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ABSTRACT

The quality of public schools is, and has often been, the focus of political and economic discussions. These discussions have occurred at the local, state, and national levels where participants have been policymakers, members of the education profession, and members of the general public, including parents and students. In an effort to improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers and schools, laws have been enacted on the state and federal levels. These laws for quality teachers have not resulted in quality teachers. However, there is one example of school reform that focuses on the improvement and preparation of school faculty and teacher candidates that does work, the Professional Development School (PDS).

This study investigated, gathered, and organized information not previously available regarding the perceptions of teacher candidates (TC), school faculty (SF), and university faculty (UF) related to the effectiveness of the PDS partnership between Grant University (GU) and Adams Elementary School (AES). Although participants in the PDS perceived the partnership was successful, data had not been collected from the participants. Data were not available to assess whether or not the list of responsibilities for SF and UF presented in the AES/GU PDS Agreement were being completed.

A mixed-methods survey-methodology with the use of questionnaires provided breadth to the study. Semi-structured interviews and narrative responses substantiated and supported discoveries in data collected via the three survey instruments. The study describes the perceptions, both positive and negative, of teacher candidates, university,
and school faculty. As a result of this study, strategies to enhance and improve the PDS partnership were identified and shared with all interested PDS participants.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The quality of public schools is, and has often been, the focus of political and economic discussions. These discussions have occurred at the local, state, and national levels where participants have been policymakers, members of the education profession, and members of the general public, including parents and students. Darling-Hammond in Shroyer, Yahnke, Bennett and Dunn (2007) reported that teacher effectiveness in the classroom is an important variable as it relates to student learning. Similarly, Cochran-Smith (2006) related that, “over the past several years, a new consensus has emerged that teacher quality is one of the most, if not the most, significant factor in students’ achievement and educational improvement” (p. 106). As a result, it is logical for leaders in the political and educational world to express a demand for better classroom teachers in their efforts to improve the quality of schools. In pursuit of better teachers, laws have been enacted at the state and federal levels. An example is the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act.

A stated intent behind the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), known as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, was to lessen the achievement gap and provide all children with equal opportunities for a quality education. The framers of NCLB recognized the importance of quality
teachers and established expectations for education leaders at the state level. The federal law clearly identified these expectations in an effort to monitor the academic progress of students and the quality of teachers in the classrooms, also known as highly qualified teachers (HQT). The NCLB federal law states three criteria for determining if a teacher is highly qualified: 1) teacher earned a bachelor’s degree or higher in the subject taught, 2) teacher obtained a state teacher certification, and 3) teacher demonstrated knowledge in the subjects taught (NCLB, 2001). Providing documentation for the first two criteria, a teacher earned a bachelor’s degree or higher in the subject taught and teacher obtained a state teacher’s certification, was simple and straightforward. Documentation necessary for the third criterion was more complex and was subjected to varying interpretations. This third criterion, requiring teachers to substantiate or prove their knowledge of their teaching subject, had the purpose to ensure the public that teachers had been well-prepared to teach their subject areas. Chandler reported in the Washington Post (January 21, 2007) that the value and purpose of this criterion has been diminished because teachers have been allowed to demonstrate subject knowledge by use of vague, broad, and inconsistent interpretations that are selected from a menu of options.

This menu of options, referred to as the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) rubric, was designed by state departments of education with an understanding that performance criteria must be at or above the level established by the United States Department of Education (USDOE). Examples found in Indiana’s HOUSSE rubric included credit given to teachers for generating online or distance education, securing and implementing a grant, and earning an acceptable level of performance on written assessments (http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtmlB).
Interestingly, teachers’ time spent with an effective classroom teacher and/or in a clinical experience was not recognized on the Indiana HOUSSE rubric. The lack of value given to and lack of recognition of clinical experiences on the HOUSSE rubric was of great concern to the researcher because of well-documented studies about the positive influence of clinical experiences on the development of effective/quality teachers. Even though research studies have provided data about the importance of clinical experiences in the development of effective classroom teachers, this has been ignored by the designers of NCLB.

Both informal and formal discussions common among educators have focused on a legitimate concern that highly qualified teachers, as determined by NCLB criteria, are not always effective teachers in the classrooms. Such discussions have also occurred among persons not in the education world, including editorials or features in news publications across our country (Banchero, September 19, 2006; Chandler, January 21, 2007). To state this differently, enacting a law or policy to mandate for quality teachers did not necessarily translate into effective teachers; the law or policy was not designed using current research about the development of effective teachers.

Research has shown that one of the most powerful variables in closing the achievement gap is how the students are taught (Schmocker, 2006). Changes in the instructional practices in the classroom have been observed to be essential for improved student learning. Despite the link between the instructional practices of teachers and enhanced student learning, the improvement of school faculty or teacher candidate behavior in the classroom usually has not been a focus of school reform (Leonard, Lovelace-Taylor, Sanford-DeShields, Spearman, 2004). One notable exception in the
school reform agenda is the Professional Development School with a focus on the improvement of school faculty members, university faculty members, and the preparation of teacher candidates.

In Professional Development Schools, the preparation of teacher candidates is not the sole responsibility of the university. The K-12 schools and/or school districts share this responsibility with the local university. As a result, everyone has an opportunity to learn, although what is learned and how much is learned is unique for each participant. The anticipated outcomes of this enhanced teacher preparation program are improved school faculty members, university faculty members, and teacher candidates.

This study proposes a case study of Grant University’s Professional Development School partnership with Adams Elementary School (both names are pseudonyms) located in a mid-western state near a large metropolitan city. In the spring of 2005, one PDS co-chair from Grant University met with the school principal and lead teacher from Adams Elementary School to discuss a potential partnership. The representatives agreed to a PDS partnership for at least three years. In September, 2005, the PDS Agreement was signed by Grant University’s Dean of the School of Education, the Head of the Department of Teacher Preparation/PDS Co-Chair, and the second PDS Co-Chair. The Methods Instructor signed the Agreement in October, 2005. The PDS Agreement included a mission statement and listed responsibilities of the GU methods instructor (known as the university faculty in this study), the host teachers (referred to as the school faculty in this study), the PDS chair/co-chairs, and the school principal (see Appendix A for the agreement).
As a result of this signed agreement between the two schools, Adams Elementary School was identified as a PDS partner with Grant University. But, did the AES/GU PDS partnership meet the criterion of a PDS as defined and used for this study? (The definition used in this study is recorded on page 13.) Data were not available to answer this question. During an informal conversation between AES administration and Grant University’s PDS co-chairs on November 14, 2007, Grant University staff members referred to their collection of data from teacher candidates participating in the PDS partnership. Even though AES administration asked for GU’s data, it was not shared with AES staff members. Since data had not been collected by AES staff and because GU’s data results were not shared with AES staff members, data were not available to determine if the AES/GU partnership was an authentic partnership in design and function or a PDS partnership in name only.

Teacher candidates were enrolled in methods classes including a field experience component, not student teaching, at the university. During each fall and spring semester of the 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 school years, teacher candidates were assigned to AES as part of a field experience. The number of TCs visiting AES was different each semester, and the number of TCs ranged from 14 to 22 each semester. In addition, TCs were at AES during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years. This time period was before the Professional Development Agreement was signed. Bell, Brandon, and Weindhol (2007) of Grant University stated, “During these years, any school that hosted teacher candidates in methods courses was considered a PDS. Some schools were designated partners, whereas others were associates. No difference existed between these schools, other than the label and some sharing of resources” (p. 45). Because of this
statement by Bell, Brandon, and Weindhol, the researcher had thoughts to include the years of 2003-2004, 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 in the study. However, memories become polarized, and as a result, there is less confidence in data gathered far from the source (Dr. Jim Jones, personal communication, August 12, 2008). The researcher made the decision to gather data from only the 2005-2006, 2006-2007, and 2007-2008 school years. Data collected during spring of the 2007-2008 school year was part of a pilot study conducted by the researcher.

It was the practice of the partnership to assign TCs to be with a member of the school faculty at AES who, after attending a before-school faculty meeting with the university faculty members teaching the methods classes, volunteered to host teacher candidates. Due to large class sizes in the methods courses at the university, teacher candidates were often assigned to the classroom in a quantity of two or three TCs per classroom. At the beginning of each semester, teacher candidates attended classes at the university for six sessions before working in the classrooms at AES for ten sessions. The teacher candidates ended their semester back at the university under the direction of the university faculty.

In an effort to collect data from school faculty (SF) and university faculty (UF) members from AES and GU, they were invited to attend a self-evaluation collaborative meeting hosted by AES’s building principal in May, 2007. Six representatives from AES attended the meeting. Even though UF were invited to attend, no one was in attendance. During this meeting, the voluntary participants from the SF group in attendance used the NCATE Standards for Professional Development School rubric to discuss, reflect, and evaluate the current PDS partnership between AES and GU. The rubric included
guidelines used to determine the partnership’s level of development for each of the standards. The development levels on the rubric were: 1) Beginning, 2) Developing, 3) At Standard, and 4) Leading, for each of the five standards.

Through collaborative discussion and use of a consensus building model, the attending AES participants identified the development function of the five NCATE standards of the AES and GU partnership to be: 1) Learning Community Standard at Developing Level, 2) Accountability and Quality Assurance Standard at Developing Level, 3) Collaboration Standard at the Developing Level, 4) Diversity and Equity Standard at the Beginning Level; and 5) Structures, Resources, and Roles at the Developing Level.

The researcher assigned a numerical value to the level of development determined for each of the 5 standards in the self evaluation; that is, Beginning Level = 1, Developing Level = 2, At Standard Level = 3, Leading Level = 4. All development levels were averaged to compute one composite score pertaining to the development levels of the PDS. The mean score for the AES and GU partnership was 2.2 (X = 2.2), Developing Level, on the NCATE Standards for Professional Development (see Appendix B). At this time, information about the effectiveness of the AES/GU PDS was limited to this self-evaluation of the NCATE standards by members of the AES school faculty. The five NCATE standards with 21 sub-standards were: 1) Learning Community, 2) Accountability and Quality Assurance, 3) Collaboration, 4) Diversity and Equity, and 5) Structures, Resources, and Roles (see Appendix B for more detail).
Statement of the Problem

Although several participants perceived the partnership was successful, data had not been collected from school faculty, university faculty, and teacher candidates relating to the positive and negative attributes of the relationship, including the completion of the agreed-upon responsibilities listed on the PDS agreement and the existence of a common understanding of the phenomenon. Since data had not been collected by AES staff and GU’s data were not shared with AES, data were not available to determine if the AES/GU partnership was an authentic partnership in design and function or PDS in name only. This lack of knowledge by stakeholders appeared to encourage continuation of past practices, thus limiting the potential capacity for research based improvements in the PDS collaboration. As a result of this study, strategies to enhance the PDS partnership were identified and shared with all interested PDS participants, including participants in the AES/GU partnership.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to collect data from the three participating groups in an effort to create a more complete description of the PDS; to describe and understand more fully the perceptions, both positive and negative, of teacher candidates (TC), university faculty (UF), and school faculty (SF) as they relate to completing the agreed-upon responsibilities including a common understanding of PDS as outlined in the PDS Agreement between GU and AES. The collection of data was necessary because within two months after the formalized PDS partnership was established in September, 2005, AES’s school faculty members and administrative members inquired among themselves: were the expectations they agreed to fulfill, as stated in the PDS Agreement, being
realized? In other words, was everyone doing what they agreed to do? Data had not been collected to answer these questions.

Significance of the Study

Even though authors have contributed good work and added information to the PDS literature, data was collected from some, and not all, of the participants in these PDS studies. In a review of more than 30 studies by the researcher, it was noted that 16 studies collected data from only one of the PDS participant groups (Bullough, Kauchak, 1997; Castle, Rockwood, Tortora, 2008; Dana, Silva, 2002; Dana, Silva, Gimbert, Zembal-Saul, Tzur, Mule, Sanders, 2000; Dana, Silva, Snow-Gerono, 2002; Dana, Yendol-Hoppey, Snow-Gerono, 2005; Everett, Tichenor, 2004; Everett, Tichenor, Heins, 2003; Fickel, Jones, 2002; Fountain, Drummond, Senterfitt, 2000; Frey, 2002; Leonard, et. al, 2004; Linek, Fleener, Fazio, Raine, Dugan, Bolton, Williams, 2001; Rock, Levin, 2002; Snow-Gerono, Dana, Silva, 2001; Templeton, Johnson, Wan, Sattler, 2008). Eight studies gathered input from two of the three participant groups in the PDS partnership (Berg, Grisham, Jacobs, Mathison, 2000; Button, Ponticell, Johnson, 1996; Curtin, Baker, 2007; Daniel, Brindley, Rosselli, 2000; Horn, 2007; Levin, Rock, 2003; Sandholtz, Wasserman, 2001; vonEschenbach, Gile, 2007).

Only two studies evaluated the PDS through the lenses of all three participant groups in the PDS partnership (school faculty, university faculty, teacher candidate) (Mebane, Galassi, 2003; Shroyer, Yahnke, Bennett, Dunn, 2007). Other research studies gathered data as relates to the design model or compared PDS prepared TCs to non-PDS prepared TCs.
This study is significant because one unique phenomenon, the PDS partnership, was studied through the lenses of all participants (school faculty, university faculty, teacher candidates) participating in the PDS. Collecting and analyzing data from PDS participants yielded valuable information, and the results were shared with interested educators from GU and AES thus filling the void of information about the partnership. The study yielded data that were useful in the planning and designing of current and/or future PDS relationships with Grant University.

Research Questions

This study attempted to answer these five questions:

1. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?

2. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?

3. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

4. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

5. In what ways do TC recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities?

Delimitations

The participants in the study were limited to teacher candidates, university faculty, and school faculty actively involved in the PDS partnership between Grant
University and Adams Elementary School during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years.

Definitions

In the literature, a Professional Development School was often, but not always, defined to be a collaborative partnership between a university and a public school (grades PK-12) where the partnering institutions shared responsibility for: 1) the clinical preparation of new teachers, 2) the continued development of school and university faculty, and 3) research directed at the improvement of teaching and learning. Because of the many definitions and various structural designs in the PDS literature, it was difficult for the researcher to identify a common definition of the PDS partnership.

For the purpose of this study, the **Professional Development School** was defined using the following expectations as stated in the PDS Agreement between AES and GU:

This partnership will reflect the PDS mission* and, through the goals of quality, diversity, and collaboration, will include activities for pre-service teacher education, the continuing education of school and university educators, avenues for professional sharing, and active support of all students’ learning. (PDS Agreement)

*Professional Development Schools Mission Statement: The primary purpose of the Grant University (pseudonym) Professional Development Schools (PDS) initiative is to support a cooperative mission of reform in both pre-service (university) and in-service (school) education. (12/10/96)

The definition of others terms used in this study include:
**Teacher Candidate:**

For the pilot study: a student enrolled in education methods classes, not student teaching, at Grant University and participating in the field experience at Adams Elementary School.

For the study: a former teacher candidate enrolled in education methods classes, not student teaching, at Grant University and assigned to Adams Elementary School during a field experience.

**University faculty:**

For the pilot study: a university professor/instructor from Grant University supervising teacher candidates at Adams Elementary School with the following responsibilities as stated in the PDS Agreement: 1) provide GU teacher candidates with foundations in instruction, 2) work collaboratively with school staff to place teacher candidates, 3) assist in the supervision of teacher candidates, 4) clearly share course expectations with the school staff, 5) provide professional development support, as determined by school staff and administration, and 6) seek avenues for professional collaboration with site-based teachers.

For the study: a former university professor/instructor from Grant University with the same responsibilities as listed above.

**School faculty:**

For the pilot study: a K-4 grade or special needs teacher at Adams Elementary School participating in the PDS relationship with Grant University with the following responsibilities stated in the PDS Agreement: 1) provide time for teacher candidates to observe and work with children, 2) provide active feedback and support of the teacher
candidates, 3) provide feedback and input about the program and partnership, and 4) secure permission to video and audio record interactions between students and teacher candidates engaging in pedagogical approaches.

For the study: K-5 grade or special needs teacher at Adams Elementary School participating in the PDS relationship with Grant University with the same responsibilities as listed above.

**Student:**

For the pilot study: a K-4 student at Adams Elementary School in a classroom where school faculty participated in the PDS partnership between AES and GU.

For the study: a K-5 student at Adams Elementary School in a classroom where school faculty participated in the PDS partnership between AES and GU.

**Collaboration:**

For the pilot study and study: collaboration is defined as working together in an intellectual and reflective effort.

**Diversity:**

For the pilot study and study: diversity is defined as being different or diverse, including the special needs of all types of learners.

**Reflection:**

For the pilot study and study: reflection on teaching is defined to include the thinking and evaluating that follows any instructional event, and it is during this follow-up thinking that teachers consider if the lesson was effective or if learning goals were attained (Danielson, 2000).

A list of acronyms used in this study can be found in Appendix R.
Summary

Gathering pertinent information about an existing Professional Development School partnership between Grant University and Adams Elementary School was the focus of this study. Much effort and energy goes into maintaining an effective partnership between a university and a public school. It is beneficial to analyze and study partnerships so strengths and weaknesses can be identified, and the necessary adjustments or modifications may be made to the clinical learning experiences we are offering teacher candidates.

Driven by the federally mandated law NCLB, the accountability movement brought heightened attention to the quality of schools and teachers. Because there were increasing pressures on schools, including university teacher preparation programs, a collaborative partnership between schools and universities appeared to be beneficial in the effort to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs. As a result of this effort, competent and effective classroom teachers can deliver enhanced and enriched instruction to students to help improve the academic achievement of the students.

In past decades, commissions at the national level have called for the placement of qualified teachers in all classrooms in the United States. These reports made the statement that future teachers must be trained to teach in ways that are successful with students and their diverse needs.

Research supports the effectiveness of Professional Development School partnerships in meeting these needs. This study was proposed to describe and give evidence of the efforts of the specific PDS partnership between Grant University and Adams Elementary School to meet these needs.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Reviewing the literature provided a foundational understanding for the study from several perspectives. First, the literature review begins with a summary of the historical developments of PDS including the social issues surrounding, and ultimately, affecting PDS. A discussion of the importance of quality teachers and the ineffectiveness of NCLB to support quality teachers then follows. Succeeding this, there is discourse about practice in context, learning in context, and the importance of reflection. The chapter concludes by presenting information about the impact of the PDS partnership on teacher candidates, school faculty, and university faculty.

Historical and Social Development

Understanding the growth and development of Professional Development Schools (PDS) requires knowledge of the social and historical contexts underpinning it, giving the reader a better understanding of the progression, development, and refinement of the PDS.

In the mid-1800s, only the children, usually males, of wealthy and/or educated families continued to attend school past the eighth grade. Reformers, such as Horace Mann, were not accepting of this situation and wanted all children to have the
opportunity to receive such an education. By the early 1900s, a publicly supported education was available to all American children thanks to the efforts of the reformers. Unfortunately, this education was limited to the elementary level for a majority of young American children.

Changing demographics and needs of society caused a demand for more skilled workers as the 20th century progressed. In response to this demand, a secondary level of schooling was now required so most states enacted a compulsory attendance law for students up to the age of 16 (Thattai, 2007). Because public schools were clamoring for more teachers, universities were forced to decide between either preparing quality teacher candidates or producing a larger quantity of teacher candidates. In reacting to the sudden increased need for more teachers and simultaneously trying to remain financially viable, most universities chose to prepare a quantity of teachers with an accompanying emphasis on adequacy rather than quality. As a result of this endeavor to generate large numbers of teachers for the classrooms in a short amount of time, the overall quality of teacher preparation programs suffered.

John Dewey recognized the overall quality of teacher preparation programs was not progressive. Dewey proposed and initiated a laboratory school affiliated with the University of Chicago in 1899 (Joseph, Bravman, Windschitl, Mikel, Green, 2000). The school was administered jointly by leaders from the local public schools and colleges. The lab school was a site for research and the preparation of new teachers; a place where Dewey and his colleagues could practice, test, and scientifically evaluate their teaching theories. Dewey placed importance on knowledge, experience, practice (M. Levine, 1998a), and community (Joseph, et al., 2000). In Cultures of Curriculum (2000) the
authors shared this about Dewey’s laboratory school, “the school itself is seen as a community where all members have responsibilities and obligations to the whole rather than merely a place where lessons are learned” (p. 79). Dewey’s laboratory school journeyed beyond a place for discussion about educational theories and provided educators with a setting for application of the theories. Years later, this model has been touted by today’s critic as a model that should be used in the reform of teacher preparation models because of its clinical design (M. Levine, 1998). The value of Dewey’s clinical model was recognized by the medical world, and this training model continues to be used in many hospitals. Unfortunately, the value of the clinical model was not acknowledged by the educational world due to significant economic and international concerns that served to divert attention away from the schools.

These economic and international concerns included the issues of immigration, the migration of the southern rural poor to the northern industrial cities, the residual effects of World War I, the Depression, and the outbreak of World War II. During these difficult times, economic instability and depression created a need for multiple incomes. In many situations, the father or male image was not present in the household, and school-aged children stayed home to help the family. People were focused on their basic needs, and survival from one day to the next was their priority, not the quality of education. This continued for a time; then, suddenly, the focus changed.

With the launching of Sputnik in 1957, societal discontent and demands emerged that redirected the focus more urgently upon the quality of education. There was a shift by political leaders to mathematic and science education as they tried to protect America’s position as a superpower after Russia’s launch of Sputnik. Despite the focus
on math and science education by political leaders, the quality of education in the United States continued to decline. The added educational challenges of minority groups and individuals with disabilities coupled with teachers not trained to deal with these issues worsened the education system. Teacher quality was diminished even more when males with a limited interest in teaching entered the teaching profession in an effort to avoid the military draft during the Vietnam War.

The mediocrity of the educational system was addressed in 1983 when the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) issued a federal report, *A Nation at Risk*. This report created a controversy and became a point of debate for political candidates’ campaigns in the national and state elections being held at the time. On the heels of, and in response to, *A Nation at Risk*, the Holmes Group released its first report, *Tomorrow’s Teachers*. This report from the Holmes Group defined expectations for interactive teacher education based on an understanding of human development from a multicultural perspective (Tunks and Neopolitan, 2007).

Holmes Group

The Holmes Group consisted of nearly 100 research institutions in the United States joined together in a consortium to address education reform and the preparation of teachers for the classroom (M. Levine, 1998). It recognized that efforts to reform teacher education must be partnered with a goal that strives to “make schools better places for teachers to work and to learn” (Darling-Hammond, 1994, p. 2).

Following the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, thinking patterns emerged among the nation’s universities. One line of thought included several of the nation’s strongest universities planning to eliminate their schools of education. This elimination would
result in an opportunity for the university to strengthen other more “worthy” schools. The leaders from each university would select the “worthy” schools within their own universities (http://www.holmespartnership.org/newsletter.html, p. 2). Succinctly stated, the strongest schools withdrew their support of teacher preparation programs. This was yet another setback in overcoming the mediocrity found in education.

In response, the members of the Holmes Group were united with an interest in reversing this ominous trend. The 2nd Holmes’ publication, Tomorrow’s Schools, “envisioned a school-university-community partnership in which new teachers were mentored by expert professionals for the ultimate goal of affecting teaching and learning” (Tunks and Neopolitan, 2007, p. vii). In the 1980s, Professional Development Schools were a means to potentially revitalize teacher education and reform schools. In the PDSs, new knowledge could be tested, refined, and tested again. Then the best practices from these learning experiences could be shared with members of the larger education community. PDSs were often compared to the models used in teaching hospitals. This model was similar to Dewey’s progressive lab school model at the University of Chicago (Abdal-Haqq, 1998).

“In 1990, the Holmes Group defined and outlined a vision for PDS as a vehicle for teacher education reform and institutionalized change” (Leonard et al., 2004, p. 27). A Professional Development School was defined by the Holmes Group as an elementary, middle, or high school in partnership with a university to develop and demonstrate learning for students to: 1) provide practical and reflective preparation for novice teachers, 2) to offer new professional responsibilities for experienced educators, 3) and
to propose research projects focused on making schools more effective (Nelson, 1998). The members of the Holmes Group identified six principles to support and guide these partnerships and to serve as launching points for negotiations between schools and districts with an interest in a PDS (Leonard et al., 2004; Tunks and Neopolitan, 2007) (see Appendix C for the Six Principles).

By 1994 a count of the PDS partnerships, collected by the Clinical Schools Clearinghouse (CSC), reported that more than 78 colleges and universities had established partnerships with more than 300 individual pre K-12 sites nationwide (http://www.aacte.org/Programs/PDS/faqpds.aspx). More recent American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) data note that 125 or more colleges and universities were in PDS partnerships with 600 or more K-12 sites in the United States in 2004 (AACTE, 2008, p. 1). The proliferation of PDS in the 20th century, and into the 21st century, created concern because an indefinite number of PDS partnerships were PDS in name only, and nothing more. Behaviors, actions, and design frameworks were not reflective of the intended model of PDS. Upon this recognition, the Holmes Group restructured itself and became the Holmes Partnership, with new and more clearly defined goals for the universities, public schools, and national organizations (see Appendix D for Holmes Goals).

PDS Standards

Despite these more clearly defined goals, PDS continued to be a fragile innovation whose intrinsic flaws generated concern. It became apparent to members of the Holmes Partnership that the lack of more specific guidelines (or standards) hindered the integrity of the PDS movement. Between 1995 and 2001, the National Council for
Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), in alliance with the Holmes Group, began discussing standards as a way to rein in the PDS movement that was growing rapidly without a clearly stated design framework.

NCATE was founded by members from contemporary and significant education organizations: the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), National Education Association (NEA), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National School Boards Association (NSBA). The need for PDS quality and accountability assurances resulted in a multi-year project pioneered under the leadership of Marsha Levine (Levine, 2002). The report from the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, issued in 1996, included a recommendation for yearlong internships. Thus, this project was timely and of monumental importance in the PDS movement (Teitel, 2003).

Marsha Levine worked with many university faculty and school faculty members. Through this design process, draft standards were piloted, re-shaped, and adjusted accordingly. As a result of the multi-year project, and in an effort to ameliorate the accountability of PDS, five standards with 21 sub-standards (Appendix B) were identified and published in 2001 (M. Levine, 2002). Lee Teitel (2004) writes, “PDS standards were designed to do the hard work of both supporting PDS development and assessing PDS quality” (p. 1). Levine’s multi-year project, together with other PDS studies, brought about much learning related to the positive impact of a PDS. Levine in Educational Leadership (2002) summarizes it best by saying, “pre K-12 schools and universities would be wise to consider investing in PDS partnerships” (p. 65).
In the early 2000s, despite the important work of Levine in the development of the standards, there was a tendency to use the term Professional Development School to describe any school-university relationship that included the preparation of new teachers. As a result, in 2007, the Executive Council and Board of Directors of the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) issued a statement, *What it means to be a professional development school* (2007), in an effort to establish a common understanding of PDS. Participants in this were experienced with PDS partnerships in the P-16 (pre-school through senior year of college) continuum and included representatives from professional education associations such as the Holmes Partnership, AACTE, AERA, and National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) who were actively involved in the PDS initiative (NAPDS, April, 2008).

This NAPDS statement identified the Nine Essentials of a PDS (see Appendix E). NAPDS’s statement clearly sets the expectation that “without having all nine, the relationship that exists between a school/district and college/university, albeit however strong, would not be a PDS” (p. 2). Communicating a common understanding and stating expectations for PDSs was needed, and, as a result, “NAPDS believes the PDS movement will continue to establish itself as the preeminent model for partnerships between P-12 schools/districts and colleges/universities” (p. 9).

The demand for quality teachers continued into the 21st century and was referenced in the federal law, NCLB. Because of its clinical design, a PDS partnership that demonstrated the Nine Essentials could offer learning opportunities for the preparation of quality teachers.
NCLB and Quality Teachers

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 is a law with the explicit motive to bring quality teachers to the classrooms and, once in the classroom, to monitor the quality of these teachers. NCLB, a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, clearly established expectations for education leaders at state levels in an effort to monitor the quality of teachers, known as highly qualified teachers (HQT) (http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtmlA). Darling-Hammond and Berry made several observations concerning the ineffectiveness of the NCLB law in supporting the development of quality teachers. Their first observation is that the motive of NCLB, to deliver and monitor quality teachers in the classroom, is not accomplished by use of the three criteria identified in the federal law (Darling-Hammond and Berry, 2006) (see Appendix F for criteria). Second, in 2004, the law’s effectiveness was diminished even more when the United States Department of Education (USDOE) gave states permission to identify teachers as highly qualified “if they simply pass a test and earn a college major in a field closely related to the subjects they want to teach” (p. 17). Third, Darling-Hammond and Berry reported that the multiple choice tests in use were focused on basic skills or subject matter with almost none of the states evaluating “actual teaching skills or performance” (p. 17). Lastly, they reported the USDOE encouraged states to re-define certification, including the suggested elimination of teacher education coursework and/or student teaching, and other existing hurdles. After SF members earn a diploma from the university, they should continue learning through clinical experiences. A diploma is not enough. The NCLB criteria discussed above did not provide an opportunity for school faculty to experience learning and/or personal reflection. However, a PDS partnership
does provide an opportunity to experience learning and/or personal reflection through clinical experiences.

Arthur Levine, former president of Teachers’ College at Columbia University, New York, reached similar conclusions about the ineffectiveness of NCLB in his four year study of recent graduates. In a Chicago Tribune article authored by Banchero (September 19, 2006), Levine reported that a first year HQT teacher, Louise (pseudonym), on Chicago’s west side did not know how to properly handle discipline issues in her first year of teaching. The discipline issues ruined the entire school year for everyone. During a conversation with Dr. Levine, Louise reflected that additional college course work could not have prepared her to handle these discipline issues. She needed more time in the classroom to observe and learn from quality teachers. (Banchero, September 19, 2006).

Much frustration with NCLB has been voiced by non-educators, as well as educators. Michael Chandler posited his dissatisfaction with NCLB’s method of determining highly qualified teachers in an article found in the Washington Post (January 21, 2007). He observed that the regulatory definition of HQT varies from state to state. Therefore, states differ greatly in the quantity of coursework and/or testing required for individuals to become teachers who are highly qualified. This same observation was made by Darling-Hammond and Berry (2006). Furthermore, Chandler shares the example of Maria, a special education teacher with a provisional license who did not meet the state of Virginia’s expectation for HQT. After completing a master’s degree plus 30 graduate hours, she was deemed a HQT in the state of Virginia. On the other hand, if her transcripts and qualifications were transferred to the state of Maryland, Maria
would not be deemed highly qualified. Maryland would require Maria to take more professional coursework and pass standardized tests. Chandler (p. 8A) concludes, “Tougher rules are probably one reason Maryland reports lower rates of classrooms with highly qualified teachers: 79 percent in Maryland, compared with 95 percent in Virginia.”

Additionally, Maryland is the only state requiring that all teacher candidates must have PDS experience before they can be certified for the classroom (Davis, Garner, Schafer, Madden & Wittman, 2008). The lower percentage rate of HQT in Maryland may be interpreted to mean the following: 1) the state’s performance standard is too high, and fewer teacher candidates obtain this standard, 2) the required PDS experience is not effective in preparing HQT, or 3) the required PDS experience is the gatekeeper and filters out teacher candidates not having the needed quality, resulting in a fewer number of HQTs. Bowie, in the Baltimore Sun (August 15, 2008) reported information that had been recently released to the public by Maryland’s education officials. The officials reported that a greater percentage of elementary and middle schools met the federal achievement standards. The list of schools needing improvement under the NCLB guidelines decreased from 176 schools in 2007 to 160 schools in 2008.

NCLB’s three criteria for HQT do not give recognition for time spent with an effective classroom teacher and/or in a clinical experience. NCLB gives credit for coursework and testing, both which are non-clinical experiences when work is usually completed in isolation and/or alone. John Goodlad, in Schmocker (2006), reminded us that teacher isolation ensures that changes in teaching practices will be minimal due to lack of exposure to new learning. McTaggert’s research reported that teachers actually appreciated work that kept them isolated from other teachers (Trachtman, 2007). As
stated by Michal Fullan in *Leading in a culture of change* (2001), “It is one of life’s great ironies: schools are in the business of teaching and learning, yet they are terrible at learning from each other” (p. 92). This resulting isolation is usually defeating both to the students and their learning, and to teachers and their potential growth. The antithesis, and a critical attribute of a PDS as identified in the NCATE PDS Standards Project, is the nurturing of a true learning community capable of providing support for adult and child learning (Middleton, 2000). Middleton’s research states there is a shift from teaching in isolation to school-wide collaboration, learning, and communicating in a PDS.

**Contextual Practicing and Learning**

The vision of the PDS is to create, support, and sustain a community of learners focused on a kindergarten through university level (K-16) systemic renewal and continuous learning for all (Shroyer, Yahnke, Bennett & Dunn, 2003). Adults and children learn best in the context of practice, and a PDS partnership offers an opportunity to develop and use teaching skills in a context of practice (Trachtman, 2007). As stated in the NCATE Standards, learning in the context of practice can support the learning of P-12 students, teacher candidates, school faculty, and other professionals, such as university faculty (NCATE Standard I). Levine (2002) reported that at the center of a professional development school can be found the learning needs of students and teachers. “Professional Development Schools take teacher learning seriously by providing seminars, problem-solving groups, and mini-courses that focus on student work, student needs, teacher reflection and inquiry, and skills development” (p. 65). Because of its clinical design where learning is observed, reflected upon, evaluated, and
discussed, a PDS experience improves the learning opportunities for all: students, teacher candidates, school faculty, and university faculty.

A context of learning is analogous to a context of practice. Fullan (2002) reported, “Learning in context has the greatest potential payoff because it is more specific, situational, and social (it develops shared and collective knowledge and commitments)” (p. 20). Learning in context provides opportunities for absorbing knowledge from others, observing and retaining best practices, and offers an environment for continual learning. In a PDS this learning may occur with other participants in the partnership, including students, or individually through reflection.

Reflection

Reflections on teaching are defined to include the thinking and evaluating that follows any instructional event, and it is during this follow-up thinking that teachers consider if the lesson was effective or if learning goals were attained (Danielson, 2000). Danielson espoused that the “effects of reflection improve teaching” (p. 53). She reported,

One of the greatest gifts an experienced teacher can offer the profession is to serve as a mentor to a novice. By sharing acquired wisdom, the veteran can spare the beginner hours of time and countless occasions of self-doubt. By serving as a friendly critic or just a patient listener, the mentor can assist the novice in identifying those areas of teaching that will benefit most from focused attention. The mentor can help by analyzing the novice’s plans and classroom interactions and by making specific and substantive suggestions for improvement (Danielson, p. 55).
Studies have documented that reflection is observed in PDS partnerships. The PDS structure supports school faculty members being reflective about their effectiveness in the classroom and with teacher candidates (Levine, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 1994). Landsman, Moore, Simmons (2008) documented the relationship between individual reflection and PDS partnerships. The authors shared that SF members were reflective and created open and honest conversations with teacher candidates and other school faculty in an effort to improve themselves as teachers. The reflective SF wanted to know if students learned. It is not surprising that if students didn’t learn, then SF re-evaluated the instructional approach, and subsequently, changed what they taught.

In yet another study, this one conducted by Leonard et al., (2004) through an interview and questionnaire process, principals and teachers reported that “having teacher candidates from the university in the PDS encouraged classroom teachers to think more reflectively about their teaching practices” (p. 567). School faculty expanded the repertoire of practice by thinking through lessons, contemplating instruction, creating alternative approaches to instruction, and analyzing the results. Teacher candidates reported more reflection about their effectiveness in the classroom and in the partnership, as a whole.

The learning of SF members and TCs can be greatly enhanced through these reflective thought processes. The roles of teacher and learner became less clearly delineated with more fluidity and movement between the roles of teacher and learner.

Teacher Candidates

It is important to recognize that the quality and effectiveness of teachers is a decisive and influential factor for successful student achievement. Cochran-Smith (2006)
concluded that in recent years teacher quality has emerged as one of the most important factors supporting the achievement of students and the overall improvement of education. Darling-Hammond (2006) posited that there is growing evidence that teacher quality is particularly critical for students’ learning.

In *Results Now* (2006), Schmocker reported that Mortimore and Sammons reached a similar conclusion in their study; i.e., the quality of teaching or instruction had six to ten times more impact on student achievement compared to a combination of other factors. In yet another study, Eric Hanushek has documented that “five years of instruction from an above-average teacher could eliminate the achievement gap on some state assessments” (Schmocker, 2006, p. 9).

The literature review identified a strong relationship between PDS experiences and the preparation of teacher candidates to be quality classroom teachers (Shroyer et al., 2007; Levine, 2002; Nelson, 1998). Ziechner (2007) noted that research comparing teacher candidates in PDSs to teachers in non-PDSs indicated a higher rating of teaching effectiveness, stronger confidence and efficacy levels, and a superior skill to collaborate with colleagues. When compared to non-PDS teacher candidates, PDS teacher candidates spent more time reciprocally active with children (Houston, Hollis, Clay Ligons and Roff, 1999, cited in Everett et al., 2003). Levin and Rock (2003), using a qualitative approach, investigated teacher candidates participating in collaborative research projects while assigned to school faculty members in a PDS school. The authors reported that through this experience teacher candidates gained important insight about themselves as teachers, students, and their curriculum. Rock and Levin (2002) cite this same study in another educational journal. The authors reported the research project in the PDS
partnership helped the development of a meaningful and collaborative mentor-mentee relationship, and enhanced the interpersonal relationships in the PDS.

Marsha Levine (2002) declared that the needs of learners, both as students and teachers, are the focus of the professional development school where in-depth and long-term clinical experiences are offered to teacher candidates. Students in PDS classrooms had more “time on task, were more consistently on task, and frequently worked in small groups” (p. 66). In addition, learning was valued and was of great importance in a PDS. Learning may be supported by collaborative problem-solving focus groups, and mini-courses focused on the needs of students.

By using observations and other evaluation techniques, Lee Teitel (2004) reported on studies that compared PDS-prepared teacher candidates with non-PDS-prepared teacher candidates. On average, PDS trained teacher candidates were rated competent while the traditionally prepared TCs were consistently rated at novice and/or advanced beginner levels. A competent first year teacher, when compared to a novice or beginning level first year teacher, is farther ahead toward becoming the preferred quality teacher in the classroom.

The PDS model offers a clinical setting so TCs can learn and practice teaching with the assistance of experienced and trained mentors. A qualitative study by Snow-Geronon, et al., (2001) explored first-year teachers who had been a PDS teacher candidate and the impact of the PDS experience on their first year of teaching. Based on in-depth interviews…

The first year teachers in this study felt well prepared to handle the daily realities of teaching and learning. They were able to
focus on substantive issues of teaching rather than “surviving” each day. Attention was focused on matters of curriculum rather than matters of classroom management and discipline. Additionally, these first year teachers exhibit a strong sense of teacher self and confidence that enables them to share their focus on curriculum and the complexities of teaching with their peers (p. 46).

The review of the literature pointed out that PDSs reduce the attrition rate, or stated differently, PDS defrays the reduction in the number of teachers due to resignation. Teitel (2001) documented the attrition of almost 2000 teacher candidates who entered teaching after 1993 in the state of Texas. Approximately half of the teacher candidates experienced a PDS program, and the remaining were graduates of traditional teacher preparation programs. The attrition rate of the PDS graduates was one-third that of the graduates of traditional programs.

Data from the Maryland Department of Education presented at the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) conference in April, 2008, paralleled Teitel’s information from Texas. In Maryland’s class of 2001, 24 of the 34 (71%) PDS-prepared-teacher candidates continued in the classroom at the conclusion of their first year of teaching while 18 of 53 (34%) TC with non-PDS preparation planned to continue in the classroom at the conclusion of their first year teaching experience (Davis et al., 2008). This research data suggested to the researcher that PDS teacher candidates are better prepared for teaching when compared to non-PDS trained teacher candidates.

In their journey to be quality teachers, PDS experiences benefit and support teacher candidates because TCs are placed in the classroom with collaborative SF
members (Shroyer et al., 2007; Levine, 2002). The benefits continue and include the reforming and renewal of university faculty and school faculty members.

School Faculty

According to M. Levine (2002), after her multi-year project on the development of the PDS standards, school faculty benefits from a PDS partnership included the significant reduction in the teacher-to-student ratio and increased preparation time in the classroom for school faculty. Teacher candidates became a part of the staff and were giving help and assistance to students in the classroom. As did other researchers, Horn (2007) described the PDS model as a partnership where everyone can look for ways to help students. Jean Lythcott and Frank Schwart in Darling-Hammond (1994) observed more active learning opportunities in PDS classrooms with this model because of the increased number of teaching staff to help with small group activities. There were increased opportunities for academic stimulation, and more freedom to make mistakes and try again. Ultimately, the discussion and evaluation of these mistakes, also known as reflection, was turned into a learning experience.

Everett et al., (2003) posited that school faculty members participating in a PDS in Nevada reported the PDS partnership offered an experience that changed their instruction, their reflection on practice, and their conception of collegial work. In yet another study (Leonard et al., 2004), principals and teachers from seven schools involved in a PDS partnership with the University of Utah were interviewed and were asked to complete a questionnaire about the successes and failures of the PDS. The study indicated that, “Results of the interviews showed that having teacher candidates from the university in the PDS encouraged classroom teachers (school faculty) to think more
reflectively about their teaching practices” (p. 567). Some of the challenges for school faculty as noted in the University of Utah study were: 1) the added demands of the PDS partnership, 2) lack of administrative support, and 3) development of a vision that was understood by and supported the needs of all participants. Furthermore, Rafferty (1993) observed that work in a PDS was more demanding in partnering schools because partnering schools: 1) required greater levels of content knowledge and pedagogical expertise, 2) had higher expectations, 3) promoted and encouraged collaboration, and 4) promoted ongoing faculty reflection.

The rapid expansion of knowledge in the 20th century and early 21st century highlights the multitude of changes that have occurred in education since many veteran SF members attended college and received their educational training (Danielson, 1996). These changes include an awareness of current educational research, advanced developments in pedagogy, and best practice strategies to guide students in learning. In a PDS partnership, veteran school faculty members have an opportunity to learn more about current research in the theory and practice of teaching as they work with novice TCs in their PDS classrooms.

University Faculty

The literature conveys that in a PDS everyone has an opportunity to learn, although what is learned and how much is learned is unique for each participant. Levine (2002) reported that PDS partnerships are important for university faculty because through these partnerships university faculty have an opportunity to gain as much knowledge as anyone else. PDS partnerships can bring together the knowledge, skills, and possible resources from universities and pre K-12 institutions with a collective
impact on the design and implementation of teacher preparation programs (Trachtman, 2007). Through discussions among members of school faculty, it is not unusual to find a substantial difference between the university’s preparation of TCs for the classroom and the current teaching practice(s) used in the school. This substantial difference is referred to as the disconnect (Dr. Roger Brindley, personal communication, October 26, 2007).

At the University of Utah, Bullough and Kauchak (1997) conducted a study of seven current and former PDS sites using data from interviews to identify the strengths and concerns of the University’s programs. Included in the interviews were the tenure-line university faculty, non-tenure track university faculty, and the clinical university faculty.

In this study, tenure-line faculty members are assigned to teach 67% of the elementary education courses and 48% of the education courses at the secondary level. However, the tenure-line faculty teacher participation falls to zero for the field-intensive sources, such as methods classes and student teaching. Bullough et al., (1997) reported that tenure-line faculty members “expressed deep concern about the perceived high costs of continued investment in PDSs” because PDSs are costly, expensive, and weaken other areas such as the scholarship and graduate programs (p. 87). They called for a decrease in the number of PDSs.

A second group from the university, the non-tenure track (also known as field-focused researchers) had both extensive experience in teacher education and past experience in PDSs. Generally, they agreed the program had not generated collaborative research. (Per Bullough et al., this should not be a surprise since tenure-faculty turned PDS over to clinical faculty from whom research is not expected.) Similar to the thinking
of tenure-line faculty, non-tenure track faculty agreed the program quality suffers as “conceptual and theoretical rigor lose out to practicality” (p. 91). The non-tenure track had ambivalent attitudes toward clinical faculty. They defined clinical faculty as hardworking teachers; teachers who had freed up time so the tenure-track faculty can publish more. Yet at the same time, they were concerned with the ability of clinical faculty to run a good PDS partnership without the help of tenure-line faculty.

The clinical faculty devoted most of their time to undergraduate level instruction and viewed their contributions to the PDS partnership as good. Members of the clinical faculty expressed concerns because the PDS partnership existed without tenure-line faculty. Clinical faculty had expected higher levels of commitment to the PDS from tenure-line faculty. This difficulty of blending school and university cultures, and overcoming the disconnect, is not a new challenge. In Levine’s *Designing standards that work* published in 1998, Stoddart chronicled PDS as a way these differences, including the tensions that historically exist between universities and schools, can be resolved.

**Summary**

Reviewing the literature provided a foundational understanding for this study from several perspectives. These perspectives included historical developments, social issues, legal areas, and the proliferation of PDSs. The inability of NCLB to posture quality teachers was glaring. A discussion of the ineffectiveness of NCLB to support quality teachers, including the importance of quality teachers, was followed by research supporting the value of a PDS to provide the opportunity for practicing and learning in context and reflection. The literature review concluded with research as it relates to the impact of PDS on school faculty, teacher candidates, and university faculty.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter includes: a statement of the purpose of the study, description of the study and the research model, descriptive information about Adams Elementary School and Grant University, details about the study, and a description of sample groups and the instruments used in the study. The researcher describes the modifications made to the survey instrument after the pilot study was conducted, and the data collection procedures that were followed.

The purpose of this study was to collect data from the three participating groups in an effort to create a more complete description of the PDS; to describe and more fully understand the perceptions, both negative and positive, of teacher candidates (TC), university faculty members (UF), and school faculty members (SF) as they relate to the connection between observed practices in the partnership and the stated objectives found in the PDS Agreement between Grant University (GU) and Adams Elementary School (AES).

At the time of the study, Adams Elementary School was a suburban K-4 elementary school located near a large metropolitan city in a mid-western state. AES was fully accredited by the state’s Department of Education, and the school made adequate yearly progress (AYP) in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007. The student
population was 598 students and 24 teachers, kindergarten through grade 4 and special needs. The student population was predominantly Caucasian (83%) with 10% Hispanic, 3% Multiracial, 3% Asian, and 1% Black. Approximately 9% of the student population qualified for free and reduced lunch, and 22% received special education services through the local special education cooperative. The average teacher age was 39 years. A professor from Grant University, also a member of the University’s PDS Committee, supervised student teachers at Adams Elementary School during past school years. During her observations and visits to Adams School, the university faculty member observed a safe, enriching, and collaborative learning community at Adams. Based on the experiences of this SF member, Grant University’s PDS faculty members were interested in a PDS partnership with the SF at Adams Elementary School.

Grant University was the largest university in the northwest section of a state in the midwest and offered degrees at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The University’s School of Education partnered with five elementary schools, one middle school, two high schools, and was NCATE accredited.

Teachers at AES had partnered with GU for several years. AES faculty hosted teacher candidates during the 2003-2004 school year and again during the 2004-2005, 2005-2006 school years. During the closing days of the 2004-2005 school year, representatives of AES and GU discussed a potential PDS partnership. In September, 2005, these same representatives arranged to sign an agreement for a three year PDS partnership. Before the agreement was signed, a consensus decision making model was used by the school administration so all AES teachers had an opportunity to be included in the decision to form this PDS partnership with GU. The researcher was principal of
AES during the time of case study and had been actively involved in the PDS partnership since its informal beginning in 2003-2004.

Lack of information related to the perceptions of pertinent personnel sources appeared to encourage both effective and non-effective practices at the PDS site. The intended result of this study was to have data available for use so data-driven decisions could be made in an effort to improve the partnership.

The research questions guiding the collection of data were:

1. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?
2. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?
3. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing development in teaching, learning, and professional sharing?
4. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing development in teaching, learning, and professional sharing?
5. In what ways do TC recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities?

Research Design and Methodology

Case Study

After identifying the purpose of the study, the researcher reviewed research options. According to Gay, Mills, Airasian (2006, p. 595), a case study is an in-depth investigation of one unit; an individual group, institution, organization, program or document. Aligning this definition with the purpose of the study, this in-depth
Investigation was to describe and know more about the effects, both positive and negative of one unit, the PDS partnership between GU and AES. To explore and understand the topics and questions of this research project, it was determined that a case study design with a phenomenological perspective using mixed-methods survey methodologies would be the most appropriate model to answer the questions of this study.

A phenomenological approach “attempts to understand people’s perceptions, perspectives, and understandings of a situation or phenomenon” (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005, p. 139). Since this study looked at the differing perceptions of participants in a collaborative partnership between a public school and a university school of education, and influenced by the researcher’s understanding of phenomenology, a phenomenological strand was deemed appropriate.

Survey Methodology

A mixed-methods survey methodology with the use of questionnaires provided a breadth to the study, and semi-structured interviews brought a depth of understanding to the study. According to Gay et al., (2006) mixed-method research designs integrate both qualitative and quantitative survey methods by mixing data results in a single study. Gay et al., state that qualitative research is the “collection, analysis, and interpretation of comprehensive narrative and visual data in order to gain insights into a particular phenomenon of interest.” Quantitative research is the “collection of numerical data in order to explain, predict and/or control phenomena of interest” (Gay et al., 2006).

The three types of mixed methods are: QUAL-quan, QUAN-qual, and QUAN-QUAL. In the QUAL-quan model, there is an emphasis on qualitative data, and qualitative data are collected before the quantitative data. When using the QUAN-qual
model, quantitative data are more heavily weighted than qualitative and are collected first. The third model is the QUAN-QUAL model. In this model the quantitative and qualitative data are “equally weighted and are collected concurrently throughout the same study; data are not collected in separate studies or distinct phases” (Gay et al., 2006, p. 491). The QUAN-QUAL model was used in this study.

Charles and Mertler (2002) suggested that cross-sectional surveys collect data from differing segments of the population at a specific time showing the perceptions of those segments of the population. The collection of data from three population groups (school faculty, teacher candidates, and university faculty) from a span of two years, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007, brings thoroughness to a study. Thoroughness of the study was significant to the researcher because results would be used to guide the modifications and adjustments of the PDS partnership.

Per Leedy and Ormrod (2005), focus groups are especially helpful when limited time is allowed for the study. In an effort to interview several participants simultaneously, focus groups were identified for the SF, TC, and UF sample groups.

**Sampling**

Purposive or judgment sampling, defined as intentional selection of sample groups determined by specific criterion, was used by the researcher (Gay, et al., 2006; Charles and Mertler, 2002; Leedy and Ormrod, 2005). The criterion used to purposively identify members of the SF population for the SF sample group was their participation in the PDS relationship during the 2005-2006 and/or 2006-2007 school years. For the pilot study, data was collected from the PDS participants during the second semester of the 2007-2008 school year. By using this same criterion, participation in PDS, members of
the TC and UF population were identified for the TC and UF sample groups, respectively.

A pilot study was conducted by the researcher in the 2nd semester of the 2007-2008 school year. The researcher used purposive sampling with the same criterion, participation in the AES and GU PDS partnership, to identify members for the sample groups. The TC sample group was 100% of the TC population (N = 29, n = 29). Similarly, 100% of the UF was identified for the UF sample group (N = 2, n = 2). The SF sample group was 16 (n = 16) and the SF population was 24 (N = 24).

Triangulation, Validity, and Reliability

Triangulation is defined as the use of multiple data sources by the researcher in an effort to address the issues of trustworthiness, including validity and reliability. Triangulation provides an additional level of protection from biases. It is less likely that “data derived from different sources and data collection strategies will all be biased in the same, unnoticed way” (Gay et al., 2006, p. 424). The multiple data sources used were survey questionnaires administered to teacher candidates, school faculty members, university faculty members, the use of a Likert scale on the questionnaire, and semi-structured interviews with three focus groups (Charles and Mertler, 2002).

Two threats to the validity of interview studies are observer bias and observer effect. Known as observer bias, a situation may be interpreted differently through the eyes of a different researcher. Because some participants were under the direct supervision of the researcher, the dean of students at Adams Elementary School moderated the focus groups. In this study, the moderator minimized the effect of observer bias on the results of the study through self-reflection and an awareness of her
personal biases. Observer effect describes a situation that may have been different if the researcher was not present (Gay et al., 2006). In an effort to diminish observer effect, the moderator was as unassuming and non-threatening as possible. The moderator practiced interview techniques with colleagues and reviewed the interviewing guidelines suggested by experts in research (Gay et al., 2006; Leedy and Ormord, 2005; Patton, 2003).

Pilot Study

In May, 2008, the three proposed questionnaires were issued to and responses were collected from school faculty members at AES, teacher candidates from GU, and school faculty members from GU. This collection of data was in the format of a pilot study. Additionally, 30 minute interview sessions were scheduled with members of the school faculty focus group, the teacher candidate focus group, and the university faculty focus group.

Description of Sample for Pilot Study

During the time of the pilot study, the SF at AES was at 24 kindergarten through grade 4 and special needs. School faculty had signed a teacher’s contract for a full-time teaching position in the 2007-2008 school year. To be included in the SF sample group, the school faculty member hosted a teacher candidate during the spring semester of the 2007-2008 school year. The SF sample group (n = 14) was purposively identified from the SF population (N = 24). Grade 5 teachers were assigned to AES during 1st semester, 2007-2008, and both semesters of the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. During December, 2007, 5th grade teachers and students were re-districted from AES to a local middle school due to student population increases. The pilot study in 2nd semester of the 2007-2008 school year did not include grade 5 teachers.
University faculty members were contracted by GU to instruct primary literacy and diverse learner classes. The UF population was two, and 100% of the UF population was identified for the UF sample groups (N = 2, n = 2). Teacher candidates were third year students in the university and had been admitted to the school of education. The teacher candidate population was 29 students. All members of the TC population (N = 29) were identified for the TC sample group (n = 29).

Description of Instruments

A mixed methods survey methodology with the use of questionnaires provided breadth to the pilot, and semi-structured interviews brought a depth of understanding to the pilot study.

Questionnaire for Pilot Study

Questionnaires used in the pilot study were based on the work of Dr. Nancy Dana, University of Florida. Permission to use her work is in Appendix G.

Charles and Mertler (2002) wrote that cross-sectional surveys collect data from different segments of the population at a specific time and show the perceptions of those segments of the populations. The questionnaires used in the pilot study were similar in construction but included individualized questions corresponding with the three sample groups from UF, SF, and TCs. Section 1 of the questionnaire for the pilot study was 47 Likert type questions with responses from 5 (five) to 1 (one); numerical values were assigned as follows: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neutral, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree, and NA = not applicable. Three open-ended questions were placed within the Likert-type questions. The insertion of the narrative questions was intended to disrupt an automatic response behavior in the interviewees. Members of the expert panel agreed
with the placement of narrative questions within the Likert-type questions. Section 2 of
the questionnaires used in the pilot study solicited demographic information from TCs,
SF, and UF about the respondent’s grade level (as appropriate), gender, age, years of
experience, and number of years participating in the PDS relationship between Grant
University and Adams Elementary School. For the purpose of this pilot study, the 2007-
2008 school year was considered year one.

Validity and Reliability for Pilot Study

Validity is the degree to which something measures what it purports to measure,
and reliability is the consistency with which something measures over time (Gay et al.,
2006). The validity and reliability of the questionnaires for the pilot study were
monitored with advice from an expert panel of five college professors/instructors with
PDS experience: Dr. Tallent, former Director of PDS at Grant University; Dr. Wartman,
Professor and former PDS Instructor at Grant University; Mrs. Hopkins, Instructor of
PDS class at Grant University; Dr. Geisen, Instructor of PDS classes at Grant University
(all are pseudonyms), and Dr. Nancy Dana, Professor, University of Florida.

The first draft of the questionnaires for the pilot study was submitted to members
of the expert panel, and changes were recommended by one member. The suggestion
was to re-evaluate the length of the questionnaire and to re-locate the narrative questions
to the end of the questionnaires. These suggested changes were analyzed by the
researcher for their impact on the data being gathered. The suggestions were discussed
with three members of the expert panel. As a result of this discussion, no modifications
were made by the researcher. Members of the expert panel were asked to review the
survey instruments a second time after typographical and clerical errors had been removed.

In addition, the reliability of the questionnaires for the pilot study was validated by three school faculty from AES with PDS experience. Pilot study questionnaires were administered to the three SF members, and, after two weeks, the questionnaires were re-administered to them. The researcher found no significant difference in the pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire responses. Guidelines for use in developing and presenting questionnaires were studied by the researcher (Gay et al., 2006; Leedy and Ormrod, 2005; Charles and Mertler, 2002). The next step was to submit the study to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University (BSU) (see Appendix H). As a result of the IRB’s review of the questionnaire a letter of introduction was attached to the questionnaire that included: IRB contact information, information that participation in the study is voluntary, participants can withdraw at any time, and the information that there are no known risks to participants in the study.

Semi-Structured Interviews for Pilot Study

The questions for the interview sessions in the pilot study were based on the work of Dr. Nancy Dana, University of Florida (see Appendix G) and were designed with the assistance of educators with previous and/or current experience in a PDS partnership. The educators selected were: Dr. Tallent, former Director of PDS at Grant University; Dr. Wartman, Professor and former PDS Instructor at Grant University; Mrs. Hopkins, Instructor of PDS classes at Grant University; Dr. Geisen, Professor and Instructor of PDS classes at Grant University (all are pseudonyms), and Dr. Nancy Dana, Professor, University of Florida. These professionals assisted the researcher in the design of clearly
worded questions focused on the topic. Suggested modifications were analyzed by the researcher for their impact on the gathering of essential data. Suggestions included the re-wording of a section of the protocol so participants could be more reflective in their answers (see Appendix G).

Because some of the participants in the pilot study were under the direct supervision of the researcher, another person, not the researcher, hosted the focus group sessions in the pilot study. As a result of this substitution, these parties would feel more comfortable and willing to provide voluntary information. A letter of introduction was attached to the protocol that included: IRB contact information, information that participation is voluntary and participants can withdraw at any time, and information that there were no known risks to study participants. The focus groups in the pilot study were moderated by the dean of students at Adams Elementary School.

Data Collection for Pilot Study

The questionnaires for use in the pilot study were distributed to members of the teacher candidate group, the school faculty group, and the university faculty group. These questionnaires were similar in design but included personalized questions that aligned with the UF, SF, and TC sample groups. In an effort to organize the data, questionnaires were color coded: teacher candidates on salmon paper, university faculty members on yellow paper, and school faculty members on buff paper.

SF members participating in the pilot study were employed at AES, and each participating SF received a questionnaire in the SF’s mailbox at AES on Monday, May 5, 2008. TCs had been assigned to AES during the second semester of the 2007-2008 school year and received their pilot study questionnaire at the conclusion of an
instructional session at GU on Thursday, May 1, 2008. UF received their pilot study questionnaire at the conclusion of this same instructional session at GU on Thursday, May 1, 2008. A cover letter was attached to the pilot study questionnaires given to SF, TC, and UF members. Cover letters stated that participation was voluntary and responses were anonymous. The letter included the contact information for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University, and it stated the willingness of the researcher to share the results of the study with participants, if participants requested the results.

SF participants in the pilot study were asked to return questionnaires to the researcher’s mailbox in the mailroom at AES by Friday, May 16, 2008. TC participants in the pilot study were asked to return their completed questionnaires by placing them in the large manila envelope on the lectern in their classroom at GU at the conclusion of the instructional session on May 1, 2008. UF were asked to return their questionnaires for the pilot study with the use of an enclosed, stamped, addressed envelope by Friday, May 16, 2008. All questionnaires used in the pilot study were color-coded by sample groups, but no other coding was used in an effort to provide anonymity for the participants. A follow up reminder letter was emailed to all SF and UF participants.

Qualitative data in the pilot study were collected by the use of semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews are face-to-face interview sessions using questions selected for use in the interview before the interview occurs (Gay et al., 2006). Because of time constraints, the researcher made the effort to schedule interviews so several participants could meet together simultaneously. During the pilot study, SF members were invited to participate in semi-structured interview sessions and were identified as Focus Group 1. Members of the TC sample group were invited to
participate in semi-structured interview sessions with an identification label of Focus Group 2. Members of the UF sample group were invited to participate in the semi-structured interview sessions and were labeled Focus Group 3.

The participating members of the pilot study from the SF sample group received a letter of introduction attached to the protocol in the SF mailbox at AES on Monday, May 5, 2008. Members of the pilot study from the TC and UF groups received a letter of introduction to the interview sessions including a copy of the protocol at the conclusion of their instructional session at the university on Thursday, May 1, 2008. The letter of introduction, attached to the protocols for the three sample groups, stated that participation was voluntary and responses would remain anonymous. The letter also listed the contact information for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University. Interview sessions that were 30 minutes in length were scheduled with SF, TCs, and SF members willing to voluntarily participate in the interview sessions during the pilot study. Two interview sessions were scheduled, and participants were asked to attend one of the two scheduled sessions.

The dean of students at AES was moderator of the focus group sessions for the pilot study. Before semi-structured interviews were held, the dean of students finished the on-line tutorial for the Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams. Also, before the semi-structured interviews began on the scheduled dates, the moderator took time to establish rapport with the interviewees in the pilot study and explained the purpose of the study. The moderator assured the interviewees that their responses would remain anonymous. Gay et al., (2006) suggested that responses made during the
The interviewer reviewed Patton’s suggestions for interviewing found in his book *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (2002). The interviewer had a written protocol or guide for use during the semi-structured interview sessions with the voluntary participants in the pilot study. The written protocol included a list of questions, an order for the questions, and delineated the amount of additional prompting that was permitted. Clear and detailed notes for use during the interview assisted the researcher in the gathering of standardized and comparable data. The interview sessions during the pilot study were limited to 30 minutes, and interview questions were worded clearly.

The researcher contracted with an unbiased and trained transcriber who transcribed the recorded interview sessions for the pilot study, indicating the date and name of the interviewed sample group (Gay et al., 2006). The transcripts were reviewed for accuracy with the assistance of a PDS colleague.

*Data Analysis for Pilot Study*

Data from the returned questionnaires in the pilot study were processed when the questionnaires were received. The individual participant responses were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 15.0 for Windows and coded such that values of strongly disagree were coded as one, disagree was coded as two,
neutral was coded as three, agree was coded as four, and strongly agree was coded as five. All responses were anonymous. Since all of the items were phrased in a positive fashion, higher ratings were consistently associated with more positive perceptions and, therefore, none of the items needed to be reverse scored prior to further analysis. All survey items were analyzed via frequencies based on the role of the participants in the PDS partnership: school faculty member, teacher candidate, or university faculty member.

In addition, all survey items used in the pilot study were averaged to compute one composite survey score pertaining to the participants’ perceptions regarding the PDS. The composite score was summarized using descriptive statistics, such as mean and standard deviation, for each of the three participant groups. In order to display the distributional characteristics of the composite score, a histogram was constructed for each group.

The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to data from the pilot study to see if significant differences existed between mean scores of the three groups of respondents. As stated by Gay et al., (2006), “ANOVA is a parametric test of significance used to determine whether a significant difference exists between two or more means at a probability level. Thus, for a study involving three groups, ANOVA is the appropriate analysis technique” (2006, p. 359). Also, the ANOVA was considered appropriate due to the continuous nature of the dependent variable, the composite PDS survey score. Furthermore, since only one composite score was being used for statistical significance testing, an ANOVA was chosen instead of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Statistical significance was set at an alpha level of $p \leq .05$. 
An analysis of the responses to the TC, SF, and UF pilot questionnaires showed excellent reliability ($r = 0.94$) on Cronbach’s alpha. Therefore, the questionnaires had high inter-item reliability and internal consistency. The questionnaires were determined to be reliable and appropriate documents by the researcher and members of the expert panel.

The large body of information from the transcribed focus group interviews in the pilot study was sorted and categorized. Underlying and abstract themes were identified. The identified themes were reflection, learning, collaboration, communication, and productive handling of conflict. Creswell’s steps in the data analysis spiral approach were followed. Creswell’s suggestions, as reported by Leedy and Ormrod are: 1) organization of data (filing or creating a computer database), 2) perusal (getting an overall sense of the data and jotting down preliminary interpretations), 3) classification (grouping the data into categories or themes, finding meanings in the data), and 4) synthesis (offering hypothesis or propositions, constructing tables, diagrams, hierarchies) (2005, p. 151).

**After the Pilot Study**

The researcher met with members of her proposal committee at Ball State University in July, 2008. The members were: Dr. William Sharp, Educational Leadership; Dr. Marilyn Quick, Educational Leadership; Dr. Barbara Graham, School of Education; and Associate Professor Carla Corbin, College of Architecture and Planning. The members of the proposal committee recommended the researcher not limit the study to one semester, but broaden and expand the study to include all participants in the PDS partnership after the signing of the PDS agreement in fall, 2005. The proposal committee members also recommended the use of an abridged questionnaire. The
researcher made contact with Dr. Jim Jones, Ball State University, for his guidance in editing of the questionnaires and the interview protocols. As a result, questionnaires and questions for the semi-structured interviews were abridged, reviewed by members of the proposal committee, and emailed to Ball State University’s Institutional Review Board for their review. In addition, the researcher made a modification request to IRB (see Appendix I).

Initially the research question included: What are the positive benefits of the PDS partnership experience between Grant University and Adams Elementary School; and, in what ways do the positive benefits vary when viewed through the lenses of participants having different roles in the partnership. This was removed from the pilot study because exact statements were not posed uniformly across the participating groups, and the three participating groups could only be compared on a few items. The researcher made the decision to compare the overall perceptions of the three groups through descriptive statistics and the use of qualitative and inductive judgments about how the groups compared.

As a result of this modification, the research questions guiding the collection of data were directly aligned with the definition of the Professional Development School as stated in the AES/GU PDS Agreement.

1. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?

2. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?
3. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

4. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

5. In what ways do TCs recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities?

Sample Groups After the Pilot Study

During the time of the study, the school faculty averaged 18 at AES during the four semesters of the study. School faculty had signed a teacher’s contract for a full-time teaching position in the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. The SF sample group (n = 18) was purposively identified from the SF population (N = 24). University faculty members were contracted by GU to instruct primary literacy or intermediate literacy classes. The UF population was six, and 100% of the UF population was identified for the UF sample groups.

The members of the teacher candidate sample group were former TCs assigned to AES during one semester of the 2005-2006 or 2006-2007 school year. As a result, the definition of teacher candidate changed slightly from the definition used in the pilot study. A teacher candidate was a student enrolled in education methods classes, not student teaching, at Grant University and participating in the field experience at Adams Elementary School during the 2005-2006 or 2006-2007 school year. It was not possible for the researcher to locate all TCs, and as a result, the TC population was 39 students. Thirty-nine TCs were located, and all were included in the TC sample group (n = 39).
Instruments

The survey instrument for the school faculty consisted of a three-part questionnaire asking for their perceptions regarding the AES/GU PDS partnership. Part one of the questionnaire included 27 Likert-type statements. The 27 statements were repeated four times: Fall 2005-2006, Spring 2005-2006, Fall 2006-2007, and Spring 2006-2007. SF members were asked to respond to the statement(s) in the semester(s) when and if the SF member hosted a TC. The second part of the survey instrument contained three open-ended questions. The open-ended questions asked: 1) What should a PDS partnership look like; 2) What is the greatest strength of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES; and 3) How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES? The third section of the questionnaire asked for demographic information from the school faculty (see Appendix J).

The UF questionnaire had 27 Likert-type statements in section 1. Section 2 asked the same three narrative questions that were asked in the SF questionnaire. Section 3 asked for specific demographic information from UF (see Appendix J).

There were 21 Likert-type statements in section one of the questionnaire developed for the former teacher candidate sample group. The narrative questions in section three were an exact replication of the narrative questions found in the UF and SF questionnaires. Section 3 asked the former TCs for specific demographic information (see Appendix J).
Data Collection

The questionnaires were similar in design but included personalized questions aligned with the UF, SF, and TC sample groups. In an effort to organize the data, questionnaires were colored coded.

School faculty members participating in the study were employed by AES during the 2005-2006 or 2006-2007 school years and hosted a TC from Grant University. Each participating SF received a questionnaire in their mailbox at Adams Elementary School on Monday, December 1, 2008. The school faculty questionnaire was divided into four sections; section 1 represented the fall 2005-2006 PDS, section 2 represented the spring 2005-2006 PDS, section 3 represented the fall 2006-2007 PDS, and section 4 denoted spring 2006-2007 PDS. School faculty members were asked to complete the section(s) when he/she participated in the PDS partnership. A voluntary “coffee and doughnut” explanation meeting was held on Thursday, December 4, 2008, at 7:40 a.m. in the school library because of the complexity and possible confusion caused by the repetitive design of the survey instrument. There was no one in attendance at this meeting. The SF sample group (n = 18) was purposively identified from the SF population (N = 24). Fourteen SF members returned the questionnaire. The return rate was 78%.

Former teacher candidates participating in the study had been assigned to AES during either first or second semester of the 2005-2006 or 2006-2007 school year. The questionnaire was mailed to the former TCs via USPS on Friday, November 28, 2008. Of the teacher candidates that were located by the researcher, all were identified to be included in the TC sample group (n = 39). Thirty three teacher candidates returned the questionnaire. The return rate was 85%. 
Similarly, a questionnaire was mailed to former UF on Friday, November 28, 2008. University faculty participants had been assigned to work with teacher candidates at AES during either semester one and/or two of the 2005-2006 and/or 2006-2007 school year. The UF population was six, and 100% of the UF population was identified for the UF sample. Five UF returned the questionnaire. The return rate was 83%.

The UF, TC, and SF questionnaires included a cover letter that stated contact information for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University (see Appendix K). The cover letter also stated the willingness of the researcher to share the results of the study with participants, if participants were interested; participation in the study was voluntary, and responses were anonymous. UF and TC participants were asked to return the questionnaires to the researcher by use of the enclosed, self-addressed and stamped envelope by Friday, December 12, 2008. School faculty members were asked to return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided to the principal investigator employed at Adams Elementary School by Friday, December 12, 2008.

Qualitative data was collected by the use of semi-structured interviews. Included with the questionnaire mailing on Friday, November 28, 2008, the participating members of the SF, UF, and TC sample groups received a copy of the protocol (see Appendix L) and a letter of introduction (see Appendix M). The letter of introduction stated that participation was voluntary, responses would remain anonymous, and listed contact information for the IRB at Ball State University. Two interview sessions were scheduled, and participants were asked to attend one of the two scheduled sessions. The sessions were held on December 11, 5:00 p.m. and December 12, 5:00 p.m. for TC; December 11,
10:30 a.m. and December 12, 10:00 a.m. for UF; and December 11, 3:00 p.m. and December 12, 4:00 p.m. for SF (see Appendix N).

Data Analysis

Data from the returned questionnaires in the study were processed when the questionnaires were received. The individual participant responses were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS), Version 16.0 for Windows and coded such that values of strongly disagree were coded as one, disagree was coded as two, neutral was coded as three, agree was coded as four, and strongly agree was coded as five. All responses were anonymous. Since each and every item was phrased in a positive fashion, higher ratings were consistently associated with more positive perceptions and, therefore, none of the items needed to be reverse scored prior to further analysis. All survey items were analyzed via frequencies based on the role of the participants in the PDS partnership: school faculty, former teacher candidate, or university faculty. Survey items were averaged to compute one composite survey score pertaining to the participants’ perceptions about the PDS. The composite score was summarized using descriptive statistics, such as means and standard deviations, for each of the three participating groups. A histogram was constructed for each group in order to display the distributional characteristics of the composite score.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to data from the pilot study to see if significant differences existed between means scores of the three groups of respondents. Furthermore, since only one composite score was being used for statistical significance testing, an ANOVA was chosen instead of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Statistical significance was set at an alpha level of \( p > .05 \).
Information from the transcribed focus group interviews was sorted and categorized so underlying and abstract themes could be identified. The identified themes were communication, collaboration, learning, and governance structure. As in the pilot study, the researcher followed Creswell’s steps in the data analysis spiral approach (Leedy and Ormrod, p. 151).

Limitations

There were limitations that may have influenced the results of this study. A limitation was the response of the participants to the questionnaire and/or their attendance at a structured interview sessions. Additional limitations included the honesty of the participants’ responses, and the potential of interviewer bias and interviewer effect. The limitations of interviewer bias and interview effect were considered and steps were taken to alleviate the undue effects of each factor. The dean of students, moderator of the focus groups, reviewed interviewing techniques stated by Patton (2002). The dean of students also self-reflected and then discussed her personal biases with the researcher. An additional limitation was the willingness of SF members, UF members, and former TCs to complete the demographic section, section 3, on the survey instruments. A final limitation was the amount of time that has passed since the phenomenon occurred resulting in a possible polarization of the memories of SF, UF, and TC.

Summary

In this chapter, the research design and methods were explained. Included in the discussion was the description of the sample, instruments used in the study, data collection procedures, data analysis, and the limitations of the study. Chapter four, which follows, is a report of the data results.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

The problem studied in this research paper was that because data had not been collected, data were not available to determine if the AES/GU PDS partnership was an authentic partnership in design and function or if the partnership was a PDS in name only. This included the completion of the agreed-upon responsibilities listed in the PDS agreement and the existence of a common understanding of the PDS phenomenon. The purpose of the study was to collect data from the three participating groups (school faculty, teacher candidate, and university faculty) in an effort to have a more complete description of the PDS. The collection of data should allow a deeper understanding of the perceptions, both positive and negative, of teacher candidates (TC), university faculty (UF), and school faculty members (SF).

The collection of data was guided by five research questions directly aligned with the definition of the Professional Development School as stated in the AES/GU PDS Agreement (see Appendix O for constructs).

1. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?
2. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?

3. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

4. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

5. In what ways do TC recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities?

A mixed-methods survey methodology with the use of questionnaires provided a breadth to the study, and semi-structured interviews brought a depth of understanding to the study. The mixed methods model, QUAN-QUAL, was used. In this model the quantitative and qualitative data are “equally weighted and are collected concurrently throughout the same study; data are not collected in separate studies or distinct phases” (Gay et al., 2006, p. 491).

Collection of data from three population groups (school faculty, teacher candidates, and university) during a two year span of time (2005-2006 and 2006-2007) identified the perceptions of the members of the three groups. A five point scale was used and created the categories of strong disagreement (SA), disagreement (D), neutral (N), agreement (A), and strong agreement (SA). Some statements on the survey instruments may cause the reader of this research report to question the difference between a response of agreement/strong agreement and the difference between a response of disagreement/ strong disagreement with the statement(s). The use of a five point scale versus a three point scale (disagree, neutral, agree) helped capture and identify small
differences in perceptions between groups. A response of strong agreement or strong
disagreement indicates passion in the response while a response of agreement or
disagreement means simply that, an agreement or disagreement with the statement.

The internal reliability of the three surveys (school faculty, teacher candidate, and
university faculty) was examined via the use of Cronbach’s alpha. The reliability results
for the three surveys are summarized in Table 1. The results indicate that the three
surveys yielded good to excellent internal reliability with values ranging between .84 and
.95. The reliability coefficient for the school faculty sample is based on the ratings
collected at the end of the time frame determined for data collection or Semester 4.

Table 1

_Internal reliability results of the three surveys via use of Cronbach’s Alpha_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School faculty survey</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidate survey</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University faculty survey</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantitative Data

*Research Question One: School Faculty*

Response frequency distributions were constructed for the items on the SF survey linked to research question one, “*In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?*” The response frequencies are based on the ratings given in Semester 4 or at the end of the program. In addition, means and standard deviations were provided for each statement. Finally, an overall active support score was computed by averaging the statements linked to research question one. A histogram displaying the distribution of the overall responses is presented in Figure 1.

School Faculty Statement 11

School faculty expressed strong agreement at 92.9% and agreement at 7.1% with the statement, “*Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at Adams Elementary School.*” Table 2 shows this data.

Table 2

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 12

The school faculty expressed strong agreement at 85.7% and agreement at 14.3% with statement 12, "Teacher candidates had an opportunity to work with children in the classroom while at Adams Elementary School." This data can be found in Table 3.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 17

The school faculty expressed agreement at 57.1% and strong agreement at 42.9% with the statement, “School faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership.”

Table 4 shows the distribution of responses to Statement 17.

Table 4

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 17*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 18

The school faculty response to statement 18, “University faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership,” was in agreement at 42.9%, in strong agreement at 28.6%, 14.3% at neutral or not with a strong feeling, and 7.1% in disagreement. No response to the statement was at 7.1%. Table 5 reports these responses.

Table 5

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 19

School faculty response to the statement, “University faculty sought avenues for professional collaboration with school faculty” was 42.9% in agreement, 35.7% in strong agreement, and a 7.1% disagreement response rate. Responses to neutral or no strong feeling were at 7.1%. Furthermore, no response and not applicable were each at a 7.1% response. The data in Table 6 shows these responses.

Table 6

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 22

Statement 22, “Adams Elementary School students received more individualized attention as a result of teacher candidates in classroom,” had a SF agreement response of 64.3%, a strongly agree response of 28.6%, and a disagreement response of 7.1%.

See Table 7.

Table 7

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 22*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 24

School faculty responses to statement 24, “The PDS partnership activities blended well with the activities in the classroom,” were 57.1% in strong agreement and 42.9% in agreement.

Table 8 reports these responses.

Table 8

*Frequency Distribution Table School Faculty Response to Statement 24*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 26

The frequency of SF responses to statement 26, “As a result of PDS efforts, I have changed my thoughts of what needs to be known to be an effective classroom teacher,” was at 42.9% in strong agreement, 35.7% in agreement, and 21.4% in disagreement.

Table 9

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 26*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 27

School faculty responses to statement 27, “As a result of PDS efforts, I have changed reflection upon my own practices,” were reported to be at 50% agreement, 42.9% in strong agreement, and 7.1% disagreement.

Table 10

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 27*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean and standard deviation for each statement linked to research question one, “In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?” is provided in Table 11. Higher values reflect stronger agreement. School faculty who did not respond or gave a response of not applicable (N/A) are not reflected in this analysis. On average, the item the school faculty agreed with most was statement 11, “Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at Adams Elementary School” with a mean score of 4.93. The statements the school faculty agreed with least were statement 18, “University faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership,” and statement 26, “As a result of PDS efforts, I have changed my thoughts of what needs to be known to be an effective classroom teacher.” Statement 18 and statement 26 each had mean scores of 4.00.

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for Statements Related to Research Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean for the overall active support of learning variable for the school faculty (SF) was 4.38, and the standard deviation was 0.41. The mean of 4.38 is an arithmetic average and not an actual score. An overall active support score was computed by averaging the participants’ responses to the statements linked to research question one. The histogram displaying the frequency distribution of active support of learning values is presented in Figure 1. The overall active support ratings tended to fall at or above a value of four (agree to strongly agree). The vertical axis of the histogram represents the frequency of responses to the statements. The horizontal axis displays the possible responses to the statements (1 = SD, 2 = D, 3 = N, 4 = A, 5 = SA).
Figure 1. Distribution of Active Support of Learning: School Faculty
Research Question Two: University Faculty

Response frequency distributions for research question two, “In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?” were constructed for all statements on the UF questionnaire linked to research question two. In addition, a mean and standard deviation were given for each of the statements. An overall active support score was computed by averaging these statements linked to research question two. Finally, a histogram was constructed displaying the distribution and frequency of active support of learning values.

University Faculty Statement 11

Statement 11, “Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at Adams Elementary School” had 100% strong agreement responses from UF.

Table 12

Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 12

“Teacher candidates had an opportunity to work with children in the classroom while at Adams Elementary School,” is statement 12. University faculty responses indicated 100% of UF in strong agreement with this statement.

Table 13

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 17

Statement 17, “School faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership,” resulted in 40% of UF in strong agreement with the statement, 40% in agreement, and 20% in disagreement. These responses are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 17*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 18

University faculty response to Statement 18, “University faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership,” was 60% of UF in agreement with the statement, 20% in strong agreement, and 20% in disagreement.

Table 15

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 19

University faculty responses to statement 19, “University Faculty sought avenues for professional collaboration with school faculty,” were 40% of responses in strong agreement and 20% of responses in agreement with the statement. Furthermore, UF responses to the statement were 20% neutral, and 20% in disagreement.

Table 16

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 22

Statement 22, “Adams Elementary School students received more individualized attention as a result of teacher candidates in classroom,” had a university faculty response of 60% in agreement and 40% in strong agreement.

Table 17

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 22*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 24

University faculty responses to statement 24, “The PDS partnership activities blended well with the activities in the classroom,” were 60% in strong agreement and 40% in agreement. These responses are in Table 18.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 26

University faculty responses to statement 26, “As a result of PDS efforts, I have changed my thought of what needs to be known to be an effective classroom teacher,” (in a classroom in an elementary school) were 60% in strong agreement, 20% in agreement, and 20% with no strong feeling or neutral.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 27

University faculty responses to statement 27, “As a result of PDS efforts, I have changed reflection upon my own (UF) practices,” were in strong agreement at 60% and in agreement at 40%.

Table 20

Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 offers the mean and standard deviation for each statement from the university faculty questionnaire linked to research question two, “In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?” Higher values reflect a stronger agreement. An overall active support score was computed by averaging these statements linked to research question one.

University faculty not responding or providing a response of not applicable (N/A) are not reflected in this analysis. On average, the statements the university faculty agreed with most were statement 11, “Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at Adams Elementary School,” and statement 12, “Teacher candidates had an opportunity to work with children in the classroom while at Adams Elementary School.” The mean score for each statement was 5.0 or strongly agree.

The university faculty agreed least with statement 18, “University shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership,” and statement 19, “University faculty sought avenues for professional collaboration with school faculty.” The mean for statement 18 was 3.80, and the mean for statement 19 was 3.80.
Table 21

*Means and Standard Deviations for Items Related to Research Question Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for the overall active support of learning variable for university faculty was 4.40, and the standard deviation was 0.59. The mean or average of the responses is 4.40 and is not an actual response score. This overall mean score was computed by averaging the responses to statements linked to research question one.
The histogram displaying the distribution of active support of learning values is presented in Figure 2. All but one of the overall active support ratings fell at or above a value of four (agree to strongly agree). The vertical axis of the histogram represents the frequency of responses to the statements. The horizontal axis displays the possible responses to the statements (1 = SD, 2 = D, 3 = N, 4 = A, 5 = SA).

Figure 2. Distribution of Active Support of Learning: University Faculty Sample
**Research Question Three: School Faculty**

Response frequency distributions were constructed for all statements on the school faculty survey that were linked to research question three, “In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?” The response frequencies are based on the ratings collected from semester four or at the end of the program. Frequency distributions were not presented for those items that were already presented in research question one.

A mean score and a standard deviation were provided for each of the statements, although the mean does not include the statement(s) linked to research question one (statements 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 24, 27). The responses to the remaining statements relating to research question three were averaged, and an overall continuing education/professional sharing score was computed. A histogram displaying the distribution of active support responses is presented in Figure 3.

Table 11 includes the mean and standard deviation of these statements as reported in relationship related to research question one.
School Faculty Statement 3

School faculty responses to statement three, “I grew professionally as a result of the PDS experience at AES,” were 57.1% in strong agreement and 42.9% in agreement. See Table 22.

Table 22

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 4

Frequency responses to statement four, “I worked collaboratively with teacher candidates during this PDS experience.” were 71.4% of SF in strong agreement and 28.6% in agreement.

Table 23

Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 5

School faculty responses to statement five, “I worked collaboratively with university faculty during this PDS experience,” were 50% in strong agreement, 35.7% in agreement, and 14.3% at neutral or no strong thought.

Table 24

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 6

School faculty responses to statement six, “I worked collaboratively with other school faculty during this PDS experience,” resulted in 42.9% in agreement, 28.6% in strong agreement, and 28.6% at neutral or with no strong feeling.

Table 25

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 8

Statement eight on the school faculty questionnaire was, “School faculty received sufficient feedback and support from university faculty during the PDS.” School faculty responses were 50% in agreement, 42.9% in strong agreement, and 7.1% with no response. Table 26 shows this data.

Table 26

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 16

School faculty responses to statement 16, “University faculty provided professional development support as requested by the staff at AES,” were 50% in agreement, 35.7% in strong agreement, 7.1% neutral or no strong thought either way, and 7.1% with no response.

Table 27

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 20

“University faculty and school faculty collaboratively planned and designed the course syllabus,” is statement 20 on the SF survey instrument. Responses of UF were 35.7% in agreement, 28.6% with a neutral response, 14.3% in disagreement, 14.3% in strong agreement, and 7.1% with no response or not applicable. See table 28.

Table 28

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 20*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 21

Responses of School Faculty to Statement 21, "There is an expectation at AES that all learners will be reflective," indicated a response of 57.1% in strong agreement and 42.9% in agreement.

Table 29

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 21*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Faculty Statement 25

School faculty responses to statement 25, “As a result of the PDS efforts, I have changed the way I collaborate with others,” were 35.7% school faculty in agreement with the statement. Additionally, 28.6% of the school faculty responses were in strong agreement, 28.6% in disagreement, and 7.1% had no response to statement 25.

Table 30

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Faculty Response to Statement 25*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means and standard deviations for statements associated with research question three, “In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing,” are provided in Table 31. Higher values reflect stronger agreement. When taking into consideration all the items linked to research question three, statement 11 had the highest rating and strongest agreement (4.93). This information was reported earlier in this chapter and can be found in Table 11.
Frequency distributions were not presented for the items included earlier in the study. After removing statement 11, on average, the school faculty agreed most with statement 4, “I worked collaboratively with teacher candidates during this PDS experience,” with a mean score of 4.71. The school faculty agreed least with statement 20, “University faculty and school faculty collaboratively planned and designed the course syllabus” with a mean score of 3.54.

Table 31

Means and Standard Deviations for Questions Linked to Research Question Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for the overall continuing education and professional sharing variable for school faculty was 4.34 and the standard deviation was .35. This overall mean was computed by averaging responses to the statements linked to research question one. The mean or average of the responses is 4.34 and not an actual score.
A histogram displaying the distribution of continuing education and professional sharing values is presented in Figure 3. The overall ratings tended to fall at or above a value of four (agree to strongly agree). The vertical axis of the histogram represents the frequency of responses. The horizontal axis displays the possible responses to the statement (1 = SD, 2 = D, 3 = N, 4 = A, 5 = SA).

Figure 3. Continuing Education/ Professional Sharing Distribution of Scores: SF
Research Question Four: University Faculty

Response frequency distributions were constructed for all of the items on the UF survey instrument linked to research question four. Research question four asked, “In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing.” Frequency distributions are not presented for those items that were reported earlier in this chapter for research question two (statements 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 24 and 27). Table 21 includes the mean score and standard deviation of the responses relating to research question two. Means and standard deviations are provided for each of the statements. However, mean scores for the statements were not re-reported. An overall continuing education and professional sharing score was computed by averaging the statements relating to research question four.

A histogram displaying the distribution of continuing education and professional sharing values is presented in Figure 3. The vertical axis of the histogram represents the frequency of responses to the statements. The horizontal axis displays the possible responses to the statements (1 = SD, 2 = D, 3 = N, 4 = A, 5 = SA). The overall ratings tended to fall at or above a value of four (agree to strongly agree).
University Faculty Statement 3

Statement 3 on the UF questionnaire reads, “I grew professionally as a result of the PDS experience at AES.” UF responses were 60% in strong agreement and 40% in agreement with this statement. See Table 32.

Table 32

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 4

UF responses to statement 4, “I worked collaboratively with teacher candidates during this PDS experience,” were 100% in strong agreement.

Table 33

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 5

Statement 5 on the UF questionnaire stated, “I worked collaboratively with school faculty during this PDS experience.” Responses of UF were 60% in strong agreement and 40% in agreement with the statement.

Table 34

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 6

Statement 6 on the UF questionnaire stated, “I worked collaboratively with other university faculty during this PDS experience.” UF responses to this statement were 40% in strong agreement, 40% in agreement, and 20% neutral or with no strong feeling.

Table 35

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 8

Statement 8 on the UF questionnaire stated, “Teacher candidates received sufficient feedback and support from university faculty while assigned to AES in the PDS.” UF responses were 60% in strong agreement and 40% in agreement with the statement.

Table 36

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 16

Statement 16 on the UF questionnaire stated, “University faculty provided professional development support as requested by the staff at AES.” UF responses to this statement were 60% in strong agreement and 40% in agreement.

Table 37

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 20

“University faculty and school faculty collaboratively planned and designed the course syllabus,” is statement 20 on the UF questionnaire. UF responses were 60% in strong disagreement, 20% in strong agreement, and 20% in agreement with the statement.

Table 38

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 20*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 21

Responses of UF to statement 21 on the UF survey instrument were 80% in strong agreement and 20% in strong disagreement. The statement is, “There is an expectation at AES that all learners will be reflective.”

Table 39

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Statement 21*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Faculty Statement 25

UF responses to statement 25, “As a result of PDS efforts, I have changed the way I collaborate with others,” were 60% of UF in strong agreement and 40% were neutral or with no strong feeling.

Table 40

*Frequency Distribution Table of University Faculty Response to Item 25*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean and standard deviation for each statement on the UF questionnaire linked to research question four, “In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continued development in teaching, learning, and professional sharing,” are reported in Table 41. Higher values reflect stronger agreement. On average, the university faculty agreed most with statement 4 on the UF survey instrument, “I worked collaboratively with teacher candidates during this PDS experience,” with a mean score of 5.00. The university faculty agreed least with statement 20, “University faculty and school faculty collaboratively planned and designed the course syllabus” with a mean score of 2.40. When taking into consideration the mean ratings for items linked to research question four, statement 4 was highest.

Table 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean of the overall continuing education/professional sharing variable for university faculty was 4.33 and the standard deviation was 0.64. This overall mean was computed by averaging the responses to the statements linked to research question one. The average or mean of all the responses is 4.33.

A histogram displaying the distribution of continuing education/professional sharing values is presented in Figure 4. The distribution for the overall continuing education/professional sharing ratings was flat. All but one of the five university faculty members provided overall ratings at or above a value of four (agree to strongly agree). The vertical axis of the histogram displays the frequency of responses. The horizontal axis of the histogram represents the possible responses to the statements (1 = SD, 2 = D, 3 = N, 4 = A, 5 = SA). Gaps, as seen in the histogram, will naturally appear when values are not obtained that are associated with a particular point on the scale.
Figure 4. Continuing Education/ Professional Sharing Distribution of Scores: UF
**Research Question Five: Teacher Candidate**

Response frequency distributions were constructed for all statements on the TC survey associated with research question five, “In what ways do TC recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities?” In addition, a mean and standard deviation were calculated for each of the statements (Table 52). Finally, an overall PDS experience score was computed by averaging all of the statements for research question five.

A histogram (Figure 5) was constructed on the overall score and displays the distribution of TC responses.
Teacher Candidate Statement 6

Statement six on the TC questionnaire reads, “I worked collaboratively with university faculty during this PDS experience.” TC responses were 48.5% in strong agreement, 39.4% in agreement, 6.1% neutral or with no strong thought either way, 3.0% in strong disagreement, and 3.0% with no response.

Table 42

*Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Statement 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 8

This statement reads, “Teacher candidates received sufficient feedback and support from university faculty while assigned to AES in the PDS.” TC responses to the statement were 48.5% in agreement, 45.5% in strong agreement, 3.0% neutral or with no strong feelings, and 3.0% in disagreement.

Table 43

*Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Statement 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 9

Statement 9, “School faculty received information about course expectations from university faculty,” had a teacher candidate response of 60.6% neutral or with no strong thought either way, 21.2% in agreement, 12.1% in strong agreement, and 6.1% with no response. TC may or may not have a response to this statement, depending on the collaborative professional relationship between the TC and SF. The 60.6% response indicates strong neutrality or lack of strong feelings by the TC.

Table 44

Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Statement 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 10

Statement 10 on the TC questionnaire read, “*University faculty shared course expectations with teacher candidates.*” Responses from teacher candidates were 45.5% in strong agreement, 45.5% in agreement, 6.1% with neutrality, and 3.0% in disagreement with the statement.

Table 45

*Frequency Distribution Table of School Teacher Candidate to Statement 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 11

TC questionnaire statement 11 stated, “Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at AES.” Frequency responses were 75.8% at strong agreement, 12.1% neutral, 6.1% in agreement, 3.0% at strong disagreement, and 3.0% at disagreement.

Table 46

*Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Statement 11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 12

Statement 12 on the TC questionnaire was, “Teacher candidates had an opportunity to work with children in the classroom while at AES.” TC responses were 48.5% in strong agreement, 36.4% in agreement, 9.1% neutral, 3.0% in disagreement, and 3.0% in strong disagreement with the statement.

Table 47

*Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Statement 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 13

Statement 13 on the TC questionnaire reads, “Teacher candidates received solid
instruction in the subject before placement started at AES.” TC responses were 45.5% in
agreement, 39.4% neutral, 12.1% in strong agreement, and 3.0% in disagreement with the
statement.

Table 48

*Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Statement 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 14

“University faculty assisted in the supervision of teacher candidates,” is statement 14 on the TC questionnaire. TC responses to this statement were 39.4% in strong agreement, 39.4% in agreement, 18.2% neutral, and 3.0% in disagreement with the statement.

Table 49

*Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Statement 14*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 16

“There is an expectation at AES that learners will be reflective,” is statement 16 on the TC questionnaire. TC responses to the statement were 51.5% in strong agreement, 24.2% in agreement, and 21.2% neutral, and 3.0% in strong disagreement.

Table 50

*Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Statement 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Candidate Statement 20

Statement 20 on the TC questionnaire read, “Teacher candidates represented a professional presence in the Adams building.” Responses of teacher candidates were 51.5% in agreement, 42.4% in strong agreement, 3.0% neutral, and 3.0% in strong disagreement in the statement.

Table 51

*Frequency Distribution Table of Teacher Candidate Response to Item 20*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A mean and standard deviation for the statements are provided in Table 52. Higher values reflect stronger agreement. The mean for the overall clinical preparation was computed by averaging the responses of teacher candidates to the statements linked to research question five.

On average, the teacher candidates agreed most with statement 11, “Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at AES,” at 4.48 and agreed least with statement 9, “School faculty received information about course expectations from university faculty” at 3.48.

Table 52

Means and Standard Deviations for Statements Related to Research Question Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean for the overall recognition of PDS as contributing to the clinical preparation activities for Teacher Candidates was 4.16 and the standard deviation was 0.55. The overall clinical preparation mean score was computed by determining an arithmetic average of the responses.

The histogram displaying the distribution of clinical preparation values is presented in Figure 5. The distribution for the overall clinical preparation was negatively skewed (not symmetrical) with an extreme value on the low end of the scale. Since most of the responses are positive with a negative response, the result is a negatively skewed distribution. However, the majority of the ratings fall at or above a value of four (agree to strongly agree).
Figure 5. Clinical Preparation Distribution of Scores: Teacher Candidate Sample

Additional Quantitative

Table 53 summarizes the SF ratings by semester and shows how the mean ratings per statement changed from Semester 1 to Semester 4. The percent change was calculated by the following formula \((\text{Mean 4} - \text{Mean1}) / \text{Mean 1}\). None of the changes from Semester 1 to Semester 4 reached a statistical significance \((p > .05)\).
Table 53

*SF Mean Ratings by Semester and Percent Change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Mean 3</th>
<th>Mean 4</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 7</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 8</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 9</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 10</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 11</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 12</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 13</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 14</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 15</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 16</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 17</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 18</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 19</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 20</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 21</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 22</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6 shows the mean ratings by semester. These mean ratings reflect the average rating across all 27 items on the survey instrument for school faculty. The results indicate that the biggest change occurred when comparing Semester 1 to Semester 2 (4.22 vs. 4.27) and Semester 3 to Semester 4 (4.22 vs. 4.35).

Figure 6. Mean Rating by Semester: School Faculty
In order to compare the school faculty ratings to the university faculty ratings, a bar chart comparing the mean ratings for overall active support and overall continuing education/professional sharing was constructed (see Figure 7). The mean ratings for the SF group are based on the Semester 4 ratings. The results in Figure 7 indicate that the two groups were very similar with regard to their overall active support ratings (4.38 vs. 4.40). However, the school faculty provided a noticeably higher mean rating for overall continuing education/professional sharing (4.93 vs. 4.33).

Figure 7. Active Support and Continuing Education Mean Ratings by Group.
Finally, in order to compare all three groups (SF, UF and TC) with regard to their general understanding of PDS, a bar chart was constructed in which the mean ratings for statements 1 and 2 on the survey were compared across the three groups (see Figure 8). The results indicate that SF provided the highest mean rating with regard to “I have an understanding of the purpose of a PDS partnership” and the university faculty and teacher candidates provided similar mean ratings (4.71, 4.40 and 4.31, respectively). With regard to the statement “I agree with the purpose of PDS work,” school faculty and university faculty provided the highest ratings and their ratings were almost identical while the teacher candidates provided a lower mean rating (4.79, 4.80, and 4.58, respectively).
Figure 8. General Understanding of PDS Mean Ratings by Group
Qualitative Data

Narrative Question Qualitative

In order to gain a more in-depth understanding of the experiences and perceptions of university faculty, school faculty and teacher candidates, three open-ended questions were added to the survey instruments. The first question asked “From your point of view, what should a PDS partnership look like?” The responses were categorized into general themes for each of the three groups (see Appendix P). The thematic results, by group, are provided in Table 54. However, the percentages reported are based on only those who provided a response. The results in Table 54 suggest that learning for all was the most popular theme overall.

Table 54

From Your Point of View, What Should a PDS Partnership Look Like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>% TC (N = 22)</th>
<th>% SF (N = 20)</th>
<th>% UF (N = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning for all</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to try teaching</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University &amp; school partnership</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second question asked “What is the greatest strength of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at Adams Elementary School?” The thematic results for the second narrative question are provided in Table 55 and indicate that both teacher candidates and university faculty members made mention of the use of best practices in the classroom. School faculty members responded equally with: 1) the growth of both teacher candidates and school faculty (50%), and 2) teacher candidates were enthusiastic and students enjoyed having them in their classrooms (50%).

Table 55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the Greatest Strength of the PDS Teacher Preparation Experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection between instruction/best practices and what TC observed in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative, reflective and helpful SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of TC and SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and safe learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC enthusiastic/students enjoyed them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third question asked “How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at Adams Elementary School?” The thematic results for the third narrative question are provided in Table 56 and indicate that all three groups referenced a need for improved communication, primarily between the school faculty and the university faculty. The teacher candidates also provided responses that related to the delivery format such as the length of the program and the length of the day.

Table 56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>% TC (N = 22)</th>
<th>% SF (N = 21)</th>
<th>% UF (N = 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better articulation between UF lesson plans and activities in the classroom at Adams</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience lacked diversity</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience needed to be longer</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience should not be all day</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve communication</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More SF involvement in designing syllabus</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New leadership at the University</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to develop relationships</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing should be changed</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semi-Structured Interview Qualitative

Qualitative data was collected by the use of semi-structured interviews. Participating SF, UF, and TC received a letter of introduction attached to the protocol in the mailing that included the questionnaires. The letter of introduction stated that
participation was voluntary and responses would remain anonymous. The letter also listed the contact information for IRB at Ball State University. Two interview sessions were scheduled for the convenience of the participants, and they were asked to attend one of the two scheduled sessions.

The collection of qualitative data was limited by the participants attending one of the semi-structured interview sessions. Two members of the UF sample group, three members of the TC sample group, and six members of the SF sample group attended the semi-structured interviews. The researcher will summarize the highlights of these semi-structured interviews.

Throughout the SF, UF and TC interview sessions, communication was a common theme. SF members reported that frequent changes were made in the university faculty assigned to the PDS site. SF also reported a need for more collaborative communication including opportunities to partner with UF members in the design of the syllabus for the class hosted at AES.

Teacher candidates reported good communication with school faculty but only acceptable communication with university faculty. Teacher candidates stated that a syllabus would add more clarity and alignment to classroom activities. University faculty reported communication to be a concern with other university faculty members of Grant University’s PDS consortium. UF described SF to be welcoming and willing to share their honest observations with teacher candidates. UF were excited to have an opportunity to place their teacher candidates at a school using best practices and job embedded professional development. UF reported the design of the governance model at AES created a collaborative and safe learning environment. The UF often referred to
AES as a benchmark or standard for the learning environment teacher candidates should strive to offer students in their future classrooms.

SF members, UF members, and TCs reported intrinsic, not extrinsic rewards, from the PDS partnership experience.

During an informal conversation with the interviewer after the semi-structured interview, both UF members shared that it was good to be interviewed about the PDS at AES because the total experience was positive ...AES was like a well-oiled machine.

(This was stated by university faculty members during an informal discussion after the interview session).

Summary

In chapter four data results were shared by the researcher. Since quality classroom teachers can have the most effect on student learning, quality teacher preparation programs are important. In the research, PDS partnerships are recognized for their effectiveness in the preparation of teacher candidates for placement in classrooms. Data in chapter four are case specific and are a direct result of the AES/GU PDS partnership. In chapter five, analyses of data including implications of the data, can be found.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

In chapter five, the researcher provides a summary of the study with a re-statement of the problem and purpose of the study, and a summary of the survey methodology followed in the study. The researcher summarizes the collected data and identifies and discusses the implication of the study. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further study.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

This research study was designed to gather information about the Adams Elementary School (AES) and Grant University (GU) Professional Development School (PDS) partnership. The study was needed because there was lack of information about the AES/GU PDS partnership. Although participants perceived the PDS partnership was successful, data had not been collected from the participants in the partnership relating to the positive and negative attributes of the relationship including the completion of responsibilities identified in the PDS Agreement for school faculty and university faculty members. Additionally, data were not available to assess if there was a common understanding of the purpose of the PDS partnership by the participants. Was the
AES/GU PDS partnership an authentic partnership in design and function as determined by the description in the PDS Agreement or was it a partnership only in name? The lack of stakeholders’ knowledge appeared to encourage the continuation of past practices, thus limiting the potential capacity for research based improvements in the PDS partnership. As a result of this study, strategies to enhance the PDS partnership were identified and shared with all interested PDS participants.

*Data Collection*

As a case study, a mixed-methods survey methodology using questionnaires provided breadth to the study. Semi-structured interviews substantiated and supported the discoveries in data from the three survey instruments. According to Gay et al., (2006), mixed-method research designs integrate both qualitative and quantitative survey methods by mixing data results in a single study. A QUAN-QUAL research approach was used. In this model the quantitative and qualitative data are “equally weighted and are collected concurrently throughout the same study; data are not collected in separate studies or distinct phases” (Gay et al., 2006, p.491). A limitation of the study was the lack of willingness of the participants to attend the semi-structured interviews. Despite this limitation, the responses of school faculty, university faculty, and teacher candidates to the narrative questions on the three survey instruments were quantified. The qualitative responses were coded, codes were highlighted, and the responses were recorded as numeric data. As stated earlier, these results supported and substantiated results from the questionnaires.

The use of multiple data sources provided a level of protection from biases. The multiple data sources used were survey questionnaires administered to teacher
candidates, school faculty members, university faculty members, the use of a Likert scale on the questionnaire, and semi-structured interviews with focus groups from each of the sample group (Charles and Mertler, 2002). The questionnaires were similar in design but included personalized questions that aligned with the university faculty (UF), school faculty (SF), and teacher candidate (TC) sample groups. With advice from Dr. James Jones, Ball State University, the questionnaires used by the researcher during the pilot study were abridged. These abridged questionnaires were used in the research study.

The collection of data was guided by five research questions directly aligned with the definition of the Professional Development School as stated in the AES/GU PDS Agreement. This definition is shared after the research questions.

1. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?

2. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?

3. In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

4. In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

5. In what ways do TC recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities?

For the purpose of this study, the Professional Development School was defined using the expectations that were stated in the PDS Agreement between AES and GU:

This partnership will reflect the PDS mission*, and through
the goals of quality, diversity, and collaboration will include activities for pre-service teacher education, the continuing education of school and university educators, avenues for professional sharing, and active support of all students’ learning. (PDS Agreement)

*Professional Development Schools Mission Statement: The primary purpose of the Grant University (pseudonym) Professional Development Schools (PDS) initiative is to support a cooperative mission of reform in both pre-service (university) and in-service (school) education (12/10/96).

Instruments

The survey instrument for the school faculty consisted of a three-part questionnaire asking for participants’ perceptions regarding the AES/GU PDS partnership. Part one of the questionnaire included 27 Likert-type statements. The 27 statements were repeated four times: Fall 2005-2006, Spring 2005-2006, Fall 2006-2007, and Spring 2006-2007. SF members were asked to respond to the statement(s) in the semester(s) when the SF member hosted a TC. Each participating SF member received a questionnaire in their mailbox at Adams Elementary School on Monday, December 1, 2008. School faculty members were asked to complete the section(s) corresponding to the survey instrument when he/she participated in the PDS partnership. A voluntary “coffee and doughnut” explanation meeting was held on Thursday, December 4, 2008, at 7:40 a.m. in the school library. This meeting was held to provide SF an opportunity to
ask questions in an effort to clarify the design of the questionnaire. No one attended the meeting.

The second part of the survey instrument contained three open-ended questions. The open-ended questions were: 1) What should a PDS partnership look like, 2) What is the greatest strength of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES, and, 3) How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES? The third section of the questionnaire asked for demographic information from the school faculty. The SF sample group \((n = 18)\) was purposively identified from the SF population \((N = 24)\). Fourteen SF returned the questionnaire. The return rate was 78%.

The UF questionnaire had 27 Likert-type statements in section 1. Section 2 asked three narrative questions: 1) What should a PDS partnership look like, 2) What is the greatest strength of the PDS teacher preparation experience at AES, and 3) How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES? Section 3 requested demographic information. The questionnaire was mailed to former UF members via United States Postal Service (USPS) on Friday, November 28, 2008. UF participants had been assigned to work with TCs at AES during either semester one and/or semester two of the 2005-2006 and/or 2006-2007 school years. The UF population was six, and 100% of the UF population was identified for the UF sample. Five UF returned the questionnaire. The return rate was 83%.

The teacher candidate survey instrument had 21 Likert-type statements in section one. Participating teacher candidates were no longer students at the university, but they had been assigned to AES during either first or second semester of the 2005-2006 or
2006-2007 school years. For the purpose of this study, former teacher candidates will be referred to as teacher candidates (TC). Similar to the narrative questions in the UF and SF questionnaires, section two asked the questions: 1) What should a PDS partnership look like, 2) What is the greatest strength of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES, and, 3) How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES? The TC survey instrument was mailed to former TCs via USPS on Friday, November 28, 2008. It was not possible for the researcher to locate all teacher candidates, and as a result, the TC population was 39 students. Of the 39 teacher candidates who were located by the researcher, all were identified to be included in the TC sample group (n = 39). Thirty three teacher candidates returned the questionnaire. The return rate was 85%.

A cover letter on the SF, TC, and UF questionnaires informed the participants of contact information for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University. The cover letter also stated the willingness of the researcher to share the results of the study with participants, if participants were interested. Participation in the study was voluntary and responses would remain anonymous. UF and TC participants were asked to return the questionnaires to the researcher by use of the enclosed, self-addressed, and stamped envelope by Friday, December 12, 2008. School faculty members were asked to return the completed questionnaire to the principal investigator’s mailbox at AES in the enclosed envelope by Friday, December 12, 2008.

Qualitative data were collected by the use of semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews are face to face interview sessions using questions selected for use in the interview before the interview occurs (Gay et al., 2006). Focus groups were
identified for the SF, TC, and UF sample groups. The questions for the interview sessions were based on the work of Dr. Nancy Dana, University of Florida, and were designed with the assistance of educators having previous and/or current experience in a PDS partnership.

In the same mailing, and in addition to information about the questionnaire, the participating SF, UF, and TC members received a letter of introduction and a copy of the protocol to be used in the semi-structured interviews. The letter of introduction included contact information for IRB at Ball State University. The letter also stated that participation was voluntary and responses would remain anonymous.

The researcher made the effort to schedule interviews so two or more participants could meet together. Some of the participants in the study were under the direct supervision of the researcher. As a result, the focus group sessions were hosted by the dean of students at AES. The dean of students had successfully completed the National Institute of Health Web-based training course “Protecting Human Research Participants.” The Institutional Review board at Ball State University granted permission for AES’s dean of students to moderate the semi-structured interviews.

Two interview sessions were scheduled for the convenience of the participants, and participants were asked to attend one of the two scheduled sessions. Two members of the UF sample group, three members of the TC sample group, and six members of the SF sample group attended one of the two semi-structured interviews. The collection of qualitative data was limited by the willingness of the participants to attend these interview sessions.
Conclusions

The main focus of this analysis was to collect data from the participants in a PDS partnership between AES and GU. Observations were made by the researcher similar to information discovered during the literature review. The statistical data revealed quantitative findings that could be interpreted in conjunction with the narrative responses. The qualitative responses, even though small in number, supported and sustained observations found in the quantitative data results. Considering the quantitative and qualitative data in isolation would not be recommended since it is evident that a deeper understanding of the perceptions of participants may be uncovered through the use of both data types.

Research Question One: School Faculty

In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?

Research Question Two: University Faculty

In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to the active support of learning for all?

Using the survey instrument, school faculty members were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the nine statements selected by the researcher to collect data relating to research question one. Using a survey instrument designed for university faculty members, UF were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the nine statements in an effort to collect their responses to research question two. Research question one and research question two used the same statements from the SF survey instrument and the UF survey instrument. The statements used from the questionnaires
were: 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 26, and 27. More information about the statements may be found in Chapter 4.

Both school faculty and university faculty members perceived the *overall effect of the PDS to be contributing to the active support of learning for all*. At the time of the survey, school faculty (100%) and university faculty (100%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statements, *teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom* and *teacher candidates had an opportunity to work with children in the classroom*. SF members (100%) and UF members (80%) responded positively to the statement *school faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership*. When school faculty and university faculty members were asked if they agreed with the statement, *university faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership*, 80% of UF and 71.5% of SF responded in agreement or strong agreement. Both university faculty members (100%) and school faculty members (92.9%) responded positively to the statement, *students received more individualized attention as a result of the TC in the classroom*.

These results provided information for AES/GU PDS participants regarding the perceived active support of learning for all by school faculty and university faculty. Furthermore, these results revealed a support for previously conducted studies that unearthed knowledge about the positive impact of a PDS and its contribution to the active support of learning for all. Additional studies illuminating the positive impact of a PDS and learning for all include Levine’s (2002) multi-year project in the design of the PDS standards. The certainty expressed by school faculty and university faculty members in their responses to these statements in the AES/GU study mirrors the certainty stated in
NCATE Standard I. NCATE Standard 1 states that a PDS can support the learning of students, teacher candidates, school faculty, and university faculty.

In her multi year project to design the PDS standards, M. Levine (2002) reported that benefits for school faculty members participating in a PDS partnership included an increased number of teaching staff to assist with small group activities resulting in a reduced teacher-to-student ratio in the classroom. As a result of the reduction in this ratio, there are more active learning opportunities in PDS classrooms including more individualized attention for students as stated in the research (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Horn, 2007). Positive perceptions from school faculty and university faculty about PDS partnerships are well-documented in other research (Middleton, 2000; Levine, 2002; Banchero, 2006; Shroyer et al., 2007; Nelson, 1998; Ziechner, 2007).

School faculty members (78.6%) agreed that since the inception of the PDS partnership at AES, they had changed their thoughts about what needs to be known to be an effective classroom teacher. UF (80%) agreed. At the same time, 21% of SF members disagreed with this statement. Even though the majority of these quantitative responses fell into agreement or strong agreement categories, the second group of responses, disagree, were minimally evident at 21%. The researcher speculates the 21.4% responses might possibly be the newly hired teachers from the local universities, including Grant University.

The results of the means and standard deviations relating to research question one (Table 11) provide information that school faculty members agree least with the statement, university faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership. SF agreed least with this statement with a mean score of 4.0. With mean
scores of 3.80 for both statements, UF agreed least with university faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership, and university faculty sought avenues for professional collaboration with school faculty. Even though the majority of the responses were positive, university faculty and school faculty had fewer positive responses to these statements.

We can look at these statements to find an area of the PDS in need of improvement and more attention. These results support previous research reports identifying that it is not unusual to find a “disconnect” between the SF and UF members in a PDS partnership (Brindley) and the observed lack of collaborative research reported by Levine (2003). In Levine’s study of seven current and former PDS sites at the University of Utah, there was general agreement about the UF disconnect with PDS. The study reported that UF members on a non-tenure track agreed the program had not generated collaborative research. Yet at the same time, research in the literature review reported that PDS partnerships are important for UF because through these partnerships UF members have the opportunity to gain more knowledge (Levine 2003).

Research Question Three: School Faculty

In what ways do SF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

Research Question Four: University Faculty

In what ways do UF recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing?

Using the SF survey instrument, school faculty members were asked to indicate their level of agreement with nine statements identified to collect data for research question three. While responding to statements on the UF survey instrument, the
university faculty members were asked to indicate their level of agreement with nine statements identified to solicit their response to research question four. Statements used were statements 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16, 20, 21, 25, and 27 on both the SF survey instrument and the UF survey instrument.

At the time of the survey, school faculty members (100%) responded in agreement or strong agreement with, *I grew professionally as a result of the PDS experience.* The discovery that SF viewed professional growth to be a result of the PDS is similar to the findings of Landsman et al., 2008; Leonard et al., 2004; and Danielson, 1996. Similarly, 100% of the university faculty responded in agreement with this statement. The UF response aligns with the conceptual ideas formulated by the researcher about the professional growth of UF. These conceptual ideas included the researcher’s observation of the professional growth of university faculty during the PDS partnership years through formal and informal dialogue and conversations between UF and SF members, and UF members and TCs. These observations took place during daily meetings, special release times with substitute teachers, during ½ day in-service days, and at faculty meetings. Conversations and dialogues contributed to the professional growth of both UF and SF members. However, the agreement of the UF with this statement is inconsistent with the 1997 study at the University of Utah by Bullough et al. (1997). Bullough’s results may have been unique to the PDS partnership(s) hosted by the University of Utah. More research is recommended in this area.

Collaboration is professional sharing. Collaboration has been identified as an important component of PDS partnerships in the various research studies. Middleton (2000) noted there is a shift from teaching in isolation to school-wide collaboration,
learning and communicating in a PDS. Furthermore, Rafferty observed that work in a PDS promotes and encourages collaboration (1993). Shroyer et al., (2007) and Levine, (2002) both reported that if TCs were placed in the classroom with collaborative SF members, then the PDS experience benefited and supported these teacher candidates. An observation made by the researcher in this study that supports earlier studies is the SF response (100%) and UF response (100%) to the statement, *I worked collaboratively with TC during the PDS experience*. Additionally, all UF members (100%) perceive they worked collaboratively with SF during the PDS experience. Most all of the SF members (85%) agreed to working collaboratively with university faculty. 

Even though a strong collaboration existed between UF and SF members, as discussed in the previous paragraph, at the time of the study there was not the anticipated (anticipated by the researcher) positive response relating to collaboration among the members of the two groups, school faculty and university faculty. More than one-fourth of SF members were neutral in their response to working collaboratively with other school faculty during the PDS experience. Similarly, 20% of UF responded with no strong feeling to working collaboratively with other university faculty during the PDS partnership. Further study is needed to determine the effects of the lack of collaboration among members of the SF sample group and the UF sample group participating in the PDS partnership.

School faculty members (92.9%) agreed that UF members gave them sufficient feedback and support during the PDS. SF members (85.7%) and UF members (100%) agreed that professional development requested by SF members was provided by members of the UF. SF (14.3%) and UF (60%) groups responded that university faculty
and school faculty members did not collaboratively plan and design the course syllabus. This is a common result. The literature review reports that it is not unusual to find a substantial difference between the university’s preparation of TCs for the classroom and the current teaching practices used in the school. This substantial difference was referred to by Dr. Roger Brindley, University of South Florida, as disconnect. Furthermore, research as far back as 1994 chronicled the difficulty of blending school and university cultures (Levine, 1998).

Even though reflection is not a stated expectation in the AES/GU agreement, the literature identifies the importance of reflection in the PDS. Did the AES/GU PDS experience enhance the reflection at AES? SF members (100%) and UF (80%) agreed that learners are reflective at AES. This substantiates the research of Leonard et al., (2004) at the University of Utah. Their research reported that placing teacher candidates from the university with school faculty members inspired school faculty members to be more reflective about their teaching.

The perceptions of SF members (28.6%) and UF members (40%) had increased frequency response rates disagreeing with the impact of the PDS on their collaboration with others. Additional research is needed to gain a better understanding of these responses.

Research Question Five: Teacher Candidate

In what ways do TC recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities?

Using the survey instrument, teacher candidates were asked to indicate their level of agreement with ten items aligned by the researcher to collect data for research question
five. The mean for the overall recognition of PDS as contributing to the clinical preparation for teacher candidates was 4.16. This overall clinical preparation mean score was computed by determining an arithmetic average of the responses. With this overall mean score of 4.16, teacher candidates’ responses align with research in this area. Zeichner (2007) noted that teacher candidates in PDSs had higher ratings of teaching effectiveness, stronger confidence and efficacy levels, and had superior skills in collaborating with colleagues. Additionally, PDS teacher candidates spent more time reciprocally active with children when compared to non-PDS teacher candidates (Houston, Hollis, Clay, Lions, and Roff, 1999, cited in Everett et al.). The teacher candidates agreed (81.9%) they had opportunities to observe children in the classrooms at AES. UF responses (100%) and SF responses (100%) mutually agreed that teacher candidates had opportunities to observe students at AES. Current research about the preparation of quality classroom teachers stresses the importance of opportunities for young teachers to spend time in the classroom to observe and learn from quality teachers (Banchero, September 19, 2006). Even though NCLB gives credit for coursework and testing, both which are non-clinical experiences when work is usually competed in isolation and/or alone, NCLB does not give recognition for time spent with an effective classroom teacher and/or in a clinical experience.

*Additional Quantitative Analyses*

Table 53 summarized the SF ratings by semester and showed how the mean ratings per statement changed from Semester 1 to Semester 4. The percent change was calculated by the following formula (Mean 4 – Mean 1/ Mean 1). Based on results in Table 53, the greatest improvement was that university faculty members sought avenues
for professional collaboration with school faculty members with a 14.6% increase from Semester 1 to Semester 4. The mean rating reflected the average rating across all 27 items on the SF survey. The results indicated the biggest change occurred when comparing semester 1 to semester 4 (4.22 versus 4.27) and Semester 3 to Semester 4 (4.22 versus 4.35).

The SF ratings were compared to the UF ratings. In order to compare the SF ratings to the UF ratings, a bar chart compared the mean ratings of the overall active support of learning for all variable and the overall continuing education and professional learning variable. The mean rating for the SF group was based on the semester 4 ratings. The two groups were very similar with regard to their overall active support ratings (4.38 versus 4.4).

School faculty members responded with a noticeably higher mean rating for overall continuing education (4.93 versus 4.33). SF members were contracted to teach at AES for 180 days. Thus, SF members experienced AES’s rich culture of job-embedded professional development and collaborative sharing on a regular basis. Due to its excellence in these areas, AES had been recognized by the Indiana State Superintendent of Public Instruction as Indiana’s Professional Development School. UF members were only occasional participants in the professional learning culture at AES so they had limited opportunities to become a part of this culture. Adult learning and collaboration had been a focus of the AES staff for at least nine years. Not only had personal professional growth been a result of their collaborative work, a mutual trust had been fostered through all stakeholders. Landsman et al., (2008) documented that school faculty members are reflective with open and honest conversations in a PDS partnership.
It is the opinion of the researcher that if UF members from the PDS partnership had an opportunity to participate more often in the rich learning culture at AES, then an increase in university faculty members’ overall continuing education and professional sharing ratings would be observed.

A comparison of all three groups (SF, UF and TC) was made with regard to their general understanding of PDS. The mean ratings for statement 1, *I have an understanding of the purpose of a PDS partnership*, indicated SF members had the highest mean with a mean rating of 4.71. The university faculty members and TCs provided similar mean ratings at 4.40 and 4.31, respectively. In response to the statement, *I agree with the purpose of PDS work*, school faculty and university faculty members provided the highest ratings and their ratings were almost identical while the teacher candidates provided a lower mean rating (4.79, 4.80, and 4.58, respectively). These responses from SF, UF, and TCs demonstrate an understanding of the purpose of the PDS work at AES and an agreement by all participants with the purpose of the PDS work at AES.

*Qualitative Analyses of Narrative Responses*

In order to gain a more in-depth understanding of the experiences and perceptions of UF members, SF members, and TCs three open-ended questions were added to the survey. Response to the narrative or open-ended questions provided some specific information from participants in the PDS. The first question asked, *from your point of view, what should a PDS partnership look like?* The responses were categorized into general themes for each of the three groups. A limitation is that the percentages reported are based on only those who provided a response. The results suggested that *learning for*
all was the most popular theme for TCs (36.4%) and UF members (75.5%). For SF members, strong communication was the most popular theme. The second most popular theme was different for each responding sample group (see Table 54.) Interview sessions with SF members solidified the value and importance of communication in a PDS.

The second narrative question asked, what is the greatest strength of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES? The thematic results for the second narrative question indicated that both TCs and the UF members made mention of the use of best practices in the classroom. Fifty percent of SF members made mention of teacher candidate growth and school faculty growth, and 50% of the SF group identified the enthusiasm of teacher candidates to be a strength of the PDS partnership. The third narrative question asked, how would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES? All three groups, (SF, UF, and TC) referenced a need for improved communication, primarily between the school faculty and the university faculty. The TCs also provided responses related to the delivery format of the PDS, such as the length of the program and the length of the day. TC responses were varied and included: the experience lacked diversity, the experience needed to be longer, the experience should not be all day, and nothing should be changed.

Qualitative Analyses of Semi-Structured Interviews

The collection of qualitative data was limited by the willingness of the participants to attend one of the semi-structured interview sessions. Two members of the UF sample group, three of the TC sample group, and six SF attended one of the semi-
structured interviews. Since the attendance at the three interview sessions was minimal, the researcher used these results to corroborate the quantitative data.

Throughout the SF, UF, and TC interview sessions, communication was a common theme. SF reported that frequent changes were made in the assignment of UF members to the PDS. This lack of consistency in the assignment of UF members to the PDS exacerbated the communication concern between participants. SF members reported a need for more collaborative communication including opportunities to assist UF with the design of the syllabus for the class hosted at AES. They reported that enhanced and collaborative communication would offer an occasion to coordinate and align the university’s course syllabus with the educational standards and instruction occurring at AES. These qualitative responses align with the responses found in the quantitative data.

Teacher candidates reported good communication with SF members. TCs reported communication was acceptable with UF members. Even though the communication with UF was acceptable, TCs stated that a syllabus would add more clarity and alignment to classroom activities. UF members reported communication to be a concern with other UF members of Grant University’s PDS consortium. UF described SF members to be welcoming and willing to share their honest observations with TCs. UF were excited to have an opportunity to place TCs at a school where best practices and job embedded professional development are modeled daily. During the interview session, UF members shared their observation that the design of the governance model at AES resulted in a collaborative and safe learning environment and that the total building culture at AES was a well oiled machine. The UF members often referred to AES as a
benchmark or standard for the learning environment that TCs should strive to offer their students in their future classrooms.

SF, UF, and TC reported intrinsic, not extrinsic rewards from the PDS partnership. These responses of intrinsic rewards provided information to the researcher regarding the reflection experienced by the participants. The literature review documented that reflection is observed in PDS partnerships (Levine, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Landsman, et al., 2008; Leonard et al., 2004).

**Summary of Conclusions**

The purpose of the study was to gather information about the PDS partnership between AES and GU. The study was needed because there was no information available about this partnership. The research questions for the study and the analysis of data from 14 participating SF members, 33 participating TCs, and 5 participating UF members leads to the following conclusions:

1. School faculty members recognize the greatest strength of the AES/GU PDS partnership was the growth of teacher candidates, school faculty members, and the enthusiasm of the TC.
2. University faculty members recognize two strengths of the AES/GU partnership: the connection between best practices and classroom instruction; and the professional and safe learning environment.
3. School faculty members perceived a need to improve communication in the AES/GU partnership.
4. Teacher candidates perceived the need to improve communication in the AES/GU partnership.
5. University faculty members perceived the AES/GU partnership participants needed to improve communication.

6. School faculty members reported the AES/GU PDS partnership offered active support of learning for all.

7. University faculty members reported the AES/GU PDS partnership offered active support of learning for all.

8. School faculty members reported the AES/GU PDS partnership offered continuing education and professional sharing.

9. University faculty members reported the AES/GU PDS partnership offered continuing education and professional sharing.

10. Teacher candidates perceived the AES/GU partnership contributed positively to their clinical preparation.

11. Collaborative and professional sharing in a PDS partnership, along with opportunities for teacher candidates to observe quality teachers, is an effective teacher preparation program (especially when compared to the Highly Qualified Teacher procedures under NCLB).

12. Teacher candidates responded that the greatest strength of the AES/GU experience was the cooperative, reflective, and helpful school faculty.

Implications

This study was intended to collect responses from school faculty members, teacher candidates, and university faculty members related to the positive and negative attributes of the relationship. Additionally, it was the intent of the researcher to collect responses from the three participating groups relating to the completion of the agreed-
upon responsibilities listed in the PDS agreement between AES and GU and the existence of a common understanding of the phenomenon.

The results of the study provided information for participants in the AES/GU PDS partnership regarding the partnership’s active support of learning for all. Since nearly all members of the school faculty and university faculty groups perceived that the PDS is a positive experience and that the PDS is actively supporting the learning of all, continuance of the PDS should be considered. These results demonstrate to the researcher that the partnership was meeting the expectations as stated in the PDS Agreement between AES and GU: *will include activities for the active support of all students’ learning.*

Despite the positive responses about the PDS, communication was identified as an area of concern in the PDS. From the qualitative semi-structured interviews, the researcher learned that a frequent change in UF members assigned to AES during the PDS partnership did not facilitate or support good communication in the PDS. Actually, the lack of consistency in the assignment of UF members to the PDS exacerbated the communication problem between participants. As a result, it is recommended that there be the intent by the university to assign UF members to the PDS partnership using a more regular and consistent assignment schedule.

SF members reported a need for more collaborative communication including opportunities to assist UF members with the design of the syllabus for the class hosted at AES. UF and SF members may find it helpful to review the syllabus for the university class and compare their expectations before teacher candidates begin their field experience.
Most members of the school faculty and university faculty perceived the AES/GU partnership was contributing to their continuing education and professional sharing. This response aligns with the definition as stated in the PDS Agreement between AES and GU: *will include activities for the continuing education of school and university educators and avenues for professional sharing*. There is a weakness articulated in the responses relating to the UF and their role in the PDS. Some school faculty and university faculty reported that UF should be more involved in professional sharing. Additional methods for determining the appropriate professional sharing opportunities, including the qualities of these opportunities, should be explored.

Teacher candidates stated the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities. As a result, the AES/GU PDS partnership supported the stated expectation in the AES/GU partnership: *the PDS will include activities for pre-service teacher education*. In an effort to more clearly define the areas of concerns and based on the responses of teacher candidates to narrative question three, the findings suggest a need to address the lack of diversity, improve communication, and re-evaluate the length of time TCs are assigned to AES. Additional methods for addressing these areas of concern should be explored.

All participants of the PDS agreed with the purpose of a PDS. The researcher perceived this to be a strong indication that the PDS had a clearly stated purpose. School faculty responses indicate a clear understanding of the purpose of a PDS with a mean score at 4.71. Even though university faculty response at 4.40 and teacher candidate response 4.31 is strong, additional methods to increase their understanding can be explored.
Recommendations for Further Study

1. Since this study involved school faculty, university faculty, and teacher candidates it would be beneficial to identify the perceptions of the parents of the children in a classroom hosting a teacher candidate.

2. A study could be pursued to determine the reasons communication was reported to be an area of concern in the AES/GU partnership so an action plan can be designed.

3. A study could be pursued with another PDS to determine if participants in that PDS have similar perceptions.

4. A study is recommended to determine the effects of the PDS partnership on the academic growth of school children at AES.

5. A study is recommended to solicit responses from SF and UF members relating to their perceptions of the PDS contributing to the clinical preparation of teacher candidates.

6. An additional study could determine more specific information about the professional sharing opportunities of UF members.

7. It is recommended that concerns expressed in the responses to narrative question three (lack of diversity, communication, length of PDS assignment) be explored.

8. A study is recommended to compare the AES/GU PDS definition of PDS to the recently released National Association of Professional Development Schools’ (NAPDS) 9 Essential Standards.

   The design of the NCATE Standards included a research component. However, this researcher concludes that research is not usually a component of today’s PDS partnership. Research conducted by UF members working in partnership with SF of the
partnering school is rare. The researcher’s conclusion is supported by the work at the University of Utah by Bullough and Kauchak (1997) that included interviews with tenure-line UF, non-tenure track UF, and clinical UF. As a result, the researcher recommends it might be more appropriate to align the GU/AES PDS agreement with NAPDS’s Nine Essential Standards.

Summary

Research disputes the claims that the design and expectations of NCLB can prepare highly qualified and effective teachers for the classroom. However, research studies have identified the value and benefits of the collaborative learning between beginning and experienced teachers that can be found in the PDS model. Collaborative learning becomes a norm of the learning environment, minimizes opportunities for teachers to work in isolation, and assists in the preparation of effective classroom teachers. It is the belief of the researcher that the PDS model should be embraced by all individuals interested in the preparation of quality classroom teachers.

This chapter identifies and discusses the results of the collected data from participants in the AES/GU PDS partnership. The researcher found similar responses from members of the three samples groups (SF, UF, and TC) on survey instruments. When the narrative responses or qualitative data are quantified and combined with quantitative data, the results informed the researcher about perceptions of participants, including the completion of agreed-upon responsibilities found listed in the PDS Agreement. These responses align with the results of earlier studies of PDS partnerships that are presented in Chapter 2 of this research study. The results of this study will be shared with individuals interested in the results of the study.
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APPENDIX A

Grant University and Adams Elementary School

Professional Development Schools Agreement

Constructing Knowledge, Developing Practice, and Fostering Relationships

Grant University and Adams Elementary School agree to collaborate through the Northwest Indiana/Grant University Professional Development School (PDS) initiative. In addition to the University’s mission statement of constructing knowledge, developing practice, and fostering relationships, this partnership will reflect the PDS mission and, through, the goals of quality, diversity, and collaboration, will include activities for pre-service teacher education, the continuing education of school and university educators, avenues for professional sharing, and active support of all students’ learning.

Special Note from Researcher

In an effort to maintain the anonymity of the university and school involved in this case study, their agreement was re-written (as above) with the names of the university and school changed.
APPENDIX B

Results of the Self Evaluation of GU/ AES PDS Partnership Using the NCATE Standards for Professional Development were reported as:

Standard 1 = Developing Level of Development
Standard 2 = Developing Level of Development
Standard 3 = Developing Level of Development
Standard 4 = Developing Level of Development
Standard 5 = Developing Level of Development

Each Level of Development was assigned a numerical value as follows:

Beginning = 1
Developing = 2
At Standard Level = 3
Leading Level = 4

A mean scored was determined. $M = 2.0$

A mean ($M$) score is defined as the arithmetic average of a group of raw scores or other measurements that are expressed numerically. The mean is calculated by adding the raw scores together and then diving the sum by the number of scores (Charles and Mertzler, 2002, p. 108).
APPENDIX B1

NCATE professional development standards

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2001, Spring). *Standards for professional development schools*
STANDARD I: LEARNING COMMUNITY—DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES

The PDS is a learning-centered community that supports the integrated learning and development of P–12 students, candidates, and PDS partners through inquiry-based practice. PDS partners share a common vision of teaching and learning grounded in research and practitioner knowledge. They believe that adults and children learn best in the context of practice. Learning supported by this community results in change and improvement in individual practice and in the policies and practices of the partnering institutions.

The PDS partnership includes principal and supporting institutions and individuals. The principal PDS partners are members of the P–12 schools and professional preparation programs who agree to collaborate. The supporting PDS partner institutions include the university, the school district, and the teacher union or professional education association(s). Arts and sciences faculty, other interested school and university faculty, family members, community members, and other affiliated schools are important PDS participants in the extended learning community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Leading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria used to construct levels</td>
<td>Beliefs, verbal commitments, plans, organization, and initial work are consistent with the mission of PDS partnerships.</td>
<td>The PDS partners pursue the mission of a PDS partnership with partial institutional support.</td>
<td>The mission of the PDS partnership is integrated into the partnering institutions. PDS work is expected and supported, and reflects what is known about the best practices.</td>
<td>Advanced PDS work is sustaining and generative, leading to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Multiple Learners.</td>
<td>PDS participants plan an environment that simultaneously supports the learning of P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals. Their plans include the creation of field experiences and clinical practice to provide candidates with opportunities for full immersion in the learning community, professional development opportunities for faculty and other professionals, and an inquiry orientation to improve P–12 student learning.</td>
<td>The PDS environment provides support for integrated learning experiences that focus on adult and children’s learning, but these experiences may occur unevenly or without intentional communication among implementing groups. Candidates are in the PDS for extended periods of time and some effort is made to incorporate candidates into the school faculty. Candidates share responsibility with PDS partners for the learning of P–12 students. School faculty participate in candidates’ preparation by serving as mentors, co-teachers, and colleagues in study groups.</td>
<td>The PDS provides an environment that simultaneously supports the learning of P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals in an integrated way. Field experiences and clinical practice in the PDS provide candidates with opportunities for full immersion in the learning community. As members of the school faculty, with role descriptions appropriate to their levels of skills and knowledge, candidates share responsibility with PDS partners for the learning of P–12 students. 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,</td>
<td>Using a shared approach to candidate preparation, PDS partners include arts and sciences, professional education, and school faculty. Mechanisms are in place for PDS partners to share results and new knowledge with others in the extended learning community. All learners use their new knowledge to inform practice. Institutions and local and state entities use PDS generated knowledge to inform policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Practice are Inquiry-Based and Focused on Learning.</td>
<td>The PDS participants articulate a shared goal of improving and assessing the learning of P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals. They express the belief that action research and other forms of inquiry are valuable tools in improving instruction.</td>
<td>Inquiry and action research are being used in some classrooms, but there may not be a clear conception of connections among the learning of P–12 students, candidates, and experienced educators. Some university and school faculty visit classrooms to observe each other’s practice and to collect and share data; some use student outcome data to modify curriculum and instruction.</td>
<td>Practice in the PDS and partnering university is inquiry-based and an inquiry orientation weaves together learning, accountability, and faculty development. Inquiry is used routinely at an individual classroom, departmental, and school-wide level (at school and university) to inform decisions about which approaches to teaching and learning work best.</td>
<td>Sustained collaborative inquiry into improved learning for P–12 students is at the center of the partnership’s vision and practices. Vehicles for sharing ideas and practices that have been successful in the PDS partnership are in place and are used to influence practice in the school district(s) and throughout the university (arts and sciences as well as professional education unit). The PDS participants share their inquiry-based learning experiences and results with audiences beyond the local PDS partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Common Shared Professional Vision of Teaching &amp; Learning Grounded in Research and Practitioner Knowledge.</td>
<td>PDS partners have a vision that includes an articulated set of beliefs about teaching and learning for P–12 students, candidates, and PDS partners. They have a plan to support P–12 student and professional learning in the context of practice.</td>
<td>PDS partners can articulate the partnership’s vision and beliefs about learning in the context of practice for P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals. PDS partners can link some practices to their commonly-held beliefs. There are some examples of thoughtfully designed learning experiences and assessments based on these beliefs.</td>
<td>Because PDS partners believe that adults and children learn best in the context of practice, they develop and implement learning experiences and assessment processes that allow P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals to demonstrate what they know and are able to do. The learning experiences and assessment processes in the PDS reflect the most current research and the most advanced wisdom of practitioners.</td>
<td>Substantive conversations about teaching and learning infuse the PDS partnership. There is a process for reviewing and revising the shared vision as the knowledge base of the PDS partnership changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as Instrument of</td>
<td>PDS partners envision the PDS as an instrument for school and university improvement. School district and university support the PDS partnership and its potential to provide exemplars of inquiry-based practice and to impel policy changes.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership has begun to realize its potential for changing school and university practice. Some members of each faculty have changed their instructional strategies, curriculum emphases, or research focuses as a result of their PDS activities. PDS partners are represented on each other's governing and policy boards.</td>
<td>Inquiry-based practice in the PDS sits at the intersection of professional education reform and school improvement. Because the professional preparation program and the school both view the PDS partnership as integral to their individual purposes, the PDS partnership leverages significant change. By integrating their expertise and knowledge of practice, PDS partners develop new approaches for examining and improving the practices of individuals and the policies of both institutions. Changes in policy and practice contemplated by PDS partner institutions are routinely filtered through the lens of the PDS partnership.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership produces outcome data that drive changes in how P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals learn. Partner institutions change policies and practices as a result of work done in PDSs. Multiple avenues for interaction with the profession, family members, and policymakers lead to policies and practices that reflect outcomes of PDS work. Intentional policies and practices at the institutional, local, and state level support PDS partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Learning</td>
<td>Although the relationship between the school and university may engage PDS partners in a limited fashion, there are plans for extending the learning community. There is a plan for creating a forum to share practices and policies with other PDSs in the partnership and affiliated schools.</td>
<td>PDS partners recognize the importance of extending the learning community to include family members, community members, arts and sciences faculty, and others. They have made efforts to involve at least one of these groups in their work. The PDS partnership has developed a forum for sharing practices and policies across PDSs and affiliated schools.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership includes multiple partner institutions and has established relationships with multiple schools. A process is in place to articulate, understand, and address the professional and cultural differences of the various institutional partners. The PDS participants include arts and sciences faculty, family members, and members of the community.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership functions as an extended learning community for all participants, including arts and sciences faculty, family members, and other community, district, and university members. Structures exist for linking the policy-making groups of all partner institutions. Arts and sciences faculty are full partners in the PDS partnership, utilizing the professional education conceptual framework to guide teaching and learning practices for candidates. PDS partners engage family members in focusing on identifying students' needs. Family members are fully informed as stakeholders in PDS work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARD II: ACCOUNTABILITY & QUALITY ASSURANCE—DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES

PDS partners are accountable to themselves and to the public for upholding professional standards for teaching and learning. They define clear criteria at the institutional and individual levels for participation. PDS partners collaboratively develop assessments, collect information, and use results to systematically examine their practices and establish outcome goals for all P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals. The PDS partnership demonstrates impact at the local, state, and national level on policies and practices affecting its work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Leading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria used to construct levels</td>
<td>Beliefs, verbal commitments, plans, organization, and initial work are consistent with the mission of PDS partnerships.</td>
<td>The PDS partners pursue the mission of a PDS partnership with partial institutional support.</td>
<td>The mission of the PDS partnership is integrated into the partnering institutions. PDS work is expected and supported, and reflects what is known about the best practices.</td>
<td>Advanced PDS work is sustaining and generative, leading to: 1. Systemic changes in policy and practice in the partner institutions. 2. Impact on policy at the district, state, and national levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Develop Professional Accountability. | PDS partners have a plan in place for the collaborative development and prioritization of important questions about P–12 student, candidate, faculty, and other professionals’ learning. They also have a plan in place for using local, state, and national standards for assessing all P–12 students, candidates, faculty and other professionals’ learning. | PDS partners develop several important questions related to P–12 student, candidate, faculty, and other professionals’ learning. Data are collected systematically to answer questions. Partners analyze data together and make some changes in practice as a result. PDS partners implement the plan for assessing P–12 student, candidate, faculty, and other professionals’ learning based on local, state, and national standards. | PDS partners connect their questions about learning by P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals to the PDS’s purposes and mission, and to the practices and beliefs of participants. Through the process of asking and answering questions, partners examine whether and how much the PDS partnership increases learning for all. A continuous process of assessment and evaluation based on local, state, and national standards is integrated into the PDS partnership, resulting in continual refinement of practices and increased professionalism. They use their analyses to make constructive changes at the individual, institutional, and partnership levels. | PDS partners use the outcomes of standards-based reviews to influence institutional policy. The PDS partner institutions play a leadership role in the larger community, shaping the discussion of changes in policies and practices. |

<p>| Assure Public Accountability. | The school faculty report student achievement data to families and community. PDS partners explore ways to collect and report evidence related to school and | PDS partners are engaged in reporting to the public about the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of P–12 students and candidates. A format for reporting evidence about faculty knowledge, skills, and | PDS partners provide the public with evidence about what faculty, candidates, and P–12 students know and are able to do, and the values and commitments toward which PDS partners and candidates are disposed. | PDS partner institutions provide leadership in shaping the discussion about public accountability. Families, community members, policymakers, and the business community are fully engaged with the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Leading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set PDS Participation Criteria.</strong></td>
<td>University faculty knowledge, skills, and dispositions. PDS partners discuss ways to engage families, policymakers, and the business community in shared responsibility for learning of P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals.</td>
<td>Dispositions is in place. The PDS participants include at least one of the following groups in shared responsibility for learning of P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals: families, policy makers, and/or the business community.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership develops strategies for engaging families, policy makers, and the business community in shared responsibility for the learning of P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals.</td>
<td>PDS partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop Assessments, Collect Information, and Use Results.</strong></td>
<td>PDS partners develop explicit criteria for PDS participants at the institutional and individual levels. The PDS partner institutions are accredited or planning for accreditation. PDS partners identify skills and knowledge for faculty and plan training. Partners discuss criteria for candidates' admission, program completion, and certification, and the relationship of these criteria to national standards.</td>
<td>By establishing clear and shared criteria for individuals and institutions, PDS partners underscore their commitment to making informed choices. PDS partners establish explicit, public criteria for recruiting and selecting PDS participants. Partner institutions are accredited or undertake a similar institutional review and use results. Most PDS partners participate in training for new roles. Partners are aligning criteria for candidates' admission, program completion, and certification with national standards.</td>
<td>The PDS partner institutions are accredited. Both demonstrate a capacity to use results to improve practice. The open and public process for recruiting and selecting PDS faculty and other professionals reflects the partners' shared beliefs about the skills and knowledge they value. PDS school faculty are licensed in the fields they teach and supervise. All PDS partners are experienced and recognized for their competence in their field. PDS partners participate in professional development activities to prepare for their new roles. As professionals, PDS partners develop criteria consistent with state and national standards for candidates' admission to and completion of the preparation program and make recommendations for candidate certification based on the standards.</td>
<td>The PDS partner institutions review criteria for individual and institutional partners, standards-based criteria for candidates' admission to and completion of the preparation program, and ongoing professional development for PDS partner roles on a regular basis. All PDS partners are licensed in the fields they teach or supervise and are master teachers and recognized for their competence in their field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engage with the PDS Context.</strong></td>
<td>PDS partners have begun to explore the institutional and community supports and constraints to PDS work. Partners are aware of the need to engage with institutions and policymakers to influence policies.</td>
<td>PDS partners have a clear picture of the institutional and community supports and constraints to PDS work and have a plan for influencing institutional and community policies. PDS partner institutions have begun to develop inter-institutional relationships and connections with policymakers to influence policies and practices related to PDS work.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership is engaged in continual dialog with the school district, community, state, professional education unit, and the college/university regarding achievement of goals and impact of institutional/community supports and constraints on PDS work. As the PDS partnership continues to develop appropriate and consistent ways to provide all of its &quot;publics&quot; with evidence that participants are achieving their goals, the PDS partnership regularly examines the supports and constraints provided by the larger institutions and communities to which the PDS and the university are connected. The partners explicitly examine the congruence between the work of the PDS partnership and local, state, and national, education policies.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership engages with other institutions and policymakers to influence policies and practices related to PDS work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARD III: COLLABORATION—DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES

PDS partners and partner institutions systematically move from independent to interdependent practice by committing themselves and committing to each other to engage in joint work focused on implementing the PDS mission. They collaboratively design roles and structures to support the PDS work and individual and institutional parity. PDS partners use their shared work to improve outcomes for P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals. The PDS partnership systematically recognizes and celebrates their joint work and the contributions of each partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Leading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Criteria used to construct levels | Beliefs, verbal commitments, plans, organization, and initial work are consistent with the mission of PDS partnerships. | The PDS partners pursue the mission of a PDS partnership with partial institutional support. | The mission of the PDS partnership is integrated into the partnering institutions. PDS work is expected and supported, and reflects what is known about the best practices. | Advanced PDS work is sustaining and generative, leading to:
1. Systemic changes in policy and practice in the partner institutions.
2. Impact on policy at the district, state, and national levels. |
<p>| Engage in Joint Work. | PDS partners collaboratively develop a plan for joint work that shapes the learning of candidates as well as P–12 students. The plan supports collaborative decision-making approaches and strategies to implement the work of the PDS. The plan also delineates shared institutional goals and leadership and resource commitments. | PDS partners collaborate on a variety of activities relating to candidate preparation, P–12 student learning, and structural change (e.g., time and resource allocation). In general, the partners implement jointly lower stakes decisions and practices, with evidence of isolated examples of higher-stakes joint decision-making efforts. | PDS partners use their shared work to improve outcomes for P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals. Deeper levels of collaboration blur the boundaries between and among partner institutions. Fully integrated decision making for the PDS partnership exists in areas that were formerly the sole domain of one of the partner institutions. PDS participants invite engagement with and critique from the broader education and policy communities. Arts and sciences, school, and university faculty together plan for and implement the candidates’ curriculum and instruction. PDS partners select and prepare school and university faculty to mentor and supervise candidates. In response to the needs demonstrated by P–12 students, PDS partners collaboratively design staff development initiatives and undertake improvement-oriented inquiries. The PDS partners set standards for | Collaboration expands the sphere of the partnership to include others in the university and community. The deeper involvement of district, union or professional education association, university, and community members allows for the spread of ideas to the broader sphere. Partners are engaged in simultaneous and mutual renewal and are willing and able to challenge one another on policies that might get in the way. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Element</strong></th>
<th><strong>Beginning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developing</strong></th>
<th><strong>At Standard</strong></th>
<th><strong>Leading</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Roles and Structures to Enhance Collaboration and Develop Parity.</td>
<td>The development of new roles and the necessary reallocation of resources are discussed and agreed to by the PDS participants. PDS participants agree to operate the PDS in ways that recognize and encourage parity among the partners.</td>
<td>New roles for PDS participants are evident for some members. There is evidence of parity in some of the decision-making processes and resource allocations.</td>
<td>Norms, roles, structures, and resource allocations in the PDS partnership reflect the PDS partner institutions' commitment to parity. PDS partnership committees include representatives from constituent groups and clearly define the expectations and responsibilities of partner institutions. The PDS partnership designs structures, including reward structures, to support collaboration among PDS partners, within the partnering institutions, and among the extended learning communities.</td>
<td>Long-term shifts of culture and norms are woven into the partner institutions, including roles and mutual expectations and commitments of participants. All PDS partner institutions are committed to the renewal and improvement of schools and teacher education. PDS partner institutions engage district and state policymakers to allocate additional resources for PDS partners and support changes in roles and structures at institutional levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematically Recognize and Celebrate Joint Work and Contributions of Each Partner.</td>
<td>Joint work in the PDS is expressed as a value of the PDS participants and institutional leaders.</td>
<td>PDS partner institutions respect and value the beliefs, needs, and goals of all participants. Partners depend on each other to accomplish some of their professional goals.</td>
<td>PDS partner institutions maintain the norm of joint and collaborative work. Appreciating, valuing, and celebrating PDS work by all members of the partnership is an important part of the culture and reward structure.</td>
<td>Appreciating, valuing, and celebrating PDS work by all PDS partner institutions is a routine and widespread part of the culture and reward structure. District and state policymakers recognize and reward PDS work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STANDARD IV: DIVERSITY & EQUITY—DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES**

PDS partners and candidates develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions resulting in learning for all P–12 students. PDS partners ensure that the policies and practices of the PDS partner institutions result in equitable learning outcomes for all PDS participants. PDS partners include diverse participants and diverse learning communities for PDS work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Leading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria used to construct levels</td>
<td>Beliefs, verbal commitments, plans, organization, and initial work are consistent with the mission of PDS partnerships.</td>
<td>The PDS partners pursue the mission of a PDS partnership with partial institutional support.</td>
<td>The mission of the PDS partnership is integrated into the partnering institutions. PDS work is expected and supported, and reflects what is known about the best practices.</td>
<td>Advanced PDS work is sustaining and generative, leading to: 1. Systemic changes in policy and practice in the partner institutions. 2. Impact on policy at the district, state, and national levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Equitable Opportunities to Learn</td>
<td><strong>PDS partners and candidates examine the gaps in achievement among racial groups.</strong> PDS partners and candidates examine the curricula of the university and school programs in light of issues of equity and access to knowledge by diverse learners. PDS partners begin to expand their curricula to include multicultural and global perspectives. PDS partners and candidates begin to engage in learning experiences that allow them to develop the proficiencies to support P–12 students with exceptionalities and those from diverse groups including ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.</td>
<td><strong>PDS partners and candidates develop systems to use information to address the gaps in achievement among racial groups.</strong> The curricula in the university and school programs reflect issues of equity and access to knowledge by diverse learners. PDS partners and candidates begin to teach from multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and diverse cultural backgrounds of all people. PDS partners and candidates implement strategies to support P–12 students with exceptionalities and those from diverse groups including ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups. Familial aspirations for children broaden the PDS’s understanding of multiple measures of student success.</td>
<td><strong>PDS partners and candidates systematically analyze data to address the gaps in achievement among racial groups.</strong> PDS partners implement curricula in the university and school programs that reflect issues of equity and access to knowledge by diverse learners. PDS partners and candidates are able to teach from multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and diverse cultural backgrounds of all people. By integrating the aspirations identified by P–12 students and families, PDS partners and candidates increase their capacity to support P–12 students with exceptionalities and those from diverse groups including ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.</td>
<td><strong>PDS partners present data to the professional and policymaking community showing the ways in which they have decreased the gaps in achievement among racial groups.</strong> PDS partner institutions create mechanisms to disseminate curricula in the university and school programs that reflect issues of equity and access to knowledge by diverse learners. PDS partners model for the professional community the ways in which they teach from multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and diverse cultural backgrounds of all people. PDS partners share their knowledge with the professional community about integrating familial aspirations for P–12 students. They demonstrate to colleagues and the community the ways in which they support P–12 students with exceptionalities and those from diverse groups including ethnic, racial,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate Policies and Practices to Support Equitable Learning Outcomes.</strong></td>
<td>PDS partners consider family aspirations in the goal setting for P–12 students.</td>
<td>PDS partnership agreement specifies processes to evaluate the extent to which the PDS partner institutions provide equitable learning opportunities and outcomes, and the ways in which it uses results. The PDS partner institutions develop systems to examine how their curricula, instructional approaches, and assessment strategies affect outcomes for diverse P–12 students and candidates.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership implements processes to evaluate the extent to which the PDS partner institutions provide equitable learning opportunities and outcomes. Partner institutions evaluate their processes for using results. The PDS partners systematically examine how their curricula, instructional approaches, and assessment strategies affect outcomes for diverse P–12 students and candidates. PDS partners use multiple and varied assessment approaches to measure learning in the PDS. P–12 students and candidates with diverse learning needs show continuing achievement gains. PDS partners engage increasing numbers of families and community members in support of P–12 student learning.</td>
<td>PDS partners use a shared family-student - faculty-candidate approach to set goals for P–12 students and to examine results collaboratively. P–12 student and candidate results indicate that the PDS partnership significantly reduces historic achievement gaps. The PDS partner institutions demonstrate to colleagues and the community how they evaluate the connections between the outcomes achieved by diverse P–12 students and candidates and the curricula, instructional approaches, and assessment strategies used in the PDS and university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruit and Support Diverse Participants.</strong></td>
<td>School and university PDS partners recognize that their curricula, instructional approaches, and assessment strategies affect outcomes for diverse P–12 students and candidates. PDS partners examine multiple and varied assessment approaches to measure learning in the PDS. PDS partners engage families and community in support of P–12 student learning.</td>
<td>PDS partners use multiple and varied assessment approaches to measure learning in the PDS and university partner. PDS partners develop additional strategies to engage families and community in support of P–12 student learning.</td>
<td>The PDS partner institutions implement practices and policies to recruit diverse candidates, faculty, and other professionals to engage in PDS work. The PDS partner institutions begin to develop an array of academic, financial, and social support mechanisms to increase candidates’ success. PDS partners seek to expand the partnership by initiating discussions with new PDSs or affiliated schools in diverse communities.</td>
<td>At each PDS and across the PDS partner institutions the partners examine the results of their practices and policies aimed at the recruitment and support of diverse candidates, faculty, and other professionals. Using these results, PDS partners refine their approaches to recruitment and support. PDS partners demonstrate to colleagues and the professional and policy community those practices and policies that increase the capacity of candidates and faculty to work well with diverse learners and their families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARD V: STRUCTURES, RESOURCES, AND ROLES—DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES

The PDS partnership uses its authority and resources to articulate its mission and establish governing structures that support the learning and development of P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals. The partner institutions ensure that structures, programs, and resource decisions support the partnership’s mission. They create new roles and modify existing roles for P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals, to achieve the PDS mission. The partnership effectively uses communication for coordination and linkage with the school district, university, and other constituencies and to inform the public, policy makers, and professional audiences of its work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Leading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria used to construct levels</td>
<td>Beliefs, verbal commitments, plans, organization, and initial work are consistent with the mission of PDS partnerships.</td>
<td>The PDS partners pursue the mission of a PDS partnership with partial institutional support.</td>
<td>The mission of the PDS partnership is integrated into the partnering institutions. PDS work is expected and supported, and reflects what is known about the best practices.</td>
<td>Advanced PDS work is sustaining and generative, leading to: 1. Systemic changes in policy and practice in the partnering institutions. 2. Impact on policy at the district, university, and state levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Governance and Support Structures.</td>
<td>The PDS partner institutions agree to form a professional development school and to develop a joint mission statement. Institutional leaders participate in early discussions and decisions about PDS work.</td>
<td>PDS partner institutions enter into a written agreement that commits the school district, the teacher union or professional education association, and the university to the mission and support of the PDS partnership. The PDS partnership establishes a governing council that represents all PDS partner institutions. The council meets to plan, implement, and monitor the PDS partnership’s effectiveness. Institutional leaders demonstrate their commitment to PDS work. Leaders use their positional authority to inform all critical constituencies about PDS work.</td>
<td>The PDS partnership is integral to the operation of both the school and the university; the PDS is used in job descriptions, course catalogs, integrated into core values, culture and, in general, is “woven into the fabric” of the partner institutions. A critical mass of participants—both within and across the partner institutions—are engaged in the PDS partnership, including those in leadership and authority positions. The governing council meets regularly and engages a range of faculty, staff, and administrators from partner institutions in systematic oversight of collaborative work. The work, governance, and support structures of the PDS partnership include arts and sciences faculty, as well as family and community groups.</td>
<td>PDS participants help create and support an advocacy organization to represent the PDS partnership in local, state, and national arenas. This PDS advocacy organization includes family, community groups, business groups, educational agencies, and lobbyists. The organization lobbies at local, state, and national levels for changes in school and teacher education policy based on research and experiences developed from the use of best practices. PDS partnership governance is smoothly integrated with the governance structures of each partner institution in ways that reflect long-range and stable revenue streams, as well as the simultaneous and mutual renewal of partner institutions. Institutional mechanisms provide the structural support necessary to sustain a culture in which change is normative. Institutional leaders play significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Progress Towards Goals</td>
<td>PDS partners articulate partnership goals that tie in to local needs and are consistent with the mission of PDSs. The PDS partners agree to place P–12 students' needs at the center of PDS work.</td>
<td>Understanding of the PDS partnership mission spreads to an increasing number of participants. PDS partners conduct some research to assess effectiveness of the PDS partnership, and to evaluate future needs.</td>
<td>The PDS partner institutions implement a process to evaluate needs and effectiveness in light of the PDS partnership's mission.</td>
<td>The PDS partner institutions have established mechanisms for regular review of progress toward initial and developing goals of the PDS partnership, with particular emphasis on the impact of the PDS on P–12 student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create PDS Roles</td>
<td>New roles emerge in the PDS partner institutions for those involved in PDS work. PDS partners plan professional development opportunities for faculty and other professionals to develop leadership, inquiry, and other boundary-spanning skills.</td>
<td>A growing number of individuals are engaged in PDS work, although PDS work is often in addition to their regular duties. There is evidence of some training and support. PDS partners have a growing understanding of the complexities of their partnership and the boundary spanning issues that arise.</td>
<td>The PDS partner institutions create and modify existing roles, moving beyond traditional roles and institutional borders to support the PDS mission. Partner institutions encourage, develop, and support boundary-spanning roles. The partner institutions establish job descriptions for roles that include qualifications for entry, performance criteria, and processes for entry and exit. PDS-related work is woven into the regular job descriptions of PDS partners, and is not an &quot;add-on.&quot; Participants in these new roles are prepared and supported in them through a range of professional development activities. The reward system, including salaries, incentives, promotion, and tenure, at partner institutions reflects the importance of PDS work.</td>
<td>A mechanism exists to allow for the creation and support of new roles in all PDS partner institutions. Local, state, and national policymakers provide additional financial support for new PDS partnership roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Partner institutions identify the kinds of resources needed to support PDS work.</td>
<td>Partner institutions commit time and other resources to the PDS, but these commitments often rely upon grant funding and/or donated time of PDS partners.</td>
<td>Partner institutions garner and allocate resources to support PDS work. As part of their institutional commitment to the PDS partnership, the partner institutions provide participants with specific resources including time, space, incentives, professional expertise, leadership, vision,</td>
<td>Partners secure sustained resource support for PDS work from local, state, and national sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>At Standard</td>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technology, public relations, and access to community partners to advance the PDS work.</td>
<td>Communication mechanisms are in place to disseminate information to various stakeholders within the PDS partnership and to other constituent groups, especially to those who participate in the advocacy organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PDS partners develop and monitor an annual budget that commits shared resources to the PDS. Adequate resources are available, including budget lines at partner institutions that permit PDS partners to do PDS work during their regular work day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Effective</td>
<td>PDS participants see communication as a key goal. They recognize the importance of clear communication mechanisms.</td>
<td>There is evidence of attention to creating effective communication in the PDS partnership among partners and other participants</td>
<td>PDS partner institutions create communication links with the broader school district and university communities. Partners institutions receive and exchange information about PDS work plans, resources, and structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

The six principles are: 1) to teach for understanding so students learn for a lifetime, 2) organize the school and its classrooms as a community of learning, 3) hold ambitious learning goals for everybody’s children, 4) teach adults as well as young people, 5) make reflection and inquiry a central feature of the school, and 6) invent a new organizational structure for the school.

APPENDIX D

Goals of the Holmes Partnership

Goal 1: High Quality Professional Preparation

Provide exemplary professional preparation and development programs for public school educators with rigor, innovation, diversity, reflecting research and including best practices.

Goal 2: Simultaneous Renewal

Engage in simultaneous renewal of public K-12 schools, including beginning and experienced teachers, by establishing strong partnerships of universities, schools, and professional organizations.

Goal 3: Equity, Diversity, and Cultural Competence

Include equity, diversity, and cultural competence in the K-12 schools and higher education by recruiting, preparing, and sustaining faculty and students who reflect the culture of our country and our global community.

Goal 4: Scholarly Inquiry and Programs of Research

Conduct and disseminate educational research and engage in scholarly activities supportive of the acquisition of knowledge and learning for all children, including those responsible for the preparation of future educators, and impact educational policy and practice.

Goal 5: University and School Based Faculty Development

Provide high quality doctoral programs for the future education professoriate and for the advancement of professional development for school based educators. Redesign the work of university and school
faculty to better prepare educators in learning. Support education professionals serving the needs of all learners.

Goal 6: Policy Initiation

Engage in policy analysis and development as relates to public K-12 schools and the preparation of educators. Advocate policies that improve the teaching and learning of all students, promote the improvement of schools, and support the continuing development of all educators (Holmes Partnership, 1997, p. 3).

APPENDIX E

The nine required essentials of a PDS are:

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;

2. A school-university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;

3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;

4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;

5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants;

6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;

7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;

8. Work by college/university faculty and P-12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and

9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures.

National Association for Professional Development Schools. (2008, April). What it means to be a professional development school (Statement by the executive council and board of directors of the national association of professional development schools).
APPENDIX F

Per the NCLB federal law, three criteria for determining if a teacher is highly qualified: 1) teacher earned a bachelor’s degree or higher in the subject taught, 2) teacher obtained a state teacher certification, and 3) teacher demonstrated knowledge in the subjects taught.

I am sorry I did not have the opportunity to get back to you sooner. I was not at the PDS conference this year as I had just returned from New York for AERA and for the International Conference on Teacher Research and the following week, I was running a large teacher inquiry conference here in Gainesville at which our PDS students participate. We had over 350 attendees this year, so I really couldn’t take the time right before the showcase to attend the conference. If you are interested, you might enjoy checking out the program on our website: http://education.ufl.edu/csi. There was also a nice story on the local news - http://www.nefec.org/news/view.asp?id=575

You are welcome to use my work in your study. I just ask that you cite it appropriately. I would imagine your institution uses APA.

I’ve only had the opportunity to glance at your questionnaire and interview questions, as I’ve been working around the clock “tidying” up all of the business that the conference generated. I am just getting back on top of email today. In general, I think your questionnaire and interview protocol look fine. Of course, without seeing an overview of your study (background, research questions, theoretical framework, etc.), it’s difficult to assess these documents in isolation. I’m sure your committee has done a great job of scaffolding your study! A couple thoughts I had regarding your protocol is if you are going to ask about a PDS experience that went really well, you might also ask the reverse – gather some data on a PDS experience that did not go well. (Of course, again, I don’t know your research questions, so I don’t know if this makes sense). Another bit of feedback I have is on your third question. You have that phrased as a dichotomous (yes/no) question. As a researcher, you’ll find you get richer answers to your questions if they are not phrased as a yes/no. You might consider rephrasing this question as “In what ways did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection?” If you aren’t already familiar with Patton’s book on Qualitative Research Evaluation methods, you might want to get your hands on that before you begin the interviews. He has an absolutely wonderful chapter on interviewing that will give you lots of tips to make the interviewing experience that best it can be!

Wishing you all the best with your study.

Nancy Dana
APPENDIX H

National institutes of health completion certificates

----- Original Message ----- 
From: NCI OESI Support (NIH/NCI)  
To: Janice Malchow  
Sent: Wednesday, April 02, 2008 12:05 PM  
Subject: RE:  

Thank you for your note and congratulations on completing the NCI online professional course, Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams (HPPERT).  
I have attached a copy of your course completion certificate for your records. Please keep a copy in a safe place.  

Thank you, 
NCI OESI Support Team  
Office of Communications/OTSA  
National Cancer Institute  
http://www.cancer.gov  

From: Janice Malchow [mailto:jmalchow@lakecentral.k12.in.us]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 02, 2008 11:55 AM  
To: NCI OESI Support (NIH/NCI)  
Subject:  

Hi,  
I am needing a copy of the completion certification for the IRB tutorial. I completed this tutorial while enrolled in the doctoral seminar class through Ball State University in 2006-2007 school year and cannot locate a copy.  

Thanks so much.  
Janice Malchow  
jmalchow@lakecentral.k12.in.us  
11913 80th Place  
Dyer Indiana  46311  
219-322-1185 extension 235
Certificate of Completion

The NIH Office of Human Subjects Research certifies that Louise Tallent successfully completed the National Institutes of Health Web-based training course “Protecting Human Research Participants”.

Date: 05/06/2008
Certification Number: 31403
APPENDIX I

List of modifications to questionnaires

List of modifications to protocols
Summary Sheet for IRB
November, 2008

Questionnaire for School Faculty

Introductory paragraph: Changes in the introductory paragraph to use of SD, D, N, A, SA and NA versus 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Changes were made in the dates.

1. reworded: “expectation” used in place of “purpose”
2. no changes
3. added: “during this PDS experience”
4. added “during this PDS experience”
5. added “during this PDS experience”
6. new question
7. new question
8. new question
9. new question
10. new question
11. new question
12. new question
13. new question
14. new question
15. new question
16. new question
17. new question
18. new question
19. new question
20. organized the statement differently
21. organized into a more simple statement
22. “individualized” replaces “individual”
23. no changes
24. no changes
25. no changes
26. no changes
27. no changes

No changes on the remaining sections of the questionnaire.
Questionnaire for Teacher Candidate

Introductory paragraph: Changes in the introductory paragraph to use of SD, D, N, A, SA and NA versus 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Changes were made in the dates.

1. “expectation” used in place of “purpose”
2. no changes from original question
3. re-organized the statement
4. added “during this PDS experience”
5. added “during this PDS experience”
6. new question
7. new question
8. new question
9. new question
10. new question
11. new question
12. new question
13. new question
14. new question
15. new question
16. new question
17. “Adam students” replaces “children”
18. “Adam students” replaces “children”
19. “students” replaces “children”
20. re-organized the words in the statement
21. added “partnership”

No changes on the remaining sections of the questionnaire.
Introductory paragraph: Changes in the introductory paragraph to use of SD, D, N, A, SA and NA versus 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Changes were made in the dates.

1. reworded: “expectation” used in place of “purpose”
2. no changes from original question
3. added: “during this PDS experience”
4. added “during this PDS experience”
5. added “during this PDS experience”
6. new question
7. new question
8. new question
9. new question
10. new question
11. new question
12. new question
13. new question
14. new question
15. new question
16. new question
17. new question
18. new question
19. new question
20. organized the statement differently
21. organized into simpler statement
22. “individualized” replaces “individual”
23. no changes
24. new
25. no changes
26. no changes

No changes on the remaining sections of the questionnaire.
Focus Group: School Faculty

1. What were your opportunities to collaborate with other PDS participants?
   Probes
   Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement. Changed "If you could change" to "If you could have changed" (past tense)

2. Did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection?
   Probe
   New statement used to create an "open ended" response

3. Tell me about a PDS experience that went really well.
   Probes
   Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement. Added "If you assessed the learning outcomes" to the original statement

4. Tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well.
   Probes
   Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement. Added "If you assessed the learning outcomes: to the original statement

5. Did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience?
   Probes
   Re-worded the original statement
   New statement added "Please tell me more about these rewards."
Focus Group: Former **Teacher Candidate**

1. **What were your opportunities to collaborate with other PDS participants?**
   **Probes**
   - Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement.
   - Changed “Does the governance” to “Did the governance”
   - Changed “If you could change” to “If you could have changed”
     (past tense)

2. **Did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection?**
   **Probe**
   - New statement used to create an “open ended” response

3. **Tell me about a PDS experience that went really well.**
   **Probes**
   - Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement.
   - Added “If you assessed the learning outcomes” to the original statement

4. **Tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well.**
   **Probes**
   - Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement.
   - Added “If you assessed the learning outcomes” to the original statement

5. **Did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience?**
   **Probes**
   - Re-worded the original statement
   - New statement added “Please tell me more about these rewards.”
Focus Group: University Faculty

1. What were your opportunities to collaborate with other PDS participants?
   Probes
   - Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement.
   - Changed “Does the governance” to “Did the governance”
   - Changed “If you could change” to “If you could have changed”
     (past tense)

2. Did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection?
   Probe
   - New statement used to create an “open ended” response

3. Tell me about a PDS experience that went really well.
   Probes
   - Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement.
   - Added “If you assessed the learning outcomes” to the original statement

4. Tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well.
   Probes
   - Capitalized the beginning letter of each statement.
   - Added “If you assessed the learning outcomes” to the original statement

5. Did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience?
   Probes
   - Re-worded the original statement
   - New statement added “Please tell me more about these rewards.”
APPENDIX J

Modified questionnaires
School Faculty Questionnaire  
Adam Elementary School and Grant University  
Professional Development School (PDS) Partnership  
December 2008

This is a voluntary questionnaire. No names, please. In order to establish a baseline and to assess future growth and development as a PDS, please complete this questionnaire. Please circle the option that best describes your feelings in relation to the statements listed with Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N) or no strong thoughts either way, Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA), and NA = Not Applicable. In addition, please provide narrative comments at the end of each section that would provide insights into each of these areas. Return the completed questionnaire to Janice Malchow, Adam Elementary School, in the envelope provided by December 12, 2008. Thank you for your help in assessing our PDS efforts.

1. I have an understanding of the expectations of a PDS partnership.  
   SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

2. I agree with the purpose of PDS work.  
   SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

3. I grew professionally as a result of the PDS experience at Adam Elementary School (AES).  
   SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

4. I worked collaboratively with teacher candidates during this PDS experience.  
   SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

5. I worked collaboratively with university faculty during this PDS experience.  
   SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

6. I worked collaboratively with other school faculty during this PDS experience.  
   SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

7. I gave sufficient feedback and support to teacher candidates while assigned to Adam School in the PDS.  
   SD  D  N  A  SA  NA
8. School faculty received sufficient feedback and support from university faculty during the PDS.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

9. University faculty shared course expectations with school faculty.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

10. University faculty shared course expectations with teacher candidates.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

11. Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at Adam Elementary School.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

12. Teacher candidates had an opportunity to work with children in the classroom while at Adam Elementary School.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

13. Teacher candidates received solid instruction in the subject before placement started at AES.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

14. University faculty worked collaboratively with AES staff to place teacher candidates.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

15. University faculty assisted in the supervision of teacher candidates.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

16. University faculty provided professional development support as requested by the staff at AES.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA
17. School faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership.

18. University faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership.

19. University faculty sought avenues for professional collaboration with school faculty.

20. University faculty and school faculty collaboratively planned and designed the course syllabus.

21. There is an expectation at AES that all learners will be reflective.

22. Adam students received more individualized attention as a result of teacher candidates in classrooms.

23. Teacher candidates represented a professional presence in the Adam School.

24. The PDS partnership activities blended well with the activities in the classroom.

As a result of PDS efforts, I have changed……

25. …the way I collaborate with others.
26  …my thoughts of what needs to be known to be an effective classroom teacher.

27.  …reflection upon my own practices.

Narrative Question (Use the back of this paper for more writing area.)
From your point of view, what should a PDS partnership look like?

Narrative Questions (You may use the back for more writing space.)
What is the greatest strength(s) of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at Adam Elementary School?

How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at Adam Elementary School?

Demographic Information
What grade level are you currently teaching?

K – 2       3 - 4

What is your certification level?

BS       BS+15       MS       MS+       EdS       EdD       PhD
PhD+

What is your age bracket?

21- 30       31- 40       41 – 50       51+

How many years teaching experience do you have? ________________

How many years teaching experience in a PDS partnership school do you have? ________
University Faculty Questionnaire  
Adam Elementary School and Grant University  
Professional Development School (PDS) Partnership  
December 2008

This is a voluntary questionnaire. No names, please. In order to establish a baseline and to assess future growth and development as a PDS, please complete this questionnaire. Please circle the letter(s) that best describes your thoughts about the statements listed with Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N) or No Strong Thoughts, Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA), and NA = Not Applicable. In addition, at the end of the questionnaire you will find narrative questions and demographic information. Return the completed questionnaire to Janice Malchow, Adam Elementary School, in the envelope provided by December 12, 2008. Thank you for your help in assessing our PDS efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have an understanding of the expectations of a PDS partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I agree with the purpose of PDS work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I grew professionally as a result of the PDS experience at Adam Elementary School (AES).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I worked collaboratively with teacher candidates during this PDS experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I worked collaboratively with school faculty during this PDS experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I worked collaboratively with other university faculty during this PDS experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher candidates received sufficient feedback and support from school faculty while assigned to Adam Elementary in the PDS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Teacher candidates received sufficient feedback and support from university faculty while assigned to Adam Elementary School in the PDS.  

9. School faculty received information about course expectations from university faculty.

10. University faculty shared course expectations with teacher candidates.

11. Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at Adam Elementary School.

12. Teacher candidates had an opportunity to work with children in the classroom while at Adam Elementary School.

13. Teacher candidates received solid instruction in the subject before placement started at AES.

14. University faculty worked collaboratively with AES staff to place teacher candidates.

15. University faculty assisted in the supervision of teacher candidates.

16. University faculty provided professional development support as requested by the staff at AES.
17. School faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

18. University faculty shared feedback and observations about the PDS partnership.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

19. University faculty sought avenues for professional collaboration with school faculty.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

20. University faculty and school faculty collaboratively planned and designed the course syllabus.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

21. There is an expectation at AES that all learners will be reflective.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

22. Adam students received more individualized attention as a result of teacher candidates in classrooms.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

23. Teacher candidates represented a professional presence in Adam Elementary.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

24. The PDS partnership activities blended well with the activities in the classroom.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

As a result of PDS efforts, I have changed……

25. …the way I collaborate with others.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

26. …my thoughts of what needs to be known to be an effective classroom teacher.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

27. …reflection upon my own practices.  SD  D  N  A  SA  NA
Narrative Question (Use the back of this paper for more writing area.)
From your point of view, what should a PDS partnership look like?

Narrative Questions (You may use the back for more writing space.)
What is the greatest strength(s) of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at Adam Elementary School?

How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at Adam Elementary School?

Demographic Information
What is your certification level?
- BS
- BS+15
- MS
- MS+15
- EdS
- EdD
- PhD

What is your age bracket?
- 21-24
- 25-29
- 30-34
- 35-39
- 40-45
- 45-50
- 50 and older

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

How many years of teaching experience at the university level, including this year, do you have?  __________

How many years of teaching experience in a PDS partnership, including this year, do you have?  __________

How many year of teaching experience as an elementary teacher do you have, including this year?  __________
Teacher Candidate Questionnaire  
Adam Elementary School and Grant University  
Professional Development School (PDS) Partnership  
December 2008

This is a voluntary questionnaire. No names, please. In order to establish a baseline and to assess future growth and development as a PDS, please complete this questionnaire. Please circle the letter(s) that best describes your thoughts about the statements listed with Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N) or No Strong Thoughts, Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA), and NA = Not Applicable. In addition, at the end of the questionnaire you will find narrative questions and demographic information. Return the completed questionnaire to Janice Malchow, Adam Elementary School, in the envelope provided by December 12, 2008. **Thank you for your help** in assessing our PDS efforts.

1. I have an understanding of the expectations of a PDS partnership.  
SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

2. I agree with the purpose of PDS work.  
SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

3. I grew professionally as a result of the PDS experience at Adam Elementary School (AES).  
SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

4. I worked collaboratively with other teacher candidates during this PDS experience.  
SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

5. I worked collaboratively with school faculty during this PDS experience.  
SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

6. I worked collaboratively with university faculty during this PDS experience.  
SD  D  N  A  SA  NA

7. I received sufficient feedback and support from school faculty while assigned to Adam School in the PDS.  
SD  D  N  A  SA  NA
8. Teacher candidates received sufficient feedback and support from university faculty while assigned to Adam Elementary School in the PDS.

9. School faculty received information about course expectations from university faculty.

10. University faculty shared course expectations with teacher candidates.

11. Teacher candidates had an opportunity to observe children in the classroom while at Adam Elementary School.

12. Teacher candidates had an opportunity to work with children in the classroom while at Adam Elementary School.

13. Teacher candidates received solid instruction in the subject before placement started at AES.

14. University faculty assisted in the supervision of teacher candidates.

15. Professional development support, as requested by the staff at AES, was offered to teacher candidates.

16. There is an expectation at AES that learners will be reflective.

17. Adam students benefited from having teacher candidates in the classroom.
18. Adam students received more individualized attention as a result of teacher candidates in classrooms. 

19. School faculty had more time to get to know their students as a result of the teacher candidates being placed in their classroom. 

20. Teacher candidates represented a professional presence in the Adam School. 

21. The PDS partnership activities blended well with the activities in the classroom. 

**Narrative Question (Use the back of this paper for more writing area.)**
From your point of view, what should a PDS partnership look like? 

**Narrative Questions (You may use the back for more writing space.)**
What is the greatest strength(s) of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at Adam Elementary School? 

How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at Adam Elementary School? 

**Demographic Information**
What year are you in your degree work at the university? 
Year 1  Year 2  Year 3  Year 4

What will be your certification level in education? 
BS  BS+15  MS

What is your age bracket? 
21-24  25-29  30-34  35-39  40-45  45-50  50 and older

What is your gender? Male  Female
APPENDIX K

Letters of introduction for questionnaires
Letter of Introduction for Questionnaire

November 14, 2008

Dear School Faculty,

In past years, you participated in the Professional Development School partnership between Grant University (GU) and Adam Elementary School (AES). My role as principal at BES allowed me to observe and participate in this partnership. There were many benefits of this partnership, and we want to learn from this partnership.

In an effort complete my Ed.D through Ball State University I am gathering information from former participants in this PDS partnership. As part of my research, I would like to ask you to complete the attached questionnaire. Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from participation in the study at anytime. There are no known risks related to the study. If you would like more information about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University at 1-765-285-5070 or email them at irb@bsu.edu.

The questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete, and responses are anonymous. The survey instrument is designed to be simple and straightforward. The effectiveness of the PDS partnership between Grant University and Adam Elementary School is not known at this time. Your perceptions and observations of the partnership are critical and important to us. The questionnaire is divided into three sections. Section 1 represents the fall 2005-2006 PDS, section 2 represents the spring 2005-2006 PDS, section 3 represents the fall 2006-2007 PDS, and section 4 denotes spring 2006-2007. Complete only the section(s) when you participated in the PDS partnership. We will have a voluntary “coffee and doughnut” explanation meeting on Thursday, December 4, 2008, at 7:40 a.m. in the school library.

Please return the questionnaire in the addressed and stamped envelope provided for your use to Janice Malchow by December 12, 2008.

Thank you for your time and effort. Please contact me if you have any questions about the questionnaire. I will be happy to share the results of the study with you. Please email or call me if you have questions or would like a copy of the questionnaire results.

Sincerely,

Janice Malchow, Principal
Adam Elementary School
529 John Street
Dyer, Indiana 46311
1-219-253-6446 ext. 235
1-219-253-6446 fax

Dr. William Sharp, Doctoral Committee
Ball State University
Teachers’ College
Muncie, Indiana 47306
765-285-8488
bsharp@bsu.edu
Letter of Introduction for Questionnaire

November 14, 2008

Dear Former Teacher Candidate,

In past years, you were a student at Grant University. During your tenure at GU, you were at Adam Elementary School during our Professional Development School Partnership with Grant University. My role as Principal at AES allowed me to observe and participate in this partnership. There were many benefits of this partnership, and we want to learn from this partnership.

In an effort to complete my Ed.D through Ball State University, I am gathering information from former participants in this PDS partnership. As part of my research, I would like to ask you to complete the attached questionnaire. Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from participation in the study anytime. There are no known risks related to the study. If you would like more information about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University at 765-285-5070 or email them at irb@bsu.edu.

The questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete, and responses are anonymous. The survey instrument is designed to be simple and straightforward. The effectiveness of the PDS partnership between Grant University and Adam Elementary School is not known at this time. Your perceptions and observations from your placement at Adam Elementary are critical and important to us.

Please return the questionnaire in the addressed and stamped envelope provided for your use and return to Janice Malchow by December 12, 2008.

Thank you for your time and effort. Please contact me if you have any questions about the questionnaire. I will be happy to share the results of the study with you. Please email or call me if you have questions or would like a copy of the questionnaire results.

Sincerely,

Janice Malchow, Principal
Adam Elementary School
529 John Street
Dyer, Indiana 46311
1-219-253-6446 ext. 235
1-219-253-6446 fax

Dr. William Sharp, Doctoral Committee
Ball State University
Teachers’ College
Muncie, Indiana 47306
765-285-8488
bsharp@bsu.edu
Letter of Introduction for Questionnaire

November 14, 2008

Dear University Faculty,

In past years, you were a participant in the Professional Development School partnership between Grant University (GU) and Adam Elementary School (AES). My role as principal at BES allowed me to observe and participate in this partnership. There were many benefits of this partnership, and we want to learn from this experience.

In an effort complete my Ed.D through Ball State University, I am gathering information from former participants in this PDS partnership. As part of my research, I would like to ask you to complete the attached questionnaire. Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from participation in the study at anytime. There are no known risks related to the study. If you would like more information about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University at 1-765-285-5070 or email them at irb@bsu.edu.

The questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete, and responses are anonymous. The survey instrument is designed to be simple and straightforward. The effectiveness of the PDS partnership between Grant University and Adam Elementary School is not known at this time. Your perceptions and observations of the partnership are critical as we gather information to improve our PDS partnership.

Please return the questionnaire in the addressed and stamped envelope provided by December 12, 2008, to Janice Malchow.

Thank you for your time and effort. Please contact me if you have any questions about the questionnaire. I will be happy to share the results of the study with you. Please email or call me if you have questions or would like a copy of the questionnaire results.

Sincerely,

Janice Malchow, Principal
Adam Elementary School
529 John Street
Dyer, Indiana 46311
1-219-253-6446 ext. 235
1-219-253-6446 fax

Dr. William Sharp, Doctoral Committee
Ball State University
Teachers’ College
Muncie, Indiana 47306
765-285-8488
bsharp@bsu.edu
APPENDIX L

Modified protocols
Questions for School Faculty Focus Group

1. **What were your opportunities to collaborate with other PDS participants?**
   Probes: Please describe your opportunities to collaborate.
   Did the governance structure of the GU/AES partnership support collaboration?
   If you could have changed the governance structure, what would you have changed?

2. **Did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection?**
   Probes: Please tell me about this experience.

3. **Tell me about a PDS experience that went really well.**
   Probes: Who was involved?
   What was your reaction/way to handle this experience?
   Did you assess the learning outcome(s)?
   If you assessed the learning outcomes, then how did you measure them?

4. **Tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well.**
   Probes: Who was involved?
   What was your reaction/way to handle this experience?
   Did you assess the learning outcome(s)?
   If you assessed the learning outcomes, then how did you measure them?

5. **Did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience?**
   Probes: Were the rewards and recognition you received extrinsic or intrinsic in design?
   Please tell me more about these rewards.
Questions for Teacher Candidate Focus Group

1. What were your opportunities to collaborate with other PDS participants?
   Probes: Please describe your opportunities to collaborate.
   Is that your ideal?
   Did the governance structure of the GU/ AES partnership support collaboration?
   If you could have changed the governance structure, what would you have changed?

2. Did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection?
   Probes: Please tell me about this experience.

3. Tell me about a PDS experience that went really well.
   Probes: Who was involved?
   What was your reaction/way to handle this experience?
   How did you assess the learning outcome(s)?

4. Tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well.
   Probes: Who was involved?
   What was your reaction/way to handle this experience?
   How did you assess the learning outcome(s)?

5. Did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience?
   Probes: Were the rewards and recognition extrinsic or intrinsic in design?
   Please tell me more about these rewards.
Questions for University Faculty Focus Group

1. What were your opportunities to collaborate with other PDS participants?
   Probes: Please describe your opportunities to collaborate.
   Is that your ideal?
   Did the governance structure of the AES/GU partnership support collaboration?
   If you could have changed the governance structure, what would you have changed?

2. Did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection?
   Probes: Please tell me about this experience.

3. Tell me about a PDS experience that went really well.
   Probes: Who was involved?
   What was your reaction/way to handle this experience?
   How did you assess the learning outcome(s)?

4. Tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well.
   Probes: Who was involved?
   What was your reaction/way to handle this experience?
   How did you assess the learning outcome(s)?

5. Did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience?
   Probes: Were the rewards and recognition extrinsic or intrinsic in design?
   Please tell me more about the rewards.
APPENDIX M

Letters of introduction for semi-structured interviews
Letter of Introduction

November 4, 2008

Dear School Faculty,

I recognize that participants of the Professional Development School (PDS) partnership between Grant University (GU) and Adam Elementary School (AES) are successfully designing, re-designing, and implementing initiatives in this partnership. My role as Principal at BES allows me to observe and participate in this partnership. There are many benefits of this partnership, and we want to make the partnership even better.

In an effort complete my Ed.D through Ball State University, I am gathering information from past participants in this PDS partnership. I would like to ask you to attend a voluntary interview session with protocol questions (see enclosed). It is part of my research study and will be used to establish a baseline and to assess future growth and development as a PDS. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from participation in the study at anytime. There are no known risks related to the study. If you would like more information about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University at 1-765-285-5070 or email them at irb@bsu.edu.

The interview session is scheduled for 30 minutes and responses are anonymous. The first interview session will be held at Adam Elementary School, Room 27, on December 11 at 3:00 p.m. If this is not convenient, then the next voluntary interview session will be held on December 12 at 4:00 p.m. at Adam School. The effectiveness of the PDS partnership between GU and Adam Elementary School is not known at this time. Your perceptions and observations of the partnership are critical as we gather information to improve our PDS partnership. Mrs. Louise Tallent will host the interview session. Your responses will be tape recorded without identifiers.

Thank you for your time and effort. Please contact me if you have any questions about the interview. I will be happy to share the results of the study with you. Please email or call me if you have questions or would like a copy of the study results.

Sincerely,

Janice Malchow, Principal
Bibich Elementary School
14600 W. 81st Avenue
Dyer, Indiana 46311
1-219-253-6446 ext. 235
1-219-253-6446 fax

Dr. William Sharp, Doctoral Committee
Ball State University
Teachers’ College
Muncie, Indiana 47306
765-285-8488
bsharp@bsu.edu
Letter of Introduction

November 14, 2008

Dear Former Teacher Candidate,

In past years, you were a student at Grant University. During your tenure at GU, you were at Adam Elementary School during our Professional Development School Partnership with Grant University. My role at principal at AES allowed me to observe and participate in this partnership. There were many benefits of this partnership, and we want to learn from this partnership.

In an effort to complete my Ed.D through Ball State University, I am gathering information from past participants in this PDS partnership. I would like to ask you to attend a voluntary interview session with protocol questions (see enclosed). It is part of my research study and will be used to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the GU/AES partnership. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from participation in the study at anytime. There are no known risks related to the study. If you would like more information about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University at 1-765-285-5070 or email them at irb@bsu.edu.

The interview session is scheduled for 30 minutes and responses are anonymous. The first interview session will be held at Adam Elementary School, Room 27, on December 11 at 5:00 p.m. If this is not convenient, then the next voluntary interview session will be held on December 12 at 5:00 p.m. at Adam School. The effectiveness of the PDS partnership between GU and Adam Elementary School is not known at this time. Your perceptions and observations of the partnership are critical as we gather information to improve our PDS partnership. Mrs. Louise Tallent will host the interview session. Your responses will be tape recorded without identifiers.

Thank you for your time and effort. Please contact me if you have any questions about the interview. I will be happy to share the results of the study with you. Please email or call me if you have questions or would like a copy of the study results.

Sincerely,

Janice Malchow, Principal  Dr. William Sharp, Doctoral Committee
Adam Elementary School  Ball State University
529 John Street  Teachers’ College
Dyer, Indiana 46311  Muncie, Indiana 47306
1-219-253-6446 ext. 235  765-285-8488
1-219-253-6446 fax  bsharp@bsu.edu
Letter of Introduction

November 14, 2008

Dear University Faculty,

In past years, you participated in the Professional Development School partnership between Grant University (GU) and Adam Elementary School (AES). My role as principal at BES allowed me to observe and participate in this partnership. There were many benefits of this partnership, and we want to learn from this partnership.

In an effort complete my Ed.D through Ball State University, I am gathering information from past participants in this PDS partnership. I would like to ask you to attend a voluntary interview session with protocol questions (see enclosed). It is part of my research study and will be used to establish a baseline and to assess future growth and development as a PDS. Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from participation in the study at anytime. There are no known risks related to the study. If you would like more information about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ball State University at 1-765-285-5070 or email them at irb@bsu.edu.

The interview session is scheduled for 30 minutes and responses are anonymous. The first interview session will be held at Adam Elementary School, Room 27, on December 11 at 10:30 a.m. If this is not convenient, then the next voluntary interview session will be held on December 12 at 10:00 a.m. at Adam School. The effectiveness of the PDS partnership between GU and Adam Elementary School is not known at this time. Your perceptions and observations of the partnership are critical as we gather information to improve our PDS partnership. Mrs. Louise Tallent, Dean of Students, will host the interview session. Your response will be tape recorded without identifiers.

Thank you for your time and effort. Please contact me if you have any questions about the interview. I will be happy to share the results of the study with you. Please email or call me if you have questions or would like a copy of the study results.

Sincerely,

Janice Malchow, Principal
Adams Elementary School
529 John Street
Dyer, Indiana 46311
1-219-253-6446 ext. 235
1-219-253-6446 fax

Dr. William Sharp, Doctoral Committee
Ball State University
Teachers’ College
Muncie, Indiana 47306
765-285-8488
bsharp@bsu.edu
APPENDIX N

Semi-structured interview schedule for the study

School Faculty (SF):

December 11, 2008; 3:00 p.m.
December 12, 2008; 4:00 p.m.

Teacher Candidate (TC):

December 11, 2008; 9:00 a.m.
December 12, 2009; 3:00 p.m.

University Faculty (UF):

December 11, 2008; 10:30 a.m.
December 12, 2008; 10:00 a.m.
APPENDIX  O

Constructs for Research Questions

Research question one: active support of learning for all (school faculty)
SF:  11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 26, 27

Research question two: active support of learning for all (university faculty)
UF: 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 26, 27

Research question three: contributing to the continuing development of learning and professional sharing (school faculty)
SF: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27

Research question four: contributing to the continuing development of learning and professional sharing (university faculty)
UF: 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27

Research question five: TC recognize the PDS experience as contributing to their clinical preparation activities
TC: 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20

General understanding of PDS:
SF: 1, 2
TC: 1, 2
UF: 1, 2
APPENDIX P

Narrative Responses from Questionnaires
TC, SF, and UF

1. Narrative Question One: From your point of view, what should a PDS partnership look like?

Response received from 22 Teacher Candidates
8 = learning for all
6 = opportunity to try teaching before late in college
6 = talked about collaboration
2 = talked about communication

Response received from 20 School Faculty
5 = learning for all
7 = university and school partnership
1 = collaboration
7 = communication

Responses received from 4 University Faculty
1 = learning for all
1 = collaboration
2 = learning for all and collaboration

2. Question Two: What is the greatest strength of the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES?

Responses from 20 Teacher Candidates
13 = School faculty cooperative, reflective and willing to help
7 = connection between university instruction/ best practices and what TCs observed in the classroom

Responses from 5 University Faculty
1 = professional, supportive, safe environment
1 = professional environment and learning experience
2 = use of best practices
1 = growth of Teacher Candidates and School Faculty

Responses from 18 School Faculty
9 = Teacher Candidates enthusiastic and students enjoyed them
6 = learning opportunities for everyone
3 = school faculty learned, too
3. Question Three: How would you improve the PDS teacher preparation experience hosted at AES?

Reponses from 22 Teacher Candidates
5 = experience lacked diversity
5 = experience needed to be longer
3 = experience should not be all day
4 = nothing to change because school was great and accommodating
5 = improve communication between school faculty and university faculty

Reponses from 5 University Faculty
1 = improve communication
1 = work to development relationships
1 = new leadership at the university

Responses from 21 School Faculty
10 =more direction and communication between UF and SF
7 = more involvement of school faculty in designing the syllabus
4 = better articulation between UF lesson plans and activities in the classrooms at AES
APPENDIX Q

AACTE: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
AERA: American Educational Research Association
AES: Adams Elementary School
CCSSO: Council of Chief State School Officers
CSC: Clinical Schools Clearinghouse
ESEA: Elementary and Secondary Education Act
GU: Grant University
HOUSSE: High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation
HQT: Highly Qualified Teacher
NAPDS: National Association of Professional Development Schools
NASDTEC: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
NCATE: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
NCLB: No Child Left Behind
NCEE: National Commission on Excellence in Education
NEA: National Education Association
NNER: National Network for Education Renewal
NSBA: National School Board Association
PDS: Professional Development School
SF: School Faculty
TC: Teacher Candidate
UF: University Faculty

USDOE: United States Department of Education
APPENDIX R

School Faculty Semi-Structured Interview Session

Test, Test, Test
This is a test for December 12, 2008
Test, Test, Test

INTERVIEWER: Good afternoon, this is Friday, December 12, and our participants are here to answer questions for School Faculty Focus Group for Janice Malchow as she works on her dissertation.

Alright. And um, ladies as we go through this today, I am able to read the question to you and can help out in no other way as we answer the question other than to go through some probes that have been identified and um, I will start with, there are five questions and we will start with number one.

INTERVIEWER: What were your opportunities to collaborate with other um, professional development school participants? And when you think through this, the probes include please describe your opportunities to collaborate, did the governance structure of the Grant University and Adams Elementary School partnership support collaboration? And if you could have changed the governance structure, what would you have changed?

TEACHER: Ah, first of all I think that the University and the school we did have the collaboration that was there.

TEACHER: And I appreciate the collaboration right at the beginning before we started because I know they let us have some input as to um how we are going to evaluate the students, and followed our ideas. Ah, because I know they wanted to run some 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and we said you know we couldn’t expect beginning teachers to beginning 5’s. And I appreciate them listening to what we have to say.

TEACHER: Right, I remember that.

TEACHER: And just the schedule too, asking if the schedule was Ok for us and what would fit best with our um with the teachers, as far as the students coming in, the times, and those kinds of things.

TEACHER: Um, we also, to change anything, yeah, I think it would have been nice if we could have had extra time to collaborate between the teacher and the candidates because I felt we really didn’t have much time because we were busy teaching. I would
have liked some extra time built into the curriculum so we could have time to answer some questions that they were having difficulties with.

TEACHER: And, now that I think about it though, didn’t they make a change for the next year? They did change that because we said that, so then they built in some time and we had like 15-20 minutes that we could come and sit in here with the student and uh supervise her so it was like they listened to us from that year, prior year.

TEACHER: I almost felt like we needed that effervescence. They offered it like a couple times. I think it would have been good, you know, usually when a group finishes at lunchtime and then you know that was not a good time to be discussing this. I would have liked time to work on this and talk to the girls.

TEACHER: Yeah, because some of the candidates really needed some extra guidance on what to do. They were really not to sure where to go plus, when you think about it, they came into a classroom really not knowing what everybody had been taught, things like that, what standards have already been done, what is needed in first grade ready to get to second grade. So they needed a lot of help with that which is understandable.

TEACHER: hmm mm

TEACHER: And this is because it’s their first ah, first method….first experience in the classroom, so.

INTERVIEWER: Very good. Ok. Um, as we move on to the second question. Did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection and a probe about this would be just tell me about this experience?

TEACHER: Well, for me I think it definitely did just because I didn’t go to Grant University. I didn’t do my education in the states, so it was really nice for me when they were doing something, I thought, “Oh, ok, we did that.” You know when they were coming to my classroom, and said “Oh, this is what your classroom is suppose to look like” so it helped me think that I was on the right direction too because I was a fairly new teacher when I had some of these students. So, I think it really helped me reflect on, “Yeah, ok, we need to make sure that I do this everyday.” You know.

TEACHER: I feel the same. It caused me to um look at some of the activities that they were doing. I mean, you know I had been out of school for awhile and I like to see what’s fresh in the college and see how I can use some of their ideas in my classroom and it caused me to do things a little differently.

TEACHER: Ah, I think uh as a Grant U. grad, that their big thing is self-reflection so I think that was kind of built in already. But once you get into the teaching, um and I had not been teaching that long, um you get caught up in everything so I think you know it
did help to kind of sit back and look at what they were doing and see how I could implement their ideas into the classroom and those kind of things.

TEACHER: And I think watching our kids and their enthusiasm from these activities. That these teacher candidates have worked hard on, that I am sure took many hours to put together, and just to see the kids enthusiasm and um caused me to you know to try to do some extra things that sometimes we get caught up in with the time elements and aren’t able to.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, very good. Our third question is tell me about a PDS experience that went really well. Probes include who was involved, what was your reaction/way to handle this experience and did you assess the learning outcomes? If you assessed the learning outcomes, then how did you measure them?

TEACHER: Uh, I can think of one experience. Well, there were a lot of experiences that went well, but there’s uh I can recall one experience where my the Grant U. candidates uh did an activity with my students to kind of help uh with comprehension skills. They had made a game for the students with questions where the students then had to answer. They had the game boards and it was regarding Nate the Great and uh the students had to go back to the test to look for their evidence for their answers. Uh, the assessment then for example for my Grant candidates would have been uh the assessment that I received from the university and then I filled that rubric out for them, assessing the students, my students outcomes would have been comprehension questions that they had to answer after the activity, and then those were used to assess and measure the outcomes of what the candidates did with the students.

TEACHER: And one activity really stands out in my mind because the teacher candidates chose to do a story, I think it was Mittens one of the January stories and they introduced vocabulary that wasn’t in our story but then afterwards the kids had to write a story using that vocabulary and they did so well, I was surprised. Some of these words were not in our book, they were words, more challenge words but I was really surprised how the kids learned the words in context, and then they were able to sit down and apply it and that was their form of assessment. And I thought it was an interesting way to introduce vocab.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, lets move on to question #4 and that is tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well and the probes are who was involved, what was your reaction/way you to handle this experience? Did you assess the learning outcomes and if you assessed the learning outcomes, how did you measure them?

TEACHER: I remember an experience. I am not sure what skill they were working on, two teacher candidates from Grant U. were wonderful. They had prepared a lot of materials and they wanted to make sure every student got a chance, whatever they were doing. They were working on this well over an hour and at the end, when they were trying to evaluate how well the children did, the kids did not get it. The activity was too
long, the activity did not merit the amount of time that we spent on it. And, but the cool thing about it is, as we reflected afterward, they realized it themselves. You know, it’s not like I had to say “Girls, we wasted too much time there. That took too long.” They knew they had.

TEACHER: Part of the learning experience.

TEACHER: And yes, I think that the fact that they were able to pick up on that themselves says a lot for those teacher candidates, too. You know and we tried to talk about what could we have done differently to make it more time efficient, and yet, you know, get the main results.

INTERVIEWER: Alright let’s move onto the final question and it is did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience? The probes include were the rewards and recognition you received extrinsic or intrinsic in design and please tell me about those rewards?

TEACHER: I would say my rewards would be intrinsic. Of course we get a certificate at the end from the school. That’s just a certificate, but I would say more for me, it would be intrinsic because I really enjoyed it. Someone was there for me when I was a student to help me and I kind of look at it the same way. I am there, someone did it for me so you know I enjoy working with the students, I enjoy getting their ideas, getting the fresh new ideas, what’s current in research, and the partnership you know with university as well. I think that’s all just um a bonus for us.

TEACHER: I think one of the greatest rewards is just the teacher candidates’ appreciation. Every candidate I had they were always, “Oh thank you and how do you do all of this?” They were so complimentary and I said, “Girls, you know you have a lot to offer, too” and we just keep working at it. I don’t know I just felt like just their appreciation and wanting to get from me, “What could we have done or how could I do this?” Um, it was very….it felt good.

TEACHER: Yeah. Same thing here. You know. Same thing.

TEACHER: I don’t even remember the certificate and that wasn’t even important. I had all good students, everyone I worked with, uh they all worked hard, they all brought something to the table and the kids benefited all the way around.

TEACHER: And I think for me being a new teacher which is gaining confidence too in myself, that I could do it, and I was doing a good job, and you we got feedback from them, and this made me realize, “Ok, I am doing a good job. I am in my right direction.”

TEACHER: When you had said that about the certificate, I put that up in my room just because I think it is important for the parents to see that not only am I a teacher of their
children, but I am a teacher of teachers…future teachers so that was you know I always stick that up there so they can see it.

TEACHER: And I think it’s good to know that there are other good teachers out there, that they’re waiting to graduate and carry on the tradition.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, thank you very much for your time this afternoon. This concludes our question/answer session for the School Faculty Focus Group.
School Faculty Focus Group Semi-Structured Interview Session

Test, Test, Test
This is a test for December 11, 2008

INTERVIEWER: We will be going through questions for the School Faculty Focus Group and ladies, I need to let you know that there are five questions. I cannot help you in answering the questions other than just give prompts and the prompts are the probes.

The first question is: what were your opportunities to collaborate with other professional development school participants? Now here are some ideas as far as probes in answering this question. Describe your opportunities to collaborate. Did the governance structure of the university which would be GU and AES partnership support collaboration? That would be one thing you would want to tie into this question and if you could have changed the governance structure, what would you have changed?

TEACHER 1: First question, is this for the entire…I’m just looking for a time line here. Is this for the entire day? Because it depends on who is in charge?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

TEACHER 2: I’m going to go with that too then.

TEACHER 3: Yeah, the first few years, or first two, forgive me I am not sure how long I have done this. But for the first couple of years of it anyway, it seemed to go pretty smoothly and the professors were willing to work with us and we had special development opportunities with them, we had time to collaborate with them in terms of the GU students and their expectations of what they were doing in our room. The last year it has been a little rough. (Researcher comment: Last year refers to 2007-2008 PDS partnership)

TEACHER 2: Yeah, I would agree with that too.

TEACHER 1: I would agree. Um, I think that we had a more clear cut idea of what was expected and what to have the students do in our room at the beginning of the process and so I think um by being able to talk that out and work with each other, to work with the professors and that sort of thing it made it easier to come up with what we were doing or having the students do in our room.

TEACHER 2: In talking for both kindergartens, um the first time it was great too, the first semester, the second semester, but this last year was not good. Um, the GU professors that were in charge at that point they would tell us one thing and then they never followed through with it. We actually never got GU students and we were supposed to get them but we never got them this last time. There was a big miscommunication with everything and it never worked out. It got to the point where it
was like, “Forget it, we’re not doing it because it was too much of a hassle.” You know they wanted kids at certain times. They weren’t really willing to work with us this last time around so kindergarten just dropped it last time. But the first time, it was a good experience but not this last year. (Researcher comment: ‘Last year’ refers to the 2007-2008 school year PDS partnership.)

TEACHER 1: But I think the students too, before, in the first couple of years, the Purdue students knew what was expected of them. They came in, they did it.

TEACHER 2: Right.

TEACHER 3: Yeah.

TEACHER 2: And this last go around, they didn’t know what was expected so we really couldn’t help them because we didn’t know either.

TEACHER 3: Right.

TEACHER 3: A lot of confusion.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, a second question then includes did this professional development experience enhance your self-reflection? And a probe to that would be basically just to tell me about this experience and the key word here is again to repeat the question, did the professional development school experience enhance your self-reflection?

TEACHER 2: I think so because I did a lot of thinking of you know, if the student lesson went really well, how could I tie that in with what I am doing in the room or how can I help explain what I do in the room to people who aren’t familiar with the set-up. You had to think things through in a different way to make it work, to be able to do that team partnership there. I think it made a big difference in my self-reflection.

TEACHER 1: Yes, you’re explaining to the GU students why it is you are doing what you are doing so it kind of makes you reevaluate, “Well, is this really purposeful?”

TEACHER 3: Yes.

TEACHER 3: It was worth it when I was explaining it to them. And it’s also, I have taken what they have done in the classroom and used it, modified it, like you know use it again in the classroom, during the next…following year, several times.

TEACHER 1: In kindergarten, we actually have a different, I don’t know. I don’t want to say, perspective, but we actually had some that came in and tutored our kids. And in between we had AM and PM kindergarten, I had two in particular that would come in. They would talk with me, figure out what they were going to do in both our classes and we just picked out like maybe the three neediest kids in both classes and they came in and
they did extra work with them in between our two classes. Either our students in the afternoon would come early, and they would work with them and vice versa. The other students would stay a little bit later and the moms agreed to pick them out and so it was nice because they would ask us what they needed help with and we would talk about it. That worked out well.

INTERVIEWER: The third question then is tell me about a PDS experience that went really well? Probes would be who was involved, what was your reaction/way to handle this experience? Did you assess the learning outcomes? If you assessed the learning outcomes, then how did you measure them?

TEACHER 2: I can go first I guess because of the tutoring. That to me was the best experience that we had with GU because they didn’t normally do lessons in our classroom. They, the ones that we had came in between classes, they did the tutoring with the kids and I think it helped the kids a lot. They got extra help with recognition of letters and sounds and things like that so it was more of a verbal assessment between me and the GU students versus you know a paper pencil kind of thing. So that would be my good experience.

TEACHER 1: Yeah, I have, there were several but the one that stands out for me the most was I had just a group of three GU students that worked together so well, collaborated with the Professor, we all worked together, um communication was there through email and phone calls and actually, after the experiences, I mean the lessons were phenomenal and after that experience was over, I actually kept in touch with this person and all the way through his student teaching. I met up with him because he had some questions about student teaching so that network kind of stayed and then actually I know XXXXX had asked him about a job, but he had got picked up by XXXXX Schools. But, just that collaboration and having that support throughout is a neat experience.

TEACHER 2: One of the things that went really well in my room was there were times where if the kids …if they got tired of listening to me, and I could have the GU teacher candidates introduce something or teach something for them, that it was an important skill they needed to know and we could do it in a way that was a little more fun. Our students had different people in front of them, that um made it more exciting for them. It’s like, “Ew, (INAUDIBLE) that concept in on them” without them realizing that they were learning something they needed to know. So it’s not a specific thing but it was something that I would do a lot of because I need to, you need to cover this and this concept so let’s get it to work.

TEACHER 1: Ah, to assess it, ah, it was more just watching what had happened in the room and making notes for myself that then I used these notes for their evaluation forms at the end. So, I didn’t really have a formal assessment that I used.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, the fourth question then is tell me about a professional development school experience that did not go well? Once again, who was involved,
what was your reaction/way to handle this experience? Did you assess the learning outcome and if you assessed the learning outcomes, then how did you measure them?

TEACHER 3: Um, I would say my most difficult experience was that last year unfortunately with Dr. XXXX and Dr. XXXX just because there was a lack of communication, the expectations were not there for the students, um, things like at first they weren’t told that they had to DIBEL the students so that didn’t happen. I’m trying to teach them how to DIBEL unfortunately we don’t have that much time with our GU students to do that. So, kinda, take it out, work at it, and nothing ever happened with it. We didn’t have really a clear expectation or a clear goal besides assessing the GU students. Um and we just kind of did that on our own because we didn’t have any guidance.  (Researcher note: This references the 2007-2008 school year.)

TEACHER 2: Um an experience that I actually, kind of a combination between one that didn’t go well and one that worked well. Ah, a couple of years ago, I had a student who would shut down when the GU teachers were in the room and would not respond at all to any lessons that they were trying to teach. And they would always come to me after the lesson and say, “Ok, how could I have worked out differently, how could I have done it differently?” so even though it was an experience that didn’t go well for them, because the student wasn’t participating, they were trying to tie it into something to help them out by evaluating how could it have gone better. And I tried to give them ideas and I would see them try to use those ideas the next week. It didn’t always work with the student, but I don’t think it was their ideas or what they were doing. I think it was just a bad situation with the student in particular. I was very impressed by the fact that they were always looking for, “How can I fix this? How can I make it work?” And it was nice to be able to kind of bounce those ideas around with them and see if what we could try, and it was nice to see them actually trying what I had suggested as well. So, not a formal assessment but you could see that they really were trying to incorporate those things.

TEACHER 2: My opinion would be the same as XXX was saying. This past year would be my bad experience.  (Researcher note: This refers to the 2007-2008 school year)

INTERVIEWER: Ok, the fifth and final question then is did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the professional development school experience and the probes would be were the rewards and recognition you received extrinsic or intrinsic in design and please tell me a little about those rewards?

TEACHER 1: I would say with both, I mean they did do the certificates and stuff when we participated which was nice and they did the Teacher of the Year banquet and all that kind of stuff at the end. I would say because, just like I talked about that XXXXXX student, I kept that relationship with him and other ones also that I had kept in contact with. It was just kind of nice. And it makes you feel good when they’re coming back to you and saying, “I liked what you were doing in your classroom, can you give me some
ideas cause this is what I am doing now?” So, that kind of feels good and that was exciting.

TEACHER 2: I would say along the same lines of just being able to, well what I was talking about before too, with the kids where you would see the GU students trying what you had suggested and it’s nice to see that they really are paying attention. They’re not just coming in and saying, “Oh, I know how to do this, I’m fine, I can handle this on my own.” The teacher candidates were listening to those suggestions and trying to make themselves better teachers as they go through.

TEACHER 3: Just because it was basically, the same thing. They would come back to you and they say, “I really liked how you did this so can I get a copy of it” or something. You know emailing just to get a little bit of advice from here and there, and so I just thought it was nice to be able to help them out. We all were in that position once ourselves. So you know what it feels like so it’s nice to give back. So, that’s what I would say.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, well I really appreciate the time that you have taken this afternoon to go through the questions for the school faculty for Mrs. XXXXX as she works on her doctorate. If you have any other comments, if not, we will conclude our discussion.
INTERVIEWER: Our teacher candidates all teach at the elementary level, XX teaches at the fifth grade, XX teaches at the fourth, and XX teaches at the third so we have a good cross section.

INTERVIEWER: Alright, the first question is what were you opportunities to collaborate with other PDS participants? And the probes to help clarify this question can include please describe your opportunities to collaborate? Did the governance structure of Grant University (GU) and Adam Elementary School (AES) partnership support collaboration and if you could have changed the governance what would you have changed?

TEACHER: GU. I was with GU and AES. Well, I am not sure if you guys did to but we spoke with another teacher candidate in the classroom here at AES. Personally, I don’t think that was the ideal. I think as a teacher now it would have been beneficial to be in a classroom just one-on-one with the cooperating teacher and myself rather than a partner and myself with the cooperating teacher.

TEACHER: On that same topic, I was in a room where there were three of us so again, splitting work between three teacher candidates and the real teacher, we kind of stuck on each other and you get three people, one is going to sort of fall behind the others for sure. That’s just gonna happen. So that was again [INAUDIBLE]. But definitely had opportunities to collaborate with the people that we were working with. We created many lessons together talking together as much as we could sort of balance out the lesson, this person would start, this person would be in the middle, and this person would finish and we would alternate and as far as participants I’m assuming that includes the teacher and the teacher candidates and my teacher that I was paired with definitely collaborated with us, gave us feedback, was honest which I appreciated because I was there to learn so I appreciated that.
TEACHER: Yes, the collaboration was definitely with two other teacher candidates and I felt that the reasoning behind that was because if there is only a certain amount of teachers that you can pair up with the amount of students that we had so I understood the collaboration and I think it was beneficial because it helped really have the time after our lesson with all four of us together discussing, reflecting together was helpful. I definitely had a good experience with my cooperating teacher as well. She took the time to give us extra additional information and the subject that we were doing was primary literacy so anything dealing with reading from K to 3. So I was in the third grade and we did reading lessons, prefixes, suffixes, and it was very helpful to have them with us for the reception.

TEACHER: I agree that it was helpful to have a partner with us. I was in a classroom where I did my primary and my intermediate literacy at the same time so it was in two separate classes. I was in a first grade classroom and a third grade classroom. In the first grade classroom, I was with one other partner although there was actually a student teacher in there as well so that I think is where I get a little bit of negative because the teacher the cooperating teacher had to split her time between the student teacher as well as the teacher candidate. So it was very difficult to kind of make sure, you know, on the teachers part I think more so, better time [INAUDIBLE]. We also weren’t able to observe the teacher teaching because the student teacher was teaching so that was tough, but overall the collaboration with the teacher what we got was very beneficial, and also with the partner was beneficial too.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, as we move on to the second question, it says did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection and a probe that I can address is; Please tell me a little bit about this experience? Again, did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection?

TEACHER: You’re learning by doing so most definitely it enhances your reflection. We had the opportunity to teach while we were there with the cooperating teachers so even though we took turns with the partner teacher candidates that were in the room with us, we definitely were able to teach and so as you’re teaching you’re thinking and even afterwards you’re reflecting upon what you just did, so definitely it was a good experience.

TEACHER: Learning in a university classroom only goes so far so you have to step out and definitely being in a school setting you get to see if that textbook is correct and if that professor is correct. Does it work? No, maybe not and so you are able to test all the different things and the ways of teaching just seeing the student’s reaction and their faces. Are they looking at you with that blank face? You’re not getting to them. Change. You can’t do that in a university classroom so definitely having an experience here was fantastic.
TEACHER: I agree with that statement. In addition you’re also able to self-reflect on yourself and then also see what your partner is doing and whether you like what they are doing or would you change what they are doing if you were up there, that’s another way to reflect on the experience so that was beneficial. A beneficial part of having the partner in there, the self-reflection within our college class I mean we were required to self-reflect. I think it was just something that we would do anyhow, just to include the teacher individually.

TEACHER: One thing that I have noticed though is that with this particular elementary school, the teacher took the time out to reflect with us so the teachers that we worked with to collaborate with the host teacher and some of the other elementary schools we would reflect in writing. And we didn’t have that time with the teacher so that was wonderful because we were able to reflect with the teacher. [INAUDIBLE] Even the one that had the student teacher, she was very accommodating and took the time to sit down with us even though her time was limited a little bit more because [INAUDIBLE]

INTERVIEWER: Ok, then our third question says tell me about a PDS experience that went well and who was involved, what was your reaction/way to handle this experience? Additionally to this probe I can say, did you assess the outcomes and if you assessed the learning outcomes then how did you measure them?

[INAUDIBLE]

TEACHER: In my first grade experience that was the one with the student teacher and that was XX and XX was my partner and XX was the student teacher. I think I talked a little about my reactions to this experience already was that situation just to reiterate it was good and bad in both aspects. There is a lot of people kind of competing for the attention and getting the reflection with the teacher and the teacher had to set herself [INAUDIBLE] so that was tough. It was good to see a student teacher teaching. It kind of gives me an insight into my student teaching, what it would be like and the partnership with [INAUDIBLE]. We were able to work together very well and we reflected together and it was a really good experience over all. In third grade [INAUDIBLE] XX again was my partner and we did some phenomenal things in her classroom and she was very accommodating, took extra time out to help us, helped us assess our learning and changed things if it wasn’t going well, gave us ideas as did XX, gave us ideas and stuff too. So that was my experience.

TEACHER: I was in the fifth grade and I was paired with XX and I don’t think I have ever seen a teacher teach as much as she does all day long. I never once saw her step down and to see that model and to see that it’s not just saying what you need to say, then go sit and have them do work, was definitely a picture that will forever be in my mind. And it makes me think what am I doing all day long
everyday? So, that was an awesome experience. I also can’t say enough for the fact that she let us do whatever we wanted to according to what the university wanted us to do. She if we had an idea to do this, she said, “Sure, do it, try it.” She was so willing to give up her time and even I as a teacher now, I mean I see how difficult that would be. Because you have so much to do, so much to get through but she saw that we were really getting the students to learn and we ourselves were learning so she definitely let us do what we needed to get done. So, it was very positive.

TEACHER: I was paired with XX for third grade and just her warmness and responsibility was apparent right away. I mean she is the type of person that you know if there is no time, she will find time. One time that I noticed with her in the classroom was what she did with classroom management and I was able to observe that they each had a little calendar system and on their calendar was their focus or what their goal was and just different things in observation of what different teachers would do and how she managed her time and like XX said she is one of those teachers as well that knows 100 percent on topic, how her students learn, and that was a wonderful experience to see that, so definitely that. That stuck with me too.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, the fourth question is tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well and once again who was involved and what was your reaction/way to handle the experience? Would you assess the learning outcome and if you assess the learning outcome then how did you measure them?

TEACHER: I think my focus on my questions I am not paying attention to because I kind of have gone over what did not go well and what went well. I think just again with you know having so many people in the classroom, the student teacher, and myself and my partner, it was just tough to really you know get the most out of it because I wasn’t able to observe the teacher like I said before. I was observing the student teacher so I was getting her ideas but she was trying things and it was good to see that but I think I would have benefited more from seeing the teacher a little bit. Assessing my learning outcomes, I went back and I said Ok, you know obviously next time I do this hopefully we won’t have a student teacher in there so then I could see what was you know see different things from the teacher but I took out what the student teacher was doing and what I would do and what I wouldn’t do and I assessed it that way and change the way I would teach with that. So I think it was just kind of like mentally affecting them. I didn’t really have to put them on paper for assessing so it all just kind of you know self-reflection type stuff.

TEACHER: I don’t think I had bad experiences. No experience is ever perfect so one of the things that I came about with was because I was paired with two other people you know one sort of went down the line to sort of go back teacher to go to and the last teacher to teach or the last person to get involved and it was just
tricky because as a teacher, we’re teachers for a reason, we want to be in charge. We have a certain way of doing things and we want to make sure that our students are learning in the best way. So it was difficult to watch other teacher candidates teach and you want to interject and say, “Oh, their missing this, or Oh, they should do it this way.” But I guess that’s part of the reflection and learning process but that was a bad experience I guess you could say because their were times where you thought Ok if I would have taught or if I would have done it differently or if they would have done it differently than it would have been better but that’s how this partnership is. I mean you have to deal with people and look at how they teach and you learn from that when you’re watching bad things, I hate to say bad things, not best things happen. And also one other thing I was in the sixth grade classroom and there was drawbacks to every room and one of the drawbacks I felt was sort of the lack of disorganization and you know part of what is important because you can’t expect your student to be organized and for them to have their work done, and for them to have things a certain way, when you, yourself aren’t. So that was only one drawback that I saw.

TEACHER: The experience that I had to share was only one semester and it was with XX. When I think back to something that did not go well, personally for me when I was teaching, one thing that happened was when I asked the students to move from their seats to a group setting in the back. I think she still had that couch back there. And it was for reading Chrysanthemum if I remember this correctly and I didn’t ask them to go group by group. I just said, “Ok, let’s meet in the back of the room.” And oh, the chaos, just everyone all at once jumping to go back there. And when we reflected back on that, I learned that it was a classroom management issue and she said that it happens that way, you just have to bring them back on track, you know just take them and say, “Group D or group B can go because you have to wait until that group is ready and Quiet”. So as silly as it sounds now, that was the one experience I can think that didn’t go as well as planned that comes to mind. Other than that, learning outcomes and how I would assess that just learning that giving them a warning beforehand and telling them what is going to happen next, just putting yourself in their shoes, giving them even that verbal organization is necessary when I reflected back on that, that is what I thought.

TEACHER: And I guess what I learned and changed from her and took from that experience is I give my students sort of a heads up and an organization tool to be successful. My expectations are out there for them and they have a system to organize their things so that they don’t lose their things or don’t complete their work or anything like that. I also model because I’m crazy but I also model for them what it is to be organized and how it’s easier to get along in life and in your career when you know what is going on and where things are and what is expected of you.
TEACHER: I think you really have to accept that standard for your students to do as you want them to and show them how you want them to do it and I think that is something within every experience I have had here at AES and out there you know seeing how the teacher is organized and how that affects the students being organized or you know even the schedule for the day. The students you know how to react to the way the teacher is organized and I think in the classrooms here I was able to see that too and learn from that and reflect on whether it was [INAUDIBLE] you know [INAUDIBLE] within my own classroom.

INTERVIEWER: Very good, very good. Ok, we’re onto the fifth question already and it says did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience? And a probe to help with this question would be were the rewards and recognition you received extrinsic or intrinsic in design and please tell me about these rewards?

TEACHER: Well, I guess the extrinsic would be we received an A for a job well done. That’s definitely something. And with the intrinsic, wow, I mean you learn so much and you saw that you reached your students whatever skill you taught them. You were able to see they grew in that because the PDS partnership is so close with the university we had to reflect on the student learning and show that they learned just like we have to do everyday. So we were able to do that, see that as we show our professors and host teachers. That, “Yes, they have learned look at our assessments. Look at what we have found to be true.”

TEACHER: Intrinsic rewards are the most rewarding. You know I can get a few stickers saying I got an A and not be happy with it because I don’t feel like I did a good job but the intrinsic rewards when I feel like I have done a great job and see the students learning and I see the progress that they have made and stuff like that, that is just so much more powerful than you know a few stickers saying that you got an A or being on the Deans list or whatever. Extrinsic rewards from the teacher I’m not sure if it would be extrinsic because it is from the teacher, verbal recognition you know saying I am doing a good job, giving me that constructive criticism even though it is criticism is still a reward and recognition that they see I can do better or they see that I am doing a great job and here at AES I mean I feel that I got that quite often. And even in that experience of the student teaching there, the teacher was still very rewarding and you know recognizing everything that we did, whether we did it well or not so well and how we could fix that so both intrinsic. Oh, I can’t say the word and extrinsic both rewards were given and that’s it.

TEACHER: Along with that I agree with both of you. When the students are writing you those small thank you cards and when they are being specific about what they learned and not just saying, “Oh, you’re so sweet, you’re so nice.” But they’re specifically stating what they remember.
TEACHER: We like the way you taught context.

[LAUGHING]

TEACHER: That’s what you remember most and that’s the extrinsic and with receiving rewards I don’t know if this is a PDS experience/reward but I received Outstanding Student of the Year in 2007, no 2006.

TEACHER: I did as well. I think that was at the end of my college [INAUDIBLE] 2007.

TEACHER: The whole experience included AES and all of our PDS experiences, I think so.

TEACHER: [INAUDIBLE] so that’s definitely something that you can feel good about and recognizably so.

TEACHER: We were all hired.

TEACHER: Yeah.

[LAUGHING]

INTERVIEWER: Ok, thank you very much for attending this evening. We really appreciate it and your answers. That will conclude this conversation.
INTERVIEWER: Earlier describing, this is December 12, 2008 and we are doing questions for the University Faculty Focus Group.

INTERVIEWER: Ladies, today what I am able to do is to read the question and I am able to help in the answering of the question only to providing the written probes that you have a copy of. And it’s dialog and answering to the best of your ability and we’ll just begin. It should take about hmm 20 minutes.

INTERVIEWER: First question. What were your opportunities to collaborate with other PDS participants? And the probe to help with this include describe your opportunities to collaborate. Did the governance structure of the GU and AES partnership support collaboration? If you could have changed the governance structure, what would you have changed?

UF 1: Ok, my opportunity…. my opportunity is um was with the coordinator of the PDS at GU at the time and I believe we had the faculty members at the University working with the faculty members here um to um coordinate some of what was going on in the classroom. The University faculty kind of dictated the experience of the students to the candidates would have um, but I think there was an openness that we could talk about some of those things. We also provided some professional development from the University faculty for the school faculty here and that was based on the school faculty’s identified needs, things that they wanted to provide for them. Um, let’s see. I think at that point in time that one particular year, the structure was in place to have a really good partnership and to develop on that, to build upon that. To have I think more input from the school and the school faculty that could reflect what was happening and the courses that the teachers had at the table but it didn’t come to be at that point.

UF 2: And everything that XXXXX said, you know I concur with. I also want to add that as a University faculty within the building working with the teachers, I felt very welcome and I felt it was a openness that if I had any issues or problems, I could easily come to either the teachers or Mrs. XXXXXX . We set up the meetings after school in terms of the collaboration to try and work through some of the data collection instruments and work through some of the things that we needed as a University and that they were going to help us with. We wanted to hear things that they wanted also, and we did get some feedback which helped that we will refer to later on that, that, you know, had input from the school faculty. We did provide some professional development and the governance structure with XXXXXX in charge of it was phenomenal. I mean, I think everything, there were open lines of communication, everything went well. I will say that
sometimes I think the partnership did not necessarily add to that governance structure in a positive way. I don’t know if it was negative but I know one time we spoke in a meeting and XXXXX didn’t show up and that was kind of a negative reflection on us. But XXXXX did a fabulous job with working with all the schools that we had to work with.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, for our second question, did the PDS experience enhance your self-reflection and the probe would include; please tell me about that experience?

UF 1: I think as a faculty person in looking at your syllabus and trying to coordinate things with the school and the school faculty that has to be embedded in with what you are doing. You’re self-reflecting over you as a professor, what you’re sharing with your students so that it goes in line with everything that is going on in the school. You know that’s the whole point of being in a school, we want the reality to not just see you know this idealistic, we want to see us succeed. So yeah, I think it did enhance my self-reflection in terms of what I had to do in adjusting syllabus, assignments, working through things, um just being open to new ideas and learning from the faculty here. We’re all learners constantly.

UF 2: Oh, and I agree 100 percent. I think if uh if we don’t do any self-assessments based on the experiences that we have then I think we are not a quality educator. I think um self-reflection is a part of being an effective teacher, a master teacher so to speak, so I agree.

INTERVIEWER: Our third question is tell me about a PDS experience that went really well? And a probe to help with this question includes who was involved? What was your reaction or way to handle this experience? Did you assess the learning outcomes? If you assessed the learning outcomes, then how did you measure them?

UF 1: Um, the PDS experience that um I think I, what comes to mind first when I read this question is um not within the school itself although there were so many great ones, with meeting with the teachers and talking to them but there was a PDS meeting, several meetings where we met with all of the PDS partner schools and the University was trying to develop a way to assess our students and the impact that they have on the classroom students and it was from AES, XXXXXXX in particular who designed a tool that could be used with the teacher candidates and it would provide information for the school as far as any assessment (INAUDIBLE). Any comparison as to potential impact of the experiences on the student learning, but it also could have provided the University with some information um, alignment to standards, what the teacher candidates were teaching, the focus, as well as potential, identifying potential impacts that they had on student learning. So, I think that was just a tremendous step in the right direction as to what the PDS partnership could be, you know, kind of blossomed and got maybe too big to really handle and I don’t know that they really followed through with the thing. But I think it was a step in the right direction.
UF 2: I agree with that too. That, I hadn’t thought of that instance but definitely that instance. What first came to mind for me was an experience that our students underwent in the after school. We had the teacher candidates, this is what I was referring to earlier, in one of our initial meetings with the faculty we talked about getting our teacher candidates involved in the Young Authors event and the um grandparents/parents evening, I believe it was both. And so, that had never been done and so we thought why not have our students get more involved in that and so it was a requirement that our students come to that evening session and participate and with their teachers who were attending and so, it really ended up working out for that special’s person night to be a, a wonderful event for our students. They got to see a model. I mean it was wonderful the way it was all set up and they also got to experience kids writing books in the classrooms to show during that Young Authors session of the evening, and so they participated in not just coming to the event and helping but in the classroom there was a connection to the students in the writing of those Young Authors books but what I really thought you know you asked about the assessment of it, we did ask them to write a reflection. So, and I don’t want to say we measured them other than it was an open ended measurement. There wasn’t a quantitative type of response but overwhelmingly it was positive. They saw you know they saw an impact from the model basically with the community involvement and getting parents, teachers and other community members. We had a lot of people here, and so it was just a wonderful event that I really thought because it was a PDS you don’t just jump in and help anywhere. Because of our relationship that was an easier thing to do and AES teachers were extremely grateful. I heard so many thank you’s and um just they were so grateful for the help that they had with the students helping out, just more bodies to help with so many people attending that night.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, our fourth question was to tell me about a PDS experience that did not go well; probes include who was involved, what was your reaction/way to handle this experience? Did you assess the learning outcomes and if you assessed the learning outcomes, then how did you measure them?

UF 1: It was harder to find something that really didn’t go well. I guess when I thought about that question or think about that question, what immediately came to mind was we were asked to participate in professional development, you’re not necessarily an expert on the professional development you are asked to be a participant in or to lead and so that was something that I, as a personal issue, it’s harder for me because I know I want to be taken seriously. I want to make those connections and not try to do something that is not within my realm so we turned it into a positive I think because what we did then was try to get someone. We brought an outsider in who was more of an expert in that area. That was with the managed MIL, managed independent learning stations and we brought a practitioner from another school district which ended up, I think, turning into a real positive because she was able to, I think, continue to work with some of your teachers or have a site where they could go visit and see it in action. Um, so, some of that and I think that was the only thing that kind of came to mind. Measuring that I think if we most likely um had positive response from your teachers that would have been the outcome that we would have been looking for and would they then be implementing any of those
strategies and that’s not something we would have gone back to look at. But it could have been and probably should have been because, like professional development, just to have it and say ok it sounds good and then ok you’re on your way. That’s one of my big problems with professional development, it’s nice to hear but what am I taking away, what am I actually implementing and doing as a result of that. So, um that’s something that is definitely a point for growth.

UF 2: It would be a natural part of that. You know unfortunately if the partnership doesn’t continue because of the change in personnel and…(INAUDIBLE)

UF 2: If it is continuing that is something we want our students to see, managed independent learning stations. We really want to see that and so that would have been ideal. For that to continue and I have since gone to a number of workshops on that and read a lot more about that so I would be a much more able body to help them with that implementation. You do develop that over time and what if you just stop or if it doesn’t continue then that’s a shame.

UF 1: Right.

UF 2: One of the things that I thought was kind of a drawback in some of this and it doesn’t reflect at all on the teachers, it’s just the nature of school faculty hosting teacher candidates and providing valuable, realistic feedback. The teacher candidates are developing and they need to hear positive and you know negative comments about what they are doing because they are learning. And I think often the host teachers are reluctant to do that because they feel that they are so young we don’t want to discourage them. And I think that school faculty members (INAUDIBLE) with the idea that. Ok we are shaping these people so we need to do that. We even talked to the school faculty and if there are things that you feel that these teacher candidates need to work on, let us know and we can bring it up to them even. Um, but I think really that was always something that came into my mind, that there is that realistic feedback that isn’t quite always there but should be, you know.

INTERVIEWER: Ok, and our fifth and final question then is did you receive rewards and recognition as a result of the PDS experience and the probes include were the rewards and recognition you received extrinsic or intrinsic in design and please tell me about those rewards?

UF 1: I think we received. (INAUDIBLE)

UF 2: Not any extrinsic.

UF 2: I think intrinsic is always the if you feel that things are moving along and you can see the positive impact that you’re having and you see the positive feedback I think that’s an intrinsic reward um that I felt was going great with the school at that point.
UF 2: But I think our just being here as a faculty person and seeing the teacher candidates and the rewards that they get from being in a positive environment that is wonderful and a model school for them to be in that’s to me a reward because that’s the bottom line. We want them to get those kind of experiences and to know that you’re helping to build that and for future students also that’s an intrinsic reward. But I think also and this is kind of a not as much as a reward in terms of the PDS but I think the relationships you develop. I feel that I developed a lot of positive relationships with the faculty um and the administrators here that has carried over and, and to me it’s all about people so having those relationships. I know that XXXXX had called me for recommendations for students you know that may not have been in that group, but just that we have that relationship now that we can do that, that we’ve met for dinner, that it just…that really to me is what school is about and the whole kind of bringing um future teachers in on this. The more people involved in kind of educating our future teachers, our current you know, candidates, and I really feel I got a lot from that.

INTERVIEWER: Good point.

INTERVIEWER: Thank you very much. That’s all.

UF 1: Thank you.