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School improvement and teacher education should be cohesively linked (Fullan, 2001; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992). This qualitative research study explores this idea using an interpretivist perspective to examine how educators described their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a PDS focused on creating a culture of professional learning. Ethnographic tools were used to gather and analyze field notes, archival documents, and interviews collected during three and a half years of fieldwork in one rural elementary school. Findings revealed how one Professional Development School (PDS) provided embedded teacher education for prospective teachers and in-service teachers around school improvement efforts to enhance writing instruction and inclusive practices, while at the same time providing professional development for university-based teacher educators through engaged scholarship (Boyer, 1996). Six themes culled from an analysis of data sources were used to describe findings that held strong across the two school reform initiatives. The data revealed that the PDS facilitated inquiry-oriented school improvement by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis, which generated a professional learning culture for educators and
students. In addition, school leadership style and district/university organizational structures influence the scope of change within each reform initiative.
CHAPTER 1
SITUATING THE STUDY

Background

Twenty-five years ago, the United States Department of Education (1983) issued *A Nation at Risk*, which was a report that called for improvements in educator preparation and the teaching profession. Five years later, the Educational Reform Act of 1988 brought about sweeping changes for school organizations in the United Kingdom through the prescription, decentralization, competition, and privatization of curricular standards, setting the stage for American reform movements to follow suit. Fifteen years later in 2001, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act entered the educational landscape reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Similar to previous movements, NCLB legislation emphasized teacher quality as a core reform component.

NCLB became a catalyst for educational reform initiatives; as a result, schools employed new strategies for responding to mandated change (Murphy & Alexander, 2007). School improvement efforts through reform initiatives have emerged as an approach to cultivate ongoing changes within a school context. Hopkins, Ainscow, and West (1994) define school improvement as an approach to educational change “that focuses on student achievement and the schools’ ability to cope with change” (p.2). Given that quality teaching is the key determinant of student learning (Fullan, 2007) and that improved student achievement results from the knowledge of skilled educators, teacher development has become a key focus of reform initiatives (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992). Therefore, teacher development in an era of reform needs to support educators’ acquisition of subject matter knowledge and instructional strategies through contextualized learning.
Michael Fullan (2001) suggests that schools achieve improvement when learning is contextualized. Educator learning opportunities that are embedded within a school context should focus on teacher and student learning needs. Contextually embedded learning enhances the quality of professional learning, emphasizes a commitment to the continuous improvement of students and teachers, and underpins the school improvement approach to change (Fullan, 2007; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001). Therefore, a school improvement approach to educational change based on teacher and student-learning needs identifies areas for contextualized instructional improvement.

However, four decades of research highlight the messy, complex, and multi-faceted nature of school change (Fullan, 2001; Hopkins, Ainscow, and West, 1994). Murphy and Alexander (2007) contend that successful educational change requires a collaborative school culture that creates “a strong record in school-fostered improvement, good practices in professional development, and positive outcomes in pupil achievement” (p.16). School-university partnerships emerged in response to the need for additional collaborative arrangements to support educational change, thus providing vehicles to jointly support teacher education and school improvement (Fullan, 2001; Richert, Stoddard, & Kass, 2001).

**School Change and Professional Development Schools**

National reform movements called for the improvement of schools and teacher education, while professional organizations, colleges and universities focused joint efforts on the improvement of schools, the teaching profession, and the preparation of educators. *A Nation at Risk* (1983) and studies conducted by John Goodlad and his colleagues became the catalysts for the educator preparation reform movement. The concept of the Professional Development School (PDS), introduced by the Holmes Group in 1986, drew upon the conceptual foundations for Dewey’s University Laboratory School and the modern teaching hospital. PDSs were
conceptualized as new institutions that could simultaneously reform schools and teacher education programs by fostering a joint commitment to school improvement and teacher education (Abdal-Haqq, 1996; Clark, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Levine, 1992).

Professional development schools aimed to create school cultures where professional learning could become situated within unique school contexts (Borko, Mayfield, Marion, Flexor, & Cumbo, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 1994). PDSs situate professional learning experiences for in-service and prospective teachers within school contexts to enhance learning and facilitate school renewal (Clark, 1999; Frey, 2002; Frey & Fisher, 2004; Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, & Hernandez, 2004).

To date, the empirical PDS literature has investigated prospective teacher education, professional development, teacher inquiry, and school renewal as isolated components in a PDS. Studies also describe PDS school improvement as a resource intensive enterprise that facilitates change when prospective and in-service teachers engage in multiple, collaborative, and contextually responsive professional learning opportunities (Frey, 2002; Frey & Fisher, 2004; Klingner et al., 2004; Shroyer, Yahnke, & Bennett, 2007). However, missing from the literature are rich illustrations of the complexity that exists within individual PDS sites as they engage in school improvement efforts (Bullough, Kauchak, & Crow, 1997). This research study aims to deepen the understanding of how a PDS brought about shifts in the roles, rituals, and responsibilities of educators involved in school improvement in one rural elementary school by describing the PDS participants’ learning experiences.

**Research Problem**

Raywid (1990) describes the challenge of change in schools. He states, “Schools are notoriously difficult to change. One major reason is their interconnectedness. Indeed schools are very much like jigsaw puzzles: everything is connected to everything else” (p. 141). The research
suggests that improving prospective and in-service teacher learning opportunities contributes to improved student learning (Frey, 2002; Klingner et al., 2004; Shroyer et al., 2007), and that improved in-service teacher learning contributes to school change (Frey & Fisher, 2004; Klingner et al., 2004; Morrow & Casey, 2004). However, most empirical findings research are limited to self-reports of teachers’ actions via interviews and student-learning outcomes from standardized assessment outcome measures.

To date, little insight is available into the specific events within a PDS school culture that facilitate learning within classrooms between prospective teachers, in-service teachers, school leadership, university personnel, and K-12 students. There exists a need to know more about how these five groups, or pieces of the “jigsaw” puzzle, come together to influence school improvement initiatives and actualize change in a PDS. A deeper understanding is needed of what happens in PDS classrooms where multiple educators apply their expertise and knowledge of content, pedagogy, and learners around a common focus. The empirical PDS literature has not yet investigated how prospective teachers, in-service teachers, school leaders, and university teacher educators unite to apply their knowledge within a school-university partnership to influence student learning. As a result, this study contributes to a void in the PDS literature by examining how educators describe their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a PDS focused on creating a culture of professional learning.

**Research Context and Research Question**

The rural elementary PDS featured in this study is one of ten elementary schools associated with the University of Florida’s PDS network. The university’s teacher education program initiated a school-university partnership network with local schools in the spring semester of 2001. As a part of the university’s five-year Unified Elementary Preparation (UEP) program, all prospective teachers experience at least one semester of PDS field placements.
During the last semester of the fourth year, the pre-internship semester, a critical mass of 10-14 prospective teachers spend fourteen weeks co-teaching with their mentor teachers four hours per day, four days a week. Also, at Country Way Elementary, both regular and special education graduate students complete internships over 12 weeks of full time co-teaching with classroom mentors.

Country Way Elementary School was selected for this study based on the active engagement and commitment of multiple PDS participants within the context. The current educational climate in Florida is heavily influenced by the demands placed on schools due to increased accountability mandates from NCLB and Florida’s A+ reforms. School-based teacher educators (i.e. school-leadership, classroom mentor teachers) and university personnel working at Country Way Elementary valued the PDS as a resource to help meet school improvement needs. A shared commitment to the PDS concept enabled Country Way Elementary to quickly emerge as a leading PDS within the partnership network, even though it began its partnership activities at the same time as 8 other sites. Therefore, research at this site was warranted due to its unique characteristics as a promising PDS.

The purpose of this study was to examine how educators described their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a PDS focused on creating a culture of professional learning. Specifically, my research question examined: How do educators describe their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a Professional Development School (PDS) focused on creating a culture of professional learning?

A qualitative approach to research with an interpretivist perspective was used to explore the research question. Ethnographic methods were used to investigate the changing professional
learning culture of the fledgling Country Way Elementary PDS. Ethnographic methods were appropriate for studying the developing PDS context because they “sensitively attend to, and portray, the complexity of PDS development” (Bullough et al., 1997, p. 14). Additionally, Tunks and Neopolitan (2007) suggest that ethnographic methods are particularly useful for PDS research at the developing stage due to “extensive time in the field and increased access to the culture under study from observer to participant” (p. 70). To better understand the professional learning culture within Country Way Elementary, my role as researcher involved engagement as a participant and observer within the context where I collected field notes, contextual artifacts, and observations during PDS activities. Using this data, typologies, data files, and case records were created to capture the roles, rituals, and responsibilities at various time-points within the PD; and, these data sources aided in providing the descriptive account of the PDS context outlined in Chapter 4. Case records were analyzed to identify critical incidents and unique/typical cases within each time-point to reveal two distinct partnership initiatives that unfolded over three and a half years of fieldwork. A cross-case analysis of case records helped identify participants for dialogic interviews (Carspeckan, 1996). The interview data was used to strengthen participant voices, to triangulate data sources, and to member check in order to draw conclusions and identify implications for the study.

**Definition of Terms**

Terms used in this study have been defined at the end of chapter one to clarify for readers the meaning associated with frequently used words/phrases (Table 1-1). The purpose of this section is to help readers understand the context, participant roles, and concepts related to work in the Country Way PDS.
Study Limitations

Acknowledging the limitations of a study allows the researcher to identify potential design flaws that may influence the trustworthiness of the findings. Due to the nature of qualitative research, the limitations often result from factors beyond the control of the researcher. The limitations of this study include:

1. Access to data was limited to willing participants, specific partnership classrooms, and site activities that were defined as relevant to PDS work.

2. The highly contextualized nature of this study requires the onus of responsibility to be placed on the reader to determine how the findings may be transferable to other contexts.

3. The activities and responsibilities of individuals within the site related specifically to the needs of the school site and were influenced by the resources available through university arrangements, from the placement of prospective teachers to the positioning of university supervisors, graduate students, and faculty. Therefore, the contextual conditions and goals of the school and university arrangements greatly influenced the PDS work.

4. The selected improvement initiatives identified within the school context were defined based on Florida Comprehensive Accountability Test (FCAT) data. FCAT may or may not be a useful metric for determining a school’s target area of improvement. Additionally, as a result of the FCAT accountability pressures, some initiatives varied in duration, and the intensity of focus changed as short-term improvements were realized.

Significance

This study provided important insights for multiple groups. First, universities can learn how an emerging PDS culture produced meaningful professional learning opportunities for prospective teachers, graduate/doctoral students, and university faculty. Second, by studying beginning PDS work, policy makers and stakeholders can understand how one PDS influenced a school’s learning culture by creating new roles, rituals, and responsibilities; and, as a result, impacted teacher and student learning. Multiple studies cite in-service teacher learning as a factor in facilitating change in a PDS (Chiero, Sherry, Bohlin, and Harris, 2003; Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez, 2004; Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b; Morrow and Casey, 2004; Frey and Fisher, 2004). However, this study identified how one school’s
improvement needs served as a vehicle for creating a profession learning culture for educators across the partnership. This emerging school culture activated specific resources from the school/university partnership to attain school improvement goals and facilitated on-site learning for prospective teachers, in-service teachers, school leadership, and university personnel. Third, the study could encourage school districts to embrace PDSs which, in this example, provided embedded support for prospective and in-service teachers, and contextualized learning powerful enough to influence student learning without financial cost to the district/school. Fourth, this study sheds light on how universities can identify PDS cultural conditions that influence current and future educational professoriate’s ability to participate in the Scholarship of Engagement (Boyer, 1996) within PDSs. In sum, the findings from this study provide insight into how PDS organizational arrangements and activities influenced a professional learning culture by supporting inquiry-oriented school improvement.

Conclusion

Richert, Stoddard, and Kass (2001) believe that learning underpins school reform. When schools function as learning organizations, change is achieved through the connection of school improvement goals and teacher education (Fullan, 2001; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992). However, the process of school change is complex and multi-faceted. As a result, well-designed collaborative structures, such as PDSs, can facilitate this complex and multi-faceted approach by providing a catalyst for meaningful school improvement and teacher education in an era of reform. This study offers insight into the complexity of a PDS learning culture and describes how a shift in PDS roles, rituals, and responsibilities influenced educator learning and classroom practices, and how student achievement resulted from these shifts. Chapter 2 provides a review of the historical and empirical literature related to change in a PDS. In Chapter 3, the research methods are outlined, and Chapter 4 describes the PDS context where the study unfolded.
Chapter 5 provides a synthesis of the findings. Chapters 6 and 7 illustrate and analyze the stories of two school improvement initiatives. Chapter 8 discusses and offers conclusions for this research study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>To make someone or something different, a shift away from a norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Practice</td>
<td>The way(s) educators put their knowledge into action by creating and selecting activities to enhance learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>The act of working together with one or more people to achieve a common goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Individuals, events, interactions, and activities that take place within a school environment to support meaning construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Prospective Teachers- Individuals participating in the initial training process and seeking initial certification as an educator, such as regular and special education pre-interns and interns. In-service teachers- Regular education and special education educators of P-5 students who have been granted certification as a classroom teacher. School Leadership- Individuals who hold a formal role as a school administrator, such as the School principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, (CRT), Reading Coach, Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT), and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Team Leader University Personnel- Individuals who are either employed by the university or graduate students of the university who carry out specific roles to investigate or support the work of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emic</td>
<td>Describing a culture from the perspectives of individuals within the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>The process of providing advice and support to other educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Individuals who are actively engaged in site based events to support learning, these may include university faculty, university graduate students, university supervisors, school principal, school Reading Coach, Curriculum Resource Teacher, classroom mentor teachers, and prospective teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the foundational and empirical literature related to the research question: How do educators describe their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a Professional Development School focused on creating a culture of professional learning? According to Steel and Hoffman (1997), understanding “history and context are critical to analyzing or effecting any change effort” (p.51). For this purpose, the chapter begins by exploring the foundational underpinnings for the PDS movement. Then, the Holmes Partnership Goals are used to organize and examine the empirical literature to understand how PDSs bring about change in school cultures, followed by a discussion of the implications embedded within each goal.

History of the PDS Movement

Professional Development Schools are partnerships between public schools and universities established to facilitate the preparation of teachers in good schools so that our nation can have better teachers and better schools (J. Goodlad, 1990). According to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2001), PDSs are "guided by a common vision of teaching and learning, which is grounded in research and practitioner knowledge" (p. 1). The foundational underpinnings for Professional Development Schools emerged from the influential work of John Dewey, Abraham Flexner, Donald Schon, and John Goodlad.

John Dewey introduced the concept of university laboratory schools, which set the stage for the PDS mission. Dewey's philosophical views emerged as a result of his work in the Laboratory Schools at the University of Chicago (Goodlad, 1984). Dewey’s university laboratory school was designed as a space for teachers and researchers to enact and study best
practices in a clinical setting and also support the learning of novice teachers. John Dewey's conception of knowledge, experience, and practice of teaching and learning in clinical settings emphasizes a relationship between research and practice (Levine, 1992). At the heart of the progressive education movement is Dewey's position on teacher reflection as a vehicle for facilitating knowledge and learning.

The progressive philosophy of education highlights a commitment and faith in teachers' ability to analyze, synthesize, and make sense of their work; in essence viewing teaching as research (Levine, 1992). Influenced greatly by Dewey's progressive education movement, Abraham Flexner developed the concept of the modern teaching hospital. While Flexner is attributed with the reform of modern medical education through his vision for the teaching hospital, he was also directly involved with extending and applying the same principles to elementary and secondary education to create the Lincoln School at Teachers College in 1917. The concepts of research and practice connected the work of Dewey and Flexner and highlight the influential role of teaching and learning in clinical environments.

According to Levine (1992), in 1967 Robert Shafer drew upon the work of Dewey and Flexner to argue for the professionalization of teaching and the school as a center of inquiry. When schools function as centers of inquiry, teachers transform and generate new knowledge, reflect on their own learning, and learn from each other. Levine (1992) suggested that schools reflecting these characteristics be termed professional practice schools.

Professional practice schools and laboratory schools both stress a relationship between research and practice. However, they differ in that laboratory schools were developed under the assumption that “research precedes practice” (Levine, 1992, p.11), while professional practice schools emphasize Donald Schon’s (1983, 1987) notion of “reflection-in-action,” doing research
in practice. Merging action and inquiry creates a stance of “teacher as researcher,” a process where teachers are actively engaged in solving problems, generating solutions, and constructing a “new theory for each case” (Levine, 1992, p.11). According to Levine (1992) the "symbiotic relationship between teaching and learning is central to the concept of a restructured school" (p.8). Through professional practice schools, teacher inquiry emerged as a vehicle to promote practitioners as valuable contributors to the research community, a core value that underpins the PDS movement.

Traditional models for teacher education were created under the assumption that teaching is a craft to be mastered (Levine, 1992). Schon (1987) argues that in traditional university based professional education programs, such as laboratory schools, the emphasis is grounded in applied research. Professional practice in professional practice schools or Professional Development Schools is characterized by reflection, experimentation, and inquiry. Therefore, learning to teach in PDSs concentrates on teaching as a professional practice, where developing the skills and practices of reflection and research become a value and norm (Levine, 1992).

In A Place Called School, John Goodlad (1984a) describes the results and implications of his study focused on understanding public schools and the problems that besiege them. Most importantly, he utilized the results to introduce an agenda for school improvement and lay the foundation for networks of schools to be charged with the responsibility of developing exemplary practices. Schools that serve as centers for developing exemplary practices establish relationships with universities to create a "communicating, collaborating network" (J. Goodlad, 1984a, p. 301). Goodlad and his colleagues established a clear agenda, to create centers of exemplary practices for teaching and learning through school-university partnerships.
As indicated, the idea of creating centers of exemplary practice for teaching and learning are rooted in the progressive education movement and integrate components of Dewey’s laboratory school, Flexner’s modern teaching hospital, and Shafer’s centers of inquiry. During the past two decades, restructured schools that reflect a commitment to the concepts of reflective practice, teacher education, and teacher research have been referred to as professional practice schools, clinical schools, partner schools, and professional development centers (Abdal-Haqq, 1996; Clark, 1999). However, recently clinical school environments that support reflective practice, inquiry, and teacher education have become more commonly known as Professional Development Schools.

The Holmes Group (1986) introduced the concept of a Professional Development School (PDS) in *Tomorrow’s Teachers*. The National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), also founded in 1986, believed schools should be places where "education is a seamless process of self-improvement" (Clark, 1999, xii). Resulting from these beliefs, a mission emerged to improve schools and teacher education programs simultaneously. This concept is referred to as simultaneous renewal. In *A Place Called School* and in four supplemental texts, *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching, Places Where Teachers Are Taught, Teachers for Our Nation's Schools, and Access to Knowledge*, John Goodlad (1984) clarifies his educational reform agenda and the concepts related to simultaneous renewal (Clark, 1999). The initial guiding principles for Professional Development Schools were revised in the late 1990s when the Holmes Group expanded its focus to include “the quality of schooling and academic programs” (Essex, Morris, Harrison, & Johnson, 2000). The newly termed Holmes Partnership emphasized partnerships between colleges/universities and school districts to improve schools and teacher preparation.
Major organizations including the National Network for Education Renewal (NNER), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST), and the Holmes Partnership all utilize their own terminology to clarify their visions for Professional Development Schools. While their terminology may differ, all suggest that a common mission should guide the PDS movement.

After over a decade of work, the movement began clarifying the purposes and practices of Professional Development Schools. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has focused recent attention on clarifying the purposes and practices of Professional Development Schools. Hundreds of school-university partnerships emerged in the 1990’s as a result of reform reports and studies by organizations such as the Holmes Group (Abdal-Haqq, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1994). Former NCATE presidents, John Goodlad and Mary Diez, were concerned that the PDS movement would suffer from rhetoric that oversimplifies the reality of truly collaborative partnerships (Clark, 1999; Abdal-Haqq, 1998). Under the leadership of Marsha Levine, NCATE sought to establish clear standards that separate true Professional Development Schools from partnerships that were such “in name only” (NCATE, 2001, p.2). The NCATE standards were built upon the foundational work of many prior organizations, including the National Network for Education Renewal (NNER), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), National Center for Restructuring Education Schools (NCRES), and Teaching (NCREST), and the Holmes Group.

According to NCATE, the four-fold mission of a PDS includes the preparation of new teachers, faculty development, inquiry directed at the improvement of practice, and enhanced student achievement (Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/public/pdswhat.asp?ch=133 on January 23, 2008). The primary goal for establishing guidelines for assessing PDS work was to
highlight discrepancies between the goals/mission and practices of individual partnership schools and institutions. According to NCATE (2001) PDS standards emerged for five reasons: 1) to bring rigor to the concept of PDSs, 2) to support PDS partnerships as they develop, 3) to assess and provide feedback to PDS partnerships, 4) to link PDSs to the teacher quality agenda, and 5) to provide a framework for conducting and evaluating PDS research. The NCATE standards provide PDS participants with a road map for generating conversations about the purposes, goals, and structures for developing and guiding school-university partnership work.

Most recently, the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) released a statement to further clarify the mission of PDS partnerships. In August of 2007, a group of P-20 educators and leaders of national educational organizations gathered to collectively define a set of goals. The NAPDS “Nine Essentials” were released in April of 2008 with the purpose of providing tangible language and practical goals for guiding PDS work (NAPDS, 2008). Nine Essentials include 1) A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community; 2) A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community; 3) Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need; 4) A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants; 5) Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants; 6) An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved; 7) A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration; 8) Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal
roles across institutional settings; and 9) Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures. The Nine Essentials provided guidelines to aid school/university partnerships in differentiating between true PDS sites and non-PDS arrangements within the educational community.

Today’s public schools and schools of education face increased accountability pressures. With the inception of school reform movements such as No Child Left Behind (US Department of Education, 2001) and Florida A+ Schools, the field of education has been required to use learning resources that reflect research-based practices. School improvement has emerged as an expectation that emphasizes a commitment to continuous improvement, ongoing reflection, and inquiry that responds to the unique needs of the young people in a given school context (Hopkins, Ainscow, and West, 1994). Given the pressures placed on public schools and schools of education as a result of accountability press, PDSs offer clinical contexts where exemplary practices can be utilized to support teaching and learning. PDS professionals are prepared and supported to use reflection and inquiry to meet accountability demands as they collaboratively develop a resource base of exemplary practices.

Today, school improvement provides a catalyst to unite teacher professional development, prospective teacher education, and an ethic of inquiry to achieve meaningful change within Professional Development Schools (Shroyer et al., 2007). In combination, three ideas offer those engaged in PDS work an argument for their engagement in school improvement. First, learning underpins (Richert, Stoddard, and Kass, 2001) and sustains (Senge, 2000) the work of school reform. Second, the fundamental goal of school improvement is improved student learning. Third, quality teaching is the key determinant of student learning (Fullan, 2007). As a result, teacher education becomes a key component in the process of
educational change and school improvement. Andy Hargreaves (1988, as cited by Fullan, 2007) argues that teaching is a matter of “teachers actively interpreting, making sense of, and adjusting to the demands and requirements their conditions of work place upon them” (p. 211). If colleges and universities are going to provide the best education possible for the next generation of educators, then prospective teachers will need to experience and gain access to the process that professional educators engage in to make sense of their work conditions through the process of school improvement.

Review of the Research

This section reviews the empirical literature that underpins the research question: How do educators describe their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a Professional Development School focused on creating a culture of professional learning? To examine the research base, a search for literature published within the past 10 years using the subject terms “Professional Development School” and “change” was conducted using the Education Full Text database. The search returned fifty-two results, which were reduced to twenty-two studies characterized as both empirical and focused on school level change.

The PDS Holmes Partnership Goals were used as a tool to organize the empirical literature and provide a lens for analyzing the research investigating school level changes within Professional Development Schools. The six goals set forth by the Holmes Partnership included: 1) High Quality Professional Preparation, 2) Simultaneous Renewal, 3) Equity, Diversity and Cultural Competence, 4) Scholarly Inquiry and Programs of Research, 5) School and University-Based Faculty Development, and 6) Policy Initiation. The themes generated from an analysis of the literature were aligned with the Holmes Partnership Goals (Table 2-1). In addition to using these goals as an organization tool, the Holmes framework helped identify aspects of PDS work that research has not yet explored. Highlighting what is present and missing in the empirical
evidence regarding school-wide change within a PDS aided in the identification of a research question and the development of a study that would contribute to the empirical literature. The following six sections define the Holmes Partnership goals, highlight relevant research related to each goal, and discuss the implications of the research.

**Goal 1: High Quality Professional Preparation**

High quality professional preparation relies on research and best practices to guide the design, content, and delivery of teacher education programs. PDSs should provide “exemplary professional preparation and development programs for public school educators” (Holmes Partnership, http://www.holmespartnership.org/goals.html, retrieved on Oct. 15, 2007). The empirical evidence cites specific vehicles that describe how high quality prospective teacher preparation can create individual change and collective change in a PDS. The PDS vehicles identified in the literature that support high quality prospective teacher professional education included developing learning communities (Chiero, Sherry, & Bohlin, 2003; Frey, 2002; Smith & Robinson, 2003; Teitel, 2001), integrating teacher inquiry into PDS work (Frey, 2002; Kyed, Marlow, & Miller, 2003; Levin & Rock, 2003; Snow-Gerono, 2005b), and creating an expectation for responsive supervision (Frey, 2002; Gimbert & Nolan, 2003). Each of these vehicles emerged as exemplary in design, content, and delivery for promoting collective dialogue about instructional practices within the PDS. Additionally, it is important to note that learning communities, inquiry, and supervision promoted collaborative opportunities that cut across prospective and practicing teachers as well as supervisors in a PDS. That said, the empirical literature within this section focuses primarily on the professional preparation of prospective teachers. Later sections of the literature review related to school based faculty development will elaborate on how these vehicles strengthen practicing teachers’ development.
Learning communities

A learning community is a collegial group of individuals who collaborate to promote new perspectives and understandings. As a result, learning communities within PDSs engage members in collaboratively constructing knowledge and identity through social participation (Wenger, 1998). Additionally, PDS learning communities create spaces for prospective teacher learning that are individually and contextually responsive (Chiero, Sherry, Bohlin, and Harris, 2003), connect prospective teacher learning to real life events within the PDS (Frey, 2002), and build prospective teachers’ abilities to make connections between teaching observations and learning (Teitel, 2001). Further, learning communities provide prospective teachers with space to emerge as change agents (Chiero, Sherry, Bohlin, and Harris, 2003; Smith and Robinson, 2003).

As indicated, the learning community provides opportunities to connect prospective teacher learning to PDS events and experiences. This is a primary benefit of the PDS professional preparation model. Frey (2002) describes how a middle school PDS supported high quality professional preparation by integrating university professors into the site based teacher preparation program. Through the on-going collaborative work in classrooms with prospective and practicing teachers, the professors became integrated into the school learning community and were better able to connect the learning of prospective teachers to real life students and current classroom events.

Also related to the goal of offering high quality professional preparation is cultivating a learning community of school-based teacher educators who feel committed to modeling and reflecting upon best practices with prospective teachers. In this case, the PDS model provides a forum for practicing and prospective teachers to build a learning community. Teitel (2001) describes how the use of teaching "rounds" can create learning communities dedicated to exploring research-based practices and guide prospective and practicing teachers’ observations in
PDS classrooms (Teitel, 2001, p.66). During teaching rounds, practicing teachers or university faculty lead clusters of prospective teachers through a series of observations and utilize questioning to focus the community on the connections between the observed teaching and student learning. In these examples, university faculty and practicing teachers were responsible for developing school based learning communities connected to prospective teacher learning with real life classroom based experiences.

Learning communities also serve as a vehicle for high quality professional preparation by encouraging innovation within the PDS context. Chiero, Sherry, Bohlin, and Harris (2003) describe how a learning community supported prospective and practicing teachers collaboratively exploring new ways of teaching with technology. Using technology as a common focus for bringing about desired outcomes, learning communities were created between student teachers, university supervisors, and master teachers emphasizing a co-contributor relationship which shifted the balance of power. The results revealed the co-contributor relationship between participants was a factor in establishing learning communities. Specifically, learning communities created by master teachers and student teachers were more likely to generate interest and participation than those created by university supervisors. Further, each learning community benefited from the ability to determine their own needs, highlighting the importance of communities remaining responsive to the member’s needs and the context where they work.

Learning communities in teacher preparation often emerge in the form of cohorts. Also focused on the topic of technology, Smith and Robinson (2003) utilized a technology cohort model to support prospective teachers' development by positioning them as change agents to offer technical expertise, to direct the application of instructional technology, and to collaborate with other professionals. The prospective teachers worked together toward a targeted goal and
fulfilled roles as mentors, critics, and innovators when positioned as collaborative professionals within this cohort model. In this study, PDS learning communities provided an opportunity for prospective teachers to lead change by responding to individual needs and by allowing them to emerge as leaders and change agents within the school context. Learning communities generated change when prospective teachers were provided the opportunity to develop expertise, to generate new levels of knowledge in practice, and to serve as leaders and collaborative peers.

**Teacher inquiry**

Teacher inquiry, also referred to as action research, teacher research, and practitioner inquiry, is the “systematic, intentional study of one’s professional practice” (Dana & Yendol-Silva, 2003, p. 4). Strong evidence supports the use of inquiry as a vehicle for achieving high quality professional preparation of prospective teachers in Professional Development Schools. The research documents the importance of prospective teacher involvement in collaboration organized around a common focus, prospective teacher documentation of P-12 student learning through case studies (Frey, 2002), and prospective teachers facilitating change through action research (Levin & Rock, 2003). These studies also demonstrate how prospective teacher dialogue generated by the inquiry stance (Dana & Yendol-Silva, 2003) becomes a critical component of the school renewal process when inquiry and collaborative action research are utilized as tools to achieve high quality professional preparation within PDS learning communities (Levin & Rock, 2003; Snow-Gerono, 2005b).

Two studies in particular illustrate that collaborative action research serves as an important vehicle in promoting dialogue between prospective teachers and their mentor teachers. The process and the resulting dialogue are tools that lead to high quality professional preparation by supporting prospective teacher thinking about teaching and learning. Levin and Rock (2003) demonstrate the power of inquiry in their study that utilized a multiple case design which
analyzed pre/post interviews, mid-semester interviews, audiotapes of planning, mid-semester evaluation and final evaluation conferences, written action research plans, reflections, final research reports, portfolio reflections, and field notes. They studied how five prospective/in-service teacher pairs experienced collaborative action research. The analysis revealed that participation in collaborative action research provided the mentor/mentee pairs with opportunities for deliberate and focused dialogue about innovations in teaching and learning that led to high quality teacher learning and innovation. In this example, mentors and prospective teachers shared responsibility for engaging in reflective conversations as a part of collaborative action research.

Similarly, Snow-Gerono's (2005) phenomenological study of teacher inquiry documents how dialogue between prospective teachers and mentor teachers played a vital role in the shift toward uncertainty. The learning community created a space within the Professional Development School for teachers to question teaching practices, which supported high quality professional preparation opportunities for prospective teachers. Her findings suggest that inquiry also fostered a disposition toward collaboration between PDS participants that served as a unifying concept for change (Snow-Gerono, 2005b).

Teacher educators also utilize inquiry within the PDS as a tool to prompt prospective teachers to reconsider their belief systems. By allowing prospective teachers the opportunity to question existing belief systems, a space is created to explore professional practice and make change. Kyed, Marlow, Miller, Owens, and Sorenson (2003) examined evidence of teacher candidate belief modifications in a high school PDS. The results suggest that prior to the induction week interns held conflicting beliefs about the role of family and community in schools. During the induction week, teacher educators helped candidates assume an inquiry
stance toward professional learning and began utilizing inquiry as a tool for learning. The evidence cites that “a series of linked interventions” contributed to a shift in candidate thinking (p.481). The key components of the induction week were attributed to the professional environment, a focus on inquiry and reflection, and attention to site needs and concerns. Creating an inquiry stance becomes a central component of high quality professional preparation within a PDS.

These examples describe how teacher inquiry serves as a vehicle for high quality professional preparation for prospective teachers within the PDS. Teacher inquiry facilitates changes in prospective teacher learning when they question their practices and beliefs, document P-12 learning, and dialogue with other educators within their school.

**Responsive supervision**

Responsive supervision refers to how university and school-based supervisors guide the individual prospective teacher’s growth within a specific PDS context. Supervision that is responsive to the unique needs of the prospective teacher, her students, and the school is key to high quality professional preparation. PDSs are able to provide contexts for this type of supervision because of the strong relationships and shared understanding of multiple needs within the context. In a PDS, responsive supervision provides prospective teachers with on-going feedback and content specific support based on individual goals and needs (Gimbert and Nolan, 2003; Frey, 2002).

Gimbert and Nolan (2003) investigated the role of the PDS university supervisor in a phenomenological case study of six interns and one supervisor. Their findings reveal that during the year interns requested specific supervisors based on the supervisor's areas of expertise to support them in the classroom. The evidence emphasized the ability of PDS supervisors to respond to the individualized nature of learning to teach. The supervisors utilized reflective
supervision to assist prospective teachers in making changes to their teaching practices. This example provides insight into how the expertise of the university supervisor can facilitate prospective teacher learning and support individual changes in practice.

Also focused on the role of the supervisor, Frey (2002) discusses how an on-site supervision model in a middle school PDS focused on literacy. The on-site supervision model utilized a former school faculty member to support prospective teacher learning opportunities. This on-site supervisor provided each prospective teacher with eleven formal observations each semester, as well as frequent informal meetings and observations. In this example, the PDS served as an instrument for changes in literacy instruction by providing frequent and contextually sensitive feedback to prospective teachers through focused supervision tied to strategies outlined in the school’s Literary Plan. Responsive supervision in a PDS provides high quality professional preparation because it is intensive in nature and supports the individualized nature of learning to teach by offering prospective teachers frequent feedback, content area feedback that is tied to school goals, and guidance in making individual change.

**High quality professional preparation and school wide change**

High quality professional preparation for prospective teachers within a PDS includes incorporating learning communities, teacher inquiry, and responsive supervision. The empirical evidence identifies the role of prospective teachers, teacher educators/mentor teachers, university supervisors, and university faculty as creating a learning community with the shared goal of improving teaching and learning. Further, teacher inquiry emerges as an exemplary vehicle for creating dialogue and focus that leads to prospective teacher development. Finally, responsive supervision provides the individual support that meets their individual needs.

The empirical evidence related to high quality teacher preparation provides some insight into how PDSs emerge as institutions that support school-wide change. Two examples describe
how participants were positioned to support specified aspects of change within PDS sites. In one example, PDS prospective teachers worked with mentor teachers and university supervisors as change agents to develop learning communities and facilitate technology innovation within the PDS context. However, in this example the use of technology was still not a school level initiative for change but rather emphasized exemplary practices in technology as a part of PDS classroom work. This example offers insight into how prospective teachers, mentor teachers, and university supervisors can be positioned to influence change within a PDS and identifies the importance of prospective teachers in developing learning communities that target a change initiative.

Also, related to aspects of school change, Frey’s (2002) description of a middle school initiative for improving literacy instruction also utilized the PDS as an instrument of change. The growth of a learning community between prospective teachers, university faculty, an on-site supervisor, and master teachers was cited as the key component to success. The PDS positioned prospective teachers to conduct action research case studies and utilized co-teaching between university and school faculty to provide pre-service education opportunities. Further, the collaboratively developed Literary Plan that introduced new practices in this study was used to guide new teacher development and as a tool for supervision by school faculty. As a result, responsibility for student learning was shared between all PDS participants. While many components of the literacy agenda in the PDS were described, specific learning outcomes for prospective teachers and students using this PDS model for change were not reported.

Lack of systematic methodology is one dilemma related to understanding how learning communities provide high quality professional preparation for prospective teachers in a PDS. Most of the studies that emerged within this concept, with the exception of Teitel (2001),
focused on project or program descriptions that integrated data segments into the findings but none explicitly stated formal methods for data collection or analysis. This causes one to wonder what sources of data were specifically consulted and how they were analyzed to arrive at the reported results. Further, connections are not made between prospective teacher learning experiences and the process of school change.

Finally, Gimbert and Nolan (2003) and Frey (2002) provide evidence for the use of responsive supervision based on individual needs and context specific goals. However, the studies do not provide insight into how the specific knowledge base about teaching generated within the context influenced prospective teacher learning and contributed to PDS change. Gimbert and Nolan's (2003) study revealed the benefits of the supervisor's expertise in a given area to better support intern learning. However, because the study’s unit of analysis was focused on the PDS interns and their supervisor, the findings do not provide insight into any school wide change efforts that may have been occurring simultaneously. On the other hand, Frey's (2002) example describes the learning community between university faculty, on-site supervisors, student teachers, and master teachers, but this case does not provide insight into how the knowledge generated within the learning community specifically contributed to new understandings of effective literacy instruction for the teaching candidates or the master teachers through the on-site supervision model.

One of the primary pieces lacking related to high quality teacher preparation is a fundamental understanding of how prospective teacher inquiry is linked to the broader school community's change efforts. Specifically, how are school change efforts linked to prospective teacher inquiry and collaborative action research? How does prospective teacher learning through inquiry prompt changes within the school or in individual classrooms? Further, the
evidence suggests that dialogue and collaborative action research support prospective teacher thinking by shifting the focus to the needs of children and necessitating an inquiry stance toward teaching. However, the evidence from these studies does not reveal how tension unearthed through openness, collaboration, and dialogue promotes or inhibits school wide educational change efforts.

**Goal 2: Simultaneous Renewal**

Simultaneous renewal focuses on improving university and school-based teacher education support structures for educators at all levels. Simultaneous renewal is characterized by strong collaborative partnerships between universities, schools, and professional organizations to improve "public K-12 schools and the education of both beginning and experienced educators" (Holmes Partnership, http://www.holmespartnership.org/goals.html, retrieved on Oct. 15, 2007). Although simultaneous renewal is a key goal of PDS work, to date the partnership work at the university institution affiliated with this study has not yet been conceptualized as an opportunity for simultaneous renewal. As a result of the emerging nature of the PDS work in this context, this literature review focuses primarily on K-12 school level changes/renewal. The empirical literature suggests PDSs support school renewal when participants engage in the process of collaborative planning focused on K-12 student learning needs (Frey, 2002; Shroyer *et al.*, 2007) and when a shared vision is used to organize contextually responsive learning opportunities between participants (Frey & Fisher, 2004; Klingner *et al.*, 2004; Shroyer *et al.*, 2007).

**Collaborative planning focused on K-12 student learning needs**

School renewal is actualized when PDS collaborative planning focuses on defining the direction and scope of learning activities within a context. As a part of this process, K-12 student learning needs serve as a sounding board when school and university-based educators collaboratively engage in dialogue to clarify expectations, identify roles and resources, and
establish a common vision to guide PDS work. The process of school improvement action planning clarifies, documents, and focuses PDS work on K-12 student learning needs.

In a broad study of one PDS partnership network, Shoyer, Yahnke, Bennett, and Dunn (2007) investigated how school improvement action planning impacted K-12 students, prospective and practicing teachers, and school sites within the Professional Development School network. The study examined multiple surveys, interviews with PDS teachers, administrators, K-12 students, university faculty and students, as well as numerous project documents, records and student assessment data. Clinical instructors, teachers, administrators, and faculty liaisons identified multiple resources and professional development activities they believed would improve student learning in areas of weakness (Shroyer et al., 2007). By focusing school renewal efforts on the learning needs of K-12 students, practicing teachers within individual school contexts experienced changes in their beliefs and classroom instruction. Dedicated school sites realized that the greatest gains occurred when PDS participants took the action planning process seriously and prioritized K-12 student learning needs. In this example, school improvement action planning focused multiple participants on K-12 students’ learning needs by distributing responsibilities between multiple PDS roles to actualize school renewal. This distribution supported changes in in-service teachers’ beliefs and practices, and improved K-12 student learning.

Also focused on the collaborative planning process, Frey’s (2002) study of a PDS middle school engaged university and school-based faculty in dialogue to identify a set of core strategies that guided school wide literacy instruction. The PDS focused new teacher development, practicing teacher professional development, and prospective teacher supervision on seven research-based reading strategies the site justified as vital student literacy skills. The “Seven
Defensible Strategies” were collaboratively developed between PDS participants (Frey, 2002, p.9). In this example, the school’s desire to renew literacy practices and improve student learning served as the catalyst for developing a common set of criteria to plan, organize and support prospective and practicing teacher learning within the PDS. The development of specific criteria for literacy instruction provided the PDS participants with a common goal that led to school renewal.

**Contextually responsive collaborative learning**

Contextually responsive collaborative learning also is key to the school renewal process. This orientation toward collaborative learning refers to the specific activities PDS sites use to support the learning needs of K-12 students, prospective and practicing teachers, and other professionals within the context. The unique nature of collaborative learning emerges after PDS groups identify a shared vision for school improvement, a process that was discussed in the previous section. This section emphasizes the types of learning activities that provide contextually responsive collaborative learning. PDS School renewal is actualized when a shared vision is developed between participants (Frey, 2002 Frey & Fisher, 2004) and collaborative professional development opportunities support the acquisition of knowledge in practice (Frey, 2002; Frey & Fisher, 2004; Shroyer et al., 2007).

Frey’s (2002) study describes how the literacy plan guided the collaborative learning activities within the beginning teacher orientation, the focus and process of prospective teacher feedback during classroom observations, and the construction of case studies about individual middle school students. Specifically, the school’s literacy plan drew upon seven research-based strategies to guide PDS work: 1) writing to learn, 2) KWL, 3) shared reading, 4) independent reading with conferencing, 5) vocabulary and word study, 6) note taking, and 7) reciprocal teaching. The “Seven Defensible Strategies” informed instructional accountability, professional
development activities, and resource allocation within the PDS (p. 9).

Also indicative of the types of activities that emphasize collaborative planning, Frey and Fisher’s (2004) study enlisted PDS practicing teachers to develop and critique special education teacher education syllabi. The process of negotiating core criteria to guide prospective teacher education produced a course syllabi used as an organizing concept for future PDS work. In these examples, the school literacy plan and the methods course syllabi emerged as the products of the negotiation between school and university-based personnel. In a PDS, both school and university-based participants are active in developing a shared vision for PDS activities that simultaneously serve the needs of the school context and provide learning opportunities for prospective and practicing teachers. School based teacher educators, supervisors, and university faculty utilize dialogue and collaboration to establish the criteria for judging prospective and practicing teacher instruction. This example is one of the few cases that indicates not only renewal at the school but also suggests that simultaneous renewal occurred as the syllabi were revised to meet the schools’ needs.

Also emphasizing the need for PDS to remain contextually responsive, Frey and Fisher’s (2004) case study of practicing teacher development and school change presents powerful implications for how multiple practicing teacher learning opportunities influence school change. According to Frey and Fisher (2004), “Teachers are not only critical to creating school change but are essential in the more difficult work of sustaining school change” (p. 61). The authors suggest that PDSs should carefully select strategies/tools to complement the unique context characteristics and focus on teachers generating knowledge in practice. Their findings suggest that practicing teachers generate knowledge in practice through collaborative experiences such as teacher study groups, book clubs, and collaborative action research. Practicing teachers created
and sustained school change efforts by participating in multiple learning experiences, developing/critiquing methods course syllabi, and supervising prospective teachers. University practitioners served as critical friends to school-based educators as they worked to generate new knowledge. Frey and Fisher’s study demonstrates how a common PDS vision can unify the activities for both prospective and practicing teachers. The empirical evidence describes the tools school and university-based faculty use to engage in multiple collaborative professional development experiences to facilitate teacher learning and achieve school renewal.

Although PDSs achieve school renewal when collaborative learning opportunities are based on contextual needs of K-12 students and practicing teachers, Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez (2004) questioned the viability of the PDS model to improve student outcomes. In one culturally diverse elementary school, a Spanish speaking university faculty member supported practicing teachers in implementing new literacy techniques for teaching Spanish speaking elementary students. This university faculty member supported all teachers in implementing new techniques that brought research into practice and enabled practicing teachers to generate knowledge in practice. Additionally, the practicing teachers later used their new knowledge and skills to serve as mentors, implement new instructional strategies, and collaboratively generate research with university faculty. The culturally diverse PDS used collaborative research and instructional modeling to respond to the learning needs within the context. Baseline data indicated that student performance initially measured at the same level as other district schools but eight years later student performance measured 21% higher than those same schools. Although many factors may have contributed to this growth, his study suggests that collaboration between practitioners and a professor in residence with a specific area of expertise can support school renewal.
School renewal and school wide change

Negotiating a focus for contextually responsive participant learning activities and creating opportunities for these collaborative activities facilitate PDS school renewal. The learning needs of K-12 students become the catalyst for integrating university resources to support both prospective and practicing teacher learning needs in a PDS. Shoyer, Yahnke, Bennett, and Dunn (2007) highlight the importance of collaboration and utilizing multiple PDS participants as resources for achieving school improvement goals. The authors suggest that school renewal is a resource intensive enterprise, but absent from the study are examples for how individual sites within the partnership network activated university/school resources and organized professional development activities to respond to contextually specific learning needs.

Also related to the collaborative planning process, Frey’s (2002) study provides insight into how PDSs can focus professional learning activities. However, the study does not present evidence of learning outcomes for professionals who engaged in or led the literacy-focused activities.

Sufficient evidence exists to support that PDS school renewal occurs by attending to the learning needs of teachers and students within the context (Klingner et al., 2004). The literature reveals that PDSs emerge as a vehicle for change by incorporating school renewal efforts, such as research, modeling, and planning to support new knowledge generation. Empirical evidence also documents how teachers, university faculty and prospective teachers engage in collaboratively planned professional learning activities that respond to the needs of the participants, K-12 students, and the school context. The research, however, has not provided distinctions for how the specific roles of university faculty, practicing teachers, prospective teachers and supervisors are responsible for linking knowledge to practice in day-to-day partnership activities. Absent from the literature are studies that identify how multiple learning
activities facilitate participant generated knowledge that leads to renewal. Additionally, multiple vehicles for supporting teacher knowledge development are discussed within the literature (Frey and Fisher, 2004; Klinger, et. al., 2004), but the studies do not describe learning outcomes for prospective and/or practicing teachers or how changes in instructional practices are attributed to specific entry points. Based on the available research, we are unable to determine which specific learning activities influence teachers’ knowledge construction and how.

In addition to the use of multiple vehicles for teacher learning, the studies cite the important role mentor teachers and prospective teachers play in the process of school renewal. However, absent from the studies are specific links to how prospective teacher and practicing teacher learning are connected to simultaneous learning activities fostered within the partnership. The roles of prospective teachers and university teacher educators are cited as contributing to teacher learning which facilitates school change, but the responsibilities of specific roles in supporting change are unclear. Frey & Fisher (2004) cite university “outsiders” as critical friends who stimulate the process of school change, but illustrations of how change agents enacted their roles within the site are absent.

If PDSs are going to improve schools and teacher education simultaneously, a deeper research base is needed to provide a detailed understanding of how multiple participants collaborate, inquire, and continuously learn within PDS sites to influence school renewal. Absent from the PDS literature in the area of school renewal are connections between the process of negotiating a shared vision and learning outcomes for PDS participants.

**Goal 3: Equity, Diversity and Cultural Competence**

K-12 schools, higher education, and the education profession should actively engage in "recruiting, preparing, and sustaining faculty and students who reflect and deeply understand the implications of the rich diversity of cultural perspectives in this country and our global
community" to achieve equity, diversity and cultural competence (Holmes Partnership, http://www.holmespartnership.org/goals.html, retrieved on Oct. 15, 2007). PDSs can promote equity, diversity, and cultural competence by providing teacher development within diverse school contexts. Specifically, some PDS prospective teacher preparation and practicing teacher professional learning opportunities are organized within urban schools to support K-12 student learning needs (Beardsley and Teitel, 2004; Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez, 2004). Other PDSs define diversity more broadly using race, class, gender, and ability as a way of deepening teacher attention to the nature of their student population. Regardless of the orientation towards diversity adopted by the PDS, attention must be given to provide each student access to the curriculum within an inclusive rather than an exclusive learning context.

According to Holmes, PDS teacher preparation and professional development programs that provide access to collaborative learning experiences within diverse school contexts offer catalysts for individual teacher change.

**Teacher development within diverse school contexts**

Teacher development within diverse PDS school contexts cultivates educator knowledge related to issues of equity, diversity, and cultural competence. Racially diverse prospective teacher learning communities (Beardsley and Teitel, 2004), in-service teacher professional development opportunities based on K-12 students’ cultural and linguistic background (Klingner et al., 2004), and university supervisor learning communities (Jacobs, 2007) promote teacher learning about equity, diversity, and cultural competence within PDS settings.

According to Beardsley and Teitel (2004), racial diversity among prospective teacher interns in an urban high school context promotes teacher development within field based learning communities. The study surveyed university faculty, mentor teachers, and prospective teacher interns enrolled in a cohort based Master’s program to identify how prospective teacher
learning focused on issues of equity impacts PDS practicing teachers, high school students, and prospective teacher interns. The secondary teacher education program systematically recruited a racially diverse cohort of interns and placed the cohort in an urban PDS high school. Cohort activities focused on considering race as a factor that underlies school issues. The intern cohort’s racial diversity emerged as a significant factor in bringing together multiple intern perspectives, as well as prompting debate and discussion within the intern learning community. In this example, racially diverse prospective teacher interns emerged as change agents for social justice by setting high standards and providing powerful instructional role models. The urban high school PDS field experience provided an appropriate context for prospective teacher change by enabling prospective teachers to transform their personal teaching philosophies into practice.

Professionals generate new knowledge and facilitate student learning when practicing teacher learning activities are aligned with the unique needs of culturally diverse learners. Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez (2004) utilized student test scores as well as practicing teacher and administrator interviews to demonstrate how the PDS model improved student outcomes in an urban elementary school. The PDS model integrated a professor in residence with an expertise in supporting culturally diverse learners. The Spanish-speaking university professor's knowledge and extensive teaching expertise with culturally and linguistically diverse students matched the learning needs of the PDS. The professor in residence led professional development activities for practicing teachers to improve reading instruction for students who experience English as a second language. Further, participants attributed the success of the PDS model to collaborative research between university and school-based faculty. Additionally, the notion of a "good-fit" professor in residence was attributed to improved educator learning and cultural competence in this elementary PDS (p.303). Attention to equity,
diversity, and cultural competence in urban PDSs support K-12 student learning and provide professional learning opportunities for prospective and practicing teachers when university faculty and prospective teachers become learning resources.

Supervisor learning communities can promote critical reflection about issues of equity, diversity, and culture for university supervisors and the prospective teachers they supervise. In a constructivist study of PDS university supervisors, Jacobs (2007) used political analysis to investigate how prospective teacher supervisors made meaning of their transformation within a professional learning community focused on cultivating equity-oriented supervision. She found equity-oriented supervision was a challenge requiring supervisors to balance roles and multiple levels of relationships and to consider “coaching for equity” as a process that took place over time. She also found, “Supervisors made meaning of equity-oriented supervision throughout the process of transformation by engaging in individual inquiry that was simultaneously supported by a professional learning community” (p.223). The influence of a supportive learning community provided supervisors space to generate discourse and reflection around issues of equity. In this study, the university supervisors confronted these issues personally within the learning community before translating them into their supervision practice with PDS prospective teachers.

**Equity, diversity and cultural competence and school wide change**

Prospective and practicing teacher learning can facilitate attention to equity, diversity and cultural competence in urban PDSs. The interests and expertise of prospective teachers and university professors provide teacher and student learning resources within diverse contexts. The empirical evidence cites racially diverse prospective teachers as change agents for practicing teachers and high school students in an urban high school PDS (Beardsley & Teitel, 2004), while university faculty support the implementation of specific instructional strategies for linguistically
diverse students in a urban elementary PDS (Klingner et al., 2004). Additionally, urban school contexts provide a space for learning communities and research to emerge as exemplary practice activities that promote teaching competence around issues of equity, diversity and culture. While these studies are specifically related to the goal of equity, the practices evidenced in these studies illustrate how aligning participant interest and expertise can facilitate PDS change.

Some research indicates that PDSs are vehicles for deepening professional commitment to equity, although in each study specific attention has only focused on one impetus for teacher development. For example, Beardsley and Teitel (2004) provide a clear portrait for how prospective teachers can emerge as change agents for social justice, yet the evidence remains unclear for how interns impact the learning of their mentors and/or other professionals in the context. Further, Klingner et. al. (2004) highlight how practicing teachers developed new research-based instructional skills to meet the needs of their culturally and linguistically diverse student population. While the study cites the presence of prospective teachers within PDS classrooms, distinctions are not made for how they participate in or contribute to the implementation of research-based skills. The evidence outlines how recruiting and preparing a diverse pool of prospective teachers promotes equity in an urban context (Beardsley & Teitel, 2004) and how the support of the university faculty enhances cultural competence for practicing teachers (Klingner et al., 2004). Overall, interactions between prospective teachers, in-service teachers, and university faculty in urban PDSs are not clear making it difficult to ascertain how the classroom practices within the urban school context contribute to educator learning.

Goal 4: Scholarly Inquiry and Programs of Research

In a PDS, inquiry and programs of research "conduct and disseminate educational research and engage in other scholarly activities that advance knowledge, improve teaching and learning for all children and youth, inform the preparation and development of educators, and influence
educational policy and practice” (Holmes Partnership, http://www.holmespartnership.org/goals.html, retrieved on Oct. 15, 2007). Thus, inquiry and research are catalysts for school renewal because they provide opportunities for collective dialogue about instructional practices by facilitating teacher generated knowledge (Levin & Rock, 2003; Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b) and disseminating knowledge about teachers, students, and instructional strategies within a PDS (Klingner et al., 2004; Leonard, Lovelace-Taylor, & Sanford-DeShields, 2004; Levin & Rock, 2003; Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b).

**Inquiry facilitates teacher-generated knowledge**

Dana and Yendol-Silva (2003) suggest that inquiry and action research arise from “the concerns of teachers and engages teachers in the design, data collection, and interpretation of data around their question” (p. 4). Inquiry promotes a collaborative culture where dialogue is utilized to reflect, question, and support new perspectives on issues that concern educators. This theme focuses on how PDSs promote a culture of inquiry by providing space for prospective and practicing teachers to jointly participate in specific collaborative activities and discuss educational beliefs, instructional practices, and student learning needs. Collaborative action research conferences (Levin & Rock, 2003), inquiry projects, and an inquiry stance (Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b) are aspects of teacher inquiry that generated professional knowledge in PDS learning communities.

Levin and Rock (2003) studied the practices and perspectives of five pre-service/practicing teacher pairs using collaborative action research. Collaborative action research conferences between prospective teachers and their mentor teachers provided space to discuss the underlying beliefs that guide specific classroom events and decisions without dialogue being focused on mentor or prospective teacher performance. Specifically, the conferences allowed both prospective and practicing teachers to gain new insights about their elementary students and
instructional practices, while prospective teachers also gained a better understanding of themselves as teachers and more content knowledge. In this example, collaborative action research conferences enabled the PDS prospective and mentor teacher pairs to negotiate their own understandings of teaching and learning and generate new knowledge by studying instructional practices within a classroom community.

The inquiry process and an inquiry stance were two aspects of teacher inquiry that promoted change and growth for PDS teachers. Snow-Gerono's (2005) study of six practicing teachers’ experiences with inquiry revealed that teachers challenged personal beliefs through dialogue fostered between mentor teachers, university faculty, and prospective teachers within a PDS learning community. Prospective teachers engaged in teacher inquiry with the support of their mentor teachers, university faculty, and peers. Mentor teachers supported prospective teacher inquiry projects, and fostered a disposition toward reflective, classroom research referred to as an inquiry stance. Teachers reported that inquiry projects and an inquiry stance prompted thinking, problematized practice, and promoted discussions of educational reform. In this example, collaboration between PDS professionals facilitated teacher generated knowledge, promoted dialogue and provided participants with space to question teaching practices, increase uncertainty, and tap new possibilities for change (Snow-Gerono, 2005a). Within the PDS, collaborative dialogue fostered the acquisition of teachers’ self-knowledge, instructional change and student learning through conferencing, the inquiry process, and an inquiry stance.

**Research disseminates knowledge about practice**

PDS participants also engage in research to capture school renewal efforts and disseminate knowledge about educator learning within partnership contexts. For example, research has used case studies (Leonard, Lovelace-Taylor, & Sanford-DeShields, 2004) and studied site based teaching practices (Klingner et al., 2004) in order to demonstrate renewal efforts.
Leonard, Lovelace, Taylor, Sandford-Deshields, and Spearman (2004) conducted case studies on two PDS math teachers to understand how content knowledge and pedagogy influence mathematics instruction mastery. An analysis of audiotapes, script tapes, observations, and field notes revealed the interconnectedness of content, pedagogy and teacher knowledge and the importance of this interconnectedness to teacher and student learning. The data revealed that although both teachers had the content knowledge to teach effectively, only one of the contexts studied allowed prospective teachers space to learn from their mistakes. Findings from the case studies revealed that placing an emphasis on content knowledge first and then focusing on the delivery of instructional skills supported teachers’ mathematics instruction and influenced teacher mastery. Leonard et. al. (2004) argue that case studies provided practicing teachers with the tools to generate discussion about pedagogy and facilitate school change. In this example, a PDS generated an on-site knowledge base to improve practicing teacher learning opportunities, improve mathematics pedagogy and to facilitate school change through dialogue and collective inquiry.

Also focused on the role of research in a PDS, Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez (2004) studied teacher participation in the research process as a component of school change. Practicing teachers collaborated with university faculty to implement research-based practices and also studied their own practice as they experimented with new ideas and supported each other's learning. Klinger et. al (2004) evidenced three specific roles of PDS educators engaged in site based research to deepen the knowledge base of teaching and learning. Teachers identified the following three roles of research in their PDS: 1) participating in research, 2) conducting collaborative research with university faculty, and 3) being the subject of research. Opportunities to bring research into practice included introducing new ideas, modeling new
strategies, and supporting prospective and practicing teachers in implementing new techniques. School and university based educators utilize case studies, participation in research, and collaborative inquiry to disseminate and construct context specific knowledge about teaching and learning that provide other PDSs a roadmap as they consider the role of research within school sites.

**Scholarly inquiry and programs of research and school wide change**

PDSs support scholarly inquiry and programs of research that are collaborative across participants. These efforts support the school renewal and change process. The empirical evidence cites prospective teachers and mentors (Levin & Rock, 2003; Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b), practicing teachers and university faculty (Klingner et al., 2004; Leonard et al., 2004), and prospective teachers and university faculty (Leonard et al., 2004) as contributors to scholarly inquiry and research in a PDS. Inquiry and research facilitate school change by providing vehicles for teachers to generate professional knowledge as well as opportunities for collaborative research between university and school-based researchers. Additionally, the PDS allows for the dissemination of multiple types of professional knowledge within the PDS sites as well as within the research community.

PDS participants utilize collaborative action research and inquiry to facilitate dialogue about instructional practices. While professional knowledge /learning is often cited as an outcome of inquiry and research, learning outcomes are typically general and rarely directly linked to practitioner inquiry or an established focus for school change. For example, Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez (2004) had a common focus driving their school change effort. However, the evidence sites the types of research that contribute to PDS participation and site learning gains by students on standardized assessment measures as evidence of learning. The study does not describe how prospective and practicing teacher learning is connected to
classroom practices, and how classroom practices specifically improve student learning outcomes. Most often in this study, teachers were the focus of research conducted by university faculty, and while the study cites teacher research as a contributing factor to practitioner learning, little discussion is offered to provide specific learning outcomes for teachers inquiring into their own instructional practices. Based on the evidence, one is unable to determine if the improvements in student learning scores were influenced by specific instructional practices of teachers or the schools’ literacy focus over time. Additionally, what teachers learned from their peers, professional development by faculty, and research within the site was unclear. The empirical evidence cites that teachers are inquiring into their own practice, but the presence of university prospective teachers and faculty remain a catalyst for research and inquiry in the PDSs. Future studies could investigate how inquiry and research are positioned within PDS partnerships; particularly examining who is driving the agenda for research and inquiry and who actualizes inquiry with PDS contexts. Much of the empirical literature related to the goal for scholarly inquiry and programs of research overlap with the previously discussed goals for professional preparation, school renewal, and the literature for faculty development, which will be discussed in the following section. Therefore, many of the implications for inquiry and research focus more on who is leading inquiry and research and the activities they utilize rather than the focus of the research itself.

**Goal 5: School and University Based Faculty Development**

The Holmes Partnership goal for school and university based faculty development emphasizes "Quality doctoral programs for the future education professoriate and for advanced professional development of school-based educators." A PDS redesigns "the work of both university and school faculty" to better prepare educators and improve learning for children and youth. Further, PDSs should promote "conditions that recognize and reward education
professionals who better serve the needs of all learners” (Holmes Partnership, http://www.holmespartnership.org/goals.html, retrieved on Oct. 15, 2007). Responsive professional development (Frey & Fisher, 2004; Morrow & Casey, 2004) and collaborative learning communities (Klingner et al., 2004; Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b) facilitate school based faculty development in a PDS. PDSs achieve change when teachers experience multiple collaborative and context specific professional learning experiences to generate knowledge in practice.

**Responsive professional development**

Responsive professional development refers to how PDSs facilitate faculty development by situating professional learning activities/resources within the context to address K-12 student and practicing teacher learning needs. Multiple practices and conditions support school based faculty learning in a PDS (Frey & Fisher, 2004; Morrow & Casey, 2004). Specifically, PDSs actualize change when practicing teacher learning opportunities are flexible and respond to individual needs (Morrow & Casey, 2004) and when multiple collaborative learning experiences share a common focus (Frey & Fisher, 2004).

Morrow and Casey (2004) utilized field notes, observations, informal discussions and teacher interviews to investigate the characteristics of a PDS professional development project that supports changes in teacher practice. Ten conditions of professional development were identified that facilitate practicing teacher change. Teachers identified flexible goal setting, access to materials, observations of improved student learning, administrative support, collaboration with peers, opportunity to work with consultants/coaches, time for change to occur, discussion study groups, coaches to model lessons, and visiting other teachers’ classrooms as the conditions that were most important for creating change. Principal and peer persuasion also emerged as influential factors in motivating practicing teachers to participate in professional
learning activities. Additionally, participants cited that small instructional improvements prompted more changes to occur when teachers felt in control and were able make adjustments at their own pace. Practicing teachers later mentored practicing and prospective teachers as a result of personal success. In this example, teachers attributed changes in their instructional practice to a responsive faculty development program that considered individual teacher needs within the PDS context.

Also focusing on the role of school based faculty professional development in a PDS, Frey and Fisher (2004) describe a model that supports faculty development focused on teachers generating knowledge in practice, a foundational premise of the PDS model. Teachers generate knowledge in practice through socially and contextually situated and reflective experiences that foster connections between content knowledge and everyday action (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). Concurrent with Cochran-Smith & Lytle, Frey and Fisher (2004) found PDS educators gain access to the exemplary practices of experienced/peer teachers and generate knowledge in practice through a series of collaborative experiences such as teacher study groups, book clubs, and collaborative action research. In this example, Frey and Fisher (2004) identify how educational change in one PDS context resulted from a “culture shift” that involved a series of shared experiences, shared vision, available resources, and training. Therefore, responsive professional development facilitates changes in teacher’s instructional practices and generates knowledge in practice when school based faculty learning opportunities are collaborative and focus on individual/ contextual needs.

**Collaborative learning communities**

Collaborative learning communities refer to how individuals within PDS sites interact to socially construct knowledge and beliefs about teaching and learning. The literature suggests that effective learning communities emerge to support school based faculty learning when
collaboration, inquiry/research, and a shared vision focus PDS work (Chiero et al., 2003; Klingner et al., 2004; Snow-Gerono, 2005b).

Chiero et al (2003) describe a professional development program that supports new ways of teaching with technology. A learning community created between student teachers, university supervisors, and master teachers emphasized a co-contributor relationship and used technology as a common PDS focus. Collaboration between mentors, prospective teachers and university supervisors supported teaching with technology and facilitated change through the formation of learning communities. The experience revealed that learning communities created by master teachers and student teachers generated more interest and participation than learning communities created by university supervisors. Further, individual learning communities determined their own needs, which highlighted the importance for communities to remain flexible and sensitive to members’ needs and the work context. This example illustrates how changes in teacher thinking, beliefs and practice take place as a result of collaboration within learning communities.

Multiple studies cite how learning communities emerge when PDSs engage in inquiry/action research. These examples have been discussed within a previous section, under the goal for scholarly inquiry and programs of research. However, the goal for school and university based faculty development describes how teacher inquiry (Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b) and/or site based research (Klingner et al., 2004) provides a catalyst for school and university based faculty development when learning communities are established between school based faculty, prospective teacher, and university level participants.

**School and university based faculty development and school wide change**

Substantial evidence indicates that PDSs provide school based educators with opportunities for teacher generated knowledge when learning activities focus on the needs of the
individuals/context (Frey & Fisher, 2004; Klingner et al., 2004; Morrow & Casey, 2004) and a shared vision guides learning communities (Chiero et al., 2003). Both Frey and Fisher (2004) and Shroyer et. al. (2007) attribute positive learning experiences to aspects of culture. Although, the specific evidence for how multiple, shared experiences cited by Frey and Fisher (2004) were organized to support a culture shift was unclear. While the literature does identify components of professional development programs that facilitate change (Frey & Fisher, 2004; Morrow & Casey, 2004), how specific roles and responsibilities of PDS participants are organized to facilitate learning remain unspecified.

Noticeably absent from the PDS change empirical literature is evidence of how high quality doctoral programs are integrated into PDS work. Similarly, how PDSs support the development of university based faculty was not clear. While Chiero et. al. (2003) cite the presence of university supervisors as part of PDS learning communities, learning outcomes for university based faculty, doctoral level students, and university supervisors are largely absent from the empirical literature. Also unclear from the evidence is the nature of knowledge generated in learning communities and how learning transforms into action in PDS classrooms. Additionally, a deeper understanding of how the specific roles, rituals, and responsibilities of PDS participants are organized to facilitate learning for both school based and university based participants is needed.

Goal 6: Policy Initiation

The Holmes Partnership goal for policy initiation emphasizes engagement in "policy analysis and development related to public K-12 schools and the preparation of educators" (J. I. Goodlad, 1984b). The goal advocates for policy to "improve teaching and learning for all students, promote school improvement and enhance the preparation and continuing professional development of all educators" (Holmes Partnership,
http://www.holmespartnership.org/goals.html, retrieved on Oct. 15, 2007). To date, studies that specifically analyze and document policy changes in PDS are limited. However, the PDS literature does document how improved learning outcomes for PDS prospective teachers, practicing teachers, and K-12 students are a catalyst that prompt university level faculty to re-conceptualize the values and goals that underpin teacher education programs and make changes to program arrangements and activities (Beardsley & Teitel, 2004; Shroyer et al., 2007). While the studies are not explicitly linked to formal policy changes, the results can inform our understanding of how PDS learning outcomes may prompt adaptations in policy at the school, district, and university level.

**University-level change results from PDS site outcomes**

PDS based teacher education programs play a fundamental role in providing responsive, flexible, and collaborative learning opportunities for prospective and practicing teachers (Frey, 2002; Frey & Fisher, 2004; Klingner et al., 2004; Morrow & Casey, 2004). The empirical evidence also suggests that university program and activity changes result when teacher education programs examine how PDSs support the learning of practicing teachers (Shroyer et al., 2007), K-12 students (Shroyer et al., 2007; Beardsley & Teitel, 2004) and prospective teachers (Beardsley & Teitel, 2004).

Beardsley and Teitel (2004) describe how positive learning outcomes for an urban PDS cohort of prospective high school teachers and their students prompted a negotiation processes between faculty that resulted in policy changes at the university level. The authors suggest that university faculty challenged traditional views of teacher preparation when they examined the positive learning outcomes experienced by a racially diverse cohort of interns prepared in an urban PDS. Additionally, a more collegial university culture emerged, allowing open debate and discussion about the distinctions between traditional teacher education programs and teacher
education in a PDS. This example uncovers how universities re-conceptualize their own policies about teacher education when participant learning outcomes are examined.

In another example, Shroyer et al. (2007) utilize K-12 students as the focal point for revising university and school practices. Rather than advocating specifically for policy adaptations for schools and the university, the partnership network utilized school improvement action planning to focus on the learning needs of K-12 students and cultivate a shift in the structures, conceptual understandings, and assumptions embedded in the teacher education programs. This example illustrates how positive change can emerge when participants at various levels within a school/university partnership consider the learning outcome of K-12 students, teachers, and prospective teachers as significant factors in teacher education programs.

**Policy initiation and university change**

The empirical literature cites changes in policy as the result of learning outcomes of prospective and/or practicing teachers participating in PDS based programs. University faculty play a role not only in designing and carrying out research that documents the learning outcomes of PDS participants, but also in gathering data that can later serve as a catalyst for open discussion and debate. However, the literature remains focused on policy adaptations and reconsiderations at the university level. While the examples cited do not directly specify the policy changes that occurred, they do reveal how PDS schools, networks, and districts can utilize participant learning data to evaluate and reconsider the practices of PDS professionals and institutions and improve learning for all participants. A deeper research base is needed to better understand how PDSs impact policy at the school, district, university, and state level to improve schools and teacher education programs. Future research should investigate how PDS participants advocate for policy change and how school/district level policy changes influence the work and learning of PDS participants.
Conclusion

Educational improvement should focus on the individual school organization (Goodlad, 1984). The research on effective professional development also suggests that teacher learning is best supported in the contexts where educators work (Garet et al., 2001). Further, Fullan (2001) contends that quality teaching is the key to student achievement and that improvement of teaching is a crucial component for school improvement in an era of change. Fullan also suggests that school-university partnerships are powerful vehicles to support change efforts. Therefore, a school improvement approach to educational change should focus teaching improvement and changes on contextually derived school, teacher, and student needs. By serving multiple needs, PDSs can emerge as potentially powerful contexts to support educational improvement, teacher education, and student achievement.

The PDS literature cites multiple examples of how in-service teacher learning is facilitated when it is based on the needs of teachers and students within the context. The PDS literature also documents how school improvement goals facilitate participant learning within a school-university partnership network (Shroyer et al., 2007). A deeper understanding is needed of how PDS inquiry and research help create a learning culture using multiple entry points to support school wide improvement efforts. Without an intricate understanding of how multiple school and university resources are organized and integrated to facilitate learning within individual PDS sites, new and existing partnerships may never actualize their potential to serve the learning needs of multiple participants.

According to Ellsworth (n.d) the change process is underpinned by the interrelationships between individuals and stakeholders within an organization. The literature has documented how learning communities and inquiry facilitate individual teacher change for prospective and practicing teachers in a PDS. Further, the evidence also cites that prospective teachers and
university personnel emerge as facilitators of PDS change. However, identifying the interconnectedness between multiple participant roles, learning activities, and PDS resources that support professional learning experiences has been beyond the scope of previous studies. Absent in the empirical literature are studies that sensitively examine how the PDS model creates a learning culture and supports school-wide change efforts while also examining the factors that influence interrelationships and involvement between multiple stakeholders at the K-12 school level.

The theme of learning communities was also a commonality in the PDS change empirical literature related to teacher preparation, inquiry and research, equity/diversity and the development of school/university based faculty. However, the evidence cited remains focused on one aspect of learning communities within the PDS. Learning communities are described as focused on teacher inquiry, technology, prospective teacher, or practicing teacher learning. The evidence does not explore connections between multiple learning communities that may exist within a PDS or how they are positioned to accomplish multiple goals within the PDS. To date, the PDS empirical research has documented how individual teachers or single learning communities within PDSs facilitate school wide change efforts. Also absent in the empirical literature related to school change are the learning experiences of other PDS stakeholders such as principals, supervisors, university faculty, and doctoral students. For this reason, this study investigates how multiple partnership roles and the rituals they engage shift over time and how PDSs create a culture of professional learning that leads to school-wide change around a shared focus.

The purpose of this study is to examine how educators describe their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a PDS focused on creating
a culture of professional learning. Chapter 3 describes the research methodology and study design. Chapter 4 describes the PDS context where the study takes place. Chapter 5 highlights key findings to help readers transition into Chapters 6 and 7 where the findings are described and analyzed in depth. In Chapter 8 conclusions are discussed and implications are drawn from this study to make recommendations for future research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holmes Partnership Goal</th>
<th>Is influenced by:</th>
<th>Empirical Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: High Quality Professional Preparation</td>
<td>Teacher Inquiry</td>
<td>Frey, 2002; Kyed et al., 2003; Levin &amp; Rock, 2003; Snow-Gerono, 2005b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Communities</td>
<td>Chiero, Sherry, &amp; Bohlin, 2003; Frey, 2002; Smith &amp; Robinson, 2003; Teitel, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsive Supervision</td>
<td>Frey, 2002; Gimbert &amp; Nolan, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: School Renewal</td>
<td>Collaborative Planning Focused on K-12 Student Learning Needs</td>
<td>Frey, 2002; Shroyer et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextually Responsive Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>Frey, 2002; Frey &amp; Fisher, 2004; Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez, 2004; Shroyer et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Equity, Diversity and Cultural Competence</td>
<td>Teacher Development within Diverse School Contexts</td>
<td>Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez, 2004; Beardsley and Teitel, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry which Facilitates Teacher Generated Knowledge</td>
<td>Levin &amp; Rock, 2003; Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Scholarly Inquiry and Programs of Research</td>
<td>Research which Disseminates Knowledge about Practice</td>
<td>Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez, 2004; Leonard, Lovelace-Taylor, &amp; Sanford-DeShields, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsive Professional Development</td>
<td>Morrow and Casey, 2004; Frey and Fisher, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: School and University Based Faculty Development</td>
<td>Collaborative Learning Communities through Teacher Inquiry and Research</td>
<td>Chiero, Sherry, Bohlin, and Harris, 2003; Klingner, Leftwich, van Garderen, and Hernandez, 2004; Snow-Gerono, 2005a, 2005b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6: Policy Initiation</td>
<td>University Level Change which Results from PDS Site Outcomes</td>
<td>Beardsley &amp; Teitel, 2004; Shroyer et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

John Goodlad (1984) argues that educational improvement should focus on individual school organizations, the place where interconnected structures, systems, and beliefs come together. School environment interconnectedness contributes to the complexity of school change (Raywid, 1990). Richert, Stoddard, and Kass (2001) suggest that school improvement occurs when collaborative partnerships extend beyond institutional boundaries between schools and other organizations because “reform is so complex and multi-faced that it cannot be done alone” (p. 136). PDS partnerships offer a collaborative vehicle for actualizing educational improvement by merging the work of schools and universities to achieve a common goal, to improve teaching, teacher education, and student learning. According to Tunks and Neapolitan (2007)

Professional development schools integrate the functions of teacher preparation, professional development, inquiry and research, and student achievement in order to bring about whole school improvement and the simultaneous renewal of the teaching profession. (p.3)

In essence, the teaching profession benefits when the mission to improve teacher preparation/education is integrated with the mission to improve schools and student achievement. While growing evidence supports that collaborative school cultures facilitate successful educational change (Fullan, 2007), empirical studies have yet to investigate how specific, activities within a school-university partnerships influence shifts in educator knowledge, changes in classroom practice, and student learning. The purpose of this study is to examine how educators described their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a PDS focused on creating a professional learning culture. This chapter identifies how qualitative research in the interpretivist tradition serves as an appropriate framework for describing the complexity of a changing school culture in one rural elementary PDS. The chapter
also outlines the design of the study including site selection, methods for data collection, data analysis, the role of the researcher, and techniques for enhancing trustworthiness.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical perspectives taken by an investigator inherently guide methodological selections and influence the nature of the research question and the assumptions embedded within the research design (Crotty, 2003). Embracing a qualitative stance toward educational research, this study examines how educators describe their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a PDS focused on creating a culture of professional learning. According to Patton (2002), “qualitative designs are naturalistic to the extent that the research takes place in real world settings…the phenomena unfolds naturally in that it has no predetermined course established by and for the researcher” (p.39). The research question is focused on describing the real world experiences and perspectives of PDS participants in a school environment. Therefore, a qualitative design is well suited to examine the conditions that facilitate and/or inhibit shifts in educational practice and knowledge within the school’s culture.

Using a qualitative research design requires clearly articulating the theoretical orientation that guides methodological decisions. The assumptions that guide the methodological selections within the interpretivist paradigm attend to issues of language, communication, interrelationships, and community (Crotty, 2003). As a result, interpretivism serves as an appropriate theoretical orientation for examining school culture in a PDS. LeCompte & Schensul (1999) define culture as “an abstract construct put together or constructed as people interact with each other and participate in shared activities” (p. 49). The process by which meaning is constructed, negotiated, sustained, and modified by individuals within a contextually bound
environment is the focus of interpretivist research (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Schwandt, 1994).

Interpretivists are researchers who look for the “culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world” (Crotty, 2003, p. 67). Interpretivists view cultural meaning and knowledge as situated within a given context, which assumes that individuals construct meaning through social participation within the culture and are influenced by the conditions under which the social interactions take place (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). This study aims to deepen the understanding of how a PDS brought about shifts in the roles, rituals, and responsibilities of educators in one rural elementary school by describing the socially mediated and situated learning experiences of PDS participants.

This qualitative study utilized ethnographic tools and the techniques of educational sociologists and anthropologists to study the learning culture of one school environment (Beachum & Dentith, 2004; Wolcott, 1994). Hatch (2002) describes ethnography as “a particular kind of qualitative research that seeks to describe culture, or parts of culture, from the point of view of cultural insiders” (pg. 21). Culture in this study was conceptualized by how individuals, activities, and interactions take place within a PDS environment to support meaning and knowledge construction. Ethnographic methods allowed for a deep understanding of how a changing learning culture influenced individuals and their ways of life within a PDS context.

Ethnography is historically rooted in the work of cultural anthropology. Anthropologists study human beings, analyze their way of life, and identify the cultural similarities and differences that exist within and between groups throughout the world (Zaharlick, 1992). While in a traditional ethnography, culture is observed as existing rather than emerging, this research diverges from traditional ethnography since the study sought to understand the process by which a new learning culture (i.e. the PDS) emerged within a school’s culture. As a result, traditional
ethnography was not suitable and instead the study was framed as interpretivist utilizing ethnographic methods to qualitatively research a school’s changing professional learning culture. Applied to educational settings, the ethnographic lens allows researchers to describe school professionals, their daily work within a school culture, as well as the differences and similarities that emerge between individuals and groups within a context over time.

Zarharlik (1992) suggests that ethnographic educational research can provide insight into the complexity of educational contexts and examine the relationship among its many parts revealing more about the impact or success of a particular program than merely reporting an increase in standardized test scores. Applying an ethnographic lens to a study enables researchers to attend to the values and goals of cultural anthropology, as well as to seek out and describe the insiders’ perspective of a culture (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). In order to represent the perspectives of PDS participants, this study embraced an emic perspective by focusing on describing a school’s changing learning culture from the point of view of individuals within the context. Most importantly, the emic perspective captured the diverse perspectives of individuals who participated in the partnership activities using their words, definitions of situations, and opinions to describe the culture (Schwandt, 1994), giving contextualized meaning to the activities that participants attribute to their complex social worlds. Bullough et. al (1997) recommends that longitudinal ethnographic studies are needed to sensitively capture and understand the contextually specific knowledge base of PDS work. Therefore, using an ethnographic lens to examine the learning culture within a PDS can provide researchers and educators insight into the complex contexts of school-university partnerships in order to improve educational practice.
Research Design

The research design includes the unit of analysis and rationale for site and participant selection, as well as data collection, management and analysis strategies. The specific criteria and strategies employed to evaluate the trustworthiness and to enhance the credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability of the study are also described.

Site Selection

The study took place in a rural, public elementary school context in north central Florida. When the fieldwork began in January 2005, the school had just begun a partnership with a large, Research One University. Country Way Elementary became one of ten elementary school sites affiliated with the PDS network and quickly emerged as one of the leading partnership schools within the network. Country Way’s school administrators and a key group of teacher leaders embraced the PDS as a resource to collaboratively support student and teacher learning. As a result, research at this site became important to understand what happened within the partnership to set this school apart from other schools within the PDS network.

The decision to conduct research at Country Way Elementary emerged as a result of convenience, opportunity, and unique case sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002). Researchers can examine rare or unusual cases and the attributes that set a case apart from others by using unique case sampling (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993). A highly engaged principal whose vision for using the PDS as a tool for school reform was unique within the University’s PDS network, making research at Country Way Elementary an opportunity to explore a unique PDS partnership. My role as a researcher, university supervisor, and site coordinator in the newly established PDS provided access to the everyday business of the school context. The emerging school improvement work and rapid advancement of the school-university partnership gave me
an opportunity to systematically study the work of this unique site within the broader PDS network (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Country Way Elementary is a rural Title I P-5 school situated approximately 20 miles from a large Research One university. As of January 2008, the student population had reached just under 600 with approximately 42 instructional teachers and multiple other support staff members. As a part of the PDS partnership, approximately 12-18 regular and special education prospective teachers and 2-3 university supervisors are present each semester. The PDS partnership also engages school leaders, such as the principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT), Reading Coach, Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT), and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) lead teacher, in the ongoing prospective teacher support activities during an on-site seminar. At various time points during the year, university graduate students may also be present conducting research within the site for course projects, training, and dissertation research. As a PDS partnership, multiple prospective teachers, graduate students, in-service teachers, school leaders and university personnel collaboratively and individually inquired into the improvement of teaching and learning within the context. Additionally, university faculty members also provide learning support to school leadership and practicing teachers within the site. The presence of multiple individuals participating within the PDS over a three and a half-year period provides diverse perspectives. In any one semester, 35 individuals participate in PDS partnership activities. Participants included school administrators, in-service mentor teachers, prospective teachers, and university supervisors.

**Role of Researcher**

The primary method by which ethnographers obtain their data is through participant observation, which requires the investigator to become immersed in the culture under study (Patton, 2002). Using an ethnographic lens for this study, the goal was to align the role of the
researcher within the ethnographic tradition through participant observation. Hammersly and Atkinson (1983) describe the role of the ethnographer (i.e. participant observer) as one who “participates, overtly or covertly, in people’s daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions; in fact collecting whatever data are available” (p. 2). According to Zaharlick (1992), an ethnographer utilizes his/her entire persona as a primary research instrument gathering different kinds of information, such as interactions, actions, artifacts and statements of individuals. An ethnographer is a data collector who gathers any and all data available to help make sense of the culture under study (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Zaharlick, 1992). Therefore, participant observation aligns with the ethnographic tradition of research by characterizing how the researcher obtains data. When participant observers spend extended time engaged in fieldwork, many forms of data may become available to help them understand insiders’ cultural knowledge. The role of a qualitative researcher using an ethnographic lens to study a school’s learning culture required participation, observation, and the collection of multiple data sources over an extended period of time. By participating in PDS activities over three and a half years, the researcher observed daily participant activities, gained access to artifacts produced by participants, and gained insight through participant dialogue.

As a researcher “hanging around” this PDS for a three and a half year period, I worked to assume the emic perspective which enabled understanding the context from the perspective of cultural insiders. I was actively and jointly experiencing common activities as a participant and observer within the PDS culture. As a result, my engagement allowed access to the diverse opinions of multiple participants, but also allowed my researcher’s perspective to become one of many diverse points of view used for understanding the school’s changing culture. However, my stance as a participant observer combined with my goal to present an emic perspective required
carefully considering my own personal biases and seeking out multiple perspectives when analyzing and interpreting the data to understand how the roles, rituals, and responsibilities of PDS participants influence a school's learning culture. Seeking multiple perspectives, along with member checking, enhanced the trustworthiness of the findings.

**Data Collection**

Qualitative research that embraces an ethnographic lens draws on three kinds of data collection: 1) interviews; 2) direct observations; and 3) written documents (Patton, 2002). The data collection techniques were aligned with the ethnographic tradition by gathering field notes, contextual artifacts, and interviews.

From January 2005-April 2008, I visited Country Way Elementary School as a participant, observer, and data collector two to three times per week spending between 1-4+ hours per visit. My role as participant and observer was facilitated by my work as the university assigned site-coordinator. As an observer and data collector, I was able to access and gather multiple sources of data which provided insight into the cultural dynamics that emerged over time including written field notes informed by participant observation and dialogue with informants, as well as the collection of various artifacts (Emerson et al., 1995). A detailed account of data sources and the timeline for collection over three and a half years of fieldwork is outlined (Table 3-1). While field notes and contextual artifacts are utilized as primary data sources, I also gathered the narrative accounts of participants captured in interviews to illuminate a deeper understanding of selective individual cases.

**Field notes**

Field notes were gathered from January 2005-April 2008 to document observations, experiences, and insights within the school. Patton (2002) claims that "the researcher’s experiences and insights are an important part of the inquiry and critical to understanding the
phenomenon” (p.40). Therefore, as a participant and observer field notes not only represent accounts of experiences from within the PDS, but also reflected an attempt to make sense of the events as they unfolded. According to Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (1995) field notes are "accounts describing experiences and observations the researcher has made while participating in an intense and involved manner" (p.4-5). The method for writing field notes on the events within Country Way Elementary was recursive in both documentation and interpretation. Additionally, a series of questions informed by Hatch (2002) were used to guide early observations to inform the collection of field notes, and to guide the formation of a descriptive account of events, often in retrospect (Appendix A).

Field notes were jotted down both during and after field site visits, which included informal and formal meetings with informants, formal observations of prospective teachers, informal observations of classroom teaching, and informal conversations with informants. Occasionally, handwritten notes were taken during formal meetings and observations. Notes gathered during formal meetings typically reflected an approximate account of what was said, and who said it (see for example, Appendix B). The notes produced during formal meetings were used as a reference, and as a springboard for additional interpretations and questions at a later time. In most cases, additional field notes were constructed using the handwritten raw notes within a day or two of the initial event. These notes were formally recorded in a field note document maintained on my computer. Thus, handwritten notes served as artifacts to document the event and later informed my understandings of the event in retrospect, which enabled new field notes to be constructed based on participants’ impressions of the event. Field notes were constructed during one formal Writing Committee meeting and later I inserted additional observations and interpretations to make sense of events that occurred during and after the meeting (Appendix C). The movement from handwritten observational meeting notes to a more
interpretative and experiential account of the event is the premise of the research protocol. According to Hatch (2002), research protocols reflect a sense of “being in the research scene” by including details and elements that raw field notes may have left off (p.82).

Early field notes account for specific events and the emerging understandings that resulted from the events. At various points during fieldwork, reflections on initial observations were used to formulate new understandings. New insights were noted through the process of dating and bracketing developments over time. The dating and bracketing strategy helped me develop a personal strategy for documenting the experiences and events of the participants within the site over time, and enabled me to organize thoughts and writing more effectively (Emerson et al., 1995). In addition, the strategy provided an "audit trail" of the research process (Patton, 2002, p.93) that will enhance the trustworthiness of the findings.

Artifacts

Artifacts are materials/documents that are produced by individuals within a given context to collaborate and contrast researcher observation (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). Therefore, artifacts were consulted to illustrate participant thinking about concepts, situations, and events that emerged within the PDS over time. Artifacts produced during regular site activities included: 1) lesson plans written by prospective teachers and their reflections on the lessons, 2) faculty and mentor meeting agendas, 3) inquiry documents created by prospective teachers and graduate students, 4) audio-taped conversations of coaching, 5) book study blog entries, 6) email communication between PDS participants, 7) video-taped interviews, 8) photographs, 9) power-point presentations created by PDS participants, and 10) audio-taped presentations. Additionally, data also included archival sources such as interview transcripts from prior research studies where site participants were consulted as informants. The artifacts documented the work of the PDS and proved valuable in this study by offering insight into the range of activities participants
experienced over time. The artifacts also provided evidence of how participants were engaged in teaching and learning activities within the culture and provided a means to triangulate data sources during the final stages of analysis.

**Participant stories**

Written and interview narratives were consulted to provide a deeper understanding of the shifting roles, rituals, and responsibilities of PDS participants within a school’s learning culture. Lee, Rosenfeld, Mendenhall, Rivers and Tynes (2004) describe the benefit of narrative as a window into culture, citing that narrative “is a powerful tool that although universal, unfolds and acts in culturally specific ways” (p. 39). Participant stories, or narratives, became valuable sources of data for understanding the diverse experiences of PDS participants. Patton (2002) states, “stories and narratives offer especially translucent windows into cultural and social meanings” (p. 116). For this reason, participant stories were gathered both formally and informally to clarify and better understand individual experiences within the school culture.

Formal narrative materials were garnered from participants in the form of written reports and narrative interviews. According to Rock (2001), materials produced within the site by participants can provide insights into the thinking of participants because "the narrative held within traces on the artifact has an overall form that has been produced by multiple individuals and groups". Written narrative reports gathered in the form of course papers, power point presentations, and reflection journals documented participant journeys and insights within the PDS at specific time points during the study. Informal dialogue with PDS participants, captured in the form of field notes, were another means for gathering participant stories during routine site visits.
Dialogical interviews

During the final months of fieldwork at Country Way Elementary data was also collected as part of the fourth and final level of data analysis through formal dialogical interviews (Carspecken, 1996) or informal conversational interviews (Patton, 2002) with nine PDS participants. The interviews were used to gain an in-depth understanding of the participants’ actions, attitudes, beliefs, and understanding of their PDS work. Interviews generated dialogical data and are used by critical ethnographers to generate meanings from the participants’ point of view by discussing how and why the events of a situation or interaction transpired (Carspecken, 1996). In a final effort to member check and “get it right” from the participants’ perspective, participant voices from the dialogic interviews are used to describe experiences and tell the story of the changing learning culture of the PDS. During dialogical interviewing I conversed intensively with the participants through dialogue and discussion. This stage generated information with the participants, thus democratizing the research process (Carspecken, 1996).

The dialogical interviews were semi-structured using three separate interview protocols designed for school leadership, in-service teachers, and university personnel (Appendix D). Case records, created during the third level of analysis, were used to produce a timeline of cultural events and identify participants who displayed active involvement in the multiple partnership initiatives for at least 18 months. In order to draw out diverse aspects of educator knowledge, classroom practices, and student learning the interview questions were adapted slightly for each of four distinct participant groups 1) school leadership, 2) classroom teachers, 3) prospective teachers, and 4) university personnel. The interview guide was used as a springboard to facilitate conversation rather than an explicit guide. Interview questions and protocols were submitted to the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) and approved prior to the solicitation of participants. At the beginning of each interview, participants were informed of their rights and
asked to sign an informed consent document. Participants’ names have been changed in order to protect their identity, as well as the names of other individuals revealed during the interviews.

Nine participants were selected based on their active involvement in the work of teacher education, writing reform and/or inclusion. Three university faculty members were selected due to their support roles: one in teacher education, one in writing reform, and one in inclusion. Two school leaders, the principal and CRT, were selected due to their consistent and active engagement in PDS activities. Four in-service teachers who actively participated in all partnership initiatives were selected due to their understanding of diverse perspectives of each initiative. One of the in-service teachers interviewed also completed her pre-internship and internship as a prospective teacher at the site before being hired as an in-service teacher. Her perspective helps give insight into how the Country Way PDS teacher preparation activities contributed to her teaching practice as an in-service teacher.

The new data generated during the interviews served two important purposes. First, the data allowed the participant and researcher to collaboratively search for alternative explanations (Marshall & Rossman, 1999) and disconfirming evidence that challenged themes and patterns previously developed (Patton, 2002). Second, the data and discussion provided an open forum for discussing the data, themes and patterns that had been generated and for strengthening the findings using analyst triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002). This was especially important in this study because the focus was on describing the learning culture from the participants’ viewpoint (Moustakas, 1994). All conversational interviews were audio taped and transcribed as soon as possible after each interview. As outlined in the previous section, an additional phase of narrative analysis was conducted using HyperResearch to uncover findings related specifically to the research question.
The primary purpose of the interviews was to return to the participants in order to elicit multiple perspectives on the specifics roles, events, and outcomes that held personal relevance and to give voice to the lived experiences of participants as they describe the learning culture of the PDS. Long-term engagement over three and a half years within the site enabled the participants and myself to collaboratively revisit specific time points and critical events that took place with the PDS, aiding the flow of conversation during interviews. At that point, member checking allowed me to reshape critical events from the perspective of PDS participants.

Data Analysis

The process that researchers utilize to interpret stories or the texts that tell the stories is at the heart of narrative analysis (Patton, 2002). To examine the stories of change within Country Way Elementary, I approached the process of analysis at four levels. First, I examined my contextual artifacts and field notes to identify the specific evidence that warranted deeper analysis. Case records were constructed to classify and organize voluminous amounts of raw data into data files (Patton, 2002). Second, case records and data files were used to identify critical roles, events, and outcomes within the PDS. Third, a thematic and content analysis associated with narrative analysis was conducted using the critical roles, events, and outcomes that emerged from the second level of analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Patton, 2002) using HyperResearch to form preliminary themes. Finally, member checking was used through dialogical interview analysis (Carspeken, 1996). Case records, dialogical interview, and narrative analysis were the overarching tools used across four highly interactive phases of analysis. Analyzing the data at four levels provided deep insight into how PDS educators’ describe their shifting roles, rituals, and responsibilities as a professional learning culture is created. These four levels include:

- Level 1-Case record development (Patton, 2002)
• Level 2-Identification of critical roles, events, and outcomes using holistic-content reading (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998)
• Level 4-Member checking through dialogical interview analysis (Carspeken, 1997)

Case records

The process of selecting and creating cases as an ethnographic tool draws upon Stake’s (1994) rationale for studying a case and Patton’s (2002) definition of a case. Stake (1994) describes that context can be a significant factor in influencing behavior; he states “the boundedness and the behavior patterns of the system are key factors in understanding the case“ (p. 237). Therefore, in order to describe individual cases or perspectives within the context, the researcher must also understand what is happening in the broader context. Following the recommendation of Stake (1994), cases are used in this study to choose the “object to be studied” (p. 236). According to Patton (2002), “a case can be a person, an event, a program, an organization, a time period, a critical incident, or a community” (p. 55). In this study, time periods, partnership initiatives, and participants were used as case units to organize the data, respectively. Case records were used at two levels of analysis. First, case records were developed to outline partnership initiatives and participants over time. Second, the case records helped identify critical participants, roles, events, and outcomes of the PDS work within multiple partnership initiatives. The process of creating case records was recursive. The cultural dynamics of the PDS emerged as the organizing analysis units shifted from time points at the first level of analysis toward partnership initiatives during the second level of analysis.

At the first level of analysis, the data were organized into data files based on selective case units, first by time period and later by partnership initiative, to develop a deeper understanding of the school culture over three years of PDS engagement. Three case records were the final
product of the level one and two analysis reflecting an account of each specific initiative (i.e. shared commitment for teacher education, writing reform, and inclusion), the specific activities associated with the initiative, participants within each activity, and the time point for each activity. An example of one case record reflecting the focus, activities, and participants associated with a shared commitment for teacher education can be found at the end of this chapter (Table 3-3).

Identifying cases at the second level of qualitative analysis was the primary method used to organize and reduce the data. Additionally, the use of an ethnographic lens in this study makes it important to consult several cases within the school context because a key feature of ethnographic research is the need for researchers to work towards “deeply understanding specific cases within a particular context” (Patton, 2002, p. 546). To develop a deep understanding of the roles, rituals, and responsibilities within each partnership initiative the critical roles, events, and outcomes of PDS participants were examined. The critical events are also organized by focus and time-points to illustrate transitional phases over time. The product of the second level of analysis is reflected in three tables, which were developed to illustrate a timeline of critical events, roles, and outcomes of PDS work. Table 3-4 provides an example of the critical event table for the teacher education focus used during dialogical interviews with participants.

In this study, the case records allowed me to organize my data into files for each partnership initiative. Data files were created to compile all data sources into one location in order to arrange multiple data sources in chronological order by the three different partnership initiatives, then all case records and data files were re-read to gain an in-depth understanding of the data. Prior to moving on to the third level of analysis, the roles, events, and outcomes tables were used as a reference to sort through the entire data set to aid in identifying any missing
components related to the focus of the study, to understand how the roles, rituals and responsibilities of the PDS participants shifted over time. According to Steinhouse (1994, as cited by Stake), case records reflect both the process of learning about a case and the product of our learning. Based on the case records and the data files, unique cases or perspectives within the site were identified for additional interviews and follow up. Specifically, the individuals that appeared to overlap within the three partnership initiatives were consulted to identify additional events and critical incidents. This process allowed for the verification and/or addition of events, participants, and outcomes, which enabled a deeper understanding of the changing school culture at Country Way Elementary. The unique cases highlighted opportunities for deeper analysis using narrative analysis.

**Narrative analysis**

Narrative analysis was used at the third stage of analysis to provide insight into the thinking of participants and the social context of the school culture by analyzing artifacts and interview data (Rock, 2001, Carspeckan, 1997). Artifacts produced by various participants within the PDS provided evidence of the learning culture and offered a framework for deeper analysis. For this study, narrative analysis occurred at two phases, first to analyze the critical events and outcomes of the PDS work and second to analyze the dialogic interviews conducted with select informants. All narrative analysis was conducted using HyperResearch, a computer program that assists with the qualitative data analysis.

During the first phase of narrative analysis, the case records and data files were used to identify the critical roles, events, and outcomes. To analyze the narratives within the data, holistic content reading and content analysis were used to develop a deeper understanding of participants roles, rituals and responsibilities within the PDS culture (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998). First, the entire data set was read to identify critical incidents that best
illustrated the school culture at various time-points and aligned each event within its partnership focus. After developing a narrative account of the school culture using critical incidents and typical/unique cases from each time-point, a process called holistic-content reading was used to recreate the story and the content of each narrative (Lieblich et al., 1998). Using a holistic-content reading of each case allowed me to develop a deeper understanding and draw out specific concepts that characterized each partnership initiative from the raw data and from the dialogic interviews conducted with select informants.

The second phase of narrative analysis was conducted after dialogic interviews with seven participants were complete. A categorical-content approach to narrative analysis referred to as content analysis was used to examine the dialogic interview transcripts (Lieblich et al., 1998). Content analysis, a process of inductively searching for and discovering patterns and themes, was utilized to draw out within and cross-case themes from the data and develop preliminary claims (Patton, 2002).

**Presenting the stories**

A researcher’s ability to balance and negotiate writing between that of a participant and that of an observer is a crucial challenge when describing culture (VanMaanen, 1988). As a researcher, I had to make a conscious decision about my role in the final narrative account of the PDS as both a participant and an observer. As an observer, I had access to intimate cultural dynamics through extensive time spent with participants in various settings. As a participant I brought my own experiences and new understandings to the fieldwork that influenced my own learning within the PDS. After dialogical interviews were conducted, I was faced with a new dilemma, how to handle the emergence of myself as a significant character on the PDS stage. During dialogical interviews, my relationship with the participants made the sense-making process naturally unfold. In many cases, the participants brought up “you” or “your willingness”
or “your role” as they described events and experiences that influenced the learning culture of the PDS. My decision to represent myself as one of many characters/participants within the PDS was a decision that I settled on to aid the telling of the PDS story while honoring the participants’ perspectives. The benefit of this approach is that my perspective as a participant could be included as one of many perspectives shared within the PDS story. The limitation of this approach is that my role as a researcher in the PDS story is not as transparent to the reader. As a participant-observer, I transitioned back and forth during the writing process between my role as a participant and my role as an observer, much like the pendulum that VanMaanen (1988) describes as characteristic of writing between “two cultures” (p. 138).

The illustrations that I created to tell the stories of the PDS and its participants drew upon VanMaanen’s realist tales and the polyvocal approach to ethnographic writing (Spindler & Hammond, 2006). VanMaanen (1988) characterizes realist tales as an interpretive account of the native’s point of view. To tell the realist tale of the PDS I transitioned from an observer into the role of narrator to present the data. Yet, in an effort to accurately represent the multiple voices and analysis of participants, I infused participant quotes from dialogical interviews into the final illustrations. My analysis of participant perspectives serves as the overarching organizing framework for the PDS stories. I utilized direct quotes to strengthen participant perspectives, while my own voice as a participant-observer is interwoven through field notes and archival documents. Thus, narrating through a third person voice provided me with an approach to tell the story of the Country Way PDS while also shifting between my role as a participant and an observer within the context.

**Researcher Statement**

Hatch (2002, citing Goodall) defines reflexivity as “the process of personally and academically reflecting on lived experiences in ways that reveal deep connections between the
writer and his or her subject” (p. 10-11). Reflexivity is an important component in preserving the integrity of qualitative research. For this purpose, I reflected on and considered my own experiences with teaching, schools, and change to identify potential bias.

My educational career experiences, beliefs and values about teaching may produce potential biases. During my five and a half year career as an elementary school teacher I experienced the opportunity to work in four different school contexts in three different states. Each school context provided me a new lens on teaching and influenced my beliefs and values about teaching in very different ways. Further, the act of frequently changing school environments and having to learn to adapt to ways of life in new school contexts undoubtedly influenced the way I integrate myself into new school contexts. My own career experiences with school change, teacher resistance/acceptance to learning, and administrative support inevitably shape my beliefs and values about school change.

During the five years of my teaching career, I experienced many changes in school environments. My first three years of teaching took place in primary grades (i.e. 2, 3) within two elementary schools in separate districts in northern Georgia. Despite the diversity in settings, rural versus suburban, there were distinct similarities in the ways that the schools functioned, structured curriculum, and promoted instruction. Both schools were very team oriented, there was a team leader that was positioned to guide and support the grade level teachers. The “team” orientation was characterized primarily by joint planning and ensuring that common experiences were promoted for all students across the grade level. Team planning largely consisted of the sharing/copying of lesson plans, spelling lists, and worksheets across classrooms. Both schools provided a network of support through this team for me as a beginning teacher. In many ways, this support extended by team leaders promoted conforming to a common standard of practice across the team. However, the trials and tribulations within my own classroom prompted me to
question the way I was meeting diverse students needs in my classroom. Contrasting differences existed between school contexts as I searched for new approaches to teaching within team-focused environments at each school.

My experiences with team and administrative support in diverse school contexts could produce possible bias in this study. In my first teaching experience, I had a supportive principal, team leader, and grade level team as well as other collaborative peers within the school and district level support for new teachers. In this team setting, I was offered support but was given the autonomy to pick and choose the extent to which I determined the team level plans appropriate for my own teaching style and my own classroom of students. While I did not witness other teachers on our team moving away from the team’s standard of practice at our grade level, the team leader supported my need for something different. Her collegial approach to team leadership was appropriately supportive to me as a beginning teacher, while she also provided me with the professional space to try out new ideas in my classroom. My experiences with her team leadership style and the professional respect she extended to me as a beginning teacher has positively influenced my beliefs about the role of teacher leadership in schools.

On the other hand, my experience with seeking out new strategies the following year proved problematic. My second and third year, I transitioned to a new school to teach third grade math, science, and social studies in a rural school setting which was made up of only one elementary school in the county. In this teaching experience, I team taught with other third grade teachers, and content area teams supported curriculum planning and implementing center-based learning activities in math, science, and social studies. The math and science team “collaboratively” planned; however, in this example, the team leader assumed the lead by creating the scope and sequence of the plans as well as the activities students would complete. As a team, our instruction largely consisted of many written activities through workbook pages
and worksheets across most curriculum areas. Being a member of this team was a passive exercise for me, and when I finally started to examine and propose new ways to approach teaching math and science in this setting, I experienced unexpected resistance. Interestingly, the congenial team leader gave the perception that it was okay to experiment with new ideas. Although team leader support appeared evident, I had unknowingly disrupted the status quo in a way that presented discomfort for the team leader. As a result I soon noticed that the school level administrators were increasingly watchful of my classroom instruction. At times, I felt I was under a microscope with someone looking for failure so they could then question my decisions. I learned from this experience the importance of being able establish trusting relationships with team members and how teachers’ resistance to change can influence the school political environment. I also learned that teachers who question the status quo pose a threat to other teachers who resist change. My experience with the team leader’s congenial façade and lack of administrative support within this context has negatively shaped my perception of individuals who may be resistant to changes in instruction. This experience also influenced my understanding of the politics of school environments.

My own experiences and goals for bridging theory and practice directly influenced my interest in working within the PDS partnership. As a graduate of the teacher preparation program that is part of this study, I bring to my PDS interactions specific goals for teacher education. During my second and third year as a teacher my interest in supporting the learning of new teachers emerged. I felt that there were new perspectives and different ways of support that I could offer prospective and beginning teachers given my own frustrations with learning to bridge theory and practice. My early classrooms did not reflect the pedagogy that I valued from my college courses, and the professional challenge that I faced attempting to enact change was met with minimal support. After consulting with various individuals, it was during this time that I
first looked into expanding my education. Learning to apply the knowledge from my university teacher preparation program to my own classroom was a source of great frustration. My own feelings of frustration as a beginning teacher greatly shape my goals for teacher education, to support educators in blending theory and practice in an environment where experimentation, risk-taking, and continuous improvement are fostered and promoted. My goals for teacher education are particularly well suited and actualized in a collaborative environment and as a result directly influence the values that I bring to PDS work.

My third teaching experience proved to be the culmination of many highlights in my teaching career. Teaching third grade in a private K-8 school setting in a major Texas city was my first experience with putting theory to practice due to the expectations, goals, and support within the school environment. I learned quickly in this setting that while the school may be striving to achieve a common goal, teacher resistance to change continues to exist. However, unlike previous experiences, in this setting teacher resistance was an exception rather than the norm and the professional dispositions of the faculty supported a culture of continuous improvement, support, and collegiality. This teaching experience was where I learned to implement Reading and Writing Workshop, hands-on math instruction, differentiated instruction, and project-based learning. For the first time in my teaching career, I felt that I was given the true autonomy to try new things, the opportunity to expand my own learning in meaningful ways, and the peer and administrative support that enabled me to refine my instruction. During this experience, I was provided my first opportunity to assume a teacher leadership role. Serving as a team leader and new teacher support staff, I participated in team leader administrative and grade level meetings and also supported new faculty in implementing the instructional approaches such as Writers’ Workshop. This teaching experience helped me align my pedagogy with my beliefs about how students should learn. It was in this environment that I learned about
experimentation, risk taking, and the importance of creating a culture of support. Further, in this school context I was able to collaborate with like-minded professionals who demonstrated a passion for teaching children and were always working to refine their practice and bring fresh ideas into the classroom. By the end of my fifth year teaching, I was finally in a place that helped me become the kind of teacher I wanted to be. In this environment, I experienced the feelings of uncertainty and vulnerability that ensue when implementing instructional innovations. At this point in my career, I was planning my move back to the city where I attended college and began the process of applying for the graduate program at the same university where I completed my teacher preparation program. This experience influenced my beliefs about the power that learning organizations can hold in enacting a common approach to instruction and how the nature of the support from peers and administrators can facilitate professional learning. My personal experiences inevitably shape my beliefs about school and individual teacher change within a supportive school context.

My beginning experiences at the university level also shaped my values about teacher education within school-university partnerships. I was directly involved in planning meetings as the PDS network at the university was conceptualized and designed. During these meetings, I listened and observed the conceptual thinking and organizational planning that went into the launch of the PDS network. For this reason, the values that underpin my own work at the PDS school site initially reflected the broader goals and values of the university in actualizing partnerships with individual school sites. However, over time my experiences with supporting the implementation of a beginning PDS has rekindled feelings of sensitivity toward classroom teachers and prospective teachers seeking to learn about or implement instructional innovations. My passion for supporting classroom professionals as they learn to enact new classroom strategies and connect theory and practice underpins my desire to connect my work in the PDS.
My personal experiences have shaped the way that I perceive change, teacher resistance, risk taking, and the role of support when learning to implement new instructional strategies. Additionally, my experiences and beliefs about connecting theory and practice are embedded in my work within the PDS. The factors in this reflexivity statement that could lead to potential bias are teacher resistance, risk taking, role of support, and my passion for helping teachers connect theory and practice.

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness and authenticity have been proposed as criteria to judge qualitative research within constructivism inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Guba and Lincoln (1994) relate trustworthiness to a systematic research process, which addresses issues of *credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability*. Following the suggestions of Lincoln and Guba (1985), prolonged engagement, member checks, source triangulation, rich thick description, and a reflective journal were utilized as strategies to enhance the trustworthiness of this study.

Clearly articulating the conditions and criteria utilized to arrive at the study’s results demonstrates communication of method and promotes the integrity of analysis, a necessary process to enhance credibility (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982; Patton, 2002). Credibility was established in this study through prolonged engagement, referential adequacy materials, member checks, and source triangulation. Prolonged engagement has been identified as one criterion for evaluating trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Zarharlick (1992) recommends a year as a minimum for fieldwork when trying to understand aspects of culture. The criteria for prolonged engagement was addressed in this study by spending three and a half years engaged in fieldwork at the PDS site. Referential adequacy materials are the “context-rich, holistic materials that provide background meaning to support data analysis, interpretation, and audits” (Erlandson,
Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993, p. 137). Through prolonged engagement context-rich materials, such as photographs, videotapes, audiotapes, and documents produced by multiple participants have been gathered as referential adequacy materials to support the credibility of the research by providing an audit trail, which aids in communicating meaning from within the culture.

Member checks were utilized as a strategy for enhancing credibility in order to verify the accuracy of participants’ perspectives (Patton, 2002; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Member checks were used in this study to preserve the perspectives of participants, an important element of interpretive research. Participants were asked to review the timelines created during the third level of analysis during the dialogic interview to provide confirming and disconfirming perspectives on the record produced during analysis. Additionally, participants reviewed and verified the accuracy of the dialogic interview transcripts so that an accurate portrayal of PDS participant perspectives is provided. The interviews provided an opportunity to gain support in “getting it right” from the participants themselves. For this study, member checking was used to cross check and illuminate the critical roles, events, and outcomes that were identified by the researcher during the second level of analysis with the stories participants shared during dialogic interviews. Member checking was used as an additional effort to accurately represent PDS participant perspectives, which will enhance the trustworthiness of the findings.

Triangulation was also utilized to demonstrate trustworthiness in this study. Participant triangulation was conducted through comparing the perspectives of diverse PDS participants and source triangulation was established by comparing data sources. Patton (2002) states, “different kinds of data can be brought together in a case study to illuminate various aspects of a phenomenon” (p.559). Data gathered from participant stories, field notes, and contextual artifacts were used to identify the roles, rituals, and responsibilities of PDS participants in a changing school context within three partnership initiatives. Further, interview data from PDS participants
was triangulated with field notes, referential adequacy materials, and artifacts to determine unique/typical cases, to reveal themes across cases, and to form preliminary claims. The process of identifying typical and unique cases enhanced the study’s credibility by demonstrating an authentic search for meaning. Triangulation of sources and participants also enhances the confirmability of the study by considering the consistency of information between individuals and data sources.

Rich thick descriptions were used to address issues related to the study’s credibility and transferability. Patton (2002) defines thick descriptions as “using rich, detailed, and concrete descriptions of people and places…in such way that we can understand the phenomenon studied and draw our own interpretations about meaning and significance” (p. 438). Thick descriptions are used in this study to illuminate and describe the changing school culture at Country Way Elementary.

Finally, a reflexive journal was selected as a strategy to enhance trustworthiness by attending to issues related to the study’s credibility, confirmability, and dependability. An example of one reflexive journal entry is provided (Appendix E). The process of keeping a reflexive journal is similar to keeping a diary where regular entries are made about the researcher, researcher subjectivity, logistics, and reasoning behind methodological decisions as the process of data collection and analysis unfolds (Erlandson et al., 1993). The journal became part of an audit trail, a process used to assess the quality of analysis, and also enhanced the dependability and credibility for this research study (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002). The reflexive journal helped to enhance confirmability by providing a space to explore my own subjectivity throughout the process of analysis. Transferability was enhanced through the use of the journal by describing a systematic analysis process that could be duplicated by other researchers.
Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to examine how educators describe their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a PDS focused on creating a culture of professional learning. The use of the ethnographic lens within this qualitative research study relied on participant observation to gather multiple data sources. The multiple data sources collected and analyzed in this study provide a vehicle for understanding how a PDS brought about shifts in the roles, rituals, and responsibilities of educators in one rural elementary school by describing the learning experiences of PDS participants. The following chapters provide more in depth descriptions of the study’s context and critical finding that emerged during the study. Chapter 4 sets the stage by describing the context of the school-university partnership work. Chapter 5 provides an overview of the findings. Chapters 6 and 7 illustrate and analyze the findings, and Chapter 8 discusses the finding and draws conclusions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the Data</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Timeline for Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Meetings</td>
<td>Field Notes and Agendas</td>
<td>Dec. 2004-April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Teacher Meetings</td>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>April 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings w/Principal and PDC Coordinator</td>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>August 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Teacher Interviews</td>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>Aug. 2005- April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Teacher Instructional Lessons Focused on Writing</td>
<td>Lesson Plan and Reflection forms</td>
<td>Aug. 2005- April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Teacher Inquiry Focused on Writing</td>
<td>Prospective Teacher Inquiry Research Notes, written papers, and student work</td>
<td>April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Committee Meetings</td>
<td>Field Notes from meetings</td>
<td>Sept. 2005-April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student Research</td>
<td>Research papers</td>
<td>May 2006-December 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Coaching Sessions</td>
<td>Lesson plans, audio taped pre/post conferences, observation notes</td>
<td>March 2006-April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Research</td>
<td>Presentations and written reports</td>
<td>August 2005- April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAE Class Reflections</td>
<td>Field Notes and artifacts</td>
<td>Jan. 2006-April 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Research</td>
<td>5 research papers</td>
<td>May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 2005- April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Meeting (with district advisor)</td>
<td>Field Notes and artifacts</td>
<td>9-20-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Teacher Lesson Plans</td>
<td>Lesson Plan and reflections</td>
<td>Aug. 2005- April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interviews</td>
<td>Video taped interviews</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogical Interviews</td>
<td>Audio taped interviews</td>
<td>April 2008-July 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3-2. Spring 2006 typology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles for Professional Development (Rituals)</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole School Writing Committee: Oct.2005-June 2006</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Fiona Denlin</td>
<td>UF Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>G B</td>
<td>5th Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Bates</td>
<td>4th Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T H</td>
<td>3rd Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S W</td>
<td>2nd Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K D</td>
<td>1st Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KMK</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabrielle Aires</td>
<td>PDC Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator/Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Study #1: Jan.-May 2006</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog entries</td>
<td>A K</td>
<td>Reading Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G B</td>
<td>5th Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Bates</td>
<td>4th Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>4th Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Townsend</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J W</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns with Writing Inquiry: Jan.-Apr. 2006</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>5th Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Papers</td>
<td>Olivia Susa</td>
<td>5th Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Denise Mason</td>
<td>5th Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T M</td>
<td>2nd Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>2nd Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>1st Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>1st Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Class: Jan.-Apr. 2006</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research projects</td>
<td>Gabrielle Aires</td>
<td>PDC Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>R N</td>
<td>Coordinator/Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>E E</td>
<td>5th Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessica Perry</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Coaching: Mar.-Apr. 2006</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>5th Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiotapes</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>5th Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>5th Grade Pre-Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation notes</td>
<td>Gabrielle Aires</td>
<td>PDC Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>D ec 04</td>
<td>Ja n. 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Bates</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LK</td>
<td>Gabrielle Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>S Desto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*as part of WC
Table 3-3 Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrated Teaching Pre-Intern Seminar</th>
<th>DA » Intern F05</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>KM » Sp.Ed Intern</th>
<th>EW</th>
<th>NK » Intern S08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>KDC » Sp.Ed Intern</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>AS » Intern F06</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>MOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>RL</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>LB » Intern F07</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>JG » Intern F07</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>KG</td>
<td>JG » Intern F07</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>JN</td>
<td>GV</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Gabrielle Aires</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>KD</td>
<td>EMK</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>AW » Intern F06</td>
<td>Deanna Rizer</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Lee Van Crist</td>
<td>SH » Intern F07</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Olivia Susa</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Christy James</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy James</td>
<td>Mason » Intern F06</td>
<td>Jessica Perry</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas White</td>
<td>Gabrielle Aires</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>CJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Regan Lundsford</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>CJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy James</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Gabrielle Aires</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>CJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas White</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Gabrielle Aires</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>CJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

» Denotes prospective teacher who returned in a future semester for additional field placements and/or was hired as a classroom teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time point</th>
<th>Critical Events for Teacher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>New PDC schools are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah connects with Regan via JB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regan shares idea with faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah presents goals to faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty agree to try out the PDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabrielle and JZ meet with Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal meetings with PDC Mentors begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>IT Seminar and SS courses taught on school site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal PDC meeting between Regan and Gabrielle begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regan and Christy participate in on-site seminars for pre-interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tensions emerge with supporting some pre-interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors express frustration with lack of clear guidelines for their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regan examines pre-intern feedback on mentors/site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some mentors are optimistic about the impact of Inquiry on students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors begin using pre-interns to facilitate small group instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both Regan and Gabrielle conduct exit interviews with pre-interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>Regan begins doctoral program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Struggling intern needs explicit planning support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors analyze pre-intern feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interns become a part of Fall PDC work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA returns to GB class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>A pre-intern cohort with literacy specializations enter the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-intern inquiries focus on literacy aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tensions emerge with the implementation of pre-intern writing lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regan, Christy, and Thomas present at on-site seminar meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Pre-Intern cohort with special education specialization enter site: Deanna and Lee supervise; Jessica P. supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 pre-interns return for internship with same mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regan, Thomas, and Christy facilitate on-site seminars for interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classrooms begin work to implement writers workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All interns and pre-interns and supervisors attend welcome back breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tensions between conflicting agendas with pre-intern supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor meetings become more mentor focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christy, Regan, and Gabrielle collaboratively plan for Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors become frustrated with intern assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Jennifer Townsend becomes part of the presentation circuit in IT seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regan leads seminar, Christy supervises half of pre-interns, Gabrielle supervises other half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regan experiences union challenges b/c of teaching IT seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>IH support interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regan appoints KP to take on role as school based PDC site coordinator, begins leading mentor meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer coaching emerges between SPED intern and pre-intern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
CONTEXTUALIZING THE PDS

This chapter describes the components of both the university teacher education program and the Country Way Elementary School context. The university program components provide insight into the emphasis of the program and the specific semesters that served as PDS entry points. A descriptive account of the PDS work at Country Way Elementary illustrates the school context and the activities/resources activated to respond to three specific school improvement initiatives.

The Unified Elementary PROTEACH Program

Goodlad (1986) called for the restructuring of educator preparation so that future teachers can learn how to meet the needs of diverse student populations. In the mid 1990s, in response to a growing need to prepare educators for teaching students with diverse cultural and learning needs, the faculty at the University of Florida collaboratively restructured the five-year teacher preparation model to include a dual emphasis on elementary and special education. Two interrelated themes guided the program development: democratic values and knowledge of content and inclusive pedagogy. These two themes underpin the Unified Elementary Proteach Program at the University of Florida (Bondy & Ross, 2005).

Within the Unified Elementary Proteach (UEP) program, the theme of democratic values requires an ethic of responsibility, continuous inquiry and reflection, and professional accountability. According to Ross, Lane, and McCallum (2005),

Teachers within a democratic society must be committed to the value of equity in education and society. They must be able to work collaboratively with colleagues, families, and members of the community to develop alternative ways of educating our diverse population. In addition, teachers must accept responsibility for the learning of ALL children within our schools (p. 54).
The theme of democratic values is embedded within course work and varied community/field experiences in the UEP program, fostering knowledge and abilities of future educators to support the learning of a diverse student population.

The UEP program also places an emphasis on content and inclusive pedagogy. The program is designed to support prospective teachers’ understanding of the content areas they will teach as well as strategies for acquiring new information because, “In today’s world content knowledge is constantly changing and expanding, teachers increasingly will be asked to make decisions about what and how to teach” (Ross, Lane, and McCallum, 2005, p.54). To help prospective teachers develop pedagogical knowledge and learn how to make informed instructional decisions based on student needs, the program promotes participation in learning communities, demonstration of content knowledge and inclusive teaching practices, and effective communication.

Field experiences in the UEP program were designed with a commitment to school and community partnerships. The field experiences have been characterized by: a) strong links between campus courses and fieldwork, b) offering interdisciplinary experiences, c) the use of technology, and d) modifying the collaboration models prospective teachers experience at various time-points within the program (i.e. moving from dyad observation/teaching to solo teaching opportunities). In Preparing Teachers for Inclusive Teaching (2005), Bondy and Ross, provide specific details about the field experience opportunities provided for prospective teachers during each semester in the UEP program. The focus for this study emphasizes the UEP’s entry point into the PDS work during semester eight (the second semester of the senior year) and the master’s program internship.
During semester eight, referred to as the pre-internship semester, seniors in the UEP program simultaneously participate in an intensive field experience and take three core courses. The pre-internship pairs prospective teachers into dyads and places them in PDS classrooms for four days a week across 16 weeks. The prospective teachers spend 16 hours each week collaborating and co-teaching with each other and their classroom mentor teacher. During semester eight, pre-interns are enrolled in Intermediate Reading, Social Studies Methods, and the Integrated Teaching Seminar. As a part of their coursework in each of these classes, pre-interns are required to implement specific activities and lessons within their placement classrooms, which are intended to help actively connect theory and practice through inquiry.

The graduate internship engages prospective teachers in a full time field experience. Full time graduate interns collaborate with a classroom mentor teacher during the entire instructional day and during after school planning for 14 weeks. During the first five weeks of their placement, interns are on site four days a week, and during weeks 6-14 interns spend five days a week in their placement classrooms. During the graduate internship a three-hour course is required each Wednesday afternoon where interns meet as a large group to discuss readings and assignments. Additionally, all interns meet weekly with their intern supervisors.

**Professional Development Communities**

In the fall of 2004, faculty members from the department of special education and elementary education met with two school-university partnership principals. In the meeting they discussed new ways to position the cohort-based field experiences during the Integrated Teaching semester and broaden the scope of placement experiences positioned within school-university partnerships. While the UEP had a long-term relationship with the University Laboratory School, deep levels of collaboration were not present within other elementary schools within the neighboring county. As a result of positive collaborative experiences within two rural
school-university partnerships, an attempt to institutionalize the model across multiple sites
became the focus of the Professional Development Communities (PDCs). The PDCs, influenced
by the work of the Holmes Group, were being added to provide all prospective teachers within
the UEP program with an intensive field experience committed to issues of diversity and
democratic practices in a school-university partnership. The PDC partnerships are underpinned
by the values of the Professional Development School (PDS) reform movement. However, in an
effort to reflect the emerging development of each individual school-university partnership site
the term PDC was coined to respect the complexity of true PDS work. Although working toward
the PDS goals outlined by NCATE, Holmes, and others, the UF partnership believes the term
PDS should be reserved for PDC sites that have reached a collective and formal agreement
between the district, school, and university. This movement toward PDS status, as recommended
by the NAPDS Nine Essential’s Framework, is an endeavor that is in progress, however, has yet
to come to fruition.

PDCs are school-university partnerships that integrate field experiences, prospective
teacher supervision, and on-site coursework for a critical mass of prospective teachers. The
university partners with “ten demographically unique elementary schools within PDC schools
where approximately 200 prospective teachers learn to teach alongside a mentor committed to
linking the theory of “inclusive” teaching to practice, while simultaneously targeting the school-
 improvement goals of each PDC school.” (PDC fact sheet). The key activities of the PDCs
include 1) preparing prospective teachers to teach all children, 2) cultivating school-based
teacher educators, 3) creating teacher leadership for school-improvement through teacher
inquiry, 4) networking schools to share improvement efforts, and 5) preparing the next
generation of teacher educators. During the pre-internship semester, a critical mass (~12-14) of
prospective teachers is placed within each PDC. Some PDCs also host graduate student interns as well. The following sections describe the PDC context specific to Country Way Elementary, which officially began its partnership work with the university in the Spring of 2005.

**Country Way Elementary**

Country Way Elementary is a rural Title I PK-5 elementary school. Located in north central Florida, Country Way Elementary is situated within a growing rural community approximately thirty miles from a major Research One university. The growth of the community has influenced both the student population and the number of teachers who work within the school community at Country Way. When the PDC partnership began in 2005, the student population was 475 and by 2007 had grown to 593. To support the growth of the student population, the school faculty and staff has also increased from 63 in 2005 to 70 in 2007. The instructional faculty has grown from to 33 in 2005 to 39 in 2007. Table 4-1 illustrates student and teacher demographic data over the course of the study.

Amidst the hiring of new teachers to support the school’s growing student population, the school experienced a turnover of existing faculty due to retirement. In 2005, teachers’ average years of experience shifted from 18.7% to 15.9% in 2007. While teachers’ years of experience may be lower, the percentage of teachers with advanced degrees increased from 37.9% in 2004 to 57.2% in 2007, a growth of 20% in just three years. This growth demonstrates that while the teachers hired during this period of growth may have fewer years of classroom teaching experience, they have higher levels of advanced education. This change is directly attributed to the commitment of the school’s principal to hire educators who value continuous learning.

The PDC at Country Way elementary has evolved in many ways over three and a half years of partnership work. First, the school has experienced a growth in its student population and, as a result, a rise in the number of faculty and staff has also occurred. Second, the school’s
faculty has experienced some specific transitions as well. Finally, the work of the school’s partnership with the university has moved through several initiatives spurred on by a range of catalysts. The following section provides an overview of the Country Way PDC.

**The PDC at Country Way Elementary**

The PDC at Country Way Elementary embraces the four purposes of a PDS (Clark, 1999) through a shared commitment to teacher education, professional development, inquiry, and school renewal. At Country Way Elementary, school renewal serves as the unifying concept to organize and align the focus for teacher education and professional development activities, while inquiry is used as both a tool for learning and a means to document the work of the partnership. Clark’s four purposes of a PDS provide a framework to guide the inquiry-oriented work within Country Way Elementary (Figure 4-1). School renewal is the overarching concept that helps guide in-service teacher professional development and prospective teacher education through inquiry.

A shared commitment to school renewal served as the entry point for the school-university partnership, which began in January of 2005. During the three and half years in which this study unfolded, three initiatives characterized the work of the Country Way Elementary PDC: a shared responsibility for teacher education and school-based professional development, writing reform, and the movement toward inclusion. These three initiatives will be used to describe the context and activities of the partnership. The multiple components of each initiative and the participants who collaboratively engaged in aspects of the work are outlined (Table 4-2).

Three and a half years of field work in the PDS and three distinct school improvement initiatives brought many characters to the PDS stage. Two distinct groups of individuals are central to the PDS work at Country Way Elementary, the school-based participants and the university or district based. The following sub-sections describe specific PDC activities as they
relate to each of three focus initiatives. Participants will be introduced as their role is presented within each sub-section. Together multiple participants rallied around school improvement needs in writing instruction and inclusion, while teacher education activities were aligned with each focus.

Shared Responsibility for Teacher Education

The shared responsibility for teacher education was an initiative initially presented by Hannah Dobbs, an assistant professor in teacher education within the university’s College of Education. In Fall 2004, Country Way principal Regan Lundsford, was contacted by Hannah to discuss the potential of forming a collaborative partnership with the university. The shared responsibility for teacher education formed the initial entry point for the activities that emerged within the site. PDC meetings, monthly mentor meetings, an on-site prospective teacher seminar, teacher inquiry, and co-teaching, facilitated the shared work for teacher education. Within each activity, school leadership and university personnel were the common threads that collaboratively fostered a mutually beneficial relationship to support the specific needs of the school and shared responsibility for site-based teacher education. School leadership, classroom teachers, prospective teachers, and university personnel worked in various ways to enact and sustain a shared commitment to teacher education.

PDC meetings

PDC meetings began in the Spring of 2005 as a forum for planning, monitoring, and adapting the work between school administrators, university site coordinator, school site coordinator, and university faculty. At the onset of the partnership, the meetings were formally scheduled on a bi-weekly basis between university site-coordinator and doctoral student, Gabrielle Aires, and principal, Regan Lundsford. While regular in person meetings took place on site between Gabrielle and Regan, phone and email communication between Regan and Hannah,
and between Gabrielle and Hannah were frequent. As the partnership moved past the first semester, the PDC meetings occurred more frequently but became more informal. “Meetings” often took place in the hallway, in classrooms, via email communications and within Regan’s office as needed. The movement from a formal forum to informal forum allowed the dialogue to unfold around immediate needs and concerns and allowed the participant actions/reactions to respond in a timely manner around the needs of individuals within the school.

Over the course of the partnership, there was some shifting of site-coordinator roles within the PDC. During the Summer of 2007, Regan appointed Peyton Kelly, a fourth grade classroom mentor teacher, to be the school-based PDC site-coordinator. From that point, much but not all of the “administrative” work of the PDC, the scheduling of meetings, planning, and communication of needs and concerns were frequently handled between Gabrielle and Peyton, while Regan maintained the responsibility for placing prospective teachers in specific classrooms.

**Mentor meetings**

Also beginning at the on-set of the partnership in Spring 2005 were monthly mentor meetings. These meetings provided a space for school leadership, in-service teachers, and university personnel to plan, organize, and discuss the content and processes for supporting prospective teacher learning within placement classrooms. The university site-coordinator, supervisors, classroom mentor teachers and school principal met once each month from August to May. All pre-intern and/or intern mentor teachers and the university site coordinator attended the meetings, while other university supervisors and special education classroom mentors were invited to attend and joined occasionally. During mentor meetings, classroom mentors, university supervisor(s), and school leadership discussed ways to best support prospective teacher development, connect assignments to school improvement goals, raise concerns about classrooms issues, and generate solutions in a collaborative forum.
The facilitator role during mentor meetings shifted over time from university led to school led. In the beginning of the partnership, Gabrielle would plan and facilitate the mentor meetings, answer questions and sometime present information. However, in Fall 2006, the mentor meetings became very large with up to 14 classroom mentor teachers and 3 university supervisors. During the 2006-2007 school year, the mentor meetings shifted from being primarily university led in the Fall to more school led by Regan in the Spring. School led mentor meetings continued facilitated by Peyton during the 2007-2008 school year, while Gabrielle handled weekly email communications outlining upcoming events and assignments for prospective teachers.

**On-site seminar**

On-site prospective teacher seminars provided a weekly space for prospective teachers, specifically pre-interns and interns, to meet and discuss issues related to teaching, student learning, and coursework with university personnel, school-based leaders, and their peers. During on-site seminars, the site-coordinator collaborated with school-based leadership, such as the principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT), Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT), Reading Coach, and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teachers to arrange a schedule for expert speakers. School-based practitioners were invited to co-teach the seminar with the site-coordinator to share their knowledge and expertise with prospective teachers. These expert speakers made presentations, promoted discussions and facilitated activities to support prospective teachers’ knowledge base and skills related to their various areas of expertise. Most seminars focused on topics such as differentiated instruction, aspects of content area instruction, classroom management, data-driven decision making, assessment, co-teaching, and teacher inquiry. On site pre-intern seminars took place on Wednesday mornings for three hours, and on Thursday afternoons for one hour for interns. However, the timing of the on-site seminars
occurred during hours when in-service teachers were working with children and, as a result, classroom mentor teacher expertise was not shared during the on-site seminars.

While the majority of the time Gabrielle served in the role of site-coordinator, during the Fall of 2006 and Spring of 2007 there were some shifts in the PDC arrangement due to higher than average numbers of prospective teachers placed at the school. The Fall of 2006, Gabrielle was assigned to the supervision of graduate level interns, and a new site-coordinator, Deanna Rizer, came in to lead the pre-internship seminar and supervise pre-interns with the support of Lee VanCrist. Like Gabrielle, Deanna was also a doctoral student, but Deanna also served as the PDC Coordinator, a formal departmental position that organized and supervised the work of all ten PDC sites. Lee was a doctoral student in the department of special education. While Gabrielle was still on site during this semester, her role was to support the interns and the intern classroom mentors while Deanna and Lee worked to support the pre-interns. Gabrielle, Deanna, and Lee continued to seek the expert knowledge of school-based leaders in their seminars even though the groups did not meet together. In the Spring of 2007, the responsibility for shared teacher education became more school-led as Regan rose to the occasion and assumed the role of on-site seminar leader for the pre-interns. While Gabrielle was still on-site supervising the prospective teachers, she would plan with Regan and Christy James, the school’s CRT, and on occasion co-teach a seminar with Regan. As both the school’s principal and prospective teacher seminar leader, Regan’s role truly embraced the commitment to shared teacher education. However, due to union issues, Regan was not able to maintain such an active and formal role as seminar leader beyond the Spring of 2007. In 2007-2008 Gabrielle once again assumed the primary role as seminar leader, but continued to capitalize on the expertise of school-based educators as much as possible.
Co-teaching

Co-teaching describes the process used by PDS participants to enact their work in classrooms. Within placement classrooms, prospective teachers and classroom mentor teachers collaboratively used co-teaching to reduce student teacher ratios and provide small group instruction. Co-teaching was used between pre-intern teaching pairs when they taught lessons independently, and also between classroom mentor teachers, pre-interns, and interns during various daily teaching activities. Additionally, co-teaching was promoted as a part of the pre-internship course affiliated with the on-site seminar. Multiple co-teaching models were presented and modeled to support prospective teachers’ understanding of how to organize the classroom environment to support the needs of diverse learners in inclusive classrooms. The prospective teachers were strongly encouraged to try out multiple models within their placement classrooms in order to identify the benefits and limitations to each model.

Co-teaching was also modeled during on-site seminars when possible between school leadership and university personnel. When school leaders presented during on-site seminars, the prospective teachers were able to see how collaborative teaching structures could be used in their own classrooms. Co-teaching within placement classrooms enabled prospective teachers to learn how to collaboratively plan, implement, and reflect on their teaching with another educator.

Teacher inquiry

Teacher inquiry was the predominant learning tool enacted with both pre-intern and interns to facilitate discussions about student learning and teaching practice. Classroom mentor teachers, seminar leaders, and school leadership facilitated inquiry support with prospective teachers within classrooms and during seminar meetings. During on-site seminars prospective teachers learned about the process of teacher inquiry with the guided support of their seminar instructor(s), while school-based leadership attended on-site seminars to lead discussions about
data-driven instruction which gave prospective teachers specific strategies for gathering data for their inquiries. In placement classrooms mentor teachers provided on-going guidance with specific strategies, specific students, and materials. Additionally, university supervisors would assist prospective teachers in their placement classrooms by gathering data and making suggestions, while also helping them access/locate necessary data sources within the school. At the end of each semester, the inquiries were shared with Regan, the school’s principal, either in formal meetings with prospective teachers or informally through papers. Support for prospective teacher inquiry was a collaboratively shared endeavor between all PDC participants.

**Classroom observations**

All PDC participant groups used both formal and informal classroom observation to support the ongoing growth and development of prospective teachers. Informal classroom observations of prospective teachers were conducted by school leadership during regular walk through, by university supervisors during twice weekly classroom visits, and by classroom mentor teachers during on-going classroom teaching opportunities. Formal prospective teacher observations were conducted by classroom mentor teachers three times each semester and by university supervisors four times each semester. Formal observations conducted by university supervisors utilized the Pathwise Observation Instrument (Educational Testing Service, 1995) as a formative tool for prospective teacher feedback. Additionally, prospective teachers were required to visit at least five classrooms over the semester where they observed multiple classroom teaching activities, a range of teaching styles, and a range of grade levels. Even teachers who did not typically participate as classroom mentor teachers would often invite the prospective teachers to observe within their classrooms. These observations were self-selected, informal visits that took place during the final two weeks of the prospective teachers’ pre-internship/internship placement.
**Writing Reform**

Within the first six months of the PDC partnership, another initiative began to unfold in response to student performance on the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT). After reviewing the schools’ assessment outcomes, Regan identified writing instruction as an area for focus due to lower performance on the 2005 FCAT assessment coupled with rising state expectations for students’ writing skills. Using her observations of classroom practices, Regan also recognized a need for professional development opportunities for teachers in order to increase the frequency and improve writing instruction school-wide. The need for improved student results and teachers’ professional development opened the door for a new level of collaboration between the school and the university in the Summer of 2005. During an informal meeting between Regan, Hannah, and Gabrielle at Country Way Bar-B-Q the three discussed how the university may be able to offer support for professional development and infuse writing into prospective teacher assignments to support students’ needs within the classroom. After the meeting, Hannah connected Regan with Fiona Denlin, an expert in writing instruction and a Professor the University. Through this connection, Regan and Fiona establish several activities to facilitate professional learning within the school. With Regan’s position as the instructional leader of her building she felt that it was important to provide multiple learning opportunities for her teachers, therefore she continued to infuse professional development training with consultants, district level personnel, conference opportunities, as well as on-site face-to-face and online learning opportunities. The learning opportunities included professional development activities during in-service and faculty meetings, writing committee meetings, grade level writing plan development, classroom observations, in class modeling, writing strategy training, two online book studies, in class coaching, prospective teacher inquiry focused on writing instruction, and a theory and practice graduate course.
Professional development activities

Professional development activities were the process by which classroom teachers learned about specific curriculum initiatives and strategies for enhancing writing instruction. In some cases, external consultants were brought into the school to lead the trainings that were relevant to the materials they designed and promoted. At other times, district level personnel came to the school to make presentations and lead activities with the faculty. Additionally, some faculty members would travel within the state to learn about new materials and strategies at conferences and workshops.

On the other hand, the school’s partnership with the university also supported a range of professional development activities to improve writing instruction that took place within the school. One year Fiona Denlin led activities for in-service teachers, school leadership and the site-coordinator during committee meetings, while the following year she met with a grade level team. Fiona collaborated with school leadership to support them in identifying and refining activities that they led with in-service teachers. Fiona also led graduate student coursework to facilitate learning for school leadership and other university personnel.

Consultant led in-service

External consultants led classroom teachers in learning about new curriculum materials and strategies during on-site and off site in-service activities. These activities ranged in specificity from highly specific curriculum guides, to more general strategies. Kelly Robertson’s Just Write and Michelle Fisher’s curriculum materials were examples of two specific consultant led trainings that influenced the way teachers thought about teaching writing within their classrooms. Consultant led professional development was often a one time event where teachers attended a meeting or conference to learn about an instructional program and it’s supplemental materials.
Kelly Robertson led classroom teachers and school leadership professional development during a school-wide workshop early in the 2005-2006 school year. During the training she shared specific strategies for teaching writing instruction to boost creativity and writing details. Kelly’s Just Write curriculum materials were purchased for multiple grade levels. The curriculum was held together in 2-3 inch binder containing a weekly and daily pattern of lessons and writing activities to use with children. Additionally, the forward written by the author was visible at the beginning of the notebook. The forward described how the curriculum was developed, whom it was initially designed to serve, and the knowledge base that informed the curriculum. More information about Kelly Robertson’s curriculum materials are available at her website (http://www.writemath.com/index.html). Names have been changed for confidentiality purposes, and as a result do not match author’s true names as cited on their websites.

Michelle Fisher, a writing consultant and conference speaker, was another resource used by classroom teachers at Country Way Elementary. During Fall 2006, fourth grade classroom teachers attended a conference led by Michelle Fisher to learn about additional strategies for supporting writers during the highly critical year of Florida Writes. After returning from the conference the teachers expressed a sense of freedom and relief because the said that her approach simplified the process of writing for a prompt, they immediately returned to their classrooms and put her suggests and materials to use. They presently continue using her strategies to support their writing instruction. More information about Michelle Fisher’s curriculum materials are available at her website (http://www.melissaforney.com).

**Faculty meetings**

Professional development opportunities were also led in collaboration with the district level and school level leaders during faculty meetings. Faculty meetings provided a space for all grade level teachers to come together and learn about aspects of writing instruction.
Additionally, prospective teachers, specifically full time interns, were also present during faculty meetings because they attended all professional development and faculty meetings with their mentor teachers. As the university site-coordinator, Gabrielle also attended faculty meetings whenever possible in order better understand the types of contextual issues and learning activities taking place within the school.

For example, during one faculty meeting in the Fall of 2005 Maureen Martin, the district level Title I director, made a presentation to faculty that focused on how writing samples were scored and showed some examples of writing samples that scored fours, fives, and sixes on the Florida Writes Assessment. During this meeting all school faculty members were present, including school leadership and classroom mentor teachers. In addition, prospective teachers, specifically full time interns, and Gabrielle, the university site-coordinator and intern supervisor were present. Maureen identified how creative language and organizational aspects of writing were the most important components in achieving higher scores, rather than spelling and grammatical accuracy. After sharing the scored writing samples, Maureen introduced the Writing Plan of another Elementary School in the district as an example of the kind of curriculum guide that was needed to help each grade level work collectively to achieve higher scores on the Florida Writes Assessment.

**Writing committee**

Beginning in November of 2005, representatives from each grade level, school leaders, and university personnel met to discuss writing instruction in a formal venue. Grade level representatives were appointed to the writing committee by the school’s principal, Regan Lunsford. The writing committee representative attended meetings led by university faculty member Fiona Denlin and were then asked to share their insights with their peers during grade level team meetings. Also in attendance during writing committee meetings was Regan, the
school’s CRT, Christy James, and university site-coordinator, Gabrielle Aires. While attendance for writing committee members was required, school leaders and university personnel voluntarily attended meetings.

The writing committee met over the course of the 2005-2006 school year four times and once again during the fall of 2006. During each meeting, the writing committee shifted its focus while also adding new participants over time. During the first writing committee meeting Fiona led the conversation, using a fourth grade teacher’s writing classroom framework to discuss and make suggestions for classroom writing practices. Later meetings focused on classroom teachers sharing student-writing samples, and the group analyzing and making suggestions for teachers. The final two meetings focused on sharing and discussing aspects of writing instruction that were both problematic and successful, during these meetings additional classroom teachers who were participating in an online book study joined the group conversation and participated openly.

**Writing plan creation**

Shortly after the Faculty meeting when Maureen Martin shared scored writing samples with school faculty, she began working closely with grade level teams to create a school-wide writing plan. During the writing plan meetings, Maureen Martin, Christy James, and grade level teams of classroom teachers met to discuss how to help students make steady progress at each grade level toward in writing. During the meetings, the writing plans from other county schools were used as a guideline to create Country Way’s writing plan. The planning meetings began with the fourth grade team and then worked backwards to specify and align outcomes and expectations for K-5 students. The product of these meetings resulted in the school’s writing plan.
On-site graduate course

In the Spring 2006, university faculty member Fiona Denlin offered a graduate level course focusing on linking compositional theory and practice. Graduate students from various program backgrounds enrolled in the course, including Regan, Country Way’s principal, a fifth grade teacher and Gabrielle, the university site-coordinator. This course was different in that it included once a month site visits to Country Way Elementary School, as well as traditional on campus meetings. The course framed discussions around the theoretical basis for composition as well as the experiences and dilemmas of writing instruction in real classrooms.

The course integrated classroom observations, action points, and a research project to connect theory to practice. Classroom observations took place during on-site visits to Country Way Elementary. Pairs of graduate students visited classrooms to observe writing instruction for approximately 45 minutes-1 hour before returning to share insights and discuss observations with classmates and Fiona. Four different students in the course used action points at Country Way Elementary. These graduate students would implement actions points within classrooms using Donald Grave’s book, “A Fresh Look at Writing” and then would reflect on the outcomes and connect them with the theory in the text. Each student in the course completed a research project per course requirements; five graduate student research projects were conducted at Country Way Elementary. These projects will be discussed later as a part of the Inquiry component of the writing reform movement at the school.

Writing coaching

School leadership and university personnel modeled writing instruction and used instructional coaching to improve the quality of writing instructional lessons within classrooms. Christy James, the school’s CRT, Gabrielle Aires, Fiona Denlin, Jessica Perry and prospective teachers participated in coaching activities focused on the writing instruction. When Fiona
became a part of the writing reform movement, she formed a relationship with Christy James. During the Fall of 2005, Christy modeled a lesson she may lead within a classroom and Fiona watched and offered her feedback. During the Spring of 2006 Gabrielle and Jessica each worked with a classroom teacher on enhancing writing instructional activities. In addition, during the Spring and Fall of 2006, Gabrielle and Jessica coached prospective teachers in implementing effective writing lessons.

**Classroom modeling and observations**

School leadership, classroom teachers, university personnel, and prospective teachers engaged in modeling and observation to improve their own skills and the skills of others. When modeling lessons occurred, there were participants modeling and participants observing. At multiple points during the writing reform movement, all participants would observe lessons but not all participants modeled lessons.

Modeling was a form of in class professional development provided by school leadership, university personnel, and prospective teachers. Over the 2005-2006 school year Christy James embarked on a long-term commitment with one reluctant second grade teacher. As a part of her long-term work within the class, she would model lessons daily while the classroom teacher and students participated in the activities. The same year, Gabrielle and Jessica would conduct in class work in classrooms. Gabrielle modeled lessons in second and fifth grade classrooms for classroom mentors and prospective teachers, while Jessica modeled lessons in an intermediate special education classroom for the classroom teacher and students.

During the 2005-2007 school years, writing lessons were modeled by prospective teachers following the guidelines suggested by Lucy Calkin’s in “the Art of Teaching Writing” and in her “Primary Units of Writing” series. The lessons were integrated into the prospective teacher coursework and required as one of four instructional lessons observed by their university
supervisor. During the Fall of 2005 and 2006, Gabrielle supported full time interns in their implementation of writing lessons. In the Spring of 2006, Gabrielle supported the work of pre-interns, while in the Fall of 2006 Jessica worked to support the work of pre-interns. The interns and pre-interns provided modeling within classrooms, where their classroom mentor teachers were able to see how they were applying their knowledge of writing pedagogy in the classroom. Additionally, classroom mentor teachers provided modeling for prospective teachers in placement classrooms.

**Online book study**

Two book studies were led by the school’s principal to provide a forum for dialogue around a common text. The first book study focused on Lucy Calkin’s “The Art of Teaching Writing” and the second on Donald Graves’s “A Fresh Look at Writing”. Both book studies engaged classroom teachers, school leadership and university personnel through the use of an online blog created by the school’s principal. Having used book studies in the past, Regan hoped that the online forum would allow teachers the flexibility of participating in a more convenient forum rather than during face-to-face meetings.

The first book study took place January-May of 2006 using Lucy Calkin’s “The Art of Teaching Writing” (http://newberrybookstudy.blogspot.com). In the Fall of 2005, Fiona recommended this text when Regan shared that she was planning a book study and asked for her recommendation. Regan then ordered the books, created the blog, and invited participants to join in the discussion. Not all invited participants were classroom teachers; Regan also invited university personnel to participate in the conversations. While all participants engaged in the shared reading of the text, participants’ level of online discussion around the text varied greatly. Additionally, book study participants were invited to share their thoughts during the final Writing Committee meeting in May 2006.
The second book study took place from October 2006-February 2007, focusing discussions around Donald Grave’s book “A Fresh Look at Writing” (http://newberrybookstudy2.blogspot.com). The format for this book study was very similar in that it was also facilitated by Regan Lundsford through an online blog. Regan read the text during a graduate course she attended in the Spring of 2006, she selected the Grave’s text because she felt it provided specific activities that could prompt action in the classroom and serve as a springboard for conversation on the blog. Once again, university personnel were invited to participate. Based on the feedback she gathered from the first book study blog, Regan made the opportunity to meet in person to discuss the text an option as well. In November 2006, a group of classroom teachers, school leadership, and university personnel met in person to discuss the text and writing instruction. While this meeting took place in the same classroom as the first Writing Committee meeting just one year early, there was a distinct difference in the nature of conversation and overall collaborative atmosphere of the meeting.

**Inquiry**

School leadership, classroom teachers, university personnel and prospective teachers systematically studied education practices at Country Way Elementary as a part of the ongoing movement to improve writing instruction. School leaders, specifically Regan, the school’s principal, engaged in on-going inquiry and shared her learning in multiple venues. The overall writing reform initiative was a form of school-wide inquiry, seeking to find multiple ways to make instructional improvements. During the Spring of 2006, Regan participated in the university’s Inquiry Showcase to share the school’s inquiry journey. Also in the Spring of 2006, Regan investigated the influence of the online book study as her research study in Fiona’s graduate course. During the same semester, graduate students and prospective teachers conducted inquiries and formulated papers to fulfill course requirements. Five graduate students
in Fiona’s course conducted research projects in the area of writing in the Spring of 2006. Jessica also returned to conduct further research in the Fall of 2006 and then again in the Spring of 2008. The influence of inquiry in these examples provided not only a learning process for participants, but also a paper trail to document the work of the partnership. The inquiry work continued during the 2006-2007 school year, however classroom teachers emerged as more active participants as they worked to improve and systematically reflect on their writing instruction.

While Christy had also collaborated with the school district to facilitate professional learning activities for the faculty, the connection between Christy and Fiona was the beginning of a relationship that fostered professional learning for the educational leaders in the building, an unintended learning outcome that had powerful implications for the professional learning culture.

**Inclusive Education Reform**

The movement toward inclusion began during the 2005-2006 school year and continues presently. The planning phase of the inclusion movement began at the end of the 2006 school year when school leadership, classroom teachers, ESE teachers collaboratively drafted the school’s inclusion plan with the support of district personnel. The inclusion plan outlined the specific actions that would take place to support the classroom work of both ESE and regular education teachers as they joined together to provide powerful instruction for all students. The work of inclusion was held together through co-teaching practices, an inclusion course, an inclusion group, and teacher inquiry within classrooms.

**Co-Teaching**

Co-teaching is defined as two or more people sharing responsibility for teaching some or all of the students within a classroom (Villa, Thousand, and Nevin, 2004). Co-teaching between classroom mentor teachers and university prospective teachers became a part of the school’s work within some classrooms when the PDS began in the Fall of 2005.
In the Fall of 2006 the school’s inclusion movement brought about co-teaching within classrooms between ESE teachers, prospective teachers, and classroom teachers. The inclusion work began by grouping ESE students at each grade level within 1-2 classes, depending on the number of ESE students, and assigning an ESE teacher and aide to support the ongoing work within the inclusion classrooms. The scheduling of the aides and ESE teachers was the responsibility of ESE team leader Jennifer Townsend. ESE teachers, ESE aides, and prospective teachers would spend time each day within classrooms co-teaching with regular education classroom teachers providing individual student support, small group instruction, and assisting teachers in providing accommodations and differentiated instruction. In many of the inclusion classrooms both regular education and special education prospective teachers would be a part of the collaborative work with ESE teachers and aides, as well as collaborators with regular education teachers. In many semesters, Jennifer would serve as a mentor for special education prospective teachers and the inclusion classes that she would work in would also host regular education prospective teachers. So, in some classrooms, there would be as many as 5 adults (i.e. ESE teacher, ESE pre-intern, classroom teacher, regular education intern, and full time ESE aide) collaboratively working together to plan and implement activities to support a range of student needs.

**Inclusion course**

ESE and regular education teachers from Country Way Elementary participated in an online course offered through the university to support their knowledge and skills related to inclusive education practices in the Spring of 2006. Ryan Toms and Harrison Dobbs, university instructors and district level ESE directors, led the online course. As university instructors, Harrison and Ryan led the Project Include course. As ESE district supervisors, Ryan and Harrison supervised and supported schools as they worked to improve Exceptional Student
Education. The goal of the inclusion course was to provide participants with the background knowledge and skills related to inclusion and differentiated instruction.

**Inclusion group**

Concurrent with the inclusion course, ESE and regular education teachers met weekly with a group of teachers from another elementary school within the county. The inclusion groups engaged school leadership and classroom teachers in conversations about models for inclusion and allowed them a space to discuss and identify how inclusion could be situated within their school contexts. The goal of the inclusion group was to provide the participants with a network of support to collaboratively design an inclusion model for their school that would serve the needs of the teachers and use available resources to meet the needs of students.

**Inquiry**

Prospective teacher inquiry was used as a learning tool for K-5 students and for prospective teachers. Each semester prospective teacher pre-interns would be responsible for selecting one or two students who needed additional support with either remediation or extension activities. With the support of their classroom mentor teacher, and often the ESE team leader in the primary grades, prospective teachers would gather data and implement specific activities designed to support the students’ learning needs. Over the course of the semester, pre-interns would adapt their instruction based on the progress of their students and monitor their progress over time through on-going documentation in their inquiry journals and through the collection of work samples. The inquiries would provide a paper trail of the work with specific students and would be used by the school in some cases to discuss student’s progress and response to specific activities. On occasion the inquiry paper prospective teachers would present their work during Academic Improvement Plan (AIP) meetings along with their classroom mentor teachers, school
leadership, and ESE teachers. AIP meetings were formal meetings used to monitor the progress of student specifically identified as needing additional learning support.

**Integrated teaching course**

As previously described in the section outlining the shared work of teacher education, the on-site prospective teacher seminar engaged multiple groups within the site to support prospective teacher learning. While the focus of the seminar had multiple goals, the course placed the strongest emphasis on differentiated instruction, accommodating diverse learners, and positive behavior support. This focus, while always present, became visibly connected to the work within inclusive placement classrooms and provided new aspects of expertise to come to fruition.

While throughout the partnership school leadership and university personnel worked closely to align the work of the school with the focus of the seminar in Spring 2007, the course and focus seamlessly overlapped the school’s focus on inclusion. For the first time, the flexibility of ESE team leader Jennifer Townsend’s schedule as an inclusion teacher paired with Regan leading the on-site pre-internship seminar tapped a previously unrealized resource within the PDS. From that point on Jennifer became a frequent expert consulted for presentations on Individualized Education Plans (IEP) and inclusion models, and during the final year provided a wealth of insight into the Response to Intervention (RTI) movement brought about by No Child Left Behind legislation (NCLB). Jennifer’s expertise and position as ESE team leader enabled her to provide the most up-to-date information about inclusion and the resulting reforms that were sweeping county schools. Jennifer was able to connect the theory that informed the prospective teachers’ coursework with the real life work of school, providing prospective teachers with experiences that on-campus university coursework alone could not provide. Thus, this movement toward inclusion embodied the focus of the Integrated Teaching course that pre-
interns within the site had always engaged in, making the connections between theory and practice more seamless than ever.

**Conclusion**

The context at Country Way Elementary experienced three specific movements from January 2005-April 2008 that highly influenced the professional learning culture within the site. The writing reform and inclusive education reforms were initiated in different ways and by different organizations (ex. University, school, district). Yet, the connections fostered through the school’s partnership with the university provided learning resources across both movements and provided collaborative structures between school leaders, classroom teachers, prospective teachers, district personnel, as well as university personnel. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 discuss the outcomes of the PDS and chapter 8 draws conclusions and implications from the study.
Table 4-1. Country Way student and teacher demographic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Disabilities (%)</th>
<th>Gifted (%)</th>
<th>ELL (%)</th>
<th>FCAT Writing</th>
<th># of Staff Administrators (%)</th>
<th>Instructional (%)</th>
<th>Teachers with Advanced Degrees (%)</th>
<th>Teachers’ Average Years of Experience (%)</th>
<th>Support (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4-1. Four purposes of the Country Way Elementary PDC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>School Leadership</th>
<th>Classroom Teachers</th>
<th>Prospective Teachers</th>
<th>University Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Commitment for Teacher</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDC Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Mentor Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Teacher Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant led KR PD</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAM at Faculty Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Committee Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Plan Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Course On-site</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF PD</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Group Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching On-Site Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
TRANSITIONING THROUGH PDS RESEARCH AND REFORM

This chapter provides an overview of the findings and offers an organizational map for readers as they transition into the reform stories featured in Chapters 6 and 7. This chapter also clearly highlights some distinct differences between the two reform initiatives that unfolded within the Country Way PDS. Additionally, this chapter identifies several connections and transitions that occurred as the writing and inclusive education reforms unfolded.

Country Way PDS participants describe the emergence of a professional learning culture through school improvement initiatives in writing and inclusive education reform. Country Way’s approach to school improvement is characterized by participants as a collaborative approach where all participants are learning and studying together, thus the term inquiry-oriented is used to describe this process. One overarching assertion briefly summarizes the story of Country Way’s collaborative school improvement journey: Inquiry-oriented school improvement shifted structures, relationships, and praxis for PDS participants. Six claims are presented to specifically describe how the inquiry-oriented approach to school improvement generated a professional learning culture for PDS educators and students. The six claims are thematic in nature in that they held strong across the writing reform and inclusive education reform. Yet, within each reform the claims unfolded in different ways and with different outcomes. As a result sub-concepts are used to provide deeper insight into each claim. An organizational table synthesizes the overarching assertion and claims at the end of this chapter to help the readers’ transition more easily through Chapters 6 and 7 (Table 5-1).

Country Way PDS generated a professional learning culture for educators and students by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis through an inquiry-oriented approach to school improvement. The PDS writing reform and inclusive education reform:
1. Shifted participant roles and responsibilities
2. Shifted participants relationships
3. Shifted educator learning through praxis
4. Shifted student performance
5. Influenced leadership style
6. Influenced by existing university and district structures

Although the six claims outlined are similar, they played out within each reform differently due to multiple contextual factors. In fact, the writing reform directly influenced Country Way’s readiness for the inclusive education reform. For this reason, the connections across reforms are briefly outlined.

**Connections and Transitions Across Reforms**

The writing reform and inclusive education reform held some common connections and some differences. Across the two reforms there were differences in the role of the researcher, collaboration between participants, leadership, and the anatomy of the reforms.

**Role of Researcher**

As a researcher, my role as a participant and observer played out differently within each reform initiative. In the beginning of the PDS, my role was tightly coupled with prospective teacher education within the school’s culture. Then, through the onset of new reforms, such as writing, I participated in both prospective teacher and in-service teacher learning activities. My role as an observer in classrooms provided me access to classroom instruction and instructional interactions between PDS educators and students across both the writing and inclusive education reform.

As the writing reform began, I observed most PDS supported writing activities for in-service teachers and actively participated in many others for both in-service and prospective teachers. As a participant and observer at multiple stages through the writing reform journey I had the opportunity to observe how participants reacted to and engaged in the PDS learning
experiences. As an observer, I had access to PDS classrooms but not every writing reform participant’s classroom, so in these cases I had to rely on the observation of others within the site.

As the inclusive education reform unfolded, I was engaged as a participant and observer for all prospective teacher learning activities. However, my understanding of what took place during in-service teacher trainings and reform activities relied more heavily upon the accounts of participants rather than my own observations during the specific events. My access to the in-service teacher reform activities and meetings were limited, and as a result I understand participants’ experiences differently because I was not intimately engaged in observation during these events. As an observer, I had access to inclusive classrooms where I gained insight into how co-teaching and inclusive practices unfolded between educators and students.

**Collaboration**

Collaboration between participants across the writing and inclusive education reform was different. The writing and inclusive education reforms differed in how teachers were recruited for participation. The individual school faculty members who participated in various learning activities also influenced collaboration. In fact many of the in-service teachers who willingly engaged in the professional book study blog were the same group of educators who engaged in the PDS and inclusive education reform. However, these educators were less present when writing reform activities were required.

The writing reform was a precedent setting event for the PDS. The writing reform marked the first time that university faculty were invited to collaborate and offer professional development for in-service teachers. In the beginning, voluntary participants expressed a willingness to learn and teachers who were required to participate expressed resistance. The principal appointed writing reform committee participants and set up collaborative structures...
with university faculty. Book study blog members participated voluntarily and received professional development stipends for various levels of participation through district level funding. Willing participants displayed a greater degree of openness to the insight shared by university faculty and other PDS participants. The writing reform took place during a time when collaboration between school-based participants was minimal and many in-service teachers were not open to changing their instructional practices. In many ways the writing reform helped cultivate readiness for new collaborative structures between university and school based educators.

The inclusive education reform was set in motion first through collaboration around prospective teachers education and later around in-service teacher professional development. One of the most critical factors influencing collaboration in the inclusive education reform was the in-service teachers who participated in the learning activities. Many new in-service teachers joined the Country Way faculty or changed roles within the site. The principal recruited many of these newly hired teachers to participate in Project Include and also as PDS mentor teachers. The university/district faculty members worked with a willing group of in-service teachers to foster a collaborative learning community of educators. Most importantly the connection between writing reform goals and inclusive education goals were fostered between multiple PDS participants, such as Katherine Duarte, Jessica Perry, Jennifer Townsend, and Carol Bates, who actively participated in both writing reform activities and engaged in work with ESE students.

Leadership

Country Way’s principal approached her role as a leader through the writing reform and inclusive education reform in very different ways. As an active learner in the writing reform she engaged in learning activities, led professional development for teachers, and distributed leadership responsibilities to other PDS participants. In the inclusive education reform, she
recruited a willing team of teacher leaders to participate in Project Include and distributed decision-making responsibilities to the ESE team leader and trusted district/university level personnel to facilitate professional development activities.

In the writing reform, the principal had to assert a lot of pressure on teachers to set changes in motion. At the same time she strived to learn as much as she could about writing instruction in order to serve as an instructional leader. The writing reform helped the principal begin thinking differently about how to activate university resources to support school improvement efforts. As a result, her leadership style began to transition through her participation in the writing reform.

The principal’s leadership role in the inclusive education reform was less hands-on and engaged more teachers in leadership roles. In fact, the principal released many responsibilities to teachers and university/district personnel early on in the inclusive education reform. Her role as a leader shifted in many ways as a result of the writing reform, but she used her new leadership skills to facilitate the inclusive education reform from the beginning. Her leadership decisions at the onset of the reform helped generate more teacher leadership for inclusive education reform.

Anatomy of Reform

The writing reform and inclusive education reform emerged with different structures and goals. The writing reform emerged from a need to improve performance on high stakes assessments and sought to change instructional practices. The inclusive education reform emerged from the desire to integrate more collaborative teaching structures and small group instruction within classrooms, with little at stake. Although discussed separately in Chapters 6 and 7, the two reforms overlapped in timing and personnel. In many ways, the writing reform helped foster relationships and structures that facilitated the inclusive education reform, which contributed to the complexity of both reform initiatives.
The writing reform was set in motion with the primary purpose of improving standardized assessment performance. As a result, the pressure to increase performance was high. The need to change writing instruction stemmed from the premise that if students were going to become better writers that better writing instruction would be necessary. Changing writing practices began with the instructional goal of providing daily time for student writing and allowing students more choice when writing. The writing reform was riddled with complexity that ranged from differing goals for instruction/reform between school/university/district, to conflicting teacher beliefs about writing instruction. As a result, the writing reform was merely the beginning of a journey to initiate instructional changes and improve writing performance. The success of the writing reform was judged by school-wide student performance on state writing assessments.

The inclusive education reform was set in motion to increase small group instruction and help all students gain access to the regular education curriculum. Although not specifically linked to high stakes standardized assessment performance, the goal was to change how students with disabilities gained access to the curriculum and to improve learning for all students in the process. The school district and university structures provided resources to support the reform and offered assessment support and tools to help monitor students’ progress. Thus, the inclusive education reform specifically monitored how exceptional students’ progressed from year to year.

Conclusion

This chapter introduces the findings and highlights specific characteristics of the writing reform and the inclusive education reform. Although they are described in depth in separate Chapters 6 and 7, the outcomes of the writing reform in many ways influenced and fostered conditions for readiness during the inclusive education reform. This chapter clarified some of the key transitional aspects that facilitated one reform after lessons learned from another. Chapter 6
presents the story of the writing reform and Chapter 7 presents the story of the inclusive education reform. Chapter 8 discusses the lessons learned and implications of the two PDS reform initiatives.
Table 5-1. Assertion and claims related to creating a professional learning culture within a PDS

Overarching Assertion: Inquiry-oriented school improvement generated a professional learning culture for PDS educators and students by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Reform Claims</th>
<th>Inclusive Reform Claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collaborative writing reform shifted participant roles and responsibilities.</td>
<td>1. Inclusive education reform shifted participant roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Broker</td>
<td>- Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coach</td>
<td>- Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learner</td>
<td>- Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collaborative writing reform shifted participant relationships.</td>
<td>2. Inclusive education reform shifted participant relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collaboration across partners</td>
<td>- Camaraderie, leadership, ownership, and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuity and trust</td>
<td>- Mutual respect and equal status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuity facilitated trust</td>
<td>- Continuity facilitated trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaborative writing reform shifted educator learning through praxis.</td>
<td>3. Inclusive education reform shifted educator learning through praxis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge, beliefs, and practices</td>
<td>- Co-teaching practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theory to practice connections</td>
<td>- Praxis in inclusive classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Motivation and writing volume</td>
<td>- Engagement and individualized instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessing progress</td>
<td>- Learning gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collaborative writing reform influenced leadership style.</td>
<td>5. Inclusive reform influenced leadership style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Top-down distributed leadership</td>
<td>- Organic teacher leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balancing pressure and support</td>
<td>- Balancing pressure, support, theory, and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaborative writing reform was influenced by existing university and district structures.</td>
<td>6. Inclusive reform was influenced by existing university and district structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of theoretical alignment</td>
<td>- Theoretical alignment and simultaneous renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expectations and participation</td>
<td>- Inhibited further PDS development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6
STORY OF PDS WRITING REFORM

This study examined how educators described their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a Professional Development School focused on creating a culture of professional learning. Chapters 6 and 7 present stories or descriptions (Wolcott, 1994) of professional learning within one newly created Professional Development School and within each chapter the stories are unpacked to provide an analysis in the form of claims (Wolcott, 1994). In addition, each story revealed multiple shifts in roles, responsibilities, relationships, and learning that crossed PDS reform initiatives and participants. The need to reduce the data required a search for themes across cases and the selection of critical events as described by participants, therefore not all examples could be shared or illustrated.

The stories and claims selected for inclusion in Chapters 6 and 7 describe the work of educators’ in the Country Way PDS and provide specific lessons for the work of PDS participants. The first illustration, found in Chapter 6, portrays a shift in writing instruction and the second illustration, presented in Chapter 7, portrays a shift toward creating inclusive classrooms. Worthy of noting are the different sources of motivation for these two school improvement initiatives. Students’ writing performance on the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) became the catalyst for the writing focus, particularly driven by the desire of the Professional Development School’s principal to improve assessment results. The inclusive education reform emerged from the school district’s interest in placing children in the most appropriate placement that would offer them access to the general education curriculum. The overarching assertion made about both school improvement efforts is that the Country Way PDS generated a professional learning culture for educators and students by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis through an inquiry-oriented approach to school improvement.
The Illustration

Country Way PDS participants describe how a school improvement focus on writing instruction influenced the professional learning culture of the school by shifting PDS structures, relationships, and praxis. The writing illustration was selected because it describes how the school-wide focus on writing reform served as a critical event to thrust the PDS forward as a resource to support professional learning through school improvement. A shared focus on writing instruction and multiple PDS professional learning opportunities enabled content area experts, teacher educators, in-service teachers, and prospective teachers to collaboratively and individually inquire and shift their knowledge and practice.

Country Way Elementary began its PDS work in the Spring of 2005. As the school principal, Regan Lundsford, championed the PDS movement and encouraged her teachers to accept pre-interns in their classrooms. Several weeks after Country Way completed its first semester as a PDS, the state released assessment scores for the 2004-2005 school year. Regan’s analysis of the student learning data and accountability reports from the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) scores revealed both positive and negative outcomes. The score reports indicated that Country Way Elementary had once again earned the status of an “A” school, however only 62% of this year’s fourth grade students scored a 3.5 or above causing the school to not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing.

In this case, high stakes assessments became a catalyst and motivation for change. Regan’s experience in leading her school through change taught her a process for improving teaching and learning by focusing “all of the effort into really looking at something, drawing attention to it, and focusing your energies through your staff development” (Regan 33765,34063). Regan began conversations with multiple groups and activated energy around the school-wide improvement focus on writing instruction reform.
At Country Way Elementary, the writing reform inquiry brought new opportunities and a new focus to the PDS. Regan charted new territory as she began thinking collaboratively with university faculty and personnel about ways to activate PDS resources to support writing improvement goals. As a newly established PDS, Regan used her connections with the university to tap into what she believed would be “powerful human resources” and “connect with people with expertise to help with school improvement efforts.” Realizing the school’s writing needs, the PDS partnership coordinator, Hannah Dobbs, connected Regan with Fiona Denlin, a university professor specializing in writing instruction.

Throughout the year, Regan’s stance of “us all studying together” underpinned Country Way’s commitment to writing instruction improvement. Regan’s plan was to use group inquiry to make progress toward three specific school-wide writing goals: 1) to revise the existing school-wide writing plan, 2) to provide additional resources for teacher professional development, and 3) to inform the school’s writing committee work. The school district supported the revision of the school-wide writing plan, while the PDS rallied a critical mass of educators to offer multiple entry points for participation in school-wide writing improvement efforts around the two later goals. PDS support structures included: a writing inquiry committee, prospective teacher inquiry, a graduate seminar focused on writing, and a book club. Although Regan’s primary goal was to raise assessment scores, she knew that significant instructional changes had to occur. Initial school-wide instructional goals focused on providing daily writing opportunities for students and allowing students opportunities to choose their own writing topics. The PDS supported instructional goals to help teachers develop high quality student writing within classrooms, while district and consultant-led activities often focused on strategies to help raise student assessment scores.
The writing inquiry committee served as the entry point for university faculty to begin conversations with in-service teachers about writing instruction. Fiona Denlin led a committee comprised of the Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT), the principal, the PDS site coordinator, and six teachers, with one teacher representative appointed from each grade level. The committee gathered once each month to discuss practices of writing instruction. Fiona’s goal for the committee was to focus on instructional practices that would promote quality student writing. Prior to each meeting, Fiona visited classrooms and observed writing instruction at various grade levels. During the meetings, Fiona facilitated conversations based on her observations in classrooms, helped teachers examine student work, and encouraged teachers to share their writing instruction progress. Based on Fiona’s observations and teachers’ comments, they collaboratively highlighted key areas for improvement to explore in future meetings.

Four of the six teachers participating in the writing inquiry committee also served as PDS mentors for full-time interns. Gabrielle Aires, the PDS site-coordinator supported the PDS work for prospective teachers as part of her doctoral studies while doubling as the school’s site coordinator. This connection provided Gabrielle opportunities to generate parallel conversations about writing and connect the school’s broader work to the prospective teachers’ inquiry during regular classroom visits. Gabrielle’s embedded role provided access to the inside work of the classrooms which proved highly advantageous in connecting the content of writing instruction to prospective teacher work. Occurring simultaneously, the interns brought inquiry into the school as they studied their students’ writing and their own writing instruction. After just a few months of inquiry, classroom observations revealed that students were writing daily, an improvement on one of the initial goals established by the school in the area of writing. By the end of Fall Semester, the writing committee’s collaborations continued and while some participants gained a
sense of community and began creating a shared understanding about writing practices that might support school improvement, others did not have positive experiences and sought out other professional learning opportunities.

Collaboration in the PDS reached an all-time high in the spring of 2006, when both undergraduate field placements and graduate coursework aligned with the school’s improvement focus on writing. Gabrielle wanted pre-interns specializing in literacy at her school to further support the school’s writing improvement goals. In Fall of 2005, Gabrielle requested that the university’s pre-internship placement coordinator place a literacy cohort at Country Way for Spring 2006. This was a very exciting opportunity to have fourteen prospective teachers and seven practicing teachers inquiring together into writing instruction. The fourteen prospective teachers provided important human resources to the in-service teachers because they possessed a valuable theoretical knowledge base from their writing methods course that was aligned with the work of the writing committee, while in-service teachers possessed valuable practical knowledge. The goal was for compositional theory and practice to align. Under the supervision of Gabrielle, the prospective teachers inquired into children’s writing and their own writing instruction.

Also in fall 2005, Fiona began planning a graduate seminar focused on connecting research, theory, and practice. Regan, Gabrielle, and one in-service teacher from Country Way enrolled in the course along with other graduate students. The course focused on the underlying theories and practices that inform process-writing instruction. The blended on-campus/on-site course facilitated shared inquiry that extended beyond the scope of previous structures as Regan, Gabrielle, other graduate students, and one fifth grade teacher actively engaged in inquiry to examine various elements of teacher learning and changes in instruction underway in the school.
One of Fiona’s graduate students attended the writing committee work and visited teachers’ classrooms to observe instruction and provide support. Another graduate student of Fiona’s, Jessica Perry, engaged in classroom work and coaching within one ESE classroom. Jessica returned in future semesters to coach prospective teachers in Fall 2006 and again in future semester to continue work with the ESE teacher. Thus, the PDS writing reform provided graduate students with the opportunity to engage in connecting research, theory, and practice.

Regan describes how the graduate course also met on site at Country Way Elementary with Fiona:

“The course met once a month on site, walking through my classrooms with me looking at writing, talking to teachers about writing, and then that class coming back together. We were studying the theory of writing and looking at lots of research and then applying it to what we were seeing in our classrooms. (Regan 6794,7113)"

Regan describes how the experience of having a graduate class aligned with her school improvement focus shifted her own learning,

“It really helped me think about how to lead the school into better writing and really getting a writing workshop going in places and that was significant to me because I never had a class that came to my school and what they were seeing was the topic of conversation every class. (Regan 7114,7434)"

In addition to the graduate course, Regan secured district money to engage teachers in a book study using a text recommended by Fiona, *The Art of Teaching Writing* by Lucy Calkins (1994). A group of teachers voluntarily agreed to participate in the book study as their shared inquiry. The book study did not meet in person, as the writing committee did, but rather utilized a Web Blog to share text connections and reflections. Regan served as the facilitator, each week she focused on a chapter or two in the text, posed a set of questions for reflection, and teachers responded with topic related thoughts and ideas. Participants included the principal, CRT, in-service teachers, the PDS site-coordinator, and a university faculty member. As part of her research for the graduate course, Regan studied the effectiveness of the web based approach for
supporting teachers’ professional learning. The professional book study created a shift in teachers’ writing knowledge and beliefs.

Classroom observation, archival documents, and field notes revealed that powerful changes occurred when individual teachers engaged in multiple learning activities. For example, one teacher who participated in the book study, the writing inquiry committee, and supported intern inquiry work, also engaged in peer coaching with Gabrielle. Peer coaching enabled Gabrielle to embed the coursework from the graduate seminar into her role as a prospective teacher supervisor. As the teacher made significant efforts to improve writing instruction in the spring of 2006, she put her new knowledge, skills, and dispositions to work full scale in the fall of 2006 when she implemented a Writer’s Workshop in her classroom with the support of her prospective teacher and Gabrielle. Prospective teachers participating in coaching with Fiona and Gabrielle had the opportunity to put theory into practice and learn by doing with the guided support of multiple “coaches”. One prospective teacher suggests that coaching made previous suggestions relevant. She states:

Before I was finding it really difficult to understand what you (Gabrielle) meant when you said make it smaller, narrow the focus, but now I understand. I noticed a distinct change in student performance during this mini-lesson, the students remained on task and carried out the desire outcome. (post-conference coaching interview #4 )

Through the process of coaching, prospective teachers learned how to improve their mini-lessons and conferencing, and Gabrielle learned “how to use prospective teachers as a visible model to prompt dialogue about writing instruction with in-service teachers.”

After one year of intensive inquiry into writing instruction, the accountability results demonstrated progress. In an email to her faculty Regan reported, “80% of fourth grade students achieved a score of 3.5 or higher on the FCAT Writing Assessment.” The results indicated an 18% improvement in fourth grade writing scores after just one year. As a result, the school’s
intensive focus on writing shifted after the 2005-2006 and because adequate progress was made in writing the reform received less emphasis. Regan contended that, “we will still talk about writing and a lot of what we were doing is still happening so it is not like we just quit, it is just not the conversation at every faculty meeting now and at every staff development now” (Regan 34880,35111). This shift in focus placed the writing reform initiative as a secondary focus, which generated some conflict for university personnel who were continuing work with in-service and prospective teachers.

This illustration describes how the roles, rituals, and responsibilities created by PDS organizational arrangements, which emphasized collaboration and theory to practice connections, brought about Country Way’s inquiry-oriented school improvement focus on writing reform. In combination, these factors enabled the beginning PDS to quickly create one of the more established professional learning cultures within the university’s PDS network.

**Examining the Illustration**

The overarching assertion is that the Country Way PDS facilitated inquiry-oriented school improvement by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis, which established a professional learning culture for educators and students. The overarching assertion represents the big idea of how the PDS created a professional learning culture, while the claims specify how the process unfolded. Thematic claims emerged related to how educators described their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as they focused on improving writing instruction within Country Way Elementary. Six thematic claims were culled through an analysis of field notes, interviews with informants, and archival documents gathered over three and a half years. Field notes served as the primary data source while informant interviews and archival documents were used to strengthen participant voices and triangulate analysis. The claims presented in this chapter provide a deeper understanding of how the PDS writing reform
initiative influenced multiple shifts in the professional learning culture and influenced the roles, responsibilities, values, behaviors, and practices of participants. The collaborative writing reform:

1. Shifted participant roles and responsibilities.
2. Shifted participant relationships.
3. Shifted educator learning through praxis.
5. Influenced leadership style.
6. Influenced by existing university and district structures.

Within each claim, sub-concepts specifically discuss how the writing reform shifted the learning culture for educators and/or students.

Claim 1: Shifted Participant Roles and Responsibilities

The school improvement focus on writing instruction shifted the roles and responsibilities of PDS participants at Country Way Elementary. Claim One specifically explores how the PDS infused new professional learning resources for educators and enabled new participant roles to emerge. Within Claim One three distinct roles underpinned the school improvement focus on writing: 1) the broker, 2) the coach, and 3) the learner. Each role shifted how professional learning within the PDS took place and who was responsible for supporting professional learning within the PDS. The inquiry-oriented school improvement focus on writing caused multiple participants within the PDS to shift in and out of multiple roles simultaneously, which facilitated connections, relationships, and educator learning.

The broker

In the writing reform, the role of the broker was responsible for a shift in PDS human resources. In this case, the broker was an individual who fostered connections between PDS individuals and concepts. Concepts represented aspects of instructional content, instructional values, and educator belief systems. Although multiple participants participated as PDS brokers,
Hannah Dobbs emerges as the initial broker when the school initiated a focus on writing. As the initial PDS broker, Hannah was responsible for connecting university personnel with expertise in writing instruction with Regan and Country Way Elementary. Hannah recalls, “she [Regan] asked for help in writing and I hooked her up with Fiona. So, I was kind of the contact person, or broker, for the writing” (Hannah 10144,10381). Hannah helped Regan connect with Fiona, she also helped align doctoral students with an interest in writing instruction as university supervisors and researchers. Hannah explains her role as a broker,

I put people there that were going to be present and sustained over time so that those relationships and roles could develop for the PDS. In this case, it was Gabrielle. So I think probably my greatest role was to make sure that I put someone there that understood the concept, not just anyone can walk in and do PDS work. Unfortunately, some people think that you can, but people really have to have a certain value and belief system, so making sure that happened. (Hannah 3116,4705)

Hannah describes how placing sustainable human resources with a value system congruent with PDS work was her primary responsibility as a PDS broker.

As the school year unfolded and the writing focus continued, Gabrielle and Fiona shifted into brokering roles when they began to connect undergraduate and graduate students with an interest in writing to the PDS work. Gabrielle solicited the help of campus-based university personnel to place a cohort of prospective teachers with a literacy focus into the site, while at the same time Fiona organized and developed a graduate student seminar focused on compositional theory and practice. This is the seminar that met monthly at the PDS site. The significance of the brokering role for PDS participants cannot be understated. Although the broker has the least visible role in the work, the broker can have a significant impact on how PDS human resources within the PDS structures are organized. In many cases, the role was less visible because brokers were often university personnel. The PDS brokers in the story of writing instruction reform generated alignment by connecting school initiatives with university human resources, which
shifted PDS structures by increasing the number of participants focused on improving writing instruction.

**The coach**

The coach in the writing reform was responsible for shifting how professional learning resources were integrated into PDS work. A coach is an individual who provides instructional support for PDS participants. Coaches often use modeling, observation and dialogue with participants as an instructional tool to support participants in refining their instructional practice. As the PDS moved forward, many participants who served as brokers shifted into coaching roles. At the same time, the meaning attributed to the role of coach also shifted as a result of the PDS focus on writing. In the beginning of the PDS, primarily classroom mentor teachers and university supervisors fulfilled the role of coach for prospective teachers. However, the school improvement focus on writing instruction provided an entry point for university faculty, prospective teachers, and school administrators to shift into active coaching roles as well.

In the very beginning of the writing improvement initiative, university faculty held a significant coaching role. Fiona served as the primary writing coach for practicing teachers and school administrators. Fiona coached teachers and Christy James, the school CRT, during on-site visits and Regan, during graduate seminar coursework. Christy James described her coaching experience with Fiona:

> I was telling her what I was doing and she was giving me ideas. I said why don't I do it for you, and you could help me. Then I'll go into the classrooms and take it in there. So I got my stuff together and she'd come in here and sit and I'd teach some lessons from the beginning to the end. She gave me good feedback and I kind of refined some areas and it was very valuable to me. I learned that I was on the right track after 20 years of doing it and so it instilled some confidence in me. I learned just how to tweak it here and refine it there and go from where I was to a higher level. (Christy 35017,36205)

Fiona’s coaching boosted Christy’s confidence and helped her refine her writing instruction. Later, Christy brought her newly refined skills into the classroom where she then coached in-
As the story of writing reform at Country Way unfolded, school leadership served as writing coaches for teachers at multiple points. Regan, the principal, and Christy James, the Curriculum Resource Teacher, held significant coaching roles by providing professional development for in-service teachers. Regan’s coaching role took place in the form of facilitation through online book studies, and on a few occasions she also modeled writing lessons in classrooms. Christy’s coaching role was on-going and consistent across multiple K-2 classrooms. Christy’s entry point into the coaching role was enabled by her shift from Reading Coach to the CRT position in the Fall of 2005. Christy describes her coaching experience with Anna Kates, a reluctant second grade teacher:

I went in there. Anna was crying and so I humbled myself and cried along with her and said, “You know what, Regan has asked us to do this. I have never done it before. I don't know whether I can do it or not. I have never had a literary tea with another person's class. But, you know what? I am going to give it my best shot and all you have to do is sit at the desk with the kids. I am going to give you a little desk right here and your chair and every thing I ask the kids to do I want you to do it too.” Anna called me at home one night after that and said Christy, I just don't know about this, and she was upset. I said, “Anna, you know what, all we can do is try it.” I said, “Just try it, it will be fun.” So I went in there the first day and oh my gosh it was so much fun. She had a ball and she relaxed and she did exactly what I asked her to do. So everyday I would go in there and we would do the writer's workshop and she'd sit in the chair and she'd do exactly what I asked the students to do. When I got to Roald Dahl's rhyming version of Little Red Riding Hood my mini lesson was using words that rhyme and then they were to write. She wrote in 45 minutes a rhyming version of Little Red Riding Hood that made my mouth fall open. I could not believe it and she came up and read it in the microphone during our sharing time. Then I asked her to read it in a faculty meeting. I took the microphone in there and I said, “I have been doing writer's workshop in Anna’s room and today we did a rhyming version of Little Red Riding Hood and this is her rhyming version.” Anna got up in front of the faculty meeting and she read it and she began to change, her whole persona changed after that. (Christy 35017,36205)

What is notable in this example is how Christy coached a very reluctant teacher. By taking the reigns as the writing teacher in Anna’s classroom, Christy “coached” Anna by modeling multiple
lessons within Anna’s classroom. In this case, Anna did not simply observe Christy but rather participated in all aspects of the lesson, which built her confidence as a writer and a writing teacher. In this example, Christy’s responsibility as a coach required her to first attend to Anna’s emotional response to her presence by building a trusting relationship before she began modeling and engaging Anna in writing lessons in the classroom. Although Anna entered into the coaching work with Christy with reluctance, over time she gained confidence and became motivated to learn more, write with her students, and share her learning with peers. This example demonstrates how PDS participant roles and responsibilities are often directly linked to relationships.

In some cases, university graduate students coached prospective and practicing teachers, while in other cases, prospective teachers coached in-service teachers. As university graduate students, Gabrielle Aires and Jessica Perry participated in the ongoing coaching of a couple of practicing teachers and multiple prospective teachers within the site. Gabrielle’s entry point for coaching was tied primarily to her role as a university supervisor, while Jessica’s entry point for coaching was tied to her role as a graduate student and researcher. For university doctoral students, the coach role was tied intricately to their own inquiries as they worked with prospective teachers and practicing teachers to improve writing pedagogy. As a result of university students’ coaching role being intricately linked to inquiry through praxis, specific examples will be discussed in detail within Claim Three.

The role of the coach shifted PDS structures by providing job-embedded professional learning opportunities for school leaders, in-service teachers, and university students at Country Way Elementary. PDS coaches shifted the professional learning practices of educators by infusing much needed research-based knowledge about writing instruction into the school
culture. Fiona provided coaching for administrative team members, graduate students and practicing teachers. While at the same time, graduate students and administrative team members provided coaching for practicing teachers and prospective teachers. As PDS participants shifted into the role of coach, they generated camaraderie and relationships and in turn prompted dialogue, observation, and modeling of writing instruction. What makes understanding the coaching role challenging is that the role of the coach is simultaneously linked in most cases to the role of the learner.

**The learner**

In the writing instruction reform, the learner was responsible for shifts in educator beliefs and classroom practices. The role of learner underpins the premise of the PDS movement and is the most visible role in Country Way Elementary PDS classrooms. A learner is an individual who is influenced by the teachings of another PDS participant. Prospective teachers held the initial role of learner when the PDS began. As a result of the inquiry-oriented focus on writing instruction, learning became a responsibility for all PDS participants. As the writing reform movement gained momentum, school based administrators, university graduate students, some practicing teachers, and prospective teachers developed new understandings/skills that helped them refine writing instructional practices. The CRT, some teachers, and prospective teachers learned through the applied coaching work, while the principal, graduate students, and other teachers learned through more formal structures such as coursework, writing committee meetings, and book studies. During the writing reform movement, the PDS became a place where prospective teachers, practicing teachers, university faculty, university graduate students, school administrators, and children simultaneously learned together. PDS participants took on learning as both a role and responsibility due to increased human resources available, which facilitated a shift in the school’s learning culture.
At the onset of the partnership, Regan conceptualized the PDS as a vehicle to shift professional learning by positioning prospective and practicing teachers in classrooms to learn together. Regan describes how she conceptualizes the role of the learner within the PDS, “we can learn from them; they can bring new ideas to us” (Regan 357,410). While a few classroom mentor teachers embraced the fusion of the coach and learner role from the onset, it wasn’t until the school improvement focus on writing that dual roles became more prominent. Most importantly, PDS participants describe the principal as the “head learner” in the school (Barth, 1990). As the leader of the writing reform, Regan describes the importance of learning for herself and her school,

I started back to school and we encouraged other people to start going back to school, so there was this whole discussion about learning more, being the teachers of the pre-service teachers, and all studying together. When we did the book study, I was learning right along with them. I readily admitted up front to them that I was no writing teacher and didn’t know how to teach writing, and I felt like I needed to learn as much as they did so that I could help lead in that direction and know what they need when I am watching their classroom. I have always tried to do that. I think that is important to show teachers that I can learn this just like they can and that I wouldn't put expectations on them that I don't have on myself. I think that the whole focus is on our learning because we are learning from the pre-interns, too. (Regan 24748,25928)

Regan led by example during the writing reform movement, learning about writing instruction from university faculty along side her teachers, other graduate students, and prospective teachers. Regan also describes how her own professional learning through university coursework influenced her understanding of writing instruction. She states,

The class I took with Fiona and that class coming to the school once a month and those people walking through my classrooms with me looking at writing, talking to teachers about writing, and then that class coming back and we were studying the theory of writing and looking at lots of research and then applying it to what we were seeing in our classrooms. (Regan 6755,7434)

As the “head learner”, Regan searched for support with school improvement by bringing resources into the school through university faculty and prospective teachers while also seeking
out opportunities to continue her own professional learning through university coursework. As a learner, the school’s principal modeled a learning disposition and participated in professional development activities to improve her own content knowledge.

In-service teachers were positioned as the primary learners in the beginning of the writing reform initiative. A few practicing teachers embraced the opportunity to learn from university faculty, while others resisted learning new ideas while participating in the writing committee. Christy James explains the teachers’ hesitation in the beginning:

I think it was just stubbornness or hitting the wall. You know, “I've done this for twenty years and it has worked for 20 years, why do I have to change it now?” That kind of attitude. (Christy 46477,47130)

Christy attributes teachers’ resistance to a lack of willingness to change their practices. Although, Christy recognized that many of these teachers eventually “came around” because of the multiple learning opportunities available. While some of the in-service teachers learned from coaching, others participated in workshops led by the Christy, while still others were coached by graduate students within their own classrooms, and a couple even learned from prospective teachers.

As indicated, the PDS provided multiple avenues to professional learning. Christy describes one example of a practicing teacher learning from her full time intern:

Wendi was out here, in a second grade classroom and she kind of trained the teacher that she was working with and that was an invaluable experience for that teacher. That is a good teacher who learns from the people they are around and always open to learn whether it is an intern or one of their own students. You’re always willing to grow and mature and listen to other people. (Christy 39248,39414)

Similarly to how Regan modeled her own willingness to learn, this example describes how some practicing teachers also displayed a willingness to learn from others as well. While some teachers were hesitant learners in the beginning, they eventually came around and embraced the
opportunity to learn from other PDS participants. Again, the PDS provided multiple entry points to learning and flexibility for all participants.

Multiple participants, such as university personnel, school-based administrators, teachers, and prospective teachers, embraced the learner role by participating in various professional learning opportunities. Although some teachers initially resisted the learner role, the influx of learning resources helped them shift into this role over time. The PDS influenced the professional learning culture by shifting the number of professionals learning within Country Way Elementary. Over time there was a shift away from consultant-led learning opportunities toward more PDS supported embedded learning opportunities. The examples shared in Claim One illustrate how PDS participants embraced new roles and responsibilities as part of the writing instruction reform. The learning culture for educators shifted as brokers, coaches, and learners simultaneously focused on a common focus, to improve writing instruction. These PDS participants modeled learning and instruction, as well as connected human resources to support educator learning by accessing multiple entry points.

Claim 2: Shifted Participant Relationships

The school improvement focus on writing instruction shifted PDS participant relationships at Country Way Elementary. Claim Two specifically explores how the PDS enabled new collaborative structures, which in turn influenced participant relationships. Within Claim Two relationship shifts were influenced by two specific concepts. First, the collaborative site-based professional development generated collaboration between university-based and school-based participants, which was an influential outcome of the writing reform movement. The second concept revealed that participants viewed a connection between personnel continuity and trusting relationships. The school improvement focus on writing generated collaboration between
Collaboration across partners

Country Way’s inquiry-oriented approach to writing reform generated new levels of collaboration between university-based educators, school administrators, and school-based educators through site-based professional development. Collaboration is defined as “the act of working together with one or more people in order to achieve something” (Encarta World English Dictionary, 1999). Collaboration in the story of writing reform held diverse outcomes for participants. Prior to Country Way’s focus on writing reform, teacher professional development was not an explicit component of PDS activities. The writing reform movement provided an important common mission for participants to enhance writing instruction. The common mission shifted collaborative structures by infusing university faculty and supervisors into the PDS to collaborate with school leadership, teachers, and prospective teachers to support a specific site-based need. University personnel and school-based educators developed new relationships as they collaboratively engaged in multiple professional learning activities focused on improving writing instruction at Country Way Elementary.

The collaboration resulting from Country Way’s writing reform generated camaraderie and relationships for many participants, however for other participants the new collaborative structures generated dissonance. Site-based professional development activities generated collaboration for PDS participants at multiple levels. University faculty, school leadership, one university supervisor, and in-service teachers collaborated to improve writing instruction through professional development activities. For some PDS participants, collaboration between participants came in the form of individual and/or shared inquiry, while for others collaboration took the form of active in-class work through coaching. In many cases, the school principal
initiated formalized inquiry groups, whereas individual inquiries were initiated by prospective teachers, practicing teachers, and university graduate students, which supported collaboration with other PDS participants.

The inquiry-oriented school improvement focus on writing prompted new levels of collaboration between university personnel and school personnel. Prior to the writing reform, university faculty members had not engaged in a systematic effort to support school improvement at Country Way Elementary. In the beginning, collaboration unfolded almost exclusively between university faculty and the school principal. Fiona Denlin describes how her collaboration with Country Way initially began with Regan Lundsford, the school’s principal:

Before I started my work, I went in the summer to talk to the principal first. I said that I needed everyday writing time before I go in to help because if you don't guarantee 45 minutes a day for writing, there is no point to talk about writing because you don't have time to teach writing. Also, the choice, this is to guarantee conditions. Students have to write everyday for 45 minutes and the students have to have choice, not just give prompts because I don't want them to write with the format. What I said is choice is the free-writing, and for 45 minutes. Regan was kind of hesitant, she thought '45 minutes too long, it's impossible, and our teachers cannot talk about writing for 45 minutes’. By that time I understood when I said 45 minutes, she thinks about teachers talking about writing for 45 minutes, not just 45 minutes focused on writing. So I said once students really write 45 minutes, it's not long at all. Regan did do that, but I think she started with 35 minutes. Then after they have the time in place, the first time I walked in was September. (Fiona 1736,2990)

Fiona describes how collaboration with the PDS principal fostered dialogue and observation in Country Way classrooms which helped her better understand the perspectives of writing instruction within the context and provided her with access to classrooms. Fiona collaborated with the principal to negotiate instructional conditions to facilitate the school’s writing goals and frame future professional development activities. In this example, the inquiry-oriented approach to school improvement fostered collaboration between university faculty and school administrators prior to any collaboration between university faculty and PDS teachers. Thus, collaboration and dialogue between university faculty and the PDS principal established the
pragmatics and parameters of future professional development activities and provided an entry point for university faculty.

As the writing reform moved forward, collaboration emerged between university faculty, school leadership, university supervisors, and teachers. The writing committee provided the shared space for multiple educators to engage in conversations about writing instruction. In the beginning, the writing committee generated dissonance for many teachers, while the shared space generated new relationships between university faculty, school leadership, and university supervisors. As Fiona began visiting Country Way Elementary, she established camaraderie and relationships with other school leaders. Christy James, the school’s CRT, describes how her relationship with Fiona developed:

Well, she [Fiona] came out here, I took her to Backyard BBQ and I fell in love with her. We had the best time. We had so much in common, and so then we were just talking and I'm like I was telling her what I do in writer's workshop. What I had done for years and how we did it, and how I learned from the teachers on my team. And, they'd come in my classroom and teach lessons, and then I'd go into the next one and teach a lesson, kind of critiqued each other, and she loved that. (Christy 35017, 36205)

Christy describes experiencing an immediate connection with Fiona, which led to a relationship that continued for many years. Christy’s relationship with Fiona generated new opportunities for Christy’s own professional development through coaching, and it also gave Christy and Regan access to collaboratively present with Fiona at national and state level conferences. This example illustrates how meaningful and positive relationships were established between university faculty and school leadership as a result of Country Way’s inquiry-oriented approach to school improvement. However, although Fiona established camaraderie and relationships with school leadership, her professional development activities with teachers at times began with different results.
Fiona collaborated with Country Way Elementary in-service teachers through classroom observations and the writing committee. In September 2005, Fiona began visiting classrooms during the school day to observe writing instruction and after school she led the writing committee.

They have me observe a few classrooms to see what I feel about the writing. Then after that I went to the first writing committee because then I realized what they need. (Fiona 3025,3226)

She describes what she observed when she began observing classrooms in the beginning,

I see the teachers really do teach. I saw the Kindergarten and I saw several fourth grade levels. I saw a very structured way of teaching. Teachers are not comfortable to really let the students write. Very, very structured and also at lower grades it's very skill based and for the Kindergarten is based on the sound they learned. So the kids basically drew a picture and then write that sound. It's very controlled, so that's why when I started to go to the committee I talked about time guaranteed, choice, and length. (Fiona 3298,3881)

In these examples, Fiona describes how her observation of classrooms helped her identify instructional needs in writing, which she in turn used to frame the focus of the writing committee work. Her classroom observations and writing committee work established the foundation for Fiona’s collaboration with PDS teachers. Although Fiona’s collaboration began with the school principal, classroom observations and writing committee meetings helped Fiona gain access to classrooms where she began collaborating with practicing teachers.

Professional development activities in the writing committee fostered collaboration that generated dissonance for teachers. In the beginning of the writing reform movement, multiple participants described experiencing tensions during the initial writing committee meeting. One fourth grade teacher specifically recalls her reaction during the first writing committee meeting:

There were tensions felt among the staff that were present at that meeting because Fiona would give suggestions and perhaps in the delivery of her suggestions she made people feel like what they were doing was not adequate or was incorrect (Carol, 16115,16356). I don't know if it was a pride problem. I don't really know. I think some of us just got our dander up by some of the things she said. I definitely got over that and I wanted to listen to what she had to say. (Carol 16377,17225)
Carol describes how her pride caused initial feelings of dissonance when Fiona began making suggestions in the writing committee. However, over time Carol was able to become receptive to Fiona’s insight because she wanted to learn from her expertise. Participants commonly described initial tensions that took time to “get over” as an outcome of the new collaborative structures of the writing committee.

While all participants recall tensions in the beginning writing committee meetings, there is a lack of agreement among participants as to the source of the tension. While some participants attribute the tension as teacher “resistance” or a problem with “pride,” a few attribute tension to their perceptions of the “delivery” of suggestions, or conflict with other writing agendas at work within the school. In an email after the first writing committee meeting, Fiona describes her insight into the tensions felt in the first meeting:

> From my own observation and what Regan and Christy shared with me, I could tell from the audience their hesitance, confusion, and some resistance. But this is very natural at the beginning stage. And Regan should have a meeting and present her stance. Without her firm support, it is hard to achieve any goals. And also, we should let the teachers choose their path, but not force them to do what they don’t believe. (Excerpt from Fiona’s email 10-6-05)

Consistent with the literature on teacher professional development (Putnam & Borko, 2000; Richardson, 2003), Fiona described the tensions experienced by participants as a natural part of professional development. However, she also suggests the need for Regan to reduce the tension by clarifying her stance on the multiple approaches to writing instruction at work within the site. As the writing reform continued, participants describe that tensions lessened for most teachers. Overall, the writing committee provided the time that enabled school leadership and university supervisors to generate camaraderie and new relationships, which later led to more professional development opportunities for in-service teachers.
Continuity and trust

In the inquiry-orientated writing reform PDS at Country Way Elementary, participant relationships and continuity of key personnel were important and interconnected. One aspect of the writing reform story where consensus is not clear is the causal outcome of continuity and relationships in the PDS. While some educators suggest that a lack of relationships inhibited the continuity, other suggests that the lack of continuity inhibited relationships. In some cases, long-term relationships enabled continuous professional activities between PDS educators, while in other cases relationships and continuity were part of a negative cycle of influence. The largest example of collaboration at Country Way was the writing committee, which sustained focus and continuity over one year. While educators may not agree on the causal links of continuity, they do agree that time to establish relationships influences continuity and is a critical component to support on-going professional development in a PDS.

Time to develop relationships is a key component to PDS continuity. Fiona and Regan echo common experiences about the lack of relationships developed with in-service teachers during the writing reform movement. Fiona describes how a lack of time with teachers during the writing committee was a dilemma in establishing relationships. She states:

The committee there was just not enough time. You have an hour; you observe the classroom then on to the committee work and talk and ... I don't think I built enough partnership with the teachers, but I was very happy with the principal and the CRT. We [CRT and Fiona] talk a lot and we sit in the room and she would go with teachers and we go out for lunch. So I have this relationship with her. But teachers, you just don't have this because they are always with kids and you don't have this time to just talk about teaching that much. I think that's a missing link with the teachers. (Fiona 18100,18547).

Fiona feels that the time needed to develop relationships with teachers was not sufficient. Fiona describes one challenge was that school structures did not allow her to have access to “just talk” with teachers in order to build relationships. However, Regan’s perspective provides deeper implications for the lack of relationships developed between Fiona and the teachers. She states:
When they [university faculty] come through the room once in a blue moon and they question something, unless they have a relationship with the person, it is questioned. There were people who didn't want to have Fiona back to the writing committee because it was like, she showed up and she questioned things instead of building a relationship. (Regan 10274,10630)

As the school principal, Regan describes how the lack of relationships between Fiona and the teachers caused dissonance, which threatened the continuity of Fiona’s work in the PDS. While both Fiona and Regan recognize the importance of building relationships, they have differing perspectives about how the lack of relationships influenced continued work in the Country Way PDS. The story of writing reform illustrates how a lack of relationships inhibited in-service teachers’ willingness to accept the expertise of university faculty and also threatened continuity for university personnel. Although this example illustrates how a lack of relationships can generate dissonance among PDS participants, it also illustrates how positive collaborative relationships developed between university faculty and the school leadership team provided new learning opportunities for the principal and the CRT, which later influenced in-service teachers’ learning. On the other hand, the lack of continuity during the writing initiative prohibited long term opportunities to deepen relationships with teachers.

The school improvement focus on writing reform provided an intense focus for professional learning for a one-year period of time, which enabled some relationships to emerge. University faculty member, Fiona Denlin, and Country principal, Regan Lundsford, also have differing opinions regarding the effectiveness of the school’s approach to school improvement. From Fiona’s perspective, an intensive one-year focus on writing instruction was not enough. She states:

You know to continue, the continuity is the key. Everything takes three years, the best would be five years when you're phasing out and still continue something. Three years intensive is the key. But I think every time you start, you move on too fast. The models move on too fast, almost like I think that's the situation. Yeah probably with some other partnerships it's like this, it's move on-get done-go to another one. You know the structure
should be for three to five years. That's what I believe. You know, start to build up and the teachers feel that part you know. Almost like if you want to establish partner school let the school feel their partnership, and with partnership every teacher feels partnership, instead of just principal feel partnership. I think the partnership is felt at that leadership level, not at the grassroots level. (Fiona 22277,23350)

Fiona feels that continuity is the key and that a three-year intensive focus would be a minimum for collaborative partnerships to emerge between faculty and in-service teachers. Country Way’s intensive one-year focus on writing reform provided powerful collaborative structures to emerge between university and school partners. However, the writing reform lacked a sustained intensive focus, which inhibited continuity and further relationship building between university faculty and teachers. Interestingly, the short-term focus shifted not as a result of the dissonance, but because of the onset of the inclusion initiative which emerged as school and district attention refocused on the next year’s high stakes data that needed attention. This movement from one focus to another is a frequent outcome of the accountability movement in Florida, often because progress is measured primarily on performance outcomes from standardized assessment scores.

Regardless of any dissonance generated, this inquiry-oriented school improvement focus on writing provided an important and precedent-setting entry point for collaboration between university and school-based educators with a content area focus. To this point, this authentic collaboration was atypical for the PDS network and not a characteristic of the town/gown relationship between the school/university partners. Prior to the writing committee, school administrators, university faculty, university supervisors, and in-service teachers never met as a group to discuss instructional content. The writing committee generated camaraderie and relationships for university faculty, university supervisors, and school administrators, which enabled a shift in professional learning for the school leadership team and university supervisors. The writing committee generated relational dissonance for many in-service teachers in the beginning, but Fiona’s active engagement as a collaborative partner benefited learning for
willing teachers, while resistant teachers sought out alternative professional learning opportunities. In many ways, teacher’s relational dissonance prompted participation in additional learning activities, some of which were supported by other PDS participants while others were district or consultant led.

**Claim 3: Shifted Educator Learning Through Praxis**

The school improvement focus on writing instruction shifted educator learning by providing opportunities for the fusion of theory, research, and instructional practices in the Country Way PDS. Praxis is defined as “a recurring passage through a cyclical process of experiential learning” (Retrieved from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Praxis_(process)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Praxis_(process)) on September 15, 2008). Claim Three specifically explores how new PDS structures and relationships enabled educators to generate new theoretical and practical knowledge about instructional writing practices through active engagement. Two sub-concepts within Claim Three describe specifically how participants’ learning was influenced through praxis. First, embedded professional development provided opportunities for educators to gain new knowledge while they also considered their beliefs and practices. Next, inquiry and coaching provided opportunities for some educators to go a step further to generate theory and practice connections. The primary overarching professional learning practice educators describe is a shift toward more inquiry-oriented practices within PDS supported activities. In essence, learning by doing and reflecting upon the process enabled educators at multiple levels to generate new knowledge. Writing committee meetings, online book studies, on-site undergraduate/graduate seminars, in-class coaching, and inquiry projects were professional learning tools utilized by PDS participants to generate new understandings about writing instruction. Outside of the PDS, faculty in-service trainings, writing plan development, and faculty meetings were used to help participants learn about writing instruction. For some PDS participants, inquiry generated
ownership and responsibility for new knowledge and instructional practices, while for others coaching shifted educators’ knowledge, beliefs, and practices. Together inquiry and coaching provided PDS educators with the tools for educators to generate theory to practice connections, which for participating educators ultimately led to shifts in instructional practice.

**Knowledge, beliefs, and practices**

Some PDS educators shifted their knowledge, beliefs, and practices through embedded professional development activities. Some educators participated in individual and/or shared inquiry, other educators participated in discourse communities, and a few educators engaged in coaching with other PDS participants. The PDS supported multiple entry points for educators to gain new knowledge and explore new practices, which for many led to shifts in beliefs about writing instruction. The writing committee and online book studies began as a space for educators to gather and share information, but over time shifted to require participants to actively engage in “class work”.

Writing committee meetings were the first formal PDS efforts to generate a shared vision for writing instruction through collaborative inquiry. The writing committee engaged school leaders, in-service teachers, the PDS coordinator, university graduate students, and university faculty in a shared inquiry around writing instruction. Fiona describes the work of the writing committee in the beginning:

> When I start to give the committee I talk about time guaranteed, choice, and length. They have to write longer, so what I said 'okay let students write longer. Only when they write longer then we can work on to write better. If they couldn't write longer, they couldn't write better'. So that's what I explained to what they must and then what is the next step in how to help. (Fiona 3299,4175)

Fiona describes how she primarily led the first writing committee meeting, but subsequent committee meetings focused on teachers talking and sharing student work while the group and Fiona shared feedback. Fiona describes how committee meetings shifted over time:
I think the change is when you look at a student's work and help them to how to look at what need to teach from looking at the student's work. You know. I see some [teachers] want to progress, some you know. (Fiona 4277,4922).

Fiona suggests that looking at student work helps willing teachers determine students’ instructional needs. The writing committee required participants to actively engage in the learning process by promoting classroom action and examining student work as part of committee work. While some educators engaged actively in productive dialogue, others continued to defend their practice and were not open to making adaptations to their writing instruction. Most importantly, the committee provided a space for university and school educators to discuss and generate suggestions for improving writing instruction.

Similar to the writing committee, the online book study allowed educators the opportunity to “study” the theoretical underpinnings of writing instruction. For many, the book study shifted educators’ beliefs about teaching writing by causing them to question the relationship between the expectations and goals promoted by curriculum materials and assessments. For others, it shifted their practices, particularly when action was promoted as part of participation as with the Donald Graves book study. Fiona explains how this shift relates to the work of educators,

I think it helped the teachers to reflect themselves as writers and also about connecting their writing experience with teaching. I think that might help the most and also the other help is reading a book really helped the teachers as professionals instead of just technicians. (Fiona 15000,15280)

The online book studies provided visible forums for reflection and dialogue by enabling all educators equal access as participants, but it also provided great sources for documentation that captured studying the learning outcomes for participants. While not all participants chose to participate through posting their reflections, many educators were able to access the site and read the reflections of others enabling them to virtually learn from others. For many educators, dissonance emerged as their beliefs were contradicted in the texts and they reflected upon the
process. The dissonance eventually prompted them to take action. One first grade teacher describes the nature of the dissonance:

I agree with Julie about being pulled in 2 different directions in teaching writing. Just coming back from the 1st grade conference tonight we were all talking about how we are expecting our students to do too much with the expository & narrative writing formats in the early grades and they don't have much time / freedom to write anything and everything. We are not allowing them explore writing as much as we could because we have to teach them to write a formatted 6 sentence expository and narrative and so many other small details. (Katherine, blog entry)

For this particular teacher, dissonance prompted action to make instructional changes and study how students’ writing shifted as a result. Therefore, praxis enabled many teachers to explore theory in their practice by connecting their writing committee work and professional book study with inquiry into their own teaching of writing.

**Theory to practice connections**

Inquiry and coaching also served as powerful tools to help prospective teachers, graduate students, and a few teachers generate theory and practice connections. For prospective teachers, inquiry was often a way to generate theory to practice connections while integrating “best practices” into placement classrooms. Practicing teachers, prospective teachers, and their coaches describe coaching as one form of praxis that shifted educators’ knowledge and beliefs about writing instruction. Coaching was also a form of praxis that deepened or shifted beliefs for coaches and educators alike, thus providing theory to practice connections for multiple groups. For practicing teachers, coaching helped them gain additional support with areas where they felt less confident, as discussed in Christy’s coaching example within Claim One. In another example, Gabrielle coached one teacher participating in the book study and writing committee. The teacher also served as a mentor for prospective teachers and was interested in improving mini-lessons in her classroom. In one book study blog entry, a teacher describes the focus and impact of coaching in her classroom:
My writing mini lessons are in the baby stages right now. I was never very sure of how to do them or what they looked like. Gabrielle is coaching me through the next few weeks as I learn how to do them. I have learned that you really cannot go by a curriculum found in a book. You have to know what your students’ weaknesses are and then create a mini lesson to address that need. And it may be a mini lesson for a small part of your authors (Book study blog excerpt, GB).

This excerpt provides insight into how coaching and inquiry helped one teacher build connections between theory and practice. This example illustrates how coaching helped one willing educator gain new skills as her knowledge base deepened and her beliefs began to shift because she was engaged in multiple learning opportunities. This example also provides some insight into how a mentor teacher and her prospective teachers can learn together to improve mini-lessons with the support of a coach. However, coaching also provided theory to practice connections for Gabrielle to learn through coaching. As a coach, Gabrielle learned how to simultaneously coach prospective teachers and in-service teachers within the same classroom. She realized that coaching prospective teachers provided learning opportunities for the in-service teacher through modeling and shared reflection (Gabrielle Inquiry Paper, Spring 2006). Thus, coaching provided theory and practice connections for in-service teachers, prospective teachers, and doctoral students.

In Fall 2006, doctoral student Jessica Perry coached prospective teachers in writing instruction as part of a supervised research project. Using coaching as a form of inquiry, Jessica formed new opinions and beliefs about the role of methods’ coursework and field placements in teacher preparation. She states:

The Language Arts Methods class trains the student teachers to be excellent writing instructors by giving them a personal experience of writing process and teaching them about writer’s workshop. If they do not have the chance to see how this is put into practice, how it is managed, how students progress and are evaluated, then we can not expect that many of them will be able to teach in this way themselves when they have their own classrooms. (Jessica paper excerpt Fall 2006)
Through actively engaging in coaching as a form of praxis, Jessica experienced one of the greatest challenges facing teacher educators, the importance of connecting knowledge with practice. Although Jessica was disappointed in the disconnect in some placement classrooms, she discovered the challenges that beginning educators face when striving to enact theory and practice in real classrooms. In this case, the PDS provided a doctoral student an opportunity to connect theory and practice, while also developing new beliefs and skills as a prospective teacher educator through coaching and inquiry. Therefore, writing instruction coaching was a form of inquiry for PDS graduate students to support both in-service and prospective educators.

Country Way’s writing improvement focus shifted the practices of undergraduate and graduate PDS participants through on-site seminars. While undergraduate students had participated in on-site seminars in the past, the school’s focus on improving writing prompted the alignment of undergraduate and graduate students with an interest in literacy. Undergraduate prospective teachers specializing in literacy met once a week on-site to discuss various aspects of teaching, enact a writing lesson, and develop literacy focused inquiry projects within their placement classrooms as a result of the school improvement focus on writing. At the same time, graduate students met on-site once a month to observe classrooms and discuss the theory and practice of writing instruction, and some graduate students conducted in-class research. Some graduate students conducted their inquiries primarily with in-service teachers, while others conducted their inquiries in PDS classrooms where teachers and prospective teachers learned together. The presence of on-site seminars for both undergraduate and graduate students at the university shifted the practices of university coursework by integrating it into the school’s improvement focus while also providing a wealth of documentation for the school in the process. A total of twelve inquiry papers focused on writing instruction were developed by undergraduate
and graduate students during Spring 2006 due to the alignment of school focus and university coursework. Thus, theory to practice connections generated by university students were enabled through PDS engagement because coursework was aligned with the school improvement focus.

Graduate and undergraduate students shifted their knowledge and understandings about teaching writing through the process of actively engaging in the act of teaching and inquiry. In-service teachers and school administrators also gained new knowledge, beliefs, and practices through inquiry and job-embedded professional development in writing instruction. Job-embedded professional development and on-site university coursework provided an opportunity for participants to expand their own expertise and generate new understandings about the theory and practice of writing instruction. Thus, praxis became a key activity to help educators at multiple levels expand their writing expertise.

**Claim 4: Shifted Student Performance**

The school improvement focus on writing reform shifted student-writing performance. Claim Four explores how the writing reform influenced student performance on both standardized and non-standardized measures. More specifically, Claim Four discusses how the writing reform helped increase student motivation and student writing volume, but it also discusses a dilemma that emerged with using standardized assessments as a primary indicator of student performance. PDS participants describe positive shifts in student performance during the 2005-2006 school year when the Country Way PDS focused intensive resources on writing instruction reform. Standardized assessment data from the Florida Writes Assessment showed huge improvements in the first year of the reform, followed by a downward trend in outcomes in subsequent years. However, multiple participants describe an increase in students’ motivation for writing and students’ writing volume as significant shifts in student performance resulting from the writing reform.
Motivation and writing volume

PDS writing initiatives facilitated shifts in student motivation for writing and increased students’ writing volume. The writing reform in the Country Way PDS provided specific conditions for writing instruction that had previously been absent. Based on Fiona’s recommendation, guaranteed time for writing provided the framework for other improvements to emerge. She states:

First the writing is guaranteed in every classroom, time is guaranteed and also and they do spend more time on writing at every grade level. I think for the first year that's enough. That is enough. If continued there would be more.  (Fiona 4595,4776)

As Fiona suggests in this example, there was a lapse in continuity and intense focus in the PDS writing reform. Yet while a one-year intense focus enabled first year goals to be met, school-wide development was inhibited due to a lack of continuity. However, some PDS participants suggest that they continued their work in small ways in individual classrooms. These participants suggest that the progress they saw over time related to students’ writing volume. Christy recalls:

I see a lot more writing on the paper, and I know that when we first started this the teachers would have a little shape like a president's head or the child's head and they were to do their writing sample in that little head, now the kids are writing way outside of the head. We are not using that anymore they have several pages of paper, so the quantity of writing has changed, the quality of writing has changed, the enthusiasm for writing. If I walk through the halls the kids are begging for me to come in their classrooms and do writing with them.  (Christy 47211,47760)

Christy suggests that increased attention on writing instruction has improved both the quantity and quality of student’s writing. She also recalls, how her visits in individual primary grade classrooms show that over time the writing reform has proven successful. She states:

I went in and I did my little mini-lesson and then the kids wrote during the time they were to write it and then they came up into the microphone and they read what they had and it was just unbelievable. I think everybody's mouths just flew open that those kids were such good writers and that they could put words together to fit the way they did. I remember, it was just a light bulb moment for me to know that what we had been doing in the school in the past three years in writing was paying off because it was the beginning of the year in second grade and when I went in there and taught that lesson and then had them write it
was just an aha moment for all of us in there because I think that the intern and the teacher and Ivey, none of us could believe what those kids had written. (Christy 32671,33620)

Christy recalls a moment in Fall 2007, three years after the focus on enhancing writing instruction began, when observable differences in students’ writing abilities emerged in one second grade classroom. Multiple PDS participants were present to observe students’ writing abilities and see how shifts in writing instruction had “paid off,” often in ways that standardized assessments were not designed to capture and in grade levels that are not assessed. Multiple PDS in-service teachers echo Christy’s observation about how the PDS focus on writing reform increased student writing volume and students’ motivation to write by changing instructional practices. Although school-wide progress may not have appeared evident due to a lapse in focus, significant progress was achieved in primary grade classrooms. However, the primary dilemma that emerged was how to position intermediate grade (i.e. 3-5) educators within the writing reform when high stakes accountability demands place intense pressure to increase student performance in writing in fourth grade. In Spring 2006, 4 out of 12 intermediate grade teachers participated in PDS supported professional learning opportunities. In most cases, intermediate grade teachers participated in consultant-led learning workshops rather than PDS supported learning activities. PDS participants continued to observe shifts in motivation and writing quantity several years after the reform began. However, because most positive instructional shifts were achieved in primary grade classrooms, participants suggest that true improvement results may not be evident for many years if fourth grade FCAT results are the only measure by which effectiveness is determined.

Assessing progress

The school improvement focus on writing instruction shifted student performance on the FCAT Florida Writes Assessment. However, assessing student progress toward PDS writing
reform goals was more complex than simply examining standardized assessment scores.

Standardized assessment data indicated that students’ writing performance shifted over time (Table 6-1). Specifically, students scoring at level 3.5 or above, which is considered a passing rate, increased from 62% to 80% after the first year of the writing reform initiative. In the following two years, scores gradually shifted downward to 78% in 2007 and then to 61% in 2008. The intensive focus on writing reform occurred during the 2005-2006 school year, and gradually decreased during subsequent years. Although, PDS participants do not agree on what caused extreme shifts in student performance on standardized writing assessments in the Country Way PDS, some participants attribute an 18% shift in student writing performance in one year to focused professional development, while others attribute the shift specifically to a group of talented writers.

Participant interviews provide deeper insight into the shifts in student performance and helped raise new questions about the utility of standardized assessments for evaluating the success of the writing reform initiative. Principal Regan Lundsford attributed significant shifts in student creative writing abilities to primary grade classrooms. When asked about how the PDS focus on writing influenced student learning, she specifies where the most significant shifts occurred:

I think definitely, our primary age kids especially are where we have seen the most creative writing, and they love it! Less formula writing and to the prompts, they really enjoy that creative and the teachers saw that too, they see that the kids love it. And even doing more of it they just love. We have talked a lot the past couple of years about just teach them to be creative writers and let fourth grade teach them how to take that test. Because if fourth grade can get creative writers they can teach them to do the format of the test and score well. I really think those fourth grade teachers are starting to see it, some of those kids you know are like in second and third grade now, so I expect it like next year for this year's third graders going up to fourth for next year. I expect to hear fourth grade teachers say that they are more creative writers. (Regan 32509,33384)
Regan expresses how primary grade classrooms moved away from a heavy emphasis on prompt writing and sparked students’ love for writing and improved creativity. Classroom observations of second grade students engaged in writer’s workshop and book making activities validate Regan’s observation (Figure 6-1). In many primary grade classrooms, children were given more opportunities to produce authentic writing than in previous years when there was limited time for writing instruction and an emphasis on writing to prompts. However, even two years after the intense focus on writing reform concluded Regan contends that she still doesn’t anticipate seeing the real results for another year. Regan’s insight points to the first dilemma with using standardized testing measures as a primary metric for assessing student learning, the amount of time that must pass before true “results” are measured.

Student creative writing boosts fourth graders’ performance on standardized writing assessments. Fourth grade teacher Carol Bates attributes the significant shift in the first year to the writing skills of one group of students. She recalls:

Two years ago¹ I had probably the most talented writers I have ever had and I had a very high performing class that year…those kids could have taught second graders how to write. That is how good they were, well not all of them of course. But, they truly had talent…Youe’r really gonna be talking about the creativity there because they’ve got the story down. But they need to learn about what the readers of the papers are going to be looking for, because we want to make sure that they are putting in strong vocabulary, strong verbs, figurative language, idioms, similes, metaphors, and some dialogue. (Carol 23970,24775)

Carol attributes large leaps in assessment scores to the talent and creativity of her fourth graders’ writing in 2005-2006. She believes that the creativity that students brought into fourth grade helped her better prepare them to learn the specific aspects of writing that FCAT assessors were rating. It is noteworthy to consider that Carol was the only one of the four fourth grade level team members who consistently participated in PDS writing reform activities. Carol participated

¹ Interviews with Carol, were conducted in the Spring of 2008.
in both book studies, the writing committee, mentored PDS prospective teachers, and worked with a university graduate student. All fourth grade team members, including Carol, gained instructional support through consultant-led workshops. Additionally, many writing reform activities were not consistent and sustained after the first intensive year. A new online book study began with a group of willing teachers and some in-class coaching continued. The reform focused on instructional goals such as increasing the use of mini-lessons and providing students with more choice when writing. The goals behind the PDS writing reform focused on fostering quality writing and creativity in primary grades so that fourth grade teachers could help students learn to structure their creative thoughts in a format that could be measured by the Florida Writes assessment.

Classroom observation tools provide a new lens when examining shifts in writing instruction. In Fall 2007, a team of three university observers visited Country Way Elementary classrooms to collect data for an Instructional Practices Inventory (IPI). The IPI is an observation tool developed by University of Missouri researchers to provide schools with “valid, reliable data for profiling student engaged learning and serves as the basis for the collaborative problem-solving faculty conversations necessary in a professional learning community” (Retrieved from http://education.missouri.edu/orgs/mlle/4A_ipi_overview.php on October 18, 2008). The data gathered during the visit revealed two instances of level 6 student-engaged instruction where students were actively engaged in higher order learning activities, one in a fourth grade classroom and the other in a second grade classroom. Both examples of level six engagement occurred in classrooms where writing instruction was observed. The observers believed students in both classrooms were engaged in writing activities that provided students with authentic opportunities to use higher order thinking skills while writing. In the second grade
classroom, students were provided with a visual prompt (i.e. a sketched cartoon without words) and asked to write about what they believed was happening in the picture. In Carol Bates’ fourth grade classroom students were conversing and revising individual writing samples created during a previous lesson. After talking with individual fourth grade students, the researchers determined that students had to utilize higher order thinking skills to synthesize personal experiences and analyze their writing to engage in the lesson activities. Thus, the IPI observation tool provided a new kind of data that had been previously absent, a valid tool for assessing instructional practices and for generating conversations about school improvement. The IPI data suggested that in classrooms where writing instruction was observed, students were actively engaged in higher order thinking activities. These data demonstrate that students were engaged in authentic writing instruction two years after the intensive focus on writing reform.

Standardized assessments of student writing performance are given to fourth grade students across the state of Florida. Multiple Country Way participants attribute the most significant student writing performance shifts to the primary grade classrooms (i.e. K-2) and the fourth grade students of 2005-2006. While the primary age students received multiple years of more “creative” writing opportunities, they will not be assessed again on the Florida Writes until Spring 2009 and 2010. The fourth graders that were assessed the first year had primarily been exposed to writing instruction that focused on tested skills. Therefore, gauging the effectiveness of the writing reform initiative using standardized assessment scores alone presents a challenge due to amount of lapsed time, student abilities, and the instructional focus on test preparation in fourth grade. Additional observational tools can supplement standardized assessment measures and provide methods for monitoring progress on instructional goals before standardized assessment results help identify student writing progress. Observational tools, such as the IPI,
can provide additional data to illuminate specific shifts in instructional practices. As indicated by multiple participants, the standardized assessment data could not offer insight into the multiple shifts in writing instruction that occurred in primary grade classrooms. Although, the writing reform shifted student performance in many ways, the use of one primary assessment measure (i.e. FCAT) in one grade level made it challenging to monitor school-wide student writing progress on PDS reform goals. The large shift in student writing progress suggested that students were making AYP in writing, which also proved to be a dilemma for sustaining a long-term focus on writing improvement. Once the principal’s goal for raising assessment scores was achieved it relieved the intense pressure to perform. However, the instructional goals for writing improvement were just beginning to emerge in meaningful ways when the emphasis for improvement shifted to a new focus.

Claim 5: Influenced Leadership Style

The school improvement focus on writing instruction influenced school leadership practices, which influenced the scope of change within the learning culture. Claim Five offers insight into how PDS school leadership style shifted during the writing reform and impacted the learning culture. Writing reform in the Country Way PDS provided multiple examples of how school leaders generated action and supported educator learning around a common focus for school improvement. Specifically, within Claim Five the data reveal how Country Way’s “top-down” approach to inquiry-oriented writing reform applied pressure for change and support by distributing leadership among participants, which required PDS participants who worked as change agents to achieve a “balancing act”. Concurrent with the school reform literature, top-down initiatives are important in the beginning to provide sustained coordination and support (Richert et al., 2001). Much like many school reform initiatives, the top-down approach to school improvement generated dissonance for some participants but at the same time provided
multiple entry points for professional development which contributed to shifts in the learning culture. A “top-down” approach to school improvement may seem to contrast traditional notions of a PDS because all stakeholders were not provided equal voice during decision-making and planning stages. However, the “top-down” approach to writing reform enabled PDS leaders to collaboratively define a shared pedagogy for writing instruction, which became a necessary first step in clarifying the school’s mission for writing improvement.

**Top-down distributed leadership**

Participants describe the writing reform initiative as a top down approach to school improvement. School principal, Regan Lunsford, initiated the writing instruction reform within the Country Way PDS. Prior to the initiation of the PDS in Spring 2005, Regan had to make significant changes in her school, which required her to use her power as a principal to generate action. The story of writing reform followed a similar pattern, yet marked the beginning of a shift in how Regan accomplished her goals as a principal. Prior to the writing reform movement, the school leadership team initiated most school improvement action and also delivered many professional development activities themselves or sent teachers to attend consultant-led workshops. The writing reform began a shift toward more collaborative professional development practices by sharing responsibility for in-service teacher professional development between the Country Way Elementary leadership team and university personnel.

The writing reform initiative began as a “top-down” effort to make significant shifts in writing instruction at Country Way Elementary. Regan identified an area for improvement based on FCAT assessment scores and Hannah Dobbs, the university’s PDS director, connected her with a university faculty member with expertise in writing. As previously described in Claim Two, relationships between university faculty member, Fiona Denlin and Country Way
Elementary began at the top, with principal Regan Lundsford. Fiona Denlin describes how her experience with Country Way Elementary began:

> It started with the principal. The principal wanted it so it's very easy, I don't have to push in myself. I was invited into the classrooms and to get into the school is not difficult. I think the difficult part is it's just because principal’s wish is different and the teachers did not seem ready for it. So the principal of course wishes to improve the testing score and that's why you can tell with the first writing committee the teachers feel 'why do you have another person’? (Fiona 484,1043)

Fiona describes how she was welcomed into the school by the principal but that the teachers were not ready for hearing the advice of yet another expert on writing instruction. Fiona was brought in by Regan to accomplish a mission to improve writing instruction, a goal that was conceptualized, defined, and planned by Regan with guided support by Fiona, Hannah, Gabrielle, and Christy. Thus, in the beginning the vision for the writing reform was primarily “owned” by the principal.

The top-down inquiry-oriented approach to writing reform enabled the principal to distribute leadership to other PDS participants. As new professional development activities became infused into the school culture, university personnel became more involved in professional development activities, which also created natural resistance from some of the teachers. Teaching and learning is a knowledge intensive enterprise; therefore, the central task of distributive leadership is to create a common culture of expectations around the use of individual skills and abilities, maximizing the human capacity within the organization (Elmore, 2004). The writing reform movement provided a model (Figure 5-2) for how human resources with expertise in writing instruction became infused into various organizational structures (Copland, 2003) within the PDS. The writing reform model distributed leadership between the principal, university faculty, university supervisor(s), graduate students, and the CRT. All of whom facilitated diverse learning opportunities for sub-groups within the PDS. Hannah Dobbs
describes how the shift occurred because the principal identified a need to focus on a common goal, in this case writing reform, and sought out resources to support school improvement goals. Hannah states:

The inquiry is giving them something to talk about something they have in common, something they share….and that is brought on by the head learner, I mean she has helped to pick those based on data in the school and then when she realizes there is a problem she sought out resources to help inform that inquiry. (Hannah 7269,7372)

Hannah believes that it was Regan’s value for external knowledge that enabled her to activate more resources to improve writing instruction. The PDS provided Regan access to more human resources to support writing reform in her school. As a result, she was able to achieve school goals through the collective work of university faculty, university supervisors, prospective teachers, and doctoral students, while at the same time her own school leadership team and teachers worked to achieve reform around a common mission.

The formation of trusting relationships with university personnel enabled distributed leadership practices to emerge. Regan formed relationships with university faculty members in a top-down framework. This was important for Regan because she had to establish a trusting relationship in order to build confidence in each individual. Hannah provides more insight into the importance of Regan’s relationship with university personnel. She states:

In the beginning she [Regan] appeared to have more of a finger on everything and I think now she is using more distributive leadership. Probably not to the full extent that she could, but I think that comes again with trust. She had to figure out who she can trust and who she can delegate things to. In the beginning, she had to control a lot, that's not unlike a lot of principals when they go into new schools, though, and have to do some clean up work for lack of a better term. I think that has changed. (Hannah 16770,17315)

Hannah believes that Regan’s top-down approach to writing reform emerged from her need to develop content-specific pedagogical knowledge and build trust with university personnel. Once Regan established trusting relationships with university faculty, supervisors, and doctoral
students, she became more open to delegating more responsibilities and allowing more access to her classrooms and teachers.

The top-down approach to writing reform shifted the leadership practices within the PDS by sharing leadership responsibilities with university personnel, but teacher leadership roles did not emerge. As a result, Fiona expresses caution with a “top-down” partnership model. She states:

Too much at the top. I think this model should be very careful because it's almost like there's no foundation if you change the principal that school will fall back. You know you're okay with this teacher with the principal here, you become an A-school, you know you raised testing score from 60 to 80 tremendously. But you leave it's gone, so what does this mean? It means there's no grassroots foundation; you know the foundation is still very sandy. You move the top, it's gone. (Fiona 31888,32619)

Fiona suggests that focusing partnership activity primarily with the school principal makes it challenging to establish a solid foundation for change. Fiona’s suggestion is concurrent with the school reform literature base that suggests both top-down and bottom up initiatives should be in place to achieve and sustain change (Richert et al., 2001). The writing reform’s top-down model emerged as a first step to school improvement. However, the intensive reform focus never moved beyond the first year of implementation, which inhibited a movement toward a grass roots model where more teacher leadership could be integrated.

An important consideration when looking at the writing reform example is that a common set of expectations for writing instruction was achieved through multiple, collaborative learning opportunities for writing reform leaders and teacher participants within the PDS. Learning together, the school principal, CRT, university supervisor, doctoral students, in-service teachers, and prospective teachers were able to negotiate natural tensions and refine a common set of expectations for writing instruction, even in the face of contrasting perspectives. Although, the writing reform did not translate to more teacher leadership or grass roots leadership due to
lack of a sustained focus, the framework offered a significant shift for PDS participants to consider how school and university organizational structures could become collaboratively infused into a school culture to achieve a common mission. Therefore, a sustained focus is required to establish organizational structures that enable shared leadership between PDS leaders and teachers.

**Balancing pressure and support**

The top-down writing reform initiative frequently generated action and energy that was “not optional” for teachers. Required participation during PDS activities did generate action and energy around a common focus, but in the beginning often left teachers with feelings of dissonance. While some PDS participants were able to overcome their initial tensions because of their willingness to learn, willing participants sought out support through other voluntary professional development activities that they found more comfortable such as coaching, book studies, and additional trainings. Participants who were willing to learn more often utilized their relationships with the school’s CRT and university doctoral students to gain support in alternative forms.

Participants recall multiple aspects of mandated participation in the writing reform movement. Specifically, looking across field notes and interview data transcripts, the data reveal that almost every face-to-face PDS activity that Fiona Denlin participated in over two years of writing reform work was accompanied by required in-service teacher participation. These data help explain why establishing trusting relationships with in-service teachers proved challenging for Fiona. The writing committee was the first example where writing reform activities required participation. Christy James reflects on the tensions present in the writing committee. She recalls:
You know something that it could be, too, coming from they were made to go to that. That it was not optional. (Christy 54924,55080)

In this excerpt Christy explores the idea that tensions in the writing committee were in part due to teacher resistance, but when paired with required participation more dissonance emerged. Some teachers eventually came around and began to shift their practice when given the opportunity to participate in voluntary forms of professional development in writing.

Mandated participation by an entire grade level team occurred during the second year of the writing reform. As Country Way’s emphasis shifted slightly in 2006, so did the group Fiona was asked to meet with. Once again teacher participation was “not voluntary” and they weren’t ready/willing to accept support. The writing committee was no longer in place and Regan determined that meeting with the third grade team was warranted. Regan describes that a lack of progress in writing instruction in third grade prompted her to ask third grade teachers to meet with Fiona. She states:

Fiona had talked to me about working with a grade specific on writing. I had really felt like the forth grade had so much training and that they were really moving and rocking as far as the writing for the FCAT. Third grade, I felt like was not, and so I asked third grade to meet with Fiona and to talk about a project and/or what do they need and what is something that we can help. (Regan 7689,8082)

In this example we again see how Regan determined which grade level should work with Fiona, again applying new pressure to change and asking the team of teachers to meet with Fiona as a means for support. Although Fiona was present during some activities when teacher participation was voluntary, those events were not consistent or organized with a specific goal in mind. Fiona was often observing during these events rather than given a specific support role, as in other PDS activities. Therefore, university faculty members were often placed in a position to provide direct support for in-service teachers when participation was not voluntary which generated dissonance
and caused teachers to reject support. As teachers rejected support for instructional changes, PDS participants working as change agents had to negotiate a “balancing act.”

PDS participants leading professional development activities worked as change agents and each used unique approaches to provide support for educators. Multiple participants describe individual ways to support teachers as they learned new skills in writing instruction. While some participants used their relational skills to establish rapport with in-service teachers and collaboratively engaged in professional development activities, others carefully structured activities to give teachers voice within activities that required participation. Claim Two illustrates how Christy James achieved this goal by building a trusting relationship with an uncertain teacher, and Claim One illustrates how coaching provided learning opportunities for in-service teachers. Similarly, Fiona used the writing committee to generate conversations and dialogue around students’ needs, while Regan led a discourse community through an online book study. All of the entry points for learning in the writing reform worked together to achieve a common vision for writing instruction.

The writing committee analyzed and discussed student-writing samples to balance pressure and support for writing reform. Fiona began the first writing committee in Fall 2005 by offering suggestions for achieving school-wide writing goals, she gradually shifted to focus future meetings on having teachers participate in more talking and sharing. Writing committee members attended meetings and brought student work to analyze as a group. By the final writing committee meeting of the year, book study participants also voluntarily joined the group where teachers continued to share samples of students’ writing. Fiona praised the teachers stating that “comfort in yourself with teaching has come so far” but she continued to encourage the teachers to “invite students to see their own progress” by using portfolios to collect student writing
samples. Overall, the final meeting of the year received positive feedback from the teachers, but student work samples showed that students were still primarily writing from teacher directed prompts. Regan encouraged the group to examine the new writing plan because “it is so focused on FCAT. We need to add to it and make it more about a quality writing plan.” After the final meeting the formal “writing committee” never met again, instead the following year the book study participants voluntarily met to discuss their insights and issues. However, these meetings were less structured and did not identify specific goals and formal revisions to the writing plan never transpired. As a change agent, Fiona helped teachers negotiate the pressure to change by providing a space where they could collaboratively engage in dialogue about student writing needs.

Teachers who opted not to participate in voluntary writing professional development activities received more pressure to change from the school principal, and were offered support during team meetings. Regan applied pressure on in-service teachers by requiring participation in PDS activities, which in some cases prompted teachers to arrive at meetings ready to defend or reject the support of others. When Fiona Denlin and another university faculty members sat down to meet with the third grade team in November 2006 the meeting did not go “as planned.” Regan asked the third grade team to meet with Fiona and her colleague to identify ways to support them in achieving new goals to improve content area reading instruction. However, even Regan wasn’t aware that the teachers had met as a team prior to meeting with faculty members to discuss what they would say and who would say it. The teachers entered the meeting with a plan to reject any additional “support” that was being provided unless it related to two specific programs they wanted support in implementing because they were “overwhelmed with assistance”. During the meeting teachers stated that they already were getting too much help
from other places and rejected the support that was being offered from the university faculty members. In this case, pressure to change was paired with support, but participants clearly rejected additional support. Regan recalls the outcome the meeting:

The meeting turned quickly into how can we help you to this is something you should be doing and so they [the teachers] backed off the table. And I recognized it and I said you know, I ended the meeting, I just said you know it is obvious that this isn't going in the direction that we want it to. I want to do something helpful and it not feel like extra to you guys. (Regan 8739,9092)

Regan describes her role as a buffer in this example, having to balance the amount of support provided without overwhelming them with too much assistance. Even though Fiona stated during the meeting that her goal was to “help you look at the students’ work, see their strengths and how to help them. We are not bringing a program, we are trying to target the kids and help” (Field notes 11/18/06). Fiona recalls how multiple initiatives at work during this school year made providing teachers support a challenge. However, neither Fiona nor Regan were aware of the planning dynamics that framed the meetings before it ever began. Multiple PDS participants felt that dissonance/teacher resistance increased when top-down pressure to change was paired with mandated participation. Mandated participation made it challenging for teachers to overcome their feelings of dissonance and in some cases caused them to reject support altogether. Therefore, pressure to change through mandated participation generated dissonance that caused many teachers to reject support from university faculty members.

PDS leaders also describe using their authority and relationships with participants to balance pressure to change with support. In the story of writing reform, Regan used her authority as principal to apply pressure to change writing practices, while Fiona was brought in to provide support around the school’s writing focus. Participation in writing committee and the grade level meeting was “not optional” and these activities in most cases were used as a way to apply pressure to change on teachers who “weren't where we wanted them to be” while at the same
time providing them with resources for support. However, other PDS leaders came in to provide support by creating relationships with teachers and to help teachers overcome their dissonance. Therefore, PDS leaders need to understand that outside experts can provide a wealth of support for teaching and learning within a context; however applying just the right amount of pressure to change requires a delicate balancing act. The top-down hierarchical approach to writing reform was a blessing and a curse, it provided an easy entry point for university faculty members but required participation from in-service teachers that was too often mandatory and generated tension and conflict. If improvement is to occur, teachers need to feel they are given the opportunity to understand the need for the change as well as have voice and participate in reform planning, while outside experts need opportunities to build relationships with participants who express a willingness to learn not just those who are required to participate.

Claim 6: Influenced by Existing University and District Structures

Existing university and school district structures influenced Country Way’s school improvement focus on writing instruction. Claim Six offers insight into how organizational structures influence university/school collaboration. Specifically, a lack of theoretical alignment between university and district writing reform goals were confounded because existing university faculty expectations inhibited PDS participation. University faculty members and in-service educators at Country Way describe how existing university structures inhibited continuity and alignment within the Country Way PDS. In the beginning, many participants describe their experiences as generating dissonance, but as the PDS moved forward participants describe how dissonance generated action to make change. However, the extent to which shifts were actualized hinged upon who had the power to influence existing structures. PDS educators describe how the inability to influence or shift existing structures generated frustration and threatened the sustainability of the PDS work.
Complexity of theoretical alignment

The inquiry-oriented school improvement focus on writing reform generated dissonance for PDS participants due to a lack of alignment between district and university approaches. The issue of theoretical alignment presented another layer of complexity into the writing reform because of a contrast of goals between raising test scores and improving writing quality. Multiple participants recall how differing approaches to writing instruction prompted dissonance, but also made it difficult for willing educators to negotiate a balance between two seemingly opposite perspectives. While many participants initially felt these tensions during early writing committee meetings, it wasn’t until writing plan meetings with district personnel that dissonance reached an all time high. While most educators simply took what they wanted from each perspective, some simply rejected one perspective, and a few investigated the utility of both perspectives. Catherine Duarte, a graduate of the university’s PROTEACH program and first grade teacher explains her reaction to the lack of alignment between university and district perspectives. She explains:

We sat down with the university group about how we wanted to do writing in our school and then the county came in and said this is how writing is going to go. It was two totally opposite spectrums, it really was. The university said you need to let them be free, you need to let them be creative, you need to let them write about what they want but all those kind of things, about letting the students make all their choices in regards to their writing and how to write. Then when we came to the county it was okay, you have to teach your students how to write a narrative, you have to teach them how to write an expository and in their expository they have to have this, this, this and this and in their narrative they have to have this, this, this and this, those are the two things you are going to teach them, go teach them writing. So, it was very direct what they [county] wanted, how they wanted it, they even gave examples of how it needs it be with introduction, a sentence, a detail, a detail, conclusion. Six sentences, cut and blank that's it, that's all there is to it. (Catherine 10864,12227)

Catherine describes contrasting approaches between the university’s PDS activities, which promoted process oriented writing instruction, compared to county activities which focused on
more of formulaic writing structure. Catherine describes how conflicting perspective made it
challenging for her to determine the best approach for her classroom. She states:

   It was hard for me to come back after sitting with those two groups and say how am I
supposed to teach writing, it was very difficult for me to come back having those two ideas
seeing the county we have to do it this way, the university says it's better to do it this way.
What do we do? (Katherine 10864,12227)

While some in-service teachers, like Catherine chose to try both approaches and find a personal
balance between both perspectives, others simply rejected the university perspective because the
county’s approach provided them a concrete structure that required them to learn less about the
process of teaching writing and students’ writing development. The lack of alignment between
the university and country approaches to writing instruction generated dissonance for many
educators in the Country Way PDS. The contrasting approaches to professional development
illuminate how two distinct instructional purposes for writing improvement were at work within
one context.

   The challenge with the lack of alignment between the university and district perspectives
was that university prospective teacher were experiencing field placements within Country Way
that promoted both perspectives. While some prospective teachers learned a great deal by having
the opportunity to explore writing workshops, others were experiencing great tensions between
the theory and practice divide because prospective teachers and in-service teachers did not see a
connection between two seemingly different belief systems. Therefore, a lack of theoretical
alignment between university and district structures generated dissonance and limited PDS
participants’ learning due to diverse goals and purposes for instructional improvement.

**University expectations and structures**

   Existing university structures and expectations influenced the writing reform and
inhibited PDS participation for university faculty members. University faculty members describe
how existing university expectations and support structures created dissonance for faculty members who choose to engage in PDS work. Existing university structures do not recognize/support the collaborative nature of PDS as part of faculty assignment, which inhibits continuity for university faculty members engaged in PDS sites. As a university professor with an established research agenda, Fiona describes how her work in the PDS was beneficial but that existing university structures did not recognize PDS work as part of her faculty responsibilities. She asserts:

Yeah you do it. It's good. But once you do it, nobody would count for the time. So it's extra work. So if you're one hundred percent, your teaching is a hundred, your writing publishing is a hundred percent. Of course, I can connect with my research, but at this point I have enough research to do, so that one I just become my service to help. (Fiona 37999,38342)

Fiona suggests that a PDS may be a way for beginning faculty members to establish a research agenda and connect research to teaching and service. However, she feels strongly that for professors who already have established a research agenda the balance of responsibilities is a challenge unless new university structures are established to account for partnership time. Fiona recommends that building in new university structures would facilitate continuity and enable faculty members to balance their responsibilities. Fiona states:

I think it's almost like have to... more structure, have to build in. If it's a real project built into our work, just like the teaching I have to go. I think that made up the reasons, so Country Way is my side project. It's not really my major project but with I work with New York for years, consistent for 10 years, so that become part of my job, but this Country Way is, I have so many jobs, so this one is add-on a little bit of things. That will work. So if you want to do the partnership, it should be a major thing to do the job. I think that's why I'm trying for grant now, because I don't want just okay go someplace for spare time. I want to build into structure of my research, service, or teaching. You know as part of the job. (Fiona 36424,37446)

For Fiona, the dissonance she experienced from her participation at Country Way generated action to seek out external funding that would enable her to make partnership participation part of her job rather than apart from her appointment as a university faculty member. For Fiona, the
challenge of balancing a wide variety of commitments as a university faculty member left her with limited time to offer “service” for Country Way Elementary. As discussed in previous claims, a lack of time for partnership work influenced Fiona’s ability to build relationships with in-service teachers, which challenged her ability to maintain participation within the site. One way Fiona dealt with this challenge was to place graduate students, like Jessica, out in the PDS to observe teachers’ work and offer instructional support. Therefore, if existing university structures do not account for and recognize time necessary for PDS research, teaching and service, then building and sustaining meaningful and long-term collaborative partnerships with schools will continue to be a challenge for university faculty. As a result, university faculty members may have to develop new ways to confront the time-intensive nature of PDS work, such as placing graduate students within the context to conduct research and support teacher learning.

Hannah Dobbs suggests that new university support structures should support university faculty members who are willing to engage in PDS work. She states:

People like Fiona, faculty members need to be rewarded for going in there. They need to have support for how to go in there, and I don't mean like someone should teach them, it is more like I should have spent more time relationship building with the school. I too didn't have the relationships with the school faculty, just the principal...You know, in other partnerships there is a person that's kind of like PDS coordinator that's from the system that now works with the university that can probably broker that relationship better, and we didn't have that to support Fiona. So that is one thing that I have learned from Country Way. (Hannah 13648,14384)

Hannah suggests that university support structures should reward professors for their engagement in PDS work, but universities should also provide appropriate support to help faculty members build relationships with PDS participants. University faculty members agree that more formal support structures should be in place to facilitate PDS partnership work. However, the primary inhibitor in the Country Way PDS was that Hannah did not have the time
or personally have relationships with teachers at the school, which made it challenging for her to support Fiona.

Multiple educators describe how a lack of support for university faculty members and university personnel who conduct PDS work within schools has inhibited the alignment of PDS work between the university and schools. At the same time, a lack of theoretical alignment between university and district approaches to writing instruction limited shifts in educator learning. Therefore, although the writing reform initiative supported educators within the Country Way PDS, existing university and district structures actually inhibited the continuity for university faculty members and alignment between university and district writing goals.

Conclusion

Chapter 6 examined how PDS educators described the shifting structures, relationships, roles, responsibilities, and knowledge through inquiry-oriented writing reform. The Country Way PDS facilitated an inquiry-oriented approach to writing reform by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis, which generated a professional learning culture for educators and students. Participants described both theoretical and relational dissonance at multiple points, but the collaborative nature of the writing reform provided an entry point for new relationships to form between school personnel and university faculty. The “top-down” nature of the writing reform illustrated how the principal initiated PDS school improvement focus enabled the activation of new PDS resources. The top-down nature also enabled the principal to provide teacher-learning resources by distributing leadership responsibilities among university faculty, university supervisors, university graduate students, and the school-based leadership team. As a result of increased resources, many PDS participants overcame dissonance through inquiry and coaching. The writing reform shifted the way PDS participants organized professional learning resources for prospective teachers, teachers, graduate students, and school leaders,
simultaneously. Although the long-term collaborative outcomes of the reform were not sustained, participants agree that educator learning and the writing reform movement positively shifted classroom practices. Leadership practices within the PDS also shifted which later influenced future reform initiatives. The results shared in Chapter 7 present the inclusive education reform movement, a reform that unfolded immediately following the writing instruction reform. Finally, Chapter 8 will describe lessons learned from both stories and identify implications for the field.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Fourth Grade Students Scoring 3.5 and above in Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6-1. Photos of second graders engaged in process oriented writing

A) Students illustrating during book development workshops
B) Final student created books
Figure 6-2. Writing reform distributed leadership model
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CHAPTER 7

STORY OF PDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION REFORM

This study examined how educators described their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a Professional Development School focused on creating a culture of professional learning. Chapter 6 presented a description and analysis of the writing instruction reform within the newly created Country Way Elementary PDS. Similarly, Chapter 7 provides a description and analysis of how the inclusive education reform shifted the professional learning culture of Country Way Elementary. Although the writing reform and inclusive education reform share common claims, the process and outcomes unfolded in very different ways and with different results. Chapter 7 describes and analyzes how the PDS and Country Way’s focus on inclusive education reform dove-tailed to facilitate inquiry-oriented school improvement by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis, which generated a professional learning culture for educators and students.

The stories and claims selected for inclusion in Chapter 7 describe the work of educators’ in the Country Way PDS and provide specific lessons for the work of PDS participants. The inclusive education reform emerged from the school district’s interest in providing all students access to the general education curriculum. The motivation for inclusive education reform was not set in motion solely by standardized assessment measures like in the writing reform, but rather initiated by the school district and supported by multiple university level structures. University teacher education program supported professional learning through the Unified Elementary PROTEACH (UEP) teacher preparation program and Project Include. The UEP program prepared prospective teachers to work in inclusive classrooms. Project Include facilitated in-service teacher knowledge about inclusive teaching models and engaged teachers in collaboratively crafting a school-wide inclusion model. When the Country Way PDS, an
outgrowth of the unified general education/special education teacher education program, and Project Include aligned, they facilitated inquiry-oriented school improvement by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis, which generated a professional learning culture for educators and students.

**Illustration**

Country Way PDS participants describe how a school improvement focus on inclusive education reform influenced the professional learning culture of the school and prompted significant shifts in PDS structures, relationships, and praxis. The inclusion illustration was selected because it describes how the school-wide focus on inclusive education reform served as a critical event to generate alignment between the university’s goals for preparing inclusive educators and the school’s goals for helping all students gain access to the regular education curriculum. The shared focus on inclusive education unfolded in two phases. The first phase focused on prospective teacher education, while the second phase focused on in-service teacher professional development. The two phases converged as the Country Way PDS collaboratively engaged in teaching and learning, integrated co-teaching practices between prospective teachers, in-service teachers, university supervisors, and school administrators, and supported practitioner inquiry around a shared focus school improvement.

Prior to the PDS at Country Way Elementary, a lack of collaboration between teachers was evident. When the PDS began in Spring 2005, twelve prospective teacher pre-interns were infused into the context in six classrooms. The pre-interns were placed in dyads to support their ability to practice co-teaching with another educator. As part of their coursework during the pre-internship, the prospective teachers were encouraged to try various co-teaching models in their placement classrooms. At the same time, principal Regan Lundsford encouraged mentor teachers to utilize pre-interns as small group instructional resources within PDS classrooms. The
following example represents a typical process as prospective and practicing teachers learned to share responsibility for teaching and learning.

In Spring 2006, Denise Mason and Olivia Susa began their pre-internship in Ms. Desto’s fifth grade classroom at Country Way Elementary. Spring 2006 was the third semester of the PDS; however, it was Ms. Desto’s first semester as a PDS mentor because she was new to the school. Denise, Olivia, and Ms. Desto collaborated well with each other from the beginning. They shared a passion for teaching that was obvious in their instruction and interactions with each other and the students. Ms. Desto shared classroom instruction with Denise and Olivia and allowed them ample space to engage actively in teaching activities. In the beginning of the semester, Ms. Desto allowed Denise and Olivia space to co-teach whole group lessons with each other. Denise and Olivia co-taught whole group lesson in Ms. Desto’s fifth grade classroom using team teaching (Figure 7-1). As a teaching team during whole group lessons Denise and Olivia often would role-play for students as they introduced a new concept. During role playing Olivia might play the role of “a student” by asking Denise clarifying questions as she explained the concept.

As the semester moved forward Denise and Olivia tried new instructional grouping arrangements and different co-teaching models. Denise and Olivia engaged in small group instruction using “station” teaching (Figure 7-2), a model that enabled multiple educators to lead simultaneous small group lessons. Denise and Olivia planned a Social Studies unit that integrated creative writing and art into the lesson. In their lesson plan, Denise and Olivia explained how “each group will be led and taught by a teacher” because “teaching students in small groups will allow us to better meet student individual learning needs and focus instruction so that students comprehend the material” (Appendix F). Denise led the creative writing station, at the same time
Olivia led a mask creation station, while Ms. Desto led a poetry station outside the classroom in the fifth grade common area.

Denise Mason returned to Ms. Desto’s 5th grade classroom in Fall 2006 as a full time intern. Denise and Ms. Desto continued to co-teach together using various methods, often using multiple co-teaching models within the same lesson. During one particular Math lesson, Denise and Ms. Desto introduced the lesson through whole group instruction and later divided into small groups to review the concepts using parallel teaching. Parallel teaching is a small group co-teaching strategy where each teacher is responsible for teaching similar content to a different group of students. During the small group portion of the lesson, Denise and Ms. Desto both conducted a “Small Group Crash Course Review” simultaneously while another group of students worked independently at their desks. In her lesson plan, Denise discussed why she selected small groups instruction for this lesson. She states, “Utilizing small groups will allow me the opportunity to see which students need additional help and what concepts I potentially need to revisit” (Appendix G). Ms. Desto’s classroom example illustrates how co-teaching in the PDS reinforced the teacher education program’s commitment to inclusive education, and how the infusion of interns enabled small group instruction within classrooms by providing “extra hands” to support students.

The PDS also provided opportunities for participants to bridge theory and practice. The semester following her internship, Principal Lundsford hired Denise to take over a second grade classroom for a teacher on leave. During Denise’s transition from prospective to practicing teacher in the Country Way PDS, she experienced an inclusive classroom for the first time. Denise was able to translate the knowledge she gained from her PDS preparation into her professional practice. As a second grade teacher, Denise began collaborating with Exceptional
Student Education (ESE) team leader Jennifer Townsend. Approximately the same time that Denise’s collaboration began with Jennifer, Jennifer and other Country Way teachers began participating in Project Include. Project Include was a professional development outreach grant project offered through the university’s department of special education. Project Include facilitated teacher knowledge about inclusive teaching models and engaged teachers in collaboratively crafting an inclusion model for their school. As inclusive education experts jointly employed by the school district and university, Harrison Dobbs and Ryan Toms began collaborating with Country Way teachers through Project Include. In addition, Jessica Perry, a university graduate student continued to work in one ESE teacher’s classroom maintaining a focus on improving writing instruction. Through such actions the work between the writing reform and inclusive education reform was linked through its participants who carried over their learning into inclusive classrooms.

Project Include began as a stepping stone for future school improvement work in Spring 2006. Ten teachers, the guidance counselor and the principal participated in 12 two-hour meetings during professional development project led by Harrison Dobbs and Ryan Toms. Harrison Dobbs describes Project Include, the grant funded offered through the university’s department of special education. He states:

It paid for participants to look at school improvement score reports and focus on kids with disabilities, and then we got into other kids. It focused on what teachers were doing, not just what they weren't. Mainly looking at school-based inclusive programs. (Harrison 2515, 3075)

During this professional development activity teachers participated in various activities, including describing their school, their students, and their instructional delivery models. Participants studied the book “Inclusive Schools in Action” and they conducted interviews with parents, students, and other teachers to assess their beliefs about Inclusion. The group visited
other local schools in the district and outside the district. The project culminated in the writing of “an inclusive school action plan that focused on school practices, student achievement, and professional development.” The project required participants to examine various aspects of inclusive education. Harrison specifies aspects the project’s focus:

Project Include at Country Way and another local elementary school set the planning up for looking at how teachers were currently doing things to improve for all kids. We covered philosophy, curriculum, instruction, behavior, data, and scheduling kids, and all that stuff. Then the seed was planted. (Harrison 1838,2143)

The fusion of the PDS and Inclusion brought about more opportunities for teachers to collaborate and learn new instructional strategies from other educators within their classrooms.

In Fall 2006, the school improvement focus on inclusive education officially began by collaboratively implementing the developed school inclusion plan. At the same time, the PDS experienced a surge of prospective teacher field placements, with two special education practicum students, five full time interns, and twelve pre-interns. This was the first semester that cohorts of both interns and pre-interns were placed in the PDS at the same time. The influx of prospective teachers provided valuable human resources for teachers who were leading inclusive classrooms for the first time, while at the same time providing prospective teachers with the opportunity to experience inclusive classrooms in action. In primary grade classrooms where Jennifer served as an ESE specialist, prospective teachers benefited from the mentorship of both regular and special education teachers.

Over time, more PDS classrooms and inclusive classrooms overlapped. At the same time, teachers began to share their ESE expertise with in-service and prospective teachers through co-teaching. In Fall 2007, six out of seven pre-internship field placements also served as inclusive classroom settings. During this semester, the focus on co-teaching and accommodating diverse learners was a topic that Jennifer Townsend discussed when she presented in the on-site seminar
for prospective teacher pre-interns, but it also was a practice that most prospective teachers actively engaged in on a daily basis. For the first time, the theory and practice connection was deeply embedded in the work of PDS classrooms, which facilitated prospective teachers understanding of how multiple educators collaboratively engaged in co-teaching to accommodate a wide diversity of student needs within the context of a regular education classroom.

Examining the Illustration

The overarching claim is that the Country Way Elementary PDS facilitated inquiry-oriented school improvement by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis, which established a professional learning culture for educators and students. The school’s inclusive education reform movement was the second of two major school improvement initiatives that emerged within the first two years of the PDS. Six thematic claims emerged related to how educators described their shifting belief, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as they focused on infusing inclusive educational practices into the Country Way Elementary PDS. The six claims emerged from an analysis of field notes, interviews with informants, and archival documents gathered over three and a half years of fieldwork at Country Way Elementary. Field notes again served as a primary data source while informant interviews and archival documents are used to strengthen participant voices and triangulate analysis. The claims presented in Chapter 7 are similar to those presented in Chapter 6, however Chapter 7 claims provide a deeper understanding of how the inclusive education reform facilitated multiple shifts in the professional learning culture as a result of new roles, responsibilities, values, behaviors, and practices of participants.

Participation in the inclusive education reform:

1. Shifted participant roles and responsibilities.
2. Shifted participant relationships.
3. Shifted educator learning through praxis.
5. Influenced leadership style.
6. Influenced by existing university and district structures.

The claims shared in Chapter 7 are similar to those presented in Chapter 6 because they represent overarching general themes shared between the two school improvement initiatives. However the sub-concepts presented within each of the six claims specifically analyze how the inclusive reform shifted the learning culture for educators and/or students. The sub-concepts also compare and contrast the inclusive education and the writing instruction reform.

**Claim 1: Shifted Participant Roles and Responsibilities**

The school improvement focus on inclusive education reform shifted the roles and responsibilities of PDS participants at Country Way Elementary. Claim One specifically explores how the PDS and Project Include infused new professional learning resources for educators and enabled new participant roles to emerge. Within Claim One, similar to the writing reform, three roles emerged that underpinned the school improvement focus on inclusion: 1) the broker, 2) the coach, and 3) the learner. Each role shifted participant ownership and responsibility for teacher professional learning and educating K-5 students in the PDS. The inquiry-oriented school improvement focus on inclusive education reform promoted a fusion of multiple roles, which facilitated connections, relationships, and educator learning.

**The broker**

In the inclusive education reform, the broker was responsible for a shift in PDS learning resources. In this case, the broker was an individual who fostered connections between individuals, organizations, and concepts within the PDS. In the story of inclusive education reform, participants from school, district, and university positions served as brokers to connect inclusive education concepts with practice at Country Way Elementary. When the PDS initiated university faculty served as brokers. Similarly to the writing reform initiative, Hannah Dobbs served a brokering role during both phases in the inclusive education movement, first connecting
Country Way Elementary with the university PDS network and later connecting university/district personnel with expertise in inclusive education with the school’s principal.

Hannah explains how her work with Country Way unfolded:

We called Regan and asked her if she was interested and she came and heard what the PDSs do and kind of what the underpinnings are, we made her familiar with the Holmes Partnership so that she could kind of see the overarching goals. She felt like those were consonant with the things that she believed in. She also was a PROTEACH graduate, so she understood the University pretty well, she also was someone that was interested in going back to graduate school, so I think that those things also helped to kind of coalesce, come together and create a motivation for her. She had also been involved with really reshaping the faculty already in that school. She came into a context where there were a lot of older faculty that had done things the same way for a very long and this kind of gave her a way shake things up a bit. I think the pre-interns, she liked them because they gave her access to the classrooms that it was hard for her to get into the classrooms being the principal to see actually what was going on with the children. So, having the opportunity to go into the classroom and focus on the pre-interns, rather than the teachers feeling like she was focused on them, gave her an advantage instead. (Hannah 996,2220)

The PDS network enabled Hannah to connect Country Way into the PDS network and recruit Regan into the university doctoral program. Hannah worked closely with Regan because she was also a doctoral student, which helped Regan connect with other university personnel to support her school. As a PDS broker, recruiting a principal who shared a value system congruent with PDS work was a key responsibility.

As the inclusive education reform began university/district personnel facilitated connections between people and concepts. Harrison Dobbs, a supervisor for special education curriculum and staff development for the school district, played a significant brokering role by connecting Regan with valuable district and university resources to support inclusive practice in Country Way Elementary. He describes how his work with the Country Way PDS began:

I met Regan through the Florida Inclusion Network and my wife, Hannah, and I went out awhile ago to watch a workshop with Avenue and Country Way, and met Regan and we started talking about inclusion and various different things to meet more kids’ needs at Country Way and then she couldn't commit to it right away, she wanted to wait a year because the PDSs were starting the next year, so the year after, that next year I stayed in touch with her and we came out and looked at a couple of really difficult kids, and made
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accommodations and modifications for them, mostly the teachers. But at the end of that school year, or the second half of that school year, we did Project Include at Country Way and another local elementary school, which set the planning up for looking at how they were currently doing things to improve for all kids. We covered philosophy, curriculum, instruction, behavior, data, and scheduling kids, and all that stuff. And kind of the seed is planted. (Harrison 1172,2143)

In this excerpt, Harrison describes how he began and maintained a relationship with Regan even prior to bringing in resources for inclusive education. Thus, the responsibility of the inclusive education broker was to establish and maintain relationships with school participants, and seek out opportunities to infuse resources into the school site when appropriate.

The role of the broker in the story of inclusive education reform was two-fold. First, connections between Hannah and Regan enabled Country Way to become part of the PDS network, and second, connections between Harrison and Regan enabled inclusive education concepts to become part of the school improvement focus. The power in the inclusive education reform was how university teacher education goals and school improvement goals became seamlessly connected. Further, other PDS participants, such as Country Way’s principal, university supervisors, and ESE lead teachers, facilitated the continuity of the inclusive reform initiative within the school site by brokering in new human resources whose belief and value systems aligned with the inclusive education reform and the PDS.

As a PDS principal, Regan hired teachers who value inclusive education and also want to support the next generation of teachers. As she interviewed new teachers, she brokered in new educators who valued inclusive education and could contribute to the teaching profession by supporting prospective teachers. Harrison describes how the role of the broker is linked to the role of the coach in the Country Way PDS. He states:

Regan has hired people who come in and do their internships, which keeps the continuity going. If you're thinking about building a mentoring base, granted they're beginning teachers, but give them a few years, at least you can send people into the classrooms and watch them and help here and there, even if they're not the mentor all time, but you're
building a base of people who understand the PDS format, who understand inquiry, who understand inclusion, and hopefully, with some of the veteran teachers can become the teachers of tomorrow that the whole program wants them to do. That's the whole purpose of the program, is meeting the kids' needs. (Harrison 24343, 25452)

As a result of Regan’s brokering role, Harrison believes the PDS focus on inclusive education reform helped build a mentoring base of inclusive educators within Country Way Elementary. Therefore, by connecting new educators who understand and share the Country Way PDS philosophy, Regan’s responsibility as a PDS broker generated continuity within her professional learning culture for inclusive education.

Brokers in the story of inclusive education reform connected personnel who shared a common value system about inclusive education to the Country Way PDS. Hannah, Harrison, and Regan enabled a shift in professional learning resources when they connected university teacher education goals with the school improvement initiative, and then later aligned district professional development goals with university professional development resources. Although PDS brokering initiated as a university faculty responsibility, the PDS and the inclusive education reform required brokering by school-based educators, which generated ownership and responsibility. Once PDS brokers placed key personnel with a common value system within the context, the inclusive education reform became actualized through the ongoing support and commitment of PDS coaches.

The coach

Coaches in the inclusive education reform were responsible for sharing on-going learning support for educators across school, district, and university structures. The term coach is used interchangeably with the term mentor in the inclusive education reform because of the influential coaching work of in-service mentor teachers. Inclusive education coaches shared theoretical knowledge, engaged in collaborative planning, and often used modeling to learn from the
expertise of others. In the beginning, university supervisors and some teachers maintained responsibility for coaching prospective teachers. As the movement became part of the school improvement focus, district/university personnel, and even prospective teachers took on coaching roles. Additionally, some brokers took on coaching roles while new coaches emerged from the hiring practices of the principal. The coach in the inclusive education reform movement was significant because in most cases, the role of the coach was linked to co-teaching. The school improvement focus on inclusive education reform provided opportunities for coaches to help participants shift the theoretical knowledge base gained from university coursework and teacher professional development into real life classroom practices.

In the beginning of the inclusive education reform, the responsibility for coaching was shared between university supervisors and in-service teachers who served as PDS coaches. The role of coach was a new responsibility for many teachers at Country Way. In the beginning, participation as a prospective teacher coach generated dissonance due to a lack of explicit responsibilities, but later collaborative planning between teacher and university supervisors helped many teachers generate ownership and responsibility for the PDS concept. As the school grew and Regan hired new teachers, more teachers were brokered into coaching roles. When the PDS and the inclusive education reform aligned, some ESE teachers began coaching prospective teacher pre-interns and in-service teachers. Jennifer Townsend describes her coaching role in PDS and non-PDS classrooms:

I mentor my inclusion teachers. I have mentored a lot of first year teachers, just colleagues, on different ways to work with ESE kids and not just ESE kids but behavior problem kids. I have done a lot of mentoring (Jennifer 1970,2186). I do a lot of modeling and coaching. I guess within the environment itself they learn strategies for small group instruction just because in the nature of an inclusive class setting a lot of times those teacher are more willing to try more best practice methods like small group instruction, learning centers, more differentiated instruction, more hands on learning. So, just in that environment they have been able to observe and see how centers are organized, how small group instruction
is managed and then also I try to go back and talk to pre-interns about the reality is you are not going to have this many people in your classroom, this is how you can make it work when you have fewer people in your classrooms and just some tricks and strategies for making different strategies work with your people. (Jennifer 2957,3821)

For Jennifer, her work as a coach emerged simultaneously through co-teaching in inclusive classroom settings. As a coach, Jennifer modeled, mentored, and provided both in-service and prospective teachers support with inclusive practices. Co-teaching provided Jennifer the opportunity to coach regular educators within inclusive classrooms, which also provided prospective teachers with the opportunity to benefit from the coaching expertise of both regular and special educators. The PDS provided both prospective and in-service teachers learning opportunities within inclusive classroom settings, which improved the collaborative learning culture of Country Way Elementary.

The role of the coach in the inclusive education reform shifted PDS structures by providing additional mentoring support for prospective and practicing teachers, while also aligning PDS field experiences with university teacher preparation goals. Multiple examples of coaching emerged when the PDS began in Spring 2005, but the inclusive education reform generated alignment between school, district, and university goals. The inclusive education reform provided coaching for teachers first through a university-supported state grant. Later, prospective teachers benefited from the expertise and coaching of two mentors, one regular education mentor and one special education mentor, by observing and participating as co-teachers in inclusive classrooms. The school improvement focus on inclusive education reform required regular and special education teachers to collaboratively share coaching responsibilities for prospective teachers, with the support of university supervisors. The inclusive education reform also provided opportunities for in-service teachers to coach each other as they co-taught in inclusive classrooms.
The learner

In the inclusive education reform, the learner shifted educators’ knowledge and practices. Learning in the inclusive education reform became a responsibility for all participants, although in the beginning of the PDS prospective teachers and K-5 students took on primary learning roles. As the inclusive education reform moved forward, teachers and university personnel shifted into learning roles as well. The inquiry-oriented inclusive education reform enabled educators at multiple levels to collaboratively focus energy and action around improving learning for all students. Therefore, while multiple educators engaged in learning opportunities, the primary focus hinged upon improving outcomes for K-5 student learners.

Inclusive education reform enable in-service teachers began to take on new learning roles through Project Include. Teachers who took on learning roles in the inclusive education reform were responsible for collaborating with partners at both the district and university level. Jennifer Townsend describes how learners collaborated with multiple partners. She states:

Harrison Dobbs and Ryan Toms were some of the people brought in to talk about inclusive practices, also our colleagues from Avenue because we went through Project Include with another school. Even though our schools are different we could share ideas and bounce off one another and really learn from one another. There were a mesh of ideas, it wasn't just any one faction, it was that there was buy in from all parts that were involved. And that was all on a volunteer basis, the inclusion class that we went through the people that went through it they were all volunteers nobody was forced to be a part of it. (Jennifer 22666,23451)

For Jennifer, collaboration with educators from other schools paired with support of inclusion experts helped generate new ideas and buy in for inclusive education. Thus, collaboration, dialogue, and a willingness to learn with colleagues outside of the classroom became an important responsibility when in-service teachers participated as inclusive education learners.

Inclusive education also required in-service teacher to engage as collaborative learners within classrooms. Increased action and energy focused on inclusive education promoted a
culture where in-service educators, as well as prospective teachers, jointly engaged as collaborative learners. Multiple PDS participants cite Jennifer Townsend as a significant influence in helping them learn how to better meet the needs of diverse students. However, Jennifer feels that she benefits as a learner from the PDS as well. She states:

I learn as much from the pre-interns and interns probably as they learn from me, from watching their interactions it helps me figure out how I need to adjust my teaching to help them and help my students. I learn strategies sometimes or watch them do a lesson and I think oh I can incorporate that in this way with this child, so it is a mutually beneficial relationship. (Jennifer 5806,6183)

For Jennifer, she feels that PDS classrooms provide mutual learning benefits for in-service teacher and prospective teachers alike. Prospective teachers help her stay “on the cutting edge of what is being taught at the university” which she incorporates into her work with children. Similarly, other in-service educators describe the benefits they receive as Jennifer learns new approaches and strategies. According to Denise Mason, she benefits from Jennifer participating in multiple classroom environments:

I think that because Jennifer has worked in so many classes she can offer you so many different perspectives because she is like the all time floater, she is like the all time get around girl. She goes everywhere and she sees instruction in every class and I know she is like a sponge, absorbing what she can and when she gets something good she can bring it back and reproduce it another room. She is great, a great resource. (Denise 58230,58652)

Denise believes that educators and students benefit when other teachers learn, thus more learning resources are available due to the structures enabled by co-teaching in inclusive classrooms. The inclusive education reform learner is responsible for collaborating with other educators at multiple levels, and later sharing their new ideas with other educators.

The inclusive education reform required in-teachers to take on new roles and responsibilities due to new collaborative structures, such as the PDS, Project Include, and inclusive classroom environments. At the same time prospective teachers learned about inclusive practices and co-teaching. The examples shared in Claim One examine how the inclusive
education reform required PDS participants to embrace new roles and responsibilities as teacher educators and inclusive educators simultaneously. The professional learning culture for educators shifted as brokers, coaches, and learners engaged in co-teaching and collaboration to improve instruction for diverse students. Collaborative learning increased as a result of coaching and learning in PDS and inclusive classrooms at Country Way Elementary, thus shifting the professional learning culture.

Claim 2: Shifted Participant Relationships

The school improvement focus on inclusive education reform in the Country Way PDS shifted participant relationships. Claim Two specifically explores how the PDS and inclusive education reform shifted the collaborative structures within the school context. Within Claim Two relational shifts were influenced by three specific concepts: 1) ownership and responsibility for teacher education, 2) mutual respect and equal status between co-teachers, and 3) personnel continuity and trust between participants. PDS collaborative structures and Project Include combined to facilitate Country Way’s school improvement focus on inclusion. As the two movements dove-tailed a culture of collaboration emerged and new relationships were fostered which generated new leadership opportunities for some participants, as well as ownership and responsibility for teacher education. Successful co-teaching relationships were underpinned by mutual respect and equal status, while relationships lacking these characteristics generated dissonance. Participants who sustained continuity over time developed trusting relationships with other PDS members, which facilitated more camaraderie, leadership, and responsibility.

Camaraderie, leadership, ownership, and responsibility

Country Way’s inquiry-oriented approach to inclusive education reform facilitated collaboration between university personnel and school-based educators, which generated camaraderie and leadership opportunities for PDS participants. When the PDS began in Spring
2005, a lack of collaboration between teachers, prospective teachers, school administrators, and university personnel was evident. The PDS integrated new organizational structures that increased collaboration between teachers, university supervisors, school leadership, and prospective teachers. PDS mentor meetings and on-site prospective teacher seminars served as collaborative spaces where participants generated ownership and responsibility for teacher education. Project Include provided a space for Country Way teachers to collaborate and form relationships with colleagues while also generating ownership and responsibility for inclusive education reform.

Mentor/coach meetings generated collaboration between university supervisors and teachers and served as a space for building relationships. PDS collaboration brought about shifts in relationships between university supervisors and school administrators, but it also influenced relationships between teachers as well. Regan Lundsford describes the influence of PDS monthly mentor/coach meetings:

I think it's has brought a lot of my faculty together, there has been more, there has been a sense of, more of a group identity between people in different grades and through all of them being mentors and having that shared experience of having pre-interns and interns. I think it has allowed some staff members to step up and take leadership roles and participate more in decision making and planning. (Regan 590,992)

In this example, Regan describes how participation as PDS mentor provided teachers with a shared experience, which generated leadership opportunities. Collaboration during PDS mentor meeting provided teacher opportunities to develop new relationships with their peers, while also collaboratively shaping the agenda for teacher education activities. The collaborative space shared between PDS participants during mentor meetings shifted the professional learning culture by increasing teacher voice in decision-making, which generated ownership, responsibility, and teacher leadership.
The PDS on-site seminar emerged as the space where the collaborative relationships fostered between school leadership, teachers, and university personnel benefited prospective teacher learning. Harrison Donald explains how the PDS site coordinator generated collaboration around the inclusive education focus:

Gabrielle knew how good they [teachers] were, she got some of these teachers involved in teaching the seminar or talking to different people about inclusion and assistive technology, you name it, and there's people you cap into their expertise. (Harrison 27183,27411)

In this excerpt, Harrison describes how the university site coordinator’s knowledge of Country Way teachers helped her recruit PDS participants from within the site to share their expertise and co-teach the on-site seminar with her. The relationships formed between school-based educators and university personnel in PDS mentor/coach meetings facilitated collaboration and later generated co-teaching between university personnel, school leadership, and teachers during the on-site seminar. The on-site seminar provided a space where the school principal, CRT, and ESE teacher generated camaraderie and new collaborative relationships with the university supervisor and prospective teachers.

The collaborative structures built into the inclusion support group facilitated new relationship, teacher leadership, and responsibility for inclusive education reform. Participants describe how the fusion of multiple groups collaboratively influenced the learning community fostered between participants during Project Include. Jennifer Townsend recalls:

I think it was the whole conglomerate, of course it was the leadership because you can't do anything without positive leadership but there are very proactive regular education teachers, there are very proactive special education teachers and they work well together to figure out how it best work at our school. Then there were all the support personnel from the university. (Jennifer 22286,22659)

Jennifer attributes the collective whole (ie. school leadership, university personnel, and peer support) as facilitators of the inclusion learning community. The learning community created
between ESE and regular education teachers, and university support personnel contribute to a positive collaborative experience with Project Include. Participants suggest that the collaborative support structures generated “buy in” which led to greater ownership and responsibility from PDS participants.

**Mutual respect and equal status**

The fusion of the PDS and inclusion movements in Country Way Elementary are intricately linked by collaboration through co-teaching, which highlights an emergence of key relational values. Multiple participants describe the importance of trust, mutual respect, and equal status as key relational values between PDS educators. The majority of PDS educators who collaboratively participated in PDS and inclusive education initiatives established trust, mutual respect, and shared equal status with other educators. However, the absence of some or all of these key values inhibited educators’ ability to build relationships at Country Way Elementary, which also inhibited collaboration. Positive and negative examples of collaborative participant relationships emerged in the PDS and inclusive education reform.

The inclusive education reform movement encouraged teachers and prospective teachers to share equal status as educators. When the PDS began, co-teaching was a practice that required a shift in participant relationships. For many prospective teachers, co-teaching alongside their mentors provided them an opportunity to share equal status with another teacher. Denise Mason recalls one specific instance during her internship:

I will never forget this, I was in the middle of a lesson and I totally went blank at the board and she just came up and she knew where I was in the problem and she just finished the problem and the kids never knew. It was kind of like having that extra person there in the room watching your flow of thinking watching you work the problem out, watching you teach and being a floater and handling behaviors and just really playing the role of another teacher in the room and I appreciated that. She just picked up the marker as if she was another teacher and I was equally a teacher and the kids saw that transition between us. (Denise 18627,19641)
Denise recalls how co-teaching provided her with an opportunity to share equal status as a teacher alongside her mentor teacher, which helped her grow as a prospective teacher in her placement classroom. As a PDS educator, Denise’s mentor embraced co-teaching as a learning tool to support her students and her prospective teacher by extending equal status and responsibility for teaching. The relationship between Denise and her mentor teacher was based on equal status, which provided space for Denise to take risks while having appropriate support. The importance of sharing equal status with other educators in a classroom was a value that Denise continued as she became a teacher of an inclusive classroom. She emphasizes:

Making an inclusion class work and it not being like the specialist that came in was an aide, she really took on the role of being a co-teacher. I don't know if that happens on every grade level because a lot of teachers they get so used to their classroom and the climate being their classroom that when someone comes in and they're a specialist, it is not just like they are extra help, they almost treat them kind of like just an aide and they give them something on the side to do. But Jennifer was really an active teacher in this class. (Denise 15684,16419)

For Denise, the importance of sharing equal status as co-teaching educators was a value that she experienced as a pre-intern, intern, and as a teacher in the Country Way PDS. “Equal status” was achieved when in-service educators shared responsibility for classroom instruction with prospective and/or ESE teachers. In many ways the PDS helped in-service teachers learn how to share their teaching space equally with other educators through co-teaching, which set the stage for the inclusive education reform. Co-teaching shifted relationships between PDS as more in-service teachers learned to extend equal status to their prospective teachers, and then later to ESE teachers. However, an absence of equal status in co-teaching relationships often indicated an absence of mutual respect shared between participants.

Collaboration in the inclusive education reform required mutual respect between educators. The presence or absence of mutual respect between co-teaching educators directly influenced the outcome of collaborative relationships in the PDS. In the inclusive education reform, this trend
held true between multiple participant groups. One example emerged during the first year of the inclusive education reform when intermediate grade (i.e.3-5) teachers tried co-teaching with a special education teacher with minimal success. However, the second year of the inclusive education reform brought new ESE personnel into the inclusive classrooms, which enhanced co-teaching between ESE and regular educators. Harrison Donald provides some insight in to the dynamics of the dilemma. He states:

Marcy did a great job building credibility, particularly with 3rd grade this year, because they did not have the support that they had last year because the woman who was retiring that they did not respect. So, I think the biggest thing that helped them was the respect, the mutual respect of what they could do together, sharing their different levels of expertise. So I think that's really important. (Harrison 26758,27162)

Harrison describes how one ESE teacher’s ability to establish mutual respect with one grade level team facilitated co-teaching in inclusive classrooms, which contrasted the co-teaching experience that unfolded the previous year. The difference between the two years was the collaborative relationship between ESE and regular educators. Similarly, an absence of mutual respect between prospective and in-service made forming positive co-teaching relationships a challenge. This example shows how inclusive educators who shared mutual respect with their co-teaching partners enabled new relationships to emerge. This example is just one of many that illustrates the vital importance of educators’ relationship in co-teaching arrangements.

The importance of mutual respect and equal status between co-teaching educators is clear. The interesting aspect of this concept is that all of the in-service teachers featured in these examples are also graduates of the university’s Proteach program, who also specialized in special education and conducted their pre-internship/practicum and internship experiences at Country Way Elementary. Therefore, PDS and inclusive education reform shifted participant relationships by embracing the relational values of equal status and mutual respect between co-
teaching educators, and as a result these values have become a part of the professional learning culture in many PDS and inclusive classrooms.

**Continuity facilitated trust**

The PDS inclusive education reform required university and district personnel to establish trusting relationships with school leadership and in-service teachers. Personnel continuity and the ability to establish a trusting relationship with school leadership facilitated PDS collaborative relationships. In the PDS personnel continuity enabled trusting relationships to emerge between in-service teachers, school administrators, and the university appointed site-coordinator. Regan describes the influence of the relationships established between the PDS site coordinator and other participants. She emphasizes:

> Having the same person over multiple semesters has been great because she knows our expectations, she knows how I want to run the school you know what, she know the mentors, what works for them and she can communicate with the students if something is not working how do I approach that person because she knows them well enough now. (Regan 39537,39874)

Regan describes how personnel continuity facilitated PDS work because it enabled trusting relationships to form over time between the site coordinator and other PDS participants. Similarly, Harrison Donald attributes collaboration over time through the inclusive education reform to a shift in his relationship with Regan and in-service teachers. He states:

> My relationship with Regan has totally changed. She used to call and ask questions to try to begin an argument, and it's evolved into, we can pretty much do anything and, I need you to help me figure how to support, and how do we go to my boss, about stuff. Not that she was mean or anything before, but it was more about building the trust, she needed to trust me before she allowed me to help her handle some other tough budge negotiations, negotiating with teachers, negotiating with those parents who also were teachers. (Harrison 27671,28201)

In this example, Harrison describes the importance of establishing trusting relationships with Regan as a key facilitator for the inclusive education reform. Harrison began his work with Country Way educators in the Spring of 2006 and continued his work until July of 2008.
Therefore, his ability to maintain continuity with Country Way educators enabled him to developing trusting relationships with in-service teachers and the school administrative team. Therefore, university and district personnel continuity influenced PDS participants’ ability to establish and maintain trusting relationships. The examples shared within Claim Two examined inclusive education reform participation generated collaboration and shifted participant relationships in PDS and inclusive classrooms. Multiple educators generated relationships based on trust, mutual respect, and shared equal status within PDS and inclusive classrooms as they shared responsibility for teaching, which positively influenced the professional learning culture for educators and students.

**Claim 3: Shifted Educator Learning Through Praxis**

The inquiry-oriented inclusive education reform shifted educator learning through praxis. Claim Three explores how PDS and inclusive reform structures and relationships enabled participants to negotiate theory and practice connections. Within Claim Three two concepts became highly influential in shifting educator learning. First, PDS classroom practices shifted as participants shared instructional responsibilities through co-teaching. Second, educator learning shifted as PDS participants engaged in praxis within inclusive PDS classrooms. The two concepts shared within Claim Three are inter-related, but in order to understand how teacher learning and classroom practices influenced each other, they are discussed in detail separately. In the inclusive education reform prospective teachers and in-service teachers experienced significant learning benefits by connecting theory and practice in real classroom settings as they collaboratively engaged in and inquired into inclusive practices.

**Co-teaching practices**

Multiple educators describe significant shifts in co-teaching classroom practices since the PDS at Country Way Elementary began in Spring 2005. Prior to the PDS, participants described
Country Way Elementary classroom as sedentary. Regan Lundsford describes classroom instruction in the beginning:

> Very traditional, everyone in their seat. Teacher up doing all the work, students passively engaged, or whatever that, I can't even remember what that kind of engagement is, where they are looking but they are kind of asleep. Just very little engagement. Didn't see small group work, mostly directly instruction. Lots of worksheets. (Regan 91845,92176).

While Regan describes the practices as “traditional,” other participants use terms such as “sedentary-style” and “isolated” to describe classroom practices at Country Way before the PDS began in Spring 2005. Hannah Dobbs, a university professor, recalls the absence of collaboration within classrooms, “There was no co-teaching going on at all. It was much more isolated, more like an egg carton” (Hannah 58929,59444). After three and a half years as a PDS, multiple educators describe a shift in teaching practices over time. Regan describes an increase in grouping structures through “more small group work” (Regan 92857,93183). Harrison cites an increase in the use of differentiated practices. He states:

> The classrooms are not sedentary- style anymore, there's cooperative groups and learning centers. When they go to centers, the centers are differentiated, particularly in the primary grades. (Harrison 11154,12778)

To suggest that classroom practices shifted underscores what actually occurred within PDS classrooms at Country Way Elementary. The shift in classroom practices emerged as PDS and Inclusion goals aligned and educators began to take on more new roles, but the shift in classroom practices emerged gradually through co-teaching practices.

The PDS brought about the first shift in classroom practices as prospective teachers learned co-teaching skills. As part of the pre-internship, prospective teachers were required to implement lessons that integrated various models of co-teaching in their placements. Co-teaching was not simply a product of the Country Way PDS structure, but rather a process that took time for all educators to acquire. As pre-interns, prospective teachers were placed in dyads and co-
teaching was encouraged as a practice to provide diverse students access to small group and differentiated instruction. While some mentors simply tolerated co-teaching between their pre-interns to allow them fulfill PDS placement requirements, other mentors embraced co-teaching by participating jointly in teaching activities along side their pre-interns/interns. Table 5-1 illustrates the evolution of co-teaching practices at Country Way Elementary.

Co-teaching practices shifted PDS classroom instruction. The first semester of the PDS, only three out of six PDS mentors embraced co-teaching with prospective teacher pre-interns. However, overtime the number of mentors who embraced rather than simply tolerated co-teaching practices shifted. For example, in Fall 2007 as many as 10 out of 12 mentor teachers embraced co-teaching with their prospective teachers. In many cases once mentors embraced co-teaching, co-teaching became a part of their professional practice and became a ritual in their PDS classroom. However, in some cases mentors who had traditionally embraced co-teaching with their prospective teachers temporary shifted away from active co-teaching with their prospective teachers and during these times less teacher led small group instruction was observed. At Country Way Elementary, classroom practices were positively influenced when mentor and prospective teachers shared the relational values described within Claim Two. However, the absence of key relational values prompted shifts away from small group instruction and differentiated grouping structures in some PDS classrooms.

Ms. Desto’s classroom, as described in the beginning of the chapter, represents a typical a process in PDS classrooms at Country Way Elementary. In the beginning co-teaching was a practice often carried out between prospective teachers. As mentors began to embrace co-teaching they began to co-teach with their prospective teachers, which provided more teacher led instruction for students. By the end of the third semester, six out of eight placement classrooms
had embraced co-teaching within classrooms by sharing the responsibility for instruction between mentors and prospective teachers. Ms. Desto embraced co-teaching within one semester of working as a PDS mentor; some mentors embraced co-teaching immediately; while others took more time and did not fully embrace co-teaching until their third semester as a PDS mentor. However, by the end of the 2005-2006 school year almost every active participant in the Country Way PDS had embraced co-teaching to some extent. The only mentor who had not yet shifted towards embracing co-teaching chose not to continue as a PDS participant.

Praxis contributed to a shift in co-teaching practices. Connecting the theory behind co-teaching to the actual practice of co-teaching changed the instructional interactions between prospective teachers and in-service teachers in PDS classrooms, and in turn provided more small group and teacher directly instruction for students. The PDS shifted classroom practices by placing multiple educators within a classroom to shared instructional responsibilities, which set the stage for the school wide inclusive reform movement.

In Fall 2006, the movement toward inclusion generated alignment with the goals of the university’s teacher preparation program and the goals of the school. and provided more instructional resources in classrooms. Six out of the twelve PDS classrooms were inclusive classrooms that fall. In inclusive PDS classrooms prospective teachers co-taught with regular education and special education teachers In some PDS classrooms, as many as four or five adults might be present to support student learning needs in inclusive classrooms. In other PDS classrooms were two to three adults facilitating instruction. The number of adults depended on whether a PDS classroom had a full time intern or two pre-interns and if the ESE inclusion teacher also had an intern. Thus, the PDS and the inclusive education reform shifted classroom practices by increasing the number of educators available to provide classroom instruction.
Praxis in inclusive classrooms

The inclusive education reform shifted educator learning by providing opportunities for praxis in inclusive classrooms. As the PDS and inclusive education reform dove-tailed in the fall of 2006, opportunities for theory to practice connections increased. Prospective teacher inquiry projects helped some participants generate theory and practice as they accommodated diverse learners in PDS inclusive classrooms. For other participants, actively engaging in co-teaching with both ESE and regular educators generated meaningful theory and practice connections.

Participants suggest teacher inquiry was valuable tool for helping teachers connect theory and practice in the PDS. Group inquiry, in the form of the inclusion learning community was used to support in-service teachers in connecting theory and practice, while individual inquiry projects helped support prospective teacher learning. Catherine Duarte believes that inquiry projects generated meaningful learning for prospective teachers by emphasizing a focus on accommodating diverse learners. She states,

> When pre-intern had to do their inquiry project, where they pick one or two students and they work with that student. I see that they notice that the work that they are doing with these kids are definitely changing students’ learning… I think it makes them feel successful and then it makes them want to go and do more or push it to the next level and see how, well if she learned two today how many can she learn tomorrow, should we up it? They learn how to adapt instruction, well this didn't work at all so I am going to change it because she is not learning how to say her ABCs this way so I better switch and try to teach it a different way. So they learn how to change instruction for what works for the kids. So in a way they are making the accommodations and but they don't know that is what they are doing. (Catherine 45276,47156)

In this excerpt Catherine describes how teacher inquiry helped prospective teachers learn how to accommodate individual students’ needs by focusing on K-5 student learning. This example shows how inquiry provided prospective teachers the opportunity to learning by connecting the concept of accommodating students with the actual practice. Therefore, praxis through inquiry
generated theory to practice connections and helped teachers learn how to accommodate diverse learners.

Co-teaching provided educators at multiple levels the opportunity to connect theory and practice. For many prospective and in-service teachers, co-teaching in the PDS helped them learn new skills by participation in inclusive classrooms. For university graduate students and university personnel the opportunity to engage in co-teaching and observing co-teaching in real inclusive classrooms provided meaningful learning opportunities. Harrison Donald describes how the shift in classroom arrangements and practices at Country Way generated theory and practice connections. He states:

The PDSs are training teachers to work in inclusive settings. So they need to see it in action. They get placements in other schools where they don't see it. They come out and they've got this ivory tower saying to do this, and that's not reality. Having worked in the same role as Gabrielle, I understand that. So I think the nice thing is the teachers out there, most of the teachers that I see who have interns or pre-interns, have given them responsibilities to do certain things in the classroom. It's different based on the teacher's comfort level, especially when it comes to pre-interns, but they get exposure to working with kids with different types of needs, and then they have the honest dialogue with their mentors. (Harrison 12939,14411).

Harrison describes how co-teaching in inclusive classrooms provides prospective teachers with increased responsibility for instruction and generates meaningful theory and practice connections. In addition, Harrison attributes his understanding of how theory and practice interact to his former role as a PDS supervisor when he was a doctoral student. PDS participants generated a deeper understanding of co-teaching, developed new skills, and learned how to accommodate diverse learners through participation in inclusive classrooms.

Country Way’s inclusive education reform shifted educator learning and classroom practice for educators at multiple levels. The examples shared within Claim Three explain how PDS and inclusive education reform shifted structures and provided highly situated learning opportunities for prospective teachers, in-service teachers, and university graduate students. The PDS and
inclusive education reform shifted the professional learning culture within Country Way Elementary by providing educators with the opportunity to learn through praxis and active engagement in co-teaching.

**Claim 4: Shifted Student Performance**

Country Way’s inquiry-oriented school improvement focus on inclusive education shifted student performance. Claim Four explains the inclusive education reform’s impact on student performance. Claim Four will specifically examine how the PDS and inclusive education reform increased student engagement and individualized education practices, as well the specific learning gains achieved by students with disabilities. Unlike the writing reform initiative, the inclusive education reform emerged as a result of positive shifts in one “pilot” fourth grade classroom during the 2005-2006 school year. Multiple participants believe that the overarching emphasis on promoting student learning success permeates the professional culture at Country Way Elementary. Participants suggest that the PDS contributed to shifts in instruction, which led to increased student engagement and the ability to accommodate students with diverse needs. Student learning data shows that students with disabilities achieved higher learning gains than regular education students.

**Engagement and individualized instruction**

Multiple participants suggest that PDS classrooms increased student engagement and individualized instructional practices. Specifically, multiple PDS participants attribute K-5 students learning benefits to an increase in human resources within PDS classrooms. Some participants believe that co-teaching in PDS classrooms increased student engagement, or time on-task, while others believe that inquiry projects provided students more individualized instruction. Regardless of the specific approaches, participants agree that in “inclusion classrooms with extra adults you saw the most gains” (Regan 38997,39093).
Each semester in the Country Way PDS 14-16 prospective teachers conducted inquiries focused on an individual child. Principal Regan Lundsford believes that individual attention from prospective teachers impacted student learning. She states,

I am sure that it [the PDS] has impacted learning by giving individual attention to some of our most struggling kids and trying to figure out what would work for them and kind of allow that experimentation. And, I know that has continued, like if a child started using manipulatives to learn more concrete math the teachers have continued it even though that pre-intern is gone. I have seen that happen. (Regan 30807,31201)

Regan believes prospective teacher inquiry has provided individualized instruction for children and helped provide mentor teachers with specific tool to continue learning supports, even after prospective teachers left their placements. Prospective teacher inquiry focused educator attention and resources on individual student learning needs.

Co-teaching enhanced learning and increased student engagement by providing students the opportunity to learn from multiple educators. The PDS and the inclusive education reform provided more instructional resources for students, which offered students the opportunity to learn from other in-service teachers and prospective teachers. Denise and Jennifer both describe how co-teaching has enhanced learning benefits for students. Denise states,

I am not the only person that my kids can see teaching. I think that a lot times kids they got a lot out of having more than one person providing instruction, and not only that but they got used to more than one person just being the disciplinary they got used to more than one person being able to come in and provide instruction. They [students] learned to learn from other people and now when aides come in or different staff is made available. So, they are able to work with them without it being like they only can learn from one person and I think that that's really, for some kids it's hard for them to make that transition and working with inclusion and seeing some of my kids tied to routines and then getting out of that need to be tied to a routine is really, really good. (Denise 13254,15132)

Denise believes that students benefit from learn how to work with and learn from multiple educators through co-teaching and inclusion. Jennifer echoes the belief that students have benefited in many ways, but also attributes the ability to provide more individual assistance to students as a benefit of PDS classrooms. She states:
They [students] have the opportunity to learn to deal with a lot of different personalities and in reality in this world is you have to learn to deal with a lot of personalities and be able to adjust to certain nuances in the personality. Not to mention just the flat out another set of hands in the classroom allows the teacher to provide more individual assistance not only if kids are struggling but those kids who are above average and need challenges whether it is the teacher doing it or she directs her pre-intern or the intern to do it. Kids bottom line get more individual assistance and more learning occurs. More learning occurs and more on task time occurs when you have pre-interns and interns in your classroom than if you don't. (Jennifer 13645,14419)

Jennifer’s experience in working in both PDS and non-PDS classrooms has given her a balanced perspective when examining the impact that prospective teachers can have on student learning. Participants agree that PDS and inclusive classroom provided more human resources to support student learning, which increased student engagement during instruction and focused attention on individual student needs. Although causal relationships between student learning shifts and PDS and/or inclusive classrooms cannot be made due to the influence of multiple factors. Standardized assessment results can help provide insight into which students are achieving significant learning gains in specific classrooms.

**Learning gains**

Country Way PDS data suggests that students in co-taught classrooms out gain their regular education counter parts. Standardized assessments results provide validity to Denise and Jennifer’s claims. Harrison Donald, a district level ESE supervisor, provides some specific evidence and insight into Country Way’s student learning data. He states,

General education peers are outperforming students with disabilities, which is understandable, but when you look at gains scores, the kids with disabilities had significantly out gained their peers. (Harrison 10233,11046)

According to Harrison, gain scores provided a better indicator of how ESE students performed in a given year than simply looking at their performance on one assessment. The gain scores helped indicate how much student performance shifted from year to year. Gain scores were calculated for students beginning in grade 4 after two years of FCAT data were gathered. In primary grade
classrooms, norm referenced assessment scores were used to provide information about student progress from year to year.

Standardized test scores indicate that inclusive education classroom enabled ESE students to make more gains than general education students. FCAT student performance data from the 2006-2007 school year (Table 6-2) reveals that in reading fourth grade students with disabilities gained 218 points compared to 182 points gained by fourth grade regular education students. Fifth grade students with disabilities showed an average reading gain of 151 points compared to regular education students with reading gains of 135. The math data reveals a similar story for fourth grade and a contrasting story for fifth graders. In Math, fourth grade student with disabilities gained an average of 103 points compared to regular education students who showed a 76-point gain. However, in fifth grade math, students with disabilities showed only an average 6-point gain compared to the 42-point gain achieved by regular education students. Archival documents and field notes reveal the rationale for the differences in instructional arrangements may have contributed to the differences in gains achieved in fourth and fifth grade. For example, in 2006-2007 all ESE student were place in two fourth grade classrooms and fifth grade ESE students were place among several teachers. Additionally, the two fourth grade teachers who participated in inclusion also participated as mentors in the PDS during the 2006-2007 school year.

In primary grades, the data show student performance shifts on the norm referenced test (NRT) from 2006 to 2007 (Table 6-3). First and second graders were assessed using the Stanford assessment tool. Similar to the writing reform movement, participants suggest that primary grades achieve the most significant shifts in inclusive instructional practices and student learning support. The data reveal that three out of five teachers participating in inclusion also participated
as PDS mentors. For example in one inclusive PDS first grade, students with disabilities gained an average of 9.3 points in Reading, where as students with disabilities in an inclusive third grade classroom gained 1.8 points in Reading. To suggest that these data could provide an accurate metric to compare student gains in PDS and non-PDS classrooms would be misleading. First grade and third grade gain scores are calculated based on student performance on two different assessments, which could make comparing gain score data problematic.

Multiple participants suggest that the PDS provides additional learning support for ESE students in inclusive classrooms by providing more individualized instruction and increased student engagement. The examples shared in Claim Four reveal how the PDS and inclusive education reform shifted student performance. Additionally, the data suggests that ESE students are making higher learning gains than regular education students in inclusive classrooms. Although the data does not allow us to make a causal link between student outcomes in PDS and non-PDS inclusive classrooms, interview data does suggest that students and teachers are getting additional instructional support for ESE students as a result of the PDS because of an increase in human resources.

Claim 5: Influenced Leadership Style

In the inclusive education reform school leadership style influenced the scope of change within the learning culture. Claim Five offers insight into how PDS school leadership style impacted the professional learning culture of Country Way Elementary. The story of inclusive education reform in the Country Way PDS provides examples of how school leadership generated action and energy around a common focus for school improvement, aligned resources to facilitate educator learning, and shifted responsibility to teacher leaders. Within Claim Five the data reveal how the “organic” nature of the inclusive education reform generated ownership, responsibility, and teacher leadership. The inclusive education reform also generated pressure to
change and provided multiple resources to support change, which required change agents to achieve a delicate balancing act between theory and practice.

**Organic teacher leadership**

The school improvement focus on inclusive education reform required the school principal to trust outside experts and to delegate more responsibility to teachers. Prior to the PDS, principal Regan Lundsford and her leadership team maintained the instructional leadership responsibilities in the school. The PDS’s writing reform initiative helped to re-conceptualize how instructional leadership might be shared with university partners. But the model for the inclusive education reform required her to trust university and district personnel and entrust more instructional responsibilities to in-service and prospective teachers. Although this process began in small ways during the writing reform, it was not until the inclusive education reform that Regan truly began to release responsibility for instructional leadership to other PDS participants. Harrison Dobbs describes how Regan’s willingness to value expert knowledge contributed to this process. He states:

> Inclusion is valued by the leader, and without the leadership buy-in, different and new ideas, you would have no credibility. When she brings in Hannah and Gabrielle and Fiona and myself, they're there to facilitate the knowledge and build the knowledge. They're not there just to dump it and leave. The whole coaching mentoring follow-up, regularly scheduled thing was difficult for Regan in the beginning because she's doing a hundred things at once. But once she understood, oh, if I do this I could have regular built-in support and it comes off my back, and other people will be responsible for it, and I can trust them, it opened up a whole new way of doing things. So the external knowledge piece is important but you can't do professional development by just coming in and doing a sit-and-get or dumping it and then expecting teachers to do it on their own. (Harrison 15942,16806)

Multiple participants attribute Regan’s willingness to rely on expert knowledge for teacher professional development as an influential leadership skill that contributed to the success of the inclusive education reform. Specially, participants attribute her willingness to delegate responsibility for scheduling and inclusive education resource planning to the ESE team leader.
Jennifer Townsend. PDS participants recognize how multiple participants “carried the torch” of inclusive education between the PDS and Project Include. However, the passion and enthusiasm of the in-service teacher instructional leaders generated new levels of ownership and responsibility for inclusive education. Harrison describes how the ESE team leader contributed significant leadership for the inclusive education reform. He suggests:

Jennifer, because she is such a champion of the cause. Her knowledge of assistive technology and young kids and what they need, and her enthusiasm is contagious. (Harrison 31630,31788)

Harrison describes how the personal attributes of one specific in-service teacher contributed enthusiasm and energy to the inclusive education reform. Jennifer was also a key figure who supported Regan’s ability to delegate responsibility to in-service teachers.

The inclusive education reform formed a professional learning community of in-service teachers most prominently through Project Include. Project Include generated ownership and responsibility for inclusive education by providing space for and giving power to in-service teachers to explore, negotiate, and develop the school wide inclusive plan. However, without the buy-in from the school principal, such a transformative form of leadership could not have emerged. Regan’s leadership style shifted the professional learning culture because she delegated power to make decisions and responsibility for enacting the plan to a core group of in-service teachers, district level personnel and university support personnel who collaboratively carried the torch for inclusive reform.

**Balancing pressure, support, theory and practice**

The inquiry-oriented inclusive education reform required PDS leaders to achieve a delicate balancing act. Similar to the writing reform, Regan continued to apply pressure to change with support for change. However, unlike the writing reform, the inclusive education reform began with teachers who possessed a willingness to change. Even among a group of
educators willing to make change, dissonance still emerged. However, the ability of school
leadership and outside experts to engage in meaningful dialogue and negotiate a balance between
pressure and support and theory and practice eased the tension for many educators.

Pressure and support became balanced when teachers were allowed voice in decision
making. Harrison describes specifically how pressure and support interacted in the inclusive
education reform. He states:

You know the good thing of FCAT is all kids count now and teachers have to look at it.
So, without that, I don't think they'd be in at all, but Regan’s a great leader, and her vision
is, we're gonna do this, which isn't always popular with the teachers. But she finds ways to
pull it off and give them the voice that they can help set up and design it…There's gotta be
some pressure to change, the pressure to change is there but there's got to be some support
to help with the pressure, and that's the balance that has to come, and sometimes the
balance is out of whack, like the scenarios I said, but when it goes back and forth is a good
time to build that knowledge or use your outside experts. I mean they like me up there, but
I know that I can be a thorn in their side if they don't do things the way that I think they
should be. But at the same time, I'm a big advocate of them. So it's fine line that the
external people have to walk. (Harrison 15942,17411)

In the inclusive education reform, pressure to change came from the principal and standardized
assessment pressure to improve results for all students. Together, the PDS and Project Include
provided specific support activities to provided in-service teacher with voice in decision making,
which generated ownership and responsibility. However, even though participation in these
activities was considered optional, they still experienced dissonance at times. Harrison describes
the nature of the conflict in the inclusive education reform:

I think you can convert some, but there's gonna be that 10-20 percent that you're never
gonna change, and I think Regan’s done a good enough job to let them know this is the
direction they're going, to encourage them if they don't like it to possibly look elsewhere,
and sometimes you've got to make people uncomfortable to get them to change. (Harrison
19277,19618)

Harrison describes that the pressure to change generated dissonance for some, and even with the
support to enact changes, teacher resistance continued in some cases. Harrison emphasizes that
professional development activities and projects should begin with the in-service teachers who
express a willingness to learn and participate. In the PDS, some in-service ceased to participate as mentors, and in inclusive classrooms in-service teachers sometimes shifted positions within the school or left the school altogether because they were unhappy with the changes underway. Although, the direction and focus of inclusive education reform disrupted some educators’ beliefs about how students should learn, with ongoing support many in-service educators were able to find a balance between the theory and practice of inclusive education.

PDS participants describe how the inclusive education reform required external support personnel to consider how to balance theory and practice. All PDS participants recognize the importance of infusing “best practices” into Country Way classrooms. However, the university faculty members working in the PDS and Project Include understand that both the university and school should be collaboratively defining what “best practices” mean within the school context. Hannah Dobbs suggest that part of the dilemma is developing an understanding of whose practices are “best”. She states:

Best practices really need to be defined, maybe by taking the best knowledge from both camps and integrating it and seeing how it works, and then adjusting it and accommodating it and the outcome of that study, that inquiry, is the merging of the craft knowledge and maybe the external knowledge is what is a best practice. (Hannah 40664,4100)

Hannah wonders if the notion of best practice should be re-conceptualized as the fusion of knowledge from two contexts where external experts and teacher practitioners collaboratively generate “best practices” together. The balance of “external” knowledge and “craft” knowledge required inclusion reform leaders to be open to new notions of “best practices”.

The fusion of school and university expertise is how district supervisor Harrison Dobbs generated in-service teacher buy-in. He describes how he had to accommodate the grant funded professional development program to better meet the needs of the school-based educators. He states:
I forced it into kind of what I think is, it's different, but it comes out with an output-based action plan, and Regan was pretty critical of it in the beginning. We've tweaked it and made it better, but I think the way that I think is always based on what teachers think. And with their honest dialogue, with them asking hard questions and me figuring out a way, I don't know how the heck I maneuvered that rooms of sharks that day, but they were ready to basically throw the towel in, and I answered their questions. I think they gave me an opportunity to practice what I preach, which is we can do this together, using best practices and making it real, and using the knowledge that they have at the school site, we can come up with things that can work. (Harrison 32919,33675)

Harrison describes that as university/district personnel he had to demonstrate to in-service teachers that their knowledge and voice was valued, and that the inclusive education reform was truly a collaborative effort to change. When dissonance emerged, Harrison demonstrated his willingness to negotiate a plan by allowing in-service teachers to use their contextual knowledge of their school and students. Harrison reflects upon how his experiences with Country Way helped him gain new experience, which help him better serve other schools. He states:

Would I like them to use a little bit more research, of course, but it's ok. I think they're doing ok. I think they, they made me a better person because as you go through these things, then you have more experience and background to draw from, and be able to help yourself inform other people down the road. I think the key to me is that they draw on good things, solve dilemmas, not perfectly, but work their way through this, and over time, people have kind of gone, ok, this is what we're about. (Harrison 33676,33984)

Although Harrison hopes to see more the school using more “research” based practices down the road, he celebrates the small accomplishments and works toward solving new dilemmas as they arise. As inclusive education reform leaders, university/district personnel were given more leadership opportunities to support in-service teachers. However, new leadership roles required PDS participants to find a balance between the theoretical knowledge base of inclusion with the contextual knowledge based of educators within the site.

Multiple examples illustrate how school leaders and district/university experts achieved a balancing act to support Country Way’s inquiry-oriented approach to inclusive education reform. The examples shared in Claim Five illustrate how leadership within the inclusive education
reform generated a more “organic” form of teacher leadership, and delegated responsibility among many PDS leaders. Much like the writing instruction reform, school leaders had to find a balance between asserting pressure to change with support for change. However, the data suggests that PDS participants may have learned from the negative writing reform experiences of mandating participation, and instead selected voluntary participants for the inclusion professional learning community. Similarly, university and district level participants learned to shift the focus toward balancing the craft knowledge of school-based educators with the research-based practices promoted by university-funded projects.

Claim 6: Influenced by Existing University and District Structures

The inclusive education reform brought about new energy through the PDS and alignment emerged as school/district goals dove-tailed with university program goals. Claim Six offers insight into how university and district organizational structures influenced PDS collaboration. Within Claim Six, two specific concepts directly influenced the professional learning culture in the Country Way PDS. First, the theoretical alignment between university teacher preparation goals, and district/school goals, for helping all students gain access to the general curriculum generated simultaneous renewal. However, the second concept, which explores existing university and district organizational structures, limited further PDS growth and development. The inclusive education reform generated new structures, relationships, and roles for professional learning opportunities to contribute to both school and university renewal. However, the extent to which renewal was actualized hinged upon the flexibility of university and district structures.

Theoretical alignment and simultaneous renewal

The Country Way PDS inquiry-oriented inclusive education reform generated alignment between school, district, and university goals. In the beginning, the university’s focus on training
inclusive educators provided the structural resources for the PDS. However, when district
support incentives were aligned with school goals, it generated action and energy by university,
district, and school personnel around a common mission, helping all students gain access to the
general education curriculum. Harrison Dobbs believes that the alignment between school goals
and university goals have been a key facilitator in the inclusive education reform. He states,

I think that the key thing is that the goals of the school have been realigned with the PDC concept. The word I'm gonna use overall is the coaching and mentoring kind of philosophy. They are helping young, beginning teachers, and some of them do a better job than others, and Regan’s in that program, they've taken on the responsibility and that's what they're doing. At the same time, they've done the same thing with the district. We come out and help them and we ask them to do a lot at other schools. I think the biggest facilitator is that willing to change, the willingness to look at doing things differently, that how do we capitalize in this era of high stakes accountability and budget cuts, to meet the needs of kids. (Harrison 22454,24268)

Harrison believes PDS educators’ willingness to take on new responsibilities, and to embrace a
new approach to meeting diverse student needs, generated alignment between university and
school programs. Although in the beginning the PDS provided the focus on inclusion, later the
school and district fusion of goals generated a professional learning culture around a common set
of beliefs about educating diverse learners.

Key university and district personnel shared a common belief system which supported
theoretical alignment among sites. Hannah Dobbs describes how shared beliefs influenced the
roles of key support personnel. She states:

Harrison was in dual roles both at UF and with the school district and Regan reached out to him. The power there was that he understood the PDS network and what the work is of PDSs, he understood inquiry, so now we had her and him working internally in the system. But Gabrielle also understood the inclusion role and could bring in people and special ed folks came aboard from Country Way, so that was a different dynamic in how everyone got together, but I think the reason it was so easy for folks to get together around inclusion, this notion of co-teaching and all of that, was because everyone had a shared knowledge base. Harrison had it because of his training at the University, and then Harrison ended up in a position in the district that allowed a very tight coupling of theory and practice. So, I think that it is just an emerging of people with a shared knowledge base, shared vocabulary, shared goals, shared beliefs, all of that stuff kind of coalesced. And Gabrielle
says to me sometimes that inclusion is probably one of the strongest pieces that has happened there and it really wasn't an initial, it almost happened spontaneously. I think the reason that it happened spontaneously though, it that you didn't have to go around creating shared knowledge, shared beliefs because people were positioned that already had that and it was less work. (Hannah 10387,11090)

In this excerpt, Hannah describes the importance of a shared knowledge base surrounding inclusive education as a critical component for PDS success. Multiple participants who shared a common knowledge base and set of beliefs about inclusive education influenced the professional learning culture at Country Way.

The willingness of district and university personnel to adapt and accommodate educator learning programs contributed to simultaneous renewal in the Country Way PDS. In the beginning, the principal, in-service teachers and the PDS site coordinator collaboratively adapted university coursework to meet contextual needs between. Later, district/university personnel adapted university professional development programs to better meet the needs of educators. Hannah Dobbs describes how she conceptualizes the process of collaboratively negotiating, adapting and accommodating university and schoolwork. She states:

Regan and Gabrielle’s flexibility to adapt assignments and tasks, the university, its simultaneous renewal, so Regan is renewing her school but your also simultaneously renewing teacher education but accommodating and adapting to what the school is working on and as they are doing that your learning too. (Hannah 28664,28960)

But although Hannah believes that process of adapting and accommodating programs to meet contextualized needs is a component of simultaneous renewal, she questions how simultaneous renewal is defined by considering key components of PDS history. She recalls:

The lab school was theory, take the expertise and apply it in the school, and the PDS movement was born out of the expertise of the school rather than external. A PDS should do both, I think I learned that because of Regan, because Regan goes out and finds knowledge and brings it in at the same time they are trying knowledge, they are trying out this knowledge and studying it as it is happening so they are creating this craft knowledge. So, instead of it being either or it is really and or both of these kinds of knowledge and she really taught me about that. (Hannah 28664,28960)
Hannah suggests that simultaneous renewal is about the willingness of participants to engage in a learning process that supports negotiating theoretical knowledge and craft knowledge, while at the same time using this process to inform teacher education. The Country Way PDS helped in-service and prospective teachers generate knowledge and skills around inclusive practices, while at the same time university and district level personnel gained important new insights from the ways school-based personnel carried out their improvement process, thus generating improvement for both school and university partners.

The benefit of the inclusive education reform was that all participants working within the PDS classrooms had a common knowledge base and understood how the PDS and district could creatively negotiate traditional structures to improve learning benefits for educators and students. The alignment between university, district, and school initiatives supported a professional learning culture for educators who valued a common knowledge base and displayed a willingness to adapt and accommodate program models to meet the contextual needs of the Country Way PDS teachers and students.

**Inhibited further PDS development**

In the inclusive education reform, both district and university organizational structures inhibited further PDS development. Multiple participants describe how a lack of district and school organizational structures inhibit PDS alignment, while others describe how a lack of organizational alignment at the university level inhibits alignment within the Country Way PDS. Some PDS participants describe how district level organizational structures inhibit PDS work at Country Way Elementary. Others suggest that organizational disconnects between regular education and special education departments in the university inhibit PDS work. Overall, while the theoretical underpinnings of multiple organizations have aligned with positive outcomes, organizational structures continue to inhibit further PDS work.
District organizational structures inhibit PDS support. Harrison Dobbs describes how organization barriers between Country Way and the district inhibit PDS work. He states:

Even though I'm a district employee, it's probably the district itself, the district leadership showed that they weren't really committed to her, that this was a school-based commitment, and that's not unusual, they've done that to other principals who have gotten involved [in the PDS]. (Harrison 29096,29434)

In this example Harrison describes how organizational support for PDS work has remained largely supported by individual school efforts. Hannah Dobbs reiterates Harrison’s point and provides further explanation about the consequences of this dilemma. She states,

The district is a huge inhibitor. There appears to be not recognition by the district of the work that she's done being related to PDS. I think they gave recognition that she is improving her school and that kind of thing, but I think the district has not gone to any means to understand what PDS is, how it is contributing, they just act like it doesn't exist. So, there's no kind of organizational sustainability build in within the county. And now according to the nine essentials of PDS this school wouldn't even be considered a PDS, because of not having an organizational structure that supported by the school system. (Hannah 18173,18805)

According to Hannah, organizational sustainability is a major consequence of the existing structure between the schools, districts, and university. The lack of organizational support structures between the district and university inhibits PDS work in district schools, but it also underminds the hard work of PDS participants working to contribute to the PDS knowledge base.

University organizational structures inhibit PDS support. Multiple PDS participants express dissonance with a perceived disconnect between regular education and special education programs in the college of education. Regan Lundsford describes her frustration as it relates to a lack of organizational alignment in the teacher education. She states:

You know the whole structure, like the special ed department and the elementary and the early childhood and my art and music teacher would love to become a part of the PDS. The special ed interns, there is no reason why they couldn't be supervised by the same person. Teaching is teaching. I think that we still have all these separate little entities here when we, in a PDS school, we should all be under one. I think they feel so isolated, we have one
special ed intern here, that's so isolating, they don't get near the experience that that group does. (Regan 47903,48462)

Regan expresses how the perceived disconnect between regular education and special education generates dissonance rather than unity in the PDS. Other PDS participants echo her tension, but site alternative reasons. Jennifer Townsend feels that the organizational disconnect does not embrace the spirit of collaboration promoted by the teacher education program. She explains:

   It is my understanding that it is general education that does the PDC, the Professional Development Community and special ed for one reason or not is not joined in on that or not been active, I don't know the ramifications but she was a special ed intern so therefore, her supervisor came from the special ed department wasn't a supervisor from the partnership and just had totally different requirements, didn't have to attend seminar, just different, there is a huge dividing line between special ed and regular ed when it comes to teacher preparation. I just feel like it is turf wars. I don't know, I haven't been at the university or I may be speaking out of turn, I just feel like everything that I have learned special ed a lot of it is not being implemented at the university level, which is communication, above and beyond, you communicate and you work together to meet the best needs of the students and the collaboration is not taking effect at the university level and I don't know how we can expect the students coming out of the university to be good collaborators if the university staff itself does not collaborate and provide the best education possible for students. (Jennifer 23278,23451)

Jennifer perceives the disconnect between university department is a product of “turf wars” within the university organization, and she describes how this influences prospective teachers working within the Country Way PDS. She further suggests:

   I see that the regular ed interns and pre-interns have much more support, active support from their supervisors because they're on campus at least once a week they do attend a seminar in which the supervisor is well aware of what is going on at our campus and is able to work more closely and become a more meaningful part of their education than the supervisors from the special education department. The Special Education department, even though they are very good supervisors they are not as tied into the happenings of the school, what the nuances of the school are, what are some of the things that the interns are having to deal with on a day to day basis and therefore they are not as able to counsel them or direct them in things that might be more beneficial for them. So, I think that the regular ed pre-interns and interns have a much better supervisory system than special education system does. On the other hand, I do feel that based on my experiences that special education students come out much more prepared for differentiated instruction for behavior management for a lot of things that make a classroom function well for all of the students. There are pros and cons to both. (Jennifer 24405,25598)
Both Regan and Jennifer feel that alignment between departments within the PDS environment would provide better supervision structures for the learning needs of special education prospective teachers. However, Jennifer further suggests that coursework emphasis for special education prospective teachers produces better prepared educators. The examples shared within Claim Six specifically illustrate how the inclusive education reform generated theoretical alignment between school, districts, and university goals and facilitated learning in the Country Way PDS for educators and students. However, existing district and university organization structures continue to inhibit further PDS alignment.

**Conclusion**

The Country Way PDS facilitated inquiry-oriented inclusive education by shifting structures, relationships, and praxis, which generated a professional learning culture for educators and students. The inclusive education reform unfolded first through the PDS, and second through the school improvement focus on inclusive education reform. The PDS initiated co-teaching practices between prospective and in-service teachers, which set the stage for inclusive classrooms to emerge where coaching and learning became part of classroom practices. Co-teaching participant relationships were underpinned by mutual respect and equal status, while university personnel continuity enabled participants to develop trusting relationships. However, the most significant facilitator occurred when school, district, and university goals aligned, which generated theory to practice connections and enabled educators to learn through active engagement and praxis. Although, some district and university organizational structures inhibited further PDS development and alignment, the overall outcomes of the inclusive education reform improved classroom practices and supported learning for students with disabilities. In Chapters 6 and 7 findings were presented from two school improvement reform movements. Chapter 6
presented outcomes from the writing reform, and chapter 7 presented findings from the inclusive education reform. Chapter 8 discusses the findings and draws implications from the data.
Figure 7-1. Whole group co-teaching photos

A) Denise co-teaching with pre-internship partner during a whole group lesson,
B) Olivia co-teaching during the same whole group lesson in Ms. Desto’s 5th grade.
A) Olivia leading a small group during a “station teaching” during a Social Studies unit,
B) A fifth grade student working on a writing activity in Denise’s small group lesson during the same lesson.
Table 7-1. Evolution of co-teaching in the Country Way PDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>PDS Classroom Mentors</th>
<th>Prospective Teacher Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>PDS Classroom Mentors Co-Teaching with Prospective Teachers*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CD*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TR*</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DM*</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BC*</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RN</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE K-2</td>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7-2. FCAT results 2007 scaled and gain scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reading School Average</th>
<th>Reading School Gain</th>
<th>Reading Students w/disabilities Average</th>
<th>Reading Students w/disabilities Gain</th>
<th>Math School Average</th>
<th>Math School Gain</th>
<th>Math Students w/disabilities Average</th>
<th>Math Students w/disabilities Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-3. Shifts in primary grade student performance on standardized assessments 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Reading Percentiles</th>
<th>Math Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st grade-Student 1</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 1</td>
<td>36 down to 23</td>
<td>17 up to 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st grade-Student 2</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 1</td>
<td>8 up to 25</td>
<td>8 up to 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st grade-Student 3</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 1</td>
<td>63 up to 80</td>
<td>54 up to 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st grade-Student 4</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 1</td>
<td>27 up to 37</td>
<td>28 down to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st grade-Student 5</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 1</td>
<td>45 up to 59</td>
<td>37 up to 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd grade-Student 1</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 2</td>
<td>20 up to 31</td>
<td>54 down to 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 1</td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>16 to 37</td>
<td>38 to 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 2</td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>43 to 68</td>
<td>29 to 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 3</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 4</td>
<td>21 to 15</td>
<td>26 to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 4</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 4</td>
<td>34 to 32</td>
<td>10 to 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 5</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 4</td>
<td>59 to 74</td>
<td>18 to 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 6</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 4</td>
<td>14 to 32</td>
<td>20 to 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 7</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 4</td>
<td>63 to 94</td>
<td>55 to 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 8</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 4</td>
<td>10 to 96</td>
<td>72 to 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 9</td>
<td>PDS-Teacher 4</td>
<td>80 to 77</td>
<td>34 to 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 10</td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>21 to 11</td>
<td>7 to 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 11</td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>21 to 39</td>
<td>6 to 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 12</td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>40 to 68</td>
<td>51 to 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 13</td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>34 to 35</td>
<td>68 to 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade-Student 14</td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>46 to 18</td>
<td>7 to 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Review of the Study

The purpose of this research study was to examine how educators described their shifting beliefs, values, roles, behaviors, rituals, and responsibilities as participants in a PDS focused on creating a culture of professional learning. Knowledge gained from this study was valuable for multiple reasons:

1) By deeply understanding the characteristics that educators describe as facilitators and inhibitors for PDS work within one school context, school and university educators can consider how structures, relationships, and practices can be implemented/adapted to better support the contextualized school improvement work of individual PDS sites and across PDS networks.

2) The results of this study help universities, districts, and schools identify how PDS sites can provide mutual benefits for educators at multiple levels to improve teaching, learning and instructional practices in their respective institutions.

3) The findings can also help university and school educators determine the conditions and characteristics of PDS work that influence theory and practice connections within a school context.

For this study, field notes, artifacts, and participant interviews were gathered over three and a half years of field-work within one fledgling elementary PDS. Dialogical interviews with nine participants were transcribed and then analyzed based on how participants described shifts in the professional learning culture. Six claims derived from participant descriptions were presented within the two reform illustrations. These claims were supported by evidence from field notes, artifacts, and interviews. Finally, each claim was examined and discussed to provide a thick description of the contextual characteristics within the Country Way PDS. A summary table of the overarching assertion and claims that emerged from the writing reform and inclusive education reform is provided at the end of Chapter 5.
Lessons Learned

Country Way’s inquiry-oriented approach to school improvement has highlighted many key lessons about PDS work and teacher learning within school-university partnerships. Many lessons learned from this study resulted from the successes and struggles within the writing and inclusive education reforms. The struggles of one reform brought about opportunities to improve the PDS work. The following lessons emerged from these experiences:

• A shared inquiry focus for PDS work enables educators at multiple levels to collaboratively improve teaching and learning.

• PDS participants must be given voice in the development of reform purposes and goals.

• Different types of reform goals generate different levels of resistance and support.

• All stakeholders should benefit from PDS engagement.

• PDS work cannot be sustained at the school level without district buy in and support.

• Simultaneous renewal can occur incrementally and fundamentally.

• PDS partnership teams need to span boundaries to maximize continuity and alignment within a context.

• School and universities can expand the membership of their communities through PDS work.

• School leaders need to balance authority and power to achieve reform goals.

• Dissonance, resistance, and tension in a PDS are catalysts for professional growth.

• PDS participant relationships can help translate conflict into productive tensions.

• University faculty members engaged in PDS work are often required to negotiate a balance between multiple theoretical and organizational agendas.

• Reform continuity and duration dramatically influence relationships, educator learning, and the overall success of PDS reform.
These lessons are described in more detail as they relate to four overarching interpretations. The following section outlines the interpretations and describes how each lesson learned from the Country Way PDS can inform the work of other PDS sites.

**Interpretations**

This study offers four interpretations (Wolcott, 1994) drawn from an analysis of multiple data sources gathered over three and a half years at the Country Way Elementary PDS. The interpretations draw upon data to inform new understandings or lessons learned from the PDS work of Country Way Elementary and to form recommendations for the work of other PDS sites (Table 8-1). The four interpretations presented are connected to the data and its analysis in four areas: 1) the utility of inquiry in linking theory and practice through reform 2) the need for flexible structures and pathways in PDS work, 3) PDS work as a balancing act of power and knowledge, and 4) the tension between stability and change in PDS reform. Each interpretation presented is connected to specific lessons learned from the writing and the inclusive education reforms.

**Interpretation 1: The utility of inquiry in linking theory and practice through reform.**

The Country Way PDS utilized inquiry as an overarching approach for school improvement, which included individual teacher inquiry and collaborative inquiry around a shared focus. Virginia Richardson (2003) suggests that an inquiry approach to professional development allows teachers to “maintain individual autonomy while bringing teachers together to make crucial decisions for school reform” (p.406). Similar to the inquiry approach to professional development, this study provides evidence that inquiry-oriented school improvement enabled multiple learning opportunities for educators to study together around a shared focus for improvement. Teacher, teacher educator, and administrator practices, beliefs and understandings about teaching and learning shifted due to the writing instruction and
inclusion focus at Country Way Elementary. Thus, a shared focus for PDS school improvement facilitated the professional learning culture at Country Way Elementary because it brought educators at multiple levels together to collaboratively inquire into teaching and learning.

PDS participants must be given voice in the development of reform purposes and goals. The importance of participants voice in defining reform purposes and goals was pivotal to linking theory and practice through inquiry-oriented school improvement. Inquiry should bring teachers together to make important collaborative decisions about reform (Richardson, 2003). The school principal defined the first year goals of the writing reform, and later with the support of one university faculty member writing instruction reform agenda was collaboratively negotiated. Yet, district level perspectives about writing instruction and FCAT pressure added complexity to the purpose of the reform. The complexity of the reform made defining a shared mission between PDS leaders and teachers a challenge. Teachers struggled to understand the purpose and goals of their collaborative work with the university and the district because they were not given voice in the development of the reform goals. As the inclusive education reform began, teacher voice became an integral component of developing the Country Way inclusion plan. Integrating teachers’ voice in the development of inclusive reform goals generated ownership and responsibility for the reform and helped more teacher leadership emerge. Thus, integrating PDS participant voice into the creation of reform goals facilitated a professional learning culture by allowing teachers to make decisions about school reform.

Different types of reform goals generate different levels of resistance and support. The goals of the writing and inclusive education reform were different in many ways. In addition, the differences influenced how teachers responded to reform and their openness for support. The focus of the writing reform emphasized overarching instructional changes to help promote
quality-writing instruction. Teachers’ personal beliefs and current instructional practices were challenged as they read professional texts and shared student-writing samples with peers. As individuals confronted and navigated through their own belief systems they began to be open to learning new ideas. However, the process of confronting and overcoming differing belief systems about instruction is a time consuming and uncomfortable process that requires on-going support to actualize meaningful change. Concurrent with other change literature (Fullan, 2001; Putnam & Borko, 2000), educators who participated in the book study and inquired into their practice experienced more shifts in beliefs and practices than those who only participated in committee work alone. The inclusive education reform focused on changing the ways that school and university personnel worked together to help all students gain access to the regular education curriculum. Changing the way educators worked together required specific attention to relationship building and collaborative inquiry into co-teaching practices. As educators engaged in co-teaching and inclusive practice they supported each other and developed new understandings. Dissonance most often emerged due to relationships that lacked mutual respect and equal status within classrooms. Educators who developed positive co-teaching relationships fostered theory to practice connections through their daily work and they collaboratively supported each other through the learning journey.

**Interpretation 2: The need for flexible structures and pathways in PDS work.**

All stakeholders should benefit from PDS engagement. PDS contexts often attend to the contextual needs of school sites, districts, and universities to develop partnership structures and goals. However, this study brought into focus the need for school districts, school sites, and universities to establish flexible structures and relationships that enable individual stakeholders to benefit from PDS engagement. PDS work is time and labor intensive because it requires participants to develop and maintain relationships while also engaging in collaboratively
problem solving and learning. Each partnership initiative benefited stakeholders in diverse ways. At the same time, structures and/or relationships between participants influenced the extent to which stakeholders sustained or actualized benefits from PDS work. Mutually beneficially PDS engagement draws upon the proposed notion of a “good fit” professor in residence for PDS work (Klingner et al., 2004) and explores contextual, teacher, and university factors that influence PDS collaboration (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997). The evidence from this study revealed that “good-fit” PDS participants were able to achieve mutual teaching and learning benefits from the partnership and sustained active engagement over time. Likewise, the evidence also suggested that district and university structures inhibited engagement at times for some PDS participants. Thus, schools, districts, and universities need to establish flexible structures so that individual participants can maintain a “good-fit” through PDS engagement.

PDS work cannot be sustained at the school level without district buy in and support. Establishing flexible organizational structures between multiple institutions is a challenge, but without district level support it is nearly impossible. Evidence from this study suggests that an absence of collaboration between university and district level resources in the writing reform generated complexity, which prompted dissonance for PDS participants and at times inhibited learning. However, the inclusive education reform benefited from key personnel who spanned university and district organizational roles to help streamline university-led professional development activities and provided on-going support for the reform through their district roles. Therefore, school districts should consider how PDS partnerships between schools and universities can provide additional professional development for teachers, more learning resources for students, and provide more human resources to support school improvement efforts without the financial burden of outside consultants. District level buy in would facilitate PDS
work because flexible structures between university and districts could provide schools with sustainable resources to support for reform initiatives.

Simultaneous renewal can occur incrementally and fundamentally. Although partnership work was not considered a part of university faculty member responsibilities, simultaneous renewal occurred in small ways throughout the writing reform. University faculty began integrating on-site PDS visits in graduate coursework, and graduate students began revising on-campus coursework for undergraduate students because of lessons learned coaching prospective teachers in PDS classrooms. Individual university-based PDS participants improved their work as teacher educators because of their participation in the Country Way writing reform. Through the inclusive education reform, district/university level personnel adapted and revised the professional development program for teachers through work with Country Way participants. The revising and adapting teaching and learning in incremental ways resounds with the notion of simultaneous renewal, the most notable lessons in these reform examples is how individual participants utilized their participation and learning from the PDS to improve their own teaching. The data also indicates that a fundamental shift toward simultaneous renewal occurred when university teacher preparation goals, district goals, and school goals aligned to create an inclusive education context.

PDS partnership teams need to span boundaries to maximize continuity and alignment within a context. One significant lesson that emerged from this study was the need for PDS partnership teams to encompass participants from district, school, and university contexts to collaboratively make decisions about teaching and learning. Additionally, within the PDS participants representing all active reform initiatives should be present to identify ways to streamline their support and maximize benefits for all educators. The findings from this study
suggest that PDS participants viewed the writing reform and inclusive education reform as separate entities. Missing from the Country Way PDS was a partnership team that engaged PDS teacher education personnel, writing reform personnel, and inclusive education reform personnel. The creation of such a team may have helped participants unite and collaboratively embark on multiple agendas simultaneously. PDSs need a unified team that brings in expertise from outside of the context and joins them with the expertise of educators within the context to support improved teaching and learning.

Schools and universities can expand the membership of their communities through PDS work with new pathways for educator learning. The data suggests that educators at Country Way Elementary learned how to be better teachers and teacher educators in writing and inclusive practices through active engagement. Educators at multiple levels learned about what it meant to be a PDS, teacher educator, or teacher by having the opportunity to participate in the work. The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning (n.d) note mentors need time to mentor and opportunity to learn to mentor (National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, n.d), Together educators learned by engaging in the process of teaching, mentoring, and coaching, a concept central to Lave and Wenger’s notion of legitimate peripheral participation (p. 14). According to Lave and Wenger (1991), individuals “acquire the skill to perform by engaging in the process” (p.14). The data from this study in fact suggest that educator participation was legitimate in that all participants shared equal status as educators. In this context, prospective teachers, mentors, and graduate students learned their craft through engaged scholarship (Boyer, 1996), while at the same time school leaders and university personnel learned how to be better teacher educators through active engagement and inquiry. Therefore, new pathways for teacher
preparation and teacher educator preparation may consider how active engagement is a pathway for induction into professional communities.

**Interpretation 3: PDS work is a balancing act of power and knowledge.**

School leaders need to balance authority and power to achieve reform goals. Concurrent with the teacher learning and school improvement literature (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Hopkins, Ainscow, & West, 1994), PDS participation requires a balancing act of top-down and bottom-up pressure and support. In addition, the writing and inclusive education reform initiatives provided new understandings of how balancing power and knowledge influenced the professional learning culture at Country Way Elementary. French and Raven (2001) suggest that five forms of power affect social influence in an organization: coercive, reward, legitimate, expert, and referent. For school leaders, balancing coercive and legitimate power became a particularly challenging task. As evidenced in Chapters 6 and 7, the school principal asserted her legitimate power to set the writing and inclusive reform in motion. Within the writing reform, the principal utilized coercive power to generate participation. In contrast, the inclusive reform generated the bottom-up leadership as teachers were given legitimate power to make decisions about reform, which generated ownership and responsibility. Thus, school leaders can generate a professional learning culture by balancing multiple sources of power to achieve top-down and bottom-up changes. Specifically, the data from this study verifies that all five sources were at work at various time points in the Country Way PDS. Between the two initiatives, a model emerged that illustrates how the Country Way PDS achieved inquiry-oriented school improvement (Figure 8-1).

Dissonance, resistance, and tension in a PDS are catalysts for professional growth. All PDS participants need to understand how conflicting notions about the application of theory and practice can prompt PDS participants to collaboratively negotiate new understandings. The
results from this study indicate that teachers overcame multiple forms of dissonance to foster new beliefs, knowledge, and skills related to writing instruction and inclusive education. However, at almost every turn of success there existed some form of tension or dissonance that helped the PDS participants move toward new levels of collaboration and understanding. Dissonance prompted action and energy to either resolve the conflict or find new ways to conduct work within the context. Thus, professional growth was often preceded by a tension that required participants to negotiate old ways of thinking with new ideas for practice.

PDS participant relationships can help translate conflict into productive tensions. The act of collaboration generated dissonance at times and at other times helped participants generate new understandings that would not have otherwise been achieved without PDS collaborative structures. Concurrent with other PDS studies (Johnston & Kerper, 1996), power played an influential role in the professional learning culture of the Country Way PDS. Specifically, referent power, or the power of relationships, in many ways helped move participants from dissonance toward a productive tension that generated shifts in beliefs, practices, or new understandings. When PDS participants lacked referent power through PDS collaboration, conflict often resulted in unresolved dissonance. Thus, the referent power that emerged through PDS participant collaboration in the writing and inclusive education reforms helped generate productive tensions (Johnston & Kerper, 1996) that led to new levels of knowledge development. Thus, social power held a power influence on helping PDS participants negotiate dissonance.

University faculty members engaged in PDS work often had to negotiate a balance between multiple theoretical and organizational agendas. They had the task of negotiating a contextually sensitive balance between theory and practice. Often, the role of negotiator required faculty members to use their expert power to help generate new insights, while at other times
faculty members needed to use their referent power to help participants negotiate tensions between theory and practice. As evidenced in the writing reform, the expertise of university faculty members was better received as PDS participants and faculty developed relationships. But, the added theoretical complexity within the writing reform made negotiation even more challenging. The inclusive education reform verified the importance of referent power as district/university personnel utilized their relationships with teachers to navigate through dissonance and achieve change. Concurrent with other research (French & Raven, 2001; Johnston & Kerper, 1996), there is a relationship between expert and referent power in supporting teacher learning in PDS work.

**Interpretation 4: The tension between stability and change in PDS reform.**

Reform continuity and duration dramatically influence relationships, educator learning, and the overall success of PDS reform. The final lesson of this study regards the tension between stability and change. As participants described positive shifts in various aspects of their PDS work there was always something that remained stable in order to facilitate a shift. Even moments of teacher resistance and/or dissonance prompted change, as some teachers rejected new writing practices in an attempt to maintain stability it prompted school leaders and university personnel to consider the utility, balance, and alignment of current professional development programs in writing. A stable group of PDS leaders, including the principal, CRT, and university appointed supervisor enabled continuity and facilitated support for PDS activities due to established relationships with practicing and prospective teachers. This included stability in mentorship and supervision as prospective teachers returned for additional field experiences at the site. In contrast to other studies on teacher turnover diminishing the mentor base or coordinator turnover in PDS sites (Bullough *et al.*, 1997), turnover in faculty members at Country Way actually prompted stability in values as “non-PDS” teachers retired or left and the
principal brokered in new PDS community members who shared her vision for continuous learning, supporting teacher education, and educating all students. Unlike many PDS sites plagued with turnover, Country Way maintained stability of key human resources in many ways. However, the flux of frequently revisiting and revising school improvement initiatives made university faculty continuity challenging. Emihovich (1998) suggests a relationship between stability and change, “Schools are dynamic organizations in constant flux. But, at the same time, there are momentary points of stability around which people get things done” (p.129). The more stability that can be built into PDS work the better, particularly related to human resources to support prospective teacher preparation, practicing teacher professional development, and school leadership. The data from this study strongly supports that the continuity of school-based school and university personnel was a facilitator for PDS work.

The primary challenge in this study was the duration of change initiatives within the context. Fullan (2001) suggests that meaningful change takes 3-5 years to achieve. The data from this study and the participants agree that a one-year intensive focus was not enough to achieve meaningful instructional changes in writing. However, the inclusive education reform data suggests that changes occurred in small phases over time, and after three years the school context was beginning to foster inclusive education practices. Thus, the duration of the reform impacts success.

**Future Research**

As a result of this study, multiple new pathways for PDS research have emerged. Given the importance of relationships in PDS work, one study could specifically examine how PDS leaders negotiate both contextual and theoretical barriers to develop meaningful school and university partnerships. Specifically, future studies should explore how university professors use both their expertise and relational skills to collaboratively accommodate (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997) a
collaborative agenda for school reform. More insight is needed into how university faculty have successfully negotiated and accommodated contextual conditions within schools to develop new views of effective practice through PDS participation.

Additional studies into the school renewal efforts between universities and schools in diverse contexts would enable other researchers to identify the extent to which these findings transfer into other contexts. Of particular interest would be studies that examine the organizational structures that enable connections between practicing teacher professional development and prospective teacher learning around a common content area focus. Studies that provide insight into PDS work in other state contexts or in urban sites would be beneficial to PDS practitioners working in diverse contexts.

Additional research is needed to supplement the use of standardized assessment data in measuring student learning in a PDS. This study found standardized assessment data alone did not account for many of writing instructional changes actualized in PDS classrooms due to the majority of instructional shifts taking place in primary grade placements where writing assessment measures were not gathered. While the inclusive education reform found standardized gain scores useful to measure student learning, the standardized assessments could not account for the shifts in student engagement and individualized instruction. Additional measures are needed to supplement standardized assessment results and systematically compare student learning PDS and non-PDS classrooms. One way to accomplish this may be to examine student engagement in PDS sites. Future studies could explore how students are engaged in classroom instruction in PDS classroom where multiple educators are present to facilitate instruction.
Conclusion

To summarize this study, I revisit the Holmes Partnership Goals to identify connections between their goals and the professional learning culture at Country Way Elementary. The six goals set forth by the Holmes Partnership include:

- High Quality Professional Preparation
- Simultaneous Renewal
- Equity, Diversity and Cultural Competence
- Scholarly Inquiry and Programs of Research
- School and University-Based Faculty Development
- Policy Initiation

This study provides evidence of how high quality professional preparation, school renewal, and school and university faculty development can be linked through an inquiry-oriented approach to school improvement within a PDS.

The PDS began by establishing a community of teacher educators who collaboratively shared responsibility for preparing the next generation of teachers. The Country Way PDS linked prospective teacher inquiry to both writing and inclusive reform initiatives in order to provide high quality professional preparation. Additionally, the theoretical alignment achieved between school, district, and university inclusive education goals provided prospective teachers with the opportunity for active engagement and praxis.

As the partnership progressed, school renewal occurred as school and university-based faculty members engaged in an inquiry-oriented approach to school improvement in writing instruction and inclusion, which prompted prospective teachers, in-service teachers, and teacher educators to develop new knowledge and expertise. Fullan (2001) differentiates between re-culturing and restructuring. School renewal first occurred through restructuring the Country Way PDS by changing structures, roles, and relationships within the site. Later, the inclusive
education focus shifted attention toward student achievement and differentiated instructional practices, which helped re-culture the PDS.

The commitment to educating diverse learners was embedded within the PDS focus through prospective teacher inquiry and co-teaching from the beginning; however these concepts dovetailed and enhanced the professional learning culture when Country Way’s reform efforts shifted toward inclusion and more practicing educators embraced co-teaching with prospective teachers. The integration of the university and school mission to educate all students using inclusive practice enabled Country Way to become a professional learning culture that embodied “best practices” and engaged educators at multiple levels to experience situated learning opportunities.

The complexity of policy initiation at the university and district level inhibited alignment and continuity in the PDS, while an absence of support structures for PDS work required faculty members to utilize graduate students to support the on-going work of PDS reform initiatives. This study illustrates how policy initiation is a complex process that can directly impact the learning culture of PDS site by influencing the structures, relationships, and praxis.
### Table 8-1. Lessons learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretations</th>
<th>Lessons learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The utility of inquiry in linking theory and practice through reform.| • A shared inquiry focus for PDS work enables educators at multiple levels to collaboratively improve teaching and learning.  
• PDS participants must be given voice in the development of reform purposes and goals.  
• Different types of reform goals generate different levels of resistance and support. |
| The need for flexible structures and pathways in PDS work.          | • All stakeholders should benefit from PDS engagement.  
• PDS work cannot be sustained at the school level without district buy in and support.  
• Simultaneous renewal can occur incrementally and fundamentally.  
• PDS partnership teams need to span boundaries to maximize continuity and alignment within a context.  
• Schools and universities can expand the membership of their communities through PDS work. |
| PDS work as a balancing act of power and knowledge.                 | • School leaders need to balance authority and power to achieve reform goals.  
• Dissonance, resistance, and tension in a PDS is a catalyst for professional growth.  
• PDS participant relationships can help translate conflict into productive tensions.  
• University faculty members engaged in PDS work are often required to negotiate a balance between multiple theoretical and organizational agendas. |
| The tension between stability and change in PDS reform.             | • Reform continuity and duration dramatically influence relationships, educator learning, and the overall success of PDS reform. |
Figure 8-1. Power source interaction within a PDS
APPENDIX A
QUESTIONS FOR GUIDING EARLY FIELDWORK OBSERVATIONS

Guiding questions as recommended by HATCH (2002):

- What are the places where social activity occurs?
- Who are the people involved in the social action?
- What individual activities are people engaged in?
- What group activities are people engaged in?
- What are the objects people use?
- What is the sequence of activity that takes place over time?
- What things are people trying to accomplish?
- What emotions are expressed?
APPENDIX B
EXAMPLE OF HANDWRITTEN FIELD NOTES

Meeting w/ a teacher specifically about writing.

- Every time we work w/ a teacher specifically about writing, it is very important.
- Students are writing more, trying to come up w/  more words.
- Write about students who don’t have a lot of words in their heads or on paper.
- Quantity is increasing – students are writing more.

- What is writing? Do they write differently?
- Should we talk more about process?

What is purpose? How does it relate to FCAT?
- Building stamina to get them writing.
- Can think and use language learned.
- Process is thinking.
- Practice the process, read writing to internalize it.
- Same challenge for kids.

- Focus – reflective. Theme must be the starting point.
- Think about the debate sounds you want to write.

- Initial debate: “We have been doing this for a long time and it works.”
- Now you can relate, relate to personal self.
- “Help students how you can use to frame strategies to write a sentence.”
- “The key is: the limit in but developmentally they don’t make the jump.”
- “It is thus comprehensive of the story.”
- “That K is talking to DF like she doesn’t have a clue what it is like to teach KJ...”
- “I can your internship...”
   - How would you help them write to make it better?
   - Have them pick the one that they would rewrite?
   - What is it that you want to write about, what is the point?
   - Associate - think of something and drift away (think away)
   - Writing is different from conversation, this is why we train them
   - You don't have to brainstorm first
   - How can we connect the similar ideas?

3. Timed prompt - 45 min. - 3 things about a good neighbor
   1. (draft) Brainstorm 5 min.
   2. Several could not be selected due to lack of focus.
   3. Why is the 2nd better than the rest?

   B: giving more of a focus, examples, description, elaboration;
       much more connected

   C: better because the focus is there, the picture that I can visualize what they are describing
   D: help #1 what is good?

   Welcome to the neighborhood, someone babbling to get to a point

   E: Don't think of organization yet because she hasn't gotten the ideas but yet.

   Concrete & pick up trash; lots of details about summarizing

   Abstract & lots of labels - get them to regroup - see

   Prompts lead you to this kind of writing

   The writer did what they were asked

   What is a neighbor? What does a good neighbor do?

   Information may not belong to the theme, this is why the focus is a primary concern
Only when you have a topic, then work on organization.

4. 45 min - Reel: Timed writing test - We are following the curriculum - Prompt: Halloween was fun. What do you like about Halloween?
   - Why do I like Halloween? Why was Halloween fun?
   - Topic was different than the prompt. With a slight twist they could reframe.
   - I love Halloween - annual party
   - trick or treating
   - what are going to be
   - Close to standard, a shift to how to make Halloween fun.
   - Kids tend to write about their experiences.
   - Use the same ideas to write another genre, train them to reuse the same info to write a different genre.
   - Kids need something to start from (some kids)

5. I like to give a prompt that doesn’t exclude
   - “A favorite event” - special event - 45 minute timed prompt

   * The details focused on what happened, not why it may be favorite. Why was this a favorite trip?
   * Details focused on what happened - not so much why it is favorite, gets to that punch to late.

**Focus is most important! Sometimes the focus gets lost in the wrong details (wrong tone)

- How does the author get to theme
- Read good writing through literature
1. Writing can make everything better. Teaching students to write using different forms of writing can help make it easier.

2. Teachers who are afraid of writing something can look at their own notes to help make it easier.

3. **Prompt writing:**
   - usually hard to integrate with other areas
   - can be integrated into other curriculum

4. Read diverse material, fictional and nonfictional, new and old, to get ideas.

5. *What do you think about the use of problem-solving in the narrative writing?*

6. *What do you want to do?*
APPENDIX C
EXCERPT FROM FIELD NOTES

Writing Committee-Dr. Denlin* 11-9-05
Wow! What an interesting meeting (see notes), today’s meeting seemed to bring very fruitful conversations around the table. The meeting started at 1:00 and last until 3:30, teachers were very willing to stay to continue to discuss the topics at hand. Dr. D began by outlining how her approach was similar/different to the other approaches going on within the school. Each teacher brought three writing samples to share with the group, one low, one medium and one high. Each teacher presented their writing pieces with the group looking at focus as the primary concern. Their writing revealed across the board that teachers are still using only prompts as a source of writing; they are often timed or tested. The first draft seems to be the only one that is being written. The group was very open to sharing and ideas that generated conversations, however there were times that created tension among the group. When the K teacher shared she primarily talked about the stages of developmental writing and provided some examples of her students’ work, she became very defensive when Dr. Denlin* asked questions of her as to why the focus was so heavily on letters and their sounds. She commented [defensively] and snipped back a few times and spoke to Fiona* like she had never taught K to write and that she had no idea what she was talking about. After her sharing time, Mrs. W came to share. I know that her class does little writing beyond the journal, which is prompted and timed. Her students wrote about storybook characters, but they were often focused on story characters that also came from movies and their descriptions seem to depict the movie visuals. I posed a question about the focus of their writing and we discussed the writings in terms of the desired prompt and actual content.

The meeting after the meeting was rejuvenating, Regan*, Dr. Denlin*, Christy*, and myself met to discuss the progress. While we all thought the meeting went well, we discussed the points that generated tension and the next steps for the group. It was decided that little writing was being done away from prompts. The decision was made to leave the 4th grade teachers alone this year and work with a second grade teacher. She will work closely with Christy*, to provide more open writing time, develop mini-lessons, and create a workshop environment. Regan*, Dr. Denlin*, and myself will be involved in a spring semester course that will use Country Way* as a resource to study and help teachers learn to teach writing more effectively. It is going to be an interesting adventure! I will be working to infuse the pre-interns work with the goals that we have discussed as vital, this may help model in some ideas for teachers and provide support for mini-lessons and conferencing.

12/0/05
After our mentor meeting today 12/6/05 S W stopped me to thank for speaking up at the last writing meeting. She expressed that she thinks that Fiona* is noticing different things then the teachers do in the kids writing [which I think is the whole point]. She was definitely defensive towards the criticisms that were posed. [For some reason SW thought I was defending her and the other teachers with my comments about what I noticed in the students writing. That is interesting to me because I thought I was validating Fiona’s point that the students aren’t really writing to the prompt that they are being given but finding creative ways to write around the prompt within guidelines.] During the meeting, I trying to point out that the students who were supposed to be writing about their favorite book characters were actually writing about movie characters and that there writing is deviating from the prompts, verifying that details and elaboration in the wrong place doesn’t help the students remain focused. I guess I just expressed it in a way that seemed validating to SW. I wonder if she just perceived that our observations were different because we are not coming from the same place, i.e. professor from “the university” that is not in her classroom on a weekly basis. She also expressed success with the Saturday workshop she attended, she said that was the one thing she found very valuable more so than Kathy Robertson, I wish I knew what they did that day! [I will need to find this out]
APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Principal Interview Guide

Can you describe some of your responsibilities as the principal of the Country Way* Elementary PDC?

Can you describe the specific activities that you have participated in as a PDC principal, starting in the beginning and moving up until the present? How has your role changed since the partnership began?

Can you tell me more about your role in ____? Can you describe what you do as a ______ in ______?

Writing Committee, Online Book Study, Other Meetings with Univ. Faculty, etc (add others as they are mentioned)

Probe for:
• Learning:
  How did the experience with ______ influence your own learning?
  Which individuals facilitated your learning during ______?
• Classroom Practices:
  How did ______ influence the way you thought about ___ / taught ___?
  How did ______ influence what you observed in classrooms?
• Student Learning:
  How did student activities change as a result of ______?
  How did ______ influence student learning?

In your opinion, what have been the key facilitators to the success of the PDC partnership at Newberry Elementary?

In your opinion, what have been the inhibitors to the success of the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary?

Can you tell me about a time when your involvement in the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary has influenced your learning?

Can you tell me about a time when your involvement in the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary influenced your instructional leadership practices? Professional development?

Can you tell me about a time when the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary has influenced student learning? What do you attribute to this influence?
Classroom Teacher Interview Guide

As a mentor/classroom teacher, can you tell me about your overall experience with the PDC partnership with the University?

Can you describe some of your responsibilities as a mentor/classroom teacher within the Country Way* Elementary PDC?

Can you describe the specific activities that you have participated in as a mentor teacher, starting in the beginning and moving up until the present?

How has your role changed since the partnership began?

- Can you tell me more about your role in _____?
- Can you describe what you do as a _____ in _____?
- Writing Committee, Online Book Study, Other Meetings with Univ. Faculty, Mentor Meetings (add others as they are mentioned)
- Probe for:
- Learning:
  - How did the experience with _____ influence your own learning?
  - Which individuals facilitated your learning during _____?
- Classroom Practices:
  - How did ______ influence the way you though about ___ / taught ___?
  - How did ______ influence what you observed in classrooms?
- Student Learning:
  - How did student activities change as a result of ______?
  - How did ______ influence student learning?

In your opinion, what have been the key facilitators to the success of the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary?

In your opinion, what have been the inhibitors to the success of the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary?

Can you tell me about a time when your involvement in the PDC partnership has influenced your learning?

Can you tell me about a time when your involvement in the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary has influenced your classroom instructional practices?

Can you tell me about a time when your involvement in the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary has influenced student learning?

What do you attribute to this influence?
University Faculty/Personnel Interview Guide

As a university faculty member, can you tell me how your experience with Country Way* Elementary began?

How has your work with Country Way* evolved since the beginning?
What do you attribute this to?

Can you describe some of your roles and responsibilities at the Country Way* Elementary PDC?
How have your responsibilities changed since the beginning?
What do you attribute this to?

How does the role of external knowledge influence the professional learning culture at Country Way*?
Can you describe the specific activities that you have participated in as a university faculty member, starting in the beginning and moving up until the present?

Can you describe some of your roles and responsibilities at the Country Way* Elementary PDC?
How has your role changed since the partnership began?
Can you tell me more about your role in ______? Can you describe what you do as a ______ in ______?

Writing Committee, Online Book Study, Other Meetings with Univ. Faculty, Mentor Meetings (add others as they are mentioned)

Probe for:
- Learning:
  - How did the experience with ______ influence your own learning?
  - Which individuals facilitated your learning during ______?
- Classroom Practices:
  - How did ______ influence the way you thought about ___ / taught ___?
  - How did ______ influence what you observed in classrooms?
- Student Learning:
  - How did student activities change as a result of ______?
  - How did ______ influence student learning?

In your opinion, what have been the key facilitators to the success of the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary?

In your opinion, what have been the inhibitors to the success of the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary?

Can you tell me about a time when your involvement in the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary has influenced your learning?

Can you tell me about a time when your involvement in the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary has influenced your professional development practices with teachers?

Can you tell me about a time when your involvement in the PDC partnership at Country Way* Elementary has influenced student learning?
What do you attribute to this influence?
APPENDIX E
REFLEXIVE JOURNAL ENTRY

Has been drawn to ind. who shared alike philo., passions and also positions. Really as a learner. This seems to be their that holds the core of the PDC together is a shared disposition for continuous learning. This is a disposition that we try to emphasize in PDC but what is becoming clear is that this disposition has to be present in ind. across all levels. The tensions appear when with ind. when they aren’t perceived as “learning” w/i the environment. I am beginning to think this holds true across ind. at all levels. I think JC used to refer to this as “a teachable spirit.”

The influence of history and experience has to be a qualitative in some way because if not, it only shapes the expertise that multiple individuals bring to the program. But how they learned it is also of utmost importance.

1. Influenced by her work at “t,” who
   are winners in the area and how she learned it
2. Influenced by her work coursework, experience in Houston, work MM at “t.”

D. During an interview I was pleased that she spoke during most of interview. Even though she was uncomfortable talking about the tensions from the writing committee. Therefore, she was able to get a clear understanding of what was happening. She was learning a different practice regarding writing. She also talked a lot about inclusion as in the frame of the PDC. I am having a hard time finding through the inclusion component, directly it appears to be so tied together w/ the PDC. Teachers feel sort it go of the PDC.
APPENDIX F
CO-TEACHING LESSON PLAN

Time Machine through the American Revolution
Day Two
Teacher: Denise Mason* and Olivia Susa*
Grade: 5th
Co-Teaching Method: Station
Subject: Social Studies

Learning Objectives:
What are your objectives for student learning in this lesson? That is, what do you intend students
to learn?
1. Given a set of information, including illustrations, maps, biographies and texts,
students will identify important people and events from the American Revolution.
2. Identify the impact that certain people from the Revolutionary War had on our country's
history.

Why have we chosen these objectives?
These objectives were chosen because they are the most relevant factors necessary for students to
grasp the concept in a complete fashion. All of these objectives are essential in comprehending
the key events of the American Revolution. Finally, these objectives reach out to various
learners, as they emphasize independent as well as cooperative grouping, as well as the usage of
various manipulatives.

What Standards (National or State) relate to this lesson?
Standard 4:
The student understands U.S. history to 1880. (SS.A.4.2)
1. Understands the geographic, economic, political, and cultural factors that characterized early
exploration of the Americas.
2. Understands why Colonial America was settled in regions.
3. Knows significant social and political events that led to and characterized the American
Revolution.

Benchmark LA.A.2.2.5: The student reads and organizes information for a variety of purposes,
including making a report, conducting interviews, taking a test, and performing an authentic task.

Standard 2: The student constructs meaning from a wide range of texts. Benchmark LA.B.1.2.3:
The student produces final documents that have been edited correct formatting according to
instruction. Standard 2: The student writes to communicate ideas and information effectively.

2. Content Knowledge
What is the underlying content knowledge that the teacher must help the students understand?
What are the tricky pieces in the content? When you deconstruct the content you are teaching
what are the pieces that are essential for children to understand?

Paul Revere
Paul Revere was a soldier in the French and Indian War. He joined the Sons of Liberty, took part
in the Boston Tea Party and was a courier for the Massachusetts committee of correspondence.
He became a popular figure in history on April 18, 1775 when he went to warn the people of the
Massachusetts countryside that British soldiers were being sent out in the expedition that started
the American Revolution. He is remembered as the midnight rider. He designed the first seal for the United Colonies. Designed and printed the first Continental bond issue and established a powder mill in Massachusetts.

Taxation
Stamp Act- Requiring colonists to pay a tax on approximately fifty paper items (including newspapers, legal documents and playing cards). To avoid being taxed, shopkeepers refused to sell British goods and offered illegal goods bought from other countries. This served to be an insult to the British economy and fueled anger between the colonists further igniting the war. As a result the colonists began to riot.

Townshed Act- The British made a second attempt to tax colonists in America. This time they tried to tax imported goods such as paper, paint and tea. Once again the colonists refused and Britain bowed to the colonists again. Only this time they removed all goods except tea.

The Boston Tea Party
Two hundred colonists dressed as Mowhawk Indians boarded British ships in the Boston harbor and threw 342 chests of tea into the sea. As a result, colonist had destroyed thousands of dollars worth of tea. The revolt led to the enactment of more rules from the British government. Rules from the British government fueled the anger of the colonists. Colonists became more opposed to British government and resisted laws that were later passed by the British.

A group of colonists called the Sons of Liberty showed their displeasure at the British government by impersonating the Mohawk Native Americans and dumping a shipload of tea overboard into the Boston Harbor. This incident is known as the Boston Tea Party.

The Mohawks used masks made of wood and cornhusks. They also used certain kinds of colored clay and stone, finely ground and mixed with oil to make their face paint. The painting of faces was considered a form of magic to the Indians, as was the wearing of a mask. Every color had its own meaning. Red meant power; blue meant defeat or trouble; white meant peace; and yellow meant joy, travel, or bravery. Black usually meant death or sorrow. The designs used were usually symbolic of animals, the sky, the clouds, and/or the sun. It is probable that the colonists did not know all this and therefore used berries and vegetables native to their areas for making the dyes to color their faces.

3. Student Grouping
How will you group students for instruction?
For this assignment we have decided to group the students in three small groups. In each of these groups we will discuss different topics related to the American Revolution. Each group will be led and taught by a teacher and the students will be required to be stamped before they will be allowed to move on. The idea is that students will be taking a journey throughout the events of the American Revolution, while getting their “passports” stamped at each occurrence. Each group will have a different lesson being taught, and will last for about 15 minutes, when students will be asked to rotate to the next “event” and begin gathering more information.

Why have you chosen this grouping? We have chosen this type of grouping because we believe that it will be most beneficial for instruction and for students’ understanding. Teaching students in small groups will allow us to better meet student individual learning needs and focus instruction so that students comprehend the material. It is also the most beneficial way to teach three different concepts so that students do not confuse them and can focus on one event at a time.
4. Methods
What teaching methods will you use for this lesson?
Constructivists Learning
Modeling
Direct Instruction
Questioning and prompting

What students need specific accommodations in this lesson?
Samantha T. - We would ask her questions (prompting) and give her extra feedback to make sure she is grasping the concept and understands what is expected of her (modeling).
Austin W. – Additional prompting and refocusing.
Many of our students can not work together because they may cause a distraction to each other as well as their classmates. This includes the following students together:
Logan R. and Taylor S.
Holly S. and Samantha T.
Devante C, Dale G, and David H
Amber H. and Courtney E.

What specific accommodations have you made for these students?
To accommodate students that may need additional support during this lesson we will foster their specific learning needs during small group instruction. Students that need additional support will be given extra practice in their small groups.

Why have you chosen these methods?
We believe that the methods we have chosen will accommodate all of our students meeting their most basic needs appropriately. Each and every child will be challenged in our classroom! We believe this lesson incorporates a myriad of different cognitive learning styles. It incorporates the need for collaborating as well as independent study, and plenty of opportunities to ask for help. For some students this activity may take longer time than intended; we will allow these students to have more time to work on their activity. Finally, we would motivate all students to get involved, and encourage them to ask questions.

5. Activities
What activities have you planned?
Students will be placed into three groups, and will rotate from one group to the next every fifteen minutes. Music will be played to signify that it is time to rotate to the next group.

Taxation- Creative Writing
Hand Out Vocabulary Card.
1. Ask the students what they know about taxes.
2. Pose the question, “When you purchase something listed on McDonald’s Dollar Menu, how much do you pay the cashier? What causes this cost?”
3. Explain to students that the Parliament (the governing body) decided to tax the colonies so that they could pay the cost of the French and Indian War.
4. Explain that the Sugar Act (1764) had colonists pay taxes on goods coming to the colonies from other places, including pounds of tea. The Stamp Act (1765) placed tax stamps on paper products in the colonies: newspapers, legal papers (such as wills, diplomas, and marriage papers), some books, and playing cards.
5. Explain that drinking tea was an important part of the English way of life. The British often sipped tea while socializing much like the children today may have soda and snacks while spending time with friends. Discuss that the taxes on tea made it difficult to afford and enjoy such drinks.
6. After the discussion, have students write a letter to the parliament describing how they feel about the new taxes on their favorite items.

Stamp the student’s passport for learning all about Taxation

The Boston Tea Party- Making Masks
Students will construct masks similar to those worn at the Boston Tea Party.
Hand Out vocabulary card.

1. Begin by going over the events leading to the Boston Tea Party. (The instructor should go through pictures in a book to help students visualize the information. Use and explain the vocabulary terms that the students should become familiar with.)
2. Review the origins of the Boston Tea Party mask. Explain the significance of Mohawk face painting and mask designing.
3. Have students brainstorm reasons for wearing masks.

Making the Mask
Hand out a Mask Template for the student to work with.
1. Set out paint and colors and model the usage of each color, and each color is significant.
2. Students may use crayons, markers, glitter or foil to design their masks
3. Cut the mask out to make sure it is the correct size.
4. Apply this mixture moderately to the mask with a paintbrush.
5. Attach rubber bands and string.
Allow volunteers to share their mask and explain their selection of color choices.
Stamp the student’s passport for traveling to the Boston Tea Party

Paul Revere – Fun With Poems
1 The instructor will introduce Paul Revere, showing the students many pictures.
2. The instructor will begin the discussion by asking: What would you do if they received word that one of their friends was going to be hurt?
3. The students will all be given a copy of the poem Paul Revere’s Ride by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow
4. Students should look over the questions they will answer prior to reading.
5. Students will take turns reading the poem aloud.
6. Review what was learned about Paul Revere and his midnight ride.
7. Student will fill in their QAD (question, answer, discussion) chart with their peers.
8. Finally, students will create an acrostic poem using Paul Revere’s name. They should fill in their poem with words and or phrases that describe Paul Revere, using information from the poem they read.
Stamp the student’s passport for visiting Paul Revere

6. Materials
What instructional materials will you use, if any?
Three stamps and ink, line papered, Song Sheet

Boston Tea Party
Texts and photographs
-mask
-scissors
-pencil
-crayons
-paper towels
-red, black, white, yellow, and blue paints
-mixing plate
-paintbrushes
-glitter
-rubber bands and string
-aluminum foil
-feathers
-newspaper
Taxation
Texts and Photographs
Envelopes and paper
pencils

Paul Revere
Paul Revere's Ride by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow
Paper
Pre-created worksheet
Pencils/markers

Why have you chosen these materials?
These are the essential materials needed to complete this lesson. We chose a variety of materials so that students’ attention will be maintained. Additionally, using such a variety of materials reaches out to different learners. Each station has different materials, which will help refocus students and catch their attention to begin another lesson.

Evaluation
How and when do you plan to evaluate student learning on the content of this lesson?
Students will be assessed in both formal and informal methods. To begin, in each group students will be observed to make sure they are grasping the concept in a concise manner. This will be done by prompting the students to answer questions and through the group discussions that will be taking place.
Furthermore, we will assess the students’ understanding by looking over the work that they accomplish during each group task. At the “Boston Tea Party” group, students will be assessed by the outcome of their masks; we will also to their responses in terms of why masks were colored in certain manners and why masks were used. For the “Taxation” group, students will be assessed informally by listening to their input during the group discussion. We will make sure they grasp the concept of taxation without representation. Additionally, their letter to parliament will help us see if they comprehend the material. Finally, for the group session on “Paul Revere,” we will look over the answers that students write in their QAD chart. We will also look over their acrostic poem on Paul Revere to make sure that our students understand who Paul Revere is and how to describe him.

Why have you chosen this approach to evaluation?
Through observation we can observe if our students have acquired the skills we have gone over in each group. We are also able to gauge our students’ knowledge on the concepts through group discussion. Finally, by looking over their written work, we are able to point out any incorrect answers, and help our students come to the correct answer. Our goal is to make sure students are given accurate information, and from there, they can transform it and use it in a fun activity that shows us that they comprehend the material.
APPENDIX G
CO-TEACHING LESSON PLAN 2

Teacher: Ms. Mason* and Ms. Desto*
Grade: Fifth
Subject: Math -Chapter 2 Test Review

1. Learning Objectives
What are your objectives for student learning in this lesson? That is, what do you intend students to learn?
Students will complete their worksheet and work in small groups cooperatively.
Students will answer assigned questions in small groups with at least 85% accuracy.
Students will practice strategies they have learned for writing decimals as fractions.
Students will correctly write and read fractions and decimals.
Students will correctly add decimals.

Why have you chosen these objectives?
I have chosen these objectives because these are the necessary objectives required to complete this lesson. In order for students to understand the content covered on the exam it is necessary that they are given sufficient practice in small groups. I also have chosen these objectives because they provide me with a way to measure students understanding and project their performance on their upcoming test.

What Standards (National or State) relate to this lesson?
MA.A.2.2.1 The students understand uses place value concepts of grouping based upon powers of ten (thousandths, hundredths, tenths, ones) within the decimal number system.
MA.A.1.2.3. The student understands that symbolic representations of whole numbers, fractions, decimals and percents in real world situations.
MA.A.1.2.4. The student understands that numbers can be represented in a variety of equivalent forms using whole numbers, decimals, fractions and percents.

What assessment will you use to measure this objective?
During this activity I will informally assess students’ progress and use the Ch. 2 test the following day to measure their understanding of the material. I believe that by working with students in small groups I will be able to see what concepts they understand and what areas they need additional instruction in. Utilizing this approach will also allow me to gauge what students are having trouble and how to accommodate my instructional approach so that the students may better understand.

2. Content Knowledge
What content knowledge do you possess in this area?
I understand the basic concepts related to teaching decimals. I understand the components necessary to teaching and understanding place value, how to read and write a decimals and what areas to target when teaching place value. Prior to teaching this lesson my understanding of place value was basic. My understanding consisted of concepts that I had learned as a child and was not completely clear. After studying the basal and taking time to plan and practice teaching I have had the opportunity to familiarize myself with the concepts related to teaching place-value and decimals.
How did you prepare for understanding the content of this lesson?
I will prepare to teach this lesson by collaborating with my host teacher, sharing and adapting ideas and teaching strategies where appropriate. I also will use the teaching materials given me to prepare for this lesson. I will utilize the basal completely and review the Ch. 2 test in order to better prepare my students for what they will experience on the test the following day.

3. Student Grouping
How will you group students for instruction?
Students will be led through a review together in a whole group discussion and then will be broken into smaller groups to complete small group review.

Why have you chosen this grouping?
I have chosen this grouping because I believe that it allows me to better visualize what students still need additional reinforcement and what students have a complete understanding of the material that will be on the test. Utilizing small groups will allow me the opportunity to see which students need additional help and what concepts I potentially need to revisit.

4. Methods
What teaching method(s) will you use for this lesson?
Whole group instruction
Small groups
Collaborative teaching

What students need specific accommodations in this lesson? What specific accommodations have you made for these student needs?
Allie A. has been identified as a student eligible for a 504 plan. Due to this accommodation Allie will receive additional time on given assignments and allowed the opportunity to work with a peer advisor.

Why have you chosen this method or these methods?
By providing Allie with additional time and a peer advisor I can ensure that she will remain on task and that whether in small groups or not she will have the help of another student or teacher. Furthermore, by allowing Allie the opportunity to receive more time I will better be able to measure what concepts she understands and what areas she may need additional help in.

5. Activities
What activities have you planned?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Time Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening: Discuss Expectations, Daily Agenda, and Ch. 2 Exam</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main activity/activities: Ch. 2 Review, Break into small groups, groups Review</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups 1 and 2 Small Group Crash Course Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 Independently work on worksheets at their desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing: Regroup, and answer small group questions 5-10mins

6. Materials
What instructional materials will you use, if any?
The materials necessary for this lesson include:
Dry erase boards, markers Harcourt Math book and worksheets, and Student dry erase boards.

Why have you chosen these materials?
I have chosen to use these materials because these are the materials necessary to complete this lesson. Using these materials will allow me to effectively teach students and provide them with materials necessary to complete the assigned task.

7. Evaluation
How and when do you plan to evaluate student learning on the content of this lesson?
I plan to measure students understanding while in small groups informally and on the following day when they are given their Ch. 2 test. I will use the time provided to me in small groups to measure students understanding and areas that I need to clarify.

Why have you chosen this approach to evaluation?
By informally measuring students understanding I will be able to determine whether or not additional time needs to be spent discussing Ch. 2. Using small groups to measure what students may still need additional support will allow me to measure whether or not students will be ready to take the test the following day or later in the week. Furthermore, reviewing concepts in small groups will allow me the opportunity to work with students who need additional support in a smaller setting.
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