

2004

## A case study of a university-school partnership: impacting the success of children, teacher candidates, and inservice teachers

Paula Summers Calderon

*Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations](https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Calderon, Paula Summers, "A case study of a university-school partnership: impacting the success of children, teacher candidates, and inservice teachers" (2004). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 51.  
[https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations/51](https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/51)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact [gradetd@lsu.edu](mailto:gradetd@lsu.edu).

A CASE STUDY OF A UNIVERSITY-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP:  
IMPACTING THE SUCCESS OF CHILDREN, TEACHER CANDIDATES  
AND INSERVICE TEACHERS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
Louisiana State University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction

by Paula Summers Calderon

B.S., Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1990  
M.A., Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1993  
Ed.S., Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 2000

August, 2004

© Copyright 2004  
Paula Summers Calderon  
All rights reserved

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would be impossible for me to begin to thank all of those who contributed to my success in the completion of this degree. That said, I would like to try. First and foremost, I cannot even find words to express my thanks to my major professor, Dr. Robert Lafayette. “Le Marquis,” as he is called around the department, is a wealth of knowledge and has a never-ending supply of patience. His faith in me to be the graduate student he chose for this research project was what kept me going until completion of this dissertation. Unfortunately, throughout this endeavor, I am certain I let him down a few times, but I hope, in the end, that I redeemed myself. I am forever indebted to his graciousness. I must add a word of thanks to his wife who kept dinner warm while Dr. Lafayette stayed late at his office helping me.

Dr. Earl Cheek has also been a source of strength. He has seen many of my tears and listened to my sob stories for a number of years. I hope, now, that he knows the smile on my face is due, in part, to his kindness and patience. Professionally, Dr. Cheek has never let me down, always available to give advice or solve a problem with a student. He always made sure I was writing and did not miss any important deadlines. Thank you, Dr. Cheek.

For their willingness to serve on my doctoral committee, share books and resources, Dr. William Doll and Dr. Margaret Stewart are also very much appreciated. Never have I walked into either of their offices and been turned away. Even brief e-mails with the name of a professional resource to help with my research showed they were thinking about me and my success. Thank you both.

Dr. Sylvie Dubois, chair of the Department of French Studies, was assigned as my Dean's Representative late in the game. Thank you for your willingness to serve as a committee member. It was a nice surprise to have a Dean's Representative related to my original background—and love— of teaching French.

Michelle Haj-Broussard and Debbie Davis Reed have definitely been a source of strength. I would not have made it had they not been in the doctoral program as well. Thank you, partners in crime. Patricia Exner was my lead cheerleader during this time. Her kindness in freely sharing her knowledge, resources, and wisdom can never be repaid. Thank you, Patti.

There are others, of course, in the College of Education whom I cannot forget— professors, friends, and colleagues, alike. Unfortunately, I cannot name them all, but I hope they know who they are and know they are appreciated. Dr. Denise Egéa-Kuehne deserves a special word of appreciation for her wisdom and words of encouragement. Largely responsible for my job position as a French teacher at St. Joseph's Academy for eight and one-half years, Denise kept the love of teaching and the love of foreign languages alive in me. Thank you, Denise.

The principal, teachers, staff, and students at the partner school also deserve a word of thanks for allowing me to invade their time and space in order to complete this research. I am sure they tired of me more than I know and are probably glad to be rid of me. Hopefully this research will better the partnership and make the years to come run more smoothly.

Finally, this dissertation would never have been complete without the support of my family. My husband—who married me in the middle of my doctoral program—made

sure I did not give up when frustrated. I will never know how he withstood my tears and frustration, but he did. I know I would not be writing this today were it not for him. My parents have also been my cheering squad. Thank you for paying for years and years of my education, never complaining about the cost of tuition, and the sacrifices you made to help keep my house clean, and beautify my yard. What would I do without you!

Friends and other family members have been more than patient while I delved into my research, declining invitations to social functions. I am so fortunate to have such understanding people in my life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xii
ABSTRACT.....	xiii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Significance of the Present Study .....	3
Background of Professional Development Schools.....	6
Background of the Study .....	11
Research Questions.....	17
Definitions and Acronyms .....	17
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	20
Introduction to Research on Professional Development Schools.....	20
Problems of PDS Implementation .....	22
Effects of PDS Partnerships on Inservice Teachers and Teacher Candidates .....	26
Research Focused on the Professional Development of Inservice Teachers.....	27
Research Focused on Teacher Candidates.....	32
Research on the Effects of PDS Partnerships on P-12 Students.....	42
Summary.....	46
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	49
Setting of the Study.....	50
Research Strategies and Sources of Data.....	53
Role of the Researcher .....	56
Research Question One.....	58
Participants for Research Question One .....	58
Instruments for Research Question One .....	59
Data Collection Procedures for Research Question One .....	64
Data Analysis Procedures for Research Question One.....	65
Research Question Two .....	66
Participants for Research Question Two.....	66
Instruments for Research Question Two.....	67
Data Collection Procedures for Research Question Two .....	69
Data Analysis Procedures for Research Question Two .....	69
Research Question Three .....	71
Participants for Research Question Three.....	72
Instruments for Research Question Three.....	73
Data Collection Procedures for Research Question Three .....	74
Data Analysis Procedures for Research Question Three .....	74
Validity and Reliability, Objectivity and Bias in this Case Study .....	75

Bias .....	76
Limitations .....	77
CHAPTER 4 THE STUDY .....	78
Research Question One.....	78
School Report Cards and School Performance Scores .....	79
School Report Cards for the Partner School in this Study.....	81
Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP) .....	83
LEAP—English Language Arts.....	85
LEAP—Mathematics .....	87
LEAP—Social Studies.....	88
LEAP—Science .....	90
Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS).....	92
Third Grade ITBS—Reading.....	93
Third Grade ITBS—English Language Arts / Writing.....	95
Third Grade ITBS—Mathematics.....	96
Third Grade ITBS—Social Studies .....	98
Third Grade ITBS—Science.....	99
Fifth Grade ITBS—Reading.....	100
Fifth Grade ITBS—English Language Arts / Writing.....	100
Fifth Grade ITBS—Mathematics.....	101
Fifth Grade ITBS—Social Studies.....	102
Fifth Grade ITBS—Science.....	102
Research Question Two .....	103
Teacher Candidate Perspective, Likert Questions .....	104
Teacher Candidate Perspective, Group 1 .....	105
Teacher Candidate Perspective, Group 2.....	107
Teacher Candidate Perspective, Group 3.....	109
Teacher Candidate Perspective, Group 4.....	111
Comprehensive Report of the Questions Across All Groups of Teacher Candidates.....	113
Teacher Candidate Perspective, Open-Ended Questions.....	120
University Faculty Perspective .....	123
Partner School Faculty Perspective .....	126
Research Question Three .....	128
Partner School Faculty Perspective .....	129
Section 1: Statements 9 – 30.....	131
Section 2: Statements 32 - 45.....	137
Section 3: Statements 46 and 47 .....	139
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION .....	142
Restatement of the Problem .....	142
Research Questions.....	143
Summary and Discussion of Results by Research Question .....	143
Research Question One.....	143
Research Question Two .....	153
Research Question Three .....	155



Implications and Suggestions for Future Research.....	157
Conclusions.....	161
REFERENCES .....	163
APPENDIX A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHER CANDIDATES.....	171
APPENDIX B QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNER SCHOOL FACULTY .....	173
APPENDIX C QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNER SCHOOL FACULTY .....	174
APPENDIX D PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS EVALUATION.....	175
APPENDIX E TRANSCRIPTION OF TEACHER CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE .....	176
VITA.....	227

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 School Demographics .....	59
Table 3.2 Fourth Grade LEAP .....	61
Table 3.3 ITBS Subject Area Calculations .....	62
Table 3.4 School Performance Scores 1998-99 through 2002-03 .....	63
Table 3.5 School Performance Scores for 2002-03 .....	64
Table 4.1 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fourth Grade LEAP English Language Arts Test. ....	86
Table 4.2 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fourth Grade LEAP Mathematics Test. ....	88
Table 4.3 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fourth Grade LEAP Social Studies Test. ....	90
Table 4.4 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fourth Grade LEAP Science Test. ....	91
Table 4.5 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS Reading Test. ....	94
Table 4.6 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS English Language Arts / Writing Test. ....	96
Table 4.7 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS Mathematics Test. ....	97
Table 4.8 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS Social Studies Test. ....	98
Table 4.9 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS Science Test. ....	99
Table 4.10 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS Reading Test. ....	100
Table 4.11 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS English Language Arts / Writing Test. ....	101
Table 4.12 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS Mathematics Test. ....	101

Table 4.13 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS Social Studies Test. ....	102
Table 4.14 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS Science Test.....	103
Table 4.15 Responses from Teacher Candidates Having Taken All Methods Blocks on the University’s Campus (Group 1, 37 candidates).....	106
Table 4.16 Responses from Teacher Candidates Having Taken Language Arts / Social Studies Blocks at the University and Math / Science Blocks at a Partnership School (Group 2, 1 candidate). ....	108
Table 4.17 Responses from Teacher Candidates Having Taken Language Arts / Social Studies Blocks at a Partnership School and Math / Science Blocks at the University (Group 3, 27 candidates).....	110
Table 4.18 Responses from Teacher Candidates Having Taken All Methods Blocks at a Partnership School (Group 4, 17 candidates). ....	112
Table 4.19 Agreement Scale Grouping Percentages of Agreement to Statements in Teacher Candidate Questionnaire. ....	114
Table 4.20 Percentage of Teacher Candidates Agreeing with Questionnaire Statements. Results Are Sorted by Group Numbers Denoting Location of Methods Blocks....	115
Table 4.21 The Three Statements on the Teacher Candidate Questionnaire Receiving the Lowest Percentage of Candidates Reporting They Agreed With the Statements...	119
Table 4.22 Percent of Partner School Faculty Who Responded “Excellent” When Asked to Rate Teacher Candidates’ Knowledge or Ability in the Following Areas. ....	127
Table 4.23 Scale for the Classifications of Different Levels of Agreement for Questionnaires Collected from Partner School Faculty.....	133
Table 4.24 Section 1: Results From Statements 9-30 Determined From Responses on Questionnaires Completed by Partner School Faculty. ....	133
Table 4.25 Scale for the Classifications of Different Levels of Responses of “Excellent” for Questionnaires Collected from Partner School Faculty. ....	137
Table 4.26 Section 2: Results From Statements 32-45 Determined From Responses on Questionnaires Completed by Partner School Faculty. ....	138
Table 4.27 Section 3: Results From Statements 46-47 Determined From Responses on Questionnaires Completed by Partner School Faculty. ....	140

Table 5.1 Percent of Students Scoring at the Unsatisfactory Level on the 4th Grade LEAP.....	148
Table 5.2 Percent of Students Scoring in the 1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile on the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade ITBS. ....	149
Table 5.3 Percent of Students Scoring in the 1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile on the 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade ITBS.....	149

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1 School Performance Scores Reported on School Report Cards.....	82
Figure 4.2 Fourth Grade LEAP Index Scores as Reported on School Report Cards.....	84
Figure 4.3 Third and Fifth Grade ITBS Index Scores as Reported on School Report Cards. ....	93
Figure 5.1 School Performance Scores as Reported on School Report Cards.....	144

## ABSTRACT

School reform is an often heard term within the Bush administration. Since the signing of his *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), President George W. Bush set out to make certain our teachers are highly qualified and that our children perform better in school.

From the Holmes Group (1986) to present-day mandates from The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), university-school partnerships are becoming part of preservice teacher education as well as school reform. This study describes a pilot university-school partnership, focusing on teacher candidates, inservice teachers, and P-5 students. Employing qualitative and quantitative analysis (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), and case-study research (Yin, 1994), this work studied a first-time, three-year pilot effort toward the formation of a university-wide-elementary school partnership program. This study examined the impact the partnership had on P-5 student achievement, the education of teacher candidates, and on current teacher professional development.

The three tiers of this study are reported here in an effort to support existing research on professional development school partnerships while adding to a growing area of research on school reform. The case study was carried out to provide the College of Education with data on its first university-school partnership. Furthermore, the researcher hopes these findings will provide insight and encouragement for others as they create their own university-school partnerships.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

“The best professional education in medicine, public affairs, business, and law, that can be found in the world is found here in the United States. There is no doubt that our universities can do an equally outstanding job for teachers. The only question is whether they will” (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 20).

A man before his time, the dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education in the 1920s, Henry W. Holmes, “argued persuasively that ‘the training of teachers is a highly significant part of the making of the nation’” (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 24). Indeed from Sputnik, 47 years ago, to the tragedy of September 11, 2001, any significant event in which America has perceived itself in a weakened state has resulted in calls for a look at how Americans are educated and for improvement in the education system in the United States (Ruettgers, 2002).

“Ideally, America’s elementary and secondary schools ensure that all of the nation’s young people learn to think clearly and critically, live honorably and productively, and function effectively in a social and political democracy” (Clark, 1999, p. 2). Educators strive to produce students who will become productive citizens, good scholars, and world learners. Teacher educators are concerned about the environment in which future teachers are prepared. According to some researchers, teacher educators must be willing to change the way teachers are educated and must be committed to finding more effective ways of preparing the next generation of teachers (Futrell, 1996). This concern and commitment to change are important steps toward the improvement of the nation’s schools. Though it sounds like a vicious circle, Clark summarizes his thoughts nicely by asserting that the nation cannot have good schools if there are no good

teachers, yet the teachers must be educated and learn to teach in good schools. “Linking school reform with the reform of the education of educators in partner schools or PDSs [Professional Development Schools] substantially increases the chances for lasting improvements in schooling” (p. 8).

In this chapter, I describe the problem and the significance in studying this particular case. The background of professional development schools is given as well as the background of the particular partner school being studied. Finally, the research questions to be addressed in the study are given as well as definitions and acronyms repeated throughout the paper.

#### Statement of the Problem

As outlined by Teitel’s (2001a) study, for a partnership program to be considered successful beyond organizational implementation, evidence of improvement must occur in the achievement of classroom students, the preparation of teacher candidates, and the further professional development of inservice teachers. The present research examines the three-year pilot school-university partnership to determine the effectiveness of the partnership in preparing teacher candidates, improving student achievement, and aiding in better professional development of inservice teachers. The first of its kind, this endeavor can lead the way for future school-university partnerships in the area or can put a stop to any further plans to continue school-university partnership programs.

Byrd and McIntyre (1999a) state that professional development schools should be able to offer more than a placement site for teacher candidates. Ideally, PDSs and universities must create “true partnerships with efforts to jointly improve the education environment for children, beginning teachers, practicing teachers, and college and



university faculty” (p. viii). However, improvements are rarely documented, as Murray (1993) criticized,

The emergent literature on professional development schools indicates that efforts to create these schools have proceeded to the point at which individual schools and universities have agreed to declare that a PDS has been initiated but not to the point where there have been documented improvements in student or teacher learning and understanding as a result of the PDS innovation (p. 69).

Book (1996) adds that research on PDSs could prove beneficial in providing the foundation for sustaining the effort to document the positive benefits of these schools. Solid documentation may be beneficial to others who are struggling to create professional development school partnerships.

In 2000, a southern, public school system with a majority of African-American students and a southern flagship university entered into a first-time school-university partnership. To protect the privacy of the participants, the school system, the partner school, and the university have been given pseudonyms as well as the names of the participants. Using mixed methodology (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), an analysis of test scores and case study research (Yin, 1994), this study aims to provide recommendations for possible changes and strategies for improvement in the current implementation of this partnership program and will additionally present recommendations for any future agencies interested in this effort.

#### Significance of the Present Study

In order to determine whether efforts such as this University-School Partnership should continue, research must support public opinion regarding the effectiveness of the

partnership. Both the partner school and the university are public institutions. The participating teachers, administrators, and educators have given of their time to create and sustain this partnership. Research is needed to rationalize the expenditure of time, effort, and money within these two institutions.

The amount of time spent in the planning and implementation of a new partnership is significant. More than three years will have been spent in the partnership setting, including the months before beginning the partnership, preparing, and arranging the final agreement. The elementary school faculty, College of Education faculty, as well as the school board have made sacrifices to benefit all who are involved. There have been changes in the setting of the school (e.g., classroom space, the constant presence of university personnel) which have most likely caused some despair and confusion among the students as well as the elementary school's faculty. College of Education faculty, teaching away from their own comfort zones (familiar classrooms, offices, computers, phones, to name a few), have learned how to create bright classroom experiences for their students. Notwithstanding the above changes, the College of Education has invested time, resources, and faculty in educating teacher candidates within the context of a school-university partnership.

Nevertheless, the potential for success as well as future changes in how teacher candidates are prepared can be found in professional development schools. "The joining of school and university forces in PDSs can create a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts, qualitatively transforming the possibilities for developing teacher knowledge and knowledge about teaching" (Robinson & Darling-Hammond, 1994, p. 204). Darling-Hammond purports that the PDS extends beyond the early analogy of a teaching hospital

in that the PDS movement is an effort toward the redesign of university preparation programs for teachers as well as the transformation of the teaching profession as a whole (Darling-Hammond, 1994). “Because they join professional education with intensively supervised opportunities for practice, PDSs promise to develop more effective teachers” (Darling-Hammond, 1994, pp. 7-8). It is on this premise of “intensively supervised opportunities for practice” that the undergraduate methods courses are designed in this university-school partnership setting.

In several of its commissioned reports, The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) expressed the importance of carefully preparing teachers in order to reform schools (Auton, Browne, Futrell, 1998; Teitel, 2001b; NCATE, 2001). The United States Secretary of Education, Dr. Rod Paige, correlates student achievement with *good* teachers and *bad* teachers. Ironically, Secretary Paige relies on students’ (not teachers’) standardized test scores to determine whether a teacher is qualified to teach. “By testing students annually and comparing the growth of individual students and individual classrooms, researchers can pinpoint the effect teachers are having on their students” (United States Department of Education, 2002, p. 7). Although true that a teacher’s effectiveness is displayed in the success of his/her students, is this the best way to determine a teacher’s qualifications? The factor of the school environment does not rate very high on Secretary Paige’s list of school quality. He claims that anecdotal evidence is relied upon rather than rigorous scientific evidence (e.g., pp. 6, 8). In later chapters of this paper, it will become evident to the reader that anecdotal evidence can add significant value to research that a standardized test cannot measure.

A recent report by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) purports that research in education is limited and poorly funded compared to research in other areas such as medicine and agriculture (Allen, 2003, p. 123). Typically PDS efforts take time in documenting. The larger the sample or the longer the time period, the more expensive the research. With educational research being limited and poorly funded, it is no surprise that research concerning professional development school partnerships is scarce. Allen maintains that the largely descriptive research on professional development schools is inconclusive. He does note, however, that determining whether PDSs “represent the most successful model, and whether they are successful enough in strengthening new teacher knowledge and skills...” does warrant further research (Allen, 2003, p. 42).

In 1998, Teitel described his 1995 search of the ERIC Database as yielding 200 studies on professional development schools. Of these, 86 were found to be descriptions of PDS programs, 41 were classified as opinion or policy, 18 referred to surveys while 18 more were case studies. Five references were reports based on focus groups. There were 15 books and 19 items such as handbooks. In 2001, Teitel still reported the research on PDSs as “at best, thin, and sometimes close to non-existent” (p. 1). In addition to Teitel, others who have compiled reviews of literature concerning effective PDSs have repeatedly bemoaned the need for future research, and moreover, the need for research employing higher quality methods (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Book, 1996; Teitel, 1998, 2001b; Zeichner & Miller, 1997).

### Background of Professional Development Schools

The call for what was soon to be termed professional development schools (PDSs) began in the mid-1980s and has quickly blossomed throughout the nation (Goodlad,

1993). The Holmes Group (1986) searched for a site of learning and development for teacher candidates as well as inservice teachers. They envisioned a site that would be more than just a warm room in which to place students for a few weeks of student teaching. The Holmes Group presented the concept of “professional development schools” and made the term quite familiar to schools of education across the nation (e.g., Teitel, 2001b). “*Professional development schools*, the analogue of medical education’s teaching hospitals, would bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty in partnerships that improve teaching and learning on the part of their respective students” (p. 56, italics in original). Likewise, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) stated that these schools should be called “clinical schools, and [should be] staffed for the preparation of teachers” (p. 76). The Carnegie Forum also called for these schools to be outstanding public schools working closely with schools of education. These factors outlined what were later to become professional development schools. The sites were to be clinical schools, like teaching hospitals, staffed by teachers, administrators, and university faculty who focused on the preparation of teachers and the improvement of P-12 education. Over a decade later, Renee Campoy (2000) deemed worthy the creation of professional development schools stating that the “professional development school (PDS) is one of the most prominent, compelling, and recent models of teacher education reform” (p. 3).

Participation in a PDS partnership “ranges from taking on a cadre of student teachers isolated from one another in classrooms (like cars scattered about in a parking lot) to a symbiotic partnership in which school and university personnel share the decisions of the teacher education program” (Goodlad, 1993, p. 25). As the Holmes

Group (1986) proposed, the desired level of participation involves more of Goodlad's idea of symbiosis than of isolated incidences of student teaching.

Education reform is not a new concept, but specific reference to teacher education reform is a very recent phenomenon. The past years have seen the literacy and mathematics debates, high-stakes testing, and school accountability reports. Today, the most focused attack is on teacher education.

Levine refers to a John Dewey Lecture of 1967 in which the dean of Teachers College at Columbia University, Robert Schaefer, described his "vision of schools as centers for inquiry" (1992, p. 9). Within these "centers," teachers and teacher candidates were learning together. While they were learning, the students were witnessing this learning taking place. Schaefer maintains that students were then able to learn how to learn rather than simply learn. These schools where professional learning takes place, where new teachers are inducted would be called professional practice schools.

In contrast, PDSs focus specifically on the professional development of teachers. Goodlad (1980) asserted that the previous concept of the laboratory school had strikingly similar goals. On the other hand, Murray (1993) maintains that "attempts to implement the professional development school (PDS) are frustrated by a lack of consensus about the meaning of the defining characteristics of these new schools...The PDS is not a laboratory or demonstration school" (p. 61). In March, 2000, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) published its *NCATE 2000 Standards* to ensure that schools of teacher education are producing high quality teacher candidates. In keeping with the spirit of accountability, NCATE then published its *Standards for Professional Development Schools* (2001). Both sets of standards address the importance

of and need for professional development school partnerships in order to produce highly qualified teachers. NCATE defines professional development schools (PDSs) as

innovative institutions formed through partnerships between professional education programs and P-12 schools. Their mission is professional preparation of candidates, faculty development, inquiry directed at improvement of practice, and enhanced student learning. Professional development schools are real schools, often in challenging settings, which have been redesigned and restructured to support their complex mission. PDSs support professional and student learning through the use of an inquiry-oriented approach to teaching (NCATE, 2001, p. 2).

The professional development school is designed to prepare new teachers, extend the professional development of classroom teachers, and improve the K-12 schools (e.g. Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Campoy, 2000; Holmes Group, 1990, 1995; NCATE, 2001; Teitel, 2001a).

While the characteristics of PDSs has been defined through the efforts of organizations such as the Holmes Group and NCATE, Clark (1997) defined professional development schools as “K-12 schools that have developed the broader mission of assisting with the learning of educators” (p. 3). Clark lists four purposes for the collaboration of universities and schools. These purposes are to “provide an exemplary education for some segment of P-12 students; provide a clinical setting for preservice education; provide professional development for teachers and professors; promote and conduct inquiry that advances knowledge of schooling” (p. 3). All PDSs do not ascribe to all four of Clark’s purposes. As confirmed by Teitel (2001a), most PDSs tend to focus on only the first two purposes. “The professional development school movement has grown out of two distinct, yet related, concerns: the need for full-scale reform in colleges of education, and the need for continuous renewal and improvement in P-12 schools” (p.

i). As described in later chapters, Long Elementary School (a pseudonym for the school in this study) strives to focus on the third purpose as well as the first two.

The school-university partnership is very similar in definition and purpose to the professional development school. Having grown out of the professional development school's teacher education reform movement, the school-university partnership is a potential solution to the amelioration of teacher education programs (Levine, 1992). "The very name *professional development school* suggests just how central the role of teachers' professional growth is in these full-fledged, long-term, school-university partnerships" (McBee & Moss, 2002, p. 61). Professional development schools became a potential solution to reforming teacher education within the university as well as teacher preparation within PreK-12 schools (Abdal-Haqq, 1998). "Because PDSs would be designed and implemented by school-college partnerships, they were envisioned as institutional settings that would be both models of P-12 practice and optimum sites for clinical preparation of novice teachers" (Adbal-Haqq, 1998, p. 2). This school-university partnership is key to this model of collaboration for educating teacher candidates. In her co-edited collection of PDS reports, *Collaborative Reform and Other Improbable Dreams: The Challenges of Professional Development Schools* (2000), Johnston writes in her introduction,

Collaboration is a fragile process on which to base a reform agenda. It is easily subverted and depends on relationships that must be nurtured and attended to in ways that more hierarchical arrangements do not. Collaboration is more easily undermined than sustained. It requires changes in attitudes, working relationships, and pedagogies, as well as in organizational structures. There are few proven models and most participants have had little personal experience with this kind of organizational structure (p. 3).



It is this same collaboration that enables the professional development school to “blend the resources and expertise of universities and schools to study and develop teachers’ instructional practices” (McBee & Moss, 2002, p. 61).

Unfortunately, as Teitel (2001a) found, although “...many of those involved in PDSs feel strongly that their partnerships are improving the learning of prospective and experienced teachers at the K-12 level, teacher educators, and K-12 students, there is rarely any credible evidence to document those impacts” (p. 57). Furthermore, Teitel calls for more documentation of the effects partnerships have on these different groups in order to justify maintaining PDS partnerships in the future. The professional development school partnership is a not a simple model of reform due to its unique goal which upholds the ideal that any change or reform in education should take place both at PreK-12 schools and at the university level.

Not only is it prudent to continue to foster the relationship school-university partnerships offer, but it is also a necessary step in school reform as well as better teacher education. It is to the advantage of all those involved in education to create and maintain professional development schools.(e.g., Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Goodlad, 1993, 1994; Levine, 1992; Trachtman, 1998). Better teachers produce better students. These students enter the universities and become excellent teachers, thus renewing the cycle. Those students who do not enter into education will still excel in college, find good jobs, and be better workers (Campoy, 2000).

#### Background of the Study

“A school-university partnership represents a formal agreement between a college or university (or one or more of its constituent parts) and one or more school districts to

collaborate on programs and projects in which both have a common interest” (Goodlad, 1994, p. 113-114).

As mentioned earlier in the chapter, a professional development school and the partnership school of this study have many similarities: they are both associated with a university’s school of education, both serve to educate teacher candidates, and encourage continuing professional development for inservice teachers, and both maintain an interest in improving student achievement. In Louisiana, the Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality (BRC) mandated that each school of education be required to have “at least one fully-functioning professional development school by Spring, 2005 (Louisiana Board of Regents, 2000). In addition, the BRC encouraged universities to create other partnerships with public schools. The present study came into existence not only according to the BRC’s plan, but for political reasons as well.

In 1999, in an effort to reduce the number of students in 31 of its 59 public elementary schools, the school board which serves a low socio-economic, majority African-American population proposed to create two magnet schools. The magnet program is “one of the desegregation plan’s main voluntary desegregation tools” which attempts to attract White students to inner-city schools with a majority Black student population. This is accomplished through specialized academic programs of interest to the students (King, 2000).

Long Elementary School was one of the two schools selected to become a magnet school, both of which would be partnership schools with Louisiana State University. Although the creation of these magnet schools never came to be, on February, 3, 2000, an agreement was reached between the university and the school district to establish two

partnership schools. They were referred to as *partnership schools* to distinguish them from several other schools in the district that had previously been identified as professional development schools (PDSs). Long Elementary School would be the first university-school partnership school in the district, and one of the middle schools would soon follow.

A public pre-kindergarten through fifth-grade school, the partner school was chosen for several reasons: the school is within three miles of the university, standardized test scores were below average, and 94.55% of the students participated in the Free/Reduced Lunch Program (Louisiana Department of Education, 2000). The elementary school is located in an upper middle-class subdivision; however, the students are bussed to the school from Section 8 housing<sup>1</sup> not far from the area. The university is a Land Grant and Sea Grant, Doctoral/Research-Extensive University, as classified by The Carnegie Foundation (Carnegie Foundation, 2000), and is the flagship university of Louisiana in the capital city of Baton Rouge.

It is not easy to believe, when riding through the neighborhood where the elementary school is located, that the school serves students from low income families. One of the university students completing a class assignment on the city's schools noted that the students of this school are "forced to ride the bus through a beautiful neighborhood" before and after school. Understanding how this situation came to be is difficult. Due to a 47-year-old desegregation lawsuit involving the school system, students are bussed from their neighborhoods to other schools in an effort to assure equal

---

<sup>1</sup> "Housing assistance, in the form of direct payments to private landlord, secured from local housing authority that low-income people can use to rent apartments and homes on the private market...The tenant pays 30% of household income for rent, with the balance paid by the housing authority directly to the landlord" (National Housing Law Project [NHLP], 2001).

resources among majority Black and majority White schools. For the most part, gone is the picture of students walking to their nearby school. Instead, the students wake up early to catch a school bus which takes them into an unfamiliar area of town.

The aforementioned lawsuit began in 1956 when 37 Black students attempted to go to their neighborhood school and were not allowed to enter. In the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* suit, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that separate schools (for Whites and Blacks) were unequal. Two years later, the 14 families of the 37 children became plaintiffs in a lengthy suit against the local school board. Finally, in 2003, a Memorandum of Understanding was agreed upon and signed by all parties declaring the school district unitary and thus ending the 47-year-old case.

It is important to reiterate that the partner school serves a low-income population. The importance of this fact is underscored by Pechman (1992), who noted that “typically, low-income communities are served by the worst systems” (p. 28). By introducing a partnership with a large university, the *richness* of the university spills over into the school and into the lives of the children. The partnership makes the partner school attractive to students, potential faculty, and the community. This statement is evidenced by the many community volunteers who have adopted the school and are a constant presence on campus helping both the faculty and school children. In addition, when potential faculty are interviewed, a frequent comment is made regarding the interviewee’s interest in the university’s presence at the elementary school. The interviewee wants to know how this partnership came to be, what is the university’s role, and what does the university have to offer the faculty members. When these answers are given, the potential faculty member finds the position all the more appealing, thus, as stated above,

avoiding the tragedy of hiring only what remains of the teacher pool at the end of the summer hiring term.

Throughout the planning stages of this partnership, the school board and the university agreed that a new faculty should be hired—an exemplary faculty to benefit both the elementary school students and participants from the university. All certified teachers interested in teaching at the partner school were required to submit an official application, including current faculty. Although this created some dissension among faculty who did not care to go through the application process, administrators within the partnership believed it was a necessary step to creating their ideal faculty. Members of the EBRP School Personnel Office, members of the College of Education at LSU, and the principal of Long Elementary School, were all part of the interview team. During the selection process, in most instances, the interview team gave preference to teachers with masters' degrees and significant classroom and mentoring experience. Upon accepting a job offer, faculty members were required to commit to three years of service at Long Elementary, agree to participate in professional development, and agree to mentor the university's teacher candidates and be enrolled in a master's degree program by the end of the first year of the partnership (EBRP, 2000).

The faculty at Long Elementary were not the only ones required to make certain commitments. University faculty agreed to “conduct/guide research with each [partnership] school to develop greater understandings of the teaching and learning process” and participate in a “Visiting Scholar Series” to be held at the partnership schools (EBRP, 2000).

In an effort to fulfill this commitment, a university liaison was hired. This liaison, paid for by the school system, coordinates university volunteers for special events or needs in the classrooms. For example, if a teacher needs an entomologist for a lesson on bugs, the liaison might contact a professor of entomology or a graduate student in entomology to serve as a guest speaker. At the beginning of the partnership, a graduate student and her professor from the School of Music taught piano lessons to the children before the school day began.

The College of Education (COE) at LSU developed an interest in such a partnership to enhance the preparation of future elementary school teachers as well as play a significant role in the effort to increase student achievement. Undergraduate elementary methods classes (9 semester hours) taught by two instructors in the College of Education were arranged to be taught on site in a vacant elementary school classroom during the fall and spring semesters. The classes taught are two junior-year methods courses: Reading, Writing, and Oral Communication in Elementary School, and Curriculum Disciplines: Social Studies in Elementary School.

The school and university were not the only aspects of the partnership. A community church became involved as well. A Baptist church—located approximately two blocks from Long Elementary School—offered support for the elementary school faculty, and one-on-one tutoring for the students. Church members “adopted” students and teachers as part of this program. On Wednesdays, church members supplied teacher appreciation snacks in the teachers’ lounge as well as encouragement gifts for the teachers throughout the year. These volunteers pulled students from their regular classrooms for one-on-one tutoring time in an effort to improve student achievement.

## Research Questions

Using qualitative and quantitative analysis (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), and case-study research (Yin, 1994), this study examined a three-year pilot effort toward the formation of a university-wide – elementary school partnership program. This study explores the following questions:

- How does this University-School Partnership affect student achievement as measured by LEAP, and ITBS tests?
- How does the Louisiana State University-East Baton Rouge Parish Partnership affect development of teacher candidates as measured by questionnaires and interviews of teacher educators and teacher candidates?
- How does this University-School Partnership affect current teacher professional development as measured by questionnaires of inservice teachers?

## Definitions and Acronyms

**LEAP** is the abbreviation for the Louisiana Education Assessment Program. Technically called LEAP 21 (21 for the 21<sup>st</sup> century), it is the criterion-referenced test given to Louisiana’s fourth- and eighth-grade students. The test measures how well a student has mastered the state’s content standards for English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. Unlike Louisiana’s previous criterion-referenced tests, the LEAP, by law, “must be as rigorous as those of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)” (Louisiana Department of Education, 2002a, p. 1).

The **Iowa Test of Basic Skills** (ITBS, or simply, Iowa) is a norm-referenced achievement test given to third- and fifth-graders. The tests are published by Riverside

Publishing of Itasca, Illinois, and were standardized nationally so students' scores can be compared to the scores of other local students as well as students tested in the national sample (Louisiana Department of Education, 2002b).

**Teacher candidates** refer to those students in Colleges of Education who have not yet received their state teacher licensing. These students may be undergraduate or graduate students depending on the program in which they are enrolled.

**Inservice/Classroom teachers** refer to those teachers who have graduated from college and have received their state teacher licensing either through a traditional, four-year undergraduate program, a fifth-year graduate program, or by means of an alternative method.

**At-risk population** (as defined by the free/reduced lunch program) refers to the students of low socio-economic status who qualify for the federal free/reduced lunch program. Students of at-risk populations are often identified as potential future drop-outs. The student population of the school in this study is an at-risk population.

**Title I School** refers to a school in which at least 40% of the student population qualifies for the federal free/reduced lunch program.

**Section 8 Housing** is "Housing assistance, in the form of direct payments to private landlord, secured from local housing authority that low-income people can use to rent apartments and homes on the private market...The tenant pays 30% of household income for rent, with the balance paid by the housing authority directly to the landlord" (NHLP, 2001).

**Teacher educators** are the faculty in the College of Education who educate the teacher candidates. Teacher educators are found in the traditional, four-year



undergraduate programs and the fifth-year graduate programs as well as alternate certification programs.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

“Teacher education is under attack. There is no shortage of accounts of what is wrong with teaching, teachers, and teacher education...” (Cochran-Smith, 2000, p. 163).

As the above quote suggests, educators are finding themselves in the limelight of bad publicity (Hammadou, 1998; Zeichner, 1996). Glisan and Sullivan (1993) state that “teacher training has been one of the targets of the harsh criticism that education in the United States has experienced in the past decade” (p. 217). For some time now, teacher education has come under particular scrutiny (Holmes Group, 1986; Carnegie Task Force, 1986). These reports, among others, demand better teacher quality and better quality in teacher education. The intent of this chapter is to present an account of the research of professional development school partnerships created to address the subject of teacher quality. The chapter examines the problems of implementation of professional development school partnerships, and the effects of professional development schools on teachers, teacher candidates, and P-12 students. Before examining the problems and outcomes, the general state of research on professional development schools will be discussed.

#### Introduction to Research on Professional Development Schools

This section defines professional development schools (PDS) and examines the present research and direction of professional development school research. Although the *partner school* described in this study is unique in its description, researchers tend to use the term “partner school” to describe a general category of schools. Throughout this chapter, the reader will see professional development schools (PDSs) and partnership

schools used interchangeably along with professional practice schools and clinical schools (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Byrd & McIntyre, 1999b; Clark, 1999; Zeichner, 1992).

One cannot describe professional development school partnerships without describing the other side of the partnership: the university. “The long-neglected relationship between elementary-secondary (K-12) and postsecondary education is beginning to receive some of the attention it merits” (Maeroff, Callan, & Usdan, 2001, p. 1). “Schools and universities have very different cultures” (Clark, 1997, p.11). Each group has its own way of working and its own concerns. University faculty are often pressured into publishing and tend to work as individuals rather than as a team. P-12 teachers maintain their own schedules leaving little time to reflect on a new PDS or meet with university faculty. However, through careful nurturing, the two worlds can combine to create an effective professional development school program (Clark, 1997).

In 1998, Teitel compiled a review of research for NCATE’s Professional Development Schools Standard Project. From an ERIC search, Teitel found 200 references to professional development schools. Of these references, 86 were descriptive studies or documentations, and 41 references were considered simply policy or opinion. 34 of these references pointed to books or handbooks, and there were 18 surveys or evaluations, 18 case studies, and five reports from focus groups or interviews. Teitel noted that although there are references to professional development schools, research on PDSs is thin and ranges in level of quality.

Within the literature on professional development schools, researchers discuss the *raison d’être* of PDSs. According to Byrd and McIntyre (1999a), “The common goal for PDSs is to improve the education of teachers by forming centers of collaboration between

higher education and public schools that serve as models for inquiry and best practice” (p. viii). While Abdal-Haqq (1988) and Clark (1999) agree that PDSs should be concerned with the preparation of teacher candidates, they go further, stating that these partnership schools also play a role in professional development of classroom teachers, and in providing means of increasing student achievement. Because this research focused on discovering the best practices, this review of literature examines how the professional development schools were implemented and whom they affected, namely the teachers, teacher candidates, and P-12 students.

This review of literature is divided into three sections. The first section addresses the problems of implementing a professional development school partnership. The second section addresses the effects of PDS partnerships on inservice teachers and teacher candidates, and the third section focuses on the effects of PDS partnerships on the P-12 students.

#### Problems of PDS Implementation

According to the *American Heritage College Dictionary*, to collaborate is “1. To work together, esp. in an intellectual effort. 2. To cooperate treasonably, as with an enemy” (2000, p. 273). Unfortunately, P-12 and post-secondary collaboration is not always an easy task, and at times, it resembles the second definition rather than first. Hoffman, Reed, and Rosenbluth describe this collaboration. “Collaboration between colleges and universities and K-12 schools has frequently resembled an enemy attempting to occupy someone else’s country” (Hoffman, Reed, Rosenbluth, 1997, p. 33). Upon reading that statement, one quickly realizes that this scenario could frighten anyone involved in the creation of a university-school partnership. However, knowing the

promise of such collaboration in terms of sharing knowledge among teachers and teacher educators and educating teacher candidates may, in fact, prevail over any fear (Darling-Hammond, 1994).

Goodlad (1995) summarizes the effort of a university-school partnership as needing to be symbiotic. “Symbiosis, in the nonparasitic interpretation of the word, means the intimate living together of two dissimilar organisms in a mutually beneficial relationship. For five decades since World War II, the relationship between schools and universities has not been symbiotic” (p. 11). Adding to this lack of symbiosis is the lack of time to develop a beneficial relationship. Clark (1997) states that educators in the P-12 schools and in the universities report that their schedules do not allow time to meet with each other for the collaboration necessary to begin and maintain an effective professional development school (p. 11).

Levin and Rock (2003) examined the collaboration among five preservice teachers and their respective cooperating teachers during action research projects. The five pairs of participants worked together on a mutually agreed-upon action research project. With regard to the collaboration that took place, nine out of the ten participants revealed that the benefit of collaborative action research is the opportunity to work as partners on a project in which both partners were interested. Having the opportunity to develop a deeper personal and professional relationship with a colleague was an often repeated sentiment of the participants. The authors concluded that understanding the pedagogical beliefs of the cooperating teacher and the preservice teacher may lead to a better working relationship during the year of internship and student teaching. Furthermore, the authors note that if collaborative action research is deemed beneficial,

then time, training, rewards and accountability, and support must also added to the formula.

In her meta-ethnography, Rice (2002) was interested in the collaboration process in professional development schools. She defined *collaboration* as a “situation in which people work together to promote change” (p. 56). Rice collected case studies of PDSs between the years 1990 and 1998. After finding 66 case studies that described collaboration processes, a panel of experts in PDS collaboration was convened to select a sample set of studies. Using case study criteria based on Merriam (1988; 1998), the 66 studies were narrowed to 20 for Rice’s meta-ethnography. The 20 PDS case studies selected “(a) were particular to the collaboration process, (b) provided ample description of the collaboration process in a PDS, (c) discussed interpretively the collaboration process, and (d) were capable of contributing details to understanding the process of collaboration in PDSs” (p. 57).

Twelve themes emerged across the 20 case studies: unwillingness to collaborate (13 of 20); prior relationships and attitudes affect the PDS (8 of 20); difficulty sustaining funding (13 of 20); lack of formalization (8 of 20); issues of parity and control (14 of 20); the importance of the principal (16 of 20); miscommunication (12 of 20); intraorganizational strain (18 of 20); conflicting goals between organizations (9 of 20); initial distrust and skepticism (13 of 20); the importance of key individuals (8 of 20); the importance of informal meetings (10 of 20).

Using the literature from interorganizational relationships (Alter & Hage, 1993; Swan & Morgan, 1993; Van de Ven, 1976), Rice categorized the 12 themes into 4 categories: situational factors, structural dimension, process dimension, and relational

dimension. Of the 12 themes, only 2 did not fall within the area of relational dimension (sustaining funding and lack of formalization). Three themes shared the category of relational dimension with one other dimension: miscommunication appeared in both relational dimension and process dimension; unwillingness to collaborate and prior relationships and attitudes fell under relational dimension and situational factors (Rice, 2002, p. 63-65).

Furthermore, Rice found that in schools where only some of the teachers were involved in the PDS, there was much discord. Participating teachers were criticized by teachers who were not chosen to be a part of the collaboration. This discord played a large role in 18 of the 20 PDS case studies which displayed signs of “intraorganizational strain” (p. 61). University faculty involved in the PDS collaboration often encountered conflict with their colleagues because many of them disagreed with the collaboration effort and refused to join them in the PDS sites.

Interestingly, Kochan and Kunkel (1998) surveyed the partners within their school-university partnerships and found that the major problem areas fell into three categories: issues of management, commitment, and collaboration (p. 328). The management issues were further broken down into “policies, logistics, and human and structural problems” (p. 329). The human and structural problems included “changing personnel, time constraints, and overloaded agendas and responsibilities” (p. 329). Darling-Hammond’s (1994) collection of essays reaffirms both Rice (2002) and Kochan and Kunkel (1998) in that she found similar challenges in PDS partnerships labeling them as institutional, financial, and policy challenges (p. 20-26).

In another article about the impact that collaboration can have in a partner school, Wiseman and Cooner (1996) write about the change that occurred after engaging in dialogues with the teacher education faculty of the university. The teachers in this study discovered that the university's philosophy on teaching reading did not match the present language arts practices. The students of the partner school had poor writing scores, and the conflict of practices was certain to fail. Both the faculty at the partner school and the teacher education faculty were not happy with the arrangement.

Communication between the two sets of faculty was "the most difficult component of the collaboration" (p. 21). Fortunately, several partner school faculty members knew some of the teacher education faculty and were comfortable beginning the dialogue process. After some discussion of philosophies and practices, the idea of using university students as "writing buddies" was formed. As stated later in this chapter, the desired outcome of an increase in student achievement was dramatic.

It is quite evident from the aforementioned research that, in implementing a school-university partnership, there will be friction between the P-12 faculty and the university faculty. In the research discussed in this chapter, the P-12 faculty was already in place at each of the partner schools. In the school-university partnership of the present study, the partner school administration and representatives from the university chose to select a new faculty in an effort to hire teachers who were willing to buy in the idea of a school-university collaboration.

#### Effects of PDS Partnerships on Inservice Teachers and Teacher Candidates

"We will not improve learning substantially unless we learn to do the work of educating our diverse young people differently than we do today" (Lanier, 1994, p. xi).



In a field where formal preparation is not always required for practice, where teachers can teach although not necessarily knowledgeable in the discipline, professional development school partnerships are an effort to refocus efforts toward best practices in teaching and in teacher education.

### **Research Focused on the Professional Development of Inservice Teachers.**

Riding on the premise that teachers play the key role in educational renewal, professional development school partnerships are created so that future teachers can learn from a knowledgeable, successful, professional mentor. “PDSs are strongly rooted in the movement to professionalize teaching” (Teitel, 1998, p. 37). If future teachers are to be educated by present-day teachers, it is imperative they be mentored by a team of caring classroom teachers who seek constant improvement and make an effort to include inquiry in their professional practice (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Sykes, 1998; Teitel, 1998).

Wiseman and Cooner (1996) reported that an increase in student achievement at the partner school had a positive effect on the teachers. Classroom instruction began to change as novice and veteran teachers alike discovered what worked in the language arts classroom. What began as a sense of frustration over the poor writing skills of the students developed into a sense of empowerment for the classroom teachers. As discussed later in this chapter, the philosophy of the teacher interns conflicted with the language arts teaching practices of the classroom teachers. Likewise, the conflict spread to the university as the teaching interns expressed their frustration over the difference in philosophies. The teachers felt the university students would not be able to teach in the “real world” while the university faculty were disappointed that the classroom practices were so different that their students could not make the connections between theory and

practice. A few of the classroom teachers were familiar enough with some of the university faculty to express their concerns to them. What later ensued was an effective dialogue between the two sets of faculty.

The dialogue and discussions were focused on the discrepancies between university teaching and classroom practices. One university professor and five classroom teachers volunteered to work together in restructuring the language arts methods course the teacher interns were required to take. After developing a course syllabus and planning a total of 14 lab activities to accompany the lectures, the first semester began with 125 undergraduate teacher education students. The lectures were taught at the university twice per week, yet the students were required to meet once per week with their mentor teachers in the teachers' classrooms at the elementary school. The classroom teachers led small group discussion and planned activities with the small groups. In addition, the university students served as a "writing buddy" one hour per week and were assigned a small group of elementary students. The writing buddy activities were designed by the classroom teachers and targeted the weak writers who exhibited a need for individual attention in writing.

Although it was difficult at first to find time for communication, the parties involved deemed this endeavor worthy enough to make time for meetings and planning. The project was a success and grew in popularity. During the first semester, 80% of the classroom teachers at the elementary school requested an opportunity to participate in the writing buddy project. After the first semester, the number grew to 100%. The elementary students' successes are detailed later in this chapter when the effects of PDS partnerships on P-12 students is addressed.

The elementary school now hosts over 100 language arts students each semester. Wiseman and Cooner maintain that this partnership is cost effective and that professional development schools partnerships do not need to be expensive endeavors in order to succeed. Not only have the teachers at the elementary school realized the change in themselves, but there has also been a change in the teacher education program at the university. Although not the easiest way to teach a methods course, nor the easiest way to run an elementary school, “the gains quickly outweigh[ed] some of the challenges and tribulations that emerge during real collaboration” (p. 27). Furthermore, this study showed that “the teachers were growing in self confidence, professionalism, and in the ability to work with teacher education programs” (p. 23). What began as a frustrating experience for both the partner school faculty and the teacher educators turned out to be—and continues to be—a dynamic collaboration between the two institutions.

Also touting low expense and high outcome is the research conducted by Houston, Hollis, Clay, Ligons, and Roff (1999). In their study of four universities, three school districts, and two intermediate school agencies, (known now as the Houston Consortium), Houston et al. examined the consortium’s implementation of a teacher education program designed specifically for prospective urban teachers. The schools and organizations comprising the consortium are located in and around Houston, Texas. Together the three school districts educated over 25,000 students at the time of publication. Teitel (2001b) considers this work by Houston and his colleagues “one of the most comprehensive and convincing large-scale studies” (p. 6). Although the study is focused more toward teacher candidates and student achievement, it is important to point out that 43% of the teachers in the professional development schools believed they

changed the way they taught. A more in-depth description of this program can be found in the subsection addressing teacher candidates.

In order for a school-university partnership to be successful, there are cultural changes that must take place within both institutions (Morris, Harrison, Byrd, & Robinson, 2000). Morris, Harrison, Byrd, and Robinson studied the PDS program at the University of Memphis and its 15 PDS sites and collected data over a two-year period. Data for the study were collected from 211 teachers at eight of the 15 PDS sites and included naturalistic observation, group and individual interviews, and finally the results of a survey of teachers' perceptions at Friar Tuck Elementary School. The authors surveyed these teachers and asked about the benefits classroom teachers received from mentoring student teachers. The survey showed that nearly 75% of the teachers felt that "student teacher experiences at their school were more powerful and useful than traditional experiences at regular clinical sites" (p. 126). Furthermore, 100% of the responding teachers believed that student teachers at their school received "sufficient support in learning how to teach" (p. 126). The cooperating teachers who responded to the survey saw themselves as teacher educators as well as classroom teachers. Ninety-six percent of the teachers at Friar Tuck Elementary School believed that the teachers at their school had more support in learning how to become mentor teachers and assumed more responsibility as mentor teachers than did their counterparts at non-PDS sites. Unfortunately, only 50% of the respondents indicated that they were receiving sufficient resources and time to fulfill their mentoring responsibilities.

Concerning changes in roles or changes in school culture, 96% of the teachers reported new responsibilities in teacher education as mentor teachers, while 88% had the

opportunity to engage in research opportunities with university faculty. A few teachers appeared as guest lecturers in education classes, and 46% of the teachers indicated any involvement in teaching university classes. However, 54% of the elementary school teachers noted that university faculty were accepting more responsibility for teaching the children in the public schools. Finally 83% of the Friar Tuck Elementary School teachers indicated that the teachers of the school and the university faculty worked together in planning professional development inservices.

Morris et al. later found that 71% of the teachers had changed how they perceived teaching, and 91% had actually begun to change the way they taught since their school became a PDS site. Sixty-six percent of the teachers changed the way they interacted with their own students, and 83% indicated a change in what they thought needed to be known in order to teach. Quite significantly, 96% of the teachers felt that being a part of a PDS helped them change their reflections upon themselves and their practices, while 71% believed that the teachers at Friar Tuck Elementary had become more committed to teaching and to the work of the PDS program.

In addition to the teachers at Friar Tuck Elementary, the university faculty indicated their own positive changes. The dean of the College of Education has made a long-term commitment to the PDS project including financial support from the COE's budget, faculty release for work in the PDSs, office support (e.g. duplicating service), and support and budget for travel to professional conferences. Although Morris et al. do not give numbers or percentages to show the amount of and/or increase in participation within the College of Education, the authors do indicate that more university professors

are teaching in P-12 classes and opening their own classes for the P-12 teachers to serve as guest lecturers.

Despite initial hesitations and a few challenges at the beginning of a PDS partnership, inservice teachers perceive professional development schools as having a positive effect on their school and on themselves as teachers. The following section analyzes how professional development schools affect teacher candidates.

### **Research Focused on Teacher Candidates**

Entering a classroom for the first time as a preservice teacher is an exciting experience. Professional development schools provide a place for pre-practicum experiences, practicum experiences, or quite often, both experiences. This section reports the research of the initial education and preparation of teacher candidates taking place at professional development schools.

In implementing a better teacher education program, the consortium used six objectives as their guide for this endeavor. The first four objectives represent the process while the last two objectives represent the desired outcomes of the program: improved achievement for teacher candidates and improved achievement for the P-12 students. As stated in the above section, Houston, Hollis, Clay, Ligon, and Roff (1999) implemented a large-scale PDS program in Houston, Texas, where, in the past, traditional teacher education programs have not been successful in producing teachers who are effective in “culturally diverse and economically challenging environments” that represent the urban schools of Houston, Texas (p. 8). The fourth largest city in the United States, the Houston schools educate one-fifth of the students in the state of Texas. These students

total 30% of all African American students in the state, 40% of all Asian American students, and 16% of all Hispanic American students in Texas.

Drawing from test scores of prospective teachers who took the Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) as well as observational data collected during the student teaching semester, Houston et al. found that graduates of the consortium program achieved a pass rate ranging from 92%-100% compared to the control group which had a pass rate ranging from 58%-85% (1999, p. 24). Furthermore, observations of the student teachers revealed that they “taught differently and made higher achievement scores on the state certification test than a comparison group.”

The relationship between the teacher candidate (preservice teacher) and his/her cooperating teacher is a dynamic and ever-evolving relationship. This relationship, in the professional development school setting, is shifting from a “see-and-do-as-I-do” relationship to one of collaboration (Levin & Rock, 2003, p. 137). In their study, Levin and Rock found that only two recent case studies have been published on collaborative action research between teacher candidates and cooperating teachers (Catelli, 1995; Friesen, 1994). Following this research, Levin and Rock studied five pairs of preservice teachers and their mentor teachers as the pairs conducted collaborative action research projects.

Levin and Rock’s study took place at two professional development school sites in one school district in the southeastern part of the country. These two PDSs are in partnership with the School of Education of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). The students at Allen Elementary PDS are of low socio-economic status (60% of the students are eligible for free/reduced lunch) while the students at

Gibson Primary PDS have a middle-class population with only 30% of the students receiving free/reduced lunch.

The teacher candidates in this study are a cohort of students who were accepted into the UNCG PDS program which is a part of the College of Education. This program has been in existence since 1991 and presently has 20 PDS sites, 14 elementary schools, 3 middle schools, and 3 high schools (UNCG, 2000). This cohort, called an “inquiry team,” remains together throughout their methods courses and field experiences. The study’s five teacher candidates were recruited on a volunteer basis from a cohort of 25 senior-level students. These participants were all White, typically college-aged females (approximately 20-22 years of age) in their senior year as elementary education majors. Their mentor teachers were all female, four White and one African American, and had from two to 29 years of teaching experience. The five pairs of volunteers worked together for an entire school year which consisted of the internship semester of the teacher candidates and the following student teaching semester. Before the study began, the cooperating teachers participated in a two-hour professional development workshop on conducting action research. The workshop covered the teachers’ roles and responsibilities for the action research study to be completed with their preservice teachers.

Qualitative data were collected in the form of (a) pre- and post-interviews with the preservice teacher and the cooperating teacher; (b) midsemester interviews with each participant; (c) audiotapes during planning, and conferences at midterm and final evaluation time; (d) written plans for the action research including written reflections from the preservice teachers; (e) written final reports of the action research including



written reflections from the preservice teachers; (f) portfolio reflections following INTASC guidelines from preservice teachers; and finally, (g) researchers' fieldnotes during the study. Transcripts of audiotapes were made and given to the participants so any changes or amendments could be made. The authors of this study noted there were no significant changes made to the content of the transcripts. Two participants made some changes in grammar while one teacher amended the word "kid" to "student" in her transcript. The authors used "invivo coding" to search for emerging themes throughout the transcripts (p. 139). In the end, the researchers had a total of ten case studies: 5 preservice teachers, and 5 cooperating teachers.

Levin and Rock found that the preservice teachers ended the study with a better "understanding of self as a teacher, of their students, and of their roles and responsibilities [as] teachers" (p. 140). Four out of five of these preservice teachers learned how valuable it is to focus their attention on their students. From this, the preservice teachers were more aware of the needs of the learner. Three of the five preservice teachers understood the need for teachers to conduct action research in their own classrooms. They discovered that through action research, teachers interact more with the students than they would in a traditional teacher role. These same three preservice teachers recognized the importance of being reflective practitioners as well as the importance of continuing professional development and deeper knowledge of the content. The five experienced teachers discovered new insights about their own students through the action research project. They found they were more aware of the needs of the students and what motivated their students. Only two of the five cooperating teachers exhibited any evidence of an increased understanding about themselves as teachers.

According to Levin and Rock, it appeared that the cooperating teachers believed their role in this was to assist their preservice teachers rather than examine themselves as teachers.

Hopkins, Hoffman, and Moss (1997) compared the levels of stress among preservice teachers in a pilot Professional Development School (PDS) with the levels of stress among preservice teachers in a traditional program. The authors anticipated finding that the PDS student teacher would have less stress than their counterparts because of the support system designed into the PDS.

Sixty-four elementary education majors participated in this research. The preservice teachers were assigned at random to either a PDS or traditional student teaching site. Before beginning their field experience, the student teachers were given the Teacher Stress Scale (developed by Pettegrew and Wolf in 1982) as a pretest. On a selected day at the end of their student teaching term, both groups of preservice teachers were administered the same instrument as a posttest. The tests were given to both groups at the same time in the same room. The authors concluded that on all items, posttest means were higher (i.e., the preservice teachers had greater potential for dealing with stress) than pretest means for both the experimental (PDS) and control groups. Although statistically not significant, this indicated that the participants developed greater potential for dealing with stress in all areas except at times of illness. The increase was greater for the traditional student teachers (control group) on all measures except the one addressing role overload. However, the difference was not statistically significant.

This quasi-experimental design refuted Hopkins, Hoffman, and Moss's hypothesis that the PDS student teachers would fare better than the traditional student teachers.

Several possible explanations were given as to why one group exhibited better stress-coping skills than another group. The PDS was a pilot study, and other members of the study (clinical faculty, for example) were new to the situation and might have been trying to cope with their own stress at the time. Moreover, it was noted that the PDS sites gave more responsibilities to the preservice teacher than the traditional sites. The preservice teachers may not have been prepared in advance for these duties (Hopkins, Hoffman, Moss, 1997, p. 43).

In short, teacher educators must make it a priority to be aware of what happens in the schools where their student teachers and/or teacher interns are placed. Furthermore, the characteristics of the preparation program should be examined in light of what is happening in the schools. In doing so, Hopkins, Hoffman, and Moss maintain public schools and colleges of teacher education can reform together.

“Experience can be an excellent teacher” state McDermott, Gormley, Rothenberg, and Hammer (1995, p. 184). In keeping with this maxim, the authors studied the influence of field experience on how student teachers viewed teaching. The researchers cited studies arguing that more classroom practica experiences could enhance student teachers’ learning and understanding of pedagogy. The authors examined questionnaire responses from two groups of student teachers: undergraduates, and graduates. The graduate students had no experience in elementary classrooms before student teaching while the undergraduate students had approximately 90 hours of observation and participation time in elementary classrooms. Other than this one item and differences in ages, the groups were very similar and had similar preparation.

Forty-five graduate and 63 undergraduate student teachers made up the sample for the study. A questionnaire was distributed to all the students before student teaching began and another, 16 weeks later, after the completion of the student teaching term. The questionnaires contained 30 closed-stem items pertaining to the components of the teacher education program, one open-ended item before student teaching, and two open-ended items after student teaching. The single open-ended question prior to student teaching asked the student teachers to name their greatest concern about student teaching. The two open-ended questions after student teaching asked the student teachers to list (1) their most encouraging moment and (2) their most discouraging moment during their student teaching term.

After analyzing and coding the responses from the two questionnaires, the researchers categorized the written responses into different theme groups. Both graduate and undergraduate student teachers gave similar responses on the pre-student teaching questionnaire. Both groups were concerned about their ability to teach and their ability to plan and carry out lessons. McDermott et al. concluded that the differences occurred when the researchers analyzed the open-ended questions from the post-questionnaire. The undergraduates' responses showed concern for their students' learning more than the graduate group. Although both groups wrote about their anxiety over what others thought of their teaching, the graduate responses showed that they were more concerned about this than the undergraduate group. The authors noted a significant difference in the percentage of students who chose not to answer the question about their most encouraging moment on the post questionnaire. Twice as many graduate students (28%) chose not to respond to the question compared to 14.3% of the undergraduate students.

McDermott et al. asserted that preservice teachers' growth is hastened with more opportunities for classroom experiences before the student teaching term takes place. Moreover, the authors concluded that these experiences should be in various settings with experienced teachers. This was evident in the responses to the post questionnaire in which the undergraduates' responses were focused more toward their students and their students' needs while the graduates' responses were focused more toward what others said about their performance in the classroom. In addition, according to Antonek, McCormick, and Donato (1997), it appears that keeping a journal, or portfolio, might enhance the field experiences before and during the student teaching term.

Antonek, McCormick, and Donato (1997) argued that student teacher portfolios are an effective and appropriate tool for documenting professional growth and development and for promoting reflective practice. The authors conducted a qualitative study gathering their data from preservice teachers' portfolios in an effort to support their argument. In a second-year education course, one of the requirements was for each student to keep a portfolio throughout the semester. At the end of the semester, the authors collected the portfolios and chose two: one from a male student in the traditional teacher education program, and one from a female student in a nontraditional teacher education program. The authors explain in a footnote that a traditional teacher education student enters the fifth-year certification program just after completing the undergraduate degree. A nontraditional teacher education student is one who returns to the university at a later time (after working or raising a family, for example) to obtain teacher certification. The authors maintain that portfolios serve as a way in which teachers can document and reflect upon their experiences in the classroom. In a teacher education program,

portfolios can be used as an assessment tool in that they provide a record of the professional development of the preservice teacher.

The timeline of the study is one semester. In this education course, the portfolios were used for self-documentation of the preservice teacher's teaching experience, providing evidence of class and school involvement, charting the professional growth of a developing foreign language teacher, providing a tool for self-assessment, and encouraging student teachers to document and interpret their actions in the foreign language classroom as well as general beliefs about teaching a foreign language. Each portfolio included several required items: table of contents, ten entries indicating teaching effectiveness, reflections on each entry, feedback from the course instructor, and a final statement of reflection from the student teacher.

Antonek et al. purposely chose the two portfolios to use in this research to give an example of the experiences of both a traditional student and a nontraditional student, and to represent both genders. This collective case study illustrated the novice teachers' professional development throughout the student teaching term. The authors analyzed the portfolios by first looking for meaningful themes. They identified three common themes in the portfolios and their frequencies of occurrence throughout the two portfolios. Taking a closer look at the types of entries each student teacher chose to include in his/her portfolio, the authors made some distinctions between the two students: Ed (male, traditional student teacher) focused primarily on his students while Marianne (female, nontraditional) focused on herself. Interestingly, Ed's portfolio entries relied on events in the classroom and how the students reacted to these events. Marianne's entries were a reflection of her cooperating teacher's feedback. In addition to looking for

emerging themes, the authors examined the portfolios for any reference to target language use. Sadly, few references were made. In one instance, Marianne made comments about her own use of the target language when the professor of another course asked Marianne to tape one of her classes. Simply put, Marianne's "reflection" was prompted by an exterior source rather than from within. Both teachers finished the program with honors, and both became confident, reflective practitioners. The authors maintain that reflective practice (not just thinking about teaching) is parallel to developing self as an educator. Thus, student teacher portfolios are appropriate in teacher education programs. A student teacher's professional development can be, and often is influenced by the portfolio.

Reinhartz and Stetson (1999) studied leadership skills of teacher candidates trained at professional development schools with those trained in traditional teacher education programs. Twenty-two novice teachers and nine elementary school principals who had hired beginning teachers trained in both programs participated in the study. Twelve of these novice teachers were graduates of PDS programs, while 10 teachers graduated from traditional education programs. The authors aimed to report on the descriptive results of the study rather than attempt to conduct any statistical analyses. This qualitative procedure consisted of a survey for the teachers, and interviews for the principals who hired these teachers. The authors collected the data and compared the principals' answers with the self-reported answers from the teachers to determine consistency of the same experiences.

One of the questions Reinhartz and Stetson included in their questionnaires and interviews was, "Looking back at the beginning of the school year, do you believe you

had an advantage over other new teachers who graduated from programs different from yours?” (p. 163). One hundred percent of the teachers (12 teachers) receiving their education at a PDS responded “yes” to the above question, while 20% (2 teachers) from the traditional education program responded affirmatively.

From the data collected from surveys and interviews, the authors concluded that the leadership skills of the teachers trained in professional development schools “exceeded those of teachers trained in a traditional teacher preparation program” (p. 158). Furthermore, the principals noted that the PDS graduates were more confident and more knowledgeable than their counterparts from the traditional education program. The PDS graduates rated the importance of classroom management as a higher priority than those teachers who were traditionally trained.

Overall, the research on teacher candidates in professional development schools reveals that PDSs have a positive effect on teacher candidates, but life in a PDS can be stressful. While the *raison d’être* of creating PDSs might revolve around teachers and teacher candidates, the most important goal for schools in general is the success of the P-12 students. The following section discerns the effects of professional development schools on P-12 student achievement.

#### Research on the Effects of PDS Partnerships on P-12 Students

Student achievement is not often the focus of professional development schools research. In his 2001 work, Lee Teitel noted that only recently “studies documenting the impact of PDSs on student learning have started to emerge” (2001, p. 10). Unfortunately, when any mention of P-12 students is documented, it is not the primary interest of the research (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Book, 1996; Teitel, 2001b).



As stated earlier in this chapter, the work of Houston, Hollis, Clay, Ligons, and Roff (1999) was lauded by Teitel (2001b) as being “one of the most comprehensive and convincing large-scale studies” with encouraging results for inservice teachers, teacher candidates, and P-12 students. A consortium of four universities, three school districts, and two intermediate school agencies implemented a professional development school program among urban schools in Houston, Texas. The challenge of the Houston school districts has been the difficulty in finding teachers to teach in culturally diverse settings. In past years, the teacher education programs have not been able to produce teachers to undertake this task. As a result of this research, the inservice teachers showed change and improvement as did the teacher candidates at the university. Furthermore, Houston et al. reported an increase in students’ scores on the state-mandated achievement test.

Observational data in this research showed that the P-12 students who were in PDSs were more consistently on task than their counterparts in non-PDSs. Test scores from the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) from 1992-93 (prior to the implementation of the PDS program) were compared with the TAAS test scores from 1994-95 in the areas of reading, math, and writing. From the pool of 16 PDSs, 14 increased in reading, 16 increased in math, and 10 increased in writing. Of the 8 PDSs that showed a decrease in achievement (2 in reading, and 6 in writing), the authors determined that, in the 6 schools decreasing in writing, the teacher candidates taught math and reading in small group settings but not writing. Houston and his colleagues present significant results in the three crucial areas of the rationale for designing and implementing professional development school programs.

Wiseman and Cooner (1996) focused on the discrepancies between classroom practices and the interns' university-based philosophy and the effect these discrepancies might have on the partner school students. One of the participating teachers "suggested it was time to question the benefits the elementary school students were receiving from the university's involvement in the school" (1996, p. 18). This concern spread throughout the school with teachers wondering if the preservice teachers were truly being prepared for life in the "real world." One university professor and five classroom teachers volunteered to join forces to reorganize the language arts methodology course. This effort "became the cornerstone of a long-term school-university partnership" (p. 20). During the first semester of this collaboration, 125 students were enrolled in the language arts methodology course which took place at the university for lecture time and at the partner school for small group discussion with the classroom teachers.

Wiseman and Cooner documented how the PDS environment allowed the school to address these concerns. Several of the teachers in this study knew some of the teacher education faculty and were able to begin a dialogue concerning their students' low scores in writing. As a result of this dialogue, writing buddies were created among the elementary students and the university students. The classroom teachers "enjoyed the flexibility of using the 100-125 university writing buddies" for one hour per week (p. 22). The partner school students dramatically increased their passing scores from a 69% passing rate to 82% the next year, and to 92% the following year. "The principal directly attributes the partnership for helping to increase the achievement of the children" (p. 23). As mentioned in an earlier section of this chapter, the classroom teachers were inspired,

learned from this experience, and were encouraged to change their classroom environment.

Pechman (1992) asserted that “in professional practice schools, children’s needs nourish the institution. Such schools are oriented toward students, and they support professionals” (p. 52). Furthermore, Pechman maintains that those involved in professional practice schools are especially sensitive to the needs and challenges of at-risk students. This is, in part, due to the fact that research is fundamental to the educational practice of the professionals involved in professional practice schools.

Darling-Hammond’s (1994) collection of reports of PDS endeavors leaves the impression that the P-12 students are not first and foremost in the minds of researchers. Miller and Silvernail (1994) gave the history of the junior high school PDS, a description of the university’s teacher education programs, the PDS model followed, professional development of experienced teachers, and teacher education issues. Although they describe their article as an “evolution of a professional development school” (p. 28), the authors never addressed the enhancement of the P-12 students’ learning experiences or achievement. While Miller and Silvernail considered teacher professional development and preservice teacher education worthy of mentioning, their exclusion of P-12 students’ experiences points to a focus on program rather than the effect that program has on the P-12 students.

In the same collection of articles, Grossman begins his work by saying “Kids Count Here” as his first three words (Grossman, 1994, p. 50). Grossman’s subsection, entitled, “Changing Teaching and Learning” (p. 64), addresses the middle school students and their mastery of subject matter. The philosophy at the partner school is directed

toward “outcome-based education” and “mastery” (p. 64-65). Students are not given failing grades; however, they are given incomplete grades and encouraged to work toward mastering the material of the class. Since the outcome-based program’s implementation, the number of low grades (Ds and Es) has dropped, while As and Bs are on the rise. One noteworthy finding: the percentage of incomplete grades is quite close to the percentage of D and E grades before the program’s implementation.

Lastly, in chapter 6, Lythcott and Schwartz included a section called “The Children’s Story” (1994, p. 149). The authors asked the students of the partner school how they felt about the differences in the school, and the differences in their classrooms. The majority of the responses centered around the extra attention and help the students received with the extra teacher(s) in their classrooms. Lythcott and Schwartz noted that middle school students crave the individual attention and enjoyed having the opportunity to receive “help” from more than one teacher.

### Summary

Encouragingly, Michigan State University published the report of a review of their professional development schools (Judge, Carriedo, & Johnson, 1995) “concluding that the extinction of the PDS would represent a grave loss for the University and for the public” (p. 1). An institution’s greatest desire would be to state that same sentiment at the end of its research of its own professional development school partnerships.

From published research one gathers that there is evidence of the importance of documenting university-school partnerships. “Until recently the evidence of the effectiveness of professional development schools (PDSs) has been at best thin, and sometimes close to non-existent” (Teitel, 2001b, p. 1). If P-12 schools and institutions of

higher education take the time to create a PDS partnership, one would hope that the partnership would be evaluated. Although time consuming, accurately documenting PDS partnership efforts is beneficial for insiders and stakeholders in the program to assess whether “starting and sustaining a professional development school is worth it” (Teitel, 2000, p. 1).

Furthermore, the research shows that a university-school partnership will go through growing pains while striving for collaboration. New relationships often require an adjustment period: the partner school now has someone else living in its “home” while the university has had to move into someone else’s “home.” Just like having a new roommate in college, adjustments must be made for a happy relationship to develop.

While concerned with education reform, educating teacher candidates, and continuing the professional development of inservice teachers, one must not lose sight of the children—an important aspect of the partnership. While juggling meetings, policy, class schedules and the like, the children may inadvertently be forgotten. “The seeds of failure for many children are sown early” (Holmes Group, 1990, p. 29), yet few studies have been conducted on the achievement of the students in the partnership school (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Book, 1996). This lack of research conveys that the P-12 students seemingly have been forgotten. “If children are not significantly benefiting from the investments of time, effort and resources devoted to PDSs, then both children and investors are being betrayed” (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 31).

The present study seeks to examine the effects of a university-school partnership on the students, teacher candidates and inservice teachers. This study documents the implementation problems and successes of the program and the results of the program on

student achievement, teacher candidates, and inservice teachers. The following chapter describes the methodology used in the study.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

“Partnership. A relationship of individuals or groups marked by mutual cooperation and responsibility”  
(American Heritage College Dictionary, 2000, p. 996-997).

Chapter Three focuses on the research methodology selected for this study: a mixed research methodology which examined and evaluated a university partnership program based on student achievement and the experiences of inservice teachers and teacher candidates. As stated in the introductory chapter, three research questions were addressed:

1. How does the Louisiana State University-Long Elementary School Partnership affect student achievement as measured by LEAP and ITBS?
2. How does this partnership affect the development of teacher candidates?
3. How does this University-School partnership affect current teacher professional development?

The first research question called for quantitative research in examining student performance. Determining student progress and/or achievement during the three-year pilot partnership required access to the results of two standardized tests: the Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP) test, which is administered to fourth- and eighth-grade students, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) for students in grades three, five, six, and seven. Student performance at each grade level was tracked from the academic year, 1999-2000 (the year before the partnership began) through 2002-2003 (the last academic year of the partnership).

Research questions two and three called for quantitative and qualitative inquiry which included questionnaires of school faculty, university faculty, and university students. These questionnaires, both open- and closed-ended, addressed the issues of the development of teacher candidates and the continuing professional development of inservice teachers. Partner school faculty who served as mentor teachers and were integral parts of the partnership completed questionnaires during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. In addition, university students who had completed all of their coursework and were in their student teaching semester also provided valuable data regarding their partnership experiences. Finally, university faculty participating in various roles within the partnership were also interviewed.

For the sake of well-planned research, questionnaires alone cannot serve as the only source of qualitative data. Direct observation of events during the three-year pilot partnership and a record of my own participation in the partnership also served as data for the qualitative study. By opting for a mixed methodology, the researcher is afforded the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative research.

#### Setting of the Study

The setting for this study is pre-determined due to the fact that this is the first university-school partnership involving this particular university and this school system. Since its inception, other university-school partnerships involving the same university and other schools within the same school system have been initiated. The partner school began in 1902 as a rural, one-room school house. It has operated continuously since then and is still in operation today. In 1922, the school had three teachers who taught nine grades. In 1939, the school moved to its present location less than three miles from the



university in the back of a peaceful, upper-middle class subdivision. The school then had seven rooms and seven teachers who taught eight grades. During the 1948-49 school year, Long Elementary met its peak enrollment of 525 students. In 1956, new additions were added to the school including an auditorium, a cafeteria, and a kitchen. In 2001, a new addition was built containing four classrooms.

In February, 2000, Louisiana State University and the school district agreed to a three-year trial partnership between the university and Long Elementary School, thus creating the first university-school partnership of its kind. The university's presence on campus allowed for meetings and classes to be held on site. Two undergraduate methods courses were held in a classroom at the elementary school three days per week:

“Reading, Writing, and Oral Communication in the Elementary School” and “Curriculum Disciplines: Social Studies.” Field experience for these third-year education students took place in grades PreK-5. These course were taught by an instructor from the College of Education and by me.

A public pre-kindergarten through fifth-grade school, the partner school in this study was chosen for several reasons: its proximity to the university, its below-average student standardized test scores, and the fact that approximately 95% of the students were eligible for the federal Free/Reduced Lunch Program. Although the elementary school is located in an upper middle-class subdivision, the students are bussed in from an area of Section 8 housing not far from the school.

The partner school is one of the smallest in the school system. The average number of students during this time was 292, ranging from a low of 285 students in 2000-2001, to a high of 297 in 2002-2003. The gender line was drawn almost down the middle

with slightly more male students than female students. The average student population was 94% African-American with a total minority population of 95.02%. The other minorities included Asians and Hispanics but no American Indians. The remaining 4.98% of the students were White. The percentage of at-risk students equaled the percentage of students who were eligible for the federal Free/Reduced Lunch program. The partner school maintained an average 88.08% of the students who were classified as being at risk.

During the 1999-2000 school year, the partner school had fifteen classes containing less than 20 students, and five classes containing 21 to 26 students. That number changed the first year of the partnership, 2000-2001, with 13 classes containing less than 20 students, and 8 classes with 21 to 26 students. The 2001-2002 school year saw a return to 15 classes of less than 20 students, and 5 classes of 21 to 26 students. The last year of the partnership, 2002-2003, there were 24 classes containing fewer than 20 students, and 16 classes of 21 to 26 students, and one class with 27 to 33 students.

There were two to three classes per grade, one special education class for K-5, and one pre-k special education class. In addition, there were a reading specialist, a French teacher, a music teacher, a physical education teacher. A librarian, a speech therapist, and a guidance counselor were also on staff. Unique to the partner school was a university liaison. This faculty member—formerly a reading specialist at the school—linked the university with the partner school. For instance, on Dr. Seuss Day, the liaison called upon university faculty to participate in reading Dr. Seuss books with the children.

The university with which this partnership was formed is the state's flagship university. With over 30,000 students, the university is the only research-extensive

university in the state as designated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The College of Education has approximately 1,500 undergraduate students and 500 graduate students (both Masters and Doctoral students). Annually, the College of Education graduates approximately 350 teacher education candidates. The teacher candidates who took their junior-year methods blocks at the partner school registered for these two courses as they would register for any other course. In other words, these students were not chosen or asked to participate in the partnership. Incidentally, most of these students were unaware a partnership existed until the first day of classes.

The methods classes held on site at the partner school were Reading, Writing, and Oral Communication in Elementary School (6 semester hours), and Curriculum Disciplines: Social Studies in Elementary School (3 semester hours). The students reported to the partner school three days per week for both lecture and lab (field experience). This was unique in that the other methods courses typically held lectures on the university campus and had field experiences at a participating public school. The courses were taught by the researcher and one other instructor from the university who also taught a graduate course designed for the partner school faculty.

#### Research Strategies and Sources of Data

There are those who believe that the only objective research methodology is quantitative research. However, qualitative research has become increasingly more accepted as a legitimate research methodology especially within the humanities and the social sciences. With that in mind, one must weigh the advantages of both forms of evaluation when determining which methodology is more appropriate for carrying out the

research. Sometimes it is to the researcher's advantage to choose a combination of methods—a *mixed methodology* (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Yin, 1994).

Because of the teacher candidates' continued presence on campus, how were the PreK-5 students impacted? Adding more teachers by placing the teacher candidates in the classrooms ultimately lowered the teacher-student ratio. Did this help or hinder the PreK-5 students? By examining standardized test scores from Louisiana's high-stakes testing, impact on student performance was determined. Furthermore, classroom teachers provided valuable information regarding the performance of their students after one or two academic semesters of housing teacher candidates. For example, did lowering the teacher-student ratio benefit the PreK-5 students or was there too much confusion in the classroom for the children to pay attention to the appropriate adult?

In this study, the pilot implementation of a university-school partnership was a selected case. "Case studies are selected because they serve a particular evaluation or purpose" (Patton, 1987, p. 19). Since this partnership was the first of its kind for the university, the parish school system, and the school, the purpose for closely examining it was to determine its efficacy and the possibility of impacting future partnerships. Teitel (2001b) maintains that "it is important to remember that many of the impacts [of PDSs] will not readily be quantified, and that full and accurate reporting of PDS impacts will have to keep the broader context in mind" (p. 13). This section is devoted to the 'how' of the examination of the partnership.

"Strategies of inquiry connect researchers to specific approaches and methods for collecting and analyzing empirical materials. The case study, for example, relies on interviewing, observation, and document analysis" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 371).

The three research questions of this study required different strategies of inquiry, one of which was case study methodology. Yin defines the scope of a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (1994, p. 13). By studying this pilot partnership as it was in real life, I was able to study the *context* under which the partnership was working as well as the *phenomenon* of a university-school partnership.

Constructivist or phenomenological approaches to research are considered qualitative in nature. The idea of studying a phenomenon—an occurrence of interest to the researcher—in its own context is often intriguing enough to the researcher for him/her to do the research. Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) reported research conducted by Dona Kagan and included university-school partnerships as a phenomenon of interest (p. 545). Hence, the study conducted in this dissertation is a phenomenon of interest. “A constructivist approach to grounded theory reaffirms studying people in their natural settings and redirects qualitative research away from positivism” (Charmaz, K., 2000, p. 510).

The “real life” aspect of this research was an authentic learning experience. As an ethnographer learns about others and their culture(s), so did I learn about the cultures of university faculty, school faculty, and the interaction of the two cultures together in a university-school partnership.

“Grounded theory can provide relevant information which is useful to program staff and other decision makers in their efforts to understand and improve their programs” (Patton, 1987, p. 40). Glaser & Strauss—defenders of qualitative research—defined

grounded theory as “the discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research” (1967, p. 2). Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) explained that “the constructs and laws are ‘grounded’ in the particular set of data that the researcher has collected.” In other words, the researcher “deriv[es] constructs and laws directly from the immediate data...collected rather than from prior research and theory” (p. 10).

Patton (1987) maintained that “grounded theory can provide relevant information which is useful to program staff and other decision makers in their efforts to understand and improve their programs” (p. 40). Three years later, Patton added that “grounded theory depends on methods that take the researcher into and close to the real world so that the results and findings are ‘grounded’ in the empirical world” (1990, p. 67). Several sources of information will provide the data for this study: informal conversations with university faculty, university students, and school faculty, as well as questionnaires directed toward these groups; direct observation of events surrounding the partnership; and written record of my own participation in the partnership.

#### Role of the Researcher

As principal investigator of this study, and as a methods instructor on site, I was in a unique position, to be a participant observer (Spradley, 1980; Yin, 1994). As principal researcher, I was an observer; because of my presence on campus as a methods instructor, I was a participant. Both of these positions allowed me an ideal opportunity to examine this case study. According to Yin (1994), by being a participant observer, I had virtually unrestricted access to people, records, and events. “The participant-observation technique has been most frequently used in anthropological studies of different cultural or subcultural groups. The technique also can be used in more everyday settings, such as an

organization or other small group” (Yin, 1994, p. 88). There are advantages as well as difficulties in being a participant observer of a case study. It is very easy to become more of a participant than an observer. A passive observer stays within his/her guidelines of research whereas as participant becomes more involved in the events surrounding the study. If potential bias is not present in the beginning, it is possible for bias to occur later in the study (Yin, 1994). Biases will be addressed later in the chapter.

I found that I was at an advantage being a participant observer. For instance, my colleagues viewed the partnership from the outside while I viewed this joint venture from both the inside (as a participant) and the outside (as an investigator). Unequivocally, the views are different. Being a participant ensured that I was present at crucial times. I was able to see and hear first hand both the good news and bad news of the university’s presence on the partner school’s campus. Furthermore, my colleagues only heard about the partnership by way of students (typically, *my* methods students who were involved in the partnership) or by way of other instructors. Being on site to fulfill my job assignment was both convenient and advantageous.

It is already known that “qualitative data...can provid[e] contextual information... [and] rich insight to human behavior” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 106). To add to that, the inquirer’s voice must be addressed. Guba and Lincoln named three types of voices: positivism and postpositivism, critical theory, and constructivism. The voice of positivism and postpositivism can be defined as the “disinterested scientist,” while the critical theorist takes on the role of “transformative intellectual.” The constructivist voice is considered the “passionate participant” (1994, p. 115). Combining Spradley’s (1980) *participant observer* with Guba and Lincoln’s definitions, I defined my voice somewhere

between the critical theorist and constructivist. “Critical researchers often regard their work as a first step toward forms of political action...[and are] never satisfied with merely increasing knowledge” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994, p. 140).

A description of the methods used to address each research question is found throughout this chapter as the research question is addressed.

### Research Question One

How does the Louisiana State University-Long Elementary School Partnership affect student achievement as measured by LEAP and ITBS? This research question examines student test scores on the ITBS and the LEAP test during the study to determine if student achievement had been impacted by the university’s presence during the partnership. In addition, the School Report cards found on the Louisiana Department of Education website also served as a useful tool for an overall look at any change that might have taken place during the partnership.

### **Participants for Research Question One**

The elementary school students at Long Elementary School in grades three through five at anytime from 1999-2003 were the participants for the first research question. Because of Long Elementary School’s high mobility rate, individual students could not be followed through this four-year period. The grade level scores were examined rather than those of individual students.

In the spring of 1999, there were 24 third-grade students taking the ITBS, 49 fourth-grade students taking the LEAP, and 28 fifth-grade students taking the ITBS. During the spring of 2000, there were 32 third-grade students. The number of fourth-grade students dropped to 26, and the number of fifth-grade students rose to 37. The first



year of the partnership, 2000-2001, showed another change in numbers. In the spring of 2001, the number of third-grade students taking the ITBS jumped to 37, fourth-grade students taking the LEAP rose to 35, and fifth-grade students dropped to 21. The spring of 2002 showed the number of third-graders rising again to 42 students taking the ITBS. The number of fourth-graders taking the LEAP rose to 44, while the number of fifth-graders taking the ITBS test rose to 34.

The final year of the partnership showed yet another change in the number of students taking the standardized tests. There were 55 third-grade students, 48 fourth-grade students, and 37 fifth-grade students. Although the number of test-takers changed over the four years, the total school population changed only slightly as shown in Table 3.1 below.

**Table 3.1 School Demographics**

	<b>1998-1999</b>	<b>1999-2000</b>	<b>2000-2001</b>	<b>2001-2002</b>	<b>2002-2003</b>
<b>School Population</b>	297	301	285	286	283
<b>3rd Grade ITBS</b>	24	32	37	42	55
<b>4th Grade LEAP</b>	49	26	35	44	48
<b>5th Grade ITBS</b>	28	37	21	34	37

**Instruments for Research Question One**

Data for the first research question included test scores for the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) and the Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP) for the years 1999-2003. This span of years included the year prior to the partnership (to establish a baseline) and the three years during the partnership.

The **Louisiana Education Assessment Program for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (LEAP 21)** began in the spring of 1999. The LEAP 21, or simply LEAP, is a criterion-referenced

standardized test which is part of Louisiana's Reaching for Results program, an educational reform system directed toward improving student achievement. The LEAP 21 is based on and aligned with Louisiana's content standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science, and measures how well a student has mastered these content standards. According to *Section 1: The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program*, the LEAP 21, "by law must be as rigorous, as those [CRT tests] of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) program" (Louisiana Educational Assessment Program, 2003, p. 1). Students in the fourth and eighth grades do not simply earn a pass/fail score; rather, the students receive a ranking at one of five achievement areas: advanced, proficient, basic, approaching basic, and unsatisfactory. In the spring of 2003, the *proficient* level was given the new title of *mastery*.

At the *Advanced* level, a student has demonstrated superior performance. With a ranking of *Proficient* or *Mastery*, a student is well prepared for the next grade level, demonstrating his or her competence over challenging material. A student receiving a ranking of *Basic* has demonstrated knowledge and skills needed for promotion to the next grade level. An *Approaching Basic* ranking indicates that the student is allowed to move to the next grade level having only partially demonstrated knowledge and skills of that which is fundamental for promotion. Finally, a ranking of *Unsatisfactory* indicates that the student has failed to demonstrate that he or she has the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in the next grade level.

In the spring of 1999, only tests in English Language Arts and Mathematics were administered to public school students in fourth and eighth grades. The following spring, Science and Social Studies test were added for both grades. Beginning in the spring of

2000, if a student did not reach the level of *Approaching Basic* in English Language Arts or Mathematics, he or she could not move on to the next grade level. This category is one above the *Unsatisfactory* level. By the spring of 2004, fourth grade students must reach the *Basic* level in either English Language Arts or Mathematics, and the level of *Approaching Basic* in the other to be promoted to the fifth grade. This requirement at the eighth grade level is not expected to go into effect until the spring of 2006. After intensive remediation during the summer, students may retake the LEAP 21 in order to attempt to promote to the next grade. Otherwise, the student must repeat the grade the following school year. Table 3.2 shows the range of scores for each of the categories (Louisiana Department of Education, 2003a).

**Table 3.2 Fourth Grade LEAP**

	<b>English Language Arts</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>Social Studies</b>
<b>Achievement Level</b>	<b>Scaled Score Range</b>	<b>Scaled Score Range</b>	<b>Scaled Score Range</b>	<b>Scaled Score Range</b>
<b>Advanced</b>	408-500	419-500	405-500	399-500
<b>Proficient (Mastery)</b>	354-407	370-418	360-404	353-398
<b>Basic</b>	301-353	315-369	306-359	301-352
<b>Approaching Basic</b>	263-300	282-314	263-305	272-300
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	100-262	100-281	100-262	100-271

Louisiana Department of Education. <http://www.doe.state.la.us/lde/uploads/1703.pdf>

The **Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS, or Iowa)**, published by Riverside Publishing, Itasca, Illinois, is a second standardized test used to measure the mastery of public school students. The ITBS is a national norm-referenced test by which students' scores can be compared to those of students locally as well as across the nation. Students in third, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades are scored in the following areas: reading (vocabulary, reading comprehension), language (spelling, capitalization, punctuation,

usage, expression), mathematics (concepts, estimation, problem solving, data interpretation, computation), social studies, science, and sources of information (maps, diagrams, reference material). Students are given standard scores in each of the areas as well as a percentile ranking. This percentile ranking can be compared to the national norms (Louisiana Department of Education, 2003a). Table 3.3 below shows how ITBS scores are calculated.

**Table 3.3 ITBS Subject Area Calculations**

ITBS Area Tested		Reporting Test Results	
<b>Reading</b>		Reading Total (RT)	Core Total = $\frac{RT+LT+MT}{3}$  Composite = $\frac{RT+LT+MT+SS+SC+ST}{6}$
Vocabulary	V	= $\frac{V+RC}{2}$	
Reading Comprehension	RC		
<b>Language</b>		Language Total (LT)	
Spelling	L1	= $\frac{L1+L2+L3+L4}{4}$	
Capitalization	L2		
Punctuation	L3		
Usage and Expression	L4		
<b>Mathematics</b>		Math Total (MT)	
Math Concepts/Estimation	M1	= $\frac{M1+M2}{2}$	
Math Problem Solving / Data Interpretation	M2		
Math Computation*	M3	M3	
<b>Social Studies</b>		SS	
<b>Science</b>		SC	
<b>Sources of Information</b>		Sources of Information	
Maps and Diagrams	S1	Total (ST) = $\frac{S1+S2}{2}$	
Reference Materials	S2		

\*Math Computation, grade 3 only.

Louisiana Department of Education. <http://www.doe.state.la.us/lde/uploads/2451.pdf>

In addition to the two standardized tests, **School Performance Scores (SPS)** were examined. In 1998, Louisiana began issuing school report cards to each of its public schools. With this accountability system, schools are given numerical scores as well as labels. For the first two years of school report cards, only English and Mathematics calculated into the school performance score, after which all four subject areas were

calculated into the score. In addition, if the score is poor, there are consequences for the school. This score is called a School Performance Score (SPS). The SPS includes a weighted index score for the ITBS and LEAP tests as well as a score for student attendance. As Table 3.4 denotes, schools are labeled from best to worst as a school of *Academic Excellence*, *Academic Distinction*, *Academic Achievement*, *Academically Above Average*, *Academically Below Average*, *Academically Unacceptable*.

**Table 3.4 School Performance Scores 1998-99 through 2002-03**

<b>SPS Range</b>	<b>Label</b>
<b>150.0 or above</b>	School of Academic Excellence
<b>125.0 - 149.9</b>	School of Academic Distinction
<b>100.0 - 124.9</b>	School of Academic Achievement
<b>69.4 - 99.9</b>	Academically Above Average
<b>30.1 - 69.3</b>	Academically Below Average
<b>30.0 or below</b>	Academically Unacceptable

For the 2002-2003 School Performance Scores, the names of the categories changed as well as the range of scores designating each category. In place of the above academic labels, schools received stars as performance labels, beginning with five stars for excellent schools and ending with one star for below average schools. Two categories remained after the one-star category: *Academic Warning* and *Academically Unacceptable*. Table 3.5 below shows that the new scoring system is divided into seven categories rather than the previous six categories. Furthermore, the minimum school performance score in 2002-2003 was lowered for the two upper categories. The range for the lower categories was also altered. A school receiving a performance label of *Academically Unacceptable* in previous years had to have an SPS of 30.0 or below. Beginning in 2002-2003, a school with an SPS of 45.0 or below is considered to be *Academically Unacceptable*.

**Table 3.5 School Performance Scores for 2002-03**

<b>SPS Range</b>	<b>Label</b>
<b>140.0 or above</b>	Five Stars
<b>120.0 - 139.9</b>	Four Stars
<b>100.0 - 119.9</b>	Three Stars
<b>80.0 - 99.9</b>	Four Stars
<b>60.0 - 79.9</b>	One Star
<b>45.0 - 59.9</b>	Academic Warning
<b>45.0 or below</b>	Academically Unacceptable

If a school's scores falls into one of the upper categories, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) has agreed to offer monetary awards to that school. If a school is deemed *Academically Unacceptable*, BESE will place the school under Corrective Action. There are three levels of Corrective Action. At the first level, schools work with District Assistance Teams to identify needs and assess or redevelop school improvement plans. At the second level, a Distinguished Educator (DE) is assigned to the school in an advisory position to help the school improve student achievement. A DE is also present in the third category. When a school enters Level III, parents have the right to remove their child and transfer him/her to another school in the district not undergoing corrective action. Finally, if a school fails to improve, that school may be shut down by BESE. This falls under the Reconstitution phase of Corrective Actions.

#### **Data Collection Procedures for Research Question One**

In order to collect official scores for the ITBS and LEAP, a Data Request Form was submitted to the State Department of Education. This form included a three-page, single-spaced proposal of research. Within a few days, the scores were mailed to the researcher. After receiving the test scores, I created a spreadsheet in Microsoft Excel

2000<sup>®</sup> in which I entered the ITBS and LEAP scores for the years 1999-2003. Entering the scores into a spreadsheet allowed me to create graphs and manipulate the data.

The School Performance Scores were found on the School Report Cards published on the State Department of Education's website. These were easily printed and collected each November when the previous school year's scores were calculated.

### **Data Analysis Procedures for Research Question One**

“Trend studies describe change by selecting a different sample at each data-collection point from a population that does not remain constant” (Gall, Borg, Gall, 1996, p. 377). This study falls under *trend studies* as a form of longitudinal research for two reasons: First, I examined scores from tests not administered to the same students every year. The LEAP is given to fourth-grade students, and the ITBS is given to third- and fifth-grade students. Second, the students who attend Long Elementary are the most transient in the parish. Each time I arrived at a data collection point, I am examined a new sample. For example, of the students who were in the second grade in 1999-2000, how many of those same students were still at Long Elementary in the fifth grade in 2002-2003? The turnover of faculty members as well as student transfers created an altered sample through the four-year time frame.

The quantitative data will provide the information needed to attempt to answer the research question: How does the Louisiana State University-Long Elementary School Partnership influence/affect student achievement as measured by LEAP and ITBS? Examination of these standardized test scores, as provided on the school report cards distributed by the State Department of Education (available [www.doe.state.la.us](http://www.doe.state.la.us)), will show how students performed—as a whole—on the standardized tests. With this

information, I plan to determine whether test scores have improved during the university's presence at the school. Since these standardized tests play a large role in determining whether a school must undergo *corrective action*, and since there are few studies addressing student achievement of partnership schools, I believe these test scores are worth examining.

For the scope of this analysis, data were collected from spring of 1999 until the spring of 2003, representing data from the fifth-grade class of 1999 to the fifth-grade class of 2005. Since the partnership began in the fall of 2000, test scores from the spring of 1999 and the spring of 2000 offered a baseline of the school's performance before the university came into the picture.

#### Research Question Two

How does this partnership affect the development of teacher candidates? In other words, by placing undergraduate teacher education students in the midst of an elementary school, is there any change in their preservice training?

#### **Participants for Research Question Two**

The teacher candidates serving as participants for the second research question are College of Education students who student taught during the fall semester of 2003. These students have completed all of their courses and are in their last semester of the undergraduate elementary education program. For some of these teacher candidates, none of their courses was taught in a partnership setting, while other teacher candidates participated in a partnership setting for one or two semesters. Ninety-five questionnaires were distributed, with a return rate of approximately 86% (82 questionnaires). Of the teacher candidates who voluntarily responded to the questionnaire, 85% (or 70



respondents) were between the ages of 21 and 24. Five teacher candidates were between the ages of 25 and 29. The remaining age brackets, 30-34, 35-39, 40-45, 46-50, and over 51, had only one or two teacher candidates per bracket.

Seventy-seven teacher candidates (94%) were female. There were four males and one respondent who chose not to respond to any question relating to age, sex, or race.

Seventy teacher candidates (85%) were White and ten candidates were Black. There was one teacher candidate of Hispanic origin and one candidate who did not respond to this question.

Thirty-six teacher candidates took their Reading and Social Studies blocks as well as their Math and Science blocks on the university's campus. Seventeen reported taking all of these blocks on site at a partner school. Twenty-seven teacher candidates completed their Reading and Social studies blocks at a partner school while taking their Math and Science blocks on campus at the university. One teacher candidate took his/her Reading and Social Studies blocks at the university and the Math and Science blocks at a partner school. The last report was from the teacher candidate who took his/her Reading and Social Studies blocks at the university and did not enter a response for the location of the Math and Science blocks. It is important to re-state at this point that since the Fall, 2000, inception of the university-school partnership of this study, other university-school partnerships have been formed, offering coursework on their campuses.

### **Instruments for Research Question Two**

The instrument used for the second research question was a 42-item questionnaire adapted from Teitel (2000) (see Appendix A). The questionnaire contains 27 close-ended questions and 15 open-ended questions. I concluded that ten themes emerged from these

questions. Thirty-six of the questions addressed the teacher candidate's preservice training, and six asked for age, race, sex, and other personal specifics. Attitude, student motivation, and the use of technology were three themes addressing only one question each. Two questions were found to address the culture of a school, and two more questions addressed classroom management and/or discipline. Three categories each had four relating questions: student expectations, student diversity, and reflection and/or improvements to be made. The category of teaching and assessment had nine questions relating to it, while professionalism and professional development had eight questions. Of the 36 questions, fourteen were open-ended and 22 required a response based on a four-item Likert scale.

In determining the questionnaire's appropriateness for this research, I consulted two colleagues to review the questionnaire. One of the colleagues was not involved in any university-school partnerships and was relatively unfamiliar with previous research concerning partnership endeavors. The second colleague was deeply involved in a university-school partnership. I asked the two to check for bias toward or against partnership programs. As expected, the colleague with little knowledge of university-school partnerships proved to be most valuable as she was able to question and challenge to comments of the other reviewer. The questionnaire was then adjusted so that the participants were answering questions about their preservice teacher education, rather than about their opinion of university-school partnerships.

A brief description of the research and a word of thanks was provided to each of the participants along with an abstract of the study. The researcher's contact information

was also provided should the participants have any questions regarding the questionnaire or their participation in the study.

### **Data Collection Procedures for Research Question Two**

Ninety-five questionnaires were distributed to student teachers in the Fall of 2003. The student teaching supervisors volunteered to distribute and collect the questionnaires at their weekly cohort meetings sometime during the four-week deadline requested by the researcher. The student teachers and their supervisors were informed that their participation was appreciated albeit voluntary. Although some of the questionnaires were not returned until well after the four-week deadline, I waited until I had received return envelopes from all of the supervisors. No one was left out of the research unless he/she chose not to complete a questionnaire.

### **Data Analysis Procedures for Research Question Two**

Eight-two of the 95 questionnaires (or 86%) were returned within the anticipated time frame of four weeks. After collecting questionnaires from the student teaching supervisors, the questionnaires were given a sequential number as a reference number. Results from the 82 questionnaires were tabulated into a Microsoft Excel 2000<sup>®</sup> spreadsheet. The elements recorded were the questionnaire reference number, question number, and the response.

The data were analyzed using the Pivot Table function found in Microsoft Excel 2000<sup>®</sup>. The Pivot Table feature is found under the Data menu and is used to create cross tabulated spreadsheets that allow for summarizing results in several different formats. I utilized the Pivot Table function to count how many questionnaire respondents had

selected a specific response for each question. Pivot Tables are dynamic in nature. If the data in the selected ranges change, the Pivot Table will reflect the changes.

Percentage values were computed for each independent group by dividing the response counts by the total number of questionnaires in the group (n=82). The four-point scale chosen for the questionnaires (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree) was then converted into a dichotomous variable of Disagree and Agree. This was easily accomplished by adding the number of responses from the strongly disagree and disagree fields and grouping them under Disagree. Likewise, the strongly agree and agree fields were added together and placed under the field of Agree. Percentages were also computed for the dichotomous variable by dividing the number of responses for each field by the total number of questionnaires composing the group (e.g. n=1; n=36; etc.). These percentages are absolute for the group but cannot be compared across the entire study. A relative percentage was computed in order to determine weighted percentages based on group populations. This relative percentage was determined by dividing the response counts of the groups by the total number of questionnaires in the entire study (n=82). This way, one can compare the strength of percentages across the different groups.

No Response values were treated as data so that absolute percentages and relative percentage could also be computed. For each group, percentages were computed for the Disagree, Agree, and No Response (NR) data fields. Two sets of percentages are presented: the absolute and the relative percentages.

Open-ended responses were transcribed and examined for apparent themes and similar patterns. Case study “investigations easily become stalled at the analytic stage”

and are simply ignored because the investigator does not know what to do with the collected evidence (Yin, 1994, p. 102). Yin (1994) describes “relying on theoretical proposition” as a strategy for data analysis: following the propositions that originally led to the case study and its research questions. Although Yin maintains that the investigator can decide which data are important and which data to ignore—for example, the data relating to the original research questions and review of literature would be considered “important”—I believe that in this study, all of the data could potentially be important.

Referring to the original research questions guiding this research, I determined if any of the themes directly address the questions. Other obvious patterns or themes may direct the investigator to further research, or even provide new insight for the present study. Since, as stated earlier in this work, the Louisiana State University-Long Elementary School Partnership is a first-time effort for the university, the parish school system, and the elementary school, data not directly relating to the guiding research questions may prove useful in evaluating the effectiveness of the partnership and determining whether the partnership is worth continuing and/or whether it is worth forging new university-school partnerships.

After recurring themes from questionnaires were determined, the next step was to examine my field notes and record any patterns which may emerge. After discovering those patterns, I then referred to the coding of the interviews and questionnaires to establish any similarities among the three sources of data.

### Research Question Three

How does this University-School partnership affect current teacher professional development? This research question asks whether partner school faculty developed

professionally during the partnership as opposed to years prior to its inception. The questionnaire given to the partner school faculty addressed issues regarding a teacher's own professional development as well as what he/she thought of his/her colleagues' professional development as a whole.

### **Participants for Research Question Three**

The partner school faculty who taught at the partner school at some point during the three-year program served as participants for this study. Of the 37 teachers who came and went during the three-year partnership, ten were African-American and 27 were Caucasian. There was only one male teacher during this time. Despite the signing of a three-year commitment to the partner school, ten of the 37 teachers (or 27%) remained at the partner school during the three-year study. Of these ten, three were African-American, and one was a White male.

Four teachers, all Caucasian females, taught at the partner school for the first two years of the partnership, and one Caucasian female taught two and one-half years. Seven female teachers (2 Black, 5 White) remained for the first year only. This included the first principal of the partnership. One White female was hired for the second year of the partnership and was relieved of her duties after that one year.

The remaining teachers, plus the ten who taught all three years, were the participants in this research. Seven female teachers, 2 Black, 5 White, taught the last two years of the partnership, while five female teachers, 3 Black, 2 White, taught during year three. Two White females taught the last semester ( $\frac{1}{2}$  year) of the partnership. Nineteen of these 24 teachers (79%) chose to participate in responding to the faculty questionnaire.

### **Instruments for Research Question Three**

The results of a questionnaire answered by 19 faculty members served as the source of data for the third research question. The questionnaire used in this study was one adapted from Chance (2000) found in Appendix B and Appendix C. The questionnaire consisted of 29 questions. Twenty-seven questions asked the respondent to disagree or agree with the statement using a four-item Likert scale. One question was to be answered *favorably* or *unfavorable*, and the remaining question asked for a *yes* or *no* answer. I grouped these 29 questions into six categories or themes: mentoring, field experiences, teacher support/professional development, participating in a partnership, teaching and curriculum, and finally, the use of reflective practice. Three questions fell under both mentoring and teacher support/professional development. Mention of reflective practice was found in only two questions. Six questions asked the respondent about their participation in a partnership setting, while five questions asked about the field experiences of university students. Finally, ten questions asked the respondents about their teaching practices and their curriculum.

Of the above questions, eight asked the teacher how he/she has changed since his/her school became a partner school. Another eight questions asked the teacher how he/she felt his/her colleagues have changed since becoming involved in a school-university partnership.

As with the questionnaires for teacher candidates, this questionnaire was given to one colleague involved in a university-school partnership as well as to a colleague with little knowledge of university-school partnerships. Unlike the questionnaire for teacher candidates, this questionnaire was designed to elicit the faculty's feelings about being

involved in a partnership; however, it remained important to check for questionnaire that were biased toward or against university-school partnerships. As in research question two, the colleague uninvolved in university-school partnerships proved to be invaluable when checking for bias.

### **Data Collection Procedures for Research Question Three**

During a faculty meeting in May, 2003, the partner school principal allowed time for me to give a brief overview of this part of the research and distribute questionnaires during the meeting. The principal believed the rate of return would be better if she allowed the faculty time during the meeting to complete the questionnaires. As a result, 19 questionnaires and consent forms were collected.

A cover letter with a brief description of the research and a word of appreciation as well as an abstract of the study accompanied the questionnaire. In addition, I was present at the faculty meeting to summarize the research and distribute the questionnaires and consent forms personally. Furthermore, having been a participant in the three-year partnership, the faculty were well acquainted with what I was doing and the importance of their participation in answering the questionnaire.

### **Data Analysis Procedures for Research Question Three**

After collecting questionnaires from the faculty, the questionnaires were given a sequential number as a reference number. Results from the questionnaires were tabulated into a Microsoft Excel 2000<sup>®</sup> spreadsheet. The elements recorded were the questionnaire reference number, question number, and the response.

The data for the questionnaires were analyzed using the Pivot Table function found in Microsoft Excel 2000<sup>®</sup>. The use of this feature is described in the Data Analysis



section of the second research question. Percentage values were computed by dividing the response counts by the total number of questionnaires (n=19). The four-point scale chosen for the questionnaires (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree) was then converted into a dichotomous variable of Disagree and Agree. This was easily accomplished by adding the number of responses from the strongly disagree and disagree fields and grouping them under Disagree. Likewise, the strongly agree and agree fields were added together and placed under the field of Agree. No Response values were treated as data as well. Percentages were computed for the Disagree, Agree, and No Response (NR) data fields.

#### Validity and Reliability, Objectivity and Bias in this Case Study

“The case study has long been stereotyped as a weak sibling among social science methods” (Yin, 1994, p. xiii). Despite being considered a less objective and less rigorous research method, the humanities / social science disciplines use case studies extensively (e.g., Patton, 1987; Yin, 1994). Steps must be taken to assure validity in the case study. One of those steps is the use of multiple sources (e.g., Patton, 1987; Yin, 1994).

Multiple sources used in this study include formal interviews and informal conversations with school and university faculty and administrators, and with university students. In addition, school report cards and student test scores over the three-year period will also be examined for significant change. My own record as a participant observer will also be considered for analysis. As participant observer, my own biases are brought to light. However, data collected from my on-site teaching partner, school faculty, and others will surely reveal any discrepancies in my record.

## **Bias**

“Researchers acknowledge the propensity for error and bias in data collection” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 36). Janesick (2000) states that the researcher must examine his/her own biases at the beginning of the study, during the study, and when the study is complete. In order to do this, Janesick suggests that the qualitative researcher should describe and explain his/her role as the researcher of the study.

Realizing that I am interested in the efficacy of university-school partnerships, and acknowledging that I am a student in the College of Education at Louisiana State University, I cannot neglect mentioning my own biases which could possibly affect the objectivity of this study. Knowing that this partnership endeavor is a “pilot” project, I had to appreciate the possibility that the College of Education, the school board, and the administration of the partner school would be optimistic of its success. As a participant, I, of course, would prefer to be part of a success rather than a failure. As a researcher, however, I am mindful of my role as an objective observer—nonetheless a participant observer—and must keep all biases in check.

In addition to my thoughts and biases toward university-school partnerships, I must also consider the state of education in Louisiana, more specifically in East Baton Rouge Parish, where I was educated. The media places the parish among the poorly-performing school systems in Louisiana. In the spring of 2002, East Baton Rouge Parish ranked 51<sup>st</sup> out of 66 parishes in student achievement and 48<sup>th</sup> out of 66 in percentage of certified teachers (Sentell, 2002). After discovering that East Baton Rouge Parish ranks at the top of the lowest quartile among Louisiana school districts, I soon became determined to find a better way to prepare our teachers, assuring they are certified—and

*qualified*—to tackle poor student achievement in the parish. My attitudes and opinions toward the rankings and toward uncertified teachers teaching low-performing students may perhaps contribute further to any biases I bring to the research.

### **Limitations**

Some researchers may consider sample size a limiting factor in research. For this study, a purposeful sample—one already intact—is used (Gall, Borg, Gall, 1996; Patton, 1987). The first question which comes to the minds of most researchers is how can one generalize from the research of only one case? This limitation, undoubtedly, must be justified to the readers. Yin (1994) maintains that the single case study is generalized “to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes” (p. 10). In an effort to evaluate this study, I cannot purport that all university-school partnerships will operate identically and produce the same results as the university-school partnership of this study. I can only offer an evaluation of the present research and give suggestions for the future of this particular partnership or suggestions for the formation of other university-school partnerships. Each university culture is different, and each school culture is different. Other university-school partnerships—regardless of the participating institutions—may not succeed at all.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE STUDY

“At the desk where I sit, I have learned one great truth.  
The answer for all our national problems—the answer for  
all the problems of the world—comes down to a single word.  
That word is ‘education.’” Lyndon B. Johnson

As stated in chapter one, this study holds true significance for the many participants in this study: the university, the school system, elementary school faculty members as well as its students, and teacher candidates. After three years, did this pilot university-school partnership reach the expectations held by those who ventured out to try something new? The research questions guiding this study were:

1. How does this University-School Partnership affect student achievement as measured by LEAP and ITBS?
2. How does the University-School Partnership affect development of teacher candidates?
3. How does this University-School Partnership affect current teacher professional development?

Chapter four provides an account of the results of the present study according to each research question.

#### Research Question One

Since P-12 student achievement is not often the focus of research concerning university-school partnerships (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Book, 1996; Teitel, 2001b), the researcher made the decision to place the focus of the first research question on the students and their achievement. In addressing the first research question, summary test scores for both the LEAP and ITBS were obtained from the Louisiana Department of

Education, and school report cards for the partner school were downloaded from the department of education's website. The researcher began collecting summary test scores in the spring of 1999 when mandatory accountability in the state went into effect.

### **School Report Cards and School Performance Scores**

In 1997, a law was passed by the Louisiana Legislature which would establish an accountability system in K-12 schools. The first School Performance Scores were issued on School Report Cards at the end of the 1998-99 school year. These School Report Cards as well as other accountability measures make up an accountability plan approved by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (Louisiana Department of Education, 2003b). The NCLB Act was designed to reform the schools in the United States and improve student achievement. This Act, signed by President George W. Bush, requires that states "give parents easy-to-read report cards on schools and districts, telling them which ones are succeeding and why" (United States Department of Education, 2002).

School Report Cards are published on the website of the Louisiana Department of Education in November of the following school year. The researcher obtained the school report cards beginning with 1998-99 and continuing through the 2002-2003 school year from this website. In order to communicate to the public which schools are succeeding in the state, School Performance Scores (SPS) were created. The School Performance Score is a numerical score given to show the progress of a school. Along with that numerical score is a performance label indicating a school's academic rank (see Chapter 3, page 63, Table 3.4).

According to the Louisiana Department of Education (1999), the school performance score for each school is calculated based upon that school's performance on

the four indicators listed below. These School Performance Scores range from 0 to beyond 100. A score of 100 indicates that a school has reached its 10-Year Goal; a score of 150 indicates the school has reached its 20-Year Goal. Each indicator is given weighted as follows:

- LEAP 21 Tests: 60%;
- ITBS Tests: 30%;
- Student Attendance: 10% (grades K-6), 5% (grades 7-12);
- Dropout Rate: 5% (grades 7-12).

In addition to performance labels, School Report Cards also give growth labels every two years. Growth labels, as defined by the Louisiana Department of Education, are based on a school's Growth Target. Growth Targets, in two-year intervals, represent the progress a school makes in order to reach its 10-year and 20-year goals. The Growth Target is calculated by determining the "difference between the school's School Performance Score and 100, divided by the number of remaining growth cycles, OR 5 points, whichever is greater" (Louisiana Department of Education, 1999). There is a slight adjustment made based on the percentage of special education students enrolled in a particular school. The following example, provided by the Louisiana Department of Education, calculates the two-year growth target for a school with an SPS of 40 in 1999, with five cycles remaining for the ten-year goal to be reached (in 2009). The sample school has 10% of its students listed as special education students. The school's formula would be as follows:

$$[90\% \times (100 - 40) \div 5] + [10\% \times (100 - 40) \div (2 \times 5)] =$$
$$[0.9 \times 60 \div 5] + [0.1 \times 60 \div 10] =$$

$$[0.9 \times 12] + [6 \div 10] =$$

$$[10.8] + [0.6] = 11.4 = \text{the growth target for 2001.}$$


The equation is divided into two formulas to be added together in order to calculate for the percent of regular education students (90% in this example) and make adjustments for the percent of special education students (10%). Since growth targets are given every two years, and this calculation was made in 1999, the school in the above example would aim for an SPS of 51.4 in 2001 (40 + 11.4).

### **School Report Cards for the Partner School in this Study.**

The first School Report Card for the 1998-99 school year labeled the partner school as *Academically Below Average* with a School Performance Score (SPS) of 41.3. The range for this performance label is 30.1 – 69.3. It should be noted that 57% of the schools in the district held the same label as did 42% of the schools in the state. A description of categories and school performance scores can be found in chapter three in Tables 3.4 and 3.5, pages 63-64. The partner school remained Academically Below Average for the 1999-2000 school year as well. The university-school partnership had not yet begun, and the SPS was 44.3, only slightly higher than the previous SPS.

The university-school partnership began in the fall of 2000. The SPS for the 2000-2001 school year was 54.0, an increase from 41.3 in 1999. Although still academically below the state average, the school was awarded a growth label of *Exemplary Academic Growth*, the highest growth label to be awarded. For the 2001-2002 school year, the SPS increased only slightly to 56.2. Although still considered *Academically Below Average* with no growth awards for this year, the SPS increased nonetheless. The third year of the university-school partnership, 2002-2003, the SPS

dropped slightly to 55.6. During this same year, the scoring system for the School Report Cards changed (see Chapter 3, Table 3.5, page 64). The range encompassing the SPS of the partner school (55.6) changed from 30.1 – 69.3 to 45.0 – 59.9. Although the level of performance did not change, the label was no longer listed as *Academically Below Average* but rather was changed to *Academic Warning*. This warning informs parents and teachers that the school must meet a certain score the following year or face undergoing corrective action from the state level (see chapter three for an in-depth description of correction action). Figure 4.1 below summarizes the School Performance scores before and during the partnership. Regardless of the range or name of the performance label, the partner school remained at the same level although showing improvements over the first year of accountability reports. An asterisk denotes the years of the partnership program reported in this study.



**Figure 4.1 School Performance Scores Reported on School Report Cards.**



As stated earlier in this chapter, the school performance score encompasses the index scores of the LEAP and the ITBS. Those scores are summarized below in Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3. A more in-depth discussion of the LEAP and ITBS appears in the following subsections.


### **Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP)**

The administration of the LEAP to fourth-grade students as a part of the state's accountability program began in the spring of 1999 and only included language arts and mathematics content areas. The spring of 2000 saw the addition of both social studies and science tests. This criterion-referenced test (CRT) was designed to measure how well students have mastered the state's content standards. For the first time in the state, students are not simply receiving a *pass* or *fail* score but, rather, they are receiving one of five achievement ratings: advanced, proficient, basic, approaching basic, or unsatisfactory. A more detailed account of the rewards and consequences attached to these ratings is found in Chapter 3.

The following bar graph, Figure 4.2, shows an increase in performance on the LEAP in the spring of 2001 (the first year of the partnership). The index scores for the LEAP rose from 43.3 in 2000 to 56.6 in 2001. Although the graph shows a decline, the LEAP scores for the remaining two years of the partnership (54.5 and 56.0 respectively) continued to show an improvement over the pre-partnership years.

Summary scores for each of the subject areas tested on the LEAP were obtained from the state department of education. Although there are a number of students still performing at the *Unsatisfactory* level, as shown in the following sections, the above graph shows an increase in overall student performance. The LEAP test carries a weight

of 60% in calculating a school's School Performance Score (SPS); therefore, the increase in overall student performance helps to raise the SPS for the partner school.



**Figure 4.2 Fourth Grade LEAP Index Scores as Reported on School Report Cards.**

The following subsections, separated by subject area, were retrieved from the summary scores provided by the state department of education. These summary scores give the percentage of students from the partner school scoring at the different performance levels. School Report Cards, however, report index scores in order to calculate the SPS. The researcher made use of “Ask DOE” on the department of education’s website (CustomerService@la.gov) in order to determine how an index score is calculated. The response from the DOE Hotline Customer Service (December 18, 2003) follows:

The index is the score calculated for each of the four components of the SPS (CRT [Criterion-Referenced Test], NRT [Norm-Referenced Test], attendance, and dropout). For example, the CRT Index (LEAP 21) is calculated by adding the points given to each student and dividing by the number of students (this is a somewhat simplified version of the formula). Once the index is calculated, it is

then multiplied by the appropriate weight to obtain the weighted index. The CRT Index [LEAP 21] is multiplied by .60 (60%).

Summary scores provided by the state department of education, are percentages of students performing at a certain level. The subsections to follow report this information by content area. Although all five performance levels are included in the tables, the researcher has chosen to focus primarily on the *Unsatisfactory* rating. Students performing at this level are not able to “demonstrate fundamental knowledge and skills” (Louisiana Department of Education, 1999), must attend summer school, and retake the LEAP test or face repeating the fourth grade. The primary reason for focusing on the change at the *Unsatisfactory* level is the large percentage of students in the partner school as well as in the entire district at that level. Decreasing the percent of students failing the fourth-grade LEAP test is very important because it means fewer students required to attend summer school and repeating the fourth grade if they fail the summer retest.

### **LEAP—English Language Arts**

The LEAP English Language Arts test was first given in the spring of 1999. A criterion-referenced test, the LEAP is designed to measure mastery of six of the seven content standards for English Language Arts:

1. Read, comprehend, and respond to a range of materials
2. Write competently
3. Use conventions of language
4. Apply speaking and listening skills (not assessed)
5. Locate, select, and synthesize information
6. Read, analyze, and respond to literature

7. Apply reasoning and problem-solving skills (Louisiana Educational Assessment Program, 2003, p. 3).

The LEAP English Language Arts test consists of four parts:

1. Writing: addresses standards two and three;
2. Using information resources: addresses standard five;
3. Reading and Responding: addresses standards one, six, and seven;
4. Proofreading: addresses standard three (Louisiana Educational Assessment Program, 2003, p. 5).

Table 4.1 below shows the five mastery levels and the percentage of students performing at each level. As stated in the introductory section, the researcher has emphasized the *Unsatisfactory* category in each of the subject areas. The years of the partnership are indicated with an asterisk (\*).

**Table 4.1 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fourth Grade LEAP English Language Arts Test.**

<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade LEAP English Language Arts</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
Advanced	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Proficient	6%	4%	11%	9%	6%
Basic	22%	31%	34%	32%	40%
Approaching Basic	39%	23%	31%	36%	27%
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>27%</b>

In 1999, 33% of the fourth-grade students performed at the *Unsatisfactory* level in the area of language arts. That percentage rose in 2000 to 42% but dropped noticeably in 2001 to 23%. In 2002, again, 23% of the students performed unsatisfactorily in language

arts. Lastly, in 2003, the final year of the partnership, 27% of the fourth-grade students performed poorly on their language arts test.

### **LEAP—Mathematics**

In addition to English language arts, mathematics was the only other content test administered to fourth-grade students in 1999. The mathematics test consists of Part A, which uses a multiple-choice format, and Part B, consisting of open-ended questions requiring students to show steps taken to arrive at the answer. All six of the mathematics strands are measured by the LEAP mathematics test. The mathematics strands, as defined by the Louisiana Department of Education, are as follow:

**Strand N:** Number and Number Relations Standard. In problem-solving investigations, students demonstrate an understanding of the real number system and communicate the relationships within that system using a variety of techniques and tools.

**Strand A:** Algebra Standard. In problem-solving investigations, students demonstrate an understanding of concepts and processes that allow them to analyze, represent, and describe relationships among variable quantities and to apply algebraic methods to real-world situations.

**Strand M:** Measurement Standard. In problem-solving investigations, students demonstrate an understanding of the concepts, processes, and real-life applications of measurement.

**Strand G:** Geometry Standard. In problem-solving investigations, students demonstrate an understanding of geometric concepts and applications involving one-, two-, and three-dimensional geometry, and justify their findings.

**Strand D:** Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Math Standard. In problem-solving investigations, students discover trends, formulate conjectures regarding cause-and-effect relationships, and demonstrate critical-thinking skills in order to make informed decisions.

**Strand P:** Patterns, Relations, and Functions Standard. In problem-solving investigations, students demonstrate an understanding of patterns, relations, and functions that represent and explain real-world situations (Louisiana Educational Assessment Program, 2003, p. 7).

As Table 4.2 shows, over one-half of the fourth-grade students performed at the lowest level of *Unsatisfactory* (55%) in 1999. In 2000, the percentage dropped to 46%. The first year of the partnership, signs of progress were dramatic. Results of the fourth-grade LEAP mathematics scores demonstrate that 26% of the students performed at the *Unsatisfactory* level in mathematics. In 2002, 34% of the students received *Unsatisfactory* ratings while in 2003, 33% received *Unsatisfactory* scores. In 2001, the LEAP scores did not only improve in mathematics, but they also improved in all of the disciplines giving the partner school the award for *Exemplary Academic Growth*.

**Table 4.2 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fourth Grade LEAP Mathematics Test.**

<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade LEAP Mathematics</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
Advanced	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Proficient	0%	0%	9%	2%	6%
Basic	18%	23%	23%	27%	44%
Approaching Basic	27%	31%	43%	36%	17%
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>33%</b>

### **LEAP—Social Studies**

The year 2000 saw the addition of tests in social studies and science to be administered and scored as part of the LEAP test. The fourth-grade social studies test consists of two major parts. Part A consists of fifty multiple-choice items assessing skills in the four social studies strands (Geography, Civics, Economics, and History). The Louisiana Department of Education maintains that these four strands are intermingled among test questions and are not arranged into separate sections. Part B consists of four

open-ended questions requiring higher-order thinking skills. Students may be required to construct or interpret maps, charts, timelines and the like. In addition, students may be required to address a certain issue or problem by writing a short paragraph. As with the labeling of strands in mathematics, the social studies labels represent the title of the strand:

**Strand G:** Geography, Physical and Cultural Systems Standard. Students develop a spatial understanding of Earth’s surface and the processes that shape it, the connection between people and places, and the relationship between man and his environment.

**Strand C:** Civics, Citizenship, and Government Standard. Students develop an understanding of the structure and purposes of government, the foundations of the American democratic system, and the role of the United States in the world, while learning about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

**Strand E:** Economics, Interdependence and Decision Making Standard. Students develop an understanding of fundamental economic concepts as they apply to the interdependence and decision making of individuals, households, businesses, and governments in the United States and the world.

**Strand H:** History, Time, Continuity, and Change Standard. Students develop a sense of historical time and historical perspective as they study the history of their community, state, nation, and world (Louisiana Educational Assessment Program, 2003, p. 9).

In 2000, the first year of testing in social studies, nearly one-half of the fourth-grade students at the partner school, 46%, performed at the *Unsatisfactory* level. In 2001, fewer students received *Unsatisfactory* ratings (31%), while in 2002, 39% of the students performed at the *Unsatisfactory* level. Finally, markedly better than the first year of social studies testing, only one-fourth of the fourth-graders performed at the *Unsatisfactory* level, an improvement of 14% (Table 4.3).

**Table 4.3 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fourth Grade LEAP Social Studies Test.**

<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade LEAP Social Studies</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
Advanced		0%	0%	0%	0%
Proficient		0%	9%	0%	2%
Basic		35%	31%	27%	42%
Approaching Basic		19%	26%	34%	31%
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>		<b>46%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>25%</b>

**LEAP—Science**

The science test, consisting of three parts, was first administered to fourth-grade students in 2000. The first part of the science test consists of multiple-choice questions addressing the five strands of science: science as inquiry; physical science; life science; earth and space science; and science and the environment. In part two, students are required to respond to four short-answer questions assessing all but one of the five strands: science as inquiry. The final section of the science test is comprehensive in nature. Students are “required to observe, utilize, and react to materials in an investigation and draw conclusions based on their experiences.” This task integrates the content strand of science as inquiry with at least one other content strand (Louisiana Educational Assessment Program, 2003, p. 8).

The five science strands are reported by the Louisiana Department of Education as follows:

**Science as Inquiry:** Students will **do** [*sic*] science by engaging in partial and full inquiries that are within their developmental capabilities.



**Physical Science:** Students will develop an understanding of the characteristics and interrelationships of matter and energy in the physical world.

**Life Science:** Students will become aware of the characteristics and life cycles of organisms and understand their relationships to each other and to their environment.

**Earth and Space Science:** Students will develop an understanding of the properties of Earth materials, the structure of the Earth system, Earth’s history, and Earth’s place in the universe.

**Science and the Environment:** In learning environmental science, students will develop an appreciation of the natural environment, learn the importance of environmental quality, and acquire a sense of stewardship. As consumers and citizens, they will be able to recognize how our personal, professional, and political actions affect the natural world (Louisiana Educational Assessment Program, 2003, p. 8, 9).

As with the social studies test, close to one-half of the fourth-grade students, 46%, performed at the *Unsatisfactory* level on the LEAP science test. In 2001, that percent improved to 31%, while in 2002, a considerable improvement was seen showing only 20% of the students performing at the *Unsatisfactory* level. A slight drop was seen in 2003, yet still an improvement over previous years with 23% of the fourth-grade students receiving ratings of *Unsatisfactory* in science (Table 4.4).

**Table 4.4 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fourth Grade LEAP Science Test.**

<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade LEAP Science</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
Advanced		0%	0%	0%	0%
Proficient		0%	6%	0%	0%
Basic		35%	26%	27%	29%
Approaching Basic		19%	37%	52%	48%
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>		<b>46%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>23%</b>


## **Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)**

The administration of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) as part of Louisiana's accountability program began in 1999. Unlike the LEAP, the ITBS is a norm-referenced test (NRT) which compares the performance of Louisiana's students to that of students nationally. The ITBS measures skills and standards in the following content areas:

- Reading: Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension
- Language: Spelling, Capitalization, Punctuation, Usage and Expression
- Mathematics: Concepts, Estimation, Problem Solving, Data Interpretation, Computation (grade 3 only)
- Social Studies
- Science

As with the LEAP, the ITBS is included in the School Performance Score (SPS). While the LEAP carries a weight of 60% in the SPS, the ITBS is weighted half of that at 30%. In addition, the 60% weight carried by the LEAP includes all of the fourth-grade students in the school. The 30% carried by the ITBS includes all of the third- and fifth-grade students in the school. Both the third and fifth grades are combined before calculating the index scores reported on the School Report Card. A description of the calculation of index scores is under the LEAP subheading in this chapter (page 83).

After a drop in the combined ITBS index score in 2000, the first year of the partnership (2001) showed a dramatic increase. Furthermore, the ITBS continued improving, although slightly, throughout the partnership period (Figure 4.3).



**Figure 4.3 Third and Fifth Grade ITBS Index Scores as Reported on School Report Cards.**

As a nationally-administered norm-referenced test, the students' scores on the ITBS were reported in quartiles with the first quartile indicating the lowest in performance. As with the LEAP test, the researcher obtained summary scores from the State Department of Education. Unlike the index scores, the summary scores are separated by grades as well as content areas. As with the LEAP scores, since a larger percent of the students performed at the lowest level, the researcher examined that level of performance (the first quartile percentages) to determine how much improvement was made over time at the partner school. The first quartile of the summary scores of the third-grade students is reported in the sections to follow.

### **Third Grade ITBS—Reading**

The reading test of the ITBS is divided into two parts: vocabulary and reading comprehension. The vocabulary section is composed of multiple-choice questions in which a word is presented in the context of a sentence. The students must select the

answer that most closely means the same as the word presented in the sentence. The vocabulary presented in this exercise may be a noun, verb, or modifier and most likely represents “general vocabulary rather than the specialized vocabulary used in various subject-matter areas” (University of Iowa, 1999, p. 1).

The reading comprehension portion of the test consists of various lengths of passages (usually taken from previously published material) ranging from several lines to a full page. Students are required to draw inferences about what they have read.

On the reading test of the ITBS, 41.7% of third-grade students at the partner school scored within the first quartile in 1999. The number of students scoring within the first quartile rose to 53% in 2000. When the partnership began in 2001, over half of the third-graders at the partner school scored in the first quartile. In 2002 and 2003, fewer students had first-quartile ratings (47.6% and 48.5% respectively) though not reaching the low percentage seen in 1999 (Table 4.5).

**Table 4.5 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS Reading Test.**

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ITBS Reading</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	8.3%	6.3%	5.4%	0%	2%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	16.7%	18.8%	5.4%	11.9%	15%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	33.3%	21.9%	32.4%	40.5%	34.5%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>56.8%</b>	<b>47.6%</b>	<b>48.5%</b>

The following descriptions of content area tests were retrieved from the Iowa Testing Programs website (University of Iowa, 1999).

### **Third Grade ITBS—English Language Arts / Writing**

The English language arts and writing components of the ITBS consist of spelling, capitalization, punctuation, usage and expression. The spelling section is comprised of questions which include five options: four words (one of which may be misspelled), and *No Mistakes*, which may be chosen if the student feels the four words are all correctly spelled.

Capitalization is the second component of the English language arts / writing test. Students must identify the line of writing in which the capitalization error occurs, or choose *No Mistakes* if they feel there are no capitalization errors in the text. Names, titles, dates, holidays, places, organizations, and the like are used in this exercise. Punctuation, the third component of the test, is much like capitalization in that students must identify the line of writing in which the punctuation error occurs, or choose *No Mistakes*. Various forms of punctuation are used in this exercise.

The final component of this tests, Usage and Expression, is divided into two parts. The first part requires students to identify the line of text containing a usage error or choose *No Mistakes*. The use of verbs, pronouns, and modifiers are tested in this section. In part two of Usage and Expression, students are required to choose the best method of expressing an idea presented in the test. Conciseness, clarity, appropriateness, and organization are key issues considered in this part of the test.

The results of the partner school's performance on the English language arts / writing test follow (Table 4.6). The first year of the test, 1999, saw the fewest percentage of low-performing students with one-fourth of the third-grade students performing in the first quartile. The years 2000, 2001, and 2002 showed a rise in percentage of low-

performing students: 37.5%, 43.2%, and 47.6% respectively. The final year of the partnership, 2003, showed fewer students performing in the first quartile, 34.5% although still not the 25% seen in 1999.

**Table 4.6 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS English Language Arts / Writing Test.**

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ITBS ELA / Writing</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	29.2%	25%	10.8%	11.9%	15%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	25%	9.4%	16.2%	19.1%	22%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	20.8%	28.1%	29.7%	21.4%	28.5%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>43.2%</b>	<b>47.6%</b>	<b>34.5%</b>

### **Third Grade ITBS—Mathematics**

The mathematics portion of the ITBS consists of three major sections each of which is divided into additional portions: math concepts and estimation; math problem solving and data interpretation; math computation. The math concepts portion of the test includes questions dealing with number properties and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, probability, and statistics. Students must demonstrate their understanding of the relationships and visual representations presented in this section. The questions addressing estimation require students to demonstrate their ability to mentally solve arithmetic and estimation problems (e.g. rounding of numbers).

Problem solving and data interpretation consist of word problems requiring several steps to solve. “Real-world” examples are used as word problems. In some of the problems, students must choose an appropriate method or approach to use in solving the problems rather than compute an answer. In addition to word problems, graphs and

tables are given, and students must be able to obtain information from these graphs and tables, compare quantities, for example, or determine relationships.

Finally, in math computation, students are faced with addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division problems. Whole number, fractions, and decimal numbers are all used in this section. Students must show their work and choose an answer from the three choices given. If a student feels he/she has the right answer but does not see that answer given, the student may choose *N* meaning the correct answer is *Not Given*.

The results of the mathematics test are given below (Table 4.7). In the partner school results, mathematics was similar to English language arts / writing in that the lowest percentage of students performing within the first quartile occurred in 1999 (45.8%). A rise in percentage in the year 2000 and a decrease in 2001 (51.7% and 48.6%, respectively) led to yet another rise in 2002, 52.3%. The final year of the study showed yet another drop in percentage to fewer than half of the students performing within the first quartile. Although an improvement, this percentage did not reach the low percentage seen in 1999, 47.0%.

**Table 4.7 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS Mathematics Test.**

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ITBS Mathematics</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	12.5%	16.1%	5.4%	4.8%	7%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	29.2%	16.1%	10.8%	11.9%	16%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	12.5%	16.1%	35.1%	31%	30%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>45.8%</b>	<b>51.7%</b>	<b>48.6%</b>	<b>52.3%</b>	<b>47%</b>

### Third Grade ITBS—Social Studies

Social studies questions on the ITBS measure students' ability to use and understand various concepts, principles, and visual material. History, geography, political science, economics, sociology, and anthropology are addressed in this test. Since social studies offers many scenarios used in other parts of the test (e.g. reading comprehension, English language arts), this test measures objectives of the social studies curriculum not chosen for other areas of the ITBS.

Table 4.8 gives the results of the third-grade social studies test for the partner school. The year 2003, the third year of the partnership, showed a dramatic decrease in poorly-performing students in the area of social studies. The researcher reminds the reader that one of the university courses taught at the partner school was Curriculum Disciplines: Social Studies, in which students learned methods for teaching social studies and fulfilled their field experience requirements in the partner school. Third grade was one of the grades which had field experience students.

**Table 4.8 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS Social Studies Test.**

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ITBS Social Studies</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	8.3%	6.3%	0%	0%	4%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	16.7%	9.4%	13.5%	19.1%	29%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	25%	28%	35.1%	33.3%	45.5%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>56.3%</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>47.6%</b>	<b>21.5%</b>

In 1999, 50% of the students performed within the first quartile. An increase in the number of students performing in the first quartile was seen in 2000 (56.3%). During



the first year of the partnership, 2001, slightly over half of the students performed within the lowest quartile (51.4%). The number of students continued to drop to below the one-half mark in 2002 with 47.6% of the students performing in the first quartile. The third year of the partnership (2003) showed substantial improvement. Only 21.5% of the students performed within the first quartile on the social studies test.

### **Third Grade ITBS—Science**

The science component of the ITBS addresses earth science, space science, and physical science. Students must be able to demonstrate their ability to hypothesize, draw inferences, explain, measure, and classify. Table 4.9, below, shows student performance on the third-grade science test. The lowest percentage of students ranking in the first quartile appeared in 1999 with 25% of the students in this category. Both 2000 and 2001 showed increases to 40.5% and 45.9%, respectively. In 2002, one-half of the third-grade students performed within the lowest quartile. The report improved in 2003 showing a drop in percentage to 38%.

**Table 4.9 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Third Grade ITBS Science Test.**

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ITBS Science</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	8.3%	6.3%	0%	4.8%	6%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	16.7%	9.4%	8.1%	4.8%	29%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	50%	43.8%	45.9%	40.4%	27%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>40.5%</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>38%</b>

The fifth-grade ITBS scores are reported next in the same fashion as the above third-grade scores. The content tested on the fifth-grade ITBS is the same as that of the

third-grade test with one exception: the math computation component is only found in grade three (University of Iowa, 1999).

### **Fifth Grade ITBS—Reading**

Student performance on the fifth-grade reading test of the ITBS are reported below and summarized in Table 4.10. On this test, 50% of the students performed within the first quartile in 1999, and only a slight improvement was seen the following year with 45.9% of the students performing in the first quartile. In 2001, a considerable improvement was seen with 23.8% of the students performing at the lowest level. The following two years, 2002 and 2003, showed an increase in the number of students in the first quartile, 35.3% and 40.5% respectively.

**Table 4.10 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS Reading Test.**

<b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade ITBS Reading</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	0%	0%	0%	8.8%	8%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	10.7%	21.6%	42.9%	20.6%	3%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	39.3%	32.5%	33.3%	35.3%	48.5%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	<b>35.3%</b>	<b>40.5%</b>

### **Fifth Grade ITBS—English Language Arts / Writing**

Student performance in the area of English language arts / writing is shown below in Table 4.11. The fewest percentage of students performing in the first quartile occurred during the first year of the partnership, 2001. Better scores were seen during all three years of the partnership although a drop occurred in 2002 and 2003. These scores are impressive compared to 39.3% in 1999, and 45.9% in 2000.

**Table 4.11 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS English Language Arts / Writing Test.**

<b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade ITBS ELA / Writing</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	0%	2.7%	9.5%	11.8%	27%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	7.1%	21.6%	33.3%	29.4%	35%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	53.6%	29.8%	42.9%	41.2%	19%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>39.3%</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	<b>19%</b>

### **Fifth Grade ITBS—Mathematics**

Student performance on the mathematics test is given in Table 4.12. Various percentages of students performing within the first quartile were seen throughout the years. The largest percentage of students (over one-half of the fifth-graders) performing within the first quartile was seen in 1999 at 57.1%. The year 2000 saw a drop to 37% while the first year of the partnership, 2002, showed a dramatic decrease to 9.5%. The remaining two years of the partnership, the percentages rose again to 44.1% in 2002, and decreased to 32% in 2003.

**Table 4.12 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS Mathematics Test.**

<b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade ITBS Mathematics</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	0%	5.4%	0%	8.8%	16.5%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	10.7%	21.6%	47.6%	20.6%	19.5%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	32.1%	35.2%	42.9%	26.5%	32%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>57.1%</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>44.1%</b>	<b>32%</b>

### Fifth Grade ITBS—Social Studies

Performance on the social studies throughout the years reported showed an improvement over 1999 when over half of the students (53.6%) performed within the first quartile. The fifth-graders in 2000 improved somewhat with a percentage of 48.7%. The first year of the partnership, the students showed sizeable improvement with a decrease in percentage to 9.5%. However, the final two years of the partnership revealed increases in the number of students performing in the first quartile: 17.6% and 24% in 2002 and 2003, respectively. Table 4.13 summarizes student performance on the social studies test as well as depict the trend of improvement from 1999 to 2003.

**Table 4.13 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS Social Studies Test.**

<b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade ITBS Social Studies</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	0%	2.7%	4.8%	2.9%	14%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	7.1%	10.8%	28.6%	20.6%	24%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	39.3%	37.8%	57.1%	58.9%	38%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>53.6%</b>	<b>48.7%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	<b>24%</b>

### Fifth Grade ITBS—Science

Finally, on the science test of the ITBS, over two-thirds of the fifth-graders (67.9%) performed within in the first quartile in 1999. Overall performance in science can be seen in Table 4.14. In the year 2000, performance within the first quartile improved slightly to just over half of the fifth-grade students, 54.1%. The first year of the partnership showed an improvement with a percentage of 28.6%, while the second

year showed another small improvement to 23.5%. Unfortunately, however, 41% of the fifth-grade students performed poorly in 2003, the third year of the partnership.

**Table 4.14 Percent of Students Scoring Within Each Performance Level on the Fifth Grade ITBS Science Test.**

<b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade ITBS Science</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Quartile	0%	2.7%	19%	5.9%	5%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	7.1%	16.2%	9.5%	14.7%	19%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Quartile	25%	27%	42.9%	55.9%	35%
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quartile</b>	<b>67.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>23.5%</b>	<b>41%</b>

#### Research Question Two

The second research question was addressed using questionnaires distributed to teacher candidates in the university’s college of education who were student teaching and had completed all of their methods courses. The return rate for these questionnaires was 86% or 82 questionnaires. The questionnaires were received in a timely fashion.

The questionnaire (adapted from Teitel, 2000) was designed to ask the teacher candidates about their preservice education experience. Although specific questions regarding partnership schools were included in the questionnaire, the goal of the design was not to “give away” the fact that the researcher was searching for responses unique to partner schools. In doing this, several questions within the questionnaire were beyond the scope of research question two; however, in the future, these responses could be shared with colleagues in the College of Education. The researcher has no plans to destroy any of the responses from the questionnaires.

After transcribing the written responses, the researcher found that open-ended questions 7-15 were not answered by approximately 20-25 teacher candidates. After reviewing these questionnaires for a trend in placement of methods courses, the researcher discovered that the questionnaires were from students who had taken methods courses in various settings. Upon further review, the researcher determined that the questionnaires lacking answers all came from a small number of the same student teaching supervisors. Since the teacher candidates were given the questionnaires during a small group meeting with their student teaching supervisors, the researcher could only speculate that the supervisors distributed and collected the questionnaires without allowing enough time to answer all of the open-ended questions.

A summary of results from the questionnaires received from all of the teacher candidates follows after which is a summary of interviews and informal conversations with the researcher's teaching partner who is the on-site university methods instructor at the partner school.

### **Teacher Candidate Perspective, Likert Questions**

Beginning with the four-item Likert questions, the teacher candidates were asked to show whether they strongly disagreed, disagreed, agreed or strongly agreed with the statements on the questionnaire. These statements began with, "After completing all or parts of this teacher preparation program, I feel I am well prepared to..." and included aspects the students might have experienced during their preservice teacher education. After collecting the questionnaires and analyzing the responses, the researcher created a dichotomy among the answers to show how many teacher candidates disagreed or agreed with the statements. Furthermore, the researcher was able to categorize the responses

according to where the teacher candidates attended their methods courses. In order to sort the 82 responses by category, a system of using zeros and ones was used in a spreadsheet. These values indicated the location where the teacher candidates were enrolled in their methods blocks: zero to indicate the university; one to indicate a partnership school. For simplification, four groups were formed:

- Group 1 (or 0,0) took all methods courses at the university;
- Group 2 (or 0,1) took reading and social studies methods at the university, and math and science methods at a partnership school;
- Group 3 (or 1,0) took reading and social studies methods at a partnership school, and math and science methods at the university;
- Group 4 (or 1,1) took all methods courses at a partnership school.

Of the 82 returned questionnaires, 37 teacher candidates, or 45%, fell into the 0,0 category (Group 1); 1 teacher candidate (1%) was in the 0,1 category (Group 2); 27 candidates (33%) were in the 1,0 category (Group 3); and 17 teacher candidates, 21%, fell into the 1,1 category (Group 4). Overall, the 82 teacher candidates agreed that they were well prepared after completing their preservice teacher preparation, ranging from a low of 85.4% of the teacher candidates agreeing with the statement to 100%. A report of responses is given below, separated by group.

### **Teacher Candidate Perspective, Group 1**

One hundred percent of the teacher candidates completing all of their blocks on the university's campus agreed with eleven statements. Ten statements showed some teacher candidates disagreeing while one teacher candidate did not respond at all (Table 4.15).

**Table 4.15 Responses from Teacher Candidates Having Taken All Methods Blocks on the University's Campus (Group 1, 37 candidates).**

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am now well prepared to...</b>			
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>No Response</b>
1. ...maintain a positive attitude toward teaching.	0%	100%	0%
2. ...set and maintain high expectations for all students.	0%	100%	0%
3. ...use a variety of teaching strategies.	0%	100%	0%
4. ...meet the diverse learning needs of my students.	5.4%	94.6%	0%
5. ...be sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences among students.	0%	94.6%	5.4%
6. ...include special education / resource students.	10.8%	89.2%	0%
7. ...work cooperatively with colleagues.	0%	100%	0%
8. ...take leadership roles outside the classroom.	2.7%	97.3%	0%
9. ...understand the culture of a school.	0%	100%	0%
10. ...be comfortable in various settings within the school.	0%	100%	0%
11. ...teach knowledgeably as a subject area expert.	5.4%	94.6%	0%
12. ...motivate students effectively.	2.7%	97.3%	0%
13. ...use different kinds of methods of teaching as needed.	0%	100%	0%

(table, continued)



<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am now well prepared to...</b>			
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>No Response</b>
14. ...manage classroom activities.	2.7%	97.3%	0%
15. ...deal effectively with discipline problems.	10.8%	89.2%	0%
16. ...use technology as a tool for teaching and learning.	8.1%	91.9%	0%
17. ...use inquiry to improve teaching and learning.	5.4%	94.6%	0%
18. ...teach as part of a teaching team.	2.7%	97.3%	0%
19. ...use multiple forms of assessment to evaluate student learning.	0%	100%	0%
20. ...reflect upon my teaching.	0%	100%	0%
21. ...be able to “bounce back” after a difficult time.	0%	100%	0%
22. ...continue to develop professionally.	0%	100%	0%

### **Teacher Candidate Perspective, Group 2**

This group contains only one teacher candidate. Although inconsequential, the researcher is reporting the information retrieved from the 82 questionnaires, and this candidate’s responses are included (Table 4.16). The researcher is calling attention to the fact that there is only one respondent in this category because percentages can be misleading in an instance such as this one (e.g. 100% = 1 person).

**Table 4.16 Responses from Teacher Candidates Having Taken Language Arts / Social Studies Blocks at the University and Math / Science Blocks at a Partnership School (Group 2, 1 candidate).**

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am now well prepared to...</b>			
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>No Response</b>
1. ...maintain a positive attitude toward teaching.	0%	100%	0%
2. ...set and maintain high expectations for all students.	0%	100%	0%
3. ...use a variety of teaching strategies.	0%	100%	0%
4. ...meet the diverse learning needs of my students.	0%	100%	0%
5. ...be sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences among students.	0%	100%	0%
6. ...include special education / resource students.	100%	0%	0%
7. ...work cooperatively with colleagues.	0%	100%	0%
8. ...take leadership roles outside the classroom.	0%	100%	0%
9. ...understand the culture of a school.	0%	100%	0%
10. ...be comfortable in various settings within the school.	0%	0%	100%
11. ...teach knowledgeably as a subject area expert.	100%	0%	0%
12. ...motivate students effectively.	0%	100%	0%
13. ...use different kinds of methods of teaching as needed.	0%	100%	0%

(table, continued)

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am now well prepared to...</b>			
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>No Response</b>
14. ...manage classroom activities.	100%	0%	0%
15. ...deal effectively with discipline problems.	0%	100%	0%
16. ...use technology as a tool for teaching and learning.	0%	100%	0%
17. ...use inquiry to improve teaching and learning.	0%	100%	0%
18. ...teach as part of a teaching team.	0%	100%	0%
19. ...use multiple forms of assessment to evaluate student learning.	0%	100%	0%
20. ...reflect upon my teaching.	0%	100%	0%
21. ...be able to “bounce back” after a difficult time.	0%	100%	0%
22. ...continue to develop professionally.	0%	100%	0%

### **Teacher Candidate Perspective, Group 3**

One hundred percent of these teacher candidates agreed with 18 of the 22 statements. The statements showing disagreement included statements six, eight, eleven, and sixteen (Table 4.17). This group of teacher candidates disagreed with fewer statements than the other groups, except for Group 2 which contains only one candidate who disagreed with three statements.

**Table 4.17 Responses from Teacher Candidates Having Taken Language Arts / Social Studies Blocks at a Partnership School and Math / Science Blocks at the University (Group 3, 27 candidates).**

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am now well prepared to...</b>			
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>No Response</b>
1. ...maintain a positive attitude toward teaching.	0%	100%	0%
2. ...set and maintain high expectations for all students.	0%	100%	0%
3. ...use a variety of teaching strategies.	0%	100%	0%
4. ...meet the diverse learning needs of my students.	0%	100%	0%
5. ...be sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences among students.	0%	100%	0%
6. ...include special education / resource students.	11.1%	88.9%	0%
7. ...work cooperatively with colleagues.	0%	100%	0%
8. ...take leadership roles outside the classroom.	3.7%	96.3%	0%
9. ...understand the culture of a school.	0%	100%	0%
10. ...be comfortable in various settings within the school.	0%	0%	100%
11. ...teach knowledgeably as a subject area expert.	3.7%	96.3%	0%

(table, continued)

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am now well prepared to...</b>			
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>No Response</b>
12. ...motivate students effectively.	0%	100%	0%
13. ...use different kinds of methods of teaching as needed.	0%	100%	0%
14. ...manage classroom activities.	0%	100%	0%
15. ...deal effectively with discipline problems.	0%	100%	0%
16. ...use technology as a tool for teaching and learning.	11.1%	88.9%	0%
17. ...use inquiry to improve teaching and learning.	0%	100%	0%
18. ...teach as part of a teaching team.	0%	100%	0%
19. ...use multiple forms of assessment to evaluate student learning.	0%	100%	0%
20. ...reflect upon my teaching.	0%	100%	0%
21. ...be able to “bounce back” after a difficult time.	0%	100%	0%
22. ...continue to develop professionally.	0%	100%	0%

#### **Teacher Candidate Perspective, Group 4**

The final group of teacher candidates disagreed with ten statements (Table 4.18). Although not exactly the same statements, Group 1 also disagreed with ten statements.

**Table 4.18 Responses from Teacher Candidates Having Taken All Methods Blocks at a Partnership School (Group 4, 17 candidates).**

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am now well prepared to...</b>			
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>No Response</b>
1. ...maintain a positive attitude toward teaching.	0%	100%	0%
2. ...set and maintain high expectations for all students.	0%	100%	0%
3. ...use a variety of teaching strategies.	0%	100%	0%
4. ...meet the diverse learning needs of my students.	0%	100%	0%
5. ...be sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences among students.	5.9%	94.1%	0%
6. ...include special education / resource students.	23.5%	76.5%	0%
7. ...work cooperatively with colleagues.	5.9%	94.1%	0%
8. ...take leadership roles outside the classroom.	23.5%	76.5%	0%
9. ...understand the culture of a school.	5.9%	94.1%	0%
10. ...be comfortable in various settings within the school.	5.9%	94.1%	100%
11. ...teach knowledgeably as a subject area expert.	17.6%	82.4%	0%

(table, continued)

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am now well prepared to...</b>			
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>No Response</b>
12. ...motivate students effectively.	0%	100%	0%
13. ...use different kinds of methods of teaching as needed.	0%	100%	0%
14. ...manage classroom activities.	0%	100%	0%
15. ...deal effectively with discipline problems.	11.8%	88.2%	0%
16. ...use technology as a tool for teaching and learning.	5.9%	94.1%	0%
17. ...use inquiry to improve teaching and learning.	0%	100%	0%
18. ...teach as part of a teaching team.	5.9%	94.1%	0%
19. ...use multiple forms of assessment to evaluate student learning.	0%	100%	0%
20. ...reflect upon my teaching.	0%	100%	0%
21. ...be able to “bounce back” after a difficult time.	0%	100%	0%
22. ...continue to develop professionally.	0%	100%	0%

### **Comprehensive Report of the Questions Across All Groups of Teacher Candidates**

In order to interpret the results of the questionnaires, the researcher created a scale (Table 4.19) to qualify the agreement consensus among the responses to questionnaires

collected within the four different groups (separated in the above sections). The scale was created so that the researcher as well as the reader could have a clearer picture of the questionnaire results.

**Table 4.19 Agreement Scale Grouping Percentages of Agreement to Statements in Teacher Candidate Questionnaire.**

Description	Level of Agreement
Unanimous Agreement	100%
Strong Agreement	90% to 99%, inclusive
Agreement	80% to 89%, inclusive
Weak Agreement	70% to 79%, inclusive
Unanimous Disagreement	0%

The table below gives the reader a complete look at the responses of all 82 questionnaires. Although still divided into the four groups, it is easy to determine the degree to which the different groups agreed with the statements presented. For example, regardless of where one was enrolled in his/her methods blocks, all 82 respondents felt they could agree with the first three questions. The fourth question, however, met with one group not reporting 100%, though hardly dissident with a result of strong agreement (see Table 4.20). The three groups taking some or all methods courses in a partnership setting agreed they could meet the diverse learning needs of their students (Table 4.20). Group one—the only group not enrolled in any courses at a partner school—could not report 100% agreement with this statement.



**Table 4.20 Percentage of Teacher Candidates Agreeing with Questionnaire Statements. Results Are Sorted by Group Numbers Denoting Location of Methods Blocks.**

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am well prepared to...</b>				
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Group 1 (37)</b>	<b>Group 2 (1)</b>	<b>Group 3 (27)</b>	<b>Group 4 (17)</b>
1. ...maintain a positive attitude toward teaching.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
2. ...set and maintain high expectations for all students.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
3. ...use a variety of teaching strategies.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
4. ...meet the diverse learning needs of my students.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
5. ...be sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences among students.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Strong Agreement
6. ...include special education/ resource students.	Agreement	Unanimous Disagreement	Agreement	Weak Agreement
7. ...work cooperatively with colleagues.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Strong Agreement

(table, continued)

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am well prepared to...</b>				
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Group 1 (37)</b>	<b>Group 2 (1)</b>	<b>Group 3 (27)</b>	<b>Group 4 (17)</b>
8. ...take leadership roles outside the classroom.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Strong Agreement	Weak Agreement
9. ...understand the culture of a school.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Strong Agreement
10. ...be comfortable in various settings within the school.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Disagreement	Unanimous Agreement	Strong Agreement
11. ...teach knowledgeably as a subject area expert.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Disagreement	Strong Agreement	Agreement
12. ...motivate students effectively.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
13. ...use different kinds of methods of teaching as needed.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
14. ...manage classroom activities.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Disagreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
15. ...deal effectively with discipline problems.	Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Agreement

(table, continued)

<b>After completing parts or all of this teacher preparation program, I feel that I am well prepared to...</b>				
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Group 1 (37)</b>	<b>Group 2 (1)</b>	<b>Group 3 (27)</b>	<b>Group 4 (17)</b>
16. ...use technology as a tool for teaching and learning.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Agreement	Strong Agreement
17. ...use inquiry to improve teaching and learning.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
18. ...teach as part of a teaching team.	Strong Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Strong Agreement
19. ...use multiple forms of assessment to evaluate student learning.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
20. ...reflect upon my teaching.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
21. ...be able to “bounce back” after a difficult time.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement
22. ...continue to develop professionally.	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement	Unanimous Agreement

In an effort to determine where the majority of dissidence lay, the researcher examined the three statements having the fewest percentage of teacher candidates agreeing with them (85.4%, 91.5%, and 91.5%). Statements 6, 11, and 16 are described

in this section. The table below (Table 4.21) gives an overview of the data for these three statements.

The statement showing the lowest percentage of teacher candidates in agreement asked the respondents if they felt they were well prepared to work with special education/resource students (statement 6). Of these respondents, 33 out of 37, or 89.2% of the students who took all of their blocks at the university (Group 1) agreed with this statement. The one teacher candidate who fell into Group 2 disagreed with the statement. Twenty-four of the 27 students (88.9%) who took their reading and social studies blocks at a partnership school and their math and science blocks at the university (Group 3) agreed with the statement. The final category (Group 4) showed 13 out of 17 students (76.5% of the group) agreed with the statement.

Statement number 11, with the second lowest percentage of teacher candidates in agreement, asked the respondents if they felt they were prepared to teach knowledgeably as a subject area expert. 91.5% of the teacher candidates agreed with this statement. After examining the four groups, the researcher determined that the students who felt most prepared to teach knowledgeably as a subject area expert were in group 1, meaning both semesters of methods courses were held on the university's campus (94.6%). The one student comprising group 2 disagreed with this statement. The percent of students in group 3 who agreed with this statement, was 96.3%. Finally, only 82.4% of the students in group 4 agreed with the statement.

The last statement examined, number 16, asked the teacher candidates if they believed they were well prepared to use technology as a tool for teaching and learning. As with question number eleven, 91.5% of the teacher candidates agreed they were

prepared in this area after their preservice education. 91.9% of Group 1 agreed with this statement as well as the one student in Group 2. In Group 3, 88.9% agreed with this statement.

**Table 4.21 The Three Statements on the Teacher Candidate Questionnaire Receiving the Lowest Percentage of Candidates Reporting They Agreed With the Statements.**

After completing all or part of this teacher education program, I feel I am well prepared to...	Statement 6: ...work with special education students	Statement 11: ...teach knowledgeably as a subject area expert.	Statement 16: ...use technology as a tool for teaching and learning.
	Agree	Agree	Agree
All blocks at LSU (Group 1); 37 students	89.2%	94.6%	91.9%
Reading/SS at LSU Math/Science at Partner School (Group 2); 1 student	0%	0%	100%
Reading/SS at Partner School; Math/Science at LSU (Group 3); 27 students	88.9%	96.3%	88.9%
All blocks at Partner School (Group 4); 17 students	76.5%	82.4%	94.1%

Finally, 94.1% of Group 4 felt prepared in the area of technology. Although the percentages do not appear to be low, per se, these statements resulted in fewer teacher candidates agreeing that they have been well prepared in these areas.

### **Teacher Candidate Perspective, Open-Ended Questions**

When examining the open-ended questions on the questionnaire for the teacher candidates, the researcher first focused on the fifth question which asked the teacher candidates if given the opportunity, would they register for courses offered at a partnership school. Fifty-six teacher candidates responded with a definite *yes* (68%). The ones who answered *no* varied from those who were definitely against attending class away from the university to those who answered *no* yet gave conditions under which they may change their mind. For example, five teacher candidates who responded in the negative said the school was too far away to drive, they disliked sitting in the cafeteria for instruction, or they disliked changing classrooms several times during the semester. It is important to note at this point that those respondents attended courses at a partner school other than the one in this research. One student had heard “horrible stories” from her friends about the aforementioned partner school, and she answered negatively even though she had no first-hand knowledge of university-school partnership settings. Ten teacher candidates who had never spent time in a partnership setting admitted that they could not answer either way since they were “not up to date on that information” or “had classes on campus and liked it.”

Although the negative answers ranged from a one-word “no” to one- to two-sentence explanations, there were no affirmative answers simply stating “yes.” All of the affirmative answers contained positive comments, exclamation marks at the end, and

words like “absolutely,” “definitely,” and “of course.” One respondent who took both semesters of methods courses at the university stated that he/she would have preferred being in a partnership setting. “It would have been a better learning experience for me,” the respondent commented.

Twenty of the 56 students (35.7%) who answered that, if given the opportunity, they would register for courses at a partner school did not attend any of the courses held at partnership schools. Some of their answers included comments such as “I believe it would benefit both the school and the university students,” and “it’s more exposure to the classroom [and] a more realistic experience.”

Three students who were enrolled in methods courses in a partnership setting stated they would not register again for courses held in this setting. The partner school in which they were enrolled was not the school in this study. Their reasons for answering “no” included that the cafeteria was no place to hold class, changing classrooms throughout the semester was difficult, and the driving distance was too inconvenient.

The responses among the affirmative answers leaned more toward the thought that being in a partnership setting would allow the teacher candidates: to understand better a school community and daily life in the school, to have more classroom/teaching experience, and to have more exposure to school/classrooms before student teaching. Furthermore, the teacher candidates believed that one’s first experience teaching is easier when the elementary students think the teacher candidates are a part of the school rather than a “student” from the university or a substitute teacher.

The teacher candidates were also asked what they believed was the greatest strength of their teacher preparation program as well as what should be improved. The

response seen most was that field experience before the student teaching semester was the program's greatest strength. One teacher candidate who was a part of the partner school in this study wrote, "By far and away my semester at [Long] Elementary [was the greatest strength]. Being taught at the school and working at the school was a most effective learning experience." Another student who had no experience with partnership schools wrote, "I felt that the amount of time we spent in the classroom prior to student teaching is a major strength of the teacher prep program." Thirty-six of the teacher candidates (44%) stated similar thoughts concurring with the above statements. Of these thirty-six responses, nineteen (53%) were from teacher candidates involved in partnership schools. Other statements regarding the strength of the teacher preparation program included references to effective instructors, learning how to write lesson plans, and having effective classroom teachers in the field.

Various answers were given regarding what needed improvement within the teacher preparation program. Some teacher candidates wrote what they needed to improve upon personally—not what the College of Education should improve. Just as field experience appeared as a strength in the College of Education, so did it appear as an area needing improvement. Nineteen responses indicated that there should be more time in the schools rather than in university courses. Although this is a small percentage of respondents (23%), it is the most frequently occurring theme among the responses. Responses concerning classroom management, including time management, discipline, what to do the first week of school, etc., followed with thirteen teacher candidates expressing concerns in this area (16%). Five teacher candidates requested more information about and experience with special education and resource students.



Fourteen of the above nineteen responses came from teacher candidates involved in partnership schools during their methods courses. However, it should be noted that half of these fourteen also listed field experience and their time in the classroom as a strength of the program.

In addition to the perspective of the teacher candidates regarding their teacher preparation program, the researcher was interested in the perspective of the university faculty member who was on site during the partnership program. As a participant-observer and course instructor, the researcher's notes are also included in the following section.

### **University Faculty Perspective**

According to the university faculty member on site at the partner school, the researcher's teaching partner (given the pseudonym, Diane), the format in which the courses are taught "gives the (teacher candidates) better experiences than when taught at the university." Although the instructor noted that her colleagues at the university informed her this was "too much work," she still believed in offering the teacher candidates the best possible experience. As a participant in this three-year study, the researcher agrees with Diane in that the different experiences the teacher candidates receive give them a better overall experience in their preservice education.

Since Diane has taught the same course in both a partnership setting as well as on the university campus, the researcher deems compelling the opinion of her teaching partner. As Diane described, when she taught at the university, the teacher candidates were released into the public schools for approximately four weeks during the semester to observe, participate, and teach small lessons. The teacher candidates saw only one

teacher that semester and did not return to the university until completing the field assignment. In the partnership setting of this study, the teacher candidates have a semester-long field experience, four weeks of which consist of classroom teaching. In addition, the teacher candidates meet as a class each day after teaching for reflection and discussion time with the university instructors. Diane indicated some advantages to this: the teacher candidates' experiences are fresh on their minds, and, moreover, if a teacher candidate felt he/she performed poorly on Monday, he/she can get help from the methods instructor before teaching again on Wednesday, for example. When the teacher candidates are released from class at the university, they may not see their methods instructor for a week or more unless they contact the instructor for an appointment. If the first day of field experience goes poorly, the following days could also go poorly depending on the support provided by the classroom teacher.

In addition to the advantages mentioned above, the teacher candidates are able to teach in four different classrooms under four different teachers in four different grade levels during the semester unlike the field experience they receive in university classes. The methods courses held at the university provide field experiences during the semester but are limited to one teacher at one grade level. With this arrangement, teacher candidates only see one teaching style, one classroom arrangement, one classroom management system, one set of students, etc. The chance to see four different teachers is clearly advantageous to the teacher candidates enrolled in methods courses at a partnership school. If, during the first week of field experience, a teacher candidate finds himself/herself in a classroom leaving much to be desired, the candidate knows better experiences are to come in the weeks to follow. In other field experience settings, the

teacher candidate knows that he/she is to remain with that teacher throughout the semester and will not have the opportunity to see anything better or anything worse in the weeks to come.

At the beginning of each semester the researcher and her teaching partner asked the teacher candidates to write what grade level they would like to teach. At the end of the semester, the same question was asked. Because the teacher candidates were able to teach and experience students in four different grade levels, there were always students who decided that their original thoughts were incorrect. Diane and the researcher were always surprised when the teacher candidates requesting upper-level placements (fourth and fifth grades) fell in love with first and second graders. The same happened with teacher candidates who wanted to teach the little ones. They soon found they preferred teaching students who “knew a little more” and “had a baseline knowledge” that teachers did not have to develop.

As the researcher and her partner worked more closely, they were able to coordinate better the field experiences in both courses. This often allowed the teacher candidate to teach students in more than four grade levels and observe more than four classroom teachers. Diane and the researcher found that the more varied the experiences, the better the experience for the teacher candidate.

Furthermore, the teacher candidates were able to see master teachers as well as teachers who may not have reached their full potential. We informed the teacher candidates that they could learn as much from a “bad” teacher as they could from a good one. At the end of the semester, the teacher candidates were able to recognize characteristics they hoped to have as a teacher as well as some they hoped they will not

exhibit in the classroom. Had the teacher candidates remained in only one classroom during their field experiences, they may not have discovered the grade level that best suits them, nor would they have been able to see different types of teachers and teaching styles in order to develop into the best possible classroom teacher.

Finally, as the researcher's teaching partner told the teacher candidates every semester, being in a partnership setting has advantages for the university instructors as well. Since the classes were taught in vacant classrooms at the elementary school, the instructors were able to "keep current" with what is truly happening in today's schools. Often times, this instructor noted, university faculty do not have the opportunity to observe public schools for any extended period of time. After spending some twenty-plus years in elementary school classrooms, Diane had a difficult time deciding to accept a job at the university level. The partnership setting allowed her the opportunity to return to elementary school, not as a teacher, but as a teacher of teachers. Moreover, she noted, opportunities to remain up to date with public schools gave her university students a more authentic learning experience. As a matter of fact, Diane often taught other courses on campus especially during the summer, and her familiarity with today's schools was passed on to other students who may not have had any courses at a partner school. When Diane taught these teacher candidates, she was able to say that she spent the past year observing and assisting in elementary school classrooms and could, therefore, pass along her observations to her university students.

### **Partner School Faculty Perspective**

The questionnaire administered to the partner school faculty (reported further in the discussion of the third research question) included some items concerning the

experience of the teacher candidates in the partner school. For example, when asked if teacher candidate experiences are more powerful and useful in the partner school in comparison to other field experience placements, 94.12% of the teachers agreed this is a true statement. The same percentage agreed that student teachers and field experience students at the partner school receive sufficient support in learning how to teach.

The partner school teachers were also asked to rate the quality of the teacher candidates' knowledge or ability (poor or excellent) in relation to the following areas.

The percentages for *excellent* are presented:

**Table 4.22 Percent of Partner School Faculty Who Responded “Excellent” When Asked to Rate Teacher Candidates’ Knowledge or Ability in the Following Areas.**

<b>Areas of Interest Regarding Teacher Candidates’ Knowledge or Ability</b>	<b>Percent of Faculty Responding “Excellent”</b>
Content	94.12%
Unit and lesson planning	88.24%
Instructional skills	88.24%
Ability to work with all students	100%
Ability to work with at-risk students	70.59%
Classroom management skills	64.71%
Ability to work with teacher/staff	94.12%

It is important to note at this point that working with special populations and classroom management were two concerns appearing in the teacher candidate responses.

Finally, the partner school teachers were asked to state how working with field experience students in a partnership setting compares with working with students under other traditional field placements. *Favorably* was chosen by 94.12% of the teachers.

The remaining questions of the faculty questionnaire are discussed below in the subsection addressing research question three. These include the perspective of the teachers regarding their own professional development.

### Research Question Three

The third research question involved the continuing professional development of teachers at the elementary school. Throughout the study, it was important to communicate to the teachers not only the importance of the partnership but also the importance of collecting data to document the partnership. The principal during the third year of the partnership was eager to maintain the university's presence at her school; she gave the researcher *carte blanche* when it came to time needed at faculty meetings, sending memos to the faculty, looking at student records, etc.

In addition to the principal's enthusiasm, the researcher assured the faculty (verbally and in writing on the consent forms) that she would share the results of the study with them. If the study is important enough for the faculty to take the time to answer questionnaires and be the subject of observations, it is important enough for them to know the results and the significance of those outcomes.

When distributing questionnaires to faculty members, one worries whether the questionnaires will be returned and when. Because of this principal's excitement at the possibility that the university may return to her campus, she gave the faculty time to complete and return their questionnaires during a faculty meeting at the end of the school

year. It did not seem as though the faculty rushed through the questionnaire; however, the researcher felt that if she had simply placed the questionnaires in their boxes, the return rate may not have been as high.

The questionnaire for the partner school faculty (adapted from Chance, 2000) consisted of four Yes/No questions, twenty-five Agree/Disagree questions, eleven Poor/Excellent questions, and one question using Favorably/Unfavorably as the possible response. In the questionnaire, the Agree/Disagree and Poor/Excellent questions were presented as a four-item Likert scale then converted to a dichotomous response for examination by the researcher. Nineteen questionnaires were examined and are reported in this chapter.

### **Partner School Faculty Perspective**

Before beginning the report of all the responses, the researcher was interested in the affirmative responses at the lower end and at the higher end. The researcher first examined the responses in which there was a large percentage of faculty who did not agree with the statement in the questionnaire. For example, item number ten stated, “as a result of our partnership efforts, teacher inservice has been more powerful and useful than traditional inservice.” The percentage of teachers who agreed with that statement was 70.59%. Furthermore, when asked if the teachers received enough support in learning how to mentor the field experience students in their classrooms, 76.47% of the teachers agreed. When asked if teachers at the partner school had sufficient resources and time in order to carry out their mentoring responsibilities, just over one-half of the teachers (58.82%) agreed. An even lower percentage (52.94%) agreed with the next statement regarding whether teachers have changed the content of their curriculum as a result of the

partnership effort. Furthermore, 64.71% of the teachers stated they have changed the way they work and interact with their own students as a result of the university-school partnership.

Approximately three-fourths of the teachers (76.47%) agreed that as a result of the university-school partnership, they had changed their commitment to teaching and/or the work of the partnership. Furthermore, 70.59% of the teachers agreed that their colleagues had changed their commitment to teaching and/or the work of the partnership. Overall, 94.12% of the teachers viewed the university-school partnership favorably. However, when asked if they wanted their school to continue as a partner school, 88.24% answered affirmatively.

Examining the higher end of affirmative responses, there were two statements which received 100% agreement from the partner school teachers. Statement 36 concerned the quality of the teacher candidates' ability to work with all students. Statement 41 asked the teachers to rate the overall quality of university support in helping teachers be better mentors and supervisors. The latter is in conflict with the statement 41 in which only 76.47% of the teachers stated that they received enough support in learning how to mentor and supervise the field experience students in their classrooms.

Below is a report of all of the data retrieved from the questionnaires collected from the partner school faculty. Questions 1-8 and question 31 are not reported here since they include information such as name and contact information. The following report is divided into three sections: questions 9-30; questions 32-45; questions 46 and 47. The reason for this division will become more obvious as the reader will see the first set of questions elicit responses of Disagree and Agree; the second set of questions asked



the respondent to rate the quality of an issue (Poor and Excellent); question 46 is a yes/no question; and finally, question 47 required a response of Favorably or Unfavorably.

### **Section 1: Statements 9 – 30**

The first section of the questionnaire requested the respondent choose the level to which he/she agrees or disagrees with the statements. Table 4.24 gives a report of those responses. In an effort to paint a clear picture of the thoughts and beliefs of the partner school faculty, a classification system was created to depict the degree to which faculty members agreed with certain statements (Table 4.23). After classification was completed, responses to questions 9 – 30 were then labeled accordingly. The classification system is arbitrary in that the wording chosen to represent each group of percentages was selected by the researcher. The researcher began with *unanimous agreement* (100%) and worked her way down the categories in increments of ten. Although some readers may not consider 50%-59% a *weak agreement*, in relation to the other reported percentages, it is the weakest category. Below 50%, the researcher would have begun using degrees of *disagreement*, and there were no statements reporting a higher percentage of disagreement than agreement in this section.

Table 4.24 below contains the 22 statements regarding partnership efforts at the partner school in this study. Eight of those statements received responses of *very strong agreement* or *strong agreement* from the partner school faculty. There was no response receiving a classification of *unanimous agreement* (100% agreement among all questionnaires). Just under half of the statements (10 statements) received responses of simply *agreement*. Finally, two statements showed a feeling of *weak agreement*, and two

more showed that, overall, faculty members were just barely in agreement with the statement (*very weak agreement*).

It is interesting to see how the partner school faculty viewed themselves and viewed others in light of the partnership. In statements 15-22, teachers were asked to state whether they had changed certain practices as a result of being involved in a university-school partnership. In statements 23-30, the teachers stated if their colleagues had changed those same practices. For example, statement 16 reads, “As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed my concept of teaching,” and statement 24 reads, “...teachers have changed their concept of teaching.” More teachers agreed with statement 24 (82.35%) than statement 16 (76.47%). Five of the eight statements showed higher percentages of agreement with the latter set of statements (“my colleagues have changed...”). In only two of the statements did the partner school faculty see a greater change in themselves than in their colleagues. Statements 21 and 29 asked the teachers whether they (or their colleagues in statement 29) had changed their commitment to teaching and/or to the work of the partnership. More teachers felt that they had changed their commitment to teaching rather than their colleagues (76.47% vs. 70.59%). Likewise, statements 22 and 30 asked whether the teachers had changed their reflections upon their own practices. The responding teachers agreed they had changed their reflections (88.24%) but did not agree as strongly that their fellow teachers had changed their reflective practices (76.47%).

Two of the four questions with weak agreement percentages asked if, as a result of partnership efforts, the respondent had changed the content of the curriculum as well as did the respondent feel that his/her colleagues changed the content of the curriculum.

The remaining two questions showing weak agreement percentages asked if teachers at the partner school had enough time and resources to carry out their mentoring responsibilities, and whether the partnership effort changed the way the respondent interacted with his/her students.

**Table 4.23 Scale for the Classifications of Different Levels of Agreement for Questionnaires Collected from Partner School Faculty.**

Description	Agreement
Unanimous Agreement	100%
Very Strong Agreement	90%-99%
Strong Agreement	80%-89%
Agreement	70%-79%
Weak Agreement	60%-69%
Very Weak Agreement	50%-59%

**Table 4.24 Section 1: Results From Statements 9-30 Determined From Responses on Questionnaires Completed by Partner School Faculty.**

#	Statement	Disagree	Agree	Classification
9	In my school, teacher candidate experiences are more powerful and useful than traditional practice experiences.	5.88%	94.12%	Very Strong Agreement
10	As a result of our partnership efforts, teacher inservice has been more powerful and useful than traditional inservice.	29.41%	70.59%	Agreement

(table, continued)

#	Statement	Disagree	Agree	Classification
11	In my school, student teachers and field experience students receive sufficient support in learning how to teach.	5.88%	94.12%	Very Strong Agreement
12	Teachers at my school have more responsibility in mentoring future teachers than teachers in other schools.	5.88%	94.12%	Very Strong Agreement
13	Teachers at my school receive sufficient support in learning how to mentor student teachers and field experience students.	23.53%	76.47%	Agreement
14	Teachers at my school have sufficient resources and time for their mentoring responsibilities.	41.18%	58.82%	Very Weak Agreement
15	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed: The content of the curriculum.	47.06%	52.94%	Very Weak Agreement
16	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed: My concept of teaching.	23.53%	76.47%	Agreement
17	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed: The way I teach.	23.53%	76.47%	Agreement

(table, continued)

#	Statement	Disagree	Agree	Classification
18	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed: My conception of collegial work.	* 5.88%	88.24%	Strong Agreement
19	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed: The way I interact and work with my students.	35.29%	64.71%	Weak Agreement
20	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed: My conception of what needs to be known in order to teach.	23.53%	76.47%	Agreement
21	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed: My commitment to teaching and/or the work of the partnership.	23.53%	76.47%	Agreement
22	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed: My reflections upon my own practices.	11.76%	88.24%	Strong Agreement
23	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed: The content of the curriculum.	35.29%	64.71%	Weak Agreement
24	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed: Their concept of teaching.	17.65%	82.35%	Strong Agreement

(table, continued)

#	Statement	Disagree	Agree	Classification
25	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed: The way they teach.	11.76%	88.24%	Strong Agreement
26	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed: Their conception of collegial work.	5.88%	94.12%	Very Strong Agreement
27	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed: The way they interact and work with their students.	23.53%	76.47%	Agreement
28	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed: Their conception of what needs to be known in order to teach.	23.53%	76.47%	Agreement
29	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed: Their commitment to teaching and/or to the work of the partnership.	29.41%	70.59%	Agreement
30	As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed: Their reflections upon their own practices.	23.53%	76.47%	Agreement

\* = 5.88% No Response

## Section 2: Statements 32 - 45

Statements 32 – 45 requested responses from Poor to Excellent on a four-point scale (1 being poor, 4 being excellent). After the responses were examined, the researcher then changed the four-point scale to a two-point scale. Table 4.26 shows statements 32 – 45 and gives a report of responses from the partner school faculty as well as a classification of degree of excellence. In keeping with the previous section of questions, the researcher created a scale to demonstrate how the partner school faculty rated the issues presented in statements 32 – 45. Table 4.25 contains this scale.

Of the fourteen statements in section two, only two received no responses of *Poor* from partner school faculty. Statement 36 asked the teachers to rate the quality of the teacher candidates' ability to work with all students. Statement 41 requested the faculty rate the support of the university in helping teachers become better mentors. Three of the statements received the classification of *very strong excellent*, while the majority of the statements (7) were given a vote of *strong excellent*. There was one *excellent* and one *weak excellent* addressing the quality of the teacher candidates' ability to work with at-risk students, and their knowledge of classroom skills, respectively.

**Table 4.25 Scale for the Classifications of Different Levels of Responses of “Excellent” for Questionnaires Collected from Partner School Faculty.**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Excellence</b>
Unanimous Excellent	100%
Very Strong Excellent	90%-99%
Strong Excellent	80%-89%
Excellent	70%-79%
Weak Excellent	60%-69%
Very Weak Excellent	50%-59%

**Table 4.26 Section 2: Results From Statements 32-45 Determined From Responses on Questionnaires Completed by Partner School Faculty.**

#	Statement	Poor	Excellent	Classification
32	The overall quality of the teacher candidates in my school.	* 5.88%	82.35%	Strong Excellent
33	Rate the quality of the teacher candidates' knowledge or ability related to: content	5.88%	94.12%	Very Strong Excellent
34	Rate the quality of the teacher candidates' knowledge or ability related to: unit and lesson planning	11.76%	88.24%	Strong Excellent
35	Rate the quality of the teacher candidates' knowledge or ability related to: instructional skills	11.76%	88.24%	Strong Excellent
36	Rate the quality of the teacher candidates' knowledge or ability related to: ability to work with all students		100.00%	Unanimous Excellent
37	Rate the quality of the teacher candidates' knowledge or ability related to: ability to work with at-risk students	29.41%	70.59%	Excellent
38	Rate the quality of the teacher candidates' knowledge or ability related to: classroom management skills	35.29%	64.71%	Weak Excellent

(table, continued)



#	Statement	Poor	Excellent	Classification
39	Rate the quality of the teacher candidates' knowledge or ability related to: ability to work with teachers/staff	**	94.12%	Very Strong Excellent
40	Rate the overall university support for implementing the partnership.	** 5.88%	88.24%	Strong Excellent
41	Rate the overall quality of university support in helping teachers be better mentors/ supervisors		100.00%	Unanimous Excellent
42	Rate the overall quality of university support in keeping everyone informed	11.76%	88.24%	Strong Excellent
43	Rate the overall quality of university support in providing needed supervisory materials	17.65%	82.35%	Strong Excellent
44	Rate the overall quality of university support in demonstrating instructional techniques	11.76%	88.24%	Strong Excellent
45	My understanding of the partnership concept.	5.88%	94.12%	Very Strong Excellent

\* = 11.76% No Response; \*\* = 5.88% No Response

### Section 3: Statements 46 and 47

The final section contains two statements for the partner school faculty.

Statement 46 asked for an answer of *favorably* or *unfavorably* while number 47 asked for

a *yes* or *no* answer. The table to follow (Table 4.27) summarizes the last two statements of the partner faculty questionnaire.

**Table 4.27 Section 3: Results From Statements 46-47 Determined From Responses on Questionnaires Completed by Partner School Faculty.**

#	Question	Unfavorably/No	Fav/Yes	Classification
46	How does working with field experience students within a partnership compare with working with field experience students under other arrangements with which you are familiar?	5.88%	94.12%	Strong Agreement
47	I would like for my school to continue being a partnership school.	11.76%	88.24%	Agreement

Statements 46 and 47 can be seen as summary statements. For example, they seem to ask the respondent, after answering the previous questions, “how do you feel overall?” Working with field experience students in a partnership setting elicited a high rate of agreement from partner school faculty. Although not considered “strong” in the arbitrary classification created by the researcher, continuing the university-school partnership would be a positive step to take.

Unsolicited comments received on the questionnaires also served as data for research question three. These comments were written by the respondents next to the closed-ended questions they answered. For instance, one faculty member wrote, “I loved

having FEX [field experience] students in language arts and social studies, but I desperately need FEX students in math and science. Will that be a possibility?” In response to the statement on the questionnaire regarding sufficient time and resources to carry out mentoring responsibilities, a faculty member, wrote “we have sufficient resources, but there is no time to meet with students, colleagues, or [university] colleagues.” This faculty member circled “2” for her response indicating that she disagreed with the statement to some degree.

In the following chapter, a discussion/interpretation of the results is presented.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

“Where the school shows that it cares,  
the students care.” Jerome Bruner

The final chapter of this dissertation presents a summary and discussion of the present research. This chapter begins with a restatement of the problem and follows with summaries of the research findings separated by research question. These findings will then be interpreted. Finally, implications for further research are discussed.

#### Restatement of the Problem

For a university-school partnership to be considered successful, evidence of improvement must occur in the achievement of classroom students, the preparation of teacher candidates, and the further professional development of inservice teachers (Teitel, 2001a). The research described in this dissertation examined a three-year pilot study of a university-school partnership to determine its effectiveness in the above-mentioned areas. This endeavor can lead the way for future university-school partnerships or make the argument to halt any future plans to create further university-school partnerships.

As stated in the first chapter, Byrd and McIntyre (1999a) maintained that professional development school partnerships should be able to offer more than a placement site where teacher candidates are involved in practice teaching. Professional development schools and universities must create “true partnerships with efforts to jointly improve the education environment for children, beginning teachers, practicing teachers, and college and university faculty” (p. viii). A recurring problem, however, is that these improvements are rarely documented. The present research was completed in an effort to add to the emergent literature on professional development school partnerships

documenting student achievement, preparation of teacher candidates, and professional development of inservice teachers.

### Research Questions

Using qualitative and quantitative analysis (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998), and case-study research (Yin, 1994), this study examined a three-year pilot effort toward the formation of a university-school partnership program. This study explored the following questions:


1. How does this University-School Partnership affect student achievement as measured by LEAP, and ITBS tests?
2. How does the University-School Partnership affect development of teacher candidates as measured by questionnaires and interviews of teacher educators and teacher candidates?
3. How does this University-School Partnership affect current teacher professional development as measured by questionnaires of inservice teachers?

### Summary and Discussion of Results by Research Question

#### **Research Question One**

In Wiseman and Cooner's (1996) study, one of the participating teachers "suggested it was time to question the benefits the elementary school students were receiving from the university's involvement in the school" (p. 18). The first research question addresses the achievement of the partner school students.

Referring to the School Performance Scores (SPS) of the partner school, the first year of the university-school partnership had a noticeable effect on the school's SPS rising from a score of 43.3 to 56.6 (Figure 5.1). In creating the partnership, a new



**Figure 5.1 School Performance Scores as Reported on School Report Cards.**

elementary school faculty was created, and university faculty and students from the College of Education arrived on campus. The fact that a new faculty was hired probably played a large role in the change in SPS. The faculty was, perhaps, better qualified, more enthusiastic, and had a better rapport with the student body. Any of those factors—and undoubtedly more—could have affected the performance of the students. However, because of the excitement of the teacher candidates and university faculty embarking upon something new in which their friends and colleagues had not been involved, extra effort might have been made on the part of the university participants. For example, the “newness” of the partnership—reading to the children, planning special lessons for the children, and spending extra time with the children to make sure they excelled—might have had a positive effect because the participants were intrigued by the partnership situation, wanted it to work, and were willing to make the effort to be more involved.

This extra effort would have played a part in better student performance on standardized tests.

Throughout years two and three of the partnership, the SPS increased only slightly from 54.0 to 56.2, then dropped slightly to 55.6. Nevertheless, the SPS scores remained higher than the scores of the pre-partnership years. The plan was to continue to increase the SPS each year. It is possible, however, that for some of the students a plateau had been reached. Due to several factors including socio-economic level and past educational experiences, these students will not be able to increase their scores on the high-stakes tests. If the scores of the students do not improve (specifically the fourth-grade LEAP which is 60% of the SPS), then the school index scores do not improve resulting in a low SPS.

In addition to a plateau being reached, there was a high turnover of faculty in years two and three of the partnership. Only 27% of the faculty remained at the end of the three-year partnership. Furthermore, the principal left the school after the first year of the partnership. A change in faculty as well as in administration is bound to have an effect on both the elementary school students and their teachers. This change alone could have affected the performance of the student body as a whole. With each new school year, a new group of students was promoted to the next grade, therefore affecting the overall performance on those tests. In other words, a low group taking the ITBS test would not affect the SPS as much in third grade, but when the group took the LEAP test the next year, that group would lower the SPS appreciably. Each time new students were tested, their overall performance was calculated into the school's SPS for that year. Obviously, many factors affected the school performance scores. Besides yearly

promotion to the next grade level, there were a number of students retained each year due to failure on the LEAP. After an intense summer school course, and a second time taking the test, the students were forced to repeat the fourth grade. It is likely that these students did not perform well the third time around, thus affecting the LEAP score for that class. As a matter of fact, this has been a concern of the partner school's principal.

Index scores are used in determining the School Performance Score (SPS). These index scores are comprised of the calculations of the different components of the SPS: LEAP, ITBS, and student attendance. As described in chapter four, the index scores for these components are then multiplied by the weight carried and factored into the SPS: the LEAP index is multiplied by 60%, the ITBS by 30%, and student attendance by 10%.

The index scores for the LEAP and ITBS differed throughout the study; however, the index scores for both tests during the partnership remained higher than the scores for pre-partnership years. For example, in the spring of 2000, the index score for the ITBS was 38.2. The index score for the LEAP was 43.3. The first year of the partnership, spring of 2001, the ITBS index score was 41.0, and the index score for the LEAP was 56.6. The LEAP index score for 2002 dropped to 54.5 and the ITBS remained essentially unchanged at 41.1. Finally, in 2003, the LEAP index score rose to 56.00 while the ITBS continued to vary only slightly to 41.6.

At no point did the ITBS index score reach the level of the LEAP index scores. The explanation for this may never be known; however, it is important to note there are several differences between the LEAP and ITBS tests and their index scores. First, the ITBS index score is a combined score of third- and fifth-grade tests while the LEAP index score represents only the fourth grade. Combining two grade levels into one report



may very well give a skewed representation of student performance. Second, the ITBS is a norm-referenced test comprised of multiple-choice items. These items are designed to assess a student's prior knowledge. The test is given nationally and can only assume what a student's prior knowledge may be in any area of the country. This may contribute to the reason the ITBS scores are lower than the LEAP scores.

In contrast, the LEAP is a criterion-referenced test based specifically on the Louisiana Content Standards outlined in chapter four. Louisiana teachers are familiar with these content standards and are more likely to teach accordingly. Furthermore, the LEAP test is not solely limited to multiple choice questions. The test includes longer reading passages, open-ended questions requiring a written response, and a writing prompt about which students must provide a written composition. On the mathematics test, for example, students are presented with “problems with more than one solution or more than one path to a solution” (Louisiana Educational Assessment Program, 2003, p. 6). Students must show written work on the mathematics test demonstrating how they arrived at the solution rather than choosing an answer from a multiple-choice list.

Whatever the case, it is encouraging to see improvement on both tests as performance on the LEAP and ITBS is included in the state's accountability for the schools. University participants—teacher candidates and faculty—theorize that the small-group teaching and one-on-one time provided by the teacher candidates played an important role in the rise in scores. While two to four teacher candidates taught small groups in a fourth-grade classroom, for example, the classroom teacher was able to work more closely with students who may have never received the help needed to perform better on these high-stakes tests.

When reviewing the report of *Unsatisfactory* scores on the LEAP, all four subject areas showed improvement. In other words, there were fewer failures during the three years of the partnership. The table below (Table 5.1) shows the highest percentage of failures on the LEAP English language arts test in 1999 and 2000, and the fewest failures in 2001, 2002, and 2003. The same can be said for mathematics. In social studies and science, the highest percentage of failures was seen in 2000 (no test was given in those subjects in 1999). The years in which the fewest percentage of failures occurred are highlighted in the table below.

**Table 5.1 Percent of Students Scoring at the Unsatisfactory Level on the 4th Grade LEAP.**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2002*</b>	<b>2003*</b>
<b>ELA</b>	33%	42%	23%	23%	27%
<b>Math</b>	55%	46%	26%	34%	33%
<b>Social Studies</b>	n/a	46%	34%	39%	25%
<b>Science</b>	n/a	46%	31%	20%	23%

The first quartile scores of the third-grade ITBS painted a slightly different picture. In all subjects except social studies, the fewest percentage of failing students occurred in 1999 (Table 5.2, below). The highest percentage of failing students in reading was seen in 2001 at 56.8%. In 2002, the second year of the partnership, English language arts, math, and science had the highest percentage of failures.

The first quartile scores for the fifth-grade ITBS looked more promising than the scores of the third-grade ITBS. On four of the five tests, the fewest percentage of failing students occurred in 2001, the first year of the partnership. The scores for the science test

showed the fewest percentage of failing students in 2002 (Table 5.3). First quartile scores on the reading test dropped 26.2 percentage points from 50% seen in 1999.

**Table 5.2 Percent of Students Scoring in the 1<sup>st</sup> Quartile on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ITBS.**

	1999	2000	2001*	2002*	2003*
Reading	41.7%	53%	56.8%	47.6%	48.5%
ELA	25%	37.5%	43.2%	47.6%	34.5%
Math	45.8%	51.7%	48.6%	52.3%	47%
Social Studies	50%	56.3%	51.4%	47.6%	21.5%
Science	25%	40.5%	45.9%	50%	38%

Failing scores on the English language arts test dropped 31.6 percentage points from 45.9% in 2000. The highest percentage of failing students in math, social studies, and science occurred in 1999 and showed decreases of 47.6%, 44.1%, and 44.4%, respectively.

**Table 5.3 Percent of Students Scoring in the 1<sup>st</sup> Quartile on the 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ITBS.**

	1999	2000	2001*	2002*	2003*
Reading	50%	45.9%	23.8%	35.3%	40.5%
ELA	39.3%	45.9%	14.3%	17.6%	19%
Math	57.1%	37.8%	9.5%	44.1%	32%
Social Studies	53.6%	48.7%	9.5%	17.6%	24%
Science	67.9%	54.1%	28.6%	23.5%	41%

In a comparison of content areas across tests, the fourth-grade LEAP and the fifth-grade ITBS English language arts test had appreciably fewer students performing within

these low-level categories throughout the years of the partnership than prior to it. It could be said that by the spring of 2001, both fourth- and fifth-grade students had “practiced” on enough standardized tests to have honed their test-taking skills. This phenomenon of test familiarity is called the “carryover effect” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998, p. 87). By the same token, the teachers were more aware of what areas needed more focus in order to obtain better results from the students. Finally, as failing students are retained in the fourth grade and brighter students are promoted to the fifth grade, it comes as no surprise that scores for fifth-grade tests might show improvement. Nevertheless, there were fewer students failing the English language arts test during the partnership years than in the years prior to the partnership.

On the mathematics tests, the fourth-grade students performed better than their third-grade counterparts performed on the ITBS. When examining the fifth-grade, however, scores were not far from that of the LEAP scores with one exception: 2001. The percentage of students performing within the first quartile on the fifth-grade ITBS (9.5%) was markedly lower. When examining the third- and fourth-grade tests, one may question if better performance on the LEAP might be due to the fact that the students are allowed to show their work rather than simply pick an answer from a multiple-choice list. Upon second glance, however, that theory begins to crumble with regard to the fifth-grade ITBS in 2001 where the percent of students performing within the first quartile dropped to 9.5%. The partnership was only a few months old at the time of this test. Nonetheless, while the reading and social studies methods students were teaching small groups, teachers did have time to work with low-performing students in areas needing improvement. The teachers had two years of testing data on each student which enabled

these hand-picked teachers to focus on certain content with certain students. Although the researcher is speculating at this point, she was involved in the partnership from the beginning which included observing the practices of the classroom teachers during the teacher candidates' field experiences.

Performance on the social studies tests did not differ much from performance on the mathematics tests. In 2001, the percent of students performing within the first quartile on the fifth-grade ITBS dropped to 9% as well. As stated in chapter four, student performance in 2002 and 2003 remained considerably better than pre-partnership years but did not improve from 2001. While there is no direct evidence linking the small-group teaching conducted by the teacher candidates to positive effects on standardized test scores, it appears that the partnership years were the most productive for these students. However, one still must consider previous test-taking skills of the students—or the carryover effect—as a factor in this improvement. For example, although the fifth-graders in 1999 had previously taken some form of standardized tests, they were taking the ITBS tests for the first time. It is also likely there was a caveat—whether spoken or implied—that these tests were more important than any test the students had taken in the past. Over one-half of these students performed within the first quartile. Only 9.5% of the fifth-grade students in 2001 performed within the first quartile after having taken the third-grade ITBS as well as the fourth-grade LEAP. Furthermore, after seeing that over one-half of the students performed poorly in 1999 (the first year of the LEAP), it is almost certain that the principal made a note to make sure teachers in all grades focused on social studies for future tests.

Examination of the science scores showed the fourth-grade LEAP had fewer students performing at the *Unsatisfactory* level, overall. Ranging from 20% to 46%, the percent of fourth-grade students performing at this level was below 50%. The third-graders, new to the testing program, hovered above and below 50% from 1999-2003, showing noticeable improvement in 2002 and 2003. The fifth-graders, on the other hand, showed almost inexplicable performance. Beginning with almost 70% of the fifth-graders performing within the first quartile in 1999, then dropping to below 30% in 2001 and 2002 showing a substantial drop in the percent of low-performing students.

Student performance through time is difficult to assess in this study. The tests differ appreciably in that the norm-referenced test (ITBS) is tailored toward a “national norm,” while the criterion-referenced test (LEAP) is customized toward the content standards in the state of Louisiana. As stated earlier, if a student fails the fourth-grade test, he must retake the LEAP in summer school. If he does not succeed in passing the LEAP, he must repeat the fourth grade and take the LEAP the following spring semester. That in and of itself creates a change in population. Furthermore, there is a fair amount of student movement in the district. Parents who have children in failing schools may move their children to non-failing schools. This move inevitably changes the population of test-takers the following year. Additionally, if families move from one side of town to another—whether purposely to change schools or simply to find a new home—the children in those families must enroll in a new school. These factors all contribute to the population at the partner school and, subsequently, affect overall performance on the standardized tests.

## Research Question Two

In their case study, Levin and Rock (2003) found that the teacher candidates at professional development school sites ended the study with a better “understanding of self as a teacher, of their students, and of their roles and responsibilities [as] teachers” (p. 140). The second research question addresses the teacher candidates and their teacher education program.

Coincidentally, the answer seen most regarding what the teacher candidates thought to be the strength of their program was also seen as an area needing improvement: field experience. The reason for improvement stemmed from the teacher candidates’ opinion that *more* field experience is needed. The researcher was not necessarily surprised at either of these answers. As a matter of fact, the researcher would be disappointed if these soon-to-be certified teachers did not enjoy their time in the classroom and want to be in the classroom more.

The responses stating that the strength of their initial teacher preparation was their time spent in the classroom were teacher candidates who completed their coursework in both partnership and non-partnership settings. However, over one-half of these responses were from students involved in university-school partnerships. These students must have truly enjoyed their classroom time since fourteen of the students listing field experience as a strength also wrote that more time in the classroom would be a way to improve their initial teacher preparation.

Being able to teach and observe in a “variety of grade levels” and being involved in a “variety of experiences” during their field experience were often-seen sentiments among teacher candidates who were enrolled in courses at a partnership school.

Although teacher candidates taking courses at the university responded that they enjoyed being in the classroom, those in the partnership schools specifically mentioned “variety.” Diane, the on-site university instructor, noted that teacher candidates are able to observe and teach in several grade levels throughout the semester thus increasing the variety of their experiences.

The required course in classroom management, taught by different instructors, was also seen as a strength and a weakness of the teacher preparation program as noted by the teacher candidates. Some candidates felt that they were prepared well in this area and are ready to handle discipline and the day-to-day “business” of the classroom. Others wanted to know why there was “no class teaching organizational skills, grade keeping, and the first days of school.” As shown in chapter four, the partner school faculty believed the teacher candidates were lacking in the area of classroom management. When rating the teacher candidates, a low 64.71% believed the teacher candidates deserved a rating of *excellent* in this area.

It is uncertain, but believed by the researcher, that some of the sections of the course in classroom management were “enjoyable” due to the instructors assigned to those sections. “The greatest strength was the classroom management class. It was fun!” “I enjoyed classroom management with Mrs. X.” The teacher candidates who felt that the classroom management course was a strength may have enjoyed the course, but they did not specify whether the course was beneficial, as one teacher candidate did: “I feel I have a lot of ideas to effectively manage a classroom.” The researcher speculates that those teacher candidates who did not enjoy the course, or who were reprimanded by a



mentor teacher during field experience or student teaching, felt they were lacking in the area of effective classroom management.

Regarding university-school partnerships, 35.7% of the teacher candidates who were not involved in a university-school partnership stated they wished they had had the opportunity to participate in one. It is pleasing to know that good news travels quickly, and the university-school partnership is beginning to develop a good reputation, per se, within the College of Education.

### **Research Question Three**

The third research question concerned the professional development of inservice teachers. According to research conducted by Morris, Harrison, Byrd, and Robinson (2000), 96% of the teachers they studied reported that they had more support in learning how to become mentor teachers and assumed more responsibility as mentor teachers than did their counterparts at non-PDS sites. Unfortunately, only 50% of the respondents indicated that they were receiving sufficient resources and time to fulfill their mentoring responsibilities.

Similarly, in the study presented in this dissertation, 58.82% of the partner school teachers agreed that they had sufficient resources and time to carry out their mentoring responsibilities. The researcher is puzzled at the conflicting reports regarding whether the partner school teachers received the support needed to perform their mentoring duties. When asked at the beginning of the questionnaire, 76.47% of the teachers agreed they received enough support in learning how to mentor the field experience in their classrooms. Toward the end of the questionnaire, however, the partner school teachers were to rate the overall quality of university support in helping them become better

mentors and supervisors. This statement received an *excellent* rating of 100%. The researcher asserts two theories for this conflict. First, when approaching the end of a questionnaire, participants may become tired and more haphazard in the answers they choose. Second, since the researcher had dual roles with the university and within the university-school partnership, the participants may have been cautious not to offend since the latter of the questions specifically mentions the support received from the university.

Each semester, a graduate-level course was offered to the teachers at the partner school, taught on the partner school's campus. Although many of these teachers already held a master's degree, they chose to enroll in the course to better themselves and their teaching practices. The researcher's teaching partner taught this course as part of her university teaching load. The courses were designed for the faculty at the partner school beginning with a course addressing issues mentors face and how to be a better mentor. Since field experience students and student teachers were placed in classrooms at the partner school, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the university and the instructor believed this was a good place to begin. The researcher noted only one problem: the mentoring course was only taught this one semester. With a high rate of teacher turnover, incoming teachers who supervised the teacher candidates were not able to benefit from the course although they were performing the same duties as someone who had been with the partnership from the beginning. Perhaps this course should have been taught every fall semester while still offering courses to faculty who had already taken the mentoring course.

Other courses included interactive writing, action research, literacy instruction, and mathematics instruction. Some of the courses spanned over the entire academic year

(two semesters) as needed. During an informal conversation at the end of the partnership, the principal told the researcher that quite often, after a teacher's formal observation, she would praise the teacher on a specific teaching method. More often than not, the teacher would tell the principal that she learned that idea/method/technique "in Diane's class," meaning that the teachers were using what they had learned in their evening graduate courses.

### Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

On the basis of this study alone, it would appear that university-school partnerships may positively impact on the participants and institutions involved. It appears that the P-5 students have an advantage over other students in that the student-teacher ratio is lowered, thus improving student achievement. Teacher candidates receive full-semester field experiences along with the typical four weeks of in-class teaching. The entire semester of experience in the field includes sounds and smells typical of daily life in an elementary school, interruptions from the public address system, and the like.

There is still much need, however, for research on professional development schools and university-school partnerships. Although those involved in university-school partnerships feel strongly about their endeavors, there is little evidence of benefits or improvements to the parties involved. As Murray (1993) criticized,

The emergent literature on professional development schools indicates that efforts to create these schools have proceeded to the point at which individual schools and universities have agreed to declare that a PDS has been initiated but not to the point where there have been documented improvements in student or teacher learning and understanding as a result of the PDS innovation (p. 69).

Furthermore, when any mention of P-12 students is documented, it is not the primary interest of the research (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Book, 1996; Teitel, 2001a). Because

research focusing on the partner school students is lacking yet desired, the researcher of the present study purposely placed the focus of the first research question on the P-5 students' achievement. It is important to remember that “the seeds of failure for many children are sown early” (Holmes Group, 1990, p. 29), yet few studies have been conducted on the achievement of the students in the partnership school (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Book, 1996). This lack of research conveys that the P-12 students seemingly have been forgotten. “If children are not significantly benefiting from the investments of time, effort and resources devoted to PDSs, then both children and investors are being betrayed” (Abdal-Haqq, 1998, p. 31). It is the researcher's hope that the results of the present study—especially the results of student achievement—will be added to the accumulating research on professional development school partnerships.

There were some complexities in carrying out the present study. For one, Long Elementary School had one of the highest transient rates in the school system. It was impossible to track individual students and their achievement in this study. The principal informed the researcher that at the end of the three-year partnership only five students had been at the elementary school the entire three years. Of those five, only one student had been at the school from grades K-5. If a university-school partnership is created in a school where the families are more stable, research tracking individual students prior to and during a partnership would provide valuable data to those interested in professional development school partnerships.

Another complexity involved the change in faculty and administration. After signing a contract to commit to the three years of the pilot partnership, the principal left the school after the first year. Only 27% of the teachers who signed the three-year

contract were still at the partner school at the end of the third year. If the teachers and administration had remained constant, more useful data might have been collected throughout the partnership years. Furthermore, children need consistency. The students know exactly what the teachers expect regarding discipline and academic performance year after year. Seeing the same faces each year tells the students that something must be good at the school for the teachers to remain on staff.

Future studies to determine if the professional development of classroom teachers in a particular area leads to increased student performance and/or achievement in that area would also be worthwhile in a growing body of research. For example, Houston et al. (1999) discovered that student test scores increased in the subjects in which teacher candidates provided help in small group settings but not in other subjects. Similar studies might be conducted with classroom teachers to determine if professional development with a concentration on problem solving, for example, equals increased student performance in that area.

Retention of teachers is often a concern of school systems. Does the atmosphere of professional development school partnerships impact the retention of teachers for a longer period of time, or do teachers seem to leave the partner school (or the profession) more quickly? In the present study, only 27% of the teachers remained throughout the three-year study. A more in-depth study of the faculty of a partner school is certainly an area that could be researched when assessing the impacts of university-school partnerships.

The teacher candidates in this study suggested more training in how to use technology as a teaching tool. These teacher candidates are adept at using various forms

of technology for their own needs but may not be able to transfer those skills to the classroom. Moreover, the P-12 students are becoming increasingly more knowledgeable in computer technology. Teachers need to remain ahead of the students in order to be successful. Teitel notes that there is an interest in “technology training as part of school improvement” (1998, p. 63). Following teacher candidates placed with classroom teachers skilled in using computer technology as a teaching tool may provide data regarding student achievement and the initial preparation of teacher candidates.

Teacher candidates are often studied by means of self-report. Observations conducted by university supervisors as well as classroom teachers could, potentially, offer more conclusive evidence of the impact university-school partnerships have on the initial teacher preparation of teacher candidates. This is time-consuming, and some would argue that this effort would take the classroom teachers away from their students. As a suggestion, the teacher candidates may be required to videotape their teaching partner a certain number of times. If a rubric is used, then the videotaped lesson can be observed and scored by the classroom teacher, the university supervisor, the teacher candidate, and even by the teacher candidate’s teaching partner. Results from all parties would be reported and might be compared to one another—the novice eye versus the professional eye.

Finally, the benefits to university faculty and their research interests can certainly be examined more closely. Furthermore, when mentioning university-school partnerships, total school reform comes to mind immediately. But for the teacher candidates, little is said about the “university” in university-school partnerships. The impact these partnerships have on the universities is a research topic to be considered.

It is difficult to make a case to one's dean or school system superintendent with little or no documentation regarding time, expense, and benefits to the university and the school. It looks nice to say that a university has "adopted" a local school and taken it under its wing, but PDS partnerships should do more. When reports can demonstrate true reciprocity—student achievement, better teacher education, and benefits to the university—then a university can say they have truly created a partnership.

### Conclusions

While writing this chapter, the research attended a meeting of a newly-formed group involved in professional development school research in the state. A common sentiment was that work in the field—in the partner schools, e.g.—must be recognized and valued by institutions of higher education. One member stated that her colleagues who "sit at their desks and write articles for tenure" are deemed more important and more successful than the professors who strive to create and maintain university-school partnerships. Another member agreed by saying that she is "out in the field more than I am at my desk." She also asked how could she assume the important role of PDS Coordinator, which requires work on site at the partner schools, yet be denied tenure because of her lack of publications.

The researcher added the above exchange at the end of this chapter to express the importance of the varied research needed concerning professional development school partnerships. When the significance of the work done by PDS coordinators is supported by research and valued by institutions of higher education, university-school partnerships will, perhaps, become an integral part of universities and school systems alike. Furthermore, the professors who enjoy working in the field, teaching and coordinating

these programs, publishing occasionally, will be seen as scholarly as those who teach a class or two, and publish greatly.

Concluding with a piece from the review of literature in this paper, Michigan State University published the report of a review of their professional development schools (Judge, Carriedo, & Johnson, 1995) “concluding that the extinction of the PDS would represent a grave loss for the university and for the public” (p. 1). An institution’s greatest desire would be to state that same sentiment at the end of its research of its own professional development school partnerships.

Many of the researcher’s colleagues have assumed the roles of “researcher” and “observer” when conducting research. This researcher had the unique opportunity of being a participant as well. Seeing a case from both the inside and the outside was advantageous in that the researcher was not simply seen as an unnamed person from the university carrying a pen and notepad. The researcher was a part of the team, had a first name, laughed and joked with the partner school faculty, and so forth. Having learned from this experience, the researcher believes it is important for a researcher to develop a rapport with the participants involved in the research. Helping in a classroom or on the playground in ninety-degree weather demonstrates to the faculty that the researcher considers his/her participants important components of the research and, therefore, important to the researcher.



## REFERENCES

- Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional Development Schools: Weighing the Evidence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Allen, M.B. (2003). *Eight Questions on Teacher Preparation: What Does the Research Say? An ECS Teaching Quality Research Report*. Denver: Education Commission of the States (ECS).
- Alter, C., & Hage, J. (1993). *Organizations Working Together*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- American Heritage College Dictionary* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). (2000). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Antonek, J.L., McCormick, D.E., & Donato, R. (1997). The student teacher portfolio as autobiography: Developing a professional identity. *Modern Language Journal*, 81 (i), 15-27.
- Auton, S., Browne, B., & Futrell, M. (1998). *Creating Partnerships to Improve Quality Teaching*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
- Book, C. L. (1996). Professional development schools. In J. Sikula, (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 194-210). New York: Macmillan.
- Byrd, D. M., & McIntyre, D. J. (1999a). Introduction: Professional development schools. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre, (Eds.), *Research on Professional Development Schools: Teacher Education Yearbook VII* (pp. vii-xii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Byrd, D. M. & McIntyre, D. J. (Eds.). (1999b). *Research on Professional Development School: Teacher Education Yearbook VII*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Campoy, R. W. (2000). *A Professional Development School Partnership: Conflict and Collaboration*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (May, 1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession*. New York: Author.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2000). Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Retrieved January 5, 2003, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/Classification/>
- Catelli, L. A. (1995). Action research and collaborative inquiry in a school-university partnership. *Action in Teacher Education*, 26, 25-38.

- Chance, L. (Ed.). (2000). *Professional Development Schools: Combining School Improvement and Teacher Preparation*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clark, R. W. (1997). *Professional Development Schools: Policy and Financing. A Guide for Policy Makers*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Clark, R. W. (1999). *Effective Professional Development Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (June, 2000). Teacher education at the turn of the century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 163-165.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Developing professional development schools: Early lessons, challenge, and promise. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional Development Schools: Schools for a Developing Profession* (pp. 1-27). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- East Baton Rouge Parish (EBRP). (Draft, February 1, 2000). EBRP-LSU Partnership Program. Baton Rouge: Author.
- Friesen, D. W. (1994). The action research game: Recreating pedagogical relationships in the teaching internship. *Educational Action Research*, 2(2), 243-258.
- Futrell, M. H. (1996). The courage to change. In L Kaplan and R. A. Edelfelt (Eds.), *Teachers for the New Millennium: Aligning Teacher Development, National Goals, and High Standards for All Students* (pp. 1-19). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Education Research: An Introduction* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

- Glisan, E.W., & Sullivan, V.J. (1993). Strengthening foreign language teacher preparation through teacher-supervisor exchange. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26(2), 217-225.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1980). How laboratory schools go awry. *UCLA Educator*, 21(2), 47-53.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1993). School-university partnerships and partner schools. *Educational Policy* 7(1), 24-39.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Education Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools* (pp. 96-130). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1995). School-university partnerships and partner schools. In, H. G. Petrie, *Professionalization, Partnership, and Power* (pp. 7-22). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Grossman, P. L. (1994). In pursuit of a dual agenda: Creating a middle level professional development school. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional Development Schools: Schools for a Developing Profession* (pp. 50-73). New York: Teachers College.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hammadou, J. (1998). A blueprint for teacher portfolios: Concerns that need to be addressed when embarking on teacher assessment via portfolios. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The Coming of Age of the Profession* (pp. 291-305). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Hoffman, N. E., Reed, W. M., & Rosenbluth, G. S. (Eds.). (1997). *Lessons From Restructuring Experiences: Stories of Change in Professional Development Schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's Teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- The Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- The Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Hopkins, W.S., Hoffman, S.Q., & Moss, V.D. (1997). Professional development schools and preservice teacher stress. *Action in Teacher Education*, XVIII(4), 36-46.

- Houston, W.R., Hollis, L.Y., Clay, D., Ligons, C.M., & Roff, L. (1999). Effects of collaboration on urban teacher education programs and professional development schools. In D.M. Byrd, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on Professional Development Schools: Teacher Education Yearbook VII* (pp. 6-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Janesick, V. J. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design: Minuets, improvisations, and crystallization. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 379-399). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnston, M., Brosnan, P., Cramer, D., & Dove, T. (2000). *Collaborative Reform and Other Improbable Dreams: The Challenges of Professional Development Schools*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Judge, H., Carriedo, R., & Johnson, S. M. (1995). *Professional development schools and MSU. The report of the 1995 review*, [Electronic Report]. College of Education, Michigan State University. Retrieved July 28, 2003, from <http://ed-web3.educ.msu.edu/pds/pdfdocs/report.pdf>
- Kincheloe, J.L., & McLaren, P.L. (1994). In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 138-157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- King, K. (January 7, 2000). Board Oks Magnet Proposal. *The Advocate Online*. Retrieved June 5, 2002, from <http://br.theadvocate.com/news/story.asp?StoryID=10151>
- Kochan, F.K., & Kunkel, R.C. (1998). The learning coalition: Professional development schools in partnership. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(5), 325-333.
- Lanier, J.T. (1994). Foreword. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession* (pp. ix-xii). New York: Teachers College.
- Levin, B.B., & Rock, T.C. (2003, April). The effects of collaborative action research on preservice and experienced teacher partners in professional development schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(2), 135-149.
- Levine, M. (1992). A conceptual framework for professional practice schools. In M. Levine (Ed.), *Professional Practice Schools: Linking Teacher Education and School Reform* (pp. 8-24). New York: Teachers College.
- Louisiana Board of Regents. (2000). Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality. Retrieved February 4, 2003, from <http://asa.regents.state.la.us/TE/reform/brc>
- Louisiana Department of Education (1999). Louisiana's School and District Accountability System: Policies Adopted by the State Board of Elementary and

- Secondary Education. Retrieved May 25, 2004, from <http://www.doe.state.la.us/DOE/account/Policy/acctmain.html>
- Louisiana Department of Education. (February, 2000). Percent of K-12 Students Eligible for the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Louisiana State Department of Education, Office of Management and Finance. Retrieved November 30, 2002, from <http://www.doe.state.la.us/DOE/bese/risktable.html>
- Louisiana Department of Education. (2002a). *LEAP 21/GEE 21 2001-2002 Annual Report*. Retrieved August 11, 2003, from <http://www.doe.state.la.us/DOE/Assessment/WhatsLeap.pdf>
- Louisiana Department of Education. (2002b). *Louisiana Statewide Norm-Referenced Testing Program: The Iowa Tests*. Retrieved August 11, 2003, from <http://www.doe.state.la.us/DOE/account/nrt.asp>
- Louisiana Department of Education (2003a). *Louisiana Statewide Norm-Referenced Testing Program: The Iowa Tests*. Retrieved January 25, 2004, from <http://www.doe.state.la.us/lde/uploads/2450.pdf>
- Louisiana Department of Education (2003b). School Standards, Accountability, and Assistance: Louisiana's School, District, and State Accountability System. Retrieved May 25, 2004 from <http://www.doe.state.la.us/lde/ssaa/1563.html>
- Louisiana Educational Assessment Program. (2003). *LEAP 21/GEE 21 2002-2003 Annual Report*. Retrieved January 25, 2004, from <http://www.doe.state.la.us/lde/uploads/1703.pdf>
- Lythcott, J. & Schwartz, F. (1994). Professional development in action: An idea with visiting rights. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional Development Schools: Schools for a Developing Profession* (pp. 126-155). New York: Teachers College.
- Maeroff, G. I., Callan, P. M., & Usdan, M.D. (Eds.). (2001). *The Learning Connection: New Partnerships Between Schools and Colleges*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McBee, R. H., & Moss, J. (March, 2002). PDS partnerships come of age. *Educational Leadership*, 59(6), 61-64.
- McDermott, P., Gormley, K., Rothenberg, J., & Hammer, J. (1995). The influence of classroom practica experiences on student teachers' thoughts about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(3), 184-191.
- Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Miller, L., & Silvernail, D.L. (1994). Wells Junior High School: Evolution of a professional development school. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional Development Schools: Schools for a Developing Profession* (pp. 28-49). New York: Teachers College.
- Morris, V. G., Harrison, M. M., Byrd, J. N., & Robinson, D. (2000). Cultural changes at the school and the university. In L. Chance (Ed.), *Professional Development Schools: Combining School Improvement and Teacher Preparation* (pp. 125-144). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Murray, F. B. (1993). "All or none" criteria for professional development schools. In P. G. Altbach, H. G. Petrie, M. J. Shujaa, & L. Weis (Eds.), *Educational Policy: Volume 7, Number 1, Professional Development Schools* (pp. 61-73). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2000). *NCATE 2000 Standards*. Retrieved June 10, 2002, from <http://www.ncate.org/2000>
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2001). *Standards for Professional Development Schools*. Washington, DC: NCATE.
- National Housing Law Project. (2001). National Housing Law Project: Section 8 Housing. Retrieved February 1, 2003, from <http://www.nhlp.org/html/sec8>
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pechman, E. M. (1992). Child as meaning-maker: The organizing theme for professional practice schools. In M. Levine (Ed.), *Professional Practice Schools: Linking Teacher Education and School Reform* (pp. 25-62). New York: Teachers College.
- Petrie, H. G. (1995). *Professionalization, Partnership, and Power: Building Professional Development Schools*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Reinhartz, J. & Stetson, R. (1999). Teachers as leaders: A question or an expectation? In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre, (Eds.), *Research on Professional Development Schools: Teacher Education Yearbook VII* (pp. vii-xii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Rice, E. H. (2002). The collaboration process in professional development schools: Results of a meta-ethnography, 1990-1998. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 55-67.
- Robinson, S. & Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Change for collaboration and collaboration for change: Transforming teaching through school-university partnerships. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional Development Schools: Schools for a Developing Profession* (pp. 203-219). New York: Teachers College.
- Ruettgers, M. (2002, October 10). Honoring Sputnik's legacy. *CBS MarketWatch*. Retrieved August 23, 2003, from [http://www.emc.com/pdf/news/1002\\_ruettgers\\_2.pdf](http://www.emc.com/pdf/news/1002_ruettgers_2.pdf)
- Sentell, W. (2002, May 3). EBR schools low in ratings. *The Advocate Online*. Retrieved February 1, 2003, from <http://www.theadvocate.com>
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. Stamford, CT: Thomson Learning.
- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2000). Retrieved May 30, 2001, from <http://www.sedl.org/scimast/landscape/la/1.html>
- Swan, W., & Morgan, J. (1993). *Collaboration for Comprehensive Services for Young Children and Their Families*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Sykes, G. (1998). Worthy of the name: Standards for the professional development school. In M. Levine (Ed.), *Designing Standards That Work for Professional Development Schools* (pp. 11-31). Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Teitel, L. (1998). Professional development schools: A literature review. In M. Levine (Ed.), *Designing Standards That Work for Professional Development Schools* (pp. 33-80). Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Teitel, L. (with Abdal-Haqq, I.). (2000). *Assessment: Assessing the Impacts of Professional Development Schools*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).
- Teitel, L. (January/ February, 2001a). An assessment framework for professional development schools: Going beyond the leap of faith. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), pp. 57-69.

- Teitel, L. (2001b). *How Professional Development Schools Make a Difference: A Review of Research*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Trachtman, R. (1998). The NCATE professional development school study: A survey of 28 PDS sites. In M. Levine (Ed.), *Designing Standards that Work for Professional Development Schools* (pp. 81-109). Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- United States Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Office of Policy Planning and Innovation. (2002). *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality*. Washington, DC: Author.
- University of Iowa. (1999). Iowa Testing Program: About the Tests. Retrieved May 25, 2004, from <http://www.uiowa.edu/~itp/bs-level9-14.htm>
- University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). (2000). Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Description of Professional Development School (PDS)Emphasis. Retrieved September 10, 2003, from <http://www.uncg.edu/cui/pds.html>
- Van de Ven. (1976). A framework for organization assessment. *Academy of Management Review*, 1(1), 64-78.
- Wiseman, D. L., & Cooner, D. (1996). Discovering the power of collaboration: The impact of a school-university partnership on teaching. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 12(1), 18-28.
- Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zeichner, K.M. (September-October, 1992). Rethinking the Practicum in the Professional Development School Partnership. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 296-307.
- Zeichner, K.M. (1996). Introduction. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of Reform in Preservice Teacher Education* (pp. 1-8). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zeichner, K.M., & Miller, M. (1997). Learning to teach in professional development schools. In M. Levine & R. Trachtman (Eds.), *Building Professional Development Schools: Politics, Practice, and Policy* (pp. 15-32). New York: Teachers College.





Appendix A, continued

At what site were your language arts and social studies blocks taught? Circle one.

On LSU's campus

At a partnership school

At what site were your math and science blocks taught? Circle one.

On LSU's campus

At a partnership school

Briefly compare your exposure to East Baton Rouge Parish classrooms during these two semesters. Compare what you learned about students each semester.

---

---

---

If given the opportunity, would you recommend registering for methods classes taught in a partnership school? Why or why not?

---

---

---

After your field experiences, describe classroom discussion/reflection time for both semesters of methods courses. When did discussion/reflection take place? Was it helpful / informative?

---

---

---

**APPENDIX B**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNER SCHOOL FACULTY**

adapted from L. Chance (2000), Table 9.1, p. 127

Thank you for your time in answering these questions. Please be as honest as possible and indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the statements by circling the appropriate numeral. Note: Partnership refers to the Louisiana State University-Long Elementary School Partnership.

# of years teaching \_\_\_\_\_ # of years at Long Elementary \_\_\_\_\_ grade(s) taught \_\_\_\_\_  
 Years employed at Long Elementary (ex. 1999-2003) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Have you mentored student teachers? If so, which semesters \_\_\_\_\_

Will you continue to take student teachers? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Have you had undergraduate students (field experience students), and for which content area(s)? \_\_\_\_\_

1=strongly disagree      2=disagree      3=agree      4=strongly agree

Survey Items	Disagree				Agree			
In my school, teacher candidate experiences are more powerful and useful than the traditional practice teaching experiences.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
As a result of our partnership efforts, teacher inservice has been more powerful and useful than traditional inservice.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
In my school, student teachers and field experience students receive sufficient support in learning how to teach.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Teachers at my school have more responsibility in mentoring future teachers than teachers in other schools.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Teachers at my school receive sufficient support in learning how to mentor student teachers and field experience students.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Teachers at my school have sufficient resources and time for their mentoring responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

## APPENDIX C

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNER SCHOOL FACULTY

adapted from L. Chance (2000), Table 9.3, p. 130

<b>As a result of partnership efforts at my school, I have changed:</b>	<b>Disagree</b>		<b>Agree</b>	
The content of the curriculum.	1	2	3	4
My concept of teaching.	1	2	3	4
The way I teach.	1	2	3	4
My conception of collegial work.	1	2	3	4
The way I interact and work with my students.	1	2	3	4
My conception of what needs to be known in order to teach.	1	2	3	4
My commitment to teaching and/or to the work of the partnership.	1	2	3	4
My reflections upon my own practices.	1	2	3	4

<b>As a result of partnership efforts at my school, teachers have changed:</b>	<b>Disagree</b>		<b>Agree</b>	
The content of the curriculum.	1	2	3	4
Their concept of teaching.	1	2	3	4
The way they teach.	1	2	3	4
Their conception of collegial work.	1	2	3	4
The way they interact and work with their students.	1	2	3	4
Their conception of what needs to be known in order to teach.	1	2	3	4
Their commitment to teaching and/or to the work of the partnership.	1	2	3	4
Their reflections upon their own practices.	1	2	3	4

**APPENDIX D**

**PARTNERSHIP PROGRESS EVALUATION**

adapted from L. Chance (2000), Table 8.2, p. 122

<b>Check One: ___Principal ___Teacher ___Methods Instructor</b>					
<b>Other</b>					
<b>Survey Items</b>		<b>Poor</b>			
		<b>Excellent</b>			
1.	The overall quality of the field experience students in my school.	1	2	3	4
2.	Rate the quality of field experience students' knowledge or ability related to:				
	• content	1	2	3	4
	• unit and lesson planning	1	2	3	4
	• instructional skills	1	2	3	4
	• ability to work with all students	1	2	3	4
	• ability to work with at-risk students	1	2	3	4
	• classroom management skills	1	2	3	4
	• ability to work with teachers/staff	1	2	3	4
3.	Rate the overall university support for implementing the partnership.	1	2	3	4
4.	Rate the overall quality of university support in the following areas:				
	• helping teachers be better mentors/supervisors	1	2	3	4
	• keeping everyone informed	1	2	3	4
	• providing needed supervisory materials	1	2	3	4
	• demonstrating instructional techniques	1	2	3	4
5.	My understanding of the partnership concept.	1	2	3	4
6.	How does working with field experience students within a partnership compare with working with field experience students under other arrangements with which you are familiar?	Favorably Unfavorably  (circle one)			
7.	I would like for my school to continue being a partnership school.	Yes			No

## APPENDIX E

### TRANSCRIPTIONS OF TEACHER CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE (APPENDIX A)

#### **Question 1: What do you consider the greatest strength of your teacher preparation program?**

- Questionnaire 1. Our internship, getting into the school system, and seeing everyday experiences.
- Questionnaire 2. I feel I have had wonderful experiences and hearing of others' experiences when we discuss & reflect with each other it helps to see the big picture.
- Questionnaire 3. The greatest strength is the experiences we had in various settings. As a student teacher, I was not intimidated to enter the classroom.
- Questionnaire 4. Actual classroom experience.
- Questionnaire 5. Working with a great mentor teacher.
- Questionnaire 6. The greatest strength of my teacher preparation program is the ability to student teach in pairs for a full year.
- Questionnaire 7. Being able to be in a very diverse school, I get to teach both gifted and traditional students, so I see a wide range of cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds.
- Questionnaire 8. Becoming fully involved with every aspect of school life & routine.
- Questionnaire 9. My ability to bounce back after a rough & hard day or lesson.
- Questionnaire 10. Being placed at 2 different schools, you are able to see two different sides.
- Questionnaire 11. The Math, Science, LA & SS blocks were very helpful
- Questionnaire 12. I think the greatest strength was the hands-on things we did like EDCI 3137's reading assessment.
- Questionnaire 13. I believe the greatest strength of this program is the way it allows students to partner teach together for the first half of the semester. This helps to make the transition into the classroom much smoother.
- Questionnaire 14. The greatest strength of my teacher preparation is classroom management. It was a fun class! I feel I have a lot of ideas to effectively manage a classroom.
- Questionnaire 15. Reflecting on practicing & experiences
- Questionnaire 16. The LA/SS block.
- Questionnaire 17. Writing lesson plans & teaching philosophies
- Questionnaire 18. Learning to budget time accordingly. I have had trouble with this before, & this program has already helped me tremendously.
- Questionnaire 19. The practicality of everything we are learning & knowing we can use what we learn as teachers.
- Questionnaire 20. My blocks had me in the classroom getting experience early. I really liked this aspect of my teaching preparation program.

- Questionnaire 21. LA blocks & Classroom Management class with Mrs. X.
- Questionnaire 22. Working with a variety of students on various levels. Classroom organization & management.
- Questionnaire 23. We have learned to be reflective practitioners.
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. The classroom experience.
- Questionnaire 26. Integration of technology and positively reinforcing students.
- Questionnaire 27. Being able to student teach--great experience.
- Questionnaire 28. Having the opportunity to be "hands on."
- Questionnaire 29. Being at the schools for so many hours during blocks.
- Questionnaire 30. Teaching strategies
- Questionnaire 31. My ability to relate how the students feel about the lesson. I can tell how well they like or dislike the lesson.
- Questionnaire 32. Working in the environment with my mentor teacher taught me how to effectively manage a classroom.
- Questionnaire 33. My field experience. I feel I have learned so much from my mentor teacher about class management & lesson delivery.
- Questionnaire 34. I am able to see a variety of teaching strategies which will make it easier for me to incorporate all or at least one into my own classroom.
- Questionnaire 35. The experience in the different schools during my college career is definitely my greatest strength because I was able to experience a variety of different children & teaching styles.
- Questionnaire 36. Fieldwork--allowing opportunities for hands-on experience.
- Questionnaire 37. The teacher preparation program touches on all of the areas mentioned above (Likert items in questionnaire). It also does an excellent job in exposing preservice teachers to their future workplace. These experiences are not only beneficial but crucial to the emerging education.
- Questionnaire 38. My greatest strength when dealing with kids is patience.
- Questionnaire 39. Blocks (preservice teaching experience).
- Questionnaire 40. Actual field work.
- Questionnaire 41. The experiences in the classroom I have been given.
- Questionnaire 42. Classroom management.
- Questionnaire 43. Field experience--getting out into classrooms helped out tremendously.
- Questionnaire 44. The field experience!
- Questionnaire 45. Being able to go to different schools in different cultural settings to gain a better perspective of real world teaching experiences.
- Questionnaire 46. The greatest strength of my teacher preparation program was being able to observe & teach at a variety of schools.
- Questionnaire 47. The ability to actually have interaction in the classroom.
- Questionnaire 48. The support & ideas that I have received from my teachers.
- Questionnaire 49. The time spent in the classrooms & actually saw what goes on. Not the theory part of the program.

- Questionnaire 50. The written assignments, my observation during the blocks & the demand for excellence.
- Questionnaire 51. To experience various teaching styles & theories to reach a broad but diverse group of students.
- Questionnaire 52. The amount of time spent in school classrooms working with & observing teachers.
- Questionnaire 53. I had the opportunity to work with various ages/grades.
- Questionnaire 54. Greatest strength I consider I have gotten was how to be an effective teacher.
- Questionnaire 55. FEX, getting to work directly with students in various settings.
- Questionnaire 56. I consider communication to be the greatest strength of my teacher prep program.
- Questionnaire 57. No Response
- Questionnaire 58. Focused a great deal on child development.
- Questionnaire 59. LA, SS, Math, Science blocks & Reading Assessment
- Questionnaire 60. Being able to see a variety of grade levels.
- Questionnaire 61. By far & away my semester at Long Elementary. Being taught at the school & working at the school was a most effective learning experience.
- Questionnaire 62. Being in the schools was the best experience.
- Questionnaire 63. Motivating the students to give their all.
- Questionnaire 64. The methods courses because we actual got to be in the classroom and teach the students.
- Questionnaire 65. The field experience which allowed application of materials taught.
- Questionnaire 66. Field experience
- Questionnaire 67. My ability to work with students even though they may have different learning styles.
- Questionnaire 68. Being organized & set up in a way that nurtures success.
- Questionnaire 69. I think getting to work with a lower grade & a higher grade is a great strength. It's an awesome learning experience plus it allows us to know where we would fit better in the schools.
- Questionnaire 70. My LA preparation.
- Questionnaire 71. Student teaching
- Questionnaire 72. Pre-service FEX & having a great math methods teacher.
- Questionnaire 73. My block classes, being in the classrooms, student teaching.
- Questionnaire 74. I felt that the amount of time we spent in the classroom prior to student teaching is a major strength of the teacher prep program.
- Questionnaire 75. Being placed in good classrooms with an effective teacher during field experiences & student teaching.
- Questionnaire 76. There is always someone to go to for help or questions; Using a variety of teaching styles is highly suggested
- Questionnaire 77. Rapport with students, management skills have improved since being in classroom from start of the program. You learn so much as you are student teaching (so many things you would never dream of).



- Questionnaire 78. My ability to manage a classroom & my ability to be flexible.
- Questionnaire 79. I think student teaching has been the most effective in preparing me to teach.
- Questionnaire 80. My methods courses have allowed me to get experience in the classroom before student teaching.
- Questionnaire 81. Learning how to use standards as benchmarks
- Questionnaire 82. Learning multiple forms of assessment

**Question 2: What would you change or improve?**

- Questionnaire 1. Change the student teaching semester to August when teachers start.
- Questionnaire 2. The communication between teachers because some teachers review for a week what we know & skim over new material.
- Questionnaire 3. I do not feel I had instruction on dealing with special ed/resource children. Student teaching was my first experience with them.
- Questionnaire 4. Have students begin working in classrooms as sophomores instead of as seniors.
- Questionnaire 5. More choice and more experience with different grade levels.
- Questionnaire 6. I think the choice of schools and mentor teachers should be given more consideration. I also believe we should have more time in the classroom; we are taken out too much.
- Questionnaire 7. I would have liked to receive a middle school teacher where I could get experience in both 6th, 7th, 8th grades rather than just 8th.
- Questionnaire 8. Having a chance to move grade levels in elementary. I can't see the importance of going to middle school if not certified.
- Questionnaire 9. I would change the discipline system. Xs do not work!
- Questionnaire 10. Starting student teaching the first day the elem school starts
- Questionnaire 11. I would add more Social Studies field experiences
- Questionnaire 12. I would make the different teacher's lesson plans more universal and usable in my own classroom.
- Questionnaire 13. I feel that the expectations should be more clearly explained. I feel that all of these assignments were thrown at me at once without clear explanation/details about due dates, procedures, instructions.
- Questionnaire 14. I would improve the ability to work with students of inclusion & resource students.
- Questionnaire 15. Practical application of different teaching philosophies
- Questionnaire 16. There should be more information on the legal issues involved in education dealing with parents & more support while in schools.
- Questionnaire 17. Classroom management
- Questionnaire 18. I don't like the idea of having to change schools just as I'm getting used to the way things are run at another school.
- Questionnaire 19. As of now, nothing.
- Questionnaire 20. Classroom management, needs a lot of improvement. I did not feel prepared in this area at all.

- Questionnaire 21. Multicultural education was pointless! We should have a class that teaches us organization skills, grade keeping, & first days of school.
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. I'd like to have a class that teaches strategies for including & teaching special ed / inclusion classrooms. The special ed class we take is more about paperwork & laws. The Harry Wong book should be used in our coursework.
- Questionnaire 24. Have more time in the classrooms and less time on campus.
- Questionnaire 25. Partnerships should not be required.
- Questionnaire 26. Need more classes of classroom management preparation
- Questionnaire 27. We should find out student teaching placement before first day of LSU classes
- Questionnaire 28. No Response
- Questionnaire 29. Make student teaching semester shorter, for example, half the semester in schools & the other half in professional development projects. Spend more time in grades.
- Questionnaire 30. How to discipline
- Questionnaire 31. More preparation needed for good time management skills.
- Questionnaire 32. More preparation for time management. I didn't know how to get everything done for my student teaching, let alone my life!
- Questionnaire 33. To learn more about the everyday teaching procedures (grading, assessments, etc.). Also to be able to see the first week of school during student teaching.
- Questionnaire 34. I have been happy with my placement & with my work load.
- Questionnaire 35. I believe that everything was done to prepare me for my future profession. One suggestion would be to require more technology courses because technology is becoming so important.
- Questionnaire 36. More required hours of field experience would be helpful.
- Questionnaire 37. I would have definitely liked some of the courses such as reading comprehension to have been broken down into 2 classes so as to have enough time to cover such a vast amount of material completely & effectively.
- Questionnaire 38. I would improve my math skills. Due to poor teaching, my math abilities are extremely low.
- Questionnaire 39. More time to apply the methods of teaching to real life
- Questionnaire 40. Some of the classes did not help.
- Questionnaire 41. The time that we have to learn it.
- Questionnaire 42. Less theory & more practical stuff.
- Questionnaire 43. Some of the classes seem to be of no help--maybe some changes could be made.
- Questionnaire 44. More field experience! Best to be hands on!!
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. No Response

- Questionnaire 47. I would change the fact that you have to student teach from 7:45-3:30 5 days a week & only get 12 credit hours. If I were taking 12 hours at LSU, I could go M, W, F, from 8:30-12:30.
- Questionnaire 48. More teaching time.
- Questionnaire 49. I think we should have the ability to be in the schools earlier in the program, like after the first year.
- Questionnaire 50. I would like to have had a class which emphasized assessment & more inclusion instruction.
- Questionnaire 51. Although state guides have just changed, I personally would have loved to have been taught how to teach a specific group of children like K-3, 4-6, etc.
- Questionnaire 52. Allow for more in depth content study of science & social studies.
- Questionnaire 53. I would like to have been able to gain more motivational strategies.
- Questionnaire 54. To be more prepared to handle discipline in the classroom.
- Questionnaire 55. Classroom management strategies; motivational techniques.
- Questionnaire 56. I would change how I introduce lessons & classroom management.
- Questionnaire 57. Not much practical information like how to actually teach a child to read or deal with discipline problems.
- Questionnaire 58. More work with technology, assessment, and special education.
- Questionnaire 59. More field work during blocks.
- Questionnaire 60. Mentor teacher's flexibility.
- Questionnaire 61. I think that our curriculum should include more interactive experiences like Long. We felt that we were responsible for improving the students' learning.
- Questionnaire 62. Either the management course or teachers. I feel very unprepared for the beginning of the school year.
- Questionnaire 63. Improve my management skills.
- Questionnaire 64. I would change the way the COE communicates deadlines
- Questionnaire 65. I would include the use of teacher manuals in the education curriculum.
- Questionnaire 66. More detail & focus on practical issues, less theory & philosophy
- Questionnaire 67. I would like to improve my writing techniques.
- Questionnaire 68. More computer training. I did not get any.
- Questionnaire 69. I think the reading blocks need to be more focused on teaching how to teach reading. Reading is so important & the block wasn't enough to allow me to feel confident enough to teach reading.
- Questionnaire 70. I'd improve how to teach science.
- Questionnaire 71. More field experience!
- Questionnaire 72. More time in schools. I would start preservice teaching in the freshman year instead of waiting until year 3. This would provide more quality experience.
- Questionnaire 73. Some of my teachers at LSU
- Questionnaire 74. The amount of work that is required outside the classroom. I don't think that 9 observations are necessary.
- Questionnaire 75. Communication between students and the College of Ed (important dates, Praxis dates, Senior deadlines, & registration).

- Questionnaire 76. I would cut down the amount of outside observations required because being in a classroom, you observe many different situations and learn from that rather than writing a paper.
- Questionnaire 77. Transitions between subjects & making sure every lesson is closed appropriately.
- Questionnaire 78. More knowledge of teaching to include special ed & resource students.
- Questionnaire 79. More knowledge on EBR schools.
- Questionnaire 80. More involvement with EBR schools in courses. Learn more by doing instead of just listening to professor.
- Questionnaire 81. I would have liked to have worked in more grades with different teachers.
- Questionnaire 82. Did not benefit from the reading assessment class

**Question 3: Please list your status (undergraduate student teacher, Holmes student teacher, etc.)**

- Questionnaire 1. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 2. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 3. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 4. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 5. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 6. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 7. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 8. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 9. Holmes student teacher.
- Questionnaire 10. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 11. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 12. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 13. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 14. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 15. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 16. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 17. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 18. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 19. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 20. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 21. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 22. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 23. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 24. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 25. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 26. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 27. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 28. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 29. Student teacher.

Questionnaire 30. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 31. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 32. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 33. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 34. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 35. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 36. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 37. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 38. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 39. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 40. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 41. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 42. Student teacher.  
Questionnaire 43. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 44. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 45. Alternate Certification intern  
Questionnaire 46. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 47. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 48. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 49. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 50. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 51. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 52. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 53. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 54. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 55. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 56. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 57. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 58. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 59. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 60. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 61. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 62. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 63. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 64. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 65. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 66. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 67. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 68. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 69. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 70. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 71. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 72. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 73. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 74. Student teacher  
Questionnaire 75. Student teacher

- Questionnaire 76. Student teacher
- Questionnaire 77. Student teacher
- Questionnaire 78. Student teacher
- Questionnaire 79. Student teacher
- Questionnaire 80. Student teacher
- Questionnaire 81. Student teacher
- Questionnaire 82. Student teacher

**Question 4: Briefly compare your exposure to EBR classrooms during your methods blocks. Compare what you learned about students during these semesters.**

- Questionnaire 1. A lot has changed since desegregation lawsuit; laws, culture, social, behavior problems, etc.
- Questionnaire 2. Both classroom situations gave me a lot of insight into how students interact with each other. I also realized how attached I get to the students.
- Questionnaire 3. I was more engulfed in the classroom setting during my LA/SS blocks not held at LSU. We were given tons of classroom exposure.
- Questionnaire 4. I spent more time at Westwind but it was less welcoming than Stuart. Stuart was wonderful; students & teachers were excited, supportive, & pleasant.
- Questionnaire 5. I have been in many classrooms due to taking my blocks at EBR schools. The students are growing in numbers each semester.
- Questionnaire 6. I had more exposure to the students in my LA/SS blocks. I felt we had more classroom experiences. I learned more about their learning styles and about how to teach them better.
- Questionnaire 7. In both of these semesters, my blocks classes were taught in 2 different middle schools. This was my first exposure to a middle school environment, so I was able to see what those students were like to be around.
- Questionnaire 8. Haven't been to 2nd placement yet.
- Questionnaire 9. I have learned that being a discipliner comes first. You can't teach until this is accomplished.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. EBR classrooms have a variety of students that are on all different levels. I find that these students are more culturally diverse.
- Questionnaire 12. The school where I took my LA/SS blocks reminded me of my own school. The school where I took Math/Science blocks had wild and undisciplined students.
- Questionnaire 13. My reading & SS block was completed in Livingston Parish. There was a dramatic difference between EBR classrooms & Livingston Parish classrooms (class size, available materials, student motivation, etc.)

- Questionnaire 14. I had the opportunity to see how no one student ever learns the same.
- Questionnaire 15. The first semester I was in Ascension Parish. The students' behavior was exceptional. The second semester (EBR) the students were more textbook-oriented and their behavior was out of control.
- Questionnaire 16. I have only experienced low socio-economic students who seemed below level.
- Questionnaire 17. Good multicultural exposure with both care & class
- Questionnaire 18. All schools are very different. Students have very different learning skills and ways of learning.
- Questionnaire 19. Both were fairly good schools. I learned a lot about both subjects (blocks). I learned about fifth and first grade students.
- Questionnaire 20. I was EBRP for one and not the other. EBR can sometimes be overwhelming.
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. I did NOT have a great experience. Never got feedback to tell me what to do. Felt like I was in the way & didn't see positive classroom environments.
- Questionnaire 23. I had great experiences. The children have impressed me. The students at Nicholson were very polite & I loved that school.
- Questionnaire 24. They think of us as "students" and they think they don't have to respect us.
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. A lot different than Livingston Parish schools.
- Questionnaire 27. Learned about diverse student classroom settings
- Questionnaire 28. The students come from very diverse, socioeconomic backgrounds.
- Questionnaire 29. I gained much exposure to EBRP classes. In each semester I visited 4-5 schools, & there were many similarities & differences.
- Questionnaire 30. Most students will try to make an effort to behave for a pre-service teacher
- Questionnaire 31. That students are a lot the same & they are a lot different. Some students have similar personalities, but they have different learning styles.
- Questionnaire 32. Students respond better to positive reinforcement than punishment & being yelled at. Some students have deep-rooted anger issues.
- Questionnaire 33. I learned that every school is different & all students are different. The one major difference is the teacher & how much control he/she has over the classroom. I've worked with some bad ones & good ones.
- Questionnaire 34. I have been exposed to lower income students which has shown me that I have to change my teaching strategies to fit the children.
- Questionnaire 35. Because we are put in some of the lowest level schools, I was able to see how teaching taught the different levels of students & how they had to adjust lessons to meet all of their students' needs.
- Questionnaire 36. It was great. Diverse student body in inner-city schools. Students were a bit rowdy but willing to learn & rise to expectations.

- Questionnaire 37. During the past 2 semesters, I have been exposed to classrooms within the EBRP school system. Some classrooms have better facilities & resources than others, however, the teachers were exceptional despite the physical drawbacks of their environment. Students were very diverse in terms of racial/ethnic background. In all my classroom experiences, the student body was predominantly black & male.
- Questionnaire 38. The students looked forward to seeing us each day we came. The students were very patient with us. I thought it would be difficult to get them to listen to us, but they were very cooperative.
- Questionnaire 39. Better to remain in one classroom rather than jump around--get to know the students more, more diversity between student in my second school.
- Questionnaire 40. Students are very diverse. Each school has different qualities.
- Questionnaire 41. In my LA block, I taught LA, SS, & spelling & rotated between 3 teachers. In the math block, I didn't get to learn much of science because my math teacher was very demanding. I liked seeing the students rotate. I believe I learned more about them that way.
- Questionnaire 42. One mentor teacher made us teach one-on-one, never the whole class. Another teacher let us teach the whole class where I learned that children are under motivated & teachers do not set high expectations.
- Questionnaire 43. All students are different, & they should be treated as individuals.
- Questionnaire 44. Completely different between lower level students & the gifted students at the 2 schools where I was placed.
- Questionnaire 45. It's hard to compare the elementary school where I was placed with the middle school because of the age difference.
- Questionnaire 46. I learned a lot about discipline in the classroom.
- Questionnaire 47. I have done first grade both semesters & the experiences were very similar.
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. Some are high, some are low. Coming from a Catholic school background, I was so surprised by these public schools--but they are great to us!
- Questionnaire 50. My block classrooms were less organized & I had less time with the teachers.
- Questionnaire 51. Every school has its climate/atmosphere. Students reflect that climate. For example, most classrooms I have had the pleasure of being in included students.
- Questionnaire 52. I've been able to see different learning styles & teaching styles.
- Questionnaire 53. What I learned in class & what I saw in the classroom did not always correlate.
- Questionnaire 54. I have been in inner city schools & have learned that some of the students don't get the care they need and this hurts them academically.



- Questionnaire 55. EBR classrooms are somewhat diverse. I noticed that supplies are available to teachers if they take the time to ask for them.
- Questionnaire 56. Ascension Parish was very different from EBR.
- Questionnaire 57. No Response
- Questionnaire 58. I have found that the atmosphere of the school depends on the faculty & administrative staff to a large degree & what they are willing to tolerate as far as academics & behavior are concerned.
- Questionnaire 59. I see how students interact with each other & I'm able to watch them learn and grow.
- Questionnaire 60. While at Long I saw poor students in a school with benefits. At Bernard Terrace, the school & students were very fortunate.
- Questionnaire 61. At the partner school, I was able to get to know my students inside & outside the classroom. Also, at the partner school, I felt that my teachers got to observe & improve my work. At LSU, classes were much less effective.
- Questionnaire 62. I learned that students are so different & come from very different backgrounds.
- Questionnaire 63. I've been to a variety of schools. Students are different at each school. I've learned new things from each school as well.
- Questionnaire 64. Even though the students may misbehave, they are still interested in learning.
- Questionnaire 65. The schools in EBR differ widely. In one a student's father was in prison, in the other the principal was a pastor in a local church.
- Questionnaire 66. All students are different regardless of what school district you are in.
- Questionnaire 67. Not all students learn the same way.
- Questionnaire 68. The teachers were always teaching to the LEAP test.
- Questionnaire 69. I learned that EBR classes are usually behind what they should be. I learned that most of the students are not too enthusiastic about school. Most of them do not have the help they need from home.
- Questionnaire 70. I was in 2 different schools for these 2 semesters. One was inner city, disadvantaged students, and the other was rural, more settled, and more obedient children.
- Questionnaire 71. Both classrooms I was in had wonderful teachers.
- Questionnaire 72. I got to experience 2 great schools. Each was small & had a comfortable atmosphere. They both had good mentor teachers & I learned that every student can learn & just wants to be loved.
- Questionnaire 73. Very run down, low-economic
- Questionnaire 74. Students learn at various paces & levels. Always have something constructive to do; never allow them to get bored. Some children will work your nerves, & you have to learn to get over it.
- Questionnaire 75. EBR classrooms are filled with students that want to learn, but they also want to have fun. EBR teachers struggle to keep excitement in the classroom daily.

- Questionnaire 76. At both schools I had great mentor teachers; during LA & SS I learned that you must learn to appropriately instruct students with disorders even though it may include extra work.
- Questionnaire 77. BR public schools were more of a challenge than what I expected. Discipline problems were high, but it opened my eyes to classrooms that were out there!
- Questionnaire 78. It was very different because I was put in a gifted school (BRCVPA), and then in an urban setting (Westminster). The students came from bad backgrounds. At BRCVPA, the students came from a loving, supportive background.
- Questionnaire 79. The school for LA & SS was a very good school for me to see first-hand, but I don't think BRCVPA is a good school to go to because it's not a normal elementary school.
- Questionnaire 80. I learned more about what teaching is about & I learned more about classroom management strategies & how they work.
- Questionnaire 81. I student taught in EBR & I'm now in Ascension Parish. The school in EBR was much stricter & demanded more of the students.
- Questionnaire 82. Too much exposure to inner-city schools. I learned these students have special needs even outside the classroom.

**Question 5: If given the opportunity, would you recommend registering for methods classes taught in a partnership school. Why or why not?**

- Questionnaire 1. No. We never saw students as part of the class. It was just a place to go to class.
- Questionnaire 2. Absolutely. Being at Long helped me observe & understand a school community rather than being at a school every now & then.
- Questionnaire 3. Yes! I loved my methods courses being taught in a partnership school (Long). We had so much more classroom experience.
- Questionnaire 4. Yes, because there is easier access in classrooms & students become used to seeing you so you can become like a fly on a wall.
- Questionnaire 5. Yes, because it gets you off of LSU's campus and you are in an EBR school.
- Questionnaire 6. Yes. I think that exposure to the students and schools is a great learning experience. It gives you a chance to experience the classroom before having to actually be in one.
- Questionnaire 7. Yes. I would recommend it because it exposes you for the first time to the school environment on a daily basis to get your feet wet and begin to feel comfortable.
- Questionnaire 8. Yes, because being on-site helps future teachers become more involved with daily school life.
- Questionnaire 9. Yes, it's a great experience.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. Yes, I would because it lets you be exposed to different environments.

- Questionnaire 12. I would not recommend this b/c of the long drive everyday. We didn't have a set classroom & didn't interact with the kids at that school. The class could have been taught just as well at LSU.
- Questionnaire 13. Yes, I believe it would benefit both the school & the LSU students.
- Questionnaire 14. Yes, because you probably receive more support from the faculty and staff. You also have a chance to get a feel of the school before doing your blocks.
- Questionnaire 15. Yes--more exposure to a school & classroom. I think it would be a more realistic experience.
- Questionnaire 16. Yes. I felt that is where I received the most support from my LSU professors. I was also more prepared and confident.
- Questionnaire 17. Yes--more exposure & experience
- Questionnaire 18. No, because being on LSU's campus for all classes is much more convenient for my personal schedule.
- Questionnaire 19. I'm in between because the parking is much better, but not if the class is taught in a cafeteria.
- Questionnaire 20. Maybe, if it was closer to my house and at a decent time.
- Questionnaire 21. Yes, but only at Long. I enjoyed going into the school.
- Questionnaire 22. No! Waste of time at Robin Hood Middle. Switched classrooms 3 times and was in cafeteria. Not ideal classroom setting. Didn't learn anything!
- Questionnaire 23. I didn't take classes at a partnership school and so I can't answer.
- Questionnaire 24. No, I have heard horrible stories how friends at Robin Hood's blocks didn't learn anything, & it was an inconvenience.
- Questionnaire 25. No.
- Questionnaire 26. No.
- Questionnaire 27. No! I would not recommend taking classes at Robin Hood Middle. It wasn't helpful being in the school, not an ideal situation.
- Questionnaire 28. Yes. It is a more accurate "gauge" for the "real world."
- Questionnaire 29. Yes. It must be convenient only scheduling & driving to class. I had night blocks, & it was hard to schedule class visits on my own.
- Questionnaire 30. Yes. If it is convenient to my schedule. I would like to further my education.
- Questionnaire 31. Yes, because I think it is tougher to teach in a partnership school. This way, if student teachers get a rough school the 1st time, it will only get better.
- Questionnaire 32. Yes, because as a methods student in a school, you get to have a class where you will get to do your methods observations. That would have been a better learning experience for me.
- Questionnaire 33. Yes, I think it is good to take your blocks at a partner school. I feel you would have much more experience & a good feel for the school because you would be there all the time.
- Questionnaire 34. Yes, because it's more convenient to be right there.
- Questionnaire 35. Yes, because then you are in a school environment during a whole semester & it is a good experience before student teaching.

- Questionnaire 36. Of course. It would be a great opportunity to gain experience & exposure in a classroom setting.
- Questionnaire 37. Definitely. I love being able to have as many outside experiences as possible. I feel that all of my outside experiences have proven to be the most beneficial in my educational journey.
- Questionnaire 38. Yes, because you are constantly surrounded by children. Resources were always readily available. Traffic was awesome compared to the LSU campus & parking.
- Questionnaire 39. Yes. You get to know the school & teachers more (more familiar) & much easier than coming on campus. You feel more like a teacher than a student.
- Questionnaire 40. Yes. I think it is good to be exposed to a variety of schools.
- Questionnaire 41. Yes, because you are constantly around the students & you see how a school operates for an entire semester.
- Questionnaire 42. Yes, because you get to know the school & staff better. Also, you get to see your students more.
- Questionnaire 43. My classes were taught on campus & I liked it.
- Questionnaire 44. I'm not sure.
- Questionnaire 45. Yes, because you are allowed to see how the students are & interact with them on a daily basis.
- Questionnaire 46. Yes, because it provides teachers in training with different opportunities to learn.
- Questionnaire 47. I took a methods class at the Lab School & it was great; however, I do agree with it being taught in a children's classroom.
- Questionnaire 48. Yes, I would recommend methods classes taught in a partnership school because it allows the future teacher the opportunity to become a part of the school they are working in.
- Questionnaire 49. Yes, the partnership schools do a great job of showing us all types of new things. Each school is unique in its own way & they are so welcoming to us.
- Questionnaire 50. Yes, the experience of seeing the students during their school days was wonderful.
- Questionnaire 51. Yes. It provides teachers in training with the experience of students from different backgrounds & cultures. The Lab School is different from that.
- Questionnaire 52. Yes. You get to see how things really work in a school.
- Questionnaire 53. Yes, I enjoyed my own experience.
- Questionnaire 54. I think LSU should branch out of EBR. I don't think it is fair that LSU students are placed in some of the worst schools. This discourages students from teaching.
- Questionnaire 55. Yes, they are diverse & provide a good place to practice new ideas & lessons.
- Questionnaire 56. Yes, it gives you a different learning experience. It teaches you to be prepared for how school actually is.
- Questionnaire 57. Didn't have class at a partnership school.
- Questionnaire 58. Yes, because it makes scheduling time in the classroom easier.

- Questionnaire 59. Yes, you can experience what you learn first-hand. You are in an elementary school setting & the FEX are more organized.
- Questionnaire 60. Yes. You are learning at an actual school. Who would not think that it would be beneficial?
- Questionnaire 61. Yes! Better educational experience for preservice teachers and students.
- Questionnaire 62. I'm not up to date on that information.
- Questionnaire 63. Yes, good experience.
- Questionnaire 64. No, because I have never taught at a partnership school.
- Questionnaire 65. Yes, I believe we need to experience as many classroom environments as possible.
- Questionnaire 66. I haven't experienced partner schools, & I can't recommend either way.
- Questionnaire 67. No, because it seems as though the focus of the methods classes were more on busy work rather than the teaching methods.
- Questionnaire 68. Yes, it's more useful.
- Questionnaire 69. I think it is a great learning experience. Not everybody will be able to teach at their dream school. This shows students all ends of the teaching spectrum.
- Questionnaire 70. Yes, because the faculty is so accepting of LSU students & teachers are determined to impart their knowledge.
- Questionnaire 71. No Response
- Questionnaire 72. You get to experience the school environment, but it is usually farther to drive. I also felt that sometimes we were in the way.
- Questionnaire 73. Yes, lots of experience; work well with school
- Questionnaire 74. Yes. I do not think anyone could get too much exposure to various methods.
- Questionnaire 75. No, because I didn't register for a methods class at a partnership school. I took classes on campus.
- Questionnaire 76. I have never been taught at a partnership school, so I do not have anything to compare it to. Being on campus, to me, is always a positive environment.
- Questionnaire 77. Methods classes are very important. Every student should be exposed to the courses. It enlightens the student on a variety of teaching strategies & helps in the future.
- Questionnaire 78. Yes. I feel like everyone has their own personality and should go where they think is best.
- Questionnaire 79. Yes, because it would be more exposure to the school.
- Questionnaire 80. I would definitely recommend it. I had my LA & SS blocks at Long. I was exposed to the students more & was able to teach more in the classrooms.
- Questionnaire 81. Yes, because you have the opportunities to be in a school setting. You are exposed to a school that you may not have previously visited.
- Questionnaire 82. Probably not because I had my classes on campus & I feel I received excellent instruction.

**Question 6: After your field experiences, describe classroom discussion/reflection time for both semesters of methods courses. When did discussion/reflection take place? Was it helpful or informative?**

- Questionnaire 1. I reflected on how my lessons went in the classroom. Discussion took place after each lesson. It was extremely helpful.
- Questionnaire 2. During my LA/SS block, reflection was done as a class after each lesson. In M/S, we returned to campus the following week for reflection.
- Questionnaire 3. In the partnership school, we reflected/discussed after every lesson we taught. In the LSU classes, we reflected after 3 weeks of teaching which was not helpful.
- Questionnaire 4. We did discussions after our weeks in the classroom. It was helpful, but hindsight is 2020.
- Questionnaire 5. I reflected in a portfolio in both classes. It was helpful because I had to reflect a lot after everything.
- Questionnaire 6. In both blocks, we went to the classroom for weeks at a time with little discussion until it was over. I feel it would have been more helpful had we broke up the experience & had discussion between.
- Questionnaire 7. The discussion and reflection time came in the form of our class discussions and personal reflections that were included in my portfolio. It was very helpful to be able to reflect back on what I had learned and experienced for that entire semester.
- Questionnaire 8. Haven't been to 2nd placement yet.
- Questionnaire 9. Numerous hours of reflection time both in & out of classroom. It was helpful because it allowed me to talk of my problems & accomplishments of the experiences.
- Questionnaire 10. We had to reflect after every school visit--very helpful
- Questionnaire 11. Discussion/reflection is very important. I would reflect after each lesson that I taught and discussion took place during class time & with my teacher.
- Questionnaire 12. Reflection took place after each visit. It was helpful to the point of my having a record of my experiences & feelings.
- Questionnaire 13. Discussion/reflection took place through written journals. It was at times very helpful, however, at times it really did seem like busy work. There were days/situations that I did feel the need to discuss or reflect. However, I had to make up some reflections just to meet the assignment quota.
- Questionnaire 14. Discussions & reflections took place the next time we met at LSU. The discussions were beneficial because you had a chance to share feelings with classmates and professor.
- Questionnaire 15. Discussion took place after I taught. It was helpful because the other colleagues' experiences helped me see what to expect in the classroom.

- Questionnaire 16. My reflections at the partnership school took place immediately which was extremely helpful. We could discuss good as well as bad lessons. My other methods courses did not have classroom discussion/reflection.
- Questionnaire 17. Yes--discussion & reflection took place after each lesson. Wonderful, because your experience is fresh in your mind. Therefore, you know immediately what worked & didn't work, what needs to be fixed, added, etc.
- Questionnaire 18. Discussion usually took place during the time we were at the school (when our teacher we could to see us) & also following the entire field experience.
- Questionnaire 19. I had to do reflections for almost every class & they were mostly unnecessary, but some were helpful.
- Questionnaire 20. Really, too much reflection. Discussion is OK.
- Questionnaire 21. Discussion is really important right after visits to the classroom.
- Questionnaire 22. Too much reflecting, writing the same thing. Always after class & felt that it didn't change me & my thinking as a teacher.
- Questionnaire 23. Too much reflective writing; I would enjoy more discussion.
- Questionnaire 24. Reflection took place at the end of the day and is repetitive & waste of time.
- Questionnaire 25. Reflections were a good self-evaluation tool & discussions helped by giving great perspectives.
- Questionnaire 26. Right after I taught the lesson I reflected. Reflecting was OK, but discussion would have been better.
- Questionnaire 27. Yes! Too much reflection. It was helpful yet an overload.
- Questionnaire 28. The reflections were helpful in guiding me to use an eclectic approach to teaching.
- Questionnaire 29. We DID NOT discuss or reflect aloud in ANY of my blocks. Everything was written & turned in.
- Questionnaire 30. We reflected both on paper & in class. I liked sharing some of my experiences.
- Questionnaire 31. Discussion & reflection took place mostly back at LSU. It was very helpful to hear other people's experiences.
- Questionnaire 32. No Response
- Questionnaire 33. Discussion & reflection took place in the form of writing & answering questions. I feel that reflection & feedback are very helpful because you are able to think about your strengths & weaknesses.
- Questionnaire 34. I reflected each day during my blocks. I constantly had to think of more ways to teach a topic. I loved to have a partner to discuss the class with.
- Questionnaire 35. We did reflections after each time in a school & we discussed them everyday in class. It was helpful because we heard what other classmates' experienced.
- Questionnaire 36. We did a lot of reflecting after each field experience. Reflections do not help me, however, some people enjoy them.

- Questionnaire 37. In both blocks, there was an extended amount of reflection everyday of experiences. Discussion was limited in science & social studies but strongly encouraged in math & LA. We had time scheduled for discussion in these classes.
- Questionnaire 38. Reflecting took place immediately leaving the school. Teachers would comment on our reflections & return them. This process was extremely helpful in letting me grow as a teacher.
- Questionnaire 39. It took place almost every day. Yes it was helpful because it made you think back on what you did in the classroom (to see your strengths & weaknesses).
- Questionnaire 40. Reflections took place immediately after the field work. In classes we would discuss any difficulties we had.
- Questionnaire 41. We really didn't discuss it in either class. We had to submit journals in math block, but they weren't responded to in an adequate time period for it to help.
- Questionnaire 42. For LA, we discussed after each time in classroom. For math, we never really talked as a group about our time in the schools. When we did talk in both classes, it was very helpful.
- Questionnaire 43. Discussion always took place after fex week. It helped me & I learned from my peers as well.
- Questionnaire 44. When we met after fex week, we would discuss each person's experiences & compare. It was helpful.
- Questionnaire 45. It took place during the classroom time. I don't feel it was helpful because many of the interns just complained about their teaching experiences.
- Questionnaire 46. No Response
- Questionnaire 47. Discussions were very informative in the class.
- Questionnaire 48. Discussion after teaching was completed everyday.
- Questionnaire 49. At first I thought reflecting was such a stupid thing, but now after about a year and a half of it, it's really one of the best things ever because it helps you to collect your thoughts & make things even better.
- Questionnaire 50. The reflections were both helpful & informative. They were productive both at home & in the classroom.
- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. All the time we wrote reflections for everything. It was overkill, but reflection in smaller doses is helpful.
- Questionnaire 53. No Response
- Questionnaire 54. Discussions were always held at the end of the lesson so we could ask questions.
- Questionnaire 55. Discussion/reflection took place in the LSU classroom in the form of Socratic seminars. We also wrote reflections of lessons & a final reflection, too. Reflection discussions were informative.
- Questionnaire 56. Discussion/reflection usually took place at home or before school started. It was helpful to see what needed to be improved.



- Questionnaire 57. Lots of discussion & reflection took place in methods courses-- usually in written forms & in class.
- Questionnaire 58. I did my reflections as soon as I could after each lesson. It has definitely been beneficial & I plan to continue doing it in hopes of continual improvement.
- Questionnaire 59. After FEX discussions took place, they were sometimes helpful. Other times they were confusing.
- Questionnaire 60. Reflection was always after lessons. It was good to hear about others' problems, feedback, etc.
- Questionnaire 61. We did reflections on lessons.
- Questionnaire 62. They were great. When the class reconvened it helped me to vent out my frustration & get advice.
- Questionnaire 63. Reflecting is used every time I teach. It was helpful during my field experiences because I was able to see my mistakes.
- Questionnaire 64. Having an open discussion was more helpful than writing reflections.
- Questionnaire 65. In class, once per week. It was helpful to have a safety net to catch mistakes before having full control of a classroom.
- Questionnaire 66. Everyday. I think it was very helpful & it allowed me to see many points of view.
- Questionnaire 67. Discussion/reflection usually took place at the end of each week or day. Yes, it was helpful in allowing me to be able to make connection to my teaching methods.
- Questionnaire 68. The evening after classes with the rest of the class.
- Questionnaire 69. Discussing took place after the teaching was done. I think we needed to reflect on way too much. Some reflection is necessary but not the amount we did.
- Questionnaire 70. Reflections took place after time spent in classes. Reflections were times to point out strengths & weaknesses of lessons & what would be done differently.
- Questionnaire 71. Discussion took place weekly. I found it really helpful & informative because I learned new things about myself as a teacher.
- Questionnaire 72. We had to write reflections. We also discussed things in class which was both helpful & informative.
- Questionnaire 73. No Response
- Questionnaire 74. Discussions usually took place once a week. They were helpful because I received multiple perspectives.
- Questionnaire 75. Classroom discussions about classroom experiences is more helpful than a written reflection.
- Questionnaire 76. Discussions are always helpful, but there needs to be a line between discussing problems & solutions and students telling every aspect of their experience! Reflection is helpful but some people get too personal & in depth.
- Questionnaire 77. Discussion would take place in the classroom after field experiences. It was helpful to see what other classmates gathered

from their experiences. I learned from others' experiences. FEX is very beneficial.

Questionnaire 78. As soon as we returned to the classroom we would discuss our time spent in the classroom. It was very helpful because we learned about other problems that aren't just our own problems.

Questionnaire 79. For both methods courses, the only reflection we did was type about the day. We just turned in a portfolio.

Questionnaire 80. It took place the week after my teaching was done. Very helpful & beneficial. It helped me to reflect more.

Questionnaire 81. Discussion/reflection took place after every lesson. It was helpful and informative because I had to stop & analyze my teaching.

Questionnaire 82. Discussion & reflection took place after each experience. Reflection is helpful, but can become useless if over killed.

**Question 7: What were your expectations for the children you taught during field experience?**

Questionnaire 1. I expected the students to be true to themselves. I didn't want to see an act.

Questionnaire 2. No Response

Questionnaire 3. My expectations were pretty low for the children that we were supposed to teach. Some of them really exceeded my expectations, but many were below grade level.

Questionnaire 4. I expected the students to be further ahead and have better discipline. I had to lower my standards of teaching to meet their needs.

Questionnaire 5. To understand what I taught.

Questionnaire 6. I expected the children to learn the material presented & grow academically.

Questionnaire 7. No Response

Questionnaire 8. For each child to perform on level socially, academically, emotionally. Also for each child to feel a part of a community.

Questionnaire 9. That they would be introduced and excited about the newness of our ideas & curriculum.

Questionnaire 10. No Response

Questionnaire 11. I expected the students to learn what was being taught. I wanted them to conceptually understand the content material.

Questionnaire 12. I expected to make a difference in their lives by being actively involved in teaching them.

Questionnaire 13. I expected the students to be open-minded in their approach to working with me. I expected the students to be attentive & respectful towards me while I was in the classroom.

Questionnaire 14. For the students to be able to perform the skills we were teaching.

Questionnaire 15. They would enjoy & participate in the lessons that were taught.

Questionnaire 16. I always have high expectations for the students--expecting on level or higher at least consistently giving their best.

- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. My expectations were very realistic for the students. I usually took into context what the teachers expected.
- Questionnaire 19. My expectations for the first graders were fairly low & luckily they proved me wrong.
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. To reach each student at some level.
- Questionnaire 29. I expected them to treat me the same as a real teacher. My expectations for their abilities were accurate.
- Questionnaire 30. No Response
- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. I expected them to respect me as their teacher. I expected them to fully appreciate the material I was teaching them.
- Questionnaire 33. I hoped that they would gain a new way of learning & exploration while I was teaching them.
- Questionnaire 34. I expected the children to get what I taught the first time around.
- Questionnaire 35. I experienced them to learn what I was teaching & actually understand it.
- Questionnaire 36. To listen & learn respectfully & to participate in my lessons.
- Questionnaire 37. A primary expectation is that all children be able to understand the material in their own way. If not, then I would encourage/expect my students to ask for help in order to see the material in a different way.
- Questionnaire 38. My goals for the students were to walk away from the lesson with knowledge & understanding of the subject matter.
- Questionnaire 39. High expectations. I wanted them to be excited & enthusiastic about what they were learning.
- Questionnaire 40. My expectations for the children were that I would be welcomed into their classroom and they would give me full cooperation.
- Questionnaire 41. I wanted them to learn what I had planned to teach. I also wanted the respect that a regular teacher was getting.
- Questionnaire 42. To fully understand the material, to think outside the box while learning it.
- Questionnaire 43. I expected the students to be excited & eager to learn.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. My expectations for the children are very high.
- Questionnaire 47. No Response

- Questionnaire 48. My expectations are for all the children I encounter to learn & grow just as I am.
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. To cooperate, participate, & to gain new insight.
- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. To be well-behaved enough that I could practice simple classroom techniques.
- Questionnaire 53. My expectations were above average but not high.
- Questionnaire 54. To learn & understand the concept I was teaching.
- Questionnaire 55. High & positive expectations. I expected every student to complete their task & add to the lesson.
- Questionnaire 56. They were expected to be respectful & to obey all rules. Without respect, they didn't receive it.
- Questionnaire 57. To learn, behave well.
- Questionnaire 58. I expect that they will all learn & understand the lessons.
- Questionnaire 59. That they would understand & learn what I was teaching.
- Questionnaire 60. I expected them to treat me as they treated their teacher.
- Questionnaire 61. That they could accomplish the lesson goals.
- Questionnaire 62. Not high at all!
- Questionnaire 63. To give 100% & respect me.
- Questionnaire 64. I expected the children to participate in class, complete the assignments & retain the information.
- Questionnaire 65. I was especially concerned for the children who were not grasping the information presented by the classroom teacher. I strove to further explain, define, and re-teach material & skills so every child could succeed.
- Questionnaire 66. That they would have a fun time & be able to learn from me. I hoped that they would be better off than before I came.
- Questionnaire 67. I expected all students to adhere to my discipline techniques. However, what works with one student may not work with another.
- Questionnaire 68. To learn to the best of their ability. To share their ideas to make my lessons valuable to them.
- Questionnaire 69. I wanted the children to be able to learn from me. I wanted them to have benefited from me in some way, shape, or form.
- Questionnaire 70. For students not to respect me as much as the teacher. I expected them to learn material if I kept them engaged.
- Questionnaire 71. My expectations for the children were to gain & meet the objectives for each lesson.
- Questionnaire 72. That they try their best & they get something out of the lessons that I taught.
- Questionnaire 73. For them to learn from us & enjoy us
- Questionnaire 74. I expected them to cooperate, participate, & give me their attention.
- Questionnaire 75. That they will all learn the material & do their best on a daily basis.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response

- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. I wanted the students to have fun & learn everything I needed to teach them.
- Questionnaire 82. I had high expectations for all of the students.

**Question 8: What was your role in fulfilling these expectations?**

- Questionnaire 1. I tried to make them feel comfortable.
- Questionnaire 2. No Response
- Questionnaire 3. I tried to reach out to these children and encourage them. By giving them confidence, I feel that children can really perform more than they ever know.
- Questionnaire 4. I lowered my standards and expectations in order to meet them a level just above their current level.
- Questionnaire 5. I was to teach my lessons so that the students would understand.
- Questionnaire 6. I taught them the material to the best of my ability using different teaching styles.
- Questionnaire 7. No Response
- Questionnaire 8. Class discussions before & after each lesson uphold respect in the classroom. Work individually with lower level.
- Questionnaire 9. I served as a facilitator not teaching but guiding them to dig deeper.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. Making sure the activities were beneficial to the students.
- Questionnaire 12. My role was that of teacher for the time I was in the classroom.
- Questionnaire 13. My role was to enter the experience as a professional. If I respected the students, they would respect me.
- Questionnaire 14. My role was to make sure they grasped the task that I wanted them to perform.
- Questionnaire 15. Providing activities & instruction that would engage the students.
- Questionnaire 16. Reminded the students that they can do their best & challenging them as well as praising them.
- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. Making lesson plans that were appropriate for their level of expectations.
- Questionnaire 19. I always brought in lesson plans that were challenging, but that were not too difficult for the children.
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response

- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. To learn as much as I could about the material I was presenting. To be prepared for anything.
- Questionnaire 29. No Response
- Questionnaire 30. No Response
- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. I was a teacher & a mentor. I feel that my experience at my school was a positive one.
- Questionnaire 33. I planned every night to make sure that I was fully prepared to teach my lessons. I made sure that all of my lessons included lots of hands-on experimentation.
- Questionnaire 34. I tried to plan fun activities & hands-on projects for them to do when I was trying to teach a concept.
- Questionnaire 35. I tried to make lessons that the students could relate to & have fun while doing them. I think that it is important for students to enjoy what they are learning.
- Questionnaire 36. I acted as a motivator, teacher, & facilitator.
- Questionnaire 37. I would try to come up with various activities that reiterated the same concept so as to have many resources to pull from.
- Questionnaire 38. From teacher-created worksheets, observations, & comments the students made, I was pleased with the positive outcome.
- Questionnaire 39. Creating lesson plans that made students work to their highest level, made them fun & exciting so the children would enjoy learning & working hard.
- Questionnaire 40. I tried to provide a relationship with the students. A relationship of respect & comfort.
- Questionnaire 41. I had lesson plans made with the objective so I knew what I wanted to succeed out of the lesson. I also had reflection time after the lesson to see if I succeeded.
- Questionnaire 42. Great. I wrote & carried out most of the lesson plans that went with subject w were in.
- Questionnaire 43. I think so. I tried to be informative & interesting throughout all lessons.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. My role is to be the best teacher that I can be.
- Questionnaire 47. No Response
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. To guide learning.
- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. Being a capable teacher but a learning disciplinarian.
- Questionnaire 53. I helped motivate the students with lessons.
- Questionnaire 54. I taught to the fullest of my ability & did extra activities for students to grasp concepts.

- Questionnaire 55. I assisted students as much as possible & provided a lot of individual time as well.
- Questionnaire 56. Along with the teacher, I used her discipline plans & respected the students in turn.
- Questionnaire 57. Provide them with a stimulating lesson & the environment in which to learn.
- Questionnaire 58. I helped to monitor the class & keep students on task, along with actually teaching some lessons.
- Questionnaire 59. I tried to guide the students to think independently & explain the material to them as clearly as possible.
- Questionnaire 60. Acting professional, lessons with meaning, answering questions.
- Questionnaire 61. Teaching, testing, reflecting, re-teaching
- Questionnaire 62. It was a huge challenge & I love challenges. I dedicated myself to helping the students who needed help the most & helped to try & catch them up.
- Questionnaire 63. To motivate them & to respect them.
- Questionnaire 64. Motivate them to do the work, explain the information well & make sure they understand the material.
- Questionnaire 65. Assess; adapting lessons, teaching, assessing & reteaching
- Questionnaire 66. Adequate planning & taking consideration for each child's needs in the classroom.
- Questionnaire 67. I set out to find a variety of discipline techniques that would be appropriate for the age level I was working with.
- Questionnaire 68. Being part of a team dedicated to leave "no child behind."
- Questionnaire 69. I think the children learned some things from me. I realize that with time, though, that I will know how to get my point across better.
- Questionnaire 70. I tried my best to maintain a professional attitude at all times & keep students motivated by interesting hands-on activities & manipulatives.
- Questionnaire 71. I was to successfully execute these lessons.
- Questionnaire 72. Making up quality lesson plans, trying my hardest, and being as effective as possible.
- Questionnaire 73. They had a blast! Some fell behind, but most of them soared with our methods.
- Questionnaire 74. I want to motivate them to want to learn more.
- Questionnaire 75. To motivate them, & bring a new approach to their classroom work & atmosphere.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response
- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. I had to plan fun & exciting lessons.
- Questionnaire 82. I was the facilitator.

**Question 9: What do you hope the children will learn with you as their teacher?**

- Questionnaire 1. I hope they will learn everything I'm trying to teach them.
- Questionnaire 2. No Response
- Questionnaire 3. I hope that they will not only learn a strong academic foundation, but will also learn confidence, social skills, and a feeling of belonging within the school community.
- Questionnaire 4. I had hoped the children would learn better from hands-on experience rather than from normal worksheet activities.
- Questionnaire 5. To always think things through.
- Questionnaire 6. I hope that the children will learn the presented material, that they enjoy learning, and learn a subject they like.
- Questionnaire 7. No Response
- Questionnaire 8. That one can learn from everyone & everything surrounding them.
- Questionnaire 9. I hope they will learn the basic content knowledge as well as how to practice self-discipline.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. I would hope that they would learn the material & actually understand it (conceptual not procedural).
- Questionnaire 12. I hope they will retain at least a portion of what I have taught.
- Questionnaire 13. I hope the students will learn how to benefit & adapt to a variety of teaching strategies. I hope that students will also learn the important concepts that I present to them through my lessons.
- Questionnaire 14. The skills & benchmarks that need to be accomplished for that grade level. I also hope they learn how to manage their own conduct.
- Questionnaire 15. To respect other cultures, how you can learn more than one subject at a time.
- Questionnaire 16. That someone believes in them...that they can do anything as long as they try...always be proud of during your best.
- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. I hope that they will learn that learning can be lots of fun and that not everything comes from a textbook.
- Questionnaire 19. Respect, right from wrong, to care about others, & of course all academic subjects as well.
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. I hope to spark their curiosity about learning in general.
- Questionnaire 29. No Response
- Questionnaire 30. No Response



- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. I hope they will learn to cooperate with each other. I hope they will respect each other. I tried to teach kindness, I hope they will take that with them.
- Questionnaire 33. I hope they learn that learning is fun through all of the hands-on fun!
- Questionnaire 34. I hope the children will learn what is expected of them & for them not to fall behind.
- Questionnaire 35. I hope they are able to learn what I teach them & I also hope that they learn to learn.
- Questionnaire 36. Subject matter as well as study skills, organization, & respect.
- Questionnaire 37. I hope the children will learn that they should feel comfortable in school & not fear asking for help if they are uncertain.
- Questionnaire 38. Not only do I hope my students will learn the subject matter I will be teaching, I hope to teach social & interactive skills as well.
- Questionnaire 39. That school can be fun & that learning doesn't always have to be so boring.
- Questionnaire 40. I hope the children will learn that learning can be fun & they should never give up.
- Questionnaire 41. I hope that they will learn what I was going to teach, but also about life as well, & how to succeed in it.
- Questionnaire 42. That they can trust me. I also want them to think outside the box & question the world around them & know how to find the answers.
- Questionnaire 43. I just hope they will learn to be responsible & knowledgeable.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. No Response
- Questionnaire 47. No Response
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. To become better thinkers.
- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. That learning is enjoyable & that teachers want to help.
- Questionnaire 53. To reach for the stars...
- Questionnaire 54. That they can learn & that learning can be fun.
- Questionnaire 55. I hope they can learn that they are human beings capable of achieving high levels of success. They simply have to apply themselves.
- Questionnaire 56. I hope they learn how to relate all subjects to real life experiences & to be honest.
- Questionnaire 57. To be better students all around.
- Questionnaire 58. I hope they will not only learn the material they are taught, but will also view me as a role model & seek higher education.
- Questionnaire 59. To think independently, to realize that everyone is unique and special.

- Questionnaire 60. I hope children learn they can do ANYTHING! I wish to instill a desire to learn in every child.
- Questionnaire 61. The same.
- Questionnaire 62. Everything that I can teach them.
- Questionnaire 63. To never give up & to give all.
- Questionnaire 64. I hope that they would learn that education is important & that they all can be successful.
- Questionnaire 65. That they can succeed to the best of their abilities
- Questionnaire 66. Not only to become more advanced in their academic skills but to become better people so they can contribute to society.
- Questionnaire 67. I hope the students learn whatever subject matter I was teaching at the time.
- Questionnaire 68. Learning can be fun. How often we use the skills that they are learning in school.
- Questionnaire 69. I hope the children at least learn to try their hardest in everything. If they fail, I want them to fail trying.
- Questionnaire 70. I hope the children will learn to reason & use higher level thinking skills to solve problems from all aspects.
- Questionnaire 71. How to develop their higher order thinking skills.
- Questionnaire 72. That they are special, they can do anything they set their minds to, and that you have to try to succeed.
- Questionnaire 73. That they can trust me & they can do anything they try to do.
- Questionnaire 74. I hope the children will learn to think for themselves & ask thought-provoking questions.
- Questionnaire 75. To all try their best at whatever they do, whether it's a worksheet or a huge project.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response
- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. I hope they learn that learning is fun & necessary to be a successful adult.
- Questionnaire 82. I hope they learn life skills along with the state's requirements.

**Question 10: What is your model of an ideal professional culture?**

- Questionnaire 1. Full support by your boss, good working environment.
- Questionnaire 2. No Response
- Questionnaire 3. A very supportive school community & supportive administration.
- Questionnaire 4. One in which teachers are encouraged to work together for ideas, support, and professional development.
- Questionnaire 5. One that everyone works together in an environment that makes everyone feel comfortable.
- Questionnaire 6. An ideal professional culture includes a principle willing to work with the teachers & teachers willing to help each other.

- Questionnaire 7. No Response
- Questionnaire 8. Team teaching, support and openness from principal. Great resources available and responsible children.
- Questionnaire 9. One that practices!
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. No Response
- Questionnaire 12. I think the teacher should remember she is in charge and act accordingly.
- Questionnaire 13. No Response
- Questionnaire 14. An environment where there is a variety & a diversity of all kinds of cultures & ethnic groups.
- Questionnaire 15. No Response
- Questionnaire 16. High morale, mutual respect, helpful & supportive administration, opportunities for professional development.
- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. No Response
- Questionnaire 19. No Response
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. One that is philosophically & academically rounded
- Questionnaire 29. No Response
- Questionnaire 30. No Response
- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. I like working as a team. I think teachers should help each other out. If I was experienced I would share my wealth of knowledge with less experienced co-workers.
- Questionnaire 33. An ideal professional culture would be in a school system like St. Tammany or Ascension.
- Questionnaire 34. An environment where all teachers work together with the resources that they have to help the students learn.
- Questionnaire 35. You need to have an environment in which all students can learn.
- Questionnaire 36. Groups of educators sharing ideas, & respecting differences while learning from each other.
- Questionnaire 37. In an ideal professional culture, educators would work cooperatively to teach classes. Teachers would also continue to grow in their own knowledge & skills as a requirement.
- Questionnaire 38. My ideal of a professional culture is people working together & a positive attitude.
- Questionnaire 39. Hands-on environment, lots of student-teacher interaction, team-working between colleagues.

- Questionnaire 40. My ideal professional culture would be that everyone would work together to create a peaceful environment.
- Questionnaire 41. Where teachers work & interact together in a way that will benefit students.
- Questionnaire 42. A place where people can trust others, support others' ideas, & act like grownups.
- Questionnaire 43. All educators would work together & treat students as individuals.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. To be paid what teachers deserve.
- Questionnaire 47. No Response
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. No Response
- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. Everyone is employed & takes their job seriously. That gives a professional attitude.
- Questionnaire 53. No Response
- Questionnaire 54. No Response
- Questionnaire 55. High levels of organization, preparation, knowledge of content, positive attitudes, & awareness of student diversity.
- Questionnaire 56. An ideal professional culture would be one where the entire school community would be respectful to one another.
- Questionnaire 57. Teachers working cooperatively together.
- Questionnaire 58. Everyone does his/her job, but they work together & collaborate. They share ideas.
- Questionnaire 59. A school that respects everyone & embraces differences.
- Questionnaire 60. A classroom that does not put barriers up & lets everyone feel comfortable--like home.
- Questionnaire 61. Stimulating, safe, & motivating.
- Questionnaire 62. Not sure.
- Questionnaire 63. No Response
- Questionnaire 64. Everyone working together & supplies are always at hand.
- Questionnaire 65. A loving supportive environment that encourages students to learn in a safe environment.
- Questionnaire 66. Respect is key! It is a place where people work cooperatively & are willing to sacrifice for the good of the cause (students). Also, a great positive attitude.
- Questionnaire 67. No Response
- Questionnaire 68. A multicultural one. We all have so much to learn about people with varied cultural experiences.
- Questionnaire 69. My ideal professional culture would be where all the teachers were teaching to the best of their ability & the students were all learning.
- Questionnaire 70. Teachers collaborating to create a consistent curriculum. Discipline procedures, and school-wide themes throughout all grades.
- Questionnaire 71. Everyone working together cooperatively.

- Questionnaire 72. Quality teachers who have a genuine love for the students & their ability to learn & succeed.
- Questionnaire 73. Organized, responsible, dress code.
- Questionnaire 74. A cooperative culture
- Questionnaire 75. A place that is welcoming & where the teachers work as a team & the students are cooperative.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response
- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. No Response
- Questionnaire 82. No Response

**Question 11: Describe the professional atmosphere at your school and describe what you think would make it better. Consider how teachers interact and work with each other.**

- Questionnaire 1. I think the professional atmosphere is great. The faculty is great.
- Questionnaire 2. No Response
- Questionnaire 3. The professional atmosphere is positive & I have felt very comfortable at my school.
- Questionnaire 4. I had never really dealt with the professional atmosphere prior to student teaching.
- Questionnaire 5. More interaction between the principal and the teachers. The teachers work well together.
- Questionnaire 6. One where the teachers are willing to work together for the benefit of the students. The principal, however, is not willing to work with the teachers.
- Questionnaire 7. No Response
- Questionnaire 8. The principal & teachers need to have a better relationship. The principal needs to step back and stop being a dictator.
- Questionnaire 9. I must say that this is one of the reasons I don't particularly care for this school. The atmosphere seems dim & there are different clicks.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. The atmosphere at the Lab School is very interactive and hands-on. The students are very advanced and well-educated. Teachers work together during their planning.
- Questionnaire 12. I think the atmosphere is strained. If the principal would promote friendliness, the school would prosper.
- Questionnaire 13. I feel that the professional atmosphere at my school is very warm and friendly. The teachers all seem to get along well and work together as a team.
- Questionnaire 14. Really laid back and friendly. The staff & faculty have a close knit relationship with each other that just brightens the entire school.

- Questionnaire 15. Teachers work together on grade level to help plan lessons. I think it would work better if all faculty had more time to interact with one another.
- Questionnaire 16. Morale is low, teachers feel beat down, administration doesn't seem consistent.
- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. Teachers have a certain time each day when they collaborate & work on future units for their classes.
- Questionnaire 19. The professional atmosphere is excellent at my school. I would not change anything.
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. It is very united. Teachers are cooperative and the principal is very accessible.
- Questionnaire 29. No Response
- Questionnaire 30. No Response
- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. I think the teachers at my school work well together. I would love to work here when I graduate because I feel so comfortable here.
- Questionnaire 33. I think the professional atmosphere is very comfortable & homey. I really enjoy working with everyone.
- Questionnaire 34. I have seen only good things when it comes to the teachers interacting with each other. They are all there to help out each other whenever they need help.
- Questionnaire 35. My school is filled with great teachers who work very well together & create a very professional environment for us & the students.
- Questionnaire 36. I'm a student teacher--the atmosphere is great, very positive, & motivational. Maybe integrating technology more would make it a bit better.
- Questionnaire 37. Most of the teachers work together sharing lessons, ideas & materials; however, it is only within a grade level. Teachers should not be restricted to help within just their assigned grade level but rather should be able to help in the entire school.
- Questionnaire 38. During field work, most of my time was spent in one classroom; therefore, I did not have the opportunity to see much interaction. The little I saw, the teachers cooperated with each other and often shared ideas and lesson plans.
- Questionnaire 39. Not creative & hands-on at all, more interaction between teacher & student.

- Questionnaire 40. The professional atmosphere is close. Teachers work together.
- Questionnaire 41. No Response
- Questionnaire 42. Most of the teachers do not interact during the day. I think if the teachers learned to lean on each other & support one another, the atmosphere would be better.
- Questionnaire 43. The teachers have great working relationships. They work hard & enjoy the students.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. No Response
- Questionnaire 47. No Response
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. No Response
- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. It is professional with collaboration among colleagues.
- Questionnaire 53. It seems to be a good atmosphere. It would be better if the teachers were able to meet more often.
- Questionnaire 54. The atmosphere is good--the teachers meet weekly.
- Questionnaire 55. My school has a moderately high level of professionalism. Teachers help each other out as much as possible. The principal communicates with teachers frequently. The discipline lady interacts with students in positive notes.
- Questionnaire 56. The teachers at my school work well together. The team teaching also works out well.
- Questionnaire 57. Overall, teachers seem to work very well with each other; They share ideas & responsibilities.
- Questionnaire 58. They work very well together. They all seem to be very friendly with one another.
- Questionnaire 59. I don't think teachers should scream at children or talk down to them. The teachers seem to like each other & work well together.
- Questionnaire 60. The principal at the school keeps an open line of communication between the teachers.
- Questionnaire 61. Better support from their administration & the community.
- Questionnaire 62. The professional atmosphere is great. The teachers get along & constantly help each other.
- Questionnaire 63. All teachers act professional around the students & each other.
- Questionnaire 64. The teachers work well with each other.
- Questionnaire 65. The teachers at this school are in a wonderfully supportive environment.
- Questionnaire 66. The atmosphere at the school is supportive & very child-centered. Most of the teachers are outgoing & respect is a theme throughout the school.
- Questionnaire 67. The professional atmosphere at the school is excellent. I would not do anything to change the atmosphere. The faculty at this school work together as a team.

- Questionnaire 68. I noticed that the staff members work well together, but a great deal of them do not dress as professionally.
- Questionnaire 69. The professional atmosphere is great at my school. The teachers interact well with each other. I haven't seen anything I could make better.
- Questionnaire 70. Teachers did collaborate to keep levels together & have the same focus.
- Questionnaire 71. The teachers help each other out. I think it is wonderful & I wouldn't change it at all.
- Questionnaire 72. Very comfortable, easy to get along with the teachers, fun to be at.
- Questionnaire 73. Casual. Organized fairly well under new administration
- Questionnaire 74. The atmosphere is professional, laid back, & comforting.
- Questionnaire 75. The atmosphere at my school is absolutely great. It's a very friendly school.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response
- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. No Response
- Questionnaire 82. The faculty is very supportive & open. Teachers are there for each other.

**Question 12: Describe a teaching experience during your methods blocks that was very successful. Why was it a success? In your opinion, what are the criteria for successful teaching and learning?**

- Questionnaire 1. A math lesson on probability was a big success.
- Questionnaire 2. No Response
- Questionnaire 3. Our lesson on writing narratives this semester was very successful. The children were engaged, involved, & eager to participate.
- Questionnaire 4. I was at Stuart with very supportive, excited, & encouraging teachers. Successful teaching & learning requires patience, a love of learning & of children, being prepared yet flexible.
- Questionnaire 5. I feel my mentor teacher had a lot to do with it. I feel I was successful because my lessons were hands-on which always makes it successful.
- Questionnaire 6. During my math block, I used a tic-tac-toe game to teach a hard concept. It was successful because the students were having fun. The criteria for successful learning & teaching is to have fun & use different learning styles.
- Questionnaire 7. No Response
- Questionnaire 8. During my LA block, my guided reading and center activities were a success.



- Questionnaire 9. We did a lesson on the voting process. We elected class president, etc. We had ballots & a ballot box. It provided a way for students to get first-hand experience in the criteria.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. Math methods block was very successful. I taught probability to 4th grade students at Washington.
- Questionnaire 12. I think success comes from careful planning and always having a backup plan. My experiences were rewarding when the students understood what I taught them.
- Questionnaire 13. During my reading block, we had the students write autobiographies. This lesson was very successful because the students were actively involved. It also made them interested in learning about the bios and autobios of famous people. I think the main criteria are that you must meet the individual needs of each student & you have to have an understanding for every student.
- Questionnaire 14. A successful experience in my blocks would be the time I taught a unit on probability. They had never even heard of the word before, however, after leaving the school, they new all about probability.
- Questionnaire 15. No Response
- Questionnaire 16. Science lesson where we made a recipe. It was successful because the students were involved and learning. Successful teaching criteria include making connections with prior knowledge, hands-on activities, students discovering instead of being given information, building a love of learning.
- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. I taught a lesson using PowerPoint. I actually taught the students how to use it & they had to come up with their own presentation on planets. It was very successful!
- Questionnaire 19. Planning, planning, planning, knowing the subject, & being enthusiastic about the subject.
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. A reading lesson. I researched using the internet to come up with facts about the author, then connected this with the story I taught.
- Questionnaire 29. No Response
- Questionnaire 30. No Response
- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. When I gave a taste test. The kids really respond well to food! Successful teaching & learning depend on the teacher's ability to be an effective teacher--reaching all needs, & the students'

motivation to learn. Students have to be motivated to learn by hands-on, interesting lessons.

- Questionnaire 33. I feel my lesson during social studies about the telephone invention was great because I included lots of hands-on experiences.
- Questionnaire 34. I really enjoyed teaching action verbs to a second grade class. It was successful because all students were involved the whole lesson. I believe it is important when teaching a lesson.
- Questionnaire 35. During my math methods we taught all about probability & it was very successful because we created a variety of activities that helped the students learn it.
- Questionnaire 36. Teaching a thematic unit on clouds was great because it was informative, interactive, & fun. Successful teaching & learning must include patience & a mutual respect between teachers & students.
- Questionnaire 37. The math lesson that I taught was extremely successful due to the preparation from my professor. Her teaching & advising made lessons easy to create & implement successfully with nearly 100% success among all students. In my opinion, criteria for successful teaching & learning is not defined in stone. Students guide the teacher in teaching just as the teacher guides the students in learning.
- Questionnaire 38. I taught a lesson on measurement that went extremely well. I was able to bring in Shaq's actual shoe. This amazed the students & in return learned all about measurement.
- Questionnaire 39. Both student & teacher working together make a successful teaching & learning environment. When I taught the class about probability using spinners, the class & I truly enjoyed the lesson & worked together to learn the information.
- Questionnaire 40. A teaching experience that was successful was in a second grade class. The teacher was very informative with feedback. Not only did I learn from my mistakes, but I also ?
- Questionnaire 41. A math lesson that I had to teach. It was successful because I was prepared for the lesson. You have to plan ahead & be motivated to teach the lesson.
- Questionnaire 42. My first lesson I taught in my math block. All of the kids were engaged. They were interested in the material because they were learning without even knowing it.
- Questionnaire 43. Most of my lessons were successful. The students learned what they needed to & enjoyed it.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. No Response
- Questionnaire 47. No Response
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. No Response

- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. No Response
- Questionnaire 53. 5th grade--lesson went great. Kids interacted after being told the class was terrible.
- Questionnaire 54. Teaching probability to first graders. They finally got the concept.
- Questionnaire 55. Lesson taught: continents, well prepared, organized materials, clear communication, clear & concise directions.
- Questionnaire 56. I did a lesson during election day where we voted on a class president. It got everyone involved & we had fun.
- Questionnaire 57. Successful teaching takes preparation, organization, & the ability to adapt. Successful learning takes engagement & interest.
- Questionnaire 58. I taught a lesson on voting that went well. The children stayed engaged & interested.
- Questionnaire 59. When I taught guided reading, I thought it was successful. I was prepared, I planned, I saw it modeled twice.
- Questionnaire 60. Many times were successful. Planning is the key to success, as well as being prepared for anything.
- Questionnaire 61. A guided reading lesson at Long on llamas.
- Questionnaire 62. Successful teaching & learning is accomplished when a teacher really wants her students to learn.
- Questionnaire 63. I taught a lesson on probability that went wonderfully. The students all gained knowledge & enjoyed doing it.
- Questionnaire 64. Ms. Pope's class was very successful. I learned more in her class than any other class. She did not just spit out information; she allowed us to do hands-on activities & she actually taught us how to teach LA.
- Questionnaire 65. The math class I taught in during my field experience was very successful because it supplied what was lacking from my LSU teacher. An environment with students can feel safe to explore new ideas and challenges on our own.
- Questionnaire 66. I was teaching probability to a 3-4 grade class. The students were on task & seemed to gain all the knowledge. I had planned for more than enough and was very pleased.
- Questionnaire 67. My experience during my science methods class was very successful because the instructor focused on the teaching process of science & less on the paperwork (lesson plans).
- Questionnaire 68. A lesson for subtraction using an interactive bulletin board. The children were excited to answer the math problems & learned using hands on, verbal, sight, & listening skills.
- Questionnaire 69. My SS block teaching was very successful. It was successful because I knew what the students' prior knowledge was, thanks to the teacher! Successful teaching needs to be in an environment that is calm & supportive. The teacher needs to show the students that she not only cares about them as a student but as a person, too.
- Questionnaire 70. I used the ocean theme to make an interactive chart to introduce vocabulary & names of ocean life to students. It was successful

because I used rhyming and singing to introduce vocab. Criteria for successful teaching are having high expectations for all students & helping them to meet those expectations.

- Questionnaire 71. I taught a lesson on The Very Hungry Caterpillar. The kids enjoyed themselves, & it was a success because I was organized.
- Questionnaire 72. My first experience at Audubon. It helped me get my feet wet & show me that I want to teach.
- Questionnaire 73. Math lesson-children both learned, listened, cooperated, and had a blast.
- Questionnaire 74. Motivate the children to want to learn & participate.
- Questionnaire 75. My methods block instructed by Mrs. Marshall was very successful. I learned methods & procedures that I could incorporate into my field experience classroom. Opposed to a methods course that taught me nothing but theory and philosophy.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response
- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. No Response
- Questionnaire 82. No Response

**Question 13: What were some of your challenges during this teaching experience?  
What was your worst disaster and how did you recover from it?**

- Questionnaire 1. It is challenging working with students with behavior problems.
- Questionnaire 2. No Response
- Questionnaire 3. We have had a challenge with one of our classroom teachers. Communication has been difficult.
- Questionnaire 4. Challenges were to feel comfortable with the teacher. I always felt like I was stepping on toes. I can't recall exactly, but probably some lesson gone bad.
- Questionnaire 5. Having a lesson not go as planned. I just changed the format of the lesson and went on.
- Questionnaire 6. My worst disaster was trying to teach a math concept that was very hard and the student could not understand. I finally used a different way of teaching the concept after struggling for awhile.
- Questionnaire 7. No Response
- Questionnaire 8. Getting enough teaching hours--some teachers were not willing to give us their classrooms.
- Questionnaire 9. Discipline. Students see you as a "student" teacher & find ways to test you. By the end of the first week, we had a talk with our students on how they were to treat us as teachers.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response

- Questionnaire 11. Class management was a challenge & also reaching ALL the students. Most students learn at different levels (some fast learners, other slower).
- Questionnaire 12. I think a challenge was overcoming the teacher's ineffectual discipline system. My worst disaster was having a lesson be ineffectual because it was above the students' level. I simply modified the lesson for the children to understand it.
- Questionnaire 13. My only challenge was starting off in a grade that I had no prior experience with. It took me awhile to figure out what level of learning the students were on. I worried about teaching a lesson that was far below or far above their level.
- Questionnaire 14. When I had to return to the school after my car was broken into and purse was stolen at the school--an elementary school!
- Questionnaire 15. No Response
- Questionnaire 16. Teaching a lesson on the dust bowl & not understanding why the students didn't understand the concept of poverty. I kept on until it hit too close to home & had a student in tears.
- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. No Response
- Questionnaire 19. My worst disaster was an activity I planned to be 45 minutes lasted for an hour and a half.
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. A behavior disordered boy was having a bad day. It didn't take long for me to realize this situation wasn't going to be resolved in a "normal" fashion. I ignored him until I spoke with the classroom teacher.
- Questionnaire 29. No Response
- Questionnaire 30. No Response
- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. Challenges were discipline-related. These students have deep-rooted anger issues & reaching their needs for attention was hard sometimes. I had to create individual discipline plans for certain students.
- Questionnaire 33. My worst disaster was losing my train of thought during the lesson & I had to ask help from the teacher. I moved on & finished the lesson & learned from my experience.
- Questionnaire 34. Student absences. I think that this is a really big problem. I recovered by working one on one with these students until they caught up.

- Questionnaire 35. All of the different learning styles of the students is definitely the greatest challenge.
- Questionnaire 36. Challenges were teaching a lesson that just was not working. You look at the situation, change how you're doing things & move on.
- Questionnaire 37. Creating lesson plans & not being effective. My worst disaster was not being able to answer a student's question.
- Questionnaire 38. My worst experience was an unhelpful teacher. She was hard to work with & provided us with no feedback.
- Questionnaire 39. Reaching the children, getting them to pay attention & focus. I let it pass me by, took a deep breath & thought of a different approach for teaching them.
- Questionnaire 40. All my math classes.
- Questionnaire 41. Having to cooperate & be flexible. The worst disaster was not being able to teach science enough because of math, but I did squeeze it in. The teacher helped out a lot.
- Questionnaire 42. My partner did not pull her weight, so I wound up teaching & planning all by myself.
- Questionnaire 43. I did a math lesson that was too advanced for my students. I had to make adaptations during it, but it worked out.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. No Response
- Questionnaire 47. No Response
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. Behavioral management & detail instruction. I had family stresses that I had to keep out of the classroom.
- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. No Response
- Questionnaire 53. When a child told me his dad was shot & killed. I told him we could talk about it after class.
- Questionnaire 54. Discipline in the classroom.
- Questionnaire 55. Lesson on probability. My partner & I lost the class.
- Questionnaire 56. Lesson on probability was terrible.
- Questionnaire 57. No Response
- Questionnaire 58. My LSU instructor was observing & before I could begin, she jumped in & stole my introduction. I just reiterated what she said & kept going.
- Questionnaire 59. Teaching children who are on different learning levels.
- Questionnaire 60. Planning one lesson and having the teacher want me to teach something else.
- Questionnaire 61. No Response
- Questionnaire 62. Getting over the wildness of the children. A student cussing me out. I asked help from another teacher.
- Questionnaire 63. Classroom management; dealing with discipline. An argument, I separated the two children.

- Questionnaire 64. In Dr. Landry & Dr. Smith's class. I did not learn anything in these classes. They did not teach me how to teach science & social studies.
- Questionnaire 65. A day with a sub. She handed out a worksheet without thoroughly reading it. We collected the worksheets, assessed the students' knowledge and had to re-teach it.
- Questionnaire 66. One challenge was learning how to work with a partner while teaching. A disaster was that we were expected to teach on a Thursday but no one informed us. That was nerve-racking.
- Questionnaire 67. Challenges of commuting from my home to my assigned school.
- Questionnaire 68. Time spent to commute. I joined a carpool & we used the 1.15 hours each way as a planning period to brainstorm for teaching & lesson ideas.
- Questionnaire 69. I have a hard time teaching reading. I have not completely recovered from it yet, but I have gotten a lot of outside support from the LSU teachers.
- Questionnaire 70. Challenges for me were writing lesson plans & coming up with new ideas to keep students interested. My worst disaster was not being prepared for a lesson with materials. I bought birdseed to be sorted that were glued to a stick. My teacher went to get beans.
- Questionnaire 71. Time management, behavior (discipline), creativity. My worst disaster was when I taught an English lesson & the students were bored & they didn't stay on task. I kept teaching anyway.
- Questionnaire 72. Getting started. Learning exactly how it is done. My worst experience was a boy telling me he wanted to punch me in the face. My mentor helped me, though.
- Questionnaire 73. No Response
- Questionnaire 74. Time was a challenge. I began conducting my first lesson out of order. I admit my mistake, got back on track, & the children carried on like nothing ever happened.
- Questionnaire 75. Being placed in a 1st grade classroom & the teacher only has 2 months of professional teaching experience. The classroom was in total chaos. I did my best to teach the students for the first time I was there.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response
- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. No Response
- Questionnaire 82. No Response

**Question 14: How will these experiences impact your teaching in the future?**

- Questionnaire 1. I know schools are having more & more behavior problems. Having this experience will help me to deal with them.

- Questionnaire 2. No Response
- Questionnaire 3. It helped me to learn how to work to communicate clearly & to work on tricky situations in the work environment.
- Questionnaire 4. Be more flexible and better prepared. Better to have too much planned than not enough.
- Questionnaire 5. It will help me realize that not every lesson will go just as planned.
- Questionnaire 6. I think that I will prepare more than one way of presenting a concept in the future.
- Questionnaire 7. No Response
- Questionnaire 8. Be more open to letting student teachers get the most teaching experiences out of my classroom.
- Questionnaire 9. I will demand respect but at the same time earn it as well.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. It will impact my teaching in the future because I am more comfortable in the classroom & because I had the opportunity to work with many wonderful teachers.
- Questionnaire 12. I think I will be more attuned to what level the students are on & will be more flexible with my plans.
- Questionnaire 13. I feel that these experiences have given me a depth of understanding for the teaching profession. I am 100% more comfortable being in a classroom than I was before.
- Questionnaire 14. The above impacted my teaching for the future because I don't trust the students.
- Questionnaire 15. No Response
- Questionnaire 16. I don't think I will ever forget to take into consideration what background & experiences the students bring with them.
- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. No Response
- Questionnaire 19. I'll know how to budget my time.
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. Yes. I will deal with the above in a calm manner and try to know my students' backgrounds (IEP).
- Questionnaire 29. No Response
- Questionnaire 30. No Response
- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. I will learn to manage a classroom successfully. The more you experience the better prepared you are for the future.
- Questionnaire 33. Yes, for awhile I want to teach, then I want to start a family. I plan to go back to teaching after my kids are in school.



- Questionnaire 34. These experiences will help me learn what to do & what not to do in my own classroom. I can also see things that could benefit my students.
- Questionnaire 35. I will make sure that my lessons are designed to teach to all of the different learning styles.
- Questionnaire 36. They will help me to be a more flexible teacher & be able to adapt in any given situation.
- Questionnaire 37. Greatly. I used the experiences to shape future decisions.
- Questionnaire 38. Even though this was a bad experience, we did not let it ruin our semester. If this were to happen again, I would continue to keep a positive attitude.
- Questionnaire 39. Made me realize that teaching is not that easy. There will be both good & bad days, just keep going & you will get through it.
- Questionnaire 40. I made it through those experiences, so I know I can make it through others.
- Questionnaire 41. No matter how much you plan, it is not always going to go the right way.
- Questionnaire 42. I know that I can handle teaching, planning on my own.
- Questionnaire 43. This showed me that not everything will run so smoothly all of the time.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. No Response
- Questionnaire 47. No Response
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. Help me with my behavioral management and detail instruction.
- Questionnaire 51. No Response
- Questionnaire 52. They will give a reference point to remember.
- Questionnaire 53. More aware of personal challenges.
- Questionnaire 54. These experiences will help be a better teachers.
- Questionnaire 55. Now I know how to deal with discipline problems & how to manage my time better.
- Questionnaire 56. I have to become more patient.
- Questionnaire 57. Taught me to be organized & prepared.
- Questionnaire 58. I've learned how to roll with the punches.
- Questionnaire 59. I'll always make accommodations for students who learn differently.
- Questionnaire 60. Experience always helps me to grow--from mistakes and also good days.
- Questionnaire 61. No Response
- Questionnaire 62. It helped me to prepare for anything & everything.
- Questionnaire 63. They will help me grow as a teacher. I'm still learning & will always be learning.
- Questionnaire 64. It may affect the way I teach these subjects.
- Questionnaire 65. Always read & thoroughly understand each worksheet.

- Questionnaire 66. I will take all of my experiences & learn from them. Hopefully I will be able to recall everything when I am in a situation & need help.
- Questionnaire 67. No Response
- Questionnaire 68. Good & bad lessons make us stronger. The more in-class experiences I have, the more confident I become in my teaching.
- Questionnaire 69. I know I will need to study more about how to teach children to read & I know I will need to practice it often.
- Questionnaire 70. I will go over the lesson in advance using materials & staying organized.
- Questionnaire 71. They were learning experiences for me & now I know how to handle certain situations when they come up.
- Questionnaire 72. They helped me grow & experience different things. It was GREAT practice seeing real teaching is action.
- Questionnaire 73. No Response
- Questionnaire 74. I will have to be flexible & take my mistakes with a grain of salt.
- Questionnaire 75. I took all the negative aspects of that classroom & learned from them. The teacher was very disorganized & that made me want to be more organized.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response
- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. No Response
- Questionnaire 82. No Response

**Question 15: Do you plan to remain in the teaching profession? How long do you see yourself working as a teacher?**

- Questionnaire 1. Yes. For as long as I can.
- Questionnaire 2. No Response
- Questionnaire 3. Definitely! I see myself teaching for a long time.
- Questionnaire 4. Yes. I see myself working as a teacher until I get married & have my own children, but that will be awhile.
- Questionnaire 5. Yes. I hope to work as long as I need to.
- Questionnaire 6. I plan on teaching for as long as I am able to teach. I may change my teaching field or concentration.
- Questionnaire 7. No Response
- Questionnaire 8. I plan to stay in the teaching profession until having children of my own.
- Questionnaire 9. Yes, as long as I shall live.
- Questionnaire 10. No Response
- Questionnaire 11. I do plan on remaining in the teaching profession. Not sure about how long.
- Questionnaire 12. Yes for the next 25-30 years.

- Questionnaire 13. I definitely plan to remain in the teaching profession. At this point, I can say that I would like to teach until I'm ready to retire.
- Questionnaire 14. Yes, I will be teaching for a long time. However, I am going back to grad school for a masters in administration & maybe one day become a principal.
- Questionnaire 15. Yes, until I start a family.
- Questionnaire 16. Yes, at least 20 years but I need to be in a position where I will make a difference.
- Questionnaire 17. No Response
- Questionnaire 18. I plan to teach until I receive a masters in child psychology.
- Questionnaire 19. Yes, until I can retire.
- Questionnaire 20. No Response
- Questionnaire 21. No Response
- Questionnaire 22. No Response
- Questionnaire 23. No Response
- Questionnaire 24. No Response
- Questionnaire 25. No Response
- Questionnaire 26. No Response
- Questionnaire 27. No Response
- Questionnaire 28. Yes, until I retire (app. 25 years)
- Questionnaire 29. No, not immediately.
- Questionnaire 30. No Response
- Questionnaire 31. No Response
- Questionnaire 32. Yes, for at least 5-10 years.
- Questionnaire 33. Student teacher.
- Questionnaire 34. Yes, I do plan to remain in the teaching profession. I might take a few years off to have children but I will return.
- Questionnaire 35. Yes, I plan to remain in the teaching profession until I can retire.
- Questionnaire 36. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 37. Yes, forever.
- Questionnaire 38. I do plan to remain a teacher. I plan to continue until retirement.
- Questionnaire 39. Yes, for as long as I can remain patient & teaching is fun & enjoyable for the students & me.
- Questionnaire 40. I believe that I will teach for many years.
- Questionnaire 41. Yes, hopefully for 20-30 years.
- Questionnaire 42. Yes for a long time or until God calls me to another profession.
- Questionnaire 43. Yes, forever.
- Questionnaire 44. No Response
- Questionnaire 45. No Response
- Questionnaire 46. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 47. No Response
- Questionnaire 48. No Response
- Questionnaire 49. No Response
- Questionnaire 50. Yes, at least 5 years, then I want to take on a professional administration job.
- Questionnaire 51. No Response

- Questionnaire 52. Yes, 15 years.
- Questionnaire 53. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 54. Yes, 25 years.
- Questionnaire 55. Yes, until I die.
- Questionnaire 56. Yes. I'm not sure how long, hopefully a long time.
- Questionnaire 57. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 58. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 59. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 60. Yes, at least 25 years.
- Questionnaire 61. No Response
- Questionnaire 62. Yes. Forever!
- Questionnaire 63. Yes, 30+ years.
- Questionnaire 64. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 65. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 66. Yes as long as I can..
- Questionnaire 67. Yes, until retirement.
- Questionnaire 68. Yes, until retirement. I have already had another professional career. Now I'll be doing something that makes me happy.
- Questionnaire 69. Yes, until I have children. I will hopefully return to teaching after my children are grown.
- Questionnaire 70. Yes, as long as possible.
- Questionnaire 71. Yes, for about 20-25 years. I would like to start my own school some day.
- Questionnaire 72. Yes. I want to get my masters & teach for a long time.
- Questionnaire 73. Yes, forever.
- Questionnaire 74. I plan to teach until I retire, but I don't know what age that will be.
- Questionnaire 75. Yes, I plan to teach for a long time. In addition, I am getting my masters in school counseling.
- Questionnaire 76. No Response
- Questionnaire 77. No Response
- Questionnaire 78. No Response
- Questionnaire 79. No Response
- Questionnaire 80. No Response
- Questionnaire 81. No Response
- Questionnaire 82. No Response

**Question 16: At what site were your language arts and social studies blocks taught?  
On LSU's campus or at a partnership school?**

- Questionnaire 1. LA/SS at a partnership school
- Questionnaire 2. LA/SS at a partnership school (Long)
- Questionnaire 3. LA/SS at a partnership school (Long)
- Questionnaire 4. LA/SS at a partnership school
- Questionnaire 5. LA/SS at a partnership school
- Questionnaire 6. LA/SS at a partnership school
- Questionnaire 7. LA/SS at a partnership school

Questionnaire 8. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 9. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 10. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 11. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 12. LA/SS at a partnership school (Robin Hood Middle)  
Questionnaire 13. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 14. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 15. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 16. LA/SS at partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 17. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 18. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 19. LA/SS at a partnership school (Robin Hood Middle)  
Questionnaire 20. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 21. LA/SS at partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 22. LA/SS at a partnership school (Robin Hood Middle)  
Questionnaire 23. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 24. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 25. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 26. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 27. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 28. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 29. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 30. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 31. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 32. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 33. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 34. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 35. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 36. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 37. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 38. LA/SS at partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 39. LA/SS at partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 40. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 41. LA/SS at partnership school  
Questionnaire 42. LA/SS at partnership school  
Questionnaire 43. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 44. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 45. LA/SS at partnership school  
Questionnaire 46. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 47. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 48. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 49. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 50. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 51. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 52. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 53. LA/SS at a partnership school

Questionnaire 54. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 55. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 56. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 57. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 58. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 59. LA/SS at a partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 60. LA/SS at a partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 61. LA/SS at a partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 62. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 63. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 64. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 65. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 66. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 67. LA/SS at a partnership school (Robin Hood Middle)  
Questionnaire 68. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 69. LA/SS at a partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 70. LA/SS at a partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 71. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 72. LA/SS at a partnership school (Robin Hood Middle)  
Questionnaire 73. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 74. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 75. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 76. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 77. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 78. LA/SS at LSU  
Questionnaire 79. LA/SS at a partnership school (Robin Hood Middle)  
Questionnaire 80. LA/SS at a partnership school (Long)  
Questionnaire 81. LA/SS at a partnership school (Robin Hood Middle)  
Questionnaire 82. LA/SS at LSU

**Question 17: At what site were your math and science blocks taught? On LSU's campus or at a partnership school?**

Questionnaire 1. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 2. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 3. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 4. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 5. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 6. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 7. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 8. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 9. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 10. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 11. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 12. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 13. Math/Science at LSU

Questionnaire 14. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 15. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 16. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 17. Math/Science at partnership school  
Questionnaire 18. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 19. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 20. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 21. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 22. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 23. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 24. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 25. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 26. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 27. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 28. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 29. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 30. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 31. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 32. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 33. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 34. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 35. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 36. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 37. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 38. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 39. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 40. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 41. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 42. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 43. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 44. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 45. Math/Science at partnership school  
Questionnaire 46. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 47. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 48. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 49. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 50. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 51. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 52. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 53. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 54. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 55. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 56. Math/Science at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 57. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 58. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 59. Math/Science at LSU

Questionnaire 60. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 61. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 62. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 63. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 64. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 65. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 66. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 67. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 68. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 69. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 70. LA/SS at a partnership school  
Questionnaire 71. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 72. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 73. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 74. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 75. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 76. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 77. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 78. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 79. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 80. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 81. Math/Science at LSU  
Questionnaire 82. Math/Science at LSU



## VITA

Paula Summers Calderon was born Paula Rae Summers to Fern and Ray Summers in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. After graduating from Glen Oaks High School in Baton Rouge, she began her studies at Louisiana State University in Secondary French Education. During her undergraduate studies, Paula received a scholarship from the Council of Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL) to study at L'Institut d'Études Françaises in La Rochelle, France.

After being offered a position to teach French at St. Joseph's Academy in Baton Rouge immediately upon graduation, Paula enrolled in the Master of Arts program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Louisiana State University.

Always wanting to obtain a doctoral degree, Paula began her studies in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Louisiana State University while still teaching at St. Joseph's Academy. After resigning from her teaching position in 1999, Paula married Andres A. Calderon and began her year of residency at LSU. During this time, she supervised student teachers and Holmes interns, and worked in the French Education Project.

Having had the opportunity to teach the methods course for foreign language, the methods course for elementary social studies, and supervise student teachers and interns at LSU, Paula's professional interests developed quickly to include the initial preparation of teachers, teacher quality, university-school partnerships, and professional development schools.

Paula will receive the degree of Doctor of Philosophy August 5, 2004, from Louisiana State University.