily increased the number of school-university partnerships that unite the functions of “professional preparation of [teacher] candidates, faculty development, inquiry directed at the improvement of practice, and enhanced student learning” (NCATE, 2001, p. 1). In order to ensure the quality of these partnerships, NCATE established Standards for Professional Development Schools (NCATE, 2001). The standards include major elements and developmental guidelines in the areas of (a) Learning Community, (b) Accountability and Quality Assurance, (c) Collaboration, (d) Diversity and Equity, and (e) Structures, Resources, and Roles. Key concepts embedded in the standards include, among others, learning in the context of practice, the expanded learning community, and leveraging change.

Mentoring is embedded within the standard of Learning Community and is included in the element of “supporting multiple learners.” At standard performance, a professional development school “provide[s] an environment that simultaneously supports the learning of P-12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals in an integrated way.” In addition, “significant numbers of school faculty participate in candidates’ preparation by serving as mentors, co-teachers, and colleagues in study groups, seminars, committees, and other professional, collegial activities” (NCATE, 2001, p. 17). Mentoring is also embedded within the standard of Collaboration, which includes the element of “engaging in joint work.” At standard performance, “partners use their shared work to improve outcomes for P-12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals.” In order to create a medium for such shared work, “partners select and prepare school and university faculty to mentor and supervise candidates.” Finally, “in response to the needs demonstrated by P-12 students, PDS partners collaboratively design staff

development initiatives and undertake improvement-oriented inquiries” (NCATE, 2001, p. 12).

Carol Mullen (2000) writes, “when professional support networks use a collaborative mentoring model, new possibilities become available for human relationship and institutional change” (p. 4). A contemporary view of mentoring “must be integrated with other developments in policy and practice that are required to transform the teaching profession” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000, p. 54). These views of mentoring are directly related to the purpose of professional development schools and the notion of simultaneous renewal for all partners. Jipson & Paley (2000) explain that “collaboration and mentoring are often intertwined” (p. 37). “Co-mentoring,” as the authors call it, “creates a democratic space for the formation of insights and understandings that help us reach for and choose ourselves in the situation” (p. 37). Although mentoring is not by itself a major focus of what a professional development school does, there is evidence that a contemporary view of mentoring is required for optimal growth in the learning community of a professional development school. Mentoring cultivates new connections among teacher preparation, professional development, inquiry, and student achievement, thus enabling a professional development school to grow and develop into a renewed context for all its members.

Mentoring played an important role at Raven Elementary School by enabling the school's focus on performance assessment to take hold within the community of learners and to affect the quality of collaboration. Raven Elementary School's inquiry project, which was part of its participation in the NCATE standards field test, served as the database for this article. It was a microethnographic study that closely examined the specific organizational activity of how teacher candidates and mentor teachers worked together to develop their under-

standing of performance assessment in a learning community.

Mentoring at Raven Elementary School created support for new learning among teacher candidates and mentor teachers and, ultimately, contributed to the increase of student achievement. In this case, mentoring was embedded in the day-to-day activities of classroom teaching and in the experiences of ongoing professional development. Experiences such as team teaching, peer coaching, collaborating on lessons, and conducting teacher-driven staff development created a medium for professional growth. At Raven Elementary School, embedded mentoring enabled the NCATE standards of Learning Community and Collaboration to take hold in real and substantive ways.

### **Performance-Based Assessment**

For nearly two decades, the emphasis on improving assessment systems and their consequent accountability structures has driven efforts to change American schools. The idea that knowledge is constructed holistically by the learner rather than transmitted in bits and pieces by the teacher has revolutionized the way some educational systems think about what children should know and be able to do as a result of schooling (Marzano, Pickering, & McTighe, 1993). Moreover, effective teachers have always used a variety of data-gathering methods to assess their students. These include performances (as opposed to multiple-choice tests) that provide students "opportunities to *demonstrate* their understanding and to thoughtfully apply knowledge, skills, and habits of mind in a variety of contexts" (Marzano, Pickering, & McTighe, 1993, p. 13).

The Maryland State Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) consists of criterion-referenced performance tests in reading, math, writing, language usage, science, and social studies for grades 3, 5, and 8. MSPAP is based on learning

outcomes developed by Maryland educators and was approved by the State Board of Education in 1990. Administration of MSPAP began in 1994, the same year in which the partnership with Raven Elementary School was established.

Basic skills of knowledge are assessed through MSPAP tasks. However, the tasks emphasize higher order thinking skills, such as supporting answers with information, predicting an outcome, and comparing and contrasting information. MSPAP guides instruction by measuring students' understanding of original content and their ability to apply what they learn to real-world problems. Teachers are encouraged to "teach to the test" by using strategies that will help students analyze what they read, apply skills and knowledge to solve problems, integrate knowledge from different content areas, and work independently and in groups (Maryland State Department of Education, *What Is MSPAP?*, 2001). (MSPAP was administered for the last time in May 2002. It has been replaced with the Maryland State Assessment, which is compatible with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.)

### ***Teacher Preparation in Professional Development Schools***

In *Tomorrow's Schools* (1990), the Holmes Group envisioned a new kind of school that would meet the challenges of educating "all people's children." This new school would bring together universities, schools, and communities in a collaborative effort to connect initial teacher preparation with the ongoing and sustained professional development of experienced teachers. The ultimate benefit of this collaboration would be increased learning for both children and adults in a new learning community. The 1990s gave rise to numerous experiments in teacher education and professional development, resulting in national and state networks. Examples include the Holmes

Partnership, the National Network for Educational Renewal, and the State of Maryland Professional Development School Network.

At present, professional development schools have become the primary settings in which many teacher education institutions deliver their teacher preparation programs. According to Abdal-Haqq (1998), more than 600 public and private schools have been deemed professional development schools. Several states, including Maryland, have provided financial resources for the establishment and development of such partnerships. Maryland's *Redesign of Teacher Education* (MSDE & MHEC, 1995) requires that by the year 2004, all teacher candidates in the state will have an intensive and extensive one-year internship in a professional development school. The redesign plan also calls for the professional development school internship experience to be assessed through a developmental portfolio review process based on performance criteria such as those provided by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

### ***National Standards for Professional Development Schools***

In an effort to establish national standards to strengthen the quality of school-university collaborations, NCATE drafted and field tested a set of standards. The NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools (NCATE, 2001) focus on the quality of (a) the Learning Community, (b) Accountability and Quality Assurance, (c) Collaboration, (d) Diversity and Equity, and (e) Structures, Resources, and Roles. From 1998-2001, 20 professional development schools participated in the NCATE Field Test Project. Sites chosen for the project represented a variety of school-university-community partnerships from across the United States, including partner-

ships at varying stages of development, multiple site partnerships, elementary schools, and high schools.

### ***Learning Community***

The NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools delineate elements of a learning community that focus on the sharing of "a common vision of teaching and learning grounded in research and practitioner knowledge" (NCATE, 2001, p. 8). First, the learning community supports multiple learners within the partnership. These include children, teacher candidates, faculty, and other professionals. Mentoring is cited as the means for providing this support. Work and practice in the professional development school are inquiry-based and result in learning for all. Next, the professional development school develops a common shared professional vision of teaching and learning by using experiences and assessment processes that allow its members to demonstrate what they know and are able to do. Finally, the professional development school partnership serves as a leverage for significant change in both policy and practice not only for itself but also for the extended learning community, which includes various institutional partners. For example, policies affected by professional development schoolwork in Maryland include extending the traditional student teaching experience to a 100-day full-time internship. All interns are required to develop and defend a portfolio as a summative assessment of the internship, and mentor teachers must undergo training to work with interns.

### ***Collaboration***

The NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools view collaboration in a partnership as "systematically mov[ing] from independent to interdependent

practice” (NCATE, 2001, p. 12). First, by engaging in joint work, boundaries that previously existed between and among the partners are blurred. For example, identifying and preparing mentor teachers becomes a joint effort between the university and the partner school. In the traditional model of teacher preparation, principals generally assign mentor teachers independently from the university. According to the standard on collaboration, however, “partners select and prepare school and university faculty to mentor and supervise candidates” (p. 12). Next, the partners work together to design roles and structures that enhance the collaboration and develop parity. Both groups cooperate with each other to define expectations and responsibilities. Finally, the partners systematically recognize and celebrate the joint work and contributions of each other. In short, a new culture and reward structure that recognizes mentoring in its many manifestations is established through collaboration.

### Context

Raven Elementary School is a Title I school with an enrollment of 900 students, pre-K-5. As part of its School Improvement Plan for 1999-2000 (the year of this study), the school concentrated all of its professional development for teachers and teacher candidates on designing and implementing performance assessments in reading and writing. Professional development included a Summer Strategic Planning Institute followed by a series of professional development days in which teachers took the lead by sharing what they had learned. Prior to the NCATE study, Raven Elementary School had hosted three cohorts of teacher candidates who spent the entirety of their professional preparation sequence (junior and senior years) in the school. In response to Maryland's *Redesign of Teacher Education* (MSDE & MHEC, 1995), university supervisors, school personnel, and

mentor teachers in the partnership collaborated to transform the INTASC standards into a learning rubric for the teacher candidates' performance. Through a yearlong graduate course, co-taught by school personnel and university faculty, teacher educators created and implemented an assessment system for the teacher preparation program. The assessment system contained a formative observational tool (aligned with INTASC standards); a summative rating sheet in the areas of planning for instruction, instructional delivery, classroom management, assessment, and human relations/communications; and an oral defense of the portfolio. Professional development focused on the need for all teachers in the partnership, including university faculty and teacher candidates, to learn about performance assessment. Members in the partnership attended workshops conducted by experts, such as Jay McTighe, a noted author on performance assessment; and were inspired through meetings with urban school reformers, such as Lorraine Monroe, a well-known principal in New York City. The entire professional staff at Raven Elementary School attended a weeklong Summer Strategic Planning Institute that collaboratively developed the School Improvement Plan and set the agenda for the next year's staff development. Professional development for the school year focused on working with performance assessments, with a special emphasis on teachers teaching other teachers in the process.

As part of its participation in the NCATE project, Raven Elementary School attempted to examine how some of its performance assessment activities “impacted” children, student teachers, and mentor teachers in the school. According to Teitel (2000), impact research on specific outcomes of professional development schools has not been widely conducted. This is due, in part, to the fact that most professional development school research has relied on data from

surveys and other methods that only scratch the surface of the phenomenon. With the support of NCATE, Raven Elementary School was enabled to carry out a research project that was deeper and more complex than any other research previously conducted within the partnership.

A site visit made to Raven Elementary School in October 2000, was the culminating activity for the school's participation in the NCATE project. The site visit team commended the partnership, among other things, for "consistently [demonstrating] serious and sustained attention to learning" and for serving as a "lever for change in the educational reform movement at both school and university level and as a model for professional development school development in the larger professional community locally, regionally, and nationally" (NCATE, 2000, p. 18).

## **Methodology**

### ***Participants***

As part of the NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools Field Test Project, data were collected for this study in spring 2000. Participants consisted of two convenience samples (teacher candidates and mentors) available at Raven Elementary School. The first was a cohort of 15 undergraduate teacher candidates (white females, ages 20 to 35). The teacher candidates self-selected to undergo their teacher preparation experience in the professional development school rather than in the traditional student teaching program offered by the university. All candidates met the standard entrance criteria for the elementary education program (GPA of 2.75 and passing scores on PRAXIS I). There were no additional requirements for entering the professional development school experience. All teacher preparation courses were delivered on site and were co-taught by

school- and university-based faculty. The majority of teacher candidates participated in all forms of staff development, including the Summer Strategic Planning Institute, start of school workdays in August, and local professional development school conferences.

The second group of participants consisted of five mentor teachers (two minority females and three white females) with a range of 10 to 20 years teaching experience. Three teachers taught Grade 1, one taught Grade 2, and one taught Grade 3. The mentor teachers participated in the same staff development experiences as did the teacher candidates. All participants gave their informed consent to participate in the project and were assured that their academic and/or employment status would not be affected in any way.

### ***Design and Data Analysis***

This study examined the impacts of mentoring as a medium in which teacher candidates and mentor teachers learned about performance assessment in a learning community built upon collaboration. It was a microethnographic study, a form of case study "on a specific organizational activity" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 60), that used multiple sources of data. Because the majority of studies on teacher candidates and mentor teachers in professional development schools rely primarily on self-report data in the form of surveys (Levine, 1998), this study sought to dig deeper into the professional development school phenomenon. For qualitative analysis, this study used (a) teacher candidates' weekly written reflections on their student teaching experiences; (b) transcripts of focus groups with teacher candidates in which they discussed their understandings of performance assessment; (c) mentor teachers' written reflections on their joint work with teacher candidates; and (d) transcripts of focus groups with mentor teachers and their respective teacher candidates in which they

discussed the nature and impacts of their collaborative relationships.

Documents were digitally scanned and subjected to qualitative analysis using QSR NUD\*IST 4 software. Analysis of the documents yielded 2,122 coded units to create categories and themes for the findings. Categories and themes were determined by examining the coded units both within and across the documents. The categories and themes constitute a critical mass (70%) of all the coded units.

### *Credibility and Limitations*

The use of multiple sources of rich contextualized data ensured the credibility of this study. Member checks and peer review of the data were also used to guard against omissions and biases and to increase the authenticity of the findings. This study is limited in that it is a case study of an intact group of teacher candidates and mentor teachers. It is also limited by the small number of participants. It is a non-experimental design that was carried out by a participant-observer rather than by an objective "outsider." However, implications drawn from the study may be applied to other groups of teacher candidates and mentor teachers who are engaged in similar activities and experiences in similar professional development school contexts.

### **Findings**

At Raven Elementary School, mentoring was embedded within the context of the Learning Community (NCATE Standard I) and manifested itself explicitly in the joint work of Collaboration (NCATE Standard III). Team teaching, peer coaching, and teacher-driven professional development contributed to the quality of the Learning Community. Joint work by mentor teachers and teacher candidates for creating, implementing, and modifying performance

assessments contributed to the quality of collaboration in the school. The following sections taken from the data provide examples that describe how teacher candidates and mentor teachers experienced embedded mentoring in the partnership. Embedded co-mentoring helped to foster mutual growth and development for the sake of children's learning.

### *Team Teaching*

Through the experience of team teaching at Raven Elementary School, mentor teachers and teacher candidates changed the traditional scenario of learning to teach. In a traditional apprenticeship model, teacher candidates observe "master teachers" and then are allowed to practice alone under the watchful eyes of their mentors. In a learning community, however, teacher candidates learn alongside mentors and implement new strategies that have real life consequences for children. A first grade mentor teacher describes a team teaching situation in her own words:

Having a [teacher candidate] in the room allows us more opportunities to assist and help children. We can work with more children because there are two of us. This is especially useful when we need to transcribe what a student has written. When one teacher is in the room, it is much more difficult to provide the needed help, especially when children are writing. Having a [teacher candidate] also allows for us to be able to pull more small groups for direct instruction geared to meet students' needs. In order to have children explain themselves on paper, we are providing them with opportunities to write their opinions with support. ... These are some of the things that we are doing to help our children be successful. (Neapolitan & Harper, 2001, para. 6)



The mentor continues, reflecting on her relationship with the teacher candidate:

You asked about my relationship with [Caitlyn] compared to that of other student teachers where there wasn't much emphasis on performance assessment. In many ways, I have had the same relationship with her as with others. I have put more emphasis on performance assessment because that is OUR goal at [Raven Elementary School]. I have had to learn more about performance assessment this year, too. Therefore, this has been a good experience because I have had someone to learn and work directly with on it. I think that this emphasis helps to keep us focused on improving instruction and making it more meaningful. The relationship is helped because more assistance tends to be needed using this strategy. Overall, [Caitlyn] and I have worked very well together. I feel that she is comfortable coming to me for help or with questions, and I am comfortable sharing and reflecting with her. This has been a very positive experience and I know that she will be a dedicated teacher next year! (Neapolitan & Harper, 2001, para. 7)

### ***Peer Coaching***

Teacher candidates were required to engage in a series of peer coaching experiences during their professional internship in the professional development school. Again, this experience differs from traditional teacher preparation that emphasizes individual development in isolation from other teachers. In the learning community of the professional development school, teacher candidates are acculturated into a profession that requires a high level of personal and professional support. By giving feedback and constructive criticism to one's peers, a sense of professional trust and

collegiality develops. A teacher candidate in Grade 4 describes her experience with peer coaching as such:

To add to the eventful week, [Jennifer] and I began to peer coach each other. I really like peer coaching with [her] because we are able to openly discuss what we have noticed and it is not done in a manner that makes each feel insufficient as a teacher. Honestly, this was a concern of mine when we were first told that we would do this activity. We each had the opportunity to observe each other once and to discuss our [Praise-Question-Polish feedback] sheets. At first I have to admit that I felt a little uncomfortable doing this because I didn't consider myself knowledgeable enough to be criticizing another [teacher candidate]. Though I realized that we are both trying to learn how to become better and our suggestions come from our own experiences and sometimes from our own mistakes. By receiving and providing feedback I realized that we have so much to learn from each other, and now I value the time we spend coaching each other. (Neapolitan & Harper, 2001, para. 40)

### ***Teacher-Driven Professional Development***

At Raven Elementary School, professional development was teacher-driven, context specific, and linked to school improvement. As a Title I school with many challenges, Raven Elementary School put its time and resources into building an infrastructure for creating new knowledge within its learning community. This new knowledge focused on the development, implementation, and modification of assessments that would help children improve their performance on the state's testing program. In order to achieve this goal, all teachers—including teacher candidates—were empowered to teach one

another. This teacher-driven professional development provided another form of embedded co-mentoring and, once again, changed the dynamics of the learning community. A teacher candidate describes her experience as a teacher/learner in the following:

There was a week before school started that we came in here and were doing some of the inservice projects with the teachers. They had a day on performance assessment and that was the first time we had ever heard of it. A lot of the teachers were in the learning process as well. ... When we came into our [Advanced Reading and Assessment course] in September, we bombarded [the instructor] with questions that eventually lead up to more instruction about it. I know personally, it was very valid for me because I was in the third grade and they were doing these assessments—one at least every week—so you were watching it being done at the same time. Throughout my experience at that point in time, I was able to make performance assessments after having gotten the instruction and watching it done in the classroom. Just having the instruction, I don't think it's enough. You need to watch it being done, too. (Neapolitan & Harper, 2001, para. 97)

### ***Collaboration on Performance-Based Assessment***

The joint work for developing performance assessments served as the focus for collaboration in the partnership. Mentor teachers and teacher candidates worked together to redesign curriculum, instruction, and assessment that produced tangible results for children's learning. Collaboration on PBA held implications for mentoring that were connected not only to teacher success

but also student success. A mentor teacher describes these connections in the following:

Another performance assessment that was used was one for a reading observation on fact and opinion. This one went much better because we collaborated on what was necessary to instruct the students, model with the students, and have them complete the assessment independently. ... I am a novice at writing performance based assessments, and it is very helpful to have colleagues, including the [teacher candidates], that are willing to share their expertise. (Neapolitan & Harper, 2001, para. 11)

For the teacher candidates, collaboration on the assessments served as a metaphor for learning to teach. A teacher candidate expressed it this way:

I know that if it weren't for all of the collaboration among the teachers, the [teacher candidates] and the professors, ... I really don't think we would be as knowledgeable as we are right now. I think we were dependent upon somebody holding our hand through the first couple of ones that we did, and then letting go of our hand and then just kind of giving us some cues, and then backing off. Like weaning themselves off of us. If it weren't for that collaboration, I don't think a lot of us would be where we are right now with performance assessments—developing them and implementing them and even grading them. (Neapolitan & Harper, 2001, para. 135)

### **Discussion and Implications**

According to Hargreaves and Fullan (2000), mentoring in the new millennium “must be linked to the redesign of initial teacher education and ongoing school improvement” (p. 55). “Co-mentoring has

the potential to infiltrate and reshape the socialization process in leadership, teacher development, and higher education" (Mullen, 2000, p. 5). This clearly describes the context of Raven Elementary School. Embedded co-mentoring was not so much the product of a formal mentoring program, but rather, the result of collaboration that addressed a real need for new learning in the partnership. Although the school's performance on the state's testing program needed further improvement, it continued to make steady progress during its partnership with the university. The collaborative development of the performance assessments and their quarterly administration at all grade levels generated an inquiry process that impacted continuous improvement in both teaching and learning. The general consensus of the mentor teachers, university supervisors, and school administrators in the partnership was that the teacher candidates were well prepared to teach children of diverse backgrounds and needs. All 15 of the teacher candidates in the cohort received open contracts by the school district, and the principal of the professional development school hired four of them as classroom teachers on his staff. This is testimony to the fact that teacher candidates who undergo teacher education in a collaborative learning community are introduced to teaching as a true profession. They bring to the work place a set of knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are compatible with a new vision for teaching and learning. Mentor teachers grew personally and professionally through their collaboration with teacher candidates. Because their joint work had real-life consequences for teaching and learning, mentors were compelled to re-evaluate their traditional "master teacher" roles. Their joint work with other teachers and teacher candidates helped to transform them into colleagues who created new knowledge toward a common goal. Team teaching and teacher-driven staff development provided opportunities for mentor teachers to

contribute to develop leadership skills "close to the classroom" (Little, 1988). Through peer coaching, teacher candidates also developed a sense of collegiality that set a professional expectation for the beginning stage of their careers.

Ultimately, mentoring can create a new cultural dynamic for innovation and renewal by bringing together the cultures of youth and experience (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000, p. 6). The NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools undoubtedly reflect this cultural dynamic. The elements of co-mentoring embedded in the national standards are subtle, but critical, support pieces for ensuring the efficacy of collaboration in a partnership and for sustaining a learning community itself. Without embedded co-mentoring, so-called collaboration in a partnership remains simply "cooperation." As the professional development school work at Raven Elementary School demonstrates, when joint work is ultimately connected to school improvement, roles are transformed, demarcations of authority are blurred, and processes and outcomes are made more important than ever. The NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools and similar frameworks, such as the Maryland Standards for Professional Development Schools (MSDE, 2001), provide "hard lenses" for examining the impacts of professional development school work. In the current climate of accountability and the call for "scientifically based research" in education, it is important that similar studies using professional development school standards—albeit larger and more rigorous ones—need to be conducted. *Sustaining* professional development school work, which includes sustaining a critical support structure for co-mentoring, is the current challenge of the professional development school movement. It is imperative that researchers in the movement put their collective efforts into designing and implementing studies that unearth the *complexity* of professional development

school activity. Without this depth of research, *Tomorrow's Schools* (Holmes Group, 1990) may be placed at risk for continuing into the present decade.

## References

- Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Jipson, J., & Paley, N. (2000). Because no one gets there alone: Collaborations as co-mentoring. *Theory into Practice*, 39(1), 36-42.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2000). Mentoring in the new millennium. *Theory into Practice*, 39(1), 50-56.
- Levine, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Designing standards that work for professional development schools*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Little, J. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman, (Ed.), *Building a professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2001). *Standards and guidelines for professional development schools in Maryland*. Baltimore, MD: Author.
- Maryland State Department of Education. (2001, February 13). *What is MSPAP?* [Online] Available from <http://www.mdk12.org/mspp/mspap/what-is-mspap/index.html>.
- Maryland State Department of Education, & Maryland Higher Education Commission. (1995). *The redesign of teacher education in Maryland*. Annapolis, MD: Authors.
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & McTighe, J. (1993). *Assessing student outcomes: Performance assessment using the dimensions of learning model*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mullen, C. (2000). Constructing co-mentoring partnerships: Walkways we must travel. *Theory into Practice*, 39(1), 4-11.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2000, October). *Site visit report. NCATE professional development school draft standards pilot project*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2001). *Standards for professional development schools*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Neapolitan, J., & Harper, S. (2001). [*Mentor teacher and teacher candidate reflections in conjunction with the National Standards for Professional Development Schools Field Test Project*]. Unpublished raw data.
- Teitel, L. (2000). *Assessing the impacts of professional development schools*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.
- The Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

*Jane E. Neapolitan is an Assistant Professor in the Elementary Education Department in the College of Education at Towson University, Maryland. She served as a research liaison for the Standards for Professional Development Schools Field Test Project conducted by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). She is currently the director of The Institute for Professional Development School Studies at Towson University, a research and development initiative supported by the Maryland State Department of Education.*