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(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to examine the events, processes, perceptions and changes that occurred as an elementary school faculty and a university faculty collaborated in a partnership formed by the creation of a Professional Development Academy (PDA). The study described how an elementary school faculty and a university faculty collaborated as they implemented a PDA. Research questions were: (1) What contributing factors led to the school and university faculties' collaboration during the first three years of the pilot PDA, 1993-1996? (2) How did the school and university faculties collaborate for change during the first three years of the pilot PDA? (3) As a result of collaboration between the school and university faculties during the first three years of the pilot PDA, what changes occurred at the school and university?

A descriptive case study approach was used to explore behaviors within these groups during the three pilot years of the PDA. The study included interviews, and a review of documents and artifacts. Four classroom teachers were randomly selected from the elementary school, four professors were selected from the university and two administrators: one from the school and one from the university, were interviewed. Responses from the interviewees were initially categorized into Kagan's (1991) six categories of collaboration and into three sections: before the PDA began, during the three years of the PDA, and reflections at the end of the three pilot years of the PDA. Kagan's categories for collaboration are: formation, conceptualization, development, implementation, evaluation, and termination/reformation stages. Documentation from the participants and PDA files were analyzed.
Six factors were found to contribute to collaboration between faculties: a wish to know the other colleagues personally; maintenance of “we're in this together” attitude; willingness to accept additional responsibilities; investment in making the PDA work; discovery of opportunities for leadership and input; and synergy between coordinators and administrators.

There was evidence that collaboration occurred because of a welcoming and supportive climate; open communication; active involvement by both faculties; validation of teachers and professors; and support for goals and recommendations.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Staff Development and pre-service teacher training were important areas of educational reform. In *Tomorrow's Teachers*, Holmes Group (1986) stated that in order for students to show improvement in performance, teachers must improve the quality of their teaching. Furthermore, for teachers to improve, there must be significant change in teacher education (p.3).

One proposed means of improving staff development and preteacher training was the creation of professional development schools. These schools were referred to in the literature as: Professional Development Schools (Holmes Group), Professional Practice Schools (American Federation of Teachers), Professional Development Centers (Goodlad), or Professional Development Academies (Schlechty, 1990). Professional Development Schools (PDSs) provided student teachers or interns with extensive hands-on experience while they worked with professional teachers and students. The term PDS was used to refer to all of the schools in the literature study that used that approach. The term PDA referred to the specific program that was established at the study school. The Holmes Group (1986) compared the PDS model to a teaching hospital model which (1) gave student teachers, also referred to as interns, a greater length of time applying the theory learned at the university into practice at the school level and which would (2) “bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty in partnerships . . .” (p. 67). In the Holmes Group (1986) model the university and the school worked collaboratively in a partnership. Colburn (1993) claimed it was possible for these two entities to collaborate, as it should be natural for them to work together. However, Colburn concluded, “Unfortunately, the two institutions rarely collaborate. Different goals, values, and governance systems often get in the way of the best intentions” . . . these barriers “can be overcome” (p. 7). Did universities and schools collaborate?
Purpose of the Study

Did collaboration occur between a school and a university faculties during a Professional Development Academy's pilot years, 1993-1996? This study began with an overview of PDSs to show how they evolved and to learn about their purposes, their characteristics, issues and benefits. Were the differences in characteristics and issues across PDSs so great that Colburn (1993) was correct when he said that collaboration may or may not take place, or did school and university work collaboratively to facilitate staff development and preservice training?

Specifically, this study examined what occurred as an elementary school faculty and a university faculty collaborated to form a partnership through the formation, conceptualization, development, implementation, evaluation and termination/reformation of a Professional Development Academy (PDA) during the years 1993-1996. This study examined the dynamics between the study school and university as a collaboration that grew from the “grass roots,” the school and university Department of Education, rather than “top down,” from the university or central offices of the school system. The following questions guided this study:

1. What contributing factors led to the school and university faculties’ collaboration during the first three years of the school and university pilot PDA, 1993-1996?

2. How did the school and university faculties collaborate for change during the first three years of the pilot PDA?

3. As a result of collaboration between the school and university faculties during the first three years of the test pilot PDA, what changes occurred at the school and university?

A Brief History of a PDA/Problem Statement

In 1993, a Professional Development Academy (PDA) was formed by an elementary school and a university in a partnership in the school district where this study was conducted to address staff development and preservice teacher education. The first focus during the formation of the PDA was to find a way for the study school to provide time for staff development and to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio in the classroom as a means of providing support for students. Secondly, the Department of Education at the university was exploring ways to improve how its student teachers were prepared for a career in teaching. The university wanted the student
teachers to have more hands-on experiences in the classroom. As the study school and university dialogued, the PDA was formed in an attempt to try to meet the needs of both the elementary school and the university. The faculties at both institutions became involved in the PDA.

The study school was located in one of the largest school districts in the country, in a large metropolitan area, and was described in Chapter 3. The school division provided a Monday afternoon early dismissal of elementary students in order for staff development and teachers’ meetings to occur. Staff development challenges occurred at the study school in 1993-94. These challenges called for a change of paradigms in order to examine possibilities for the solutions to those challenges. The first challenge was with teachers designated as Lead Teachers. Lead Teachers were teachers who were chosen by their schools to receive specialized training in an area of expertise such as mathematics or science and then were expected to provide what the school system called "turnaround training" for the teachers at the local school. Turnaround training meant the Lead Teachers were to return to their schools and give the same training to the teachers in their schools. However, Lead Teachers were frustrated leaders because they felt they lacked the time to provide quality training for their colleagues. While the investment in training the Lead Teachers was felt to be wise, lack of time to implement the training limited any dividends. Lack of time for turnaround training continued to impact the practicality of the concept as the turnaround training occurred usually before or after school and these were difficult times for teachers’ optimum concentration. Further, once the turnaround training was completed, classroom teachers lacked support from the Lead Teachers during the time of implementation. This was because the Lead Teacher was working with students in his/her own classroom. Unsuccessful efforts and the teachers' ability to sustain these implementations became cause for concern.

The study school's challenges of implementation and follow-up training were not unique to elementary schools. According to researchers such as Joyce, Wolf and Calhoun (1993), teachers needed time to implement what they had learned and to receive some form of follow-up: Many common forms of staff development result in implementation in as few as 10 percent of the classrooms, whereas certain tested designs for workshops and
follow-up in the workplace improve use to 90 percent or more . . . such support is essential for major curricular and instructional implementation (p. 53).

The Lead Teachers, at the study school, were frustrated and felt that, because of the limited time to work with the teachers, the one-half hour turnaround training was not as productive for the teachers as they had hoped. Trying to schedule a follow-up time was not always feasible. Also, a parent conference or other school committee meetings created conflict over which meeting the teachers would attend. Lead Teachers expressed concerns about not having time or coverage to leave their classroom to assist their colleagues or to teach demonstration lessons.

Other challenges at the study school were location of training sessions, the lack of technical assistance to support implementation, and use of materials that were not directly tied to current instructional needs of the study school. These problems resulted in a decrease in the probability that the teachers' new learning was transferred and implemented in the classroom. Joyce, Wolf and Calhoun (1993) in The Self-Renewing School, likened current staff development practices to "a collection of puzzle pieces" that teachers are given and then left to sort and figure out how they go together (p. 14). The lack of integration of these separate "puzzle pieces" and application of them to ongoing instruction suggested reasons to be concerned about implementation and the extent to which students benefitted from their teacher's staff development experiences.

Staff development, for professional renewal, was a high priority to Boyer (1995) in The Basic School. Boyer suggested regular meetings where teachers studied research, formed reading groups and had opportunities to discuss what they were learning. Boyer recommended that: " . . . every Basic School establish a formal partnership with a higher learning institution. . . . college students can serve as interns, . . . to free teachers for planning time" (p. 51).

The challenges for the study school administrators were to solve the teachers' staff development needs at the school by providing time for quality staff development. The administrators wanted these opportunities to occur during the school day. They also wanted to find a way to reduce the large class sizes giving smaller teacher-pupil ratios. The university's challenges were to find opportunities to give preservice teachers extensive hands-on learning
experiences and over a longer period of time than the usual student teaching block of time. The professors were committed to giving the student teachers as many learning opportunities to bring to life the classroom experiences discussed in the literature and in the university classroom.

Need for the Study

The National Staff Development Council, in 1995, stated, “Staff development not only includes high-quality ongoing training programs with intensive follow-up and support, but also other growth-promoting processes such as study groups, action research, and peer coaching, to name a few” (p. 1). Staff development was delivered using a top-down approach as described by Darling-Hammond (1989). She called this the "bureaucratic" period, which began in the early 1900s, because all decisions and policies were made from central offices or from the principal to teachers. Therefore, staff development was designed by central offices or, in smaller school districts, by the principal. Teachers were asked to implement what they learned and to try to make it accommodate specific needs both schoolwide and in their classrooms.

The question remained, did staff development meet the needs of teachers or local schools? A local school administrator's challenge was to provide appropriate training for the teaching staff to meet both the school's needs and provide professional growth for teachers. The principal's efforts to provide staff development was often hampered by the unavailability of time blocks for training during the school day. "Lack of time was the first major obstacle . . . reflection and dialogue seem to require more time.” (Rushcamp & Roehler, 1992, p. 25).

Literature on the reorganization of the schools stressed the need for staff development and preservice training of teachers. The Holmes Group's (1990) call for Professional Development Schools was quoted by many, such as Yinger & Hendricks (1990) and Lanier & Featherstone (1988):

The organizational concept receiving the most attention in the Holmes Group and elsewhere is the Professional Development School. Broadly conceived, these schools, intended to be schools in the communities as opposed to demonstration or lab schools, are committed to organizational and role changes that will enable the

For the Holmes Group's vision to work, ordinary schools will have to become places that nurture the growth and development of teachers over the span of their careers. This is why the Holmes Group cannot hope to succeed without strong allies among classroom teachers and principals, who are, after all, the real profession of education. (Lanier and Featherstone, 1988, p. 22).

The significance of this study would be for universities and schools, who seek to develop a collaborative partnership in the creation of a PDA, to see how one elementary school faculty and one group of university professors worked together in a pioneering effort of collaboration as they implemented a PDA. The study illuminated obstacles to overcome and provided insight into why changes occurred. It gave the reader a look at how the faculties from one school and one university moved toward collaboration during the pilot years of the PDA. Finally, following the analysis of the initial collaboration efforts between an elementary school and a university faculties, recommendations were made.

Definition of Terms

Professional Development Academy (PDA) was the partnership program between an elementary school and a university. The PDA, located at the elementary school, provided a site where a large number of university students in training to become certified teachers spent an entire year in the school completing university requirements for a Master's of Education and for teacher certification. The PDA was also the location for university courses and the place where staff development occurred for the faculty of the elementary school. It was a program where the developers chose the name Professional Development Academy because the vision of the developers was that everyone connected with the PDA belonged to that community of learners.

Interns was the title given to university students who were completing training to become teachers. The interns were individuals who sought certification/licensure as teachers. Interns in the PDA began training in the school on the first day the teachers reported to school for the new school year and then they stayed until the last day of the school year for teachers. Interns were
required to spend time teaching in a classroom under the supervision of a teacher. Interns were also supervised by the university professors. The Holmes Group (1986) used the term intern because of the length of student teaching, thirty-six weeks, and because it provided more time and opportunities to put the theory into practice. The experience was similar to the intensity experienced by an intern training in a hospital setting (Boyer, 1995). Therefore, the developers of the PDA in this study chose the title “intern” for the university students in the PDA program.

Student teacher was a college student who was placed in a school and assigned to a teacher, who had at least three years of teaching experience, to teach students under the supervision of the teacher and college professor. Traditionally, student teachers spend six to twelve weeks in schools during their student teaching assignment. The student teaching assignment may take place in more than one school. In the study PDA, the student teachers spent thirty-seven weeks in the same school, therefore they were called interns by the school and university. The term interns was used by the Holmes Group (1986).

PDA Coordinator was the name given to the teacher, at the study school, who administered the work of the PDA, worked with the university interns, and closely worked with the Education Program Director at the university. The position of coordinator was created as a position for a classroom teacher to assume. However, this position was held during the field test year by the study school’s assistant principal to facilitate implementation. In August of 1995, the second year, a classroom teacher assumed this full-time responsibility.

Study school and study university were the names given to the elementary school and university in this study. By using those terms, the school and university remained anonymous. Study school is the elementary school where the PDA was located, where the teachers in this study taught and the place where the professors traveled to hold classes and office hours for the PDA interns. Individuals interviewed for the study were from the study school and study university.

Inservice was the term used by the school district of the study school. The term inservice meant teacher training for teachers employed in the school system and when training occurred within the teachers' contract time or time of service. Funding for a substitute was provided by the
school district or by funds provided by the PTA or a grant. In the case of the PDA in this study, their interns taught in the teachers’ classes when the teachers were attending inservices/training.

Limitations of the Study

The focus of this study was a single case study of collaboration between one school faculty and one university faculty. The time frame, 1993-1996, was the pilot years of the PDA. Documentation, artifacts and the video were analyzed from the early stages (see documents and Artifacts Summarized in Chapter 4). Interviews for this study were conducted in the Spring of 1998. The study was limited to the faculties’ perceptions of the process of what occurred as there developed a collaboration between an elementary school faculty and a university faculty during the three years of the study pilot. The interviews were conducted with a representative random sample from the school faculty and from the university faculty members who were involved in the PDA, and the school administrator and the university administrator assigned to the PDA. This researcher was a co-creator and the first Coordinator of the PDA. In order to keep this study as bias-free as possible, the researcher made every attempt to not interject her perceptions related to the three years of the pilot test and the collaboration between the two faculties; however, it was expected that the researcher’s experience with this project also greatly enriched the analysis. The study did not evaluate the curricula of the elementary school or the preservice teachers' university programs, nor did it include any interviews with individuals other than those mentioned above. Due to the qualitative methodology and because the research looked at only one case study, the outcome was according to Maykut and Morehouse (1994), "not the generalization of results, but a deeper understanding of experience from the perspectives of the participants selected for the study" (p. 44). However, the finding provided a rich description of use to others who work toward collaboration between a school and university.

Outline of Chapters 2-4

Chapter 2 examined the history of Professional Development Schools beginning in 1986, when the term was coined by the Holmes Group, until 1993, when the PDA was established. The literature review examined the philosophy behind the movement and why it was important to
create Professional Development Schools. This movement was analyzed for the commonalities, characteristics, issues, and benefits among the PDSs. Chapter 3 described the methodology for collecting and analyzing data. Chapter 4 described the findings of the study and interpreted the collaborative events in terms of Kagan's six stages of collaboration which are outlined in Chapter 2. Conclusions were made as a result of this study with recommendations for school and university faculties who may wish to replicate PDSs.
CHAPTER 2

A SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presented a review of the literature on professional development schools which were called: Professional Development Schools (Holmes Group, 1986), Professional Practice Schools (Lemlech, Hertzog-Foliart & Hackl, 1992), Professional Development Centers (Goodlad) or Professional Development Academies (Schlechty, 1990). This chapter was divided into the following areas of discussion related to professional development schools: background, concept and purpose, characteristics, issues, and benefits.

Background

The literature review followed the progression of thinking that formed John Dewey's Laboratory School begun in 1896 to the present professional development schools. In the early part of the twentieth century, according to Darling-Hammond (1989), there was a movement away from what she termed the "bureaucratic" schools. In bureaucratic schools, the policies and decisions were made from the top down, either from the central office to teachers or from the principal to the teachers. Interpretations made from the top down resulted in teachers being viewed as followers of the rules and procedures and not needing to be highly trained. Teachers were to be compliant and functioned by following those rules and procedures.

During the bureaucratic period of the twentieth century, two types of schools were created for the professional development of teachers: laboratory schools and portal schools. Colburn (1993) traced the concept back to John Dewey's Laboratory School and the short-lived portal school of the 1970s. Lieberman & Miller (1990) stated that the laboratory schools failed because they were atypical of public schools. These laboratory schools were found on university campuses, operated with university funding and often with select student populations. Students attending the laboratory schools were different from students in the mainstream schools (p. 105).
Nystrand (1991) stated the reasons for the decline in laboratory schools were because student field experiences were increasing in the public schools and away from the laboratory schools on college and university campuses and there was a change in teachers' colleges to universities where the university faculties were not interested in the laboratory schools. The portal school reform movement, which replaced the laboratory schools, was to create "places for educating new teachers, as research sites for university faculty . . . assessing the effectiveness of new practices and curricula. . . . included an advisory council composed of school and university representatives, a collaborative site selection process, and provision of planning time for developing and implementing goals." (Winitsky, Stoddart & O'Keefe, 1992, p. 4).

Darling-Hammond (1989) saw the movement from bureaucratic to PDSs, beginning in the 1950's, when certification and licensure began to be emphasized and teacher training schools began to move to a new model. That was a means whereby "experts train and socialize novices, where research and theory are translated into practice, and where practical knowledge is translated in turn into research and theory" (pp. 59-60). Clark (1990) added reflection as a component of the PDSs.

In 1986, reports from the Carnegie Foundation and the Holmes Group called for reform in teacher education. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) suggested an establishment of Clinical Schools, to be selected from among public schools, and staffed for the preparation of teachers. The Carnegie Forum saw these Clinical Schools as analogous to teaching hospitals with interns receiving a Masters' Degree in Teaching following a two-year program of internship and residency.

The Holmes Group (1986) at the same time stated, “The improvement of teacher education depends on the continuing development of systematic knowledge and reflective practice” (p. 66). Universities joined the Holmes Group and committed themselves to these imperatives and to establishing PDSs that would be analogous to teaching hospitals. According to the Holmes Group's vision, PDSs would bring together teachers, administrators and university faculty into partnerships to improve teaching and learning for all school and university students. According to the Holmes Group (1986), PDSs would provide superior opportunities for teachers
and administrators to influence the development of their profession and for university faculty to increase the professional relevance of their work through the following:

1. mutual deliberation on problems with student learning, and their possible solutions;
2. shared teaching in the university and schools;
3. collaborative research on the problems of educational practice; and
4. cooperative supervision of prospective teachers and administrators.

Reflection, as a new focus for teachers, enabled teachers to build on their knowledge base to create a basis for “rethinking and reevaluating values and practices,” according to Lieberman & Miller (1990). Barth (1991) also believed that in order for reform to take place, teachers must have time for reflection, “. . . so you can see what's really going on for students and adults in your school” (p. 127).

How did universities and schools develop a structure which brought about this collaboration? Staff development and teacher education, through establishment of PDSs, were one means to accomplish this goal, according to researchers and scholars. Shea (1992) found a “direct connection between the process of developing a good teacher and the process of educating a person to a full and complete development of his or her human capabilities--emotional, social, intellectual, moral, and aesthetic” (p. 11).

Sagor, et al. (1994) described the dilemma teachers find themselves in today when they work in isolation and have little input into the quality of their schools (Collaborative Action Research, Overview, February, 1993). Agreeing that the reform movement must include PDSs, Colburn (1993) stated:

If you take a staff-development program that recognizes that teachers will change when the environment of the school changes and then add the notion of teacher development as a continuum that begins at the preservice level and continues to retirement, you have a PDS (p.15).

From the early 1900s, the reforming of schools of education and the pedagogy have moved toward more professionalism of teaching. These PDSs are one way to have the same basic purposes, i.e. to marry staff development of teachers to the equally important teacher training.
Concept and Purpose

The concept of PDSs evolved to mean a place or places where schools were renewed. The renewal took place through staff development for teachers, through the school and university working in collaboration, and through opportunities to provide for individuals brought into the teaching profession by using what the Holmes Group (1986) called a “teaching hospital” model of training (p. 67). In these ways, teachers were thought of as professionals who were afforded an opportunity to continually learn through staff development opportunities. The professors and teachers learned how to work together to improve education for classroom students and aspiring teachers. Student teachers, also referred to as interns, had an extended hands-on approach to teaching in the classroom.

Schlechty (1990) helped to create the Jefferson County Public Schools/Gheens Professional Development Academy in Louisville, Kentucky. The purpose of the academy was to assist faculties as they restructured their schools. Schlechty asserted that the employer was responsible for teachers and administrators’ continuing education as was the case in the corporate world. The beginnings of developing a PDA in Jefferson County, Kentucky was described by Ruscoe, Whitford, Egginton, and Easelman (1989). That PDA was built on the work of the Gheens Academy and the Kentucky Council on Higher Education. They stated, “. . . the purposes posited for professional development schools: they would serve as exemplars of practice and as induction centers for teachers and administrators” (p. 3).

Professionalism and building a community of learners among the teachers, interns, professors and administrators were the purposes of a professional development school according to the Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum (1993). This report stated, “The sooner we overcome our fears of the unknown, select capable people to build management teams and provide the opportunity for professional decisions and behavior, the earlier we will find good schools appearing in large numbers (p. 4). Likewise, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee developed a Center for Teacher Education whose mission included, “. . . the improvement of professional practice and mandates that the Center promote interactions that better integrate practical and theoretical knowledge” (Pasch & Pugach, 1990, p. 135).
The purpose of PDSs, as viewed by the Holmes Group (1986), was to improve teaching through the acquisition of knowledge and collegial relationships, to develop the practice and knowledge of the professional, and to “strengthen the profession by serving as models of promising and productive structural relations among Instructors, Professional Teachers, Career Professional Teachers and Administrators” (p. 57). The Holmes Group (1990) later suggested that PDSs began with these six principles:

1. Teaching and learning for understanding.
2. Creating a learning community.
3. Teaching and learning for understanding for everybody's children.
5. Thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning.
6. Inventing a new institution (p. 7).

According to Levine (1992), “Professional practice schools may provide a common ground in which teacher education and school reform can come together to achieve the end result of improving student learning” (p. 1). Lewis (1992) based the purpose of PDSs on the modeling of teaching, the continual growth and interaction of the experienced teachers where teachers were researchers, reflectors of their practice and the mentor of student teachers. Lewis stated:

The PDS appears to be a strong model by which preservice teachers' experiences in courses and schools can be mutually reinforcing. At the same time, the PDS has potential for being a catalyst for change, and a professional support to experienced teachers in schools (1992, p. 2).

Darling-Hammond (1989) theorized that there was urgency in the professionalism of teachers so that the quality of education would be improved and there would be “more effective means for meeting students' needs” (p. 66). The Holmes Group (1990) stated that a PDS challenged teachers toward improved practice, assumed the professional responsibility of student teachers, and analyzed their own teaching. Through teacher renewal, “They can recreate the intellectual base of their practice” (p. 46). Nystrand (1991) predicted that teachers with a shared vision would work together. He believed, “... teachers who work in a school that shares the
vision that all children can learn are likely to teach differently than those in a school where this vision does not prevail" (p. 12).

Teachers as researchers and reflectors was a common theme in the literature. Quoting Schon (1983) who called the process “Reflection-in-action,” Levine (1992) stated,

There needs to be peer interaction among teachers to allow them to communicate their thinking to one another and get feedback from their peers. Reflective practice requires that teachers know how their students think and what influences them to behave in the ways they do" (p. 14).

Lieberman & Miller (1990) added to this list the three c's of colleagueship, collaborations, and coalitions. Kennedy (1990) interviewed Thompson who maintained that the concept of collaboration between a university's experience and the school's practical knowledge would result in “powerful new educational approaches that neither one could produce alone” (p.11). The Holmes Group (1990) characterized the PDSs as intertwined “wisdom of theory and practice” (p. 48).

Characteristics

The characteristics common among PDSs were: collaboration and collegiality between and within universities and schools, disciplined inquiry such as teachers as researchers, support of student learning, staff development and teacher training. When a school and university prepared to become a PDS, they must work toward collaboration. Collegiality, according to Levine (1992), transformed inquiry into practice as a professional norm. Smith (1994) believed collegiality would be what joined the school and university teacher education programs in research that led to renewal. Barth (1991) and Pasch & Pugach (1990) saw collaboration in the form of a whole community of learners where they became equal partners.

Kagan (1991) described the six stages of collaboration which were:

1. Formation was when people were aware of a problem, discussed the idea and were recruited as members of the collaboration.

2. Conceptualization was characterized by definition of mission and objectives.
3. Development was the stage in which vision and mission of the collaboration moved from philosophy to practice.

4. Implementation was the critical point where the work plan of the collaborative process came into reality.

5. Evaluation involved the assessment of the collaboration process.

6. Termination/reformation was a stage of reevaluation and renewal opportunities for reflection, and a mechanism for prevention of a return to the old ways (pp. 29-32).

In any organization, change was a characteristic that caused a disruption of the norm. Rushcamp & Roehler (1992) listed six characteristics that supported the initiatives of change in PDSs.

1. Role shifts of members on the central steering committee needed careful nurturing.

2. The nature, direction, and pace of change needed to evolve from school and community participants.

3. School community strengths needed to be expanded to serve as the foundation for change.

4. An expectation of continued growth needed to be established within the school community.

5. A balance needed to be struck between supporting and challenging professional development at the school.

6. The school community needed to acknowledge and embrace curriculum and instructional complexities.

Developing colleagueship/collaboration, pedagogy, teacher leadership, disciplined inquiry and supporting student learning were all marks of PDSs (Lieberman & Miller, 1990; Houston, 1992 and Levine, 1992). Creating PDSs required a new kind of collaboration between school site and university participants. Both were expected to change organizational structure, alter the pattern of relationships that characterized past associations, and rethink what the education for new teachers should become (Lemlech, et al., 1992). Murray (1993) expanded on these ideas and stated that professional development schools could be defined by eleven features:
1. Understanding as the goal of the school. The primary and overriding goal of the school is to have all its pupils use their minds well and understand, not just learn, their lessons.

2. Important knowledge. Because understanding takes more time than the school concurrently allocate to the vast contemporary school curriculum, the curriculum must be restricted to important matters, things truly indispensable to a life of the mind and the life of the nation.

3. Goals of the school apply to all pupils. The fact that some children, . . . are harder to teach than others does not warrant the school's holding hard-to-teach children to lower standards of learning and understanding.

4. Dialectical instruction. . . . a high premium must be placed on self-scheduling and self-pacing in which . . . the school tasks to be completed, the rate at which they will be completed, and the degree of teacher assistance that will be solicited.

5. Active pupils. . . . Whereas dialectic requires the pupil to do something overtly--to speak, respond, and question--there are other features of teaching for understanding that require the pupil to be active.

6. Valid assessment. . . . The demonstration of recently acquired knowledge through artificial school tasks, tasks that are unlikely to occur very often elsewhere in life, are not as valid as real-world tasks that reveal what the pupil truly knows and can do.

7. The learning community. . . . The tone of the school should make it clear that school is a place where serious and important work takes place, a place where professional people practice their profession, and so forth. The importance of the work conducted in the school is reinforced and enabled by the involvement of other important people in the community, especially parents and other supporters of the pupils.

8. The professional teacher. . . . Teachers, in collaboration with their colleagues, should know enough to be fully responsive to all the demands of the classroom, calling in expert help only in rare instances when a problem exceeds their level of training and skill.

9. School organization and finance. Obviously, the school must be organized and financed in a manner that allows the foregoing principles to be salient features of the school. Like all other professionals, the teacher would need time for reflection, planning, and consultation.
10. Integrated support services. A common coordinated plan of operation, . . . is essential if the mission of each teacher and each of the separate state agencies having responsibility for the welfare of children is to be achieved.

11. The PDS research mission. . . . Research is conducted to solve practical and theoretical problems so that knowledge can be more complete and coherent. The test the PDS must meet is whether educational research is improved by this new collaboration between university researchers and teachers” (p. 63-67).

To support student learning, Pechman (1992) looked at PDSs from a special educational point of view which saw a PDS as a place where students' knowledge is reoriented on the process of learning rather than on skill acquisition. Having a PDS had the potential to “. . . ensure the influx of fresh ideas and renewed energy to support children with special needs . . . reduce student-teacher ratios and enable flexible, individual educational options for all students” (p. 51).

Teacher action research was conducted in many PDSs. In Washington State University's Regional Collaborative Professional Development Schools (RCPDS), research was in collaboration with the university (Sagor et al., 1994). In Kennedy (1990), Thompson asserted that when a teacher realized that research had answers to problems in the classroom then it placed “a problem out there which both school faculty and university faculty are looking at together, and so they're not just confronting each other, they're confronting some common problems” (p. 10).

Research revealed that the most successful learning did, in fact, occur in schools where teachers not only taught skillfully in separate classrooms, but also found solutions together. In Boyer (1995), Spillane made the point, “All the current thinking and research on good teaching practices and effective schools point to the importance of collegiality among teachers” (p. 41).

Staff development was a major characteristic of PDSs. Those staff development opportunities ranged from development of student teachers, to opportunities for faculties from both the university and school--separately or jointly. According to Richardson (1993), . . . a Professional Development School ought to become a center of professional development for school and university personnel. It is a model that may provide knowledge and leadership of education renewal and transformation throughout a district and teacher-preparation program (pp. 21-22).
Ruscoe, et al. (1989) found, as part of teachers’ growth as professionals, that teachers felt a need for involvement in decision making. “Teachers are given a group of students, a few guidelines and financial facts, and are told to *make the decisions*” (p. 14). Once teachers were empowered as teams to make decisions their view expanded beyond the classroom. It became, “impossible to return to the old ways” (p. 16).

In addition to the staff development characteristic of PDSs, the other major component was the preservice teachers’ training program. Kennedy (1992) concluded that the unique features of the PDSs for teacher preparation were that they provided expertise which was appropriate and necessary for “providing real experiences needed to begin deliberating about practice” (p. 70). “District leaders must insist that teacher education programs enroll their students as a cohort--a group of individuals who learn from each other, as well as from their professors and mentors,” said Clark (1990, p. 11). Further, “School officials should accept only as many student teachers as space in the professional development center allows and bring them into the center as a cohort. Also, school officials should insist on helping to select the students” (Clark, 1990, p. 13).

Other characteristics of PDSs found in the literature included: shared values and professional norms (Nystrand, 1991), task-oriented interaction (Pasch & Pugach, 1990), planning teams from the school site, the central office and university (Ruscoe, et al. 1989), teacher study groups, curricula writing, peer observation, case conferences, program evaluation and documentation, trying out new practices, teacher resource center, and the participation in outside events and organizations (Lieberman & Miller, 1990).
Issues

The characteristics of PDSs described above showed a positive side of PDSs. However, in such an undertaking where paradigms were broken, there were issues that needed to be resolved. The following issues surfaced as the PDSs were being implemented: university and school differences in philosophy and practice, collaboration, equity, faculty participation, communication and time, finance, support, teacher education programs, accountability and assessment, and faculty incentives and rewards.

University vs. School Issues

What seemed to cause the greatest concern was the attempt to merge the two cultures: the university and the school. Ruscoe, et al. (1989) made an analogy between the missions of the school and university. “Schools are places of action and quick decision making . . . . University researchers, in contrast, value reflection and pondering, 'mucking with data,' and theorizing” (p.17). Resolving differences meant an understanding and change of how each partner perceived their role. Rosaen & Hoekwater (1990) described similar school and university issues at Michigan State University and the school site. Perceptions of how each partner conducted their work was a major concern.

A lack of collaboration may have occurred between the university and school. Problems arose, according to Winitzky, et al. (1992) because: there was little knowledge about what worked, previous reformations were from top-down, lack of consistency was between the various systems involved and teachers' and professors' views on teaching, and finally learning and teacher education was not compatible. There was a lack of collaboration due to the reward structures of the school and university. Similarly, teachers felt the most valuable part of their teacher education program was the student teaching experience, while universities felt it was the theory that was of most value. Murray (1993) stated that universities became frustrated when the student teachers conformed to the "traditional and prevailing practices of their supervising teacher" (p. 62).

Changing the way schools and universities perceived their roles and how they must work collaboratively was a change in thinking from the past. According to Duffy (1994), as a PDS was created, a “caste system, in which professors are the gurus and teachers are followers" resulted
Duffy (1994) stated this also occurred when the university appointed the school teachers to positions. The teachers felt "dismayed, and professors fell into nonegalitarian ways" (p. 596). The problem arose as there was a dichotomy between how the university and the school perceived their roles (Smith, 1994; Nystrand, 1991). Teachers and professors must become more collegial and team players (Smith, 1994). The established "way we have always done things" must also change. (Nystrand, 1991, p. 19).

Collaboration Issues

Time was a huge factor in developing a PDS where collaboration and colleagueship occurred. Zimpher (1990), Mehaffy (1992), Lemlech, et al. (1992) and Dixon (1992) told of breaking down barriers and forming a trusting relationship between the participants. Each group needed to understand the other's history, to resolve turf issues for those in the PDSs and those teachers who were not participating, and to work toward a shared decision-making process.

Equity Issues

Equity issues revolved around students as well as teachers and professors. "Professional Development Schools will be schools that offer special programs with the benefit of resources not available to all" (Zimpher, 1990, p. 20). Nystrand (1991) said that, "Questions about the composition of the student body, the make-up of the faculty, and the length of university commitment to a single site must engage decision makers concerned about equity" (p. 20). Others such as Rosen & Hoekwater (1990) stressed the importance of equitable participation, which raised the issue of how faculties dealt with equity issues when a PDS was developed from the top down. Duffy (1994) said that in the top-down management model, the teachers who were most affected were left out of the loop until the proposal was taken to the local school. Once the PDS was created, the issues were determining who was responsible for the success of the PDS and the feelings of ownership. Barth (1991) and Pasch and Pugach (1990) saw the collaboration in the form of a whole community of learners where they became equal partners.

Faculty Participation Issues

Involving teachers in the decision-making process empowered them to make decisions concerning the implementation of the PDS and gave them a sense of ownership (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1979). There were two aspects of this issue. On one side, teachers were given decision-
making powers which led to empowerment. On the other side were the additional responsibilities of teachers who participated in the PDS which some teachers were not seeking (Ruscoe, et al., 1989). For university professors, the issue was whether the additional work load would be integrated into their faculty load or spread among other faculty members (Lewis, 1992). Another concern was who would assume school supervision responsibilities that had been carried out by graduate associates (Zimpher, 1990).

Communication and Time Issues

As a PDS was being created, implemented and carried out, there was a need to ensure that attention was paid to communication among and between all parties. There needed to be a concerted effort to keep all parties in the loop of thinking and decision making. Mehaffy (1992) suggested that there must be time set aside for regular meetings and time to develop the relationship as well as documentation such as goal statements and plans. Lack of time was attributed by Rosaen & Hoekwater (1990) as the cause for a lack of communication. Organizational concerns which took time led to a reduction of allocated time for philosophical concepts. Lemlech, et al. (1992) described needs of student teachers, parents, and other faculty members as having an impact on the teacher's time. “We need to maintain and increase collegial relationships with non PPS faculty requiring our input and assistance in other related matters” (p. 17).

Financial Issues

Examples of funding for the establishment and implementation of PDSs, staff development, personnel, programs and construction of faculties follows:

1. The Dean of the University of Louisville's School of Education allocated nine faculty members' time to plan and implement the Jefferson County Public School/Gheens Foundation Professional Development Academy. In addition, the School of Education applied to the Kentucky Council on Higher Education for funds as one of the state's centers of excellence. As a result of that funding, the Center for the Collaborative Advancement of the Teaching Profession was established. This Center worked closely with the Gheens Academy to “plan and coordinate all collaborative efforts between the two institutions” (Ruscoe, et al., 1989, pp.3-4).
2. Roosevelt University and Chicago School System PDS used funding from a major local foundation for the initial two years of the program for staff development opportunities and support. Twenty university staff worked a great deal of time each week in the PDSs. This foundation support included: a half-time director, $25,000 each of two years for stipends and materials to implement the PDS, for curricula development, and to support a First-Year Teacher Support Group (Lewis, 1992).

3. Commonly, the university retained control of the money. Representative committees of teachers helped to decide how money would be spent, but the university coordinator had the final say (Duffy, 1994).

4. Funding was required for the support of school personnel working in PDSs, paid internships, paid experiences for prospective teachers, released time for teachers working with student teachers and for continuing their education (Clark, 1990).

5. Chula Vista and San Diego University used $500,000 to construct a building for their PDS. In addition, there were costs for furniture and equipment. They attracted some private resources from a business community advisory council which provided sound systems, technology equipment and supplemented the meager resources of the university in equipping the new facility (Mehaffy, 1992).

6. A Michigan partnership was created with the goal of establishing 18-24 schools across the state at an estimated cost of $48 million (Michigan, 1990). The State of Michigan, a Michigan business leader, and a consortium of Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and Wayne State University each pledged $16 million to this partnership (Nystrand, 1991).

7. The University of North Texas and the Dallas schools in collaboration supported each other. College students who had completed 30 hours of college work were employed by the county as teacher assistants. They were paid beginning salaries of $8,500 per year for this position which benefited the students who were part-time students (Simms & Canales, 1990). The university furnished students, clinical professors, library resources and instructional funds. The Dallas school district provided classrooms, supervising teachers, resource persons, instructional equipment, office and phones for professors, and teaching positions for successful program graduates (Simms & Canales, 1990, p. 157).
As these universities and schools sought to resolve their financial issues, they served as a model of what could be accomplished. As seen by the examples above, financial issues are being resolved through foundation and business partnership support, through allocation of time for faculty and professors to work alone and together, through support of school personnel with financial resources, through use of existing school facilities and constructing new facilities and through the provision of personnel with materials and equipment.

Support Issues

District leaders needed to work with teacher union leaders to ensure a commitment to collaboration and the PDSs. Positive support from the district administration and building principal was “directly related to the likelihood that staff would continue to use project methods and materials after special funding is withdrawn. Furthermore, principal support positively affected project implementation” (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1979, p. 81).

Support from the parents must be secured as an important step in the success of the PDSs according to Darling-Hammond (1989). Parents wanted to ensure that their children's education would continue even when staff development was provided by the school system for teachers. Furthermore, involving parents during the establishment of the PDSs would “help parents understand that well-constructed programs will benefit their children” (Clark, 1990, p. 14).

Teacher Education Program Issues

The beginning teacher must be exposed to a variety of teaching experiences both “(1) formal instructional experiences. . . . (2) clinical experiences in which the beginning teacher, under supervision, encounters and examines the major domains of teaching knowledge” (Darling-Hammond, 1989, pp. 71-72). In this way, the beginning teacher began to acquire experiences for teaching and decision-making.

Accountability and Assessment Issues

Attention must be given to the curricula offered to the student teachers as well as learning opportunities. Zimpher (1990) suggested that program evaluation as we know it consisted of follow-up evaluations of first-year teachers (p. 48). Ruscoe, et al. (1989) cautioned that because of the delicate nature and maintenance of collaboration, the information sought from the researcher may be constrained and the “evaluative and judgmental conclusion of much
traditional research would destroy the fragile partnership which ethnographic research attempts to foster" (p. 18). Darling-Hammond (1989) saw the problem for PDSs in the structuring of the practice as two-fold: (1) “How can the school guarantee that novices are given adequate preparation? (2) How can the school encourage the use of appropriate practices for all children it serves?” (p. 71). Additionally, who was responsible for the accountability? Nystrand (1991) believed “As teachers and others achieve greater autonomy over decisions of what the curriculum should be and how to teach it, they accept the responsibility of communicating the results of their efforts and being accountable for them” (p. 17). Winitzky, et al. (1992) suggested that schools and universities work together to develop compatible views of “practical theory of pedagogy” (p. 6). Kennedy (1990) raised the issues of staffing complications, time and commitment to the education of beginning teachers, and providing learning opportunities.

Faculty Incentives and Reward Issues

As noted earlier, time was a valuable commodity in the creation and implementation of PDSs and the questions remained concerning how university and school personnel would be compensated for their work. Kennedy (1990) interviewed Thompson and discussed this issue. Thompson felt that if it became “intellectually respectable” to engage in this work and if time was allocated to carry on the work, there then followed the question . . . “whether provision for this kind of activity is going to get built into promotion and tenure considerations” (p. 12). The Sid W. Richardson Foundation Forum (1993) report stated that teachers and principals must elect to become a part of a PDS. The report also stated, “Universities must place a high priority on the preparation of teachers and administrators and must reward those professors who contributed to the schools” (p. 5).

Benefits

Benefits were realized where PDSs were being implemented. Colburn (1993) believed the pupils benefited due to teacher enthusiasm, access to technology, new curricula materials, more instructors, exposure to better teaching strategies and assessment. Lemlech, et al. (1992) described the benefits of improved teaching strategies, teachers as learners and models, increased dialogue between teachers and professors which resulted in adjustments in student teachers’ curricula, teachers making staff development decisions, and student teachers’ observation of the
process and being “able to reflect on why it is happening, which leads to discussions more
reflective and substantive” (p.23).

In the December 1993 NEA Today magazine, Michigan State University, along with Holt
High School, reported the advantages of collaboration included: giving students a better
education, giving better training for the education students, providing an opportunity to learn
from both the Michigan State University professors and the Holt faculty, and providing practicing
teachers an opportunity to “mold their profession and change their own jobs” (p. 17). Boyer
(1995) found “… as team members, Basic School teachers shape a curricula that is cohesive, an
assessment program that is coherent, and a learning environment that is enriched” (p. 41).

It would appear that as PDSs were implemented to meet the staff development and
teacher training needs, the issues were being resolved to the benefit of all learners: students,
student teachers, faculty, professors and administrators.

Summary

In summary, PDSs were a means of bringing the pedagogy in the form of internships
where the novice learned the “theory” and the “practice” of teaching and the professional educator
learned to expand their knowledge and repertoire of skills. The Professional Development School
concept provided opportunities for collaboration, learning and growth of all participants at both
the university and the local school levels. It gave the faculties an opportunity to work
collaboratively, resolving issues as PDSs were developed.

Some issues remained. Equity, faculty participation and “turf” issues must be worked
through before participants deal with other issues such as time. Time was needed for participants
to take on additional responsibilities and to insure that communication took place where every
one involved felt they had adequate information on which to make decisions and to carry out the
objectives of the PDS. Funding for the PDSs in terms of staff development opportunities,
program implementation, additional resources and personnel, rewards and incentives and who
controls the finances were major issues to overcome. Accountability and assessment issues
focused on who was responsible for the program evaluation and what would be assessed.
Another issue was whether student teachers had adequate hands-on or “practice” meshed with the university course work, the “theory.” The key to resolving all these issues was how collaboration and genuine colleagueship were developed.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the events, processes, perceptions and changes that occurred as the study school faculty and the university faculty collaborated in a partnership formed by the creation of a PDA, during the years 1993-1996. The qualitative study and analysis followed what Maykut and Morehouse (1996) described as being able to “understand more about the phenomenon we are investigating and to describe what we learn with a minimum of interpretation” (p. 126). They further stated, “The outcome of any of these studies is not the generalization of the results, but a deeper understanding of the experiences from the perspectives of the participants selected for the study” (p. 44). This study took on what Maykut and Morehouse (1996) described as “interpretive descriptive” research (p. 122). It is interpretive of the data collected and descriptive of the phenomena in a meaningful way for the reader. This chapter described the research methods used in the study. It was organized into the following sections: research design, description of study school and university, population selection, data collection methods and procedures, data analysis, and tests for validity and reliability.

Research Design

Using an inductive approach method as described by Maykut and Morehouse (1996), the data was collected without predetermination of the variables or testing stated hypotheses which would be found in quantitative studies. Merriam (1988) supported this type of research by stating that it was a means of gathering data in a situation where it would be “impossible to identify important variables at the beginning of the study” (p. 7). Maykut and Morehouse (1996) believed the constant comparison method for analyzing data allowed for data to be categorized into units of meaning, followed by a comparison of the units. Using this process, data was coded, categories were refined, and relationships and patterns were examined. Data sources were the ten individuals and the examination of documents and artifacts. This lead to an understanding of the
phenomenon being studied. The data were analyzed using a nonmathematical process. The study showed who and what events initiated the need for collaboration, how the university and school collaborated and what changes occurred as a result of this collaboration.

Maykut and Morehouse (1996) described this research method as the “constant comparative method.” This technique involved the gathering and analyzing of data where the variables were not identified at the beginning of the study, but were revealed in the analysis. Data were gathered and categorized into units of meaning. The units of meaning were compared to discover the how and why of collaboration between the two faculties. Words were used to describe the phenomena rather than numbers. The two faculties described in the study formed one unit of analysis. Thus the study detailed the relationship between the two faculties as one unit. The unit analyzed had existed since the initial dialogue in 1993 between the study school and the university and continued past the time frame of this study, 1996. Yin (1994) called the study of collaboration between the two faculties a contemporary event. That was because relative behaviors occurred naturally and in real time rather than being experimentally manipulated. The limited time frame of the study, 1993-1996, constituted a bounded unit of study which was a study examining a specific phenomenon over a specified time period (Merriam, 1988). In this comparative study the bounded unit was the relationship between the two faculties.

Data sources included documents from the school and the university, artifacts, and interviews. Interviews of teachers, professors and administrators, rather than observations were conducted since the time frame for this study had passed. Documents and artifacts were examined as they related to the collaboration process.

The Assistant Principal at the study school in 1993 was involved in the development of the PDA and was the researcher for this study. During the first year of implementation, 1994-1995, she assumed the role of Coordinator of the PDA, to facilitate its implementation. Maykut and Morehouse (1996) discussed the researcher’s perspective while doing qualitative research as paradoxical, noting the researcher must be “acutely tuned-in to the experiences and meaning systems of others--to indwell--and at the same time to be aware of how one's own biases and preconceptions may be influencing what one is trying to understand” (p. 123). Merriam (1988)
also emphasized that a researcher must have a tolerance for ambiguity, sensitivity, empathy for the interviewee participant, and good listening skills (p. 41).

The questions for this descriptive case study were broad and semistructured and were used as a guide to allow the interviewee freedom to expand on their responses rather than give "yes" or "no" or a scaled answer such as rating the response on a scale of one to five. This allowed the investigator the opportunity to ask interviewees to clarify or to elaborate their responses.

Description of Study School and University

The study school was located in a large metropolitan area. Approximately 500 students and four educational programs were housed in the elementary school: the regular education program, gifted and talented center program, moderately-to-severely disabled program and the English as a second language program. Because of the large number of faculty and other specialists who worked with the students, the school qualified for a principal and assistant principal. After the first year, the PDA Coordinator was an additional teacher level position added to the school to facilitate coordination of the PDA within the school and between the school and the university. The student body was made up of children from all economic levels (students living in million-dollar homes to students living in subsidized housing) from a large range of academic abilities, and from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. It had a mixture of society all housed in one school. The school staff received training in the collaborative process from the county. The faculty functioned collaboratively as they participated in the development, implementation and monitoring of the school's operating plan.

The university, with a student population of over 2,000, was a private institution in the large metropolitan area whose graduate community came from a diverse population of men and women. Those graduate students, many of whom were seeking a second career, represented a broad range of experiences such as careers in the military, the business world and other professions. Students from the university, who participated in the PDA, were from the upper twenty-five percent of college graduates who were seeking a Masters' of Education with an Nursery, Kindergarten-Eighth (NK-8) grade education endorsement.
The university faculty had advanced degrees. They were individuals who had been practitioners in the field of education with added experiences of teaching in the classroom.

During the years of this study, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) evaluated the university's teacher education program. The program was subsequently approved by NCATE and by the state's department of education.

The partnership dialogue began in 1993 when the study school administrators approached the Dean of the School of Education at the university. The study school administrators, the Dean and the Education Program Director felt the idea was worthy of pursuing. The university administration, the Dean and the Education Program Director at the university and the study school administrators were looking for ways to enhance their respective programs. They continued the dialogue with support from the university and school district administrations. By the end of the 1993-94 school year, a signed agreement between the university and the school district established the partnership and thus the PDA was created.

Population Selection

To analyze the collaborative process at the PDA, ten individuals were interviewed. The individuals interviewed were representative of those involved in the meetings between the two faculties and the development and implementation of the PDA. Seven professors from the university participated in the PDA during the years 1993-1996. The study focused on those full-time professors who only taught at the study university. Adjunct professors were eliminated from consideration as in several cases these individuals represented both the school and university faculties. However, only four-full time professors were involved either in a supervisory or teacher capacity during the entire three years of this study. Those four were chosen to be interviewed. The Education Program Director was interviewed as one of the administrators even though also she taught in the PDA.

Twelve classroom teachers, also referred to as cooperating teachers because they were assigned interns for each of the three years, 1993-1996, were considered for an interview. Ten of those teachers remained at the study school. Two cooperating teachers assigned to the primary
grades and two cooperating teachers assigned to the upper grades were interviewed. Four of those ten were selected by random drawing to be interviewed.

The school’s Principal and the university's Education Program Director mentioned above were interviewed as the administrators in the PDA, since they had a major role in creating, establishing, and implementing the concept of the PDA, as well as setting the tone and structure for meetings between the two faculties.

After the interviewees were selected, a letter asking each interviewee to participate in the study was sent to the two administrators, the four professors and the four randomly selected teachers. As a follow-up to the invitation to participate, each interviewee was contacted and given an opportunity to ask questions that pertained to the interview. All interviewees agreed to participate and were sent a copy of the questions prior to the interview. In that way, the interviewees had time to reflect upon their experiences and to review any documentation they had concerning the pilot years of the PDA. They were considered by Merriam(1988) as good informants because they could “express thoughts, feelings, opinions, his or her perspective, on the topic being studied” (p.76). In the case of the PDA, the randomly selected classroom teachers, the professors, and the administrators all had specialized information to contribute to the understanding of how the collaboration between these two groups materialized, what elements helped the collaboration to succeed, what were the results of the collaboration and what direction the collaboration should take.

Data Collection Methods and Procedures

Data were collected through interviews, archival records, and documentation. Maykut and Morehouse (1996) stated, “Data are collected that relate to a focus of inquiry. . . . what becomes important to analyze emerges from the data itself, out of a process of inductive reasoning” (pp.126-127). Yin (1994) concurred, “. . . the case study's unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence--documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations” (p. 8). “In exploring the lives and experiences of people, individually or as members of organizations, other kinds of documents may be helpful” (Maykut and Morehouse, 1996, p. 112). Documentation, relevant to the collaboration between the two faculties, was analyzed. It
included but was not limited to archival records, personal papers and physical artifacts. The randomly selected members of the faculties and the two administrators who participated in the first pilot years were interviewed and taped for transcription. Prior to the interview, the participants were given the case study questions or “probes” as described by Maykut and Morehouse (1996). Each participant signed a “Subject’s Permission” form. Before the interview began, each interviewee was told the purpose of the interview and what would happen to the results of the interview including their opportunity to read the transcription for corrections or deletions. Interviewees were reminded that the interview would be taped for transcription and notes would be taken and analyzed. Those notes included impressions with a sensitivity to the bias.

Broad questions provided an opportunity to probe for clarification. As Maykut and Morehouse (1996) explained,

The sequence of questions is really set by the interviewee, and it is the qualitative interviewer's job to be alert and responsive, to sense an opportune time to ask a question, and to know when a question has been answered out of sequence (p. 94).

Broad questions with less structure were asked to avoid “… putting things in someone else’s mind (for example, the interviewer's perceived categories for organizing the world) but rather to access the perspective of the person being interviewed” (Merriam, 1988, p. 73).

Questions were developed with the assistance of researchers in the school system who had responsibilities for testing, assessment and evaluation. A set of pilot test questions were submitted to specialists in the study school who had a working knowledge of the PDA but who would not be an interviewee for this study. Pilot test questions were also sent to the Education Program Director at the university, the Principal at the study school, and to a school administrator who was not familiar with the PDA, to be reviewed from an administrator's perspective. From their feedback, the questions were clarified, expanded upon and selected for the study. The Case Study Questions follow.
Case Study Questions

Questions for School Faculty

Before the Joint Faculty Meetings

Keeping in mind the beginning of the PDA, 1993-1994, when the concept was being developed and approved, please answer the following questions:

1. What were your first thoughts and reactions to the PDA?
2. What did you believe your role would be in the PDA?
3. Prior to the PDA, what were your experiences with university faculty members as you worked with student teachers?
4. What were your thoughts about how the PDA concept would evolve? Did you have any reservations about the PDA? If so, what were those reservations?

The First Year of the PDA

The school year 1994-1995 was the first year of the PDA. Please reflect on the year and the joint faculty meetings as you respond to these questions.

1. As you worked with the interns and professors, what happened during the first six months, September 1994 - January 1995, as the PDA began to unfold?
2. Who or what events led to the first meetings between the two faculties in the spring of 1995?
3. Thinking about the spring meetings at the school and university, what occurred during those meetings?
4. What were the results of the meetings? What were your thoughts, concerns, involvement?
After the Initial Meetings

As a result of the joint faculty meetings, please answer the following questions:

1. After the January meeting, what was the nature of your interactions with the university faculty?
2. Do you remember what other teachers were saying about their personal interactions with the university faculty? Please explain.
3. Was there a point when it became clear to you that you personally could benefit from working together? Please explain.
4. Thinking about the PDA as a whole during the three years, what role did you perceive the teachers played?
5. Did any teachers emerge as leaders? Please explain.

Looking Back Over the Three Years

Looking back over the three years, 1993-1996, what changes resulted from the PDA? Please answer the following questions:

1. Did the PDA lead to changes at the school? If yes, what were the key factors that led to the changes? If yes, what were the changes that were made?
2. What were the benefits and/or the concerns of the PDA for teachers?
3. In what ways, if at all, do you perceive the teachers changed as a result of working together?
4. Did you personally and professionally grow as the PDA developed? Please explain.
5. Did your colleagues personally and professionally grow as a result of the joint meetings? Please explain.
6. Was there enough time over the three years, 1993-1996, for you to effectively work with the professors? Please explain your response.

7. What directions do you think that the joint faculties working together could take in the future?

Questions for University Faculty

Before the Joint Faculty Meetings

Keeping in mind the beginning of the PDA, 1993-1994, when the concept was being developed and approved, please answer the following questions:

1. What were your first thoughts and reactions to the PDA?
2. What did you believe your role would be in the PDA?
3. Prior to the PDA, what were your experiences with school faculty members as you worked with student teachers?
4. What were your thoughts about how the PDA concept would evolve? Did you have any reservations about the PDA? If so, what were those reservations?

The First Year of the PDA

The school year 1994-1995 was the first year of the PDA. Please reflect on the year and the joint faculty meetings as you respond to these questions.

1. As you worked with the interns and teachers, what happened during the first six months, September 1994-January 1995, as the PDA began to unfold?
2. Who or what events led to the first meetings between the two faculties in the spring of 1995?
3. Thinking about the spring meetings at the school and university, what occurred during those meetings?

4. What were the results of the meetings? What were your thoughts, concerns, involvement?

After the Initial Meetings

As a result of the joint faculty meetings, please answer the following questions:

1. After the January meeting, what was the nature of your interactions with the school faculty?

2. Do you remember what other professors were saying about their personal interactions with the school faculty? Please explain.

3. Was there a point when it became clear to you that you personally could benefit from working together? Please explain.

4. Thinking about the PDA as a whole during the three years, what role did you perceive the professors played?

5. Did any professors emerge as leaders? Please explain.

Looking Back Over the Three Years

Looking back over the three years, 1993-1996, what changes resulted from the PDA? Please answer the following questions:

1. Did the PDA lead to changes at the university? If yes, what were the key factors that led to the changes? If yes, what were the changes that were made?

2. What were the benefits and/or the concerns of the PDA for professors?

3. In what ways, if at all, do you perceive the professors changed as a result of working together?

4. Did you personally and professionally grow as the PDA developed? Please explain.

5. Did your colleagues personally and professionally grow as a result of the joint meetings? Please explain.

6. Was there enough time over the three years, 1993-1996, for you to effectively work the teachers? Please explain your response.
7. What directions do you think that the joint faculties working together could take in the future?

Questions for Administrator

Introductory Question

What was your role in establishing the PDA?

Who or what events initiated the collaboration between the two faculties?

1. Who initiated the idea for the first meeting between the faculties?
2. What was the purpose of the first meeting between the two faculties?
3. What were your goals for the initial meetings?
4. How did you present the idea to have joint meetings to your staff?
5. Describe your role during the initial meeting?
6. As you were preparing for the meetings, was the location of the meetings an important consideration?
7. What steps did you take to inspire/facilitate the collaboration between the two faculties?
8. What did you perceive would be the benefits of additional meetings for your faculty?
9. How did you assess the results of the initial meetings? What were your conclusions?

How did the school faculty and the university professors collaborate?

1. What did you perceive would be the benefits of additional meetings for the professors and teachers?
2. Who were given leadership roles and why?
3. Who emerged as leaders among the faculties?
4. What role did you take in meetings that followed the initial meeting?

What changes resulted from this collaboration?

1. What do you perceive as the key events/factors that led to collaboration?
2. Did collaboration lead to changes in the school? If so, what were some of the ways that collaboration led to changes in the elementary educational program at the school?
3. Did collaboration lead to changes in the university teacher education program? If so, what were some of the ways that collaboration led to changes in the university teacher education program?

4. In what ways do you see the collaboration between the school and university continuing?

Table 1 illustrated the questions asked within the time frame of the study: questions referred to perceptions before the PDA, the first year of the pilot PDA, and over the three pilot years of the PDA. Questions were categorized as they applied to Kagan's categories of collaboration which were as follows: formation, conceptualization, development, implementation, evaluation and termination/reformation. Table 2 gave the teachers', professors', and administrators' abbreviated summary of the responses to questions asked of the interviewees. Tables 1 and 2 follow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>KAGAN'S CATEGORIES FOR COLLABORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers/Professors/Administrators</strong></td>
<td>Before the PDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers/Professors</strong></td>
<td>First year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before the PDA</strong></td>
<td>Over three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formation</strong></td>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Termination/Reformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your first thoughts and reactions to the PDA?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you believe your role would be in the PDA?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the PDA, what were your experiences with school/university faculty members as you worked with student teachers?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your thoughts about how the PDA concept would evolve?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you have any reservations about the PDA?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who or what events led to the first meetings between the two faculties in the spring of 1995?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about the spring meetings at the school and university, what occurred during those meetings?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the results of the meetings? What were your thoughts, concerns, involvement?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the Jan. meeting, what was the nature of your interactions with school/university faculty</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you remember what other teachers/professors were saying about their personal interactions with the school/university faculty?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there a point when it became clear to you that you personally could benefit from working together?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about the PDA as a whole during the three years, what role did you perceive the teachers/professors played?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/Professors/Administrators</td>
<td>Before the PDA</td>
<td>First year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any teachers/professors emerge as leaders?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the PDA lead to changes at the school/university? If yes, what were the key factors that led to the changes? If yes, what were the changes that were made?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the benefits and/or concerns of the PDA for teachers/professors</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways, if at all, do you perceive the professors changed as a result of working together?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you personally and professionally grow as the PDA developed?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your colleagues personally and professionally grow as a result of the joint meetings?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there enough time over the three years, 1993-1996, for you to effectively work with teachers?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What directions do you think that the joint faculties working together could take in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions for Administrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was your role in establishing the PDA?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who initiated the idea for the first meeting between the faculties?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the purpose of the first meeting between the two faculties?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you present the idea to have joint meetings to your staff?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your role during the initial meeting?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers/Professors/Administrators</td>
<td>Before the PDA</td>
<td>First year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As you were preparing for the meetings, was the location of the meetings an important consideration?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What steps did you take to inspire/facilitate the collaboration between the two faculties?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you perceive would be the benefits of additional meetings for your faculty?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you assess the results of the initial meetings? What were your conclusions?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you perceive would be the benefits of additional meetings for the professors and teachers?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who were given leadership roles and why?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who emerged as leaders among the faculties?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role did you take in meetings that followed the initial meeting?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you perceive as the key events/factors that led to collaboration?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did collaboration lead to changes in the school? If so, what were some of the way that collaboration led to changes in the elementary program at the school?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did collaboration lead to changes in the university teacher education program? If so, what were some of the ways that collaboration led to changes in the university teacher education program?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do you see the collaboration between the school and University continuing?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
**Questions Asked Interviewees: Responses Summarized/Abbreviated**

**Teachers' and Professors' Questions and Responses - Before Joint Meetings**

**What were your first thoughts and reactions to the PDA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Teacher 1** | - hesitant and nervous  
- something she wanted to do  
- anxious to get started |
| **Teacher 2** | - saw as another program coming along  
- felt it was fine |
| **Teacher 3** | - really excited to have new teachers coming and learning from teachers  
- nervous and uncertain if qualified for mentoring  
- liked having an extra pair of hands in the classroom |
| **Teacher 4** | - had student teachers previously  
- more thorough and extensive student teaching situation |
| **Professor 1** | - excited as schools of education were going in this direction  
- excited to be a part of the PDA  
- completely in favor |
| **Professor 2** | - loved idea because key to education  
- bridged gaps between theory and practice  
- needed to get back into the classrooms  
- excited about working with school system |
| **Professor 3** | - excited because PDA was state of art  
- great opportunity  
- looking forward to it |
| **Professor 4** | - delighted  
- positive way for teacher training programs to be taught |
What did you believe your role would be in the PDA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>-mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>-did not believe she had a role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>-mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>-master teacher, learner, role model, contributor, connected roles, and link in the connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Professor 1  | -instruct in the PDA  
|              | -supervise student teachers  
|              | -participate in planning |
| Professor 2  | -deliver instruction at site  
|              | -participate as part of collaborative team |
| Professor 3  | -supervise students |
| Professor 4  | -none |
Prior to the PDA, what were your experiences with university/school faculty members as you worked with student teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>didn't have any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>did not have any student teachers prior to PDA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 4    | excellent relationship  
  - close contact if student teacher was not performing to expectations  
  - evaluated student teachers together |
| Professor 1  | had prior teaching experience so previously involved with faculties  
  - positive experience |
| Professor 2  | adjunct and then as professor  
  - supervised student teachers |
| Professor 3  | was teacher  
  - supervised student teachers  
  - had neutral interactions |
| Professor 4  | was teacher and librarian |
What were your thoughts about how the PDA concept would evolve? Did you have any reservations about the PDA? If so, what were those reservations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher 1    | -anxious about someone in classroom all the time  
- felt interns would get a lot of experience  
- positive experience  
- lacked confidence  
- believed there was a strong staff who could work through it |
| Teacher 2    | - be assigned interns  
- had no reservations |
| Teacher 3    | - little anxious  
- excited for new, refreshed, innovative and current ideas  
- would get trained as a mentor  
- questioned qualifications for responsibility of intern |
| Teacher 4    | - thought it would be pervasive  
- receptive and open to program  
- had no reservations  
- great experience |
| Professor 1  | - thought research would be done  
- had no reservations |
| Professor 2  | - thought logistically it could be a nightmare depending on schedules  
- after working with school, changed perceptions for the better  
- way to control field experiences  
- had no reservations |
| Professor 3  | - didn't know, too busy getting it done  
- had no reservations |
| Professor 4  | - felt the more experiences that beginning teachers have in the classroom, the better off they are |
As you worked with the interns and professors/teachers, what happened during the first six months, September 1994-January 1995, as the PDA began to unfold?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher 1    | -had no clear understanding of professors’ expectations of teachers  
               -had opportunity to meet professors  
               -concerned over interns' work load and it's relevancy  
               -knew they were working together  
               -wanted to make changes and improvements |
| Teacher 2    | -went along with others |
| Teacher 3    | -didn't know professors |
| Teacher 4    | -felt need for more coordination and communication so interns would not waste time on projects that may not have relevance  
               -scheduling was an issue  
               -thought teachers agreed meeting was good idea  
               -didn't know the professors |
| Professor 1 | -not a lot of interaction but didn't want to burden the teachers  
               -found everyone at school was generous with time |
| Professor 2 | -frustrated  
               -unsure and insecure about what professors were doing  
               -not sure how or what would work  
               -wanted to know teachers  
               -needed more interaction with teachers  
               -felt theory and practice not the same |
| Professor 3 | -not involved with PDA first semester  
               -didn't know teachers |
| Professor 4 | -found no collaboration occurring at that time  
               -felt subtle resentment  
               -frustrated as first meeting held on professors' off-contract time  
               -concerned about what to leave and take out of course |
Who or what events led to the first meetings between the two faculties in the spring of 1995?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>- work load of interns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 2   | - brainstormed how creativity taught in the classrooms, language book talk ideas,  
- not a strong meshing of ideas |
| Teacher 3   | - completed a PMI (plus, minus, interesting) and compiled the information, then realized  
need to get together to work out difficulties  
- found both teachers and professors were open-minded and they realized they needed to  
be flexible  
- asked coordinator to help work things out |
| Teacher 4   | - gave feedback to professors  
- built second meeting on things discussed during first meeting |
| Professor 1 | - no recollection  (Note: professor out on family illness leave and missed the middle of  
the year) |
| Professor 2 | - discussed how to modify course requirements with time periods of class shortened  
- compared PDA interns constantly with other university education students  
- felt concern course work not a priority with interns  
- discussed classroom experiences in the university class that were from interns’ real  
experiences |
| Professor 3 | - needed to meet to start working together  
- careful to not give impression that professor knew everything  
- began stage of true give and take |
| Professor 4 | - needed to get to know each other better and as professionals |
Thinking about the spring meetings at the school and university, what occurred during those meetings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>-sat down to give idea of what was happening in the classroom to compare what classroom teacher and professor taught went hand in hand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 2    | -shared ideas with professors  
- got an inkling of what was being taught by professors in university classes for first time |
| Teacher 3    | -got to know each other and camaraderie began to build  
- began to incorporate suggestions of the professors within the classrooms  
- worked more hand-in-hand  
- talked with professors now  
- found everyone open-minded and able to lay concerns on table |
| Teacher 4    | -felt university built upon some things discussed previously and that had been developed  
- feedback given as a result of original sharing |
| Professor 1  | - more comfortable second year  
- not much, only visited classrooms to supervise interns |
| Professor 2  | - felt a little tense at first meeting  
- got to know teachers by name, especially the librarian on a personal level  
- felt this was going to work  
- became friends with several teachers  
- invited to join teachers in examining math textbooks that were up for adoption  
- used resources of school  
- assistance offered by teachers  
- got better idea of how to modify course  
- saw collaboration start to happen |
| Professor 3  | - not involved at that time |
| Professor 4  | - talked about curricula  
- took up time they could have been doing something else |
What were the results of the meetings? What were your thoughts, concerns, involvement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>- gave clear understanding of school system and university expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- able to communicate effectively about expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- invited to sit in on university courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- found professors coming back to teach teachers during some inservices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- able to work out first-year glitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>- started to have discussions which began breaking down barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- not much interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>- realized teachers and professors had a lot in common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- realized all wanted to be going in the same direction to benefit the interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- concerns needed to be laid out by teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>- seemed that professors were surprised at the things teachers wanted to talk about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- wondered if professors were aware of teachers’ concerns and needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- felt professors were glad to become aware of teachers’ concerns and needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- felt professors wanted to make an effort to coordinate things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- saw most of the professors were receptive to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- incorporated some of course requirements with what was happening in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- resulted in interns’ projects being used in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor 1</td>
<td>- no response - not involved at the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor 2</td>
<td>- had a better idea of how to modify course work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- learned ways of working collaboratively with teachers, realized need for more communication, and wanted more interaction with faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor 3</td>
<td>- had not much interaction except at joint meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- began to understand what the other half was doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- trying to figure out where we belonged resulted in a lot of tiptoeing around during the first year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- was more comfortable and able to talk things out the second year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor 4</td>
<td>- become more acquainted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teachers' and Professors' Questions and Responses - After Initial Meetings

After the January meeting, what was the nature of your interactions with the university/school faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>-found professors coming into classrooms to observe interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>-had no interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 3    | -had no longer felt intimidated when professor entered classroom  
               -realized all were advocates for children |
| Teacher 4    | -had no change in interaction  
               -could see professors trying to incorporate concerns and opinions |
| Professor 1  | -had no interaction |
| Professor 2  | -supervised interns  
               -had some interaction with some teachers |
| Professor 3  | -went out to the school more second semester and got to know the teachers better |
| Professor 4  | -had no interaction |
Do you remember what other teachers/professors were saying about their personal interactions with the university/school faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>-not a topic, conversation centered around interns and classrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 2    | -frustrated that suggestions weren't implemented right away  
-could see changes implemented in following years  
-had good relationship  
-were able to talk about concerns each had  
-grateful that professors were coming into classroom and giving feedback to intern which supported what teacher had shared with intern |
| Teacher 3    | -felt negative at first because of two different curricula  
-not a lot of conversation about professors |
| Teacher 4    | -comments made but were not negative  
-felt that's the way things are |
| Professor 1  | -knew more teachers  
-anxious to get to know teachers more |
| Professor 2  | -understood one professor was discontented over need to make changes and with scheduling  
-concerned teachers not following best practices |
| Professor 3  | -developed camaraderie  
-talked about interns with the teachers  
-confidence and trust building was leading to becoming colleagues now  
-knew everyone in school |
| Professor 4  | -saw range of teachers' teaching styles and methods  
-found not all teachers were using teaching strategies the way professors were instructing interns in class |
Was there a point when it became clear to you that you personally could benefit from working together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>-had a chance to think about teaching style and different ways of approaching student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>-could not see benefit because only interacted when meetings were planned for teachers and professors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 3    | -talked to professor's class  
-watched the interns grow was rewarding for teachers  
-realized as worked with intern and allowed intern to take risks, that teachers could take risks and children would not be harmed.  
-self-reflected and then was able to verbalize it to someone else |
| Teacher 4    | -left room when professor observed  
-never occurred to me |
| Professor 1  | -benefitted because could do research with teachers  
-felt PDA was goldmine of research to benefit teachers and professors  
-kept grounded in the reality that is the school |
| Professor 2  | -talked to teachers  
-believed teacher educators have a lot to learn from teachers so needed dialogue and collaboration to enhance teaching at university  
-observing in the classroom  
-used gains from classroom in the university class |
| Professor 3  | -benefitted from being in the school and supervising interns |
| Professor 4  | -saw no benefits |
Thinking about the PDA as a whole during the three years, what role did you perceive the teachers/professors played?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>mentor interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>mentor to interns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 3    | model for interns  
|              | believed teachers could go to coordinator because coordinator's role was:  
|              | - go-between interns, teachers, and professors  
|              | - laid out all professional growth responsibilities  
|              | - held discussions with professors  
|              | - observed interns |
| Teacher 4    | responsible for interns and evaluations and being absolutely aware of what you are doing  
|              | - completing end-of-week progress sheets for interns |
| Professor 1  | instructor to student teachers  
|              | supervisors of student teachers |
| Professor 2  | widened roles with PDA as they became a part of the school  
|              | shared more with teachers  
<p>|              | assessment of interns |
| Professor 3  | felt some professors enjoyed teaching at school |
| Professor 4  | felt those that tried to structure the meetings tried to give the appearance that both faculties had a role, but in reality did not think that either faculty had a role |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>-none specifically, all became leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 2    | -some took leadership during the Collaborative Team or Human Relations Committees meetings  
- some had special projects, some did extra presentations |
| Teacher 3    | -some more outspoken perceived as leaders  
- quiet teachers were also leaders  
- all who had interns became leaders in some way |
| Teacher 4    | -those on PDA Committee as part of the School Plan were leaders  
- some leaders gave inservice presentations |
| Professor 1  | -approved of university coordinator as leader because the other professors focused on other responsibilities  
- believed new chair of education asserted a leadership position |
| Professor 2  | -a couple of faculty members kept their role very limited and just taught classes |
| Professor 3  | -professors willing to change  
- those who tried to be flexible and enjoyed the whole thing may have emerged as leaders |
| Professor 4  | -no, going through NCATE at that time |
Did the PDA lead to changes at the school/university? If yes, what were the key factors that lead to the changes? If yes, what were the changes that were made?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher 1    | -teachers benefitted from a lot of inservices  
               -students benefitted from two in the classroom |
| Teacher 2    | -teachers had more time to reflect on their teaching  
               -teachers had more time to communicate with parents  
               -on personal note, teacher was able to leave school for 45 minutes to attend own child's program at another school  
               -teachers had time to prepare for presentation at inservice |
| Teacher 3    | -teachers became closer because all sharing the same feelings and interns  
               -community very positive about PDA  
               -children were happier because of two people in the classroom  
               -had someone watching over teacher while she taught, so felt she needed to stay current and on cutting edge |
| Teacher 4    | -teachers had more camaraderie and more interrelationships  
               -people ready to open up and share, to collaborate and give as well as receive |
| Professor 1  | -changed time of day courses taught  
               -only taught one course in education department so not affected |
| Professor 2  | -learned to broaden perspectives  
               -PDA interns showed more growth over the year  
               -teachers not defensive when questioned about classroom practice |
| Professor 3  | -beneficial contact with the school  
               -felt good because the PDA was recognized by NCATE  
               -able to bring back observations in the classroom to the university classes  
               -mission of the principal to start the PDA was a key factor  
               -positive collaboration of the coordinators  
               -key for everyone else was having a part and their collaboration from the beginning  
               -felt comfortable with the faculty, especially during the second year  
               -people beginning to understand what each other was doing |
| Professor 4  | -did not perceive changes |
What were the benefits and/or the concerns of the PDA for teachers/professors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>-sitting in on interns’ university classes gave new ideas and new energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 2    | -allowing for small class sizes  
  -having someone to bounce off their ideas  
  -having a rough day, the teacher can step out of the classroom for a few minutes  
  -becoming adjunct at the university and teaming with professors in several classes |
| Teacher 3    | -professional growth for teachers  
  -comfortable with intern in classroom enables teacher to attend opportunities for growth  
  -having someone work with one group of children in the classroom while teacher works with others |
| Teacher 4    | -having another person in classroom to meet the children's need  
  -different teaching style of intern adds variety to children's day  
  -being able to team teach and having someone to bounce ideas off |
| Professor 1  | -great preparation for the interns  
  -wonderful for the university to have this collaboration  
  -would be stronger if some research conducted |
| Professor 2  | -finding the PDA is better model and trying to find ways to teach courses on main campus in the same way  
  -level of professionalism in PDA interns |
| Professor 3  | -collaboration  
  -turning out interns who don't perform as first-year teachers |
| Professor 4  | -getting some insights as to where the other group was coming from  
  -best way to train teachers  
  -finding students stronger because of time with professors over whole year  
  -don't know if in general there was any big insight that either group learned across the board |
In what ways, if at all, do you perceive the teachers/professors changed as a result of working together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher 1    | -had opportunity to reflect on teaching  
               -tried to do more above basic curricula |
| Teacher 2    | -found other teachers now are not afraid to discuss their ideas with professors  
               -saw professors as part of a cohort  
               -some became adjunct or teamed with professors |
| Teacher 3    | -some of colleagues are former interns  
               -gave more opportunities for staff development and professional growth  
               -became risk-takers |
| Teacher 4    | -didn't see much of that |
| Professor 1  | -not comfortable with talking about how other people changed |
| Professor 2  | -became more flexible and open to trying new things  
               -realized professors needed to get into the classrooms and see what's going on  
               and bring it back to university classes  
               -needed to do more modeling |
| Professor 3  | -found those who went out to the school changed as a result |
| Professor 4  | -did not perceive that they did |
Did you personally and professionally grow as the PDA developed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>-didn't think of self as leader until PDA gave opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 2    | -became more confident in my teaching practices  
                -felt that teachers had something to pass on to others  
                -learned to communicate with someone, to really be explicit  
                -became the PDA Coordinator  
                -learned to stand ground  
                -gave a lot of inservices, so learned to organize herself, to make inservices applicable to what's happening in the classroom  
                -learned to ask people to do things for her rather than do it all herself |
| Teacher 3    | -wanted to be a better teacher through a lot of professional growth opportunities  
                -tried new things over four years with intern in room to assist students |
| Teacher 4    | -learned a lot from each intern |
| Professor 1  | -became comfortable with distance learning |
| Professor 2  | -renewed belief and trust in public school system  
                -wanted to get back into classroom and work with children again  
                -kept more in touch with interns than other students, because the interns are a cohort who stick together |
| Professor 3  | -became more flexible  
                -learned to use distance learning  
                -stretched because of need to teach the interns on higher level |
| Professor 4  | -hoped so, but not sure whether did or did not grow  
                -felt very frustrated with whole thing  
                -wanted it to work, but by end of year, still didn't know how to modify program |
Did your colleagues personally and professionally grow as a result of the joint meetings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher 1    | changed because they had opportunity to reflect on their teaching  
|              | went above and beyond the curricula to bring in extra materials and resources |
| Teacher 2    | enjoyed sharing ideas with professors |
| Teacher 3    | tried new things all the time because other people were looking at us  
|              | became risk-takers |
| Teacher 4    | found those not outgoing and receptive to sharing and exchanging ideas have become more able to do that  
|              | opportunity to relate to teachers and get fulfillment from that relationship  
|              | saw a strength in those who are open to growth, and enrichment and broadening  
|              | growth of those who never had a student teacher |
| Professor 1  | can't speak for anyone else |
| Professor 2  | professors tried to bridge the gap between theory and practice  
|              | became more constructionist as a professor  
|              | saw the need to get more into the classrooms  
|              | willing to be more open to trying new things  
|              | more flexible |
| Professor 3  | more collaboration between the university and school  
|              | have gotten to know more people |
| Professor 4  | don't truthfully have any idea |
Was there enough time over the three years, 1993-1996, for you to effectively work with professors/teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher 1    | -never enough time  
-need to have time again with changes in personnel to become acquainted again and take a look at the PDA again |
| Teacher 2    | -thought so  
-felt teachers were too much in awe of professors at first to feel they had an impact.  
-getting program started and moving kept everyone busy  
-afraid to ask questions first year  
-second year teachers felt they could ask questions |
| Teacher 3    | -never enough time and not sure where it would come from at this time  
-problem, because everyone has many responsibilities, the job, and a personal life |
| Teacher 4    | -needed less time on group activities and added individual teacher and professor meeting |
| Professor 1  | -didn't have very much time for interaction, but nobody wants to go to more meetings and you're pulled into too many directions |
| Professor 2  | -definitely not enough time, they should have built in some planning time  
-should have met regularly, perhaps once a month |
| Professor 3  | -could have been more |
| Professor 4  | -keeps coming back to preparation  
-feel both faculties needed some released time for at least a semester or a whole year to lay better foundation for what they were going to do and how they were going to do it |
What directions do you think the joint faculties working together could take in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher 1    | - professors give more ideas and suggestions  
               - professors have more of an impact on teaching styles of teachers  
               - professors coming in and teaching in teacher's class  
               - teachers may be reluctant to go into professors’ classes to teach because it would be awkward  
               - need to get to know the new professors  
               - need to readdress matching the university and school programs |
| Teacher 2    | - university needs to integrate courses  
               - ask teachers, and perhaps the children, to come to interns' class to demonstrate  
               - teachers model strategies in classroom that university is teaching  
               - explore ways of using distance learning |
| Teacher 3    | - professors to do more observations at school  
               - teaching together would be great, no problem with professors working with me, as long as not humongous lesson that is not realistic in classroom  
               - now not intimidated by professor in classroom, but would be intimidated at first working with professor at the university  
               - important that relationship continues and gets stronger  
               - need strong bond, camaraderie, communication and open-mindedness of everybody involved |
| Teacher 4    | - need to work together more on an individual level with intern  
               - professors in classroom not to supervise but to relate to children  
               - teaching with professor would be interesting experiment and a good experience for both, but logistically a challenge  
               - inservices become available for professors as well as teachers |
| Professor 1  | - university and school faculty doing some actual work together at school with the children  
               - professor working with children  
               - teachers give presentations to university classes  
               - set aside time to work together  
               - professors and teachers conduct research |
| Professor 2  | - university to restructure program to meet NCATE guidelines, the new licensure guidelines  
               - university coordinator spending less time at school and professors spending more time at school  
               - interns take a more active role in distance learning  
               - teachers and professors communicate more frequently through e-mail |
| Professor 3  | - teachers and professors teaching together and working on projects together |
| Professor 4  | - both need released time to talk about strengths and weaknesses  
               - professors in the classrooms more often, sometimes to demonstrate a technique or method  
               - teachers and professors have input into selection of interns |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-universities need to give weight to what professors do at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-compensation for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-university to teach fundamentals on topics such as mentoring students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-both groups meet in the summertime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrators' Questions and Responses - Before the Joint Meetings**

**What was your role in establishing the PDA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 1</td>
<td>-helped to develop the PDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-assigned as university coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-spokesperson for university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-university represented on-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 2</td>
<td>-created the PDA in partnership with the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-worked with the school and university coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-planned behind the scenes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrators' Questions and Responses - First Year of the PDA**

**Who initiated the idea for the first meeting between the faculties?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 1</td>
<td>-confluence of principal's, school's and university's coordinators' minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 2</td>
<td>-meetings a response to comments from teachers and professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-teachers wanted professors to understand what was happening in the classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-professors curious about classroom and wanted to see interns in the classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Administrator 1 | - enable interns to draw from school resources  
- help teachers to understand and support university course work  
- assist teachers in demonstrating for interns the theory into the classroom  
- understand what was taught in core methods classes  
- facilitate perceived desire of teachers to be involved |
| Administrator 2 | - faculties given opportunity to see each other and to become comfortable together  
- provide teachers opportunities to share what they were doing |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1 | - allow faculties to get acquainted  
- work together with common goal  
- validate meeting of minds  
- realize everyone in this together in collaborative pioneering effort |
| Administrator 2 | - align university syllabus and county's curricula with expectations for interns and teachers |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1 | - kept Department of Education personnel appraised of progress  
- faculty perceived meetings as a natural evolving of PDA |
| Administrator 2 | - presented during faculty meeting as opportunity  
- teachers excited as they already had a vested interest |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 1</td>
<td>- facilitator for all collaborative faculty meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 2</td>
<td>- facilitator of meeting rather than leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As you were preparing for the meetings, was the location of the meeting an important consideration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1| -wanted professors comfortable with facility  
-wanted school faculty to feel professors were coming to them and the teachers visit professors to avoid a "us and them" feeling  
-wanted it viewed as a joint effort  
-facilitated the first meeting at school where program at school and teachers were comfortable on their own turf  
-university faculty accustomed to entering different schools, so this was a usual occurrence for the professors |
| Administrator 2| -wanted to have meetings at both locations  
-to have participants comfortable at both locations  
-wanted teachers and professors to see selves as colleagues at both locations |

What steps did you take to inspire/facilitate the collaborations between the two faculties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1| -kept all of department informed  
-informed those not participating through regular faculty meetings  
-informal conversation found ways to include everyone to encourage ownership  
-formal reports were included in education faculty reports and progress reports  
-featured the PDA in university's magazine during the first year of the pilot |
| Administrator 2| -meetings of committees were attended by principal and PDA coordinator and led by teachers  
-supported teachers, during November, when teachers felt 28 inservices were too many inservices for year, then gave them opportunity to think through school's needs and change the program |
What did you perceive would be the benefits of additional meetings for your faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1 | - communication benefitting everyone  
|               | - feedback from school faculty  
|               | - on-going dialogue                                                                                                                                  |
| Administrator 2 | - teachers becoming even more professional  
|               | - teachers were already capable and competent but then they realized they were professors' colleagues  
|               | - both faculties trying to reach same goals from different directions  
|               | - teachers lounge discussions becoming focused on their profession  
|               | - teachers reflecting on practice  
|               | - both sides understood the practicality and philosophy  
|               | - PDA started by both groups who were working on the implementation of the PDA  
|               | - faculties supported each other  
|               | - teachers and professors knew they were carving the PDA out together, they were becoming a "Community of Learners"                                                                                      |

How did you assess the results of the initial meetings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1 | - assessed during the two times per month meeting between the administrators and PDA coordinator  
|               | - assessed participation of teachers and professors  
|               | - adjustments made or reasons given why adjustment could not be made  
|               | - university assessed: course work, interns feelings and experiences during exit conferences, PMI's, and from feedback  
|               | - PDA given exemplary practice by NCATE during site visit  
|               | - NCATE asked university to one of the test sites for PDA evaluations                                                                                                                                     |
| Administrator 2 | - assessed during the two times per month meeting between the administrators and PDA coordinator  
|               | - assessed participation of teachers and professors  
|               | - adjustments made or teachers told why adjustment could not be made  
|               | - feedback from collaboration meetings                                                                                                                                                                    |
What were your conclusions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1       | -comfort level established in terms of communication  
                         -professors becoming more involved in staff development by providing more resources to teachers  
                         -opportunities opening up for university faculty to provide more formal support and input to teachers  
                         -classroom teachers involved more as clinical faculty bringing teachers into more formal instructional parts of program for interns  
                         -school community's view changing to include all children rather than own child  
                         -university professors modifying assignments making them more reality-based  
                         -professors became more flexible in terms of student time lines and assignments |
| Administrator 2       | -would keep the same structure which flowed naturally  
                         -common language and ground, and their understandings and expectations were developed for the two groups |

What did you perceive would be the benefits of additional meetings for the professors and teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 1</td>
<td>-teacher education faculty keeping current with classrooms, curricula and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 2</td>
<td>-teachers need to keep current in their field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who were given leadership roles and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1       | -university saw this as a partnership from the beginning  
                         -university faculty was small, faculty therefore volunteers for many duties, when they see a need they fill them  
                         -several professors offered to provide information to teachers  
                         -going to school would provide improved preservice teacher education, and provide assistance for staff development if requested |
| Administrator 2       | -primary teachers concerned over Indian units taught in November, too many inservices, and feedback to interns, formed a PDA Committee with a teacher as leader  
                         -teachers formed a PDA Committee to solve issues                                                                                                 |
### Who emerged as leaders among the faculties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 1</td>
<td>-several strong and active classroom teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-one teacher mentor who was strong and could articulate feelings of self and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-university faculty changed, so not same professor each year, not leadership at university level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-school faculty was living with interns rather than professors whose responsibility for the PDA only part of day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-university faculty small group shared many duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 2</td>
<td>-teachers reflected and felt proud of interns leading to their taking leadership responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-teachers spoke about PDA to visitors and other education groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-five teachers interviewed for coordinator position in summer of 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-some teachers became university instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Lead Teachers became involved with professors, and some attended a professor's class with their intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-science Lead Teacher spoke to professor's class about science methods from the school system's point of view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What role did you take in meetings that followed the initial meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 1</td>
<td>-facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 2</td>
<td>-support and cheerlead as faculty made own agendas and conducted meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-teachers and professors meet on their own and do not look to principal for leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Administrators' Questions - Looking Back Over Three Years

What do you perceive as the key events/factors that led to collaboration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1  | - being recognized by NCATE led to broad changes in the PDA at university, such as bring practical examples into other university classes  
|                  | - mission of principal to have PDA collaboration of coordinators who were willing to make changes and adjustments  
|                  | - coordinator positions  
|                  | - more understanding between faculties  
|                  | - more opportunity for staff development  
|                  | - desire to improve preservice teacher education  
| Administrator 2  | - teachers asked to share at university classes  
|                  | - teachers learned to adjust instruction  
|                  | - teachers felt pride and professional  
|                  | - teacher appointed coordinator  
|                  | - teachers and professors having stimulating discussions  

Did collaboration lead to changes in the school/university teacher education program? If so, what were some of the ways that collaboration led to changes in the elementary program/university teacher education program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1  | - modification of professors' assignments to make more reality-based  
|                  | - worked with state and local programs to ground theory into practice  
|                  | - stretched in ways professors taught  
|                  | - learned to be more flexible, which was a healthy challenge  
|                  | - problems of time lines for assignments and cohort demands from school and university  
|                  | - same outcome but arriving at it different way  
| Administrator 2  | - became MAC Technology School which influenced both school and university programs  
|                  | - developed an attitude that PDA was something to share and to give back to the profession  
|                  | - found they together were preparing interns for future students  
|                  | - changed delivery of instruction, i.e. teachers began adding language centers  
|                  | - teachers conversations became focused and reflective of teaching  
|                  | - took ownership of interns  

In what ways do you see collaboration between the school and university continuing?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administrator 1  | - both groups continue to be involved in staff development and professors being a resource to teachers  
|                  | - professors emphasize growing in use of county’s Program of Studies  
|                  | - methods classes need to consider the SOL test results  
|                  | - faculties finding ways to coordinate schedules  
|                  | - professors continue to find ways to compress three-hour university class into two hours.                                                                                                                 |
| Administrator 2  | - university faculty more involved in staff development and providing more resources to teachers  
|                  | - university faculty to involve teachers as clinical faculty pulling classroom teachers into more formal instructional parts of program for interns  
|                  | - their collaborative meeting continue  
|                  | - professional language understood  
|                  | - teachers learning from the professors how to use distance learning  
|                  | - teachers in return suggest strategies and methods  
|                  | - team teaching in classrooms and university classes  
|                  | - administrators provide for two to three meetings per semester  
|                  | - everyone working together to look at content, methods and applications and applying them  
|                  | - administrators at school and university continue to collaborate |
Data Analysis

Data were organized using what Maykut and Morehouse (1996) called the constant comparative method. In this method, propositions are developed. Propositions according to Maykut and Morehouse (1996) are “statements of facts inductively derived from a rigorous and systematic analysis of the data . . . . staying close to the participants’ feelings, thoughts and actions as they broadly relate to . . . [the] focus of the study” (p. 126). Interviews, documents and artifacts were analyzed to support the events that took place during the three years when the two faculties met. Following the interviews and examination of other data the systematic analysis took place as follows.

Preparation of the raw data

Interviews were transcribed and followed by a careful reading of all of the transcripts, and documents and viewing of video tapes. Interviews were then coded as follows: teachers were labeled T1, T2, T3, and T4; professors were labeled, P1, P2, P3, and P4; and the administrators were labeled A1 and A2. The interview pages were numbered in consecutive order from page 1 to page 223 and on each page the lines were numbered from 1 to 24. To locate a quote, the reader would be able to locate the quote by the interviewee as follows: interviews were coded “I” to indicate the data came from the interview, the page number in the transcript and the line number where the quote begins were added. For example, T3, I, p. 140, L 4 would indicate that the quote came from teacher 3, from the interview, found on page 140 and the quote would begin on line 4. Notes from the interviews were compared with the transcripts.

Documents and artifacts were categorized for comparison to other data. They consisted of reflection sheets, Plus-Minus-Interesting (PMI) Reflections sheets, memoranda and video tapes. Data were highlighted when they showed relevance to this study of the collaboration between the two faculties. The information was then summarized. The summaries were placed in Chapter 4 on page 154.

Once the transcriptions were completed, and documents and artifacts summarized, it was useful for the purposes of this study to form a structure in order to analyze the data. Copies of the ten transcripts were made in order to be cut apart for the qualitative analysis and to enable the
responses to be manipulated into various categories by moving them as they fit into emerging variables. Maykut and Morehouse (1996) called this stage of analysis as “culling for meaning from the words and actions . . . framed by the researcher's focus in inquiry” (p. 128). A twelve foot long roll of paper was divided first into three sections: interviewees' perceptions before the PDA, during the first year of the PDA and after three years. Case study questions/probes were taped to the paper under the three categories. Participants responses were then cut from the transcripts and taped under the time frames and the case study questions.

Reorganization of the data

Data were reorganized into two additional categories. First, data were reorganized according to the three overriding research questions.

1. What contributing factors led to the school and university faculties' collaboration during the first three years of the school and university pilot PDA, 1993-1996?

2. How did the school and university faculties collaborate for change during the first three years of the pilot PDA?

3. As a result of collaboration between the school and university faculties during the first three years of the test pilot PDA, what changes occurred at the school and university?

Data were then broken down into emerging variables. For example, from question one above, the variable “a wish to know the other colleague personally” emerged as a perception from all of the participants.

Secondly, data were reorganized to see if the collaboration stages of the PDA could be found as applied to Kagan's (1991) stages of collaboration. Responses were categorized into these stages: formation, conceptualization, development, implementation, evaluation, and termination/reformation. Statements from the interviews were grouped by teachers', professors' and administrators and they were color coded as follows: yellow/formation, blue/conceptualization, pink/development, green/implementation, orange/evaluation, and purple/termination/reformation.

Data were entered in Table 1. The interviewee's comments were clustered by time frame (Before the PDA, First year, and Over three years) Table 2 follows Table 1 on page 52.
Comparison and inclusion of data

Comparison and analysis of all of the units of meaning were made. Data were finally looked at in each category/variable to determine if there were pro and con perceptions for each of the identified variables. This was done to give the study a balance of the interviewees' perceptions. Data that were irrelevant as applied to the emerging variable of the collaboration between the two faculties were eliminated and placed in a folder marked “miscellaneous." Pieces of data were placed in the miscellaneous folder were later compared to determine if the data still remained outside the parameters of this study or placed in this study.

Validity and Reliability

Validity, or as Maykut and Morehouse (1996) call it “trustworthiness," of the interviews and the documented data were checked using triangulation. Triangulation was used in this study as a means of collecting data from different sources to strengthen the case study: interviews of the teachers, professors and administrators; documents from the PDA; and the artifacts. Incorporating the larger body of evidence showed how collaboration occurred between the two faculties. Since interviewees had the case study questions prior to the interview, there was time for reflecting and to examine any documentation and artifacts the participants had acquired and which would help to refresh their memories. The interviews gave a “deeper understanding of the experiences from the perspectives of the participants” (Maykut and Morehouse, 1996, p. 44). Yin (1994) believed that the three tactics which increased the likelihood of construct validity were to “use multiple sources of evidence . . . establish a chain of evidence . . .and have the draft case study report reviewed by key informants” (pp. 34-35). As indicated above, documentation, artifacts, and interviews of teachers, professors and administrators were used for this research. Merriam (1988) also addressed using multiple sources of information.

The question of internal validity--the extent to which one's findings are congruent with reality--is addressed by using triangulation, checking interpretations with individuals interviewed or observed, staying on-site over a period of time, asking
peers to comment on emerging findings, involving participants in all phases of the research, and clarifying researcher biases and assumptions (p. 183).

Each interviewee received a copy of their transcript to establish accuracy. The triangulation of data, detailed notes describing how the study was conducted and analyzed and conclusions reached were documented. That, according to Merriam (1988), was a way to assure reliability of the study.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the events, processes, perceptions and changes that occurred as an elementary school faculty and a university faculty collaborated in a partnership formed by the creation of a PDA. The perceptions of ten individuals who played key roles during the three years of the PDA pilot were collected. Their reflections helped identify the individuals and events which stimulated the need for collaboration, how individuals collaborated, and what changes resulted from their collaboration. The study examined the following questions:

Research Questions

1. What contributing factors led to the school and university faculties’ collaboration during the first three years of the school and university pilot PDA, 1993-1996?

2. How did the school and university faculties collaborate for change during the first three years of the pilot PDA?

3. As a result of collaboration between the school and university faculties during the first three years of the pilot PDA, what changes occurred at the school and university?

Methodology

Four professors, four teachers, and two administrators were selected as (described in Chapter 3), were interviewed for this study. All interviewees had a significant role in the phenomenon, entitled PDA, which was a studied over a limited time frame (Merriam, 1998), of three years (1993-1996). Interviewees' responses, reported in narrative within this chapter, were summarized in Table 2 (“Questions Asked Interviewees Responses Summarized/Abbreviated”)
found on page 52 of this document. Documents and artifacts, as they applied to the study, were examined and discussed beginning on page 154 of this document.

Interviews took place, as a convenience for the interviewee and to maintain confidentiality, at the university, at a school other than where the PDA was located, in public places, or in an interviewee's home. Prior to the interviews, a discussion containing the purpose of the study and why and/or how participants were selected was provided each interviewee. The researcher was known by and had worked with each of the participants and perhaps that is the reason none of the individuals asked to participate refused to be interviewed. Before the interview, all had taken notes on the questions that were mailed to them.

Introductory questions were asked to get a sense of the interviewees' previous experiences with teacher education programs, specifically as they related to student teachers and their role. Inquiry was made into the initial reactions to the PDA and the faculties' collaboration during the first three years of the PDA. Administrators’ questions focused on the administration of the PDA as related to the teachers and professors. The participants received transcribed copies of their taped interviews which gave them an opportunity to have further input into the data. To initially organize the results of the interviews, the responses were categorized by the three sections in the time frame (Before the PDA, the first year and over three years) and then reorganized into Kagan's (1991) six categories of collaboration: formation, conceptualization, development, implementation, evaluation, and termination/reformation. Documents and artifacts were examined for additional data as they related to the collaboration process. They included: reflection data, agendas, a video of a televised presentation on the PDA, and memorandums.

Organization of the Data

The data presented in this chapter were organized into seven segments. First, the PDA was described to give the reader a sense of why the two faculties became a partnership. Second, a brief introduction of the interviewees is given through description and their own words. The information presented in this introduction reflected their professional work and attitudes rather than who they were as whole persons. Third, contributing factors that lead to the faculties' collaboration were
included, followed by how the school and university faculties collaborated to facilitate changes during the pilot years. Changes at the university and the school were described and reported to show results of the collaboration. Segment six shows the PDA as applied to other models of collaboration. Finally, a summary of documents and artifacts completed this chapter.

The PDA

The huge banner in the lobby of the elementary school reminds everyone in the building that this PDA partnership brings students, interns, school and university faculties and staff, parents, and other community members into a “Community of Learners.” As the Principal (A2, I, p. 210, L 2) explained, “We called ourselves a “Community of Learners,” meaning everybody in that building and that university were going to be learning together, and that’s the theme of our partnership, a “Community of Learners.”

The university's focus for the PDA was to give master’s level students, referred to as interns, an opportunity to have more hands-on experiences. Interns were in the school for an entire year while completing an internship and course work leading to a Master's Degree. The university student teachers were called “interns” because of the full-year length of time they spent completing their student teaching in the school (Carnegie Foundation, 1986, Holmes Group, 1986). To give the interns as enriched an experience as possible, many opportunities were provided at the school level. Interns were assigned to classroom teachers. Specialists worked with the interns and were shadowed by the interns as part of their training. Auxiliary members such as the school psychologist, social worker, and occupational and physical therapists shared information with interns during the interns' Friday seminars. The office staff and custodians also spent time helping the interns learn how a school functions. Everyone connected with the school was involved in some way with interns in the PDA.
The interns were assigned to two teachers for the year. Two classroom teachers, one from primary grades and one from the upper grades, were paired at the beginning of the year and each was assigned an intern forming a set of two teachers and two interns. The interns remained with their assigned teacher for the first semester and then they switched to the other teacher in the set for the second semester. That gave the interns an opportunity to experience a primary and upper grade classroom. An additional assignment to work with kindergartners completed the school site training. The interns became acquainted with the students in both classes and developed a relationship with those students during the year. As one elementary student reported to this researcher during 1994-1995, “You can't get away with anything, because if my teacher is out, Miss P. or Mr. C. comes to teach us.”

From the principal's perspective, important considerations in developing the PDA included providing a means of lowering the student-teacher ratio in the classrooms--two adults to twenty-four to thirty students--and providing opportunities for staff development at the school site. For example, the third teacher interviewed stated,

I think overall my first feelings were just a lot of excitement being able to have another person in my classroom, and bringing, you know, the numbers down and all that kind of stuff in my classroom, and having an extra pair of hands to help out in making small group decisions and things like that with the children (T3, I, p. 124, L 14).

The PDA provided opportunities for staff development for teachers. For example, during the July 1994 faculty meeting, the faculty narrowed the list of topics they wanted to pursue during the 1994-1995 school year to twenty-eight topics. This proved to be an overwhelming amount of teacher training sessions to undertake. On this point, the Principal (A2) stated that by October or November the teachers were making comments such as:

Oh, this is so much work, and every time we leave our classrooms, you know, we're just getting so much information and we're getting it so fast, we can't apply it in the classroom (I, p. 197, L 14).
The Principal (A2) noted the faculty's solution to the problem and identified changes taking place in the faculty. In her words, "They came up with the idea of a Professional Development Academy team . . . they would begin to see themselves as the solver of their own problems or issues" (A2, I, p. 197, L 19).

One day during the first year of the PDA, the school's Area Superintendent and the Area Elementary Program Director visited the school and attended a joint meeting between the teachers and university professors. The Principal (A2) told how the visitors were,

. . . extremely pleased with the quality of the discussions that went on around the table. Very, very professional. The school faculty caused the university professors to think and really stimulated them, and likewise the university professors, I think, caused the teachers to kind of think about why they were doing some of the things that they were doing as well (A2, I, p. 216, L 4).

The principal and coordinator maintained that the PDA provided a means of giving interns a long-term hands-on approach to teaching, more opportunities to relate theory to practice during their internship, and an insight into the day-to-day operations of a school. They also felt there was value in teachers having time for staff development at the school during the teachers' optimal time for learning.

**Introduction to Interviewees**

Each participant, when contacted, accepted being a part of this study. One professor, in a phone conversation, was surprised that she had been contacted because, she said she had some negative feelings about the PDA. Two of the four professors interviewed were within days of retiring, a third retired in 1997, and the fourth professor was in the process of starting a PDA at the high school level. The school administrator retired at the end of the 1997-1998 school year and the university administrator assumed the duties of one of the retiring professors. When the four randomly selected teachers were interviewed, one was preparing to leave the school system and another had become the Coordinator of the PDA. The other two teachers still held positions in the classroom at the school site.
Professor #1 (P1), at the time of the interview, finished the semester's work and was preparing for her retirement from the university. During the interview, she related her initial excitement about the idea of a PDA. In her words, “I thought this is where we're going with schools of education” (P1, I, p. 4, L 9). She wanted to do research on the PDA and said, “I was just completely in favor of it [PDA] and very excited that I would be a part of it, part of the people who went out there to teach” (P1, I, p. 4, L 12). She was a part of the PDA during the early, conceptualizing phases. Her comments continued:

I was very happy to know that I would be one of the professors who would be instructing at the PDA and also supervising student teachers there. And, of course, as part of the education committee here at the university, I was part of the planning and inputted a lot of information about, you know, where this should go (P1, I, p. 4, L 15).

P1, when recalling events and perceptions of the first pilot year of the PDA, appeared unsure that her responses were accurate and she would qualify her answers with the words “I think . . .” The interviewer asked P1, “. . . who or what events led to that first meeting . . . ?” She responded, “No, I don't know of any events. Unless I'm just not remembering them” (P1, I, p. 6, L 21). She explained her responses by saying that the first pilot year she had been a member of both the Psychology Department and the Education Department. She related that she taught only one of the courses to the interns during each of the three years of this study. Also, during the first year of the PDA, she reported being minimally involved at the university from November until the spring because of family illness leave. She felt these were the reasons that she could not remember specifics in response to the questions.

Professor #2 (P2) said she was not heavily involved in the PDA during the period before the pilot year. Examination of her responses indicated the importance the PDA played in developing her personal goals. P2 talked about the PDA and her need to get “back into the classroom” this way,
I loved it [PDA] personally because I had felt that I needed to get back into the classroom. I was beginning to lose touch with reality, so to speak, and even though I was supervising student teachers and I was trying to keep in touch with former students who were in the classroom, I knew that things were changing very rapidly in the classroom, the whole diversity issue, and the inclusion and a lot of things that, you know are prevalent now were just beginning back then and things were changing and I didn't feel like I was keeping, you know, like I should have. And I even toyed with the idea of taking a leave of absence and going back into the classroom for a year or two and then coming back. But the PDA kind of saved me from that. . . . I was really excited about the idea of working closely with the school system. So my first reactions were very positive (P2, I, p. 19, L 4).

It seemed important for P2 to have a personal relationship with the school faculty. She reported particularly enjoying her close relationship with the faculty and she had worked closely with several faculty members. “I'm stimulated by conversation regarding anything that has to do with education” (P2, I, p. 43, L 24). She liked the way interns “stick together and you keep in touch, the interns really do keep in touch more so than other students” (P2, I, p. 44, L 9). She claimed that her relationship with the interns had been closer than with the other students on campus. P2 also worked with another school system and was currently in the process of establishing a PDA at a high school.

Professor #3 (P3), when asked about her initial thoughts and reactions upon hearing of the PDA for the first time, she replied,

I was excited. I thought it was a great thing. And so, I was very, very excited when I heard about it because I knew that it--that it was kind of state-of-the-art and I thought this was a great opportunity for us. So I was looking forward to it (P 3, I, p. 50, L 7).

P3 related that her positive attitude continued once the PDA was under way. When asked whether she had any initial reservations, she stated,
I didn't have any reservations until it became close to my time to teach and then the reservations were more or less could I make it work, how do I have to change it, and that kind of thing (P3, I, p. 51, L 14).

The following year, P3 described herself as becoming more comfortable with the teachers as their relationship developed and they got to know each other better. She continued,

The second year was more comfortable because we'd had a pilot year and everybody said Okay, we can do this. This will work. We just need . . . I think my perception was we felt we just need to work together, we need to work on working together, getting to know each other (P3, I, p. 54, L 18).

P3 was also completing her last few days at the university before her retirement.

Professor #4 (P4) retired from the university in 1997, a year after this study's focus. She said she had an active career in the classroom, as a reading and library specialist in a school and as a professor. P4 was delighted when she first heard about the PDA. She said, “I think that is a very positive way for teacher training programs to be taught. I think that the more experience that beginning teachers have in the classroom, the better off they are” (P4, I, p. 72, L 13). She became concerned when the first meeting involving both faculties was held after the university semester and professors’ contract time ended in July 1994. At that first meeting between teachers and professors, there was little interaction between the two groups. P4 wanted to have more time allotted to get to know the teachers than was allotted during the July 1994 meeting. P4's other concerns had to do with “what they [interns] were getting in the classroom exactly that I should leave out” (P4, I, p. 78, L 8). She expressed frustration over how she was to cover the material, knowing “what to leave out . . . what to emphasize . . . and will they have time in the classroom to do some of the practical kinds of things that they were assigned?” (P4, I, p. 78, L 9). In retrospect, P4 “wished she had more time to talk and to work with the faculty before the interns began, rather than everything happening at the same time. She felt more time was needed to “get to know each other as fellow professionals” (P4, I, p. 79, L 16). Being able to present her syllabus and hearing from teachers “what they were doing in my curriculum area and how they taught kids” was important (P4, I, p. 79, L 21). She also expressed concerns about scheduling, responsibilities
and compensation. Three years later, P4 felt frustration. “I was very positive about wanting it to work. My frustration was that at the end of the third year I still didn't know how I should really and truly modify my program . . .” (P4, I, p. 87, L 2).

Teacher #1 (T1) had five years of teaching experience when the PDA began and so, as a young teacher, she was a little anxious when she thought about an intern in the classroom. She expressed her hesitation,

Since I hadn't been teaching very long, I was a little anxious about having somebody, you know, in my classroom all the time, watching me. Because I guess I didn't have enough confidence in myself and feel that I was, you know, a good teacher for somebody to be watching me (T1, I, p. 95, L 21).

T1 was a leader among the staff serving as a subject area Lead Teacher. The school administrators approached T1, before the rest of the faculty was told about the PDA, in order to get her reaction. Her first response to the administrators was, “This is something I've been waiting for.” Her words during the interview were,

At first I was a little hesitant and nervous. I didn't know how things were done--how things would work. And then after we heard the whole plan and sat down, I was very comfortable and felt that this was something I wanted to do and was anxious to get started (T1, I, p. 95, L 5).

T1 also attended some of the professors’ classes and said she benefitted from feedback when professors were in her classroom observing the interns. She continued,

. . . you always think about things that as a teacher you do, but you don't consciously think about it; it's just automatic, I guess. And then sometimes it helps when you think, oh, that's something I should be doing, or maybe I'm not doing it. I need to start doing it. So I think that benefited me, too, from a teaching perspective, when I had a chance to think about my teaching style and different ways of approaching students (T1, I, p. 100, L 2).
Experience with the PDA led to important changes in T1's self-confidence and attitude and she reported those changes this way,

I wouldn't think of myself as a leader until the PDA program started, and then it gave me more of an opportunity to--to become a leader. I guess in some ways it forced me to step up and do that. And it was good. It was a positive thing (T1, I, p. 101, L 12).

After some time of providing teacher training experiences in her area of concentration, T1 is now asked to train teachers systemwide because of her expertise when working with teachers.

Teacher #2 (T2) had experiences in all grade levels. During the first year of the PDA, however, she reported having very little involvement with the PDA outside of working with her interns. T2 stated she had a difficult class that year and felt it was important to focus her energies in the classroom. She described her role with the interns as minimal. As the program advanced, however, she reported changing her perception. For her, having an intern “glued to my side” all day, proved to be a valuable growth experience. She was ready for a growth experience. She was one of the five teachers who applied for the PDA Coordinator position and was selected by the administrators for that responsibility. Her comments continue,

I decided maybe it was time to do something else. I had taught for, what, 11 years at the elementary school, and that this would be nice working with young people. I didn't even begin to realize how wonderful working with young adults is and just--you know, they can give you such great feedback that you grow as a person right along with them. I almost feel like I've gotten more benefits out of the program than they have (T2, I, p. 118, L 8).

Over those past few years, T2 had become, “more confident in my teaching practices and that I did maybe have something to pass on” (T2, I, p. 115, L 21). She also learned,

. . . to communicate with someone, to really be explicit . . . really stand my ground . .
. . . listen to their opinions . . . meet people halfway and sometimes you have to tell
them that they're going to do it your way, and this is the way it's done (T2, I, p. 116, L 20).

Teacher #3 (T3) got very excited during the interview, when talking about her interns and the classroom. She had no experience having a student teacher or working with a professor prior to the PDA. She questioned her qualifications to have an intern when first hearing about the PDA, “I mean I think you know if you're a good, solid teacher. But you ask yourself, you know, am I really qualified to take on this extra responsibility?” (T3, I, p. 125, L 21). Those reservations were overshadowed by the excitement of having “another person in my classroom, and bringing, . . . the numbers down . . . having an extra pair of hands to help out in making small group decisions and things like that with the children” (T3, I, p.124, L 14). After three years T3 felt,

. . . these [the professors] are people who now respect me as a teacher as well. That here I am, a mentor for one of their students. And . . . what I'm doing in my classroom is great . . . because I hear feedback from not only the interns that I'm working with but also the professors when they're coming in . . . they just happen to drop by and they see my classroom in action, and the intern is doing their thing, I'm doing my thing, and the kids are doing their own thing, and it's like, ‘Wow!' . . . I get a lot of feedback on that which, of course, is always good to hear. When a professor used to walk in my classroom, I used to freak out, where now I don't think twice about it because we're all in this together and we all are advocates for education . . . we all want what is best for the children who are going through our systems (T3, I, p. 130, L 14).

When talking about the benefits she had received through the PDA and her relationship with the interns she shed tears talking about the rewards as she “look[ed] at another teacher who has trained underneath you and see all of the great things that come to be” (T3, I, p. 134, L 24).
Teacher #4 (T4) had the most experience of working with student teachers of all of the interviewees. T4 thought her role was

... modeling teaching, that I would be teaching a person to be a teacher, but also learning because I've always felt that any time you have a new person come into the situation or equation of education, you're also learning. I learn from the children and I've learned from every student teacher that I've had (T4, I, p. 149, L 20).

She had no reservations about the PDA. "I was very receptive and open to the program. I thought it would be a great experience for everybody" (T4, I, p. 151, L 11). T4 was a member of the school's Collaborative Team whose responsibilities were to oversee the Biennial School Plan Objectives and their respective committees. Her experience with professors varied according to the needs of the student teachers. While it was her practice to leave the classroom when the professor entered to observe the intern, T4 expressed a desire for more interaction with the professors and was considering spending more individual time with them. T4 liked a teaming experience with the interns. "I've always believed in team teaching and the variety that comes along with the different styles of different teachers. And so bringing another person into that mix really enhances the students' experience" (T4, I, p. 161, L 16).

Administrator #1 (A1) brought experience as a teacher, school administrator, professor, and university administrator to the PDA. She, along with the former Dean, were the first persons at the university to conceptualize the PDA and its potential for preservice teacher education programs. Notes from meetings held between the school system and the university indicate that A1 was present for all meetings and represented the university. She supported the teachers, the school administrators, and staff by committing additional time in her schedule to being at the school site on an almost daily basis during the first year of the PDA. Working closely with the PDA Coordinator, A1's administrative intervention and careful management kept conflicts to a minimum. Interns looked to her for guidance. A1 saw her role as the PDA was established as follows:

... the role of the university faculty member administrator who was assigned as the liaison, coordinator, you name it, in terms of who was going to be responsible for being the university spokesperson, and would be the person who would be on site
when the academy actually was up and running. There was only one person
assigned by the university for that role, and I was that person (A1, I, p. 170, L 3).
In addition, A1 was “the Education Program Director for teacher education at the
institution, and this was considered an extension of my role” (A1, I, p. 170, L 12). A1 was at the
school almost every day during the first few months of the PDA. This added extra hours to her
regular duties but her commitment to the PDA was a driving force in its implementation and
success. She believed that,

. . . the collaboration was facilitated and fostered and matured by the open attitudes
of everybody who had administrative responsibility at the school and at the
university up 'til now. And by open, I mean a feeling that we are colleagues, we are
peers, we're problem solving, we are not going to personalize issues. There's been a
very professional but yet very open attitude on everybody's part. So that if there is a
concern, we can sit down and talk about it openly and freely, knowing that--and
sometimes you do need to share things that may be uncomfortable because you're
looking at the larger good. And I think that attitude has been one of the things that
would make it work. The school administration has been open and supportive, and
in my role I tried very hard to be that way too, looking at this as a joint program
(A1, I, p. 190, L 24).

She stated she was pleased when the university had its five-year NCATE review. The
“academy was cited at that time as being exemplary practice, and that was before they [NCATE]
had standards” (A1, I, p. 193, L 15). In fact, the university was approached by NCATE to serve
as a “test site for the new codified proposed standards for professional development schools” (A1,
I, p. 192, L 10). While the university responded to NCATE’s request for feedback “on a set of
proposed accreditation standards for professional development schools” (A1, I, p. 192, L 6), the
university felt the changes in university administration and other personnel assignments expected
during the next few years would not enable them to participate as a test site.
Administrator #2 (A2) spent her career in education as a teacher, staff developer, and administrator. Plaques and certificates displayed in her office attest to her leadership in the school system. She served on many school system committees and was nominated by her staff and PTA for Principal of the Year for several years. She had been at the study school for eleven years when the idea for the PDA was conceived as a means of solving two of her concerns. First, she wanted to find a way of dealing with large class sizes of twenty-eight and twenty-nine students in first grade. Secondly, she wanted to provide teachers with staff development opportunities that met the needs of the school during the school day. As a leader, she was comfortable with giving responsibility for carrying on the meetings pertaining to the PDA to the teachers. When she attended a meeting it was as an observer. In her words, the sooner we would see the teachers take the lead on this [meetings], and the teachers buy into this and the teachers really being the people who were setting the goals for it, the more happy and more thrilled we were, and very, very satisfied because it was the project designed for teachers (A2, I, p. 204, L 10).

She saw her role in the PDA as a facilitator. “My role, I felt, was as person to be there to show my support for what was going on, and to just kind of cheerlead, because they were doing a really wonderful job working together . . .” (A2, I, p. 214, L 6). She continued, When I say facilitator, I think that's even giving myself a little too much credit because I did not plan the agendas; they did always bring them to me to take a look at, but I would have to say that I never modified them. And if I'm a facilitator, I see myself as someone who walks around and encourages people to go further . . . . I'm there as a support. And no one is looking at me for leadership because they themselves, the university professors and the teachers, are talking to each other, and I'm just there to support (A2, I, p. 214, L 9).

The interviewees, as reflected in their comments, exhibited a high level of professionalism, personal motivation, and the interpersonal skills that were important in the pilot years of the PDA. The data showed that each educator interviewed approached the PDA initially from a limited
perspective, i.e., thinking in a narrow perspective, such as being in their classroom, to a growth
toward the broader perspective which included both the school's and university's perspectives.
Three research questions illuminated the factors that led to a more collaborative relationship
between the participants and to changes in their perceptions and behaviors over the three pilot
years.

Research Question #1

What contributing factors led to the school and university faculties’ collaboration
during the first three years of the school and university test pilot PDA, 1993-1996?

Examination of reflections gathered from the three subject groups in this study revealed six
factors common to participant experience that were identified as contributing to intergroup
collaboration between faculties. Those were: (1) a wish to know their colleague personally, (2)
“we’re in this together” attitude, (3) willingness to accept additional responsibilities, (4)
investment in making the PDA work, (5) discovery of opportunities for leadership and
input, and (6) collaboration between coordinators and administrators.

A wish to know their colleagues personally. Sharing responsibility for the professional
preservice training of interns stimulated a desire in teachers and professors to know each other
better personally and professionally. This impetus evolved over time and contributed to
collaborative efforts supportive of the PDA. As the first pilot year of the PDA began, teachers
focused primarily on the needs and ordinary tasks and dynamics of their classrooms. Over time and
as they worked with their interns, they became aware of their need to know the professors and the
professors’ expectations both for the interns and for themselves. T1 stated at first she “had no clear
understanding of professors’ expectations of teachers” (T1, I, p. 98, L 23). She was concerned
about the “interns' work load and its relevancy” (T1, I, p. 96, L 23). T3 also focused initially on her
immediate classroom issues, yet she expressed concern that she “didn't feel like I knew them
[professors] as much as I would have liked to have known them . . .” (T3, I, p. 126, L 13).
Professors also expressed frustration with wanting to get to know the teachers. They felt the initial meeting held in July gave them little time for interaction and P4 was frustrated because the meeting was held on the professors’ off-contract time. P4 continued, “I think that we needed to actually get to know the faculty, and they us, much more closely before students would ever be introduced” (P4, I, p. 77, L 18). P1 found teachers “generous” with their time when she was at the school (P1, I, p. 6, L 12). However, she was cognizant of teachers' responsibilities and did not want to add an additional “burden” to their day. However, after the initial meetings P1, “felt that I knew more of them [teachers]” (P1, I, p. 8, L 1). P2 and P4 needed to have time to be with the teachers for more “interaction” and “collaboration.” P2 wished for more “mingling” with the faculty during the July meeting because, “We need to be talking with each other. I want to get to know these people” (P2, I, p. 22, L 22). P3 was not involved at the school until second semester. However, P3 mentioned she did not know the teachers the first year but now was more comfortable the second year (P3, I, p. 55, L 17).

A2 saw the need for a meeting because, “. . . our teachers were very anxious to get to know them and to invite them into their classrooms, and I think the university professors were very curious” (A2, I, p. 199, L 14). A1 phrased it this way:

Well, we needed to get acquainted, first of all. All of that was simply the human need to know a little bit about the people you're working with on a personal level. Education is such a personal process, and everything we do is based on interpersonal relationships in many ways. And so that was a need, just simply names and faces, who are we, get to know each other as people, as professionals working together with common goals (A1, I, p. 171, L 22).

Looking back at the July 1994 and subsequent meetings, teachers and professors wanted to know each other personally and to understand each other's perspectives on how the interns' training would be accomplished. While the two faculties did work toward collaboration and communication during the subsequent meetings, perhaps it would have been wiser to schedule more time for teachers and professors to “get to know each other” during the first meeting.
“*We're in this together*” attitude. The theme of working together to achieve each participants' goals was repeated frequently in the interviews. Interviewees saw the initial meetings as important for developing this “we're in this together” awareness. T1 was asked to reflect on the concept of the PDA and her understanding of what happened. She had positive thoughts of both faculties working together. T1 responded, "I think both staffs felt this was something that was a positive experience and we wanted it to work. We were able to talk about concerns that we had and concerns that they had" (T1, I, p. 97, L 21). T2 described this togetherness occurring during the initial meetings as facilitating and enhancing awareness of commonality. In T2's words, as a "beginning of discussion between the two faculties . . . . [where] breaking down of barriers . . . . [revealed that] we were all in the area, in the business of education" (T2, I, p. 110, L 21). T3 felt that both teachers and professors needed to be flexible. T3 observed that "both teachers and professors were open minded" (T3, I, p. 127, L 9). Later T3 added, "... everybody was very open-minded and we laid everything out on the table. It felt like from the get-go there was a lot of collaboration going on right there, and I didn't think anybody felt intimidated or anything like that" (T3, I, p. 127, L 18).

On the negative side, there was some evidence that it was difficult at first for some teachers to relate to the professors when being together in this PDA endeavor. Three out of the four teachers had no previous experience with a professor other than as a student in a professor's class. This may be one reason why initially the professors were “put on a pedestal” (T2, I, p. 109, L 15). T2 expressed the first year sentiments of other teachers when she said,

> I don't think there was really a strong meshing of our ideas, because I think our faculty had put university professors on a pedestal because we were dealing with a university. It was--that first time it was them getting together and telling us what we were doing, where now, it's so nice because now we sit down with them on even ground, which is very interesting (T2, I, p. 109, L 13).

A1 reflected that part of the reason for a joint meeting was . . . being a little bit more familiar with what the students [interns] were going to be working with in terms of their course work was another goal. Part of it was, once
again, to validate the meeting of the minds in terms of we were all in this together in this really collaborative, pioneering adventure that we were about to set off on (A1, I, p. 172, L 4).

P1 saw the two faculties working together as “two-way street . . . and they will benefit from associating with us” (P1, I, p. 9, L 6). P2 envisioned it this way, “[the] university faculty becoming part of a team, a team that would work with students, preservice students . . . and teachers in the field to focus on problems, issues that were facing that school, that particular school” (I, p. 19, L 19).

As a result of the joint meetings, teachers and professors were able to build on their colleagueship as they were “in this together” to accomplish the goals of the PDA. The data explained how both the professors and the teachers understood that this PDA was a joint venture. Both sides expressed the need for both faculties to contribute to the success of the PDA.

Willingness to accept additional responsibilities. Teachers accepted the responsibility of having two interns during an entire school year. The intern began the same day as the first day the teachers reported for the new school year in August and ended the last day of school in June. Prior to the PDA experience, teachers at the study school had had one student teacher for about six weeks and many teachers had a student teacher for only one semester a year. Although T2’s assessment of the dynamics of her class left her feeling that she already had “her hands full,” she was willing to go “along with what others had planned” (T2, I, p. 110, L 3). Thus she assumed an additional and active role working with her interns. T4 explained that one additional responsibility as a result of the PDA was an “End-of-the-Week Progress Sheet” that teachers completed before meeting with the intern (T4, I, p. 157, L 12). T4 took notes while the intern was interacting with students and provided the intern with regular feedback. It was interesting to note that at no time during the interviews did the teachers mention having an additional work load. They talked about spending time assisting and working with their interns, wanting to have additional meetings with the professors, and working with the PDA Coordinator. T2 talked about additional time spent with her interns, “I know I’ve also helped them [interns] with their observations . . . school projects . . . guiding them with some type of ideas and things like that . . . (T2, I, p. 136, L 12).
Earlier in the interview, T3 told about spending extra time during the school day with the PDA Coordinator. “We had the PDA Coordinator who we could go talk to and who had more opportunities to . . . talk to a professor . . .” (T3, I, p. 128, L 7).

Teachers' additional responsibilities included assisting their two interns, completing the weekly progress sheets, giving interns feedback on a daily basis and meeting with the PDA Coordinator. Teachers added to these responsibilities requested meetings with the professors. Lead teachers included the responsibility of presenting teacher training sessions to their colleagues and the interns. These additional responsibilities were requested by the teachers to meet perceived needs of the PDA.

Professors journeyed to the school site for the university classes rather than the interns going to the campus for classes. Round-trip travel time to and from main campus to the school was an added responsibility and use of professors' time. Professors held open office time for the interns at the school site. The traveling to the school site to teach one class to the interns and maintaining an open office time at the site were added responsibilities for the professors. Professors' additional responsibilities also included meetings with the teachers at the school site and at the university to discuss meshing of the university's syllabi and school district's Program of Studies.

The administration of the PDA was an additional responsibility for the Education Program Director. The PDA required an additional commitment of time for travel, at least a 40-minute drive from one site to the other, and supervision responsibilities for the implementation of the university program at the school site. The Principal's responsibility for the administration of the PDA at the school site included the need to work on the public relations issues. She wrote articles about the PDA and collaborated with the Education Program Director and the PDA Coordinator to develop presentations and workshops on the PDA.

All of the professionals connected with the PDA assumed responsibilities above their already established duties. For most of the participants, the time spent was considered an opportunity to create a higher good by educating the next generation of teachers and for professional growth opportunities for teachers.
Investment in making the PDA work. Teachers, professors and administrators were all committed to doing whatever was needed to make the PDA work. One important aspect in making the PDA work was the interpersonal relationships that were sought by teachers and professors.

T1 stated, “But I knew that we were a pretty solid staff, we worked together through a lot of things, and that this was something we could work through and it would be a positive experience . . .” (T1, I, p. 96, L 2). When asked to describe the relationship between the two faculties during the first year T1 said,

I think both staffs felt this was something that was a positive experience and we wanted it to work, and I think we had a good relationship between the two staffs. We were able to talk about concerns that we had and concerns that they had” (T1, I, p. 97, L 21).

P3 described working together as everyone having “different pieces and putting them together and making it [PDA] work and hoping it would all come together to be successful . . . “ (P3, I, p. 51, L 8).

P1 saw the collaboration as “a great preparation for our students” (P1, I, p. 12, L 12). P2 saw the need for meeting with teachers. After working with teachers she “. . . came away from that meeting with a much better idea of how I could modify the course work and how I could work even more collaboratively with the teachers” (P2, I, p. 28, L 9). The meetings led to being able to share information with the teachers so that, “. . . we developed--you know, we were colleagues now. And so we were sharing information as colleagues, where before we weren't doing that. And I think that was a big turning point” (P2, I, p. 30, L 20). P3 found the second year more a comfortable investment in working with and relating to the teachers as people and became more confident.

The second year was more comfortable because we'd had a pilot year, and everybody said, Okay, we can do this. This will work.’ We just need--I think my perception was we felt we just need to work together, we need to work on working together, getting to know each other

(P2, I, p. 54, L 18).
P4, however, felt her investment in the PDA could have been stronger if, she were given time to talk about mentoring the interns, having appropriate kinds of activities for students, and clarifying the roles of all the participants (P4, I, p. 80, L 15).

A1 saw the need for a joint faculty meeting to “. . . help the teaching staff at the school understand and therefore be able to support the students’ [interns] course work, because the course work was being taught on the school site . . . ” (A1, I, p. 171, L 5). Additionally, the teachers at the school needed to help the interns demonstrate in the school classroom the theory from the university classroom. There was a need to involve the school faculty and to help them understand what was “being studied, what was “being stressed.” A2 expressed the need for a joint faculty meeting not only for getting to know the other faculty but there was a desire to share what was happening in the school and university classrooms.

Because teachers, professors, and administrators made an investment of time and developed a collaborative relationship, the PDA became a reality. As T1 expressed it, “I think both staffs felt this was something that was a positive experience and we wanted it to work . . .” (T1, I, p. 97, L 21).

Discovery of opportunities for leadership and input. As the PDA evolved, teachers and professors found opportunities for leadership. T1 stated the leadership was shared, “I think we all came forward and I think we all became leaders” (T1, I, p. 100, L 21). T2 also saw leadership as shared.

I don't know if they [teachers] necessarily emerged as leaders. I think they had more time to take on special projects for school and had some extra presentations for staff development. So in that way they became . . . leaders. But its been a very gradual process (T2, I, p. 113, L 21).

Teachers were given other opportunities to step out in leadership. For example, they were asked to represent the faculty before different groups such as: principal groups, school pyramid groups, the local Association of Elementary School Principals, at conferences, when visitors came to the PDA, or to groups of other administrators. “We were often amazed at the teachers who would say, I'd like to speak about the academy’ and I'd like to speak about how it's gone with my
intern,' or on other requested topics about the PDA" (A2, I, p. 212, L 15). When summer of 1995 arrived, five teachers stepped forward to be considered for the PDA Coordinator's position.

Other opportunities for leadership at the school were serving on School Plan Collaborative Team or on one of the objective committees of the School Plan. One of those committees was the PDA Committee which began as a result of teachers finding a way to work through concerns and having a voice in the PDA. Becoming a Lead Teacher or attending staff development activities and reporting back to the staff were additional leadership opportunities. As P3 stated, "I think that all of the teachers who have experienced interns have grown professionally and have become leaders. . ." (T3, I, p. 137, L 12).

Because the professors were going through NCATE certification process and university evaluations, and with the change in deans and other personnel, the professors looked to the Education Program Director to lead the PDA from their perspective. As stated earlier, A1 had been given the task of leadership of the PDA from the beginning. A1 explained,

Our faculty is small. We're a small school. And because of that, people tend to just naturally pick up when they see that things need to be done, . . . roles were not assigned, but we just find that we've got pretty much a faculty of volunteers, . . . and if they find something that needs to be done, they will typically say they need to do it (A1, I, p. 181 L 23).

A2 stated, "Well, I think there was a lot of emerging leadership. And people that we hadn't expected to be leaders just emerged. And it wasn't that we gave it . . . I think they took it" (A2, I, p. 210, L 15).

The PDA provided opportunities for leadership by teachers and professors through service on committees and by assuming leadership to meet needs as they arose.
**Collaboration between coordinators and administrators.** The collaboration between the coordinators and administrators led to a modeling of collaboration. A2 began thinking of ways to solve the staff development and large class size issues at her school. She had "the original idea for it [PDA], and . . . a reason and a purpose for doing it because we were looking for a way to solve our problem. And so I worked collaboratively with the Assistant Principal, and she helped me put some meat on the skeleton of my ideas" (A2, I, p. 195, L 3). The Principal and Assistant Principal had worked together for five years at that time. They approached the Dean of the university to test their idea. The timing was right for both institutions and so the school administrators and the university administrators began a dialogue.

Once the PDA was established, the Assistant Principal moved out of her role to take the Coordinator's position for one year. In that capacity the Education Program Director and the PDA Coordinator worked together on a daily basis. The Principal, Education Program Director, Assistant Principal, and the PDA Coordinator frequently met, at least every other week on a formal basis. A1’s feelings about why the collaboration worked is as follows:

One thought I have is that I think the collaboration was facilitated and fostered and nurtured by the open attitudes of everybody who had administrative responsibility at the school and at the university up 'til now. And by open, I mean a feeling that we are colleagues, we are peers, we're problem solving, we are not going to personalize issues. There's been a very professional but yet a very open attitude on everybody's part. So that if there is a concern, we can sit down and talk about it openly and freely, knowing that--and sometimes you do need to share things that may be uncomfortable because you're looking at the larger good. And I think that attitude has been one of the things that would make it work. The school administration has been open and supportive, and in my role I tried very hard to be that way, too, looking at this as a joint program. Its the institution's and the school's. And we--both groups--have ownership and responsibility. I cannot think of a single instance where there was ever an accusatory tone or negative tone, and we've worked
through problems because you're working with this large number of students, impacting on a building with teachers and children and parents. You know, there are inevitable things that have to be worked through if you're working with large numbers of people. That's the nature of the human--human being. But I have never sensed anything but a very professional, supportive, concerned attitude, of we have a concern, [about] what resolution can we reach where everybody wins (A1, I, p. 190, L 24).

To summarize, the contributing factors which led to the faculties' collaboration as a joint educational venture between a school and university were a wish on the part of the participants to know each other personally and professionally and to have both faculties working toward a common goal with the understanding of being “in this together.” Participants accepted additional responsibilities through formal means such as a committee assignment or informally such as when they saw a need they tried to solve the need. Participants made an investment in making the PDA concept work and through the PDA, teachers and professors found ways to assume leadership and to provide input. Collaboration occurred because of the deep commitment by participants as each group saw not only the unique value of their own profession, but how their colleagues' input and direction could contribute to the shared goal of educating future teachers. Because of their awareness of their common goals coupled with a strong professionalism, all participants increased their desire to see the program succeed.

There were several areas where individuals were disappointed in the PDA because their hopes, ideas and leadership were not forthcoming or were slow in meeting the needs. Initially, P1 was excited about the PDA because she saw it as a “gold mine” for doing research that was important to her. An agreement was made, however, in the design phase between the university and the school system, that no research would be conducted during the pilot years. Since P1 was retiring in 1998, design limitation was terribly disappointing for her. P4 wanted time to talk and work with teachers. She found the interns reporting that strategies she suggested were not implemented in the classroom. P4 was frustrated because she wanted time to work with the teachers as well as the interns about the reported implementation problems.
T1 stated that after the first meeting some of the staff felt perhaps their meeting was not successful because they did not see that their "... input was taken and implemented because we did not see the results right away" (T1, I, p. 98, L 10). That input appeared the second year.

Some participants were disappointed because their hopes and expectations were not fulfilled. For others, their ideas and needs were not implemented as quickly as they liked nor met. While disappointments were present in some of the participants in each faculty, they were not significant enough to detract from the overall process of the PDA.

Conclusions from Research Question # 1

What contributing factors led to the collaboration of school and university faculties during the first three years of the pilot PDA, 1993-1996? Six factors that were identified in the data as contributing to collaboration between faculties were: (1) a wish to know the other colleagues personally, (2) a "we're in this together" attitude, (3) willingness to accept additional responsibilities, (4) investment in making the PDA work, (5) discovery of opportunities for leadership and input, and (6) collaboration between coordinators and administrators.

Conclusion 1

Collaboration occurred between school and university faculties because the participants wanted to work together and were dedicated to common goals. Therefore, because the participants had common goals, they fulfilled some of the Holmes Group's (1990) six principles: "continuing learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators" and "inventing a new institution" (p. 7).

Evidence

As the PDA concept was introduced to the faculties, the participants expressed a need to know their colleagues of both faculties in order to work together to follow the mission and common goals of the PDA. The perception of "we are in this together" and a desire for the PDA's success in educating preservice teachers and meeting staff development needs of teachers were the underlying goals of the participants.
Conclusion 2

The teachers and professors involved with the PDA grew as professionals during the three years of this study and by the end of the third year, teachers and professors worked together as colleagues. When teachers and professors were empowered to work together to examine a program in terms of issues and concerns, they were willing to participate even when new responsibilities are added. Lemlech et al. (1992) found that creating PDSs required a new kind of collaboration between school site and university participants. Both were expected to change organizational structure, alter the pattern of relationships that characterized past associations, and rethink what the education for new teachers should become. As found by Ruscoe, et al. (1989), such empowerment leads to growth as professionals. Barth (1991) and Pasch & Pugach (1990) saw the professionals becoming equal partners when they worked as a whole community.

Evidence

When teachers looked to the school administrator for direction, she guided teachers by helping them establish the PDA Committee to solve issues and concerns. In that way, “They began to see themselves as the solver of their own problems and issues” (A2, I, p. 197, L 22). As a result, the PDA became one objective of the biennial School Plan. School faculty members who served on the PDA Objective Committee of the School Plan also may have served on the school’s Collaborative Team which monitored the PDA Objective of the School Plan. Meanwhile, the professors grew professionally when they learned to teach as exemplified by P1 who stated, “[I became] more practical in my teaching” (P1, I, p. 13, L 3). Professors were cognizant of compressed time of fewer university class time hours compared to the course taught on campus, the student teaching hours and the professors desires to “. . . do much more hands-on stuff they could take right into their classroom and use” (P1, I, p. 3, L 5). Professors adjusted their syllabi and began to interact as colleagues with teachers.

Conclusion 3

Administrators from both institutions were willing to work in concert to unify the two groups, confirming McLaughlin & Marsh (1979) who found that positive support from the administration had an effect on a programs’ outcome.
Evidence

The Principal and PDA Coordinator from the school and the Education Program Director who served as the administrator from the university, saw themselves as facilitators. They listened to teachers and professors and supported the faculties in finding solutions to issues and concerns. As the university administrator said, “We seemed to be of a like mind in so many ways in terms of goals and process” (A1, I, p. 170, L 24). They said it was important to have meetings at both the school and university sites to avoid turf issues and “we and them” feelings. The administrators saw the PDA as a partnership and kept open minds while working through concerns. A1 summed it up this way, “I have never sensed anything but a very professional, supportive, concerned attitude, of, ‘We have a concern, what resolution can we reach where everybody wins’” (A1, I, p. 191, L 17).

Conclusion 4

It took time to create a PDA. With time, teachers' and professors' perceptions changed. Time was needed to implement the PDA concept by each faculty, to allow for participants to know each other, and to allow for interaction between the two groups. Zimpher (1990), Mehaffy (1992), Lemlech, et al. (1992) and Dixon (1992) all stress that time was needed to break down the barriers and to form a trusting relationship between the participants. Time to work together led to the growth of a collaborative effort on the part of both faculties.

Evidence

Teachers expressed feelings of intimidation and awkwardness at first when a professor was in their presence. By working together and understanding from where each one's goals were coming, the teachers began to view the professors as colleagues. One professor, who had doubts about public education, had her faith restored because of her experiences in the elementary classroom and because she had a view of education from the elementary teacher's eyes. One teacher, who initially questioned her qualifications to mentor an intern, expressed pride in her abilities because she had seen the results of her labors in her interns who had become successful first year teachers. Teachers whose professional world was contained within their classroom now
took time to add on responsibilities and leadership roles across grade levels and with the professors.

The PDA in this study began before teachers and professors had time to work together. Analysis of the available documentation and artifacts reveal there was infrequent interaction between teachers and professors during the first few months of the PDA. While the professors expressed frustration at not having time to work with teachers during the July 12, 1994 meeting, a relationship was developed at that time between teachers and interns. The teachers and interns had time to work together which created a bond between the two of them. The reflections back from the teachers on the three July days indicated their concern had to do with their role and getting to know the interns. Perhaps, because every aspect of the PDA was new to teachers, it was important for the focus to be concentrated on the teacher/intern relationship in order to facilitate the teacher's level of comfort with their interns. Once they began to be comfortable with their interns, teachers then wanted to take time to know, to meet and to interact with the professors. They began to look at the theory and practice piece and the conflict between theory and practice that was starting to develop. When the faculties had time to work together they began to collaborate in the implementation of the PDA.

Research Question #2

How did the school and university faculties collaborate for change during the first three years of the pilot PDA?

Several things occurred before the faculties were comfortable collaborating. Collaboration evolved because teachers and professors were willing to work together to make changes to solve concerns individually or jointly. Both were willing to listen to the other's point of view and collaboration was facilitated for the following reasons:

1. welcoming and supportive climate, 2. open communication, 3. active involvement by both faculties, 4. validation of teachers and professors, and 5. support for goals and recommendations.
Welcoming and Supportive Climate. As teachers and professors began to collaborate, they were anxious, intimidated and unsure of what would transpire. These concerns were turned around as they began working together. How did that happen? The following responses gave us an indication that the climate was the key.

T1 was "anxious about having somebody . . . in my classroom all the time watching me" (T1, p. 95, L 21). At the first meeting, teachers "had an opportunity to meet all of the professors" (T1, I, p. 96, L 15). At the second meeting, teachers "discussed the curriculum that we were teaching and what they were presenting to the interns to make sure that it matched and correlated" (T1, I, p. 96, L 18). T1 thought the relationship grew because teachers and professors were able to get to know each other and were able to discuss curricula.

We had an opportunity. We knew we were working together and we wanted to make some changes and some improvements, so I think our relationship did grow out of the need to make some changes. I think at the beginning we might have been a little hesitant just as a staff not--not really knowing exactly what to expect (T1, I, p. 98, L 19).

T3 saw both the teachers and professors being flexible and open-minded and they were both able to place "... everything on the table. I felt like from the get-go there was a lot of collaboration going on right there, and I didn't think anybody felt intimidated or anything like that" (T3, I, p. 127, L 19).

T4 perceived that "... some of the professors were not putting forth much effort and not listening to what we were saying as well as they could have" (T4, I, p. 154, L 19). After several meetings T4 had a slight change in her opinion,

I think I pretty much perceived them [professors] as pretty much the same as when we started, except for the fact that I could see from the course requirements and the syllabus that they were definitely trying to incorporate our concerns and our opinions (T4, I, p. 155, L 9).

Professors were welcomed at the school site. P1 talked about the joint faculty meeting at the school,
I got to know the librarian and got to know the names of a lot of the other teachers, and they had been so cordial to us when we came out there to lunch that it just--you know, I was anxious then to get to know more of them by name and so on and so forth (P1, I, p. 8, L 2).

One professor expressed to P1 that the university was being asked to make “too many concessions.” P1 did not feel that way. She saw it differently and explained by saying, “. . . in fact there was a lot of positive . . . our comments were always positive to each other about going there” (P1, I, p. 8, L 23). Feeling “warm and fuzzy about the teachers” was not experienced by P1 because she “didn't interact with them that much” (P1, I, p. 9, L 23). For P3, going to the school several times a week and getting to know teachers was a “turning point” (P3, I, p. 55, L 9). She felt comfortable with the faculty after the first year.

The university's administrator knew the importance of teachers feeling comfortable. The first joint meeting was held at the school site because, as A1 explained,

We also felt that the comfort level for the teachers initially would be higher if it was their home turf, if you will, if they were on their territory. And the university faculty were used to going in and out of many school buildings as part of their role, as they supervise student teachers and work with inservices and other things, as they naturally do as an outreach (A1, I, p. 174, L 9).

Having an atmosphere where participants were welcomed and supported led to their feeling that teachers and professors could have discussions on issues and concerns and where participants' discussions were approached with open and flexible minds. There was a level of comfort among the participants, especially the school faculty because administrators set the initial meetings purposefully on school turf. This allowed the dynamic of teachers working with professors to be explored before the element of working on the professors' turf was added to the mix.

Open Communication. Communication between the two groups was one of the keys to success as it broke down barriers and led to camaraderie. As T1 explained,

Without the communication--because the first year I think . . . there were a lot of glitches that we needed to work out, and being able to communicate effectively, we
were able to work those out, and the second year was I guess a little smoother (T1, I, p. 97, L 14).

Having joint meetings for T2 was a means of “. . . breaking down barriers that there were, because they're [professors are] teaching at two different locations, and that we were all in the area, in the business of education” (T2, I, p. 110, L 23). T4 saw the need for more "coordination and communication so the interns time was not wasted on doing projects that might not have relevance to what they're doing, when it could be just as easily coordinated and be very relevant to what they're doing in the classroom setting” (T4, I, p. 153, L 4).

T1 said the second meeting was important because it accomplished the following: . . . gave us all a clear understanding of exactly what expectations were within the county system and the classroom and what the expectations were for the interns within their courses that they were taking. So I think we were able to communicate effectively about what our expectations were on both levels (T1, I, p. 97, L 9).

According to A2, “Teachers’ dialogue in the teachers’ lounge and elsewhere changed from focusing on small talk to discussing their practice of teaching. They grew stronger in their beliefs (A2. I, p. 217, L 19). One teacher's reflections solidified her beliefs and she found ways to communicate her values. Communication increased as a result of an openness to dialogue and clearer understanding of expectations. The staff became more cohesive. Teachers and professors became more flexible. The professors learned from teachers’ strategies ways to compress the university class time. Teachers took on leadership positions at various times. Teachers and professors became risk-takers.

One-half way through the first pilot year, a PMI (Plus, Minus, Interesting chart) was completed by teachers and professors. The data from that activity were used as a means of opening the communication during the next meeting between the faculties. It was at this meeting that T3 thought,

. . . there was a lot of camaraderie between the teachers and the professors, and the professors at that point laid out what their requirements and things like that were for
the--for their course work, as well as the teachers then said . . . is there a way that we can do your requirement but more in a realistic setting? (T3, I, p. 129, L 7).

T4’s practice was to leave the room when the professor entered to observe. She thought that, “. . . as long as things are going along pretty well, there's not really--has not really been too much of a need to have that communication” (T4, I, p. 158, L 8). By the end of the interview, T4 was expressing a desire to communicate more with the professors.

P1 reflected on the joint meetings and believed there were more interactions when the meetings were at the school than at the university. P2 shared that teachers and professors realized, “We needed to have more coordination . . . I think it was a mutual thing, but I know that I went to the coordinator and said when are we going to have more meetings with the faculty” (P2, I, p. 27, L 9). The joint meeting was important because, “We really talked and we brainstormed ideas, how can we change the courses so that they . . . fit in a little bit with what you are doing?”(P2, I, p. 27, L 16). Following the meeting, P2 stated, “I came away from that meeting with a much better idea of how I could modify the course work and how I could work even more collaboratively with the teachers” (P2, I, p. 28, L 9).

One of the biggest benefits of the two faculties working jointly was communication according to A1,

The communication . . . benefits the students and it benefits the whole school community. Being able to sit down and talk about things, they may be as mundane as, should we continue to include the discrepant event in the science syllabus and should that be an assignment . . . (A1, I, p. 176, L 9).

Continuation of the communication and collaboration between the two faculties had changed. A1 phrased it this way:

I can see, with the comfort level now in terms of communication, conversation, between the two groups, I can see the university faculty became more involved in staff development and providing more resources to teachers because the comfort level is there (A1, I, p. 188, L 8).
Because there was open communication, barriers were broken and a comfort level was established which encouraged more involvement and a sense of camaraderie developed.

**Active Involvement by Both Faculties.** Teachers and professors became active participants in the meetings and, when asked, they participated in each other's classes. Because they were given time to gain a clear understanding of each one's expectations they were able to find common ground.

T1 described the relationship during meetings which involved the two faculties, I think both staffs felt this was something that was a positive experience and we wanted it to work, and I think we had a good relationship between the two staffs. We were able to talk about concerns that we had and concerns that they had (T1, I, p. 97, L 21).

T1 also talked about having a “nice experience” being invited to “sit in on some of the lessons that were being taught by the professors to the interns” (T1, I, p. 99, L 16). Professors also gave teachers training which, “. . . benefited all the other teachers . . . [to] have a professor come in and talk to them and give them an inservice [and gave] them fresh ideas” (T1, I, p. 99, L 19). T1 also benefited from the professors' work with the interns assigned to her as it led to her having a “chance to think about my teaching style and different ways of approaching students” (T1, I, p. 100, L 5).

However, T4 observed that teachers and professors still seem to work independently and that, “they don't coordinate and communicate enough with each other” (T4, I, p. 160, L 13). P4 was frustrated with the lack of communication between the two faculties during the first year. Later, she became more acquainted with the teachers and thought it wasn't until the second and third year of interaction that the teachers and professors “started to understand more what was happening with each group” (P4, I, p. 85, L 13).

P1 thought most of the professors believed the involvement and interactions were “good” between the teachers and professors. Having a personal relationship was important to P2. She began her involvement with teachers by building a relationship with the specialists she met at the school.
I became friends with the math teachers very quickly. And actually we jointly conducted a workshop for the teachers and the interns which I thought was very successful. It was a lot of fun. We got involved together right away (P2, I, p. 25, L 21).

Teachers shared with P2 the school resources, such as calculators and math manipulatives, which “saved her from lugging stuff back and forth” (P2, I, p. 26, L 9). She found the faculty willing to assist her.

The Department of Education, at the university, changed in P3’s opinion because of the involvement with the school. “We had this connection with the schools which was very beneficial because . . . all of us want to get out in the field to see what's going on” (P3, I, p. 58, L 12).

Both faculties were involved in the joint meetings. Those meetings were not highly structured. As A2 explained,

I think they needed just some open time . . . to really kind of develop a common language between the two groups and some common ground. And that's really what was established in those first couple of meetings, is some common ground and some common understandings and expectations, and each of them gaining a little more professional regard for each other and really understanding why each did what they did (A2, I, p. 207, L 13).

Teachers' and professors' active participation in both groups led to some activity in each other's classes and enabled clarification of each groups' expectations. Active involvement by the participants facilitated the groups' ability to find common ground.

Validation of Teachers and Professors. Being accepted as a colleague was important to the participants. Also when a teacher's or professor's work was validated by their colleagues, the desire to work collaboratively increased from doing whatever anyone wanted to gaining a sense of belonging.

Talking to the interviewer about the interactions between teachers and professors, T1 stated,
I don't remember anyone saying anything negative about the professors. And in fact, we were . . . grateful that the professors were coming into the classroom and watching the interns actually teach lessons so that they could give them feedback . . . if the interns heard it coming from the professors sometimes that made a difference, whereas coming from the teacher, you know, it didn't always make a big difference (T1, I, p. 99, L 3).

T2 described how being an “introvert” she would not normally “seek out a university professor's conversation” (T2, I, p. 111, L 8). However, T2 felt validated during the brainstorming session because she thought the professor met the group “. . . halfway, and it was sort of like an Aha.” It was nice on her part because I remember she said, Oh, that's really a good idea” (T2, I, p. 108, L 14). During the first meeting she remembered there was not a “strong meshing of our ideas, because I think our faculty had put university professors on a pedestal because we were dealing with a university” (T2, I, p. 109, L 14). T2 continued, “. . . now it's so nice because now we sit down with them on even ground, which is very interesting” (T2, I, p. 109, L 17).

When asked about her relationship with the professors now, T3 replied, “Well, its more professional, obviously. And I feel like these are people who now respect me as a teacher as well” (T3, I, p. 120, L 14).

P2 had positive experiences when at the school. She had a heightened sense of belonging because she had a special badge to wear when in the building and because of the collegial interactions with teachers as a colleague.

One thing I did notice particularly when I went in to observe interns is that there was a greater camaraderie . . . we would actually talk about interns or talk about students. I might ask a question about a particular student in the class, and the teacher was . . . much more open to share with me information that she had about particular students about--it was a confidence thing, it was a trust that developed . . . where I don't think they would have shared that kind of information in September or October. . . . we were colleagues now” (P2, I, p. 30, L 13).
Professors' validation also came when NCATE recognized the PDA as an exemplary practice and, as P3 excitedly stated, "It's going well, so we were recognized, which in turn makes you feel really glad because it was a pilot at first and . . . how it's going to go. So I think the success of the project really helped" (P3, I, p. 58, L 23).

Being asked to work alongside teachers as they selected a new math series and working with the school's technology committee, pleased P2. "They used me like a resource person, and I felt very valued. You know, I felt like my--my input was valued and that people were interested in what I had to say" (P2, I, p. 35, L 4).

Facilitating opportunities for the faculties to work together would have the benefit of validating the work each faculty pursued. A2 explained it this way,

And once they [teachers] met with the university faculty, they would realize that we're all colleagues and we're all basically trying to meet the same goals and we're just coming at it from different directions. And so we knew that as soon as our teachers would have opportunities to talk about their profession and to reflect on their practice with--well, they did that all the time with the interns, but now to sit and do that with the university professors, would take away some of that mystique of a university and ivory tower kind of stuff and would break some of that down and would increase our teachers' own feelings of competency and professionalism (A2, I, p. 205, L 18).

Validity also came in the form of "... a real sharing and recognition of the professionalism from both sides," according to A2 (A2, I, p. 213, L 21). For example, some teachers were involved in the courses professors taught, one professor was asked to work with the teachers as math textbook adoptions were being considered. Several of the teachers taught other classes as an adjunct position.

As a result of being validated, the desire to continue working together as professionals increased. Teachers and professors were both validated by members of their own faculty as well as the other faculty.
Support for goals and recommendations. As teachers and professors began to have a dialogue, they were able to understand each other's expectations for the PDA. However, this feeling of support for each other's goals and recommendations was slow at the beginning of the PDA.

T1 reported a “. . . lot of concerns that first year as far as workload for the interns and some of it not being relevant to what we were actually doing in the classroom” (T1, I, p. 96, L 22). T1 saw that the need for collaboration did, “grow out of the need to make some changes” (T1, I, p. 98, L 21). She experienced being supported the first year when a professor would give the same feedback to the intern and the intern who would then take the feedback more seriously. T1 also thought that, during the first year, there was some feeling among the teachers that their ideas were not taken seriously since they did not see the ideas being implemented. T1 stated their ideas were implemented during the second year.

T2 believes supporting each other began once both faculties started to look at each other's curricula. T2 expressed it this way,

I think in the beginning the teachers didn't know that they could have an impact on what the university professors were teaching. So no matter if we had five meetings in a year, I still would have been in awe of them and--and when we first started they weren't really asking us as much as they're asking now, you know, how can we make this applicable to what's happening at the elementary school . . . . I mean now they're asking (T2, I, p. 119, L 15).

Describing the second meeting, T3 said,

I do think at that point there was a lot of camaraderie between the teachers and the professors, and the professors . . . laid out what their requirements and things like that were for the--for their course work, as well. The teachers then said . . . is there a way that we can do your requirement but more in a realistic setting? (T3, I, p. 129, L 6).
P2 found the teachers open to her recommendations and she was asked to help them in the process of selecting new math textbooks. P2 talked about other opportunities to give the teachers recommendations.

... I think the faculty were very willing to help, at least the people I worked with. I didn't notice any resistance to suggestions; if I made a suggestion or if I asked a question such as “Why aren't you using calculators in your classroom,” I never experienced any defensiveness or anything like that from the faculty. They were always very open, very willing (P2, I, p. 26, L 14).

P3 saw the key to the collaboration was first the modeling by the coordinators and the administrators which led to the faculties working together collaboratively.

... that's really where working together came in, is to make things work and then, too, look at how it went and be willing to make changes, because there's been adjustments every year as we have learned more about how we can make it successful. Its changed every year, fine tuned (P3, I, p. 67, L 21).

A1 saw the benefits of working together as a means of meeting each faculty's needs and goals.

Part of the benefit to the school faculty is there's always the task that a teacher education faculty has of keeping themselves current with what's actually going on in schools with curricula and children today, and for school faculty who were right there in the classrooms with children every day, there's always the need to keep as current as you can in terms of current thinking, research into best practices. And so those two needs are benefits, I think, for both groups (A1, I, p. 177, L 10).

In summary, collaboration occurred as a result of both faculties desire to create a supportive climate where each was welcome on the other's turf. Communication opened a way to break down real and imaginary barriers. When the teachers and professors saw their work validated they became more active participants. As the dialogues continued and teachers and professors listened to each others' views, teachers and professors supported each others' goals, made adjustments in their thinking, and implemented recommendations to strengthen both participant's programs.
Conclusions from Research Question #2

How did the school and university faculties collaborate for change during the first three years of the pilot PDA? Collaboration occurred because there was (1) a welcoming and supportive climate, (2) open communication, (3) active involvement by both faculties, (4) validation of teachers and professors, and (5) support for goals and recommendations.

Conclusion 1

Participants had a common goal to try to mesh the theory and practice of teaching. As Kagan (1991) described, conceptualization of the mission and objectives allows for collaboration to occur.

Evidence

Joint meetings were held to discuss the teachers' and professors' concerns and issues. One issue was the differences in goals. Teachers were obligated to follow the school system's Program of Studies and to implement programs already in place. Professors' obligations centered around their need to provide preservice teachers with the current theories in education. The professors designed their syllabi to cover those objectives. Problems arose when the teachers and professors saw a disconnection between the two curricula. Collaboration began when everyone sat down and shared their objectives. Then participants began to understand each person from the other participants' perspectives. As meetings progressed, teachers and professors found ways to mesh the theory and practice in a way which were mutually acceptable.

Conclusion 2

Collaboration occurred when openness and trust was developed, as Zimpher (1990), Mehaffy (1992), Lemlech, et al. (1992) and Dixon (1992) suggested.

Evidence

As teachers and professors worked together and became acquainted professionally and personally, trust began to develop and the barriers came down. Teachers and professors shared expectations, ideas and strategies, which resulted in common objectives. Professors accepted teachers’ suggestions for ways to work with interns. Teachers saw the value of learning centers
and began to implement them into their classroom. Each felt validated by the other such as one teacher's amazement when she learned that a professor highly regarded her work. One professor was invited to work with teachers in the selection of new math textbooks. Teachers were no longer intimidated and welcomed the professors into their classrooms. Because a level of trust developed, teachers and professors moved from being anxious around each other to having open dialogues about seeking ways teachers and professors could team teach at the school and university.

Research Question #3

As a result of collaboration between the school and university faculties during the first three years of the pilot PDA, what changes occurred at the school and university?

Changes which occurred because of the collaboration were evident in areas such as a growing sense of professionalism and as an increase in a feeling of camaraderie between teachers and teachers and teachers and professors. Less visible changes were the teacher's attitudinal change in feeling they had something to share. Teachers also found themselves reflecting on their pedagogy.

Attitudinal changes

A2 talked about the attitudinal change that occurred as a result of the PDA:

. . . when I think of changes, it's just like even an attitude change and a feeling of--that they have something important to share and give back to the professions. This is what I saw with our teachers and they became so deeply invested in the profession because they saw themselves actually building the profession as they worked with the university people (A2, I, p. 216, L 16).

A2 also found teachers’ conversations in the lounge turning toward discussions of practice. Teachers thinking also turned to finding ways to transfer their knowledge to the interns, and both faculties were incorporating new ideas into their practices.

Reflection on pedagogy

Changes that occurred at the university, because of the collaboration, were subtle. A1 described it this way:
I've seen university professors learn to modify assignments to make them more reality-based . . . we try very hard to keep that theory and practice melding together. I've seen the program change, and this is just part of the thrust in Virginia. But it's also helped because they were working in the schools, working in terms of the methods classes, working more with the Programs of Studies, and by extension, the Standards of Learning, which has been very helpful, because it helps ground that theory into practice  (A1, I, p. 189, L 14).

Increase camaraderie

A1 continued, "Professors have had to learn to be a little more flexible in terms of student time lines, perhaps for assignments" (A1, I, p. 190, L 5). Professors had to learn to change the way they usually taught by compressing a “normal three-hour class into two hours because of the extensive field component . . " (A1, I, p. 190, L 17). And finally, professors “had to modify their course work, and that has been the challenge, and it has been a healthy one. The same outcome, but we're getting at it in a different way” (A1, I, p. 190, L 19).

Increased camaraderie was a result of the PDA according to T4 who stated, I see the staff and between administration, staff, office staff, the whole school, a lot more of interrelationships, and people that are not so much closed into their own little room and/or curriculum and/or what they're doing, but they're ready to open up and share and collaborate and be much more of a giver and also a receiver . . . . the PDA, really helped a lot of people be able to do that (T4, I, p. 160, L 2).

Growing sense of professionalism

T3 also shared a closeness with other teachers, especially the teacher with whom she was paired. T3 thought “the children are happier because they have now not just one person but two people in their classroom that they can ask a question at any time" (T3, I, p. 138, L 19).

T3 felt she needed to stay current and on the cutting edge because of the responsibility of having the intern observe her teaching. T3 found she was “always reading magazines. You're always looking at reports and things like that” (T3, I, p. 140, L 4).
In summary, collaboration had a positive effect on teachers and professors becoming more professional, in developing a sense of camaraderie while making changes in what students are asked to accomplish. More importantly, pedagogy was examined by all participants.

Conclusions from Research Question #3

As a result of collaboration between the school and university faculties during the first three years of the pilot PDA, what changes occurred at the school and university? There was a growing sense of professionalism, an increase in a feeling of camaraderie between teachers and teachers as well as teachers and professors; a modification of course syllabi; and teachers' attitudinal changes about what they had to share. Teachers found themselves reflecting on their pedagogy.

Conclusion 1

Teachers and professors were better able to meld the theory into practice, as Winitzky, et al. (1992) suggested when they urged schools and universities to work together to develop compatible views of “practical theory of pedagogy” (p. 6).

Evidence

Interns, for example, were introduced to Howard Gardner's theory of the seven intelligences during one of their Friday Seminars. Teachers used Howard Gardner's theory in classroom lessons which enabled interns to see the theory put into practice. One of the professors, who would have taught the theory during her course, learned the interns had attended the seminar sessions on Gardner's theory. The professor worked with the PDA Coordinator, who taught the seminar. As a result, the professor was able to compress the large block of university class time on the seven intelligences into a smaller block of time. Therefore, the professor reviewed the theory instead and used class time to move on to other aspects of the topic. As expectations were understood, the teachers were able to support the professors when they helped interns develop lesson plans integrating the theory into practice. This was one example of how teachers began to model in the classroom concurrently what the professors were teaching in the university class.

Conclusion 2

At the school and university, effects from the collaboration were evident, in that, teachers and professors were accomplishing more than if each worked independently. Thompson
interviewed by Kennedy (1990), maintained that the concept of collaboration between a university's experience and the school's practical knowledge resulted in "powerful new educational approaches that neither one could produce alone" (p. 11).

Evidence

Professors listened to teachers and learned from them. Some of the professors began working with teachers to find different ways to implement revisions in their teaching style and syllabi. Some of these revisions were used on campus courses. One professor felt the dialogue in the PDA classes were enriched because of the experiences interns had in the PDA over the course of the year. The professor encouraged the campus education students to substitute in schools to gain experiences that they could relate to educational theory. Teachers began to dialogue with professors and as a result teachers began to think of their practice in new ways. Teachers adopted some of the professors' suggestions into the classrooms. Teachers serving on the math textbook adoption committee sought guidance from a professor and invited her to attend their working sessions. When asked about the future of the PDA and the relationship between professors and teachers, both groups would like to find ways to continue the dialogue and to perhaps teach on each others' turf.

The PDA as Applied to Other Models of Collaboration

The concept for the PDA was introduced to the school faculty in the 1993-1994 school year, with Joel Barker's video “The Paradigm Pioneers.” Barker stated that pioneers charted the unknown territory and then told the settlers it was safe to follow. The participants in the PDA saw themselves as pioneers. On the walls, in the PDA room at the school, was the phrase, "PDA That Pioneering Spirit". Professors, teachers, interns, the school system and university viewed the PDA as a pioneering effort. During the first three pilot years of the PDA, there were evidences of this pioneering spirit. As T1 stated, “we were determined that we were going to make this work" (T1, I, p. 105, L 3). There was an acceptance of additional responsibilities as roles were carved out and refined, university syllabi and the school's program of studies were examined and changed to accommodate the needs of both institutions, and collaboration occurred between the teachers and professors. The desire to work collaboratively was enhanced by the teachers' and professors'
investment in making the PDA work. Teachers formed a PDA Committee. When professors saw a need they worked to meet that need. Both faculties found opportunities for leadership and input and grew as professionals, as they carved out the PDA.

Another way to look at the dynamic of what occurred between these two faculties was to compare the events of the phenomenon with a view of the stages in collaboration described by Kagan (1991). They were: (1) formation, (2) conceptualization, (3) development, (4) implementation, (5) evaluation, and (6) termination/reformation.

**Formation** was the stage when people were aware of a problem and of a need for communication to occur. Kagan (1991) stated that in this stage members of the groups were selected, they became acquainted, and then dialogue began between the groups.

Although a partnership, the faculties of the school and university were each a group. To become acquainted with each other, the two groups met briefly during July. Both groups found they had a desire to communicate and to know each other professionally and personally. The short time allocated for their brief meeting was not enough time for the professors and some of the teachers to meet. As A2 explained earlier it was the intention of the administration that the purpose for this July meeting was for both groups to become acquainted and not as a time to begin a formal dialogue. Brief periods of dialogue occurred when a professor would go to the school site. However, for the first part of the 1994-1995 school year, there was very little interaction between the faculties. This first step accomplished what the Holmes Group (1986) saw as creating a learning community by bringing together teachers, administrators and university faculty into partnerships to improve teaching and learning for all school and university students.

As shown earlier in this chapter, some teachers focused only on what was happening in their classrooms and noted a need to communicate with the professors. Other teachers began to see problems arise and went to the PDA Coordinator and shared concerns. They relied on the Coordinator to work with the university Education Program Director to solve those concerns. Professors gave teachers their course syllabi, but the teachers were unsure how to make it connect with what was happening in the classroom. Teachers were concerned about the intern's university work load and the relevancy of the assignments as applied to their classrooms. Finally, teachers
wanted to open dialogue to look at the concerns of having more coordination of the curricula and establishing a clear understanding of the expectations from the professors. For these reasons, the teachers saw a need for dialogue to begin. In the early months of the first year, teachers decided to form a group, called the PDA Committee, to help solve their concerns.

Professors felt welcome in the classrooms but were hesitant to take time from the teachers at the end of the teachers’ day. Professors knew that together they were charting new ground and it would result in a change in the way classes were taught and that the syllabi would need modifications. All of the professors believed they were carving new territory and knew they and the teachers were “in this together” and therefore, professors were eager for a dialogue to begin. By second semester of the first year of the PDA, formation occurred as both faculties were ready to meet, to begin a dialogue, and to communicate their awareness of problems that were arising.

The mission and objectives were defined by the group in Kagan's conceptualization stage. It was here the groups expectations for collaboration were expressed and members were actively involved.

The mission as described by T1 was, “We were going to put the best interns out there to be hired. So I think that was our main goal. We wanted--both of us wanted the interns to be really successful” (T1, I, p. 105, L 4). Rushcamp & Roehler (1992) stated that the “nature, direction, and pace of change needs to evolve from school and community participants” (p. 21). Another of the characteristics described by Rushcamp & Roehler (1992) was, “The school community needs to acknowledge and embrace curriculum and instructional complexities” (p. 25). In the case of the PDA, the teachers and professors, as the community, understood that there needed to be a change in the way instruction at both the school and university must be delivered to accommodate the needs of the elementary students and the interns. T1 summed up the need to embrace the complexities nicely when she described how she gained a clear understanding of “exactly what expectations were within the county system and the classroom and what the expectations were for the interns within their courses that they were taking . . . ” (T1, I, p. 97, L 9).

As the dialogue continued, teachers and professors were able to conceptualize the mission of the PDA: to educate the future generations of teachers, to improve instruction in the classroom,
to reduce the class ratio of teacher to student, and to provide opportunities for teachers to grow in their professional development. As a result, each faculty could conceptualize and articulate their needs and expectations for collaboration and sought opportunities to participate in the process.

In the developmental stage, Kagan (1991) said there was a movement from the mission and objectives of the collaboration, a movement from the philosophy to practice. Here a program was revised and expanded to meet the newly established goals. In that stage the faculties began to address issues and to resolve the conflicts.

Plans to improve the PDA were developed and approved. As shown earlier, the PDA Committee was formed and the professors became more actively involved in the PDA. Input was gathered by using such activities as the Plus, Minus, Interesting activity. That moved the role of decision makers from the administrators to the faculties which resulted in the faculties’ investment in the process where they established their own agendas and resolved conflicts. Therefore, both the teachers and professors worked collaboratively to address the issues to meet the demands of the students they each were responsible to teach and to resolve conflicts as they arose.

Kagan's (1991) implementation stage was where the teachers and professors carried out previously made decisions. Any policy changes were put into effect. The revisions that were proposed and approved were put into practice and carried out by the school and university faculties. The plans became a reality.

Policy changes were put into effect. The university class time was compressed. P3 talked of having class time shortened. I think we learned how to engage them [interns] right away . . . and then I think some regulations have been put into place where they better get there [class] on time.” (P3, I, p. 71, L 9). P1 shared, “We'll, we changed nitty-gritty stuff like the time of day that the courses would be taught. We--I think we all changed our teaching style somewhat." (P1, I, p. 11, L 3). P1 explained, "There was an administrator, and the administrator made a lot of day-to-day decisions, and we would hear when some major policy type of decision had to be made, and then the whole teacher education committee would talk about that and come to some resolution about it" (P1, I, p. 10, L 9). P1 also stated,
On campus it was more theoretical lecture with some hands-on, but with the compressed time and the fact that these students already . . . in the classroom all day long, and I just wanted to do a lot of practical stuff that would give them maybe some ideas and do much more hands-on stuff they could take right into their classroom and use (P1, I, p. 13, L 4).

A1 talked about changes as in the professors were learning to become more flexible in time lines for assignments and in working with a cohort of students instead of individual students.

Students don't typically move through in a cohort, and so there isn't that need to coordinate time lines and assignments, but when you have a group of sixteen students who are all taking the same classes together, and nobody else is in it so it's a controlled group, and have demands on them from the school side in terms of their responsibilities in the classroom, I think it's helped the professors to--many of them to become more flexible. Which I think is a good thing (A1, I, p. 190, L 7).

I've seen university professors learn to modify assignments to make them more reality-based. Which we try very hard to keep that theory and practice melding together. I've seen the program change, and this is just part of the thrust in Virginia, but it's also helped because they were working in the schools, working in terms of the methods classes, working more with programs of studies and by extension the standards of learning. Which has been very helpful, because it helps ground that theory into practice (A1, I, p. 189, L 14).

P3 discussed her perceptions of changes made in the Department of Education, at the university, as follows:

I think of course it changed the Department of Education because we had this outreach, we had this connection with the schools which was very beneficial because you felt like you--all of us all want to get out in the field to see what's going on" (P3, I, p. 58, L 11).

Administratively, A1 talked about assignment of professors. She said,
What we did was the university professors who were assigned to supervise PDA interns were, with the exception of the Dean, assigned to teach in the PDA, and so they had the benefit of having had the students in their classes that they were supervising on site as a student teacher (A1, I, p. 178, L21).

The PDA changed the way interns were assigned. A1 explained,

And when you have a regular student teacher, they're only in the building for 10 to 12 weeks. These students were in the building for the full year, so you have the advantage of being in classrooms with them several times throughout the whole school year (A1, I, p. 179, L 18).

Teachers and professors had some difficulty in the implementation stage of collaboration. T1 explained the feelings teachers held at first because they felt their ideas were not taken or implemented, “So I think some of the teachers may have been a little frustrated with, you know, just not seeing some things implemented that we would like to have seen right away” (T1, I, p. 98, L 12). It was only after the second year of the pilot that they began to see the impact of their ideas. Some of the professors were also frustrated that they we having to make all the changes. P1 shared,

I think we all felt that the interactions were good except for one [professor] . . . who felt that for certain reasons that the faculty of the school had the upper hand and that we were being asked to make all the concessions. I mean, I did not feel that way, and I never heard anyone else say that, either (P1, I, p. 8, L 10).

However, as the dialogues continued, the work of collaboration to meet each others' goals began. Professors and teachers took over the mission of the PDA. Teachers and professors began to feel comfortable working together and a sense of “camaraderie” developed. In T3's words, “So I really think there was a lot of camaraderie that got developed not only just for the teachers . . . I can go and talk to them [professors] about it [problems] now (T3, I, p. 130, L 3). Barth (1980) said that was when “the school and its inhabitants are alive” (p. 147).

The development of teachers and professors as described by the Holmes Group's (1986) vision was accomplished in the mutual deliberation, shared teaching in the university and schools,
and cooperative supervision of prospective teachers and administrators. Teachers and professors began the deliberations through an activity which gave them an opportunity to discover their mutual feelings about the PDA. Teachers and professors started, on a small scale, to invite each other into their classrooms. T1 shared, “In fact, we were even invited to come in and sit in on some of the lessons that were being taught by the professors to the interns, and that was--that was a nice experience” (T1, I, p. 99, L 16).

**Evaluation** was Kagan's fifth stage of collaboration. It answered the question of whether the expected goals were achieved.

A1 discussed assessing the PDA this way:

> The course work is formally assessed; the same university process goes on in every class, no matter where the location happens to be. And we have assessed student feelings and just went through, again, the exit conferences where the students talk about their experiences, and we do PMI's and we do all kinds of things getting feedback from the various constituencies, the teachers, the students (A1, I, p. 191, L 24).

While formal quantitative research studies to evaluate the PDA during the first three pilot years did not take place, there was a consensus among the interviewees that the PDA was the way to go in teacher education and in providing time for staff development. Ruscoe, et al. (1989) cautioned that the “fragile partnership,” which because of the “delicate nature and maintenance of collaboration,” could be destroyed (p. 18). P1 was disappointed that there was an agreement among the university and the school system not to conduct research during the pilot years. Other interviewees did not mention a desire to conduct research during the pilot years other than the evaluative work they completed during their working sessions. The university devised a self-assessment for student teachers. A1 explained,

> We administered it [self-assessment] to those students in our regular program and those students who were in the PDA and in both cases both groups took the assessment after they had finished student teaching. And it assesses their own teaching practices, their perceptions of themselves as a teacher. And what we found
was that the PDA--and we did all kinds of cross-referencing, but when you factor out the PDA students from those who had gone through the regular program, only looking at the NCATE endorsement group, was that the PDA group rated themselves as being more competent, more confident, and exemplifying as using best practices at a higher rate (A1, I, p.181, L 1).

Darling-Hammond (1989) saw a purpose for this type of research and Nystrand (1991) wanted the participants to “accept the responsibility of communicating the results of their efforts and being accountable for them” (p. 17). Perhaps further study should consider the impact of program evaluation on other PDAs and PDSs at different stages of development and the effect the evaluation had on the collaborative process between faculties.

The sixth category of collaboration as defined by Kagan (1991) was termination/reformation. This final stage was a time to reevaluate what had occurred and to decide if the collaboration was positive or negative. After the evaluation, the process ended and the existing structure was replaced or the process began again thorough the cycle.

Upon reflection, the teachers and administrators spoke about their perceptions of the collaboration at the end of the three years. Each teacher or professor interviewed was asked, “What directions do you think that the joint faculties working together could take in the future?” Administrators were asked, “In what ways do you see collaboration between the school and university continuing?” (see Case Study Questions) Everyone shared their aspirations for the continuation of the collaboration. T1 stressed the importance of beginning the 1998-1999 school year with a time to once more become acquainted with each other. She explained that there were new teachers on the staff, new professors involved in the PDA, a new university administrator for the PDA, and with the retirement of the Principal, a new administrator was appointed to the school site. Because of all the new participants, it was important from T1's perspective to spend time getting to know each other.

I think it would be nice just to get to know some of the new professors . . . [there are] some classes that the interns are taking that I don't think match up with what
we do in the classroom . . . I think it would be nice if we could readdress that (T1, I, p. 104, L 10).

P3 reflected on what she would like to see occur in the future:
I mean way out there somewhere ultimate. It would almost be teaching together. It would be nice to be able to work together on these things. Not just our coming in and teaching a lesson in their classroom or their coming in and doing something in our classes, but to be able to work on projects together. I think that would be wonderful. I don’t know whether it can be done or not, but . . . so that we are working completely together (P3, I, p. 67, L 2).

T2 wanted to have the teachers attend more of the professors' classes to “enrich our staff”. . . and then that would be really nice for the interns to see their cooperating teachers rejuvenating themselves in that area (T2, I, p. 122, L 21). T3 replied, “. . . it would be great if more observations can be done on both sides . . . team teaching would be wonderful” (T3, I, p. 147, L 13). T4 wanted the professors to come into the classrooms at times other than when they are doing formal evaluations of the interns. Professors should “come in and interrelate to the kids” (T4, I, p. 164, L 13). T2 wanted collaboration “enhanced through distance learning” (T2, I, p. 122, L 13).

P1 wanted to see the research piece added and “the university faculty maybe going in and doing some actual work with the children of the school, so that the teachers and the faculty could work together” (P1, I, p. 15, L 4). P2 was thinking of ways to introduce research to the teachers in a non-threatening manner where the teacher was “more open to trying new things” (P2, I, p. 40, L 22). P3 had conflicting feelings about the interns going to other schools to substitute on occasion. She saw the value of the experience but she also experienced the professors’ frustrations when the interns arrived late for the university class. She wanted to spend time thinking about this conflict. P4 wanted to have more opportunities to teach a lesson or to model in the classroom.

A1’s vision of the direction the collaboration was taking,
I can see with the comfort level now in terms of communicating, conversation--between the two groups. I can see the university faculty becom[ing] more involved in staff development and providing more resources to teachers. Because the
comfort level is there. . . . I can see the university professors reaching out to classroom teachers and involv[ing] them more as clinical faculty to pull the classroom teachers into the more formal instruction parts of the program for the interns. And I think it is highly desirable, and I think it had to evolve naturally rather than right from the beginning, and I see that process happening. (A1, I, p. 188, L 8).

No one during the interviews indicated that the collaboration should be discontinued. Teachers and professors were beginning to think about the next dialogue and to find ways to extend the collaboration beyond each one's classroom. This clearly indicated the desire to enter the reformation stage and not to terminate the collaboration.

**Documents and Artifacts Summarized**

**July, 1994 Reflections.** An analysis of the documentation collected from teachers, who were asked to reflect on the “Workshop for the Professional Development Academy Staff on July 12-14, 1994,” indicated the interest to know the interns was the primary concern for the teachers in July. The administration wanted teachers to respond after reflecting upon and assessing their own professional needs. Teachers were asked to respond to the same eight questions for each of the three days. Responses concerning the university faculty for the following questions follow.

**Question.** What do you wish you had more time to learn/do? **Responses.** The teachers wanted more information from both the university and school regarding expectations and teachers wanted to “flesh out” the objectives for the PDA, particularly a job description for the interns and their partner teachers.

**Question.** What information/topic would you like to know more about? **Responses.** The teachers wanted more information on the responsibilities of the teacher for the interns, on the responsibilities (in terms of paper work) of the teacher working with the intern, on the responsibilities of interns and teachers, and on topics related to collaboration and defining the mission.
The professors' comments during the interviews indicated a desire to get to know the school faculty better. The teachers reported that what was important to them was to understand the professors professionally and to learn the teachers' role as cooperating teacher. Teachers were overcoming the anxiety of getting to know the interns who would be in their classroom for a whole semester. Examination of the agendas clearly showed the emphasis was on teachers' staff development and opportunities to work with the interns.

June 1995 Reflections Sheets. Teachers, in June 1995, were asked to individually complete this sentence, “REFLECTION: Because of the Professional Development Academy, I . . .” as an activity at the end of the first pilot year. Each classroom teacher responded. Of the sixteen teachers who had interns, only two made any reference to the university. Those comments were:

1. need more guidance on how to be a cooperating teacher (first grade teacher)
2. exposure we had meeting with and talking to . . . faculty was meaningful and productive to maintain consistency in perspectives (fourth grade teacher)

All other comments focused on the local school, teachers, students and interns.

Plus, Minus, Interesting (PMI) Reflection Sheets. A PMI reflection sheet, was given to teachers in June 1995 and November 1996. The June 1995 PMI was collected from all classroom teachers with only one comment relating to the university or professors. A teacher wrote, “I liked interacting with university staff.” This indicated that teachers' responses were narrowly focused on the school rather than school and university. The November reflection sheet asked teachers to respond to questions that had to do with logistics and not with interactions with the professors. Again the focus was narrowly centered on activities at the school. During her interview, a teacher showed me her PMI for 1997-1998 school year. This indicated that the information continues to be gathered using the PMI strategy.

Video Tapes. The PDA and training session activities were video taped during the first pilot year. Most of the videos were of training sessions. One video was a taped broadcast on the PDA featuring the Dean of the university, the Principal and the Coordinator of the school. The
presentation centered on the Academy's program. There was no mention of professors and teachers working together.

Memorandum on January 29, 1996 on integrations of university course work with classroom practice. From this PMI, the faculties worked separately to answer the questions first, the information was collated and used during their meeting on February 29. The purpose of this activity was, "to gain clear insight regarding the impact of each of the areas listed, the value of each, and additional suggestions that could further develop the collaborative aspect of the PDA."

Memorandum on September 12, 1996 concerned the intern's evaluation schedule. For 1996-1997, teachers and professors were both evaluating the interns. However, deadlines were separate for teachers and for professors. There was no indication that they worked together to evaluate interns.

Memorandum on November 7, 1996 concerned clarifying teachers' role. This memo was in response to questions raised concerning student teaching. There was no mention of professors or the university working with the teachers in this memo.

Recommendations for Further Research

Recommendations for further research are offered as outgrowths from the analysis of collaboration between school and university faculties who are partners in a Professional Development Academy (PDA).

1. Conduct a follow-up study of the collaboration after the 1998-1999 school year to determine what happened to the collaboration when a staff change took place in the school, university administration and in instructional staffs. Determine if the change in personnel enabled the collaboration to be strong enough to re-enter Kagan's second stage, conceptualization, or if the collaboration would return to the formation stage.

2. Conduct a controlled study of preservice education students with one sample group who had a six- to twelve- week student teaching block and the complete university syllabus taught with a sample groups of preservice education students who had a full year's internship and where the university syllabus was compressed. Teacher's effectiveness in the classroom during the first year of teaching could also be compared.
3. Explore the dynamics between other elementary school faculties and university faculties to show commonalities and differences, to find evidence of the faculties team teaching, to look for the objectives specific to the collaboration, and to discover ways the faculties found to accomplish goals where little interaction between the faculties occur.

4. Compare the effects of school and university faculties who began working immediately together and with a mission clearly defined with a school and a university who began working six months to a year prior to the interns/student teachers entering the picture and where the faculties created the mission.

5. Study and develop a process where teachers and professors are able to break down barriers and begin working collaboratively in a shorter period of time. Time to meet is problematic. Find ways other collaborations solved this issue and how those solutions could be applied to others who are thinking of working together.

Reflections

The attempt was made by the researcher, as Merriam (1998) described, to have a tolerance for ambiguity, sensitivity, empathy for the interviewee participant, and good listening skills. Each interviewee was assured that perceptions both positive and negative would be reported. The trust level between the researcher and the participants was high because of the connection to the PDA and the interviewees were willing to share their perceptions during the interviews. It was hoped that this study accurately reported all the perceptions the participants wished to express in response to the broad questions. Having time and distance from the PDA gave the researcher the opportunity to look at this phenomena from the eyes of the interviewees and the multiple sources of evidence from three major sources: teachers, professors and administrators.

Having distance from the beginning pilot years as well as physical distance from the PDA, the researcher was amazed at the energy and passion each group had to make the PDA a positive reality. It was through these interviews that the magnitude of the “pioneering spirit" was revealed. Both the teachers and professors were committed and were willing to spend whatever time was necessary to understand each other. The administrators were facilitators but the desire to work
together to resolve curricular issues came from the teachers and professors. If the PDA was successful in providing opportunities for teachers and professors to grow professionally and for interns to develop into quality teachers for our classrooms, then it was due to the hard work of the teachers and professors whose commitment went beyond the scope of their positions. As P2 stated,

> based on what we've seen in terms of the success of the interns versus the students on main campus, we realize now that the PDA model is a much better model, and for the most part we're able to produce teachers who are more competent, who are more confident, who come out as leaders in their schools (I, p. 36, L 16).

If the implementation of a PDA were to come from the top down, a PDA concept could be developed, but more time would be needed to get the PDA implemented. What occurred with this PDA was the recognition that the teachers and professors were pulling together and that each group bought into the PDA concept and were willing to work toward it being successful.

Being a pioneer was worth the risk. As Joel Barker stated in “The Paradigm Pioneers,” it was the pioneers that went out into the unknown and made the way safe for the settlers. The teachers and professors of this PDA took the risk and showed the “settlers” that it was possible for collaboration to occur between these two faculties with positive results. Not only collaboration occurred but each gained new insights into the job each professional group needed to accomplish. They found a new respect each other. For those that follow, this was a model of what happened when teachers and professors are dedicated toward the same goal and worked in a positive manner to achieve that goal.

What could have been done differently? There was an intense desire of the professors to “know” the teachers. Perhaps in the future, when a PDA is being developed, there should be more time for both groups to meet before the interns are added to the equation. However, would that have slowed the process of working together to solve issues as quickly as had happened with this PDA?

This collaboration between elementary and university faculties could work with another elementary school and a university in partnership, especially when the need and desire comes from
the “grass roots” or the participants, rather than coming from “top down” or administration. Administrators are an important component, but they need to be in the role of facilitator. By giving the teachers and professors time to work together, and by getting out of their way to work out their differences, collaboration may occur.

Elementary teachers usually do not work in as isolated a situation as high school teachers who maintain contact within their department. Elementary teachers are accustomed to working on grade level teams with a variety of specialists on a daily basis. Thus there may be less emphasis on “turf” issues than one would find in a high school setting which is more departmentalized. This would be an area for further study.

One of the professors who was a proponent of this PDA is now in the process of beginning a PDA in a high school. Insight and a comparison of the two different groups by the same professor would be of value to others who would want to begin a PDA.

It would appear that the glue which held the collaboration together was the sense by everyone involved that the PDA was a joint effort. Where teachers and professors were willing to work together to understand each other from the other persons’ perspective, collaboration began to form. When working together and being willing to change one’s beliefs and structures, teachers and professors moved from theory to practice and implemented a PDA.
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