

Documenting Development: Studying a Statewide School/University Partnership

Jaci Webb-Dempsey, Van Dempsey & Rosalyn Templeton

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association 2008 Annual Meeting

Purposes

School/university partnerships built on principles of “simultaneous renewal” (Goodlad, 1991) embody a commitment to democratic and participatory decision-making. These are cornerstones of civic responsibility. These partnerships and their networks of Professional Development Schools (PDSs) have the potential to increase the capacity of schools and universities to create collaborative structures and relationships that support the continuous renewal of school communities, teaching practices, and teacher preparation. However, school/university partnerships face considerable challenges as they work to establish common and mutually beneficial goals, share resources, and institutionalize new roles and relationships. Developing, sustaining, and institutionalizing school/university partnerships is also a balancing act between the need for common goals and recognition of the idiosyncratic structural and cultural contexts of collaboration. Adding to the complexity of the macro-context for development and institutionalization, stakeholders from all sectors of public education are demanding and mandating increased accountability. These challenges and complexities can leave partnerships vulnerable. Collaborating to create new structures and cultures across traditional institutional barriers can position partnerships to realize their capacity-building potential and fulfill their civic responsibility to engage in ongoing simultaneous renewal.

This paper describes and shares the results of a research and documentation initiative designed and implemented to reflect principles of simultaneous renewal while serving multiple purposes. This study was commissioned to: 1) create a structure for informing key stakeholders on the progress and impact of a statewide coalition of school/university partnerships, 2) build a

coherent longitudinal strategy for research and documentation of partnership efforts, and 3) provide an evidentiary base of the impact of partnership work from a developmental perspective, framed by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) PDS Standards. What follows is: 1) an overview of the development of a statewide partnership among ten participating public school/university partnerships and state stakeholders, 2) a description of the design of the research commissioned by stakeholders to document the progress of the participating individual partnerships toward a common set of standards, 3) selected results of the cross-case analysis of four partnership case studies and an online survey administered to PDS and university faculty and administrators in the ten partnerships, and 4) a discussion of the implications of the statewide partnership and the research results for educational policy and practices related to developing, sustaining, and documenting school/university partnerships and PDSs.

Context for the Research and Documentation Initiative

West Virginia Partnerships for Teacher Quality (WVPTQ), is a statewide coalition of school/university partnerships and key state-level stakeholders formed in 2001 to promote common goals of sustaining and institutionalizing partnership work through the development of supportive structures, funding, and policy. WVPTQ spans the difficult geographic, economic, and political landscapes of one state to connect the work of ten diverse public school/university partnerships. The ten partnerships include the historically African American land grant campus, the flagship land grant university, and branch regional colleges and universities. There is also diversity in teacher preparation programs; including a variety of traditional configurations and a five-year integrated Bachelor's and Master's degree program.

WVPTQ has had to negotiate the challenges presented by this diversity and those unique to an emerging interdependent coalition. Just as individual school/university partnerships work to

create structures and cultures that bridge the diverse organizational cultures of universities and public schools, WVPTQ connects the diverse cultures and, sometimes, competing interests of the individual partnerships and state stakeholders. As the leveraging and distribution point for legislative funding to support partnership work, WVPTQ has a particular civic responsibility to improve the educational landscape. As school-university partnership participants and state stakeholders began working collectively to define the statewide partnership agenda and grapple with issues related to resource allocation, they also adopted a common conceptual framework. The purpose of this framework is to create a shared agenda to protect and promote the work of the participating partnerships while also supporting the systematic documentation of progress to inform policy around resource development and allocation. However, each partnership has developed in response to its unique context and there is a natural tension between those idiosyncrasies and the adoption of a common framework.

Stakeholder demands for accountability led to the adoption in 2004 of the PDS Standards as a framework for assessing the progress of participating partnerships. These standards, developed "to identify the distinguishing characteristics of PDSs, and to support the development of quality PDSs" (Levine, 1998, p. 8), were perceived as broad enough to encompass the historical development of the WVPTQ partnerships. Stakeholders worked with WVPTQ advisory board members to select a core set of indicators related to each standard that would be used to measure and report progress toward PDS and partnership development. The PDS Standards became the framework for funding proposals and for annual reporting. In 2005/06, the statewide partnership began participating in the national pilot of the PDS Standards online assessment project, funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). Subsequently, in 2006, stakeholders commissioned a study to begin to document and describe the development and the impact of the partnership agenda. There was agreement in the coalition

that any assessment initiative be data driven, developmental, and focused on the unique nature of PDS work. The research team was identified from across the WVPTQ partnerships and coordinated by two researchers, one from each of the two research universities. This team designed the study to conduct in-depth qualitative case studies of a sample of four individual WVPTQ partnerships and to develop an online survey instrument to use with PDS and university faculty and administrators. The four case study sites were selected by stakeholders to represent the range of the most well-developed partnerships.

Perspectives

The design and implementation of the research required a careful balance between shared standards and flexibility, attending to the politics and possibilities of collaboration, negotiating tensions associated with accountability, and respecting the contextual nature of partnership work. The selection of both the case study approach and the sample of four partnerships supported a developmental focus on the assessment of progress, rather than a high stakes summative evaluation of results, and allowed for context-specific challenges and complexities to be taken into account. This is consistent with a growing, relatively recent body of recommendations for conducting research on partnerships. For example, Callahan and Martin (2007) propose a typology of school-university partnerships as “organizational learning systems,” rather than “un-dimensional projects” (p. 137). They argue that the structure of a partnership should be taken into consideration when evaluating partnerships, and that partnerships should be evaluated as learning systems. Webb-Dempsey, Dempsey, Steel and Shambaugh (2007) articulate a set of principles to inform research on partnerships. They propose that such research should not only reflect principles of simultaneous renewal, but also include the explicit purpose of building the capacity of partnerships. These authors also suggest that research on partnerships should be grounded in the contexts of the central activities of renewal and teacher preparation, as

“acknowledging contexts increases the ability of the research to speak to both participants and to larger audiences” (p. 43). Finally, research on school/university partnerships should recognize the need for mutual benefits that is inherent in interdependent alliances. Lefever-Davis, Johnson and Pearman (2007) explain that in school/university partnerships, “although interrelated, partners exist in distinctive milieus in which roles and expectations differ... mutually beneficial goals, valuing each party’s unique contributions, and receipt of benefits based on involvement are critical for the egalitarianism that is realized between the partners.” (p. 205)

Research Design

The purposes of the WVPTQ research and documentation study were to:

- Support local partnerships in providing documentation of impact of the partnership work at the local level;
- Create a structure for providing reports to the key stakeholders on the progress and impact of *WVPTQ* statewide;
- Build a long-term strategy for research and documentation of partnership efforts to provide coherency and consistency in how to inform the work within and across partnerships;
- Provide an evidentiary base of the impact of the partnership work to compliment the self-analysis process that undergirds the PDS standards framework.

The study was conducted by a team of ten researchers from five of the ten participating partnerships, and included: 1) the development of case studies of four of the partnerships, and 2) an online survey framed around the PDS standards/indicators the coalition had targeted. Four partnerships were selected with input from key stakeholders. These partnerships included: (1) the oldest and largest partnership at the state flagship institution delivering a five-year teacher

education program, (2) a small, well-established partnership with a history of innovation at a small liberal arts college, (3) a small, relatively new partnership on an historically black campus that includes PDSs serving some of the most diverse P-12 student populations in the state, and (4) a mid-sized partnership at a branch campus of the flagship university. Case study site visits included semi-structured, open-ended interviews with PDS and university faculty and administrators, and teacher candidates, combined with visits to PDSs associated with each of the four partnerships. Interview questions were developed for each of the targeted core standards (see Appendix A), and then were organized around the developmental categories in order to increase the coherence of the protocols (see Appendix B). Interview protocols were customized for each of the role groups to be interviewed (see Appendices C, D, E). Interviews were conducted with 126 PDS and university faculty and administrators, and teacher candidates. Researchers did not participate in site visits or interviews at their own institutions. Interview data were analyzed to develop the case for each partnership and then a cross-case comparison was conducted to generate preliminary results across the cases (summarized below).

The online survey was hosted on a university server using Simple Forms® software. The instrument included Likert-scale items developed around the same framework as the interview protocol to support a mixed method analysis. The link to the survey was distributed to PDS and university faculty and administrators in each of the ten WVPTQ partnerships. Survey results were generated for each of the 10 partnerships and a factor analysis was conducted to establish the properties of the instrument. A factor analysis was conducted on the WVPTQ survey data to determine which survey items clustered together. Based on the results of the factor analysis, the items that were found to load on the same factor were subjected to a reliability analysis. Cronbach's Alpha values were calculated for each group of items. These values were deemed adequate if they met or exceeded $\alpha = .60$ or greater (Nunnally, 1975). Each aspect of the

framework (Teacher Preparation, Continuing Professional Development, Research and Inquiry, Student Achievement, and General Impact of the Partnership) was found to constitute a factor and each group of items met the adequacy requirement.

Results

Four cases were built from analyses of data from the site visits, interviews, and surveys. Each of the cases yielded context-specific, idiosyncratic results; the results presented here are the general emergent findings from cross-case analyses and are organized around the study framework. This aggregate reporting strategy was purposefully employed when generating reports and giving presentations from this pilot study within the WVPTQ network and for key stakeholders. While there was an expectation that the pilot study would inform funding decisions, there was also an acknowledgement that this phase of the research was primarily focused on establishing a system for documenting developmental progress.

Teacher Preparation

- In all cases, across all role groups the partnership is seen as supporting extended and *high quality clinical placements* for candidates and greater access to and coordination of clinical placements that are closely aligned with coursework.
- The assessment of candidate performance in partnerships is *framed around standards*. While the standards varied, from locally developed “characteristics of successful novice teachers” to the nationally developed INTASC Principles, both the standards and the process for assessment are well-understood by partners and candidates on each campus.
- Across the sites, candidates believe they are well-prepared and cite their clinical placements in PDSs as a critical factor in the quality of their preparation. Factors that contribute to the positive effects of PDS placements include regular and substantive communication between public school and university faculty, alignment of coursework and

clinical experiences, and a focused, shared professional development agenda that involves PDS and university faculty, as well as teacher candidates.

- Across the sites, candidates articulate an understanding of socio-economic status as the most predominant feature of diversity in their PDSs and believe their preparation focuses on *meeting the needs of low-income, at-risk students*. To some degree, candidates on each campus expressed some concern about being prepared to meet the needs of students with special needs or racially diverse student populations, given the nature of their coursework and the contexts of their clinical placements.

Professional Development

- Support for *site-based professional development* is a critical factor in the renewal of PDS faculty and teacher education. Partnerships engage in professional development to meet site-based needs of faculty and students. Making decisions about the professional development agenda in their schools has the added benefit of building commitment to partnership work and to the improvement of teacher preparation and *student achievement*. Where university faculty participate in site-based professional development, there are also positive effects on the teacher education curriculum.
- *WVPTQ* funds help leverage additional grant funds, and can be pooled across schools/counties to enhance professional development opportunities. The statewide nature of the network and the political patronage of state stakeholders makes it easier to work across traditional institutional lines to share resources and engage in joint action.
- Mature sites are ready and willing to *disseminate successful practices* and are a valuable source of “*field-tested*” *knowledge about best teaching practices*. PDSs engage in

dissemination within their partnerships and PDSs and universities share with one another across partnerships.

Research and Inquiry

- Action research is emerging as a valuable form of inquiry for faculty and candidates across the sites. Action research on the effects of professional development increases the power of the professional development and *enhances the implementation of school improvement efforts*.
- Research on the effects of particular teaching strategies or curriculum innovations is occurring across the sites; often as a strategy for evaluating funded initiatives. Research on the effects of PDS and different models of teacher preparation is more likely to occur in partnerships where evaluation of scholarly productivity is a strong component of the promotion and tenure process coupled with discretionary funding and doctoral programs. In both cases, *PDS faculty are valuable members of research teams* and there is a commitment to engaging in *research as a capacity-building activity*.

Student Achievement

- Action research is seen as an effective vehicle for encouraging preservice teachers to make *data-based decisions about student achievement*.
- Course assignments linked to clinical placements are more likely to include an analysis of *the impact of teaching on student achievement*.
- Candidates are more involved in the *assessment of student achievement* data because they are seen as being members of the PDS community and as resources for addressing student needs. Candidates are providing valuable one-on-one tutoring and remediation for

struggling students and are *focusing on the needs of low-performing students in action research projects and instructional design and delivery.*

Partnership Structures/Governance

- The partnership work encourages *collaborative decision making*. This leads to increased investment in teacher preparation, professional development, and school renewal.
- Each partnership is organized differently; however, there are key roles and responsibilities that support the development of these learning communities. These roles include a partnership director, people to bridge the cultural and communication gaps between schools and higher education, and a well-understood, *participatory, and representative governance structure.*

Conclusions

The general findings speak to core activities that support the development of effective school/university partnerships but there are also lessons to be learned from this initiative related to research and documentation efforts. For example, partnerships were able to use their survey results in their annual reporting related to their use of the legislative funding and to support their participation in the FIPSE project. The survey will be administered on an annual basis and results will be disaggregated at the PDS and institutional levels to enhance usability for reporting and for archiving and tracking progress via the FIPSE online system. However, the most important lesson came from the most intensive strategy. While building case studies as part of an ongoing, longitudinal research and documentation initiative requires sustained resources, including funding, expertise, and time, the investment is well-worth these expenditures. Research team members found the case study site visits to be a valuable form of professional development; learning both about conducting this kind of research and about the ways each partnership was developing capacity around the standards. This “cross-pollination”

led to a recommendation that in the future, WVPTQ should invest in a collaborative exchange model for both conducting research and documentation and as a form of professional development. This model would extend the benefits of simultaneous renewal efforts being supported in each partnership across the statewide network and would create a renewable strategy for collecting and analyzing documentation data.

References

- Callahan & Martin (2007). The spectrum of school-university partnerships: A typology of organizational learning systems. *Teaching and Teacher Education*,
- Goodlad, J.L. (1991). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lefever-Davis, S., Johnson, C. & Pearman, C. (2007). Two sides of a partnership: Egalitarianism and empowerment in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100 (4), 204-210.
- Webb-Dempsey, J., Dempsey, V., Steel, S. & Shambaugh, N. (2007) Simultaneous renewal in research: Principles to consider in research on partnerships. *School-University Partnerships*, 1, 38-44.

Appendix A

FIPSE PDS STANDARDS “AT STANDARD” DESCRIPTIONS

Standard I: Learning Community - A. Teacher Preparation Developmental Guidelines

The PDS recognizes and supports the distinct learning needs of faculty/staff, teacher candidates, students, parents and community members.

<p>Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners collaboratively integrate PreK-12 instructional content priorities in the teacher education program and field-based experiences.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Syllabi, Lesson plans, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: At Standard IHE and school faculty/staff ensure teacher candidates’ active participation in school and community related projects.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Syllabi, Newsletters, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Other.</p>
<p>(1) Indicator 3: At Standard Teacher candidates observe, implement, analyze and refine standards-based teaching practices during the extensive internship.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Syllabi, Lesson plans, Reflections, Feedback/evaluation, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 4: At Standard PDS partners facilitate reflection by collaborating to provide learning experiences that integrate theoretical models with classroom practice.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Syllabi, Lesson plans, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 5: At Standard PDS partners engage in reflection with one another.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Reflections, Meeting minutes, Surveys, Memos/email, Other.</p>

Standard I: Learning Community – B. Continuing Professional Development Developmental Guidelines

The PDS recognizes and supports the distinct learning needs of faculty/staff, teacher candidates, students, parents and community members.

<p>(2)Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners collaboratively create, conduct, and participate in needs-based professional development to improve instruction and positively impact student achievement.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Surveys, In-service/graduate courses, Syllabi, Meeting minutes, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: At Standard PDS partners plan and participate in activities where all school staff is encouraged to support and interact with teacher candidates.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Orientation meetings, Handbook/expectations for mentors, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners collaboratively implement changes at the school and IHE as an outgrowth of strategic planning.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Strategic planning meetings, Meeting minutes, Surveys, Memos/e-mail, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 4: At Standard PDS partners apply research-based best practices to improve instruction.</p>	<p>List of Evidence In-service/graduate courses, Syllabi, Surveys, Memos/e-mail, other.</p>

Standard I: Learning Community – C. Research and Inquiry Development Guidelines

The PDS recognizes and supports the distinct learning needs of faculty/staff, teacher candidates, students, parents and community members.

(3) Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners collaboratively engage in inquiry and/or action research.	List of Evidence Surveys, Reflections, Meeting minutes, Research/inquiry proposals, Other.
Indicator 2: At Standard PDS partners disseminate results of research/inquiry activities.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Research/inquiry reports, Presentations, Publications, other.

Standard I: Learning Community - D. Student Achievement Developmental Guidelines

The PDS recognizes and supports the distinct learning needs of faculty/staff, teacher candidates, students, parents and community members.

Indicator 1: At Standard IHE and school faculty model the use of state/local learning outcomes and assessments in coursework and field experiences.	List of Evidence Syllabi, Unit Plans, In-service/graduate courses, Meeting Minutes, Other.
(4) Indicator 2: At Standard Teacher candidates demonstrate competency in using specified learning outcomes and assessments to plan, deliver and assess instruction.	List of Evidence Teacher candidate evaluations, Teacher candidate portfolios, Student work/assessments, Action research, Other.

Standard II: Collaboration – A. Teacher Preparation Developmental Guidelines

PDS partners work together to carry out the collaboratively defined mission of the PDS.

(5) Indicator 1: At Standard IHE and school faculty collaboratively plan and implement curricula for teacher candidates to provide authentic learning experiences.	List of Evidence Syllabi, Lesson plans, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Other.
Indicator 2: At Standard IHE and school faculty use collaboratively refined standards-based teacher candidate assessment instruments.	List of Evidence Teacher candidate assessments, Handbook, Meeting minutes, Memos/email, Other.
Indicator 3: At Standard Pre-service mentors provide verbal and/or written feedback to teacher candidates on a daily basis.	List of Evidence Teacher candidate assessments, Handbook/expectations for mentors, Written feedback, Reflections, Other.
Indicator 4: At Standard Scheduled observations and three-way conferences provide the pre-service mentor, supervisor, and teacher candidate a reference for discussion of the teacher candidate's progress.	List of Evidence Schedule of observations, Teacher candidate assessments, Handbook/expectations for supervisors, Feedback from 3-way

	conferences, Other.
Indicator 5: At Standard IHE and school representatives implement criteria for selecting accomplished teachers as pre-service mentors and a procedure for making teacher candidate/pre service mentor pairings.	List of Evidence Mentor selection criteria, Protocol for mentor selection, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Other.
Indicator 6: At Standard IHE and school faculty collaborate to develop, implement, and assess strategies to determine pre- service mentor effectiveness and refine training to meet the needs of pre-service mentor teachers.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Handbook/expectations for mentors, Mentor evaluation tools, Mentor training, Other.
(6) Indicator 7: At Standard IHE teacher education, arts and science, and school faculty collaborate in planning and implementing content based learning experiences for PDS partners.	List of Evidence Syllabi, In-service/graduate course offerings, Meeting minutes, Memos/email, Other.

Standard II: Collaboration – B. Continuing Professional Development Developmental Guidelines
PDS partners work together to carry out the collaboratively defined mission of the PDS.

Indicator 1: At Standard PDS stakeholders collaborate to develop, implement and monitor teacher education across institutions.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Handbooks, Teacher candidate assessments, Surveys, Other.
Indicator 2: At Standard IHE and school faculty engage in cross-institutional staffing (adjunct faculty, co-instructional positions, co-funded positions, etc.).	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Job descriptions, Hiring protocols, Cross-institutional positions, Other.
(7) Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners determine professional development needs, plan professional development activities to meet those needs, implement activities and assess the effectiveness of the implemented activities.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Needs assessments, In-service/workshops, Surveys/evaluations, Other.
Indicator 4: At Standard Teacher education, arts and sciences, school faculty, and teacher candidates participate in content/curriculum-based workshops to address identified needs.	List of Evidence Memos/e-mail, Meeting minutes, Syllabi, In-service/workshops, Other.
Indicator 5: At Standard PDS partners provide ongoing support for all educators, including non-tenured and provisionally certified teachers.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Needs assessments, In-service/graduate courses, Action research, Other.

Standard II: Collaboration – C. Research and Inquiry Developmental Guidelines

PDS partners work together to carry out the collaboratively defined mission of the PDS.

(8) Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners collaboratively examine the action research/inquiry process.	List of Evidence Information about action research, Meeting minutes, Syllabi, Study/inquiry groups, other.
(9) Indicator 2: At Standard PDS partners identify the research/inquiry agenda based on the data-driven needs of the PDS.	List of Evidence Surveys/needs assessment, Meeting minutes, Syllabi, Research/inquiry plan, Other.

Standard II: Collaboration – D. Student Achievement Developmental Guidelines

PDS partners work together to carry out the collaboratively defined mission of the PDS.

(10) Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners use demographic and performance data to modify instruction to improve student achievement.	List of Evidence School improvement plans, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Lesson/unit plans, Other.
Indicator 2: At Standard Representatives of PDS stakeholder groups participate on the school improvement team.	List of Evidence School improvement team, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, School improvement plan, Other.
Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners collaborate to plan and implement PreK-12 performance assessments and use outcomes to guide instructional decisions.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, In-service/workshops, Lesson/unit plans, Collaboratively planned P-12 assessments, Other.

Standard III: Accountability – A. Teacher Preparation Developmental Guidelines

The PDS accepts the responsibility of and is accountable for upholding professional standards for preparing and renewing teachers.

(11) Indicator 1: At Standard IHE and school faculty collaboratively refine and implement formative and summative standards based teacher candidate performance assessments.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Teacher candidate performance assessments, Surveys/feedback, Performance data, Other.
Indicator 2: At Standard IHE and school faculty collaboratively refine and implement rubrics for standards-based teacher candidate performance assessment.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Rubrics, Surveys/feedback, Performance data, Other.

<p>Indicator 3: At Standard Teacher candidates develop professional portfolios that demonstrate mastery of recognized professional standards.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Teacher candidate portfolios, Recognized professional standards, Performance data, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 4: At Standard IHE and school faculty collaboratively assess teacher candidate portfolios and performance using standards-based scoring tools/rubrics.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Handbook/expectations for teacher candidates, Teacher candidate performance assessments, Portfolio review protocols, Meeting minutes, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 5: At Standard PDS partners develop and implement a collaborative agreement regarding exit standards for teacher candidates.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Handbook/expectations for teacher candidates, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Program completion data, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 6: At Standard IHE and school faculty solicit and use feedback from teacher candidates to modify the teacher education program.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Surveys, Reflections, Teacher preparation improvement plans, Other.</p>

Standard III: Accountability – B. Continuing Professional Development Developmental Guidelines

The PDS accepts the responsibility of and is accountable for upholding professional standards for preparing and renewing teachers.

<p>Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners assess the collaborative professional development provided in the PDS.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Reflections/feedback, Surveys, Professional development data, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: At Standard IHE and school faculty participate in ongoing training sessions to prepare for mentoring, coaching, and supervising.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Mentor/supervisor training, In-service/graduate offerings, Meeting minutes, Action research, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: At Standard Pre-service mentors and IHE supervisors provide mutual and reciprocal feedback to one another.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Mentor/supervisor committee, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Surveys/feedback, Other.</p>
<p>(12) Indicator 4: At Standard PDS partners work together to meet one another's professional development needs.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Needs assessment, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Professional development plan, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 5: At Standard PDS partners recognize one another's accomplishments.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Certificates/letters, Recognition events, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Other.</p>

Standard III: Accountability – C. Research and Inquiry Developmental Guidelines

The PDS accepts the responsibility of and is accountable for upholding professional standards for preparing and renewing teachers.

<p>(13) Indicator 1: At Standard IHE and school faculty collaboratively develop assessments and feedback tools to be used for PDS program planning and improvement.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Partnership steering committee, Meeting minutes, Partnership assessments/feedback, Memos/e-mail, other.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: At Standard PDS partners review teacher candidate, school and IHE assessment and feedback data and modify the program to address identified needs.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Assessment and feedback data, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Program modifications, other.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners use results of research and inquiry to inform future practice within the PDS.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Study/inquiry groups, Memos/e-mail, Program modifications, other.</p>

Standard III: Accountability – D. Student Achievement Developmental Guidelines

The PDS accepts the responsibility of and is accountable for upholding professional standards for preparing and renewing teachers.

<p>Indicator 1: At Standard PDS stakeholders collaborate to identify specific ways each stakeholder will address identified school improvement plan goals.</p>	<p>List of Evidence School improvement plan, School improvement team, Meeting minutes, Memos/email, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: At Standard PDS stakeholders actively engage in implementing school improvement plans and initiatives.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Lesson/unit plans, Learning extensions (e.g. tutoring), Action research, Meeting minutes.</p>
<p>(14) Indicator 3: At Standard IHE and school faculty collaboratively analyze data on the impact of PDS on student achievement.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Student achievement data, Meeting minutes, Memos/email, Action research, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 4: At Standard Teacher candidates include PreK-12 student work and their own reflections on that work in their standards-based professional portfolios to demonstrate impact on student achievement.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Teacher candidate portfolios, Student work, Reflections, Action research, Other.</p>

Standard IV: Organization, Roles and Resources - A. Teacher Preparation Developmental Guidelines

Partner institutions allocate resources to support the continuous improvement of teaching and learning.

<p>(15) Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners communicate regarding roles, responsibilities, and operating procedures and use continuous feedback to improve the operation of the PDS.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Handbook, Organizational charts, Steering committee, Meeting minutes, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: At Standard PDS partners share resources to support the learning of PreK-12 students and PDS partners.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Shared facilities, Budgets, Grants, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners seek and assess feedback concerning PDS induction for teacher candidates and new faculty, making changes as needed.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Orientation meetings, Meeting minutes, Surveys/feedback, Memos/e-mail, Other.</p>

Standard IV: Organization, Roles and Resources - B. Continuing Professional Development Developmental Guidelines

Partner institutions allocate resources to support the continuous improvement of teaching and learning.

<p>(16) Indicator 1: At Standard IHEs recognize and reward the PDS work of IHE faculty and staff through organizational structures and incentives that fully integrate PDS work with the mission of the teacher education program.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Promotion & tenure policies, Hiring practices, Stipends/honoraria, Reduced teaching loads, other.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: At Standard PDS stakeholders institutionalize recognition and rewards for pre-service mentors.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Stipends/honoraria, Course credit/points, Awards/certificates, other.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: At Standard IHE and school faculty and administrators work collaboratively to facilitate recruitment.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Resume/interview preparation, Recruitment fairs, Job interviews, Early/open contracts, other.</p>
<p>Indicator 4: At Standard The PDS partnership employs strategies aimed at the retention of new and experienced teachers.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Handbooks, Peer coaching, Induction program, other.</p>
<p>Indicator 5: At Standard A Memorandum of Understanding signed by PDS partners delineates the organization of the PDS and the resources to be provided.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, MOU/Letter of agreement, Partner signatures, other.</p>

Standard IV: Organization, Roles and Resources - C. Research and Inquiry Developmental Guidelines

Partner institutions allocate resources to support the continuous improvement of teaching and learning.

Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners model professional ethics and engage in substantive examination of ethical issues affecting research and practice.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, In-service/graduate courses, Study/inquiry groups, Network affiliations, other.
(17) Indicator 2: At Standard IHE and local school system partners provide joint resources to support collaborative school-based PDS research/inquiry.	List of Evidence Conference participation, Network affiliations, Grants, Budgets, other.

Standard IV: Organization, Roles and Resources - D. Student Achievement Developmental Guidelines

Partner institutions allocate resources to support the continuous improvement of teaching and learning.

(18) Indicator 1: At Standard PDS stakeholders build a structure to examine the impact of PDS on student achievement.	List of Evidence Steering committee, School improvement team, Newsletter, Memos/e-mail, Other.
Indicator 2: At Standard PDS stakeholders use a collaborative governance structure to design, implement and evaluate PDS policies, roles and resources.	List of Evidence Executive committee, Network/consortia, Policies and procedures, Shared/common assessments, Other.
Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners use performance data in strategic planning to make appropriate changes to policies, roles and resources.	List of Evidence Strategic planning, Shared/common assessments, Student performance data, Action plans, Other.
Indicator 4: At Standard The IHE and school district institutionalize resources to ensure the continuity of the PDS.	List of Evidence Strategic planning, Newsletter/brochure, Job descriptions, Budget, Other.

Standard V: Diversity and Equity - A. Teacher Preparation Developmental Guidelines

The PDS supports equitable involvement of PreK-16 faculty/staff and teacher candidates to support equitable outcomes for diverse learners.

Indicator 1: At Standard The IHE provides all teacher candidates equitable access to an extensive internship of at least 100 days over two consecutive semesters in a PDS.	List of Evidence Teacher Preparation Improvement Plan, Program descriptions, Field placement criteria, Description of placements, other.
(19) Indicator 2: At Standard Teacher candidates demonstrate skill in working with diverse student, parent and staff populations.	List of Evidence Field placement protocols, Placement demographics, Teacher candidate portfolios, Teacher candidate evaluations, other.
(20) Indicator 3: At Standard Teacher candidates demonstrate the ability to work with students	List of Evidence Description of placements,

with special needs and collaborate with special educators.	Lesson/unit plans, Teacher candidate portfolios, Teacher candidate evaluations, other.
--	--

Standard V: Diversity and Equity - B. Continuing Professional Development Developmental Guidelines

The PDS supports equitable involvement of PreK-16 faculty/staff and teacher candidates to support equitable outcomes for diverse learners.

Indicator 1: At Standard All PDS partners have access to benefits of the PDS partnership such as monetary and human resources.	List of Evidence Newsletters, Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Budgets, other.
(21) Indicator 2: At Standard PDS partners engage in actions to support broad involvement of stakeholders in PDS activities and assess the results of stakeholder involvement.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Improvement plans, Surveys, other.
Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners participate in, assess and refine training to support knowledge, skills and dispositions surrounding equity issues.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Syllabi, In-service/graduate courses, Surveys, other.
Indicator 4: At Standard PDS partners represent diverse backgrounds.	List of Evidence Job descriptions, Recruitment initiatives, Application and review committees, Partnership demographics, other.

Standard V: Diversity and Equity - C. Research and Inquiry Developmental Guidelines

The PDS supports equitable involvement of PreK-16 faculty/staff and teacher candidates to support equitable outcomes for diverse learners.

Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners plan and conduct action research/inquiry with attention to issues of equity.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Memos/e-mail, Action research proposals, Action research reports, other.
Indicator 2: At Standard PDS partners share collaborative research findings targeting equity issues and the needs of diverse learners with stakeholders.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Newsletters, Memos/e-mail, Conference presentations, other.
(22) Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners select, design, implement and assess instructional strategies related to equity based on research findings.	List of Evidence Meeting minutes, In-service/workshops, Lesson/unit plans, Reflections/feedback, other.

Standard V: Diversity and Equity - D. Student Achievement Developmental Guidelines

The PDS supports equitable involvement of PreK-16 faculty/staff and teacher candidates to support equitable outcomes for diverse learners.

(23) Indicator 1: At Standard PDS partners, parents and community members cooperate to increase student achievement, especially attending to achievement	List of Evidence School improvement team, School improvement plan, Meeting
--	--

needs and gaps and other equity issues.	minutes, Memos/email, Other.
<p>Indicator 2: At Standard Teacher candidates initiate, participate in, and assess the success of various forms of parent communication about student achievement, with special attention to equity issues and the participation of minority and underrepresented parents.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Letters/newsletters, Meetings with parents, Meeting minutes, Action research, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 3: At Standard PDS partners collaborate to ensure that all education is multicultural.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Lesson plans/units, Diversity and equity plan, Program modifications, Service learning/action research, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 4: At Standard PDS partners explore, celebrate, and value diversity in instruction.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Syllabi, In-service/workshops, Service learning, Action research, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 5: At Standard PDS partners explore, celebrate, and value diversity in assessment.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Syllabi, In-service/workshops, Alternative student assessments, Action research, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 6: At Standard PDS partners model appropriate decision-making, communication skills, and personal interactions with attention to equity issues.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Meeting minutes, Policies and procedures, Memos/e-mail, Reflections/feedback, Other.</p>
<p>Indicator 7: At Standard PDS partners modify instruction to eliminate achievement gaps.</p>	<p>List of Evidence Student achievement equity plan, Unit/lesson plans, Program modifications, Action research, Other.</p>

Appendix B

Framework

(Five Standards: Learning Community, Collaboration, Accountability, Organization, Roles and Resources, Diversity and Equity – Organized Around Categories of Developmental Guidelines)

Teacher Preparation

(1) Standard 1: Learning Community, **Indicator 3:** Teacher candidates observe, implement, analyze and refine standards-based teaching practices during the extensive internship.

(5) Standard II: Collaboration, **Indicator 1:** IHE and school faculty collaboratively plan and implement curricula for teacher candidates to provide authentic learning experiences.

(6) Standard II: Collaboration, **Indicator 7:** IHE teacher education, arts and science, and school faculty collaborate in planning and implementing content based learning experiences for PDS partners.

(11) Standard III: Accountability, **Indicator 1:** IHE and school faculty collaboratively refine and implement formative and summative standards based teacher candidate performance assessments.

(15) Standard IV: Organization, Roles and Resources, **Indicator 1:** PDS partners communicate regarding roles, responsibilities, and operating procedures and use continuous feedback to improve the operation of the PDS.

(19) Standard V: Diversity and Equity, **Indicator 2:** Teacher candidates demonstrate skill in working with diverse student, parent and staff populations.

(20) Standard V: **Indicator 3:** Teacher candidates demonstrate the ability to work with students with special needs and collaborate with special educators.

Continuing Professional Development

(2) Standard I: Learning Community, **Indicator 1:** PDS partners collaboratively create, conduct, and participate in needs-based professional development to improve instruction and positively impact student achievement.

(7) Standard II: Collaboration, **Indicator 3:** PDS partners determine professional development needs, plan professional development activities to meet those needs, implement activities and assess the effectiveness of the implemented activities.

(12) Standard III: Accountability, **Indicator 4:** PDS partners work together to meet one another's professional development needs.

(16) Standard IV: Organization, Roles and Resources, **Indicator 1:** IHEs recognize and reward the PDS work of IHE faculty and staff through organizational structures and incentives that fully integrate PDS work with the mission of the teacher education program.

(21) Standard V: Diversity and Equity, **Indicator 2:** PDS partners engage in actions to support broad involvement of stakeholders in PDS activities and assess the results of stakeholder involvement.

Research and Inquiry

(3) Standard I: Learning Community, **Indicator 1:** PDS partners collaboratively engage in inquiry and/or action research.

(8) Standard II: Collaboration, **Indicator 1:** PDS partners collaboratively examine the action research/inquiry process.

(9) Standard II: Collaboration, **Indicator 2:** PDS partners identify the research/inquiry agenda based on the data-driven needs of the PDS.

(13) Standard III: Accountability, **Indicator 1:** IHE and school faculty collaboratively develop assessments and feedback tools to be used for PDS program planning and improvement.

(17) Standard IV: Organization, Roles and Resources, **Indicator 2:** IHE and local school system partners provide joint resources to support collaborative school-based PDS research/inquiry.

(22) Standard V: Diversity and Equity, **Indicator 3:** PDS partners select, design, implement and assess instructional strategies related to equity based on research findings.

Student Achievement

(4) Standard I: Learning Community, **Indicator 2:** Teacher candidates demonstrate competency in using specified learning outcomes and assessments to plan, deliver and assess instruction.

(10) Standard II: Collaboration, **Indicator 1:** PDS partners use demographic and performance data to modify instruction to improve student achievement.

(13) Standard III: Accountability, **Indicator 3:** IHE and school faculty collaboratively analyze data on the impact of PDS on student achievement.

(18) Standard IV: Organization, Roles and Resources, **Indicator 1:** PDS stakeholders build a structure to examine the impact of PDS on student achievement.

(23) Standard V: Diversity and Equity, **Indicator 1:** PDS partners, parents and community members cooperate to increase student achievement, especially attending to achievement needs and gaps and other equity issues.

Appendix C

Interview Protocol for IHE Faculty

1. Describe your involvement in the partnership.
2. Describe the impact the partnership has had on you.
3. Describe the impact of your partnership on teacher preparation.
 - a. On the development of learning experiences for teacher candidates [who participates in planning and implementation, is there a focus on authenticity and content] (1) (6)
 - b. On clinical experiences (5)
 - c. On assessment of teacher candidate performance (11)
 - d. On roles and responsibilities in teacher preparation (15)
 - e. On teacher candidates experiences working with diverse populations [including students, parents, staff, special needs students, special educators] (20)
4. Describe the impact of your partnership on professional development.
 - a. How is the agenda for professional development determined (2)
 - b. How are professional development needs met [who plans and implements professional development activities, who participates] (7) (4)
 - c. On the role of IHE faculty in professional development. (16)
 - d. On the assessment of the results of professional development activities (7) (21)
5. Describe the impact of your partnership on research and inquiry.
 - a. On the way research is conducted (3)
 - b. On the kind of research that is conducted (3) (9) (22)
 - c. On who is involved in conducting research [IHE faculty, Partner School faculty, teacher candidates] (3) (8)
 - d. On how research findings are used [to inform teaching and learning in teacher preparation, in Partner Schools, issues of equity] (9) (13) (22)
 - e. On resources to support research (17)
6. Describe the impact of your partnership on student achievement.
 - a. How are teacher candidates prepared to plan, deliver, and assess instruction related to the achievement needs of students? (4)
 - b. How is student achievement addressed in the partnership? [in teacher preparation, in Partner Schools, around issues of equity] (10) (13) (23)
 - c. How is the impact of the partnership on student achievement assessed?(13) (18)
7. In closing, could you summarize the difference the partnership makes?
 - In all cases keep the focus on what has changed as a result of the partnership work.
 - Ask for concrete examples of what could be considered as evidence.

Appendix D

Interview Protocol for Partner School Faculty

1. Describe your involvement in the partnership.
2. Describe the impact the partnership has had on you.
3. Describe the impact of your partnership on teacher preparation.
 - a. On the development of learning experiences for teacher candidates [who participates in planning and implementation, is there a focus on authenticity and content] (1) (6)
 - b. On clinical experiences (5)
 - c. On assessment of teacher candidate performance (11)
 - d. On roles and responsibilities in teacher preparation (15)
 - e. On teacher candidates experiences working with diverse populations [including students, parents, staff, special needs students, special educators] (20)
4. Describe the impact of your partnership on professional development.
 - a. How is the agenda for professional development determined (2)
 - b. How are professional development needs met [who plans and implements professional development activities, who participates] (7) (4)
 - c. On the role of IHE faculty in professional development. (16)
 - d. On the assessment of the results of professional development activities (7) (21)
5. Describe the impact of your partnership on research and inquiry.
 - a. On the way research is conducted (3)
 - b. On the kind of research that is conducted (3) (9) (22)
 - c. On who is involved in conducting research [IHE faculty, Partner School faculty, teacher candidates] (3) (8)
 - d. On how research findings are used [to inform teaching and learning in teacher preparation, in Partner Schools, issues of equity] (9) (13) (22)
 - e. On resources to support research (17)
6. Describe the impact of your partnership on student achievement.
 - a. How are teacher candidates prepared to plan, deliver, and assess instruction related to the achievement needs of students? (4)
 - b. How is student achievement addressed in the partnership? [in teacher preparation, in Partner Schools, around issues of equity] (10) (13) (23)
 - c. How is the impact of the partnership on student achievement assessed?(13) (18)
7. In closing, could you summarize the difference the partnership makes?
 - In all cases keep the focus on what has changed as a result of the partnership work.
 - Ask for concrete examples, for what could be considered as evidence.

Appendix E

Interview Protocol for Teacher Candidates

1. Describe your motivation for entering teaching. This program?
2. Describe the unique features of your teacher preparation program – is there anything you believe is different about your program and most other programs?
3. What are the most positive aspects of this program? What are the aspects that could be improved?
4. Describe the aspects of your preparation to be a teacher where you've seen evidence of collaboration between your university and public school faculty. What impact has that collaboration had on your experiences?
 - a. Learning experiences [who participates in planning and implementation, is there a focus on authenticity and content] (1) (6)
 - b. Clinical experiences (5)
 - c. Assessment of your performance (11)
 - d. Roles and responsibilities of IHE and public school faculty play in teacher preparation (15)
 - e. Your experiences working with diverse populations [including students, parents, staff, special needs students, special educators] (20)
 - f. On your future teaching practice
5. Describe your involvement in professional development activities. What impact has that involvement had?
 - a. How is the agenda for professional development determined (2)
 - b. How are professional development needs met [who plans and implements professional development activities, who participates] (7) (4)
 - c. On the role of IHE faculty in professional development. (16)
 - d. On the assessment of the results of professional development activities (7) (21)
 - e. On your future teaching practice
6. Describe the kinds of research and inquiry you've been involved in [may need to use action research or work sample language]. Describe the kinds of research and inquiry you've seen university and public school faculty engaged in. What impact has that had?
 - a. On the way research is conducted (3)
 - b. On the kind of research that is conducted (3) (9) (22)
 - c. On who is involved in conducting research [IHE faculty, Partner School faculty, teacher candidates] (3) (8)
 - d. On how research findings are used [to inform teaching and learning in teacher preparation, in Partner Schools, issues of equity] (9) (13) (22)
 - e. On resources to support research (17)
 - f. On your future teaching practice

7. Describe the role a focus on student achievement has played in your preparation. From your perspective, what impact does the partnership between university and public school faculty have on student achievement?
 - a. How are teacher candidates prepared to plan, deliver, and assess instruction related to the achievement needs of students? (4)
 - b. How is student achievement addressed in the partnership? [in teacher preparation, in Partner Schools, around issues of equity] (10) (13) (23)
 - c. How is the impact of the partnership on student achievement assessed?(13) (18)
 - d. What impact will the focus on student achievement have on your future teaching practice?
- In all cases keep the focus on results of the partnership work.
 - Ask for concrete examples, for what could be considered as evidence.

Appendix F

WVPTQ Documentation Initiative Survey for IHE and Partner School Faculty

This survey is being conducted as part of an effort to document the progress of the ten school-university partnerships that participate in the West Virginia Partnerships for Teacher Quality (WVPTQ) initiative and receive legislative and Benedum Foundation funding to support their partnership work. All IHE faculty (Institution of Higher Education – university or college faculty), partner school faculty (faculty at a PK-12 public school partnering with an IHE to support teacher preparation, partner school or PDS), and teacher candidates (teacher education students placed in partner schools or PDSs) associated with your school-university partnership are being asked to participate. Your participation is entirely voluntary and your responses will be kept anonymous – you will not be asked to submit your name.

Thank you for your time and effort in support of the work of your partnership and WVPTQ.

Background

Name of your IHE or Partner School (for example, WVU or Anna Jarvis Elementary):
[pull down menu of 10 IHEs and their partner schools]

Position: (check those that apply)

IHE teacher education faculty member
IHE arts and sciences faculty member
IHE teacher education administrator
IHE arts and sciences faculty member
Partnership administrator
PK-12 faculty member
PK-12 administrator

Role in teacher preparation: (check those that apply)

Methods course instructor
Foundations course instructor
Content course instructor
Clinical supervisor or coordinator
Host/cooperating teacher
IHE liaison
Partner school liaison
Governance representative or leader

Number of Years involved in partnership: [text box]

Strength of involvement in partnership:

Not involved, Minimally involved, Somewhat involved, Involved, Strongly involved

Teacher Preparation

Please rate the following items related to teacher preparation in your partnership using the scale below. Respond based on what typically happens in your partnership. If you don't feel that you can respond or you don't know, check "NA":

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1	2	3	4	5

1. Teacher candidates placed in partner schools observe, implement, analyze and refine standards-based teaching practices during an extensive internship.
2. IHE and partner school faculty collaboratively plan and implement curricula for teacher candidates to provide authentic learning experiences.
3. IHE teacher education and arts and science faculty, and partner school faculty collaborate in planning and implementing content based learning experiences for teacher candidates.
4. IHE and partner school faculty collaboratively refine and implement standards based teacher candidate performance assessments.
5. Results of standards based assessments of are used to improve teacher candidate performance.
6. IHE and partner school faculty communicate regarding roles, responsibilities, and operating procedures related to teacher preparation.
7. IHE and partner school faculty communicate about the continuous improvement of clinical experiences.
8. IHE and partner school faculty communicate about the continuous improvement of content preparation.
9. Teacher candidates demonstrate skill in working with diverse student, parent and staff populations.
10. Teacher candidates demonstrate the ability to work with students with special needs and collaborate with special educators.

Continuing Professional Development

Please rate the following items related to professional development in your partnership using the scale below. Respond based on what typically happens in your partnership. If you don't feel that you can respond or you don't know, check "NA":

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1	2	3	4	5

11. IHE and partner school faculty collaboratively create, conduct, and participate in needs-based professional development to improve instruction and positively impact student achievement.
12. IHE and partner school faculty determine professional development needs, plan professional development activities to meet those needs, implement activities and assess the effectiveness of the implemented activities.
13. IHE and partner school faculty work together to meet one another's professional development needs.
14. The IHE recognizes and rewards the partnership work of IHE faculty and staff through organizational structures and incentives.
15. Partnership work is integrated within the mission of the teacher education program.
16. IHE and partner school faculty engage in actions to support broad involvement of stakeholders in partner school activities.

Research and Inquiry (includes traditional research and action research)

Please rate the following items related to research/inquiry in your partnership using the scale below. Respond based on what typically happens in your partnership. If you don't feel that you can respond or you don't know, check "NA":

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1	2	3	4	5

17. IHE and partner school faculty collaboratively engage in research/inquiry.
18. Teacher candidates engage in research/inquiry related to teaching and learning.
19. IHE and partner school faculty collaboratively examine the research/inquiry process for teacher candidates.
20. The research/inquiry agenda for the IHE and/or the partner schools includes a focus on data-driven needs.
21. IHE and partner school faculty collaboratively develop assessments and feedback tools to be used for teacher preparation program planning and improvement.
22. IHE and local school system partners provide joint resources to support collaborative school-based research/inquiry related to impact of the partnership.
23. IHE and partner school faculty select, design, implement and assess instructional strategies related to equity based on research findings.

Student Achievement

Please rate the following items related to student achievement in your partnership using the scale below. Respond based on what typically happens in your partnership. If you don't feel that you can respond or you don't know, check "NA":

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1	2	3	4	5

- 24. Teacher candidates demonstrate competency in using specified learning outcomes and assessments to plan, deliver and assess instruction.
- 25. IHE and partner school faculty use demographic and performance data to modify instruction to improve student achievement.
- 26. IHE and partner school faculty collaboratively analyze data on the impact of PDS on student achievement.
- 27. IHE and partner school faculty are building a structure to examine the impact of PDS on student achievement.
- 28. IHE and partner school faculty, parents and community members cooperate to increase student achievement, especially attending to achievement needs and gaps and other equity issues.

General Impact of the Partnership

Please rate the following items related to your perspectives of your partnership using the scale below. If you don't feel that you can respond or you don't know, check "NA":

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree Somewhat	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

- 29. Collaboration between IHE and partner school faculty has improved the clinical preparation of teacher candidates.
- 30. Collaboration between IHE and partner school faculty has improved the content preparation of teacher candidates.
- 31. The partnership has improved the quality of teacher preparation.
- 32. Teacher candidates who have had clinical experiences in partner schools are typically better prepared to teach than candidates who have not had clinical experiences in partner schools.
- 33. The partnership has had a positive effect on teaching in partner schools.
- 34. The partnership has had a positive effect on PK-12 student learning in partner schools.

35. The partnership has had a positive effect on teaching in the IHE.
36. My participation in the partnership has had a positive effect on my teaching.
37. The partnership has had a positive effect on teacher candidates' ability to serve the needs of diverse student populations.
38. The partnership has had a positive effect on my ability to serve the needs of diverse student populations.
39. The partnership has had a positive effect on teacher candidates' ability to serve the needs of special needs students.
40. The partnership has had a positive effect on my ability to serve the needs of special needs students.
41. The partnership has created opportunities for me to engage in professional development that I would not have had otherwise.
42. The partnership has increased the commitment of IHE and partner school faculty to professional development.
42. The partnership has provided resources for partner schools to increase student achievement.
43. The partnership has created opportunities for me to engage in research/inquiry.
44. My role as an educator has been positively affected by my participation in the partnership.
45. My commitment to teaching has been strengthened by my participation in the partnership.

Your Perspective [open-ended items, text boxes]

We are also interested in hearing about your perspective of the effect of the partnership in your own words:

46. Please use this space to share your perspective about the effect of the partnership on teacher preparation:

47. Please use this space to share your perspective about the effect of the partnership on professional development:

Please use this space to share your perspective about the effect of the partnership on research and inquiry:

48. Please use this space to share your perspective about the effect of the partnership on student achievement.

49. Please use this space to share any additional comments or concerns you have about the partnership or this survey.

Thank you for participating in this survey!