Engaged Pedagogy:
Meeting the Demands for Justice in Urban Professional Development Schools

By Ronald David Glass & Pia Lindquist Wong

Introduction

Over the past decade or more, educators and policymakers have sought to define new directions for teacher education in order to address widely perceived failures to prepare teachers adequately for the challenges to be faced in schools, especially those serving the poor and English learners (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Goodlad, Soder & Sirotnik, 1990; Holmes Group, 1995; Quartz *et al*, 2001). As colleges of education and urban school districts have established collaborative Professional Development Schools (PDSs) to meet the particular needs of under-resourced urban schools, they have discovered unexpected challenges that exacerbate the already difficult issues that they set out to address. This article investigates some of these structural, equity, and political obstacles that confront the reconstruction of teacher education programs in the effort to make them responsive to the needs of low-income, culturally and linguistically diverse (LI/CLD) students in public

Ronald David Glass is an associate professor in the College of Education at Arizona State University West, Phoenix, Arizona; Pia Lindquist Wong is an associate professor and director of the Equity Network in the Department of Bilingual/ Multicultural Education of the College of Education at California State University, Sacramento.

schools. In addition, the article elaborates some principles of the engaged pedagogy (hooks, 1994; see also, Freire, 1970) required to address these students' needs and the broad range of inequities that impact their schools.

Effective teaching in schools serving LI/CLD students demands transformations in the expectations and roles of all the partners and participants in the programs. Yet the calls for commitments to equity and meaningful educational opportunity, to reflective practice and action research that critically examines the real context of teaching and learning in urban schools, and to collaboration within and across contexts, have often been unrealized (Hawthorne, 1997; Murrell, 1998). PDSs offer a promising model for heeding these calls, though they should not be regarded as a panacea and are not without their own limitations (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Carnate, Newell, Hoffman, & Moots, 2000). PDSs build on partnerships between universities (usually Colleges of Education, but discipline-based faculty can also be involved) and schools and/or school districts. These partnerships direct cross-institutional resources and restructure governance, programs and policies around four central priorities: improving K-12 pupil learning; enhancing the field experience of teacher candidates; simultaneous professional growth for K-12 and university educators; and the use of inquiry to address problems and challenges related to the first two priorities (NCATE, 2001).

Though K-12 and university educators have historically worked in virtual isolation (both from each other and within their own settings), they each have much to offer each other and success in the 'domain' of one can lead to success in the domain of the other. Moreover, education reform throughout the system has typically been mandated through piecemeal approaches that often deny the realities or expertise of those charged with implementing the reforms (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). In the ideal, then, the PDS brings K-16 educators together around two interconnected and pressing challenges — improving student learning and achievement, and improving teacher preparation. Grounding the adoption of these shared priorities in habits of inquiry and joint and continuous professional development ensures that action proceeds in ways that are thoughtful, deliberate, reflective, and attentive to local needs and contexts. Using a partnership model to bridge gaps between two educational spheres that are fundamentally linked also builds a more solid foundation for lasting, comprehensive approaches to reform.

The barriers to the substantive transformation of university and school contexts and to the formation of collaborative PDSs within urban schools are complex and each particular story of change has its own lessons (Hoffman, Reed, & Rosenbluth, 1997). Not only are the expectations for the new forms of relationship and practice at odds with the existing institutional cultures, but also the larger social and political context of urban education is entangled with the specific reform efforts in ways that undermine their efficacy (Henig, Hula, Orr, & Pedescleaux, 1999; Stone, 1998a). These larger social and political issues also interact with the particularities of how individuals inhabit institutional roles and of how those roles inhibit or conflict with

the change effort (Steel, Jenkins, & Colebank, 1997), even when the individuals are undertaking seemingly objective collaborative research projects (Reed, Ayersman, & Hoffman, 1997). Similarly, the standards developed for PDSs frequently have received more rhetorical than institutional support as institutions and leaders attempt to cope with often-conflicting political and economic pressures (Johnston, Brosnan, Cramer, & Dove, 2000).

For a PDS to be successful, participating teachers and faculty must inevitably shift their view of their roles as professional educators as they begin to share many responsibilities previously reserved for their separate domains either in the school or in preservice teacher education programs (Clark, 1997;Wiseman & Cooner, 1996). Teachers accept direct roles in teacher education, teacher educators engage in classroom instructional planning and practice, and both take on collaborative inquiry and professional development responsibilities. While these changes can enable both teachers and university faculty to experience a greater degree of empowerment, they can also increase the types of pressure and stress that can undermine efficacy. Since the contexts of K-12 urban LI/CLD schools and of teacher preparation programs are inextricably interwoven with broader socio-historical forces, the efforts to improve them require personal and political commitments that reach well beyond traditional limits.

Contexts

The analysis developed here arises from both theoretical and practical contexts, and reflects a commitment to the praxis that defines liberatory education (Glass, 2001). We draw upon our experiences in a variety of urban schools and districts in California, Arizona and elsewhere, as well as on our work in building the Equity Network, a university-district-school-union collaboration to institute a dozen PDSs to serve the LI/CLD students in the greater Sacramento, CA, area. We have struggled alongside other educators critical of the structural disadvantages facing urban schools and their LI/CLD students in order to embody a vision of public education that promises a participatory democracy (Freire, 1993; O'Cadiz, Wong, & Torres, 1998). While the principles of dialogical, problem-posing education (Freire, 1970) provided definite direction for a collaborative approach that respected the contributions and dreams of the learners, the demand to translate these principles into particular situations required the reinvention of critical pedagogical theory by the participants. Indeed, the engaged pedagogy that characterizes education as a practice of freedom elicits a process of self-realization among teachers and students alike (hooks, 1994) that cannot be predicted in advance and must be lived through in all its contradictions, tensions, and ambiguities. In this essay, we attempt to highlight some of the principles and insights that have emerged in the course of these projects, as well as to identify the gaps and limits that reveal how far we have yet to travel to realize our aims.

The Equity Network[1] was formed in Spring, 2001, with impetus from a federal Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) Grant. The recipient university had worked in partnership with many local schools for several years, though the TQE grant was specifically designed to support elaboration of the PDS model and the schools that joined the Equity Network made explicit commitments to that model rather than other extant and on-going forms of partnership. Creating PDSs focuses the Equity Network on its central missions to improve student performance in schools serving LI/CLD students and to enhance the preparation of teachers for these kinds of schools. In Spring 2002 the Network concluded its first full year of operation; in addition to academic and student teaching projects at each school, the Network is engaged in collective activities such as monthly meetings, regional and national conference presentations, and professional development workshops, and it also distributes a monthly newsletter and maintains a website (http://edweb.csus.edu/partnering/Grants/T2/index.html).

With one exception, the 12 Equity Network schools serve a LI/CLD student population. In all the schools but one, at least 25 percent of the students are English Learners (ELs), and in 5 of the 11 schools, over 50 percent of the students are ELs. 11 of the 12 schools are 'majority-minority' schools, with a mix of Latinos, South-East Asians, and African Americans predominating; the White population includes significant numbers of recent Russian and Ukrainian immigrants. Fifty percent of the students served by Network schools receive free or reduced lunches; in nine of the 11 schools, over 80 percent of students qualify. In the one school that is the exception to these statistics, mainstreaming of students qualifying for special education services is the focus; we expand the definition of educational equity to include this school and the unique learning opportunities it offers.

In this article, we attempt to situate our experiences in relevant historical and contextual frameworks to provide clearer strategic directions for our ambitious aims of concurrently improving student learning and enhancing urban teacher preparation. What has become clear in the conflicted context of urban LI/CLD schools is that all the partners in reforms must be engaged in their schools and communities in new ways if the goal of improving student achievement is to be realized (Lipman, 1998). Historically, even many acknowledged best practices have been 2 X 4 approaches, confined within the two covers of a textbook and the four walls of the classroom. We believe that these and other limits, whether due to habitual practices or structural barriers, must be transcended if the PDSs are to embody the changes they promise.

The Myth of Method vs. The Reality of Engaged Pedagogy

The attempt to address issues of injustice and inequity in public schools in the United States must get beyond the myth of method to the reality of engaged

pedagogy (Aronowitz, 1993). While it is fundamentally important that teachers understand and can implement effective pedagogical practices that embrace cooperative learning, multiple intelligences, and diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, the challenges they face in improving student achievement (especially as measured on standardized tests) cannot be met through best practices alone or activities in the classroom. In schools serving LI/CLD students, teachers and administrators must assume new roles, and they must facilitate the inclusion of parents and community members in the fundamental aims and operations of the schools (Lewis & Henderson, 1997). In order to change the outcomes of schooling for LI/CLD students, a wide array of other reforms in associated institutions and the communities themselves must be put into motion. In the course of meeting the practical challenges of creating PDSs and supporting the professional development of teacher candidates and veteran teachers alike, a number of fundamental principles to guide the embodiment of engaged pedagogy have become clear, even if they are not always able to be fully realized in the present context of schools, universities and communities. In the following sections, we highlight principles that emanated from critical reflections on our practice, and provide illustrations of emergent practices that express them. The examples are taken from publications developed by Equity Network members as well as other documentation related to the Network's preliminary but on-going evaluation and assessment.

Engaged pedagogy requires that teachers grasp the lives of their students in both intimate detail and broad outline, and also understand the role of schools in identity formation. Engaged pedagogy elevates students' voices, perspectives, historical and cultural backgrounds, and emerging cultural formations to the status of the core curriculum. Engaged pedagogy prefers dialogical approaches, where students' languages, thoughts, and ideas are linked to actions subject to critical evaluation.

In the last decade, the voting public in California, whipped to a state of agitation by businessmen and politicians promoting an often-cynical agenda, has enacted into law a series of measures that constitute a virtual assault on low income, minority and immigrant groups. Beginning with Proposition 187 (which sought to deny public education and health care to undocumented immigrants and their children) and concluding most recently with Proposition 227 (which sought to end bilingual education), the systematic devaluing of the history, culture, language, and experiences of the students and families in the schools and neighborhoods of the Equity Network intensified. Yet Network teachers and schools, together with pupils and their families, have found creative ways to resist these attacks and publicly value the language, culture, and experience of students and their families in concrete ways that impact curriculum content, instructional practices, and other school programming.

In several Network schools, community gardens serve as entry points into the school community for Mien, Hmong, Vietnamese, and Mexican families. These settings enable families to maintain and demonstrate traditional agricultural practices while producing needed food and also enhancing opportunities to communi-

cate with their increasingly Americanized children. They also offer resources for teachers to enrich the mandated curriculum, even providing the core content for the science curriculum at one school (Martineau, 2001). In addition, support from federal grants has allowed families to market garden products (fruits, vegetables, herbs), and this provides opportunities to supplement family incomes, develop professional skills, and increase status in the community. This has also helped to raise awareness among Network faculty and students about the kinds of sophisticated skills and knowledge that these mostly immigrant adults have, despite their limited English proficiency.

Network teachers and teacher candidates are taking significant steps to deepen their understanding and awareness of the many dimensions of their students' realities. In three schools, they trained to conduct home visits and now do so several times each semester. These visits prompt shifts in their perceptions of the students' parents and families, and they also demonstrate the schools' desire to make genuine and equitable connections with the community in order to strengthen the children's/students' relationships with their teachers and enhance their learning. Further, the home visits offer ways to shrink the gap between school expectations and family and community realities, concerns, and hopes. In another Network school, K-6 pupils, teacher candidates and cooperating teachers engaged in an oral history project that recorded mostly Mien and Mexican family histories. This has been empowering for all involved, affirming and preserving valuable legacies for the first-generation children who must face the relentless forces of assimilation that discredit and ignore their rich, complex family journeys.

Taken together, school-community gardens, home visits, and community service learning (oral history projects and other activities) offer avenues for participants to determine how culture, language, ethnicity, gender and social class interact to shape identity. These opportunities, at this point in the Network's development, are most systematically available and pursued by candidates in the teacher preparation program, followed closely by pupils in the PDS K-12 classrooms. Efforts in this critical domain have only begun, and the dialogue around these activities and issues must expand to include teachers, administrators, and community members in more intensive ways.

Engaged pedagogy encompasses transformed relationships with others having key roles in the lives of children and youth. In addition to affirming the cultures, histories and languages of the students, the engaged pedagogy required to develop and sustain effective LI/CLD schools has entailed dialogue across a variety of professional borders that are often jealously guarded. Keeping student needs foremost has provided impetus for reaching across those borders, and now what had seemed to be impenetrable barriers to communication and effective teaching appear as permeable domains with possibilities for improved practice for all concerned. In several Network schools, more collaboration across programs has emerged, with fruitful and ongoing interaction between bilingual and English-only programs, and

regular and special education programs. In one district, teachers have built relationships across grade levels and schools to improve instruction; not only have deeper levels of collaboration been spurred, but also high school students now teach art and ceramics to elementary students on a weekly basis. Several Network schools — with teams of cooperating teachers and candidates — offer regular family science, literacy and math nights. These are opportunities for families to solidify connections with school faculty, to deepen or refresh their own subject matter knowledge, and to learn new ways of relating to their children around school learning. In PDSs hosting school-community gardens, linkages have been made with an eclectic group of organizations including the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Healthy Start, and the Mercy Foundation (Hammond and Heredia, 2002). While some identifiable successes foster cross-border cooperation among the various educational professionals, there remain many obstacles to effective communication and collaboration with other professionals who are actively involved with LI/CLD students and communities, such as social workers, probation officers, housing agency workers, and public health officials. Thus many of the services that support families and students continue to be fragmented and less effective than c/should be the case.

Engaged pedagogy addresses teachers' own processes of self-actualization and identity formation. Network teachers, particularly because they teach in so-called under-performing and under-resourced schools, face unique challenges in the development of a professional knowledge base and a sense of efficacy in their role/identity as "teacher." Substandard teaching/working conditions, mismatches between the students' needs and the mandated curriculum, as well as undermining ideological attacks promulgated in the media and political debates, often work to damage positive identity development as an educator. To counter these forces, Network teachers reflect on and critically analyze the background conditions that shape their daily experience in schools, their routine classroom practices, and their needs for professional learning and development. For example, in the Network high school PDS, cooperating teachers periodically draw concept maps that document their evolving notions of their roles as they work with candidates and university faculty and take on new tasks (Hecsh, 2001). Slowly, these teachers have begun to transform their self-understandings as classroom teachers focused only on pupil learning, coming to see themselves as educators with multiple domains of responsibility that include teacher preparation, action research, school reform, and community engagement. In one of the Network elementary schools, teachers have gradually taken over the organization, planning, implementation and evaluation of professional development enrichment days that had previously been the sole province of the university faculty. This assertion of leadership has occurred simultaneously with other initiatives at the school to more proactively manage the human and fiscal resources provided by the university. In several other schools, PDS educators participate in summer activities including reading current multicultural and bilingual education research and other literature. These summer activities serve to introduce Network PDS educators to new

concepts and findings as well as to reinforce the credibility and legitimacy of their own knowledge, garnered through daily practice and reflection. Despite these examples, the process of developing a positive and efficacious identity as a teacher in an urban LI/CLD setting is a difficult one.

Added to these conflicted professional identity issues, the partners in the PDSs are forced to confront identity formation matters that arise from the racial and class differences between teachers and university faculty and the LI/CLD students and communities they are trying to serve. Given their explicit commitments to LI/CLD schools, it can be particularly difficult for PDS educators to face up to the ways in which race and class bias continues to inhabit many aspects of their daily practice. Yet these inescapable operations of dominant ideologies must be examined without blame or guilt in the search for responsible ways to mitigate their impact. Though Network schools have focused selected professional development efforts on strategies for meeting the educational and other needs of LI/CLD students, deeper and more systematic professional development is still needed. The Network is diligently trying to foreground these issues in various classes with the preservice teachers, but there is still very substantial work that remains to be done to insure that a critical understanding of race and class informs teaching practices. As these questions emerge in the process of critical reflection on daily classroom practices and in the process of preparation of the candidates, some cooperating teachers have elected to do the readings and lead discussions in the university's multicultural education course. What is clear is that more attention is required at every level of the PDS to bring race and class formation into view as a critical aspect of both professional practice and K-12 student development. To counter the ideological forces in the larger culture and embedded in various school processes (despite the best intentions of teachers) that tend to make Nobodies of LI/CLD students, teachers have to actively promote both a capacity for resistance and a desire to affirm the linguistic, racial, cultural and class backgrounds of the students (Glass, 2000).

Engaged pedagogy involves deepening knowledge creation and more critical curriculum construction and selection. Despite the sharp move towards standards-based and standardized curricula, many Network teachers, together with their administrators and university faculty, have carved out spaces for curricular innovation and experimentation in ways that incorporate content reflective of community resources and concerns, and best practices in instruction, assessment and integration of technology. Two-thirds of the Network schools participate in a university-based technology grant that teams teachers, education faculty and content faculty in curriculum design groups that develop innovative units of practice integrating technology. In two Network schools, candidates, teachers and university faculty are deepening their knowledge about concept-based and thematic instruction and developing curriculum units following these frameworks. At other Network schools, teachers participate in Professional Book Groups that read current research and use the insights gleaned to experiment with new strategies to differentiate instruction

for the varied needs of LI/CLD students and to design authentic assessments. At two schools in the Network, teachers work with the science methods faculty to prepare inquiry-based lessons for pupils and to coach candidates on ways to teach these lessons. The focus of the inquiry is a topic that emerges from community interests or local realities. The benefits to all actors are myriad, but this concurrent delivery of methods courses and K-6 science curriculum constitutes an important opportunity for practicing teachers to deepen professional knowledge.

Engaged pedagogy involves continuous critical reflection and professional development, linked to classroom and school-level reform. According to Network teachers, the mere presence of a candidate in their classroom forces critical reflection on their own practice. Having to explain classroom procedures and processes demystifies their ritualized nature and can often result in needed changes and modifications. Watching as 'tried and true' practices backfire on a novice necessitates rethinking classroom dynamics as well as assumptions and expectations about particular pupils. Network teachers also participate in organized efforts that link critical reflection and professional development targeted towards both improved learning for LI/CLD pupils and superior teacher preparation. In one school, candidates, teachers and administrators conduct morning "open houses" twice each semester in which they take turns observing their colleagues as they teach. In another school, candidate and cooperating teacher pairs conduct guided observations of teachers in their own school or elsewhere modeling an exemplary practice. In groups, the pairs analyze the teaching and learning issues that emerge.

Where the university science methods course is taught on-site, the PDS educators collaboratively design the lesson, teach it to the candidates, and then all participants (university faculty, teachers and candidates) teach the lesson in small groups to the pupils in both the bilingual and English-only programs. A debriefing session follows during which significant, job-embedded professional development occurs for both the university and school faculty, and at the same time the candidates receive intensive and on-going support as they master the method and lesson in question. Since the candidates also take primary responsibility for implementing activities not otherwise possible without their involvement in the classroom, such as daily interactive science journals with the students, the curriculum becomes highly enriched. Most importantly, the K-6 pupils, bilingual and English-only, have a powerful science experience at least three times per week that is integrated across the curriculum — all the more important in a district that had previously relegated science instruction to merely one hour per week.

Almost all schools in the Equity Network focus on action research aimed at both addressing vexing school-wide teaching and learning issues and supporting professional skill and knowledge development. Indeed, acknowledging the limitations of traditional university-based research for facilitating school change, the Network experience confirms the increasing calls for research conducted in schools by classroom teachers (Holmes Group, 1995; Lieberman, 1992; Sagor, 2000). For

example, in one school, teachers investigated perceived patterns of segregation among the English learners and English proficient students. Their findings confirmed the perceptions, and led to the implementation of a new schedule that structured time and activities so that interaction among these groups of students was fostered. Within the PDS literature, action research is viewed as a principal vehicle for conducting ongoing inquiry on practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993 and 1998), but we have found that specific efforts must be made to focus on school-wide matters and reform strategies since none of the partner institutions is particularly well set up to assemble and analyze data of the kind needed.

The merits of conducting action research in schools are clear despite numerous barriers to its meaningful implementation. Some barriers are rooted within the structure of schools (e.g., daily schedule and teacher load) while others relate to historical patterns of practice within schools and universities. Additional barriers are linked to the lack of legitimacy accorded to important issues of policy and/or practice that teachers themselves have identified, and to the difficulties of obtaining rigorous data linked to strategic grade-level or school-wide interventions (Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 1994; Mills, 2000). Many obstacles to meaningful implementation of action research are grounded in differing conceptions of inquiry on practice. To overcome these differences, the institution-induced conceptions of the roles and responsibilities of school and university PDS collaborators must be explored and a common vision created.

Engaged pedagogy involves K-12 teachers in the education of the next generation of teachers, in partnership with university faculty. Perhaps because the Network teachers have found ways of developing positive and efficacious identities as urban educators they have readily taken on the challenge of adding the role of teacher educator to their professional repertoire. These teachers are acutely aware that successful teaching in their LI/CLD schools requires distinct dispositions, skills and knowledge. Moreover, because of their commitment to their students and their students' communities, and to their students' learning and achievement, they feel a sense of responsibility to prepare the future generation of teachers to work in these challenging contexts. The PDS partnership explicitly recognizes and rewards their unique expertise and applies it in the creation and implementation of programs and activities to help future teachers develop such competencies. Thus Network cooperating teachers are increasingly both designing and delivering elements of the university's teacher preparation program.

In four Network schools, university faculty and cooperating teachers are piloting new candidate assessment tools that align with the newly issued state Teaching Performance Expectations. This has involved in-depth reflection about the range of competencies and level of performance that can be expected of candidates along the learning-to-teach continuum. Through this process, Network PDS educators think deeply about evidence that can indicate proficiency in teaching to the professional standards, and then not only create tools for collecting

this evidence and rubrics for evaluating it, but also identify appropriate scaffolding strategies to support the professional development of the candidates. This process of thinking about what is best for candidates in LI/CLD settings necessarily requires thinking about what is best for the teachers themselves and their own professional development.

In some Network PDSs the student teaching seminar is jointly planned by teachers at the site and either taught entirely by them or co-taught with university faculty. Network teachers also provide guest lectures in a range of classes held on campus in the teacher preparation program. Cooperating teachers are acting as the primary evaluator of candidates in some Network schools. Network teachers are also involved in interdisciplinary, inter-institutional curriculum teams (Arts & Sciences faculty, Education faculty, K-12 teachers, Community College faculty) charged with revising university courses for the undergraduate Liberal Studies major, the primary route into the teacher preparation program and the basis for candidates' subject matter competency. These experiences are strengthening the commitment of Network teachers and administrators to the integration of theory and practice as they see the results when deeper theoretical knowledge is linked directly to improving instruction for K-12 LI/CLD students. At the same time, they understand the value of reflective practice for assessing and orienting research. Their overall sense of efficacy as teachers and professionals is enhanced as they come to understand that they are well equipped to collaborate with university faculty in shaping future teachers.

Assets for Engaged Pedagogy

A set of assets, garnered despite obstacles, facilitate the work of the Equity Network and make the successes possible. *Administrative support* in both K-12 and higher education settings has been forthcoming. College and departmental leaders in the university have met challenges to create deeper university-wide and cross-institutional collaboration by adhering to the principles underlying the Network PDSs, sharing substantive information and key contacts, and providing leadership and resources for needed restructuring. The majority of Network school districts is also fully engaged in exploring new and creative partnerships around a host of issues including professional development and renewal, teacher preparation, educational equity and school reform. In addition, teachers' associations have emerged as enthusiastic partners in the Network effort to rethink the roles of all of the partners in the development of a professional workforce, now realizing that collaboration can facilitate the achievement of objectives believed to be beyond reach in the old framework.

The partnership between *progressive faculty* in K-12 and university settings has strengthened the ability of both groups to further their goals of educational equity and the attendant changes needed in their respective but integrated contexts.

New faculty, experienced with and committed to school-university partnerships and LI/CLD communities, have joined the core of tenured and established faculty who spent years cultivating the seeds that grew into the Equity Network, and now a substantial cross-departmental group has achieved the critical mass needed to pursue PDS work in the College. This momentum further accelerates the efforts of the dedicated K-12 PDS educators who have persistently struggled to put the needs and interests of their LI/CLD students at the forefront of their districts' agendas, despite repeated defeats and rebuffs. The Network K-12 educators include novices and veterans, come from a range of ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and include many bilingual teachers. Their strong commitment to social justice and educational equity animates their advocacy for their students and families.They are enthusiastic and serious about leaving as a legacy for their students a future generation of teachers well prepared for urban settings. For the PDS educators who comprise the Equity Network, the demands of justice reach into all aspects of their professional lives and they embrace these demands with a surprising optimism given the tremendous challenges being faced. At a time when all that seems to matter in state policy circles is a test score, these educators risk their professional standing by adhering to positions that challenge narrow definitions of student learning and devalue the assets their diverse students possess.

Ironically, *the larger statewide and national policy context* has assisted the effort to create the Equity Network. Despite the considerable drawbacks and questionable validity of high stakes assessment (Amrein & Berliner, 2002; Berliner & Biddle, 1995), this state and federally sanctioned approach will continue to force all educators to pay closer attention to improving academic achievement. Many seem especially concerned about the "achievement gap" between LI/CLD students and their more affluent, White counterparts. The Network PDS educators have accepted the fact that standardized testing will be used as a measure of the success of our work, regardless of how appropriate this may be. While we are responsibly responding to calls to raise test scores and use them to focus on LI/CLD student learning, we deliberately conceptualized such learning in much broader terms, and actively work to identify and collect alternative forms of evidence associated with the classroom instructional approaches that we create to address student needs and interests. In a parallel vein, new state standards for K-12 subject matter and for teacher preparation programs have reinforced Network initiatives to increase collaboration in teacher preparation among K-12, community college and university faculty. These efforts at alignment allow Network educators to meet mandated standards and at the same time build confidence for their efforts that surpass the standards, as is required in order to meet the particular needs of LI/CLD students and their learning.

Finally, the state and national focus on teacher preparation and the seriousness of the California teacher shortage have pressured legislative and administrative actions to steer university resources increasingly into teacher preparation, both in content and pedagogy. The Equity Network, because of the number of partner

schools and of the participating university faculty, has the potential to lead systemic reforms on its campus and be an important informant for other efforts around the state. In addition, external funding creates more conducive conditions for the kinds of creative and innovative work emerging from the partnerships.

Obstacles to Collaboration and Participatory Control

Network educators have approached the PDS work well aware of the difficulties of institutional change (Fullan, 1993) and the characteristic instability of educational organizations (such as teacher and administrator mobility); these are givens in educational reform. Beyond these obstacles, however, emerging PDS activities also engender conflicts around individual and institutional norms of how educators spend their time and where they do their work, of who needs to be consulted about program decisions, and of how quality will be assessed. The need for normative transitions induces cycles of negotiations among PDS partners and with colleagues outside the Network. Until agreements coalesce around common goods and shared goals, resolutions are difficult and negotiations persist. The bureaucratic cultures of universities and schools are often at odds with the creative, resourceful and entrepreneurial skills required of PDS faculty and teachers (Hawthorne, 1997). The demands of the new roles outpace the institutions' and individuals' abilities to respond, leaving teachers and faculty struggling within formal work assignments, reward structures, and job performance definitions that remain rooted in traditional conceptions (Dailey-Dickinson, 2000). Eventually, if the PDSs are to be sustained, institutional norms will have to reflect the transformed faculty and teacher roles and responsibilities. In the interim, PDS educators must often invent ways to describe new work in old terms, while also redefining those terms and negotiating new formal understandings. At the same time, K-16 faculties must venture into the mostly unfamiliar territory of building broad coalitions with families and community organizations and educating constituencies about their work in politically strategic ways.

We have identified five primary obstacles to instilling engaged pedagogy throughout the learning-to-teach continuum. *Workplace norms and conditions* often hamper those involved in the Equity Network, though in different ways for K-12 teachers than for university instructors. Continuing public media attacks on teachers, punitive state measures against allegedly under-performing schools, and increasing pressures to adopt highly scripted standardized curricula make the PDS work a risky venture, especially for K-12 teachers. In addition, the conditions and demands of teaching in LI/CLD schools do not easily accommodate added responsibilities. Teachers question the extraordinary lengths and personal sacrifices sometimes necessary to fulfill the obligations they feel in the PDS programs. They can also be tentative about assuming their new roles as colleagues with members of the professoriate who typically have more years of formal education.

Workplace issues in the university are different, though sometimes parallel, as when faculty resent what they regard as the encroachment on their domains of practice by K-12 teachers with less formal preparation and theoretical knowledge. University teaching load assignments do not always account for the exceptional amount of time and effort that must be expended at K-12 sites working not only with candidates but also with cooperating teachers who are attempting to modify their classroom practices in response to the emerging understandings prompted by the PDS collaboration. University promotion and tenure criteria disadvantage PDS faculty whose capacity to produce and publish standard research is diminished. The critical performance reviews thus suffered by these PDS faculty can undermine their sense of efficacy and lead them to question the value of PDS objectives that are neither recognized nor rewarded within the traditional standards of academe.

Cognitive dissonance is often the result of intensifying collaboration between K-12 and university partners. For school and district actors facing increasing demands for standardization, routinization, and conformity, the PDS emphasis on inquiry and the requirements of engaged pedagogy for problem-posing education can create tension and discomfort. To succumb to the state's agenda could result in the continued oppression of LI/CLD students; to fully embrace the Equity Network agenda could mean radical resistance on the part of teachers not used to political action. *Modes of operation* are often out of synch among the Network partners. For example, school districts and the university follow distinct calendars, producing friction and delays even for simple or routine matters. Similarly, university faculty members (particularly outside of colleges of education) are unaccustomed to accommodating K-12 teachers' schedules through late afternoon or weekend meetings. It is also often a struggle for teachers to leave their classrooms for professional development activities like conferences. Most challenging are union and contract rules coupled with the extreme demands on teachers' time to fulfill everyday classroom obligations that can conflict with PDS commitments to research, reflection, collaboration, community involvement and school reform.

The creation of the Equity Network joined faculty across College of Education departments and concentrated their efforts on the preparation of teachers and the reform of schools for urban LI/CLD students. This has foregrounded *ideological conflicts* with faculty who do not share the same commitments or embrace the potential of PDS partnerships. These faculty question college investments in the Network and challenge the priority on LI/CLD students and urban schools, echoing larger battles in the state educational policy arena around issues of teaching and learning, curriculum content, student diversity, and student achievement. Given the pressing, even overwhelming, needs of the Network schools, students, and communities, these ideological conflicts can seem particularly debilitating, but they point to the strategic importance of the struggle to make issues of justice central to institutional decisions and commitments.

A final obstacle relates to *parental involvement* in schools and their children's

educational experiences, long recognized as a key indicator of students' academic success (Lewis & Henderson, 1997). To be most effective, this involvement has to reach beyond providing secretarial or staff support for teachers, attending school plays or events, or participating in the PTA school support ventures. Parental involvement must be at the level of setting aims and expectations for the schools and classrooms, and of making decisions that affect the broad actions of schools. Parental involvement must encompass parent/adult education not only to support their children in homework activities but also to support the adults in building their own lives. Key to empowering parents is extending the school into the community and bringing the community into the school. If the larger community (beyond the parent community) does not take ownership of the schools, then the long-term strategic changes required to improve student achievement have diminished chances of success. While these needs for parental and community involvement are clear, at this point only a handful of Network educators focus on transforming connections and relationships with the broader community. Network PDSs must institutionalize the participation of families in the schools, and integrate community resources and knowledge more deeply into the curriculum and school programs. Such efforts will better enable teachers and parents to deliberately assume their roles as cultural brokers, helping students to make important connections among past, present and future. Moreover, parent support and mobilization can act as an insurance policy for social justice programs that may attract the negative attention or ire of test results-focused administrators.

Engaged Pedagogy and Public Education in a Democratic Society

When Horace Mann launched his crusade for universal public education in the middle third of the 19th century, Americans were educating the first generations to be born under a democratic regime. Mann argued that education would be a key to the formation of citizens cognizant of their political and moral equality since people were still mired in habits of thought and action based in non-democratic forms of authority and power (Cremin, 1957). Engaged pedagogy returns to this root purpose of public education, seeking the justice and empowered citizenry that are the foundations of a genuine democracy. Yet engaged pedagogy recognizes that schools have had limited success as engines of democratic formation, so broader political aims must be part of the agenda (Stone, 1998b). While schools arguably have been the most equitable of all social institutions and a significant force for change, progress has been painfully slow. Millions of LI/CLD children have had, and continue to have, their life hopes and prospects dimmed by the inequities that plague their schools and communities and by the ranking and sorting regimes of schooling that demean their languages, cultures and histories. These students must face the facts that race, class, and linguistic discrimination persist even for the most

educated members of their communities, and that the racialized and gendered segmentation of the job market endures despite significant gains in recent decades (Carnoy, 1994).

While the Equity Network builds PDS partnerships focused on educational equity and improving LI/CLD student achievement through better preparation and professional development support for their teachers, it has had to confront many obstacles along the way. Like other urban PDSs, the Network has discovered the myriad forms of institutional inertia and resistance aimed at subsystem protection that combine to maintain the status quo (Jones & Hill, 1998), just as it has discovered it is possible to make substantive progress despite the obstacles (Dickens, 2000). But as the principles of engaged pedagogy animate more of the daily practices within the Network, we are learning more clearly than ever that we must reach further, toward strategic commitments to and relationships with the wider communities of LI/CLD students. The ultimate life outcomes for LI/CLD students depend not only on their academic achievements, but also on political mobilizations that can secure the promise of their accomplishments.

Note

[1]The authors would like to acknowelege the 'engaged pedagogy' of all the Network educators, especially those whose work informs this text and contributed to the first year of operations, including but not limited to: Lorie Hammond, Sue Heredia, Gloria Hernández, Hugo Chacón, Lita Lambating, Fely Lambating, Deidre Sessoms, Jana Noel, Linda Nowell, Tom Owens, Joan Gipe, Jeanne Malvetti, Sue Baker, Janie Low, Janet Hecsh, Shirley Peoples, Betsy Kean, Susan O'Hara, and Victoria Lemus.

References

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional Development Schools: Weighing the Evidence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Amrein, A. L. & Berliner, D. C. (2002, March 28) High stakes testing, uncertainty, and student learning. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10*(18). Retrieved 5/9/2002 from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n18/.

Anderson, G., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A. (1994*). Studying your own school: An educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Aronowitz, S. (1993). Paulo Freire's radical democratic humanism. In *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter*. P. McLaren & P. Leonard (Eds.). London, UK: Routledge, 8-24.

Berliner, D., & Biddle, B. (1995). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Carnate, B., Newell, G., Hoffman, S.E., & Moots, R. (2000). The growing of a school/university partnership and the preparation of teachers for the urban context. In *Collaborative reform and other improbable dreams: The challenges of professional development schools*. M. Johnston, P. Brosnan, D. Cramer, T. Dove (Eds). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 171-188.

Carnoy, M. (1994). *Faded dreams: The politics and economics of race in America*. New

York: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, R. (1997). *Professional Development Schools: Policy and Financing*. Washington DC: AACTE.

Clifford, G.J., & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). *Ed school: A brief for professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1993). *Inside outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1998). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In *Review of Research in Education*. A. Iran-Nejad & P.D. Pearson (Eds). Washington, DC: AERA. 249-305.

Cremin, L. (1957). *The republic and the school: Horace Mann on the education of free men*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dailey-Dickinson, R. (2000). A clinical educator: Redefining a teacher's role. In *Collaborative reform and other improbable dreams: The challenges of professional development schools*. M. Johnston, P. Brosnan, D. Cramer, T. Dove (Eds). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 43-52.

Dickens, C. (2000). Too valuable to be rejected, too different to be embraced: A critical review of school/university collaboration. In *Collaborative reform and other improbable dreams: The challenges of professional development schools.* M. Johnston, P. Brosnan, D. Cramer, T. Dove (Eds). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 21-42.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the city*. New York: Continuum.

Fullan, M. (1993) *Change forces: probing the depths of educational reform*. New York: Falmer Press.

Glass, R.D. (2001). Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and the foundations of liberation education. *Educational Researcher*. 30(2), 15-25.

Glass, R.D. (2000). Education and the ethics of democratic citizenship. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. 19(3), May, 275-296.

Goodlad, J.I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K.A. (Eds). (1990). *Places where teachers are taught*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gore, J. & Zeichner, K. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 7: 119-136.

Hammond, L. & Heredia, S. (2002) Fostering diversity through community service learning. *Service Learning Journal on Diversity*.

Hawthorne, R.D. (1997). Impact on colleges of education. In *Lessons from restructuring experiences: Stories of change in professional development schools*. N.E. Hoffman, W.M. Reed, & G.S. Rosenbluth (Eds). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 295-322.

Hecsh, J. (2001) Peculiar work in a peculiar profession: teacher's "work" in teacher preparation. Paper presented at American Anthropological Association Annual Conference, November.

Henig, J.R., Hula, R.C., Orr, M., & Pedescleaux, D.S. (1999). *The color of school reform: Race, politics, and the challenge of urban education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hoffman, N.E., Reed, W.M., & Rosenbluth, G.S. (Eds). (1997). *Lessons from restructuring experiences: Stories of change in professional development schools*. Albany, NY: State

University of New York Press.

Hoffman, N.E., Rosenbluth, G.S., & McCrory, K. (1997). The story of changing school-university relationships. In *Lessons from restructuring experiences: Stories of change in professional development schools*. N.E. Hoffman, W.M. Reed, & G.S. Rosenbluth (Eds). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 219-242.

Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Johnston, M., Brosnan, P., Cramer, D., Dove, T. (Eds). (2000). *Collaborative reform and other improbable dreams: The challenges of professional development schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Jones, C.L. & Hill, C. (1998). Strategy and tactics in subsystem protection: The politics of education reform in Montgomery County, Maryland. In *Changing urban education*. C.N.Stone (Ed). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press. 139-160.

Lewis, A.C., & Henderson, A.T. (1997). *Urgent message: Families crucial to school reform*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Education.

Lieberman, A. (1992). The meaning of scholarly activity and the building of community. *Educational Researcher*. 21(6), 5-12.

Lipman, P. (1998). *Race, class and power in school restructuring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Maeroff, G. I., Callan, P. M., & Usdan, M.D. (Eds). (2000). *The learning connection*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Martineau, P. (2001). Schools break new ground: Gardens offer hands-on lessons. *Sacramento Bee*. December 31, 2001, pp. B1 & B3.

Mills, G.E. (2000). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Murrell, P.C., Jr. (1998). *Like stone soup: The role of the professional development school in the renewal of urban schools*. Washington, DC: AACTE.

NCATE (2001). *Standards for Professional Development Schools. National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education*. http://www.ncate.org/standard/m_stds.htm

O'Cadiz, M.P., Wong, P.L., & Torres, C.A. (1998). *Education and democracy: Paulo Freire, social movements, and educational reform in São Paulo*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Quartz, K., Asis, C., Barraza-Lawrence, K. de Lissovoy, N., Franke, M., Gelbwachs, F., Goode, J., Hassan, L., Josephy, R., Kim, P., Lane, S., Lipton, M., Lopez-Torres, L., Metcalfe, E. L., Montano, T., Murray, N., Oakes, J., Obidah, J., Pacheco, M., Powell, A., Rogers, J., Stilman, J., Thomas, A., & Williams, R. (2001) *"Too angry to leave": supporting new teachers' commitment to transform urban schools*. Los Angeles: Center X and the Institute for Democracy, Education and Access, University of California, Los Angeles.

Reed, W.M., Ayersman, D.J., & Hoffman, N.E. (1997). The story of a changing role: teacher research in action. In *Lessons from restructuring experiences: Stories of change in professional development schools*. N.E. Hoffman, W.M. Reed, & G.S. Rosenbluth (Eds). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 109-140.

Sagor, R. (2000). *Guiding school improvement with action research*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Shive, J. (1997). Collaboration between K-12 schools and universities. In *Lessons from restructuring experiences: Stories of change in professional development schools*. N.E. Hoffman, W.M. Reed, & G.S. Rosenbluth (Eds). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 33-50.

Steel, S., Jenkins, R., & Colebank, D. (1997). The story of two changing teachers. In *Lessons from restructuring experiences: Stories of change in professional development schools*. N.E. Hoffman, W.M. Reed, & G.S. Rosenbluth (Eds). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 81-108.

Stone, C.N. (Ed). (1998a). *Changing urban education*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

Stone, C.N. (1998b). Urban education in political context. In *Changing urban education*. C.N.Stone (Ed). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press. 1-22.

Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: a century of school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wiseman, D.L., & Cooner, D. (1996). Discovering the power of collaboration: The impact of a school-university partnership on teaching. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 12(1), 18-28.