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ABSTRACT

In the mid-1980s, through the work of the Holmes Group (now the Holmes Partnership) and the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), the term “Professional Development School” emerged as a part of the nation’s educational discourse (Brindley, Field & Lessen, 2008). The success of these PDS have been widely reported within the literature presented. However, missing from our PDS literature are studies which focus on the formative implementation and progression of the partnerships as seen through the collective perspectives of PDS stakeholders. The purpose of this study was to develop and explore a participatory process for collecting, organizing and examining educator perspectives regarding the aspect most focused on by their professional development school partnerships, at the current PDS implementation stage. In order to answer the question “What are the shared educator perspectives that emerge through the InQuiry [sic] process, regarding the aspect of PDS partnership most focused on, by their professional development school partnerships, at its current stage of implementation?” this dissertation research brought to the PDS literature a new methodology by utilizing Q methodology in the form of the InQuiry process. From the data examined, a total of 3 significant factors were identified. These factors represented the shared perspectives of the participants who participated in the study. Also, the participants overwhelmingly expressed that participating in the InQuiry process was helpful and useful for the development and implementation of their PDS partnership.
Chapter 1- Introduction

Professional Development Schools (PDS) provide a part of the clinical structure of many teacher education programs within colleges of education. Darling-Hammond (1998) described PDS as spaces where prospective teacher and mentor teacher learning becomes 1) experimental, 2) grounded in teacher questions, 3) collaborative, 4) connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students, and 5) sustained, intensive, and connected to other aspects of school change. In the mid-1980s, through the work of the Holmes Group (now the Holmes Partnership) and the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), the term “Professional Development School” emerged as a part of the nation’s educational discourse (Brindley, Field & Lessen, 2008). These PDSs evolved as an extension of John Dewey’s “Laboratory schools”. The “laboratory school” opened at the University of Chicago in 1896, by Dewey, focused on clinical experience, and stressed experimentation to test his theories and their sociological implications (Creasy, 2005). This model emerged from John Dewey’s belief that individuals need experience and practice in order to develop understanding (Dewey, 1974). In adopting this Deweyan perspective, the Holmes Group defined the PDS as a place where teacher candidate could continue learning while allowing for continual research and professional development (Holmes, 1990). Today, many Colleges of Education continue to develop PDS to address these goals.

In 1991, the University of North Florida’s (UNF) professional development school network evolved out of a three-year project between Jacksonville’s Alliance for Tomorrow’s Teachers (AT &T) and UNF. The primary purpose of this project was to restructure UNF’s College of Education’s clinical component of the teacher preparation program while simultaneously assisting three urban elementary schools in Clay and Duval counties to produce
increased K-6 student achievement and reduce beginning teachers’ attrition rate when working in urban schools (Fountain, 1994). The scope of this university-school partnership has expanded over the years to include additional schools within Clay and Duval County and in 2015, through a grant funded by the UNF International Center, the partnership initiated the exploration of an International School Partnership (ISP) in Belize.

Since 2016, the University of North Florida (UNF) has embarked on an exercise to rejuvenate and elevate the PDS partnerships with Duval and Clay County schools. The current partnership includes three Clay County Public Schools, three Duval County Public Schools and one Charter and one Private schools for a total of eight K-12 schools. According to UNF’s PDS Network (2019), UNF’s PDS partnerships are built on the foundation of research and evidence based practice utilizing seven tenets: (1) to enhance the educational experience of all children; (2) engage in high quality collaborative teacher candidate preparation; (3) ensure high quality induction of new teachers; (4) develop the next generation of school and UNF based teacher education; (5) support school leaders’ professional growth; (6) stimulate in UNF teacher educators professional growth; and (7) facilitate teacher professional growth.

**My Interest as a Belizean Teacher Educator**

As a Belizean educator, improving teacher education in order to make learning to teach more relevant and applicable for teacher candidates has always been a professional goal of mine. Like Dewey, I also believed that aspiring and teacher candidates need practical, hands-on experience in order to truly understand the complexity of the classroom. Coming from a teacher education system where educational theories and models were isolated and taught as separate entities within the confine of the university classrooms, I witnessed the frustration of many teacher candidates as they enter the classroom only to find that the ideals taught to them during
their training was not the reality they faced within the everyday classroom. Due to the separation of coursework and fieldwork, most of these young teachers also lacked the skills necessary to apply the theories and models taught on campus to meet the needs of their students in their classrooms. The original concepts behind Dewey’s laboratory schools, which was later adopted for PDS, offers the important mechanism to help bridge the gap between theory and practice. The PDS provides teacher candidates with the unique context and opportunity to experience and test research-based practices and theories used to meet student needs.

Within the Belizean teacher education system, this type of partnership would revolutionize teacher education. Along with improving the development of teacher candidates, PDS partnerships would also provide an environment where new research and theories could be developed, practiced, and studied. The PDS environment would also facilitate the growth of the local university faculty, as it would allow university teacher educators to maintain recency and relevancy within their profession while simultaneously utilizing the PDSs to engage in research targeted at improving teaching and learning. As a result, the PDSs could provide Belize leadership in teacher preparation, practices and models.

**Problem Statement**

Over the last decade, many universities have embarked on the development of PDSs as a University School Partnerships. The success of these PDS have been widely reported within the literature presented. Van Scy and Eldridge (2012) stated that a “fully functioning” PDS partnership can improve teaching and learning in our schools. In order for PDSs to grow and continue to be productive, partners need to maintain ongoing attention to the implementation and progression of the partnership in regard to its alignment with the fundamental characteristics of PDS partnerships, as listed in the *Nine Essential of PDS* (NAPDS, 2008). As a part of the *Nine
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*Essential of PDS*, Essential Five (5) taken from the *Nine Essential of PDS*, states that there must be “Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants” (NAPDS, 2008, p.6). As suggested in the literature, studies have been conducted which focuses on either PDS participant perceptions of their role in relation to the PDS standards, or program success. There have also been many studies, which focus on teachers’ perceptions of the importance of PDS. These studies for the most part take on a summative viewpoint, focusing on the outcomes at the end of the PDS process. Summative evaluations, as stated by Janus and Brinkman, (2010), are intended to provide a package of results used to assess whether a program works or not. However, missing from our PDS literature are studies which focus on the formative implementation and progression of the partnerships as seen through the collective perspectives of PDS stakeholders. A formative participatory process would examine the status of the current focus of the PDS partnership, built on the *Nine Essentials of a PDS outlined* by organizations like the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) and the NCATE standards.

This formative process would facilitate stakeholders’ collective engagement in reflective practices, essential PDS work to improve. This process would allow practitioners to examine the current PDS and make changes for improvements where necessary. According to Matthew, Matthew and Peechatu, (2017), reflective practice is an important tool in practice-based professional learning settings, where people learn from their own professional experiences, rather than from formal learning or knowledge transfer. These reflective practices should not be limited to only a summative process, but could also take the form of a formative process, which is used to find and eliminate problems during the design and development process, rather than judge a completed product against specific goals (Hartson, Andre & Williges, 2003). If
Participatory process to examine PDS partnerships

institutions fail to engage in formative reflective practices, they run the risk of program failure, since formative reflective practices encourages the examination of the implementation process and the impacts of programs. This study contributes to the gap in the literature related to the use of formative tools by applying and exploring a participatory process that examined educator perspectives regarding the aspect of their professional development school partnerships most focused on, at the current stage of implementation.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to develop and explore a participatory process for collecting, organizing and examining educator perspectives regarding the aspect most focused on by their professional development school partnerships, at the current PDS implementation stage.

In 2007, the NAPDS, in consultation with educators, produced the nine essential practices that were necessary for a school–university relationship to be considered a Professional Development School. This study provides renewed attention to the nine essentials by offering a formative, participatory process which could be used by PDS partners to examine how their program reflects these Nine Essentials and identifies gaps in the implementation of their partnerships.

The formative tool created and examined in this study could also assist by contributing to the national discourse on PDS partnerships. For example, Essential #4 and #5, states:

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

5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants; (NAPDS, 2007).

These statements emphasized the important of reflective practice as well the need to share the progress and challenges PDSs experience with others, both within and outside of their PDS, as a
way of contributing to the national and international educational dialogue. In this way, the tool developed in this study and the findings generated could inform educators of shared perspectives on current foci of PDS partnerships at their current implementation stages.

The methodology utilized in this participatory process, provided a voice for partnership participants that might otherwise not be heard. This included the voices of PDS administrators, university faculty who serve as professors in residence, resident clinical faculty, who are district employees assigned to work with the teacher education programs and supervise teacher candidates, mentor teachers and interns. By including all stakeholders, the formative tool provides a comprehensive view of the current implementation and progression of the PDS partnership.

**Research Question**

This study developed a formative evaluation tool to guide an InQuiry process that answered the question “What are the shared educator perspectives that emerge through the InQuiry process, regarding the aspect of PDS partnership most focused on, by their professional development school partnerships, at its current stage of implementation?”

**Overview of Methodology**

In order to answer the question “What are the shared educator perspectives that emerge through the InQuiry process, regarding the aspect of PDS partnership most focused on, by their professional development school partnerships, at its current stage of implementation?”, this dissertation research brought to the PDS literature a new methodology by utilizing Q methodology. Typically, people’s perceptions are examined using qualitative methods, since perceptions are classified as being of a subjective nature. However, Q methodology provided a method for the scientific study of human subjectivity (Mckeown & Thomas, 1998), as well as an
InQuiry process for which to examine the implementation and progression of the PDS program. Militello, Janson and Tonissen, (2016) explained that “this is achieved by fully engaging stakeholders as participants in the collection of individual beliefs and the subsequent analysis of their collectively held beliefs” (p.89).

Q Methodology is a useful tool for conducting research in the constructionist tradition (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Social constructionism may be defined as a perspective which believes that a great deal of human life exists as it does due to social and interpersonal influences (Galbin, 2014). Constructionists use Q Methodology to reveal the dominant viewpoint extant in a data set. The methodology allowed constructionist to identify the key bodies of knowledge relative to a subject matter and to render those knowledge structures empirically observable (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

Q methodology studies involve two different phases, each involving data collection from participants. The first phase comprised of the development of the instrument, referred to as the communication concourse development. I recruited 50 participants and invited them to respond to an open-ended questionnaire that included the prompt:

1. At this current stage of your PDS partnership, list the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on.

In addition to the open-ended prompt, background and demographic information was collected from participants. The collection of opinion statements provided by participants during the concourse development phase was combined with other opinion statements collected from other sources, such as the professional literature on the topic. I then reduced the opinion statement to a representative Q sample. This reduction process involved eliminating repeated statements,
combining similar statements, and discarding statements impertinent to the initial prompt. This process yielded between 36 opinion statements was then referred to collectively as the Q Sample.

In phase two of the research, I recruited 50 participants to perform a Q sort of the opinion statements comprising the Q Sample. Of the 50 participants recruited, 36 performed the Q Sort. To perform a Q Sort, participants were invited to first sort the Q Sample statement into three piles: one for statements that are like their perspectives, one for statements that are unlike their perspectives and a pile for items that fall somewhere in the middle or that they are unsure of. After this initial sorting, participants were asked to make finer distinctions reflecting their perspectives by placing the Q Sample statements within a symmetrical sorting grid resembling a semi normal distribution. Participants were prompted to sort the Q Sample statements with the prompt (called the condition of instruction): “What best represents your prospective regarding aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on, at the current stage of implementation?”

Finally, each participant was asked questions related to the decisions they made while performing the Q Sort. Specifically, participants were asked to elaborate on why they chose the three statements that were most like and unlike their perspective.

Following the collection of participants’ Q Sort, each Q Sort was entered into a specialized Q Methodology software package called PQMethod (Schmolck, 2012). After the sorts were loaded, I utilized PQMethod to facilitate a 3-part statistical procedure which included (1) correlation, (2) relationship between correlation and (3) the identification of distinct factors which are composite perspectives shared by individual sorters. These factors were then represented by factor arrays which resembled individual Q Sort. I then examined and made holistic meaning of the composition of the factor arrays in order to generate an understanding of
the perspectives they represent. In addition to the factor arrays, I also used post sort responses and demographic and background information to provide a deeper understanding of the sort. The InQuiry process was the final step in the analysis of the data. In this step the participants engaged in a protocol to develop a deeper understanding on thoughts, feelings and opinions around the sort.

**Significance of Research**

Essential Five (7) of the *Nine Essential of PDS*, states that there must be “A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration” (NAPDS, 2008, p.6). NAPDS (2008) further explains that within the PDS partnership, an organizational structure/arrangement must be in place that not only guides the work of the PDS but also allows for and encourages collaboration, reflection, and regular communication among participants. To help guide the work of the PDS, the structure that is developed provided for decision-making over such issues as how the PDS functions, how evaluations of the PDS is to be used, and how resources would be best invested for the benefit of the relationship. This study provides a process that could be utilized by PDS partners to examine the implementation and progression of their partnership through the lens of the Nine Essentials. This process helps to sustain and maintain the integrity of their partnerships in accordance to the PDS standards and regulations.

This research also provided data that would contribute to educational dialogues on PDS programs. These dialogues could assist in strengthening existing PDS partnerships and facilitating program sustainability. This data could allow program administrators, as well as school administrators, to critically examine the implementation and progression of the PDS program in order to make informed decisions to improve on existing partnerships.
Theoretical Framework

Community Learning Exchanges (CLE) are collaborative, community-based, multiracial, and intergenerational dynamic exchanges of ideas, events, and strategies for school and community change. These exchanges offer experiences that facilitate individual and collective learning, leading to concrete action (Guajardo, Guajardo, Janson & Militello, 2016). CLE are built on the premise that the learning process is initially social. A premise reflected Vygotsky’s Social Development Theory (1978) which states “Every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological). All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals” (p57). CLE pedagogies are significantly informed by the wisdom of indigenous and other cultural models of collective leadership that similarly positions family and close trusting networks at the center of personal, organizational and community development approaches (Guajardo, Guajardo, Janson & Militello, 2016).

At the core of CLE are five Axioms. The word axiom, in this context, takes on the definition of “a truth without any need for proof in the form of linear logic” (Guajardo, Guajardo, Janson & Militello, 2016, p.23). These axioms are: Learning and leadership are a Dynamic social process; Conversations are critical and central pedagogical process; the people closest to the issues are best situated to discover answers to local concerns; crossing boundaries enriches the development and educational process; and Hope and change are built on assets and dreams of locals and their communities.
Although there were many theories that could have been applied when examining the aspect most focused on by professional development school partnerships, at its current stage of implementation, for example Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory, the theoretical framework of this study was based on these CLE axioms, conceptualizing the PDS partnership as the community and the participants of the study as the members of that community. These axioms created a lens in which the interaction and relationships within a PDS partnership was viewed, specifically focusing on the premise that learning is a social exercise and it is through that socialization process that perceptions emerge. The interaction and socialization of
University and schools’ partners, like the axioms, are based on mutual respect and the idea of learning reciprocally.

The axiom “Learning and leadership are a dynamic social process” viewed leadership as a collaborative action which emphasized the viewpoint that all participants have something to contribute. This study, with the use of Q Methodology, aimed to harness the voices of participants within the PDS programs treating each with equal importance, focusing on voices which are normally not heard or dismissed as unimportant. The axiom “Conversations are critical and central pedagogical process” spoke on creating a safe space where participants could share their stories, which is the foundations for their perceptions. If this safe environment is not established public learning becomes difficult. This space allowed participants to develop a trust in their stories and value the perceptions derived from it. “The people closest to the issues are best situated to discover answers to local concerns” is self-explanatory. This axiom recognized that the perceptions of the participants directly involved within the PDS partnerships should be considered when making program decisions. Establishing an environment where all voices were valued and participants felt safe to share their perceptions, led to the axiom of “crossing boundaries enriches the development and educational process.” Participants, through the interactions with different members within the PDS community, began to “decenter the status quo and the traditional ways of knowing” (Guajardo, Guajardo, Janson & Militello, 2016, p.26). Finally, acknowledging that “hope and change are built on assets and dreams of locals and their communities” placed emphasis on the assets found within the PDS partnership, which allowed the participants to visualize the possibilities that exist within the partnership, due to the gifts and ideas that they brought to the table.
**Definition of Terms:**

The following are a list of terms and phrases, along with its operational meaning, that was frequently utilized throughout this paper.

*Administrative staff:* Principals and vice principals from PDS

*Community Learning Exchange (CLE):* Collaborative, community-based, multiracial, and intergenerational dynamic exchanges of ideas, events, and strategies for school and community change. These exchanges offer experiences that facilitate individual and collective learning, leading to concrete action.

*InQuiry [sic]:* A multistep assessment tool that seeks participant input before, during, and after data collection. Participants provide input on the data-collection items, engage in a sorting activity of the items, and collaborate with like-minded groups and across groups to interpret perspectives.

*Mentor teachers:* In-service teachers working in PDS assigned to assist teacher candidates

*Professional Development Schools (PDS):* Innovative institutions formed through partnerships between professional education programs and P–12 schools with a mission of professional preparation of teacher candidates, faculty development, and inquiry directed at the improvement of practice, and enhanced student learning.

*Professors-in-residence:* Faculty of the university whose role is to engage in professional development and facilitate education courses to university students at the PDS.

*P set:* Participants in the study.

*Teacher Candidates:* Teacher’s in training; intern teachers placed within a PDS by university

*Resident Clinical Faculty:* Supervisors hired by the university to coach and supervise teacher candidates
Social Constructionism: A theory of knowledge of sociology and communication that examines the development jointly constructed understanding of the world. Social constructionism may be defined as a perspective which believes that a great deal of human life exists as it does due to social and interpersonal influences.

Chapter Summary

In this study, I intended to apply and explore a participatory process to examine educator perspectives regarding the aspect of their professional development school partnerships most focused on, at its current stage of implementation. In Chapter 1, the study was placed within context by providing a brief definition of the concept of PDS partnerships. This was defined as a place where teachers candidates could continue learning while allowing for continual research and professional development (Holmes, 1990). I also presented the reader with the purpose and significance of the study, calling attention to the gaps in the literature in terms of the need for a formative participatory process to examine the implementation and progression of PDS partnerships. Also presented in this chapter, was the CLE axioms as the theoretical lens in which I would examine the perceptions of participants within the study, conceptualizing the PDS partnership as the community and the participants of the study as the members of that community.
Chapter 2- Review of Literature

The purpose of this review of literature was to situate this study within the PDS research literature. To do this, I examined foundation and the impact of Professional Development School partnerships, focusing on the research methods used to evaluate these impacts, as well as presenting participatory program evaluation, in the form of an InQuiry Q-study, as a way to fill existing gaps in the literature.

Professional Development Schools

Professional Development Schools support the clinical experiences of teacher candidates, professional learning of practicing educators, as well as research and innovation for many colleges of education. The history of PDS has spanned about three decades. The PDS model evolved as an extension of John Dewey’s “Laboratory schools” at the University of Chicago in 1896, which focused on clinical experience, stressed experimentation to test his theories and their sociological implications (Creasy, 2005). This PDS model utilized John Dewey’s belief that individuals need experience and practice in order to develop understanding (Dewey, 1974). In the mid-1980s, through the work of the Holmes Group (now the Holmes Partnership) and the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), the term “Professional Development School” (PDS) emerged as a part of the nation’s educational discourse (Brindley, Field & Lessen, 2008). Likewise, the NNER agenda is based on the assumptions that we would not have better schools without better teachers, and that we would not have better teachers without better universities in which teachers can learn, practice and develop (Goodlad, 1990). In adopting Dewey’s perspective, the Holmes Group similarly viewed PDS as a space where novice teachers could continue learning while allowing for continual research and professional development (Holmes, 1990). During the last few decades, this concept of Professional Development School
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(PDS) has flourished in the United States with many school university partnerships across the country referring to themselves as PDS sites. In addition to NNER and the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS), the American Educational Research Association (AERA) PDS Research SIG is another national organization that focuses on professional development schools.

The National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) defined a Professional Development Schools as innovative institutions formed through partnerships between professional education programs and P–12 schools with a mission of professional preparation of teacher candidates, faculty development, and inquiry directed at the improvement of practice, and enhanced student learning (NCATE, 2001). According to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, PDSs have distinct characteristics:

They are learning environments that support candidate and faculty development within the context of meeting all children's needs. PDS partners are guided by a common vision of teaching and learning, which is grounded in research and practitioner knowledge. PDS partners share responsibility for professionals and students; they blend their expertise and resources to meet their shared goals. (NCATE, 2001, p. 2)

The Professional Development School is a relatively new model in many respects. PDS are contexts where school and university teacher educators can establish routines that systematically and intentionally scaffold professional learning to develop formal and tacit professional knowledge (Yendol- Hoppey & Franco, 2014). Darling-Hammond (1998) described Professional Development Schools (PDS) as spaces where prospective teacher and mentor teacher learning becomes: 1) experimental, 2) grounded in teacher questions, 3) collaborative, 4) connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students, and 5) sustained, intensive, and
connected to other aspects of school change. In addition to calling them professional development schools, other terms that are often used to interchangeably include key schools, demonstration schools, professional practice schools and professional development centers (Clark, 1993).

PDS’s were designed to accomplish a four-fold agenda: preparing future educators, providing current educators with ongoing professional development, encouraging joint school–university faculty investigation of education-related issues, and promoting the learning of P–12 students (Brindley, Field & Lessen, 2008). Lucero (2011) concluded that:

Partner schools serve as clinical laboratories for effective instruction that involve University professors as theoretical and pedagogical experts; School administrators as curricular leaders in their buildings; PK-12 teachers are the practitioners of theory; university students as the beneficiaries of the marriage between theory and practice; and ultimately, and most important the PK-12 students who are the recipients of and participants in a thoughtful intentionally developed, focused, curriculum reflective of Goodlad’s moral dimensions. (pp. 42-43).

These partnerships are often formed between Universities and K-12 schools. Specifically, PDS Partnerships historically involve relationships between educator preparation programs (EPPs) and P-12 schools (Polly, 2016). Levine (2006) indicated that a PDS can also “offer perhaps the strongest bridge between teacher education and classroom outcomes, academics and clinical education, theory and practice, and schools and colleges” (p. 105).

As of 2016, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) merged into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). CAEP is widely considered as a top teacher education
program-specific accreditation. Although the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards (2013) do not specifically mention Professional Development Schools. CAEP Standard Two (2) specifically describes the types of partnerships expected between educator preparation programs (EPPs) and partner schools. These standards address competencies that are align well with Professional Development School (PDS) work. As a result, for the past decade, most PDS partnerships have framed their work around the “Nine Essentials”, a document written by leaders of the NAPDS (Polly, 2016), which juxtaposes these nine essential elements of a PDS with the standards laid out by CAEP to guide educator preparation programs (EPP). The NAPDS posits a narrative for each of the nine required essentials of a PDS to assist with the differentiation between PDS and other forms of strong school–university partnership. Essentials 1 through 5 establish the philosophical underpinnings for PDSs, while essentials 6 through 9 describe the logistical requirements of a PDS relationship (NAPDS, 2008):

The 2013 CAEP Standards in light of the NAPDS Nine Essentials require educator preparation programs (EPPs) and their PDS partner schools to consider how to best design, implement, and analyze partnership work and projects. The CAEP Standards specifically address the creation of comprehensive partnerships (CAEP 2.1, NAPDS 1), the development of clinical faculty committing to candidate preparation (CAEP 2.2, NAPDS 2 and 4), and the creation of innovative rich clinical experiences for candidates (CAEP 2.3, NAPDS 2) (Polly, 2016, p.105).
The nine required essentials of a PDS as established by the NAPDS are:

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;
2. A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;
3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants;
6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;
7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;
8. Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings;
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures (NADPS, 2008).

Similarly, Partner schools developed by sites of the NNER share a commitment to the 19 postulates enumerated by Goodlad (1990) in *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. Each of these postulates has a bearing on the way in which partner schools are created and operated with the 15th speaking most directly to the subject:
Programs for the education of educators must assure for each candidate the availability of a wide array of laboratory settings for simulation, observation, hands-on experiences, and exemplary schools for internships and residencies; they must admit no more students to their programs than can be assured these quality experiences. (Goodlad, 1990)

In addition to the 19 Postulates, NNER partner schools share common values, which influence the way in which they approach their overall mission. These shared beliefs include the following:

1. Partner schools of the NNER assure that all learners have equitable access to knowledge.
2. Partner schools celebrate diversity and are committed to multi-racial and multicultural education.
3. Partner schools accept their moral responsibility to contribute to the growth of students as citizens in a democratic society, contributors to a healthy economy, and fully human individuals versed in the arts and ideas that help them take advantage of their talents. In short, they are schools prepared to enculturate learners for participation in a democratic society.

A successful PDS partnership brings the stakeholders together around personalized and localized interests in learning, and school learning in particular (Kruger, Davies, Eckersley, Newell & Oherednich, 2009). According to the “Nine Essentials” (2008), Essential One states, “that the partnership has a comprehensive mission that extends beyond the mission of any partner. More specifically, PDS partnerships cannot be formed only to support teacher candidates or on the other hand only the teachers in the partnership school” (p.3).

The overall finding from the review of literature indicates that PDS are simultaneously beneficial to the participating institutions, teachers being trained and K-12 students. A “fully
functioning” professional development school (PDS) partnership can improve teaching and learning in our schools (Darling-Hammond, 2005; The Holmes Partnership, 2006; Levine, 2006; Teitel, 2004; Van Scoy & Eldridge, 2012). These improvements manifest themselves in a variety of ways including, improved student achievement, powerful professional development opportunities for classroom teachers, and unique opportunities for undergraduate teacher candidates to learn their craft in a nurturing environment (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; NCATE, 2006). Likewise, Levine (2002) stated that Professional Development Schools are partnerships formed by teacher education programs and preK-12 schools’ intent on sharing responsibility for the preparation of new teachers, the development of experienced faculty members, and the improvement of practice-all with the goal of enhancing student achievement. Devia et al. (2014), concluded, based on teacher’s perceptions, that the university partnerships with k-12 schools are necessary. Ishler and Ishler, (2001) supported this argument by stating that “while there are benefits that accrue to both the P-12 school and the university, the bottom line is that there will be better educational programs available to the students who attend the PDS” (p.2). However, there is a need for the development of a process that can examine the implementation and progression of PDS programs, to bring to light the benefits that are accrued and to ensure that national standards for PDS partnerships are met.

**Understanding and Examining PDS Partnerships**

There were many examples throughout the research literature that examined the outcomes and benefits of the implementation of PDS partnerships. Research continued to show the positive influences of formal PDS partnerships, where colleges/universities collaborate with schools in order to support the processes of teaching and learning (Polly, Spooner, & Chapman, 2015). The findings from this research highlighted the PDS partnerships as beneficial, although,
limited evidence of positive effects using quantitative methods within PDS has been published (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). Engaging in research is a vital part of PDS partnerships since it allows these partnerships to fulfill essential 7 of the Nine Essentials of PDS as mandated by NAPDS. Essential 7 asserts that within a PDS partnership an organizational structure/arrangement must be in place that not only guides the work of the PDS but also allows for and encourages collaboration, reflection, and regular communication among participants. (NAPDS, 2008).

In attempting to understand and examine the benefits of PDS partnerships, qualitative and quantitative research methodology has been used as a summative assessment process to examine the perception of teacher candidates, mentor teacher, clinical supervisors, residence professors, administrators and even the K-12 students on the perceived impacts and benefits of PDS partnerships. Some examples of the benefits identified include benefit to professional development school, teacher candidates, and K-12 students.

**Benefit to professional development school**

PDS partnerships are built around the premise that participating institutions benefit from the opportunity to obtain resources that many K-12 schools might not have been exposed to outside of these partnerships and that these resources can shape the leadership and culture of the school. These resources ranged from the university expertise offered through professional development for staff and administrators of partner schools, to physical equipment and resources donated by funders and grants. Standard V, of the Standards for Professional Development Schools (NCATE, 2001), stated that Partner institutions garner and allocate resources to support PDS work. As part of their institutional commitment to the PDS partnership, the partner schools and university provide participants with specific resources including time, space, incentives,
professional expertise, leadership, vision, technology, public relations, and access to community partners to advance the PDS work. According to the NAPDS (2008), “While PDSs focus, in part, on the preparation of new teachers, they also provide a venue for professional development of educators already in the field. Thus, continuous learning focused on an engaged community of learners is a critical feature of a PDS” (p.4). Adequate resources are available, including budget lines at partner institutions that permit PDS partners to do PDS work during their regular workday. (NCATE, 2001). Patterson, Shaver- Wetzel and Wright (2012) who stated that partnerships are beneficial due to the availability of equipment between the partners, and Rieckhoff and Larsen (2012) who further stated that PDS partnerships supported the time and resources in order to make changes within their schools substantiated this point.

In addition to actual physical resources, PDS partnerships have also changed the culture and behavior of the institutions in a positive way (Smith, 2009). According to Essential Two taken from the “Nine Essentials for PDS”, PDSs create a school-wide culture that incorporates teacher candidates as full participants of the school community (NADPS, 2008). PDS’s improve school culture and community image through exhibitions and performances that help “shine the light” on students whose talents may not be apparent in the classroom (Little, 2011). Likewise, Petrosko and Munoz (2002) through both quantitative (e.g., coded observation forms) and qualitative (e.g., open-ended interview questions) data obtained from teachers within a PDS found that changes in teacher beliefs, perceptions of school climate and observable behaviors were attributable to the PDS environment.

This change of culture not only manifests itself within the classroom, but also through the work of administrators. This would include, the willingness of principals to embrace a broad range of partnership activities which are not an integral part of current practice, and which, if
developed, should have significant implications for changing the nature of schooling and teacher education (Brady, 2002). Carpenter and Sherretz (2012), for example, stated in their qualitative case-study, “Professional Development Schools partnership: An instrument for Teacher Leadership”, that the principals also offered his time to meet with teacher candidates, attend conferences and meetings, and collaborate with faculty on research and program initiatives, thus, creating a culture of continuous and meaningful ongoing professional development. Rieckhoff and Larsen (2012) considered the impact a professional development school partnership has on leadership development by documenting the principals' perspective on the impact of the PDS partnership and how the partnership allows school leaders to focus on clear school improvement goals and targeted professional development as their leadership and school-wide sustainable changes develop over time.

The change in culture within the PDS extended itself beyond the walls of the institutions, as it is also manifested in the work the PDS partnership does in the communities and neighborhoods of the PDS. This included the parents and families of the students attending the PDS. Ideally, college and university personnel involved in PDS settings would become a part of the school community. Essential One, taken from the “Nine Essential of PDS”, explains that the PDSs may also extend themselves to the community outside the school/district and college/university gates, which could include local businesses, agencies, and policymakers, who can become participants in the work of a PDS, and how their involvement becomes an expression of the PDS. P–12 parents and families may also be involved in the work of the PDS (NAPDS, 2008). For example, Frey (2002), through observation, examined the early success of a PDS partnership through the lens of the NCATE PDS standards. He stated in the conclusion of his research “Literacy Achievement in an Urban Middle-Level Professional Development School: A
learning Community at Work”, that community members, and university faculty have collaborated to secure federal and state grants that support the varied needs of students and caregivers from within the PDS community. For instance, recreational programs, tutoring and academic assistance are now available, as well as the staffing of a parent center to serve families and perform outreach to the community (p. 11).

**Benefits to PDS teachers and teacher candidates**

As stated by Carpenter and Sherretz (2012), much research on PDS partnerships has examined partners serving as instruments of change in teacher quality. This change is facilitated through the provision of a link between teacher practice and educational theory. As stated by Winitzky, Stoddart, and O’Keefe (1991), “Of these many new reform efforts, a particularly promising approach is the Professional Development School, because it seeks to link the university and the public school, and by doing so, to better link theory with practice” (p. 2). In their case study titled “Professional Development School partnerships: An instrument for teacher leadership”, Carpenter and Sherretz (2012) utilized a methods such as interviews, observation and focus groups to conclude that PDS partnership activities create potential for enhancing teachers' opportunities to become leaders within their school communities. Likewise, Helms-Lorenz, van de Grift, Canrinus, Maulana and van Veen (2018) used a mixed method approach to conduct a study in the Netherlands where 150 teachers in non-PDS were compared with 50 teachers in PDS. The comparison was done by using a student questionnaire and peer observation. This study determined that “PDS teachers generally reported more positive levels of teacher efficacy” (p.10).

This empowerment led teachers to take ownership and responsibility in teaching each other and advocating for their profession and students. Suh and Fulginiti (2012) indicated that
the Lesson Study process (assessable within a PDS) provided a unique opportunity for pre-service teachers to experience an authentic professional learning community with a set established norm. Lesson Study is a model of professional development that originated in Japan. In this professional development process, teachers systematically examine their practice, with the goal of becoming more effective. Fountain, Drummond, and Senerfitt (2000) in their study “Teacher self-evaluation of renewal efforts of their teaching practices to improve student achievement” asked classroom teachers to “name and describe one to three ways [the PDS] has influenced your classroom practice” (p. 8). Their study identified seven themes: collegiality, experimentation and risk taking, reflectivity, multicultural sensitivity, decision making, ongoing inquiry, and commitment to teaching (Fountain, Drummond, & Senerfitt, 2000).

Teacher candidates placed within PDS by their universities are one of the major stakeholders within university-school partnerships. In placing teacher candidates within PDS, candidates have an opportunity to apply educational theories to practice. Robinson (2007) stated that PDS “are emerging as particularly effective, evidence-based school-university partnership models in many sites across the nation, providing academic content and pedagogical instruction that is well integrated with extensive, closely supervised, hands-on in-school clinical experience” (p. 2). Teacher candidates placed in a PDS also can develop, through practice, an in-depth understanding of positive teaching practices. As stated by Smith (2009), positive changes have also been made in teaching practice due to university-school partnerships, as teacher candidates expressed a clear pattern of deeper and more integrated thinking as a based on their reflections on their teaching (Castle, Fox, & Fuhrman, 2009). Runyan, Parks, and Sagehorn (2000), in adapting a needs assessment questionnaire to compare developmental stages of PDS teacher candidates and traditional placement teacher candidates, administered a questionnaire both
before and after field placements for Pittsburg State University (Kansas) students. What they found was that the PDS teacher candidates were more aware of their need to develop skills necessary for sound teaching practices. One of these skills was that of reflective practice, which Dewey emphasized in 1933. Similarly, Dobler, Kesner, Kramer, Resnik and Devin (2009) in observing a PDS partnership that focused on the development of classroom management skills for preservice teachers in an urban setting, explained that the teacher candidates expressed that knowledge in the area of classroom management was needed, useful and appreciated. Oliveira (2013) also pointed out that after gathering the perceptions of teachers from within the PDS partnership, that in-class coaching within PDS contributed to teacher candidates’ understanding of developmental appropriateness for young children. PDS settings allow teacher candidates to develop the specific pedagogical knowledge needed for teaching, via situated learning contexts and lesson study (Suh & Fulginiti, 2012).

Teacher candidates also benefit from PDS programs beyond just local universities and K-12 schools within the United States. Some Universities, like UNF have extended their partnerships to include other countries like Belize. Within the international model of PDS partnerships, an International School Partnerships (ISP), institutions should intentionally design partnership to: celebrate school-based learning linked to international partner; create opportunities for students to engage in activity-based communication-driven Within an International School Partnerships (ISP) setting, pre-service teachers’ demonstrated substantive knowledge of other cultures by integrating it in their teaching (Willard-Holt, 2001). Willard-Holt (2001) states that within International School Partnerships, the teacher candidates reported that the trip (to partner countries) had been beneficial to them and that they had experienced significant personal and/or professional changes as a result.
Benefits to student in K-12 schools

In order for a PDS to be successful and effective, it is imperative that it fulfills many goals. However, the most pressing of these goals is the improvement of K-12 student learning. According to Petrosko and Munoz (2002), “PDS has distal outcomes. It is entirely appropriate that the proximate outcomes of PDS improve organizational climate, a positive work environment for teachers, and instructional progressivism. However, the fundamental purpose of school remains to produce positive student outcomes” (p.8). One of the four missions of PDS, previously mentioned is to enhance students’ achievement (NCATE, 2001). PDS partnerships seek to pool the knowledge, skills, and resources of higher education institutions and preK-12 schools and bring them to bear collectively on teacher preparation and development and student learning (Creasy, 2005). These learning partnerships should support student outcomes. Levine (2006), in his policy report on the results of a four-year study of America’s education schools, “Educating School Teachers”, cited PDS as “a superb laboratory for education schools to experiment with the initiatives designed to improve student achievement” (p. 105). A Professional Development School must strive to improve student learning (Thompson & Siegel, 2001) by allowing student learning to define the PDS curriculum and the direction of research and inquiry for teacher candidates and school and university faculty (Levine, 2002).

Gill and Hove (2000), in focusing on the gain scores of students, found that those of PDS students to be consistently higher at all grade levels, and in all subject areas, especially math. In “Using collaborative teaching research to determine the impact of PDS activities on elementary students’ math and writing outcomes”, Knight, Wiseman and Cooner (2000) established that elementary school students increased achievement in writing and mathematical problem solving, therefore substantiating the doability of this PDS goal. Similarly, Frey (2002) reported on the
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collaboration between a local middle school and San Diego State University with emphasis on the changed roles and structure caused by the PDS, which led to student growth in the quality, range, and depth of their literacy assessment portfolios, as measured by the school district's standards. PDS’s facilitate access a range of learning opportunities and developmental supports, providing opportunities for students and teachers alike to experiment with new approaches to teaching and learning (Little, 2011). Shaw et al. (2010) noted in their qualitative study entitled “University- school partnerships: On the Impact of Students of Summer Schools” a positive response from students attending PDS in the opinion within their instrument, which referred to the events and their experience within the summer school in a PDS setting. Sizmur et al., (2011), also found that students participating in International School Partnerships (ISPs), when compared to non-ISP students, demonstrated a deeper understanding of a wider range of global issues providing more specific examples of knowledge relating to global interdependence and inequality.

Some studies, however, disagreed with these findings. For example, Creasy (2005), found that professional development school setting did not account for significant amounts of positive variance when predicting academic gains. In addition, in comparing achievement test scores of students attending PDS and Non-PDS, Petrosko and Munoz (2002) saw no statistical differences were found between PDS schools and matched control schools. These comparisons included nationally standardized tests (CTBS) and the state test. Analysis of their data also revealed no differences between PDS and non-PDS school students in percentages of days attending school (p.21). Likewise, Shaw et al. (2010) stated that there was no measureable difference in students’ self- concept in the subject being taught (Chemistry).
It was important to note that the literature, which addresses student’s achievement in connection to PDSs, were conflicting in views. Ross, Brownell, Sindelar, and Vandiver (2000) argued that researchers are slow to explore the relationships to student achievement because they are skeptical about the adequacy of achievement tests to measure PDS outcomes. In addition, the lack of literature, which examined a link between student’s achievement and PDS, made it difficult to make a definitive conclusion on the impact of PDS partnerships on K-12 students with the PDS.

**From Research to Evaluation**

As seen in the literature, many studies examined the outcomes and impacts of PDS partnerships through the perspective of those that participate in the partnership. These studies utilized qualitative methods such as observations, interviews and focus groups, as was the case in Oliveira’s 2013 study “The effects of an Intervention that includes in-Class coaching on preschool teachers and children” and Carpenter and Sherretz (2012) “Professional Development School partnerships: An instrument for teacher leadership.” Quantitative methods like surveys and pretest post-test comparisons were also utilized. For example, Helmz-Lorenz, van de Grift, Canrinus, Maulana and van Veen (2018) “Evaluation of the behavioral and affective outcomes of novice teachers working in professional development schools versus non-professional development schools” and Petrosko and Munoz 2002 study on “A Collaborative Evaluation Model for Systematic Renewal of Teacher Education: Assessing the Effect of Professional Development Schools on Teachers and Students.”

There are many advantages to using these methods to examine PDS partnerships. According to Rahman (2017), qualitative research approach (interpretivism) holistically understands the human experience in specific settings. Denzin and Lincoln (2002) mentioned
that qualitative research is an interdisciplinary field that encompasses a wider range of epistemological viewpoints, research methods, and interpretive techniques of understanding human experiences. The quantitative research focuses on those aspects of social behavior that can be quantified and patterned rather than just finding out them and interpreting their meanings the people bring to their own action (Rahman, 2017). As a result, the quantitative findings were likely to be generalized to a whole population or a sub-population because it involves the larger sample, which is randomly selected (Carr, 1994).

The research, mentioned in the literature, all take the form of a summative research that focused on the outcomes at the end of the PDS process. However, what the literature lacked was a formative evaluative process that examines the implementation and progression of a PDS partnership. A summative evaluation is defined as a method of judging the worth of a program at the end of the program activities or the summation. The focus of this type of evaluation is on the outcome. In contrast, formative evaluation is a method for judging the worth of a program while the program activities are forming (in progress). The focus of the evaluation being the process (Nelson- Royes, 2015).

According to Johnston-Parsons, Johnston, Bronan, Dove and Cramer (2000), the diversity of PDS made for accountability challenges, partly due to the enormity of the PDS endeavors. As a result, most of the evaluation process of PDS consist of reports written by partners within the partnerships. What is therefore needed is comprehensive study that provides a process that could be used to focus on the core standards of a PDS partnership. This study attempts to fill this gap by developing and applying a participatory process to examine educator perspectives regarding the aspect most focused on by their professional development school partnerships, at the current stage of implementation.
Research and evaluation are characterized by similar features that center on the shared objective of answering a question. However, it is important to distinguish between the two disciplines. Research is intended to increase the body of knowledge on a particular issue; any subjective opinion limits the researcher’s credibility (Levin-Rozalis, 2003). According to Cambridge Business English Dictionary (n.d), research is defined as to study a subject carefully or in detail, especially in order to discover new information or understand the subject better. The purpose of evaluation, on the other hand, is essentially to improve the existing program for the target population, while research is intended to prove a theory or hypothesis (Beney, 2011). It is important to note that some evaluations do seek to ‘prove’ a theory; probability evaluations prove that the outcomes or impacts of a program are the result of program activities (Victoria, Habicht & Bryce, 2004). However, the main purpose of evaluation is to improve a program. According to the United Nation Evaluation Group (2016), “an evaluation should provide credible, useful evidence-based information that enables the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of organizations and stakeholders (p.10).” Stufflebeam (1983) summed up the concept of evaluation by stating, the purpose of evaluation is to improve, not prove.

**Participatory Evaluation**

Participatory evaluation is an approach that involves the stakeholders of a program or policy in the evaluation process. Through engaging in participatory evaluation, stakeholders learn more about the organization and about themselves in the context and situation in which they are participating (Cooper, 2017). Fundamentally, participatory evaluation is about sharing knowledge and building the evaluation skills of program beneficiaries and implementers, funders and others (Rossman, 2000). It is important to note that participatory evaluation is not simply a
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matter of using participatory techniques, it is about rethinking who initiates and undertakes the process and who learns or benefits from the findings (Guijt and Gaventa 1998). If learning and change are the intended focus of evaluation, extended involvement and collaboration between stakeholders is required through dialogue, critical reflection and negotiation (Cooper, 2017). Participatory evaluation process worked well with PDS partnerships because it is based on the premise of collaboration which is also the premise in which PDS partnerships are established. The Holmes Report (1998) stated that professional development schools “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 collaborative research on the problems of educational practice” (p. 63).

According to Burke (1998), participatory evaluation can help improve program performance by: (1) involving key stakeholders in evaluation design and decision making; (2) acknowledging and addressing asymmetrical levels of power and voice among stakeholders; (3) using multiple and varied methods; (4) having an action component so that evaluation findings are useful to the program’s end users; and (5) explicitly aiming to build the evaluation capacity of stakeholders. Chouinard and Cousins (2015) defined participatory evaluation as a “partnership between trained evaluation specialists and program community members in the co-production of evaluative knowledge about specific programs or interventions of interest (e.g. projects or policies)” (p. 6). This process could help fill gaps in the literature because it is reflective and action-oriented which provided stakeholders, including beneficiaries, with the opportunity to reflect on project progress and generate knowledge that resulted in being able to apply the lessons learned. It is formative evaluation, focusing on the program activities while the program is in progress (Nelson-Royes, 2015). Formative evaluation provides opportunities for
groups to take corrective action and make mid-course improvements (Zukoski & Luluquisen, 2002).

Also, instead of focusing on the voices of one specific group within the partnership, as seen in the literature, a participatory program evaluation seeks to honor the perspectives, voices, preferences and decisions of the least powerful and most affected stakeholders and program beneficiaries (Rossman, 2000). Therefore, by utilizing a participatory process, this research was able to honor the voices of the marginalized which would be otherwise be silenced by other conventional methodologies.

**Conclusion of Literature Review**

The literature examined suggests that PDS have positive impacts on stakeholders such as intern teachers, administration and institutions and even on students within the k-12 schools. In the contemporary debate on the quality of teacher education, the use of the PDS model has emerged as a highly acclaimed model of teacher preparation (Book, 1996). However, there was a gap in the literature of studies that examined the implementation and progression of a PDS partnership, a participatory process which specifically focused on the fundamental premises and standards of a PDS partnership. This study aimed to apply and explore a participatory process to examine educator perspectives regarding the aspect of their PDS partnerships most focused on, at its current stage of implementation.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Professional Development Schools are a part of the structure for many universities’ colleges of education within the United States. These PDS, according to Brindley, Field and Lessen (2008), were designed to accomplish a four-fold agenda: preparing future educators, providing current educators with ongoing professional development, encouraging joint school–university faculty investigation of education-related issues, and promoting the learning of P–12 students. The overall finding of the literature read indicated that PDS are beneficial to the participating K-12 institutions, teacher candidates and K-12 students. These studies could be categorized as descriptive research, where research is used to describe a situation, subject, behavior, or phenomenon, particularly focusing on the experiences of specific groups who participate in the partnership. These outcome-based research on PDS programs are necessary in order to link the programs with direct outcomes; however, a gap exits in the research that examines the stakeholder perspectives of the implementation and progression of a PDS partnership.

This study utilized Q methodology to develop and apply a participatory process to examine professional development school partnerships’ implementation and progression. In particularly, this study focused on the PDS partnerships established by The University of North Florida.

Research Question

The research question for this study was “What are the shared educator perspectives that emerge through the InQuiry process, regarding the aspect of their professional development school partnerships that is most focused on, at its current stage of implementation?” In 2007, the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS), in consultation with
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educators, produced an agreement on nine essentials that the NAPDS maintains need to be present for a school–university relationship to be called a Professional Development School. These nine essentials are considered, for the most part, the pillars around which a PDS partnership should be built. This study utilized a participatory process to examine which of these “Nine Essentials”, if any, were considered as most important at the current stage of the PDS partnership, providing these partnerships with data that could be used to improve and strengthen their programs.

Q Methodology

In order to answer the question “What are the shared educator perspectives that emerged, through the InQuiry process, regarding the aspect of their professional development school partnerships that is most focused on, at its current stage of implementation?” this research utilized a modify version of Q Methodology referred to as InQuiry. Q methodology provides a foundation for the systematic study of subjectivity, a person’s viewpoint, opinion, beliefs, attitude, and the like (Brown, 1993). Typically, people’s perceptions are examined using qualitative methods since perceptions are classified as being of a subjective nature. Q Methodology, however, provides a method for the scientific study of human subjectivity (McKeown & Thomas, 1998). McKeown and Thomas (1998) further stated, “Q Methodology encompasses a distinctive set of psychometric and operational principles that, when conjoined with specialized statistical applications of correlation and factor-analytical techniques, provides researchers a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (p.7).

In a Q Methodological study, people are presented with a sample of statements about some topic, called the Q-set. Respondents, called the P-set, are asked to rank-order the
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statements from their individual point of view, according to some preference, judgment or feeling about them, mostly using a quasi-normal distribution (Van Exel, & De Graaf, 2005). The Q-set and P-set are considered the variables in this methodology. By Q sorting, people give their subjective meaning to the statements and by doing so reveal their subjective viewpoint (Smith 2001) or personal profile (Brouwer, 1999). As a result, Q methodology provides a method for those seeking to make more intelligible and rigorous the study of human subjectivity ((Mckeown & Thomas, 1998). Q Methodology combines the strength of both qualitative and quantitative methods and in other respects provides a bridge between the two (Sell & Brown, 1984).

Involving both the qualitative exploration of individual opinions and the quantitative statistical analysis makes Q an effective way to systematically examine patterns of thoughts on any topic (Yang, 2016).

Rationale for Using Q Methodology for this Research

In this study, Q Methodology was used in the form of an InQuiry [sic] process. This facilitated a participatory process which examined the implementation and progression of PDS partnerships. Although this process might be similar to other methodologies such as the Action Research which seek both to inform and influence practice (Reason & Bradbury, 2008), one of the fundamental differences lies with the data analysis process. While in an Action Research, the practitioner identify the trends and patterns and methodically sort, sift, rank, and examine their data to answer (Sagor, 2000), the InQuiry process shifts the agency of the evaluation efforts from an external evaluator to the participant stakeholders (Militello, Janson & Tonissen, 2016), which leads it to be categorized as a Participatory Process of Evaluation. Participatory evaluation sits within the interpretive paradigm, as it recognized that knowledge is a social construction, that people construct their ‘lived’ reality by attaching specific meanings to their
experience, and that this construction will result in multiple versions of ‘reality’ (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). According to Militello, Janson and Tonissen, (2016), InQuiry, a modified version of Q Methodology achieves this “by fully engaging stakeholders as participants in the collection of individual beliefs and the subsequent analysis of their collectively held beliefs” (p.89).

Q Methodology, as an InQuiry process, provided a medium for participant’s voice, which would normally be marginalized or lost within large data sets, gathered using quantitative methods. Conventional surveys often conceal marginalized viewpoints (Dryzek, 2005), which can be washed out in averages as across gender, party identification, and all manner of other demographic categories, whose status is structural rather than functional (Brown, 2002). Q methodology solicits the perspectives of the participants and allows those views to be expressed idiosyncratically (Brown, Durning, & Selden, 1999). Q factors, emerge from the actual thinking of the population under observation, hence are indigenous to it (Brown, 2003). According to Stainton-Rogers (1995), Q methodology fits those research questions, which are concerned to hear ‘many voices.’ This was the intention for this study, to apply and explore a participatory process, to examine educator perspectives, regarding the aspect most focused on by their professional development school partnerships, at the current stage of implementation.

“Traditional factor analysis investigates a population around a set of tests or traits. While measuring such variables is important, they do not account for the richness and complexity of life. Life is filled with subjectivity. Q methodology inverts what is factor analyzed” (Militello, Janson & Tonissen, 2016, p.91).

In addition, factors, which emerge from a Q methodological study, are the result of the sorting activity of participants themselves rather than of built-in definitions. Smith (2001)
explained that studies using surveys and questionnaires often use categories that the investigator imposes on the responses. Q Methodology on the other hand, determined operant categories. Stephenson (1968) stated that a crucial premise of Q methodology is that subjectivity is communicable, because only when subjectivity is communicated, when it is expressed operantly, it can be systematically analyzed, just as any other behavior (Stephenson, 1968). According to McKeown & Thomas (2013), “the primary purpose of undertaking a Q study is to discern people’s perceptions of their world from the vantage point of self-reference” (p 1). Participants in a Q study have an opportunity to inflect their own meaning into the items in a particular Q set, whereas the particular sort becomes unique to each participant (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

**Participant/Sample**

This study utilized a purposeful sample technique. The purposive sampling technique, also called judgment sampling, is the deliberate choice of a participant due to the qualities the participant possesses (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, (2016). This technique was chosen for this study because it is a nonrandom technique that does not need underlying theories or a set number of participants. The aim of Q methodology was not to estimate population statistics but to access diversity of point-of-view. Hence random samples are not relevant. The use of purposive sampling in a Q Methodology study involved the researcher seeking the widest array of perspectives around the topic at-hand and sets out to find people who hold views representing that wide array (Watts & Stenner, 2012). This involved identification and selection of individuals or groups of individuals that are proficient and well-informed with a phenomenon of interest (Creswell & Plano Clark, (2011). This study included participants who hold a cross-section of roles within the PDS partnership, including professors in residence, school administrators, mentor teachers, clinical supervisors and interns.
In addition to knowledge and experience, important to note was the availability and willingness to participate, and the ability to communicate experiences and opinions in an articulate, expressive, and reflective manner (Spradley, 1979). Because of its intensive orientation, Q Methodology tends to use person samples that are small, and single case studies (Valenta & Wigger, 1997). Q Methodology, according to Smith (2001), does not need large numbers of subjects as does R Methodology, for it can reveal a characteristic independently of the distribution of that characteristic relative to other characteristics. Watts and Stenner (2012) states that William Stephenson devised the generic name “R Methodology”, for all methods which employ tests or traits as variables and operate using a sample of persons (p.10).

More specifically, this research utilized an approach similar to what is referred to as Maximum Variation Sampling (MVS). The idea behind MVS is to look at a subject from all available angles, thereby achieving a greater understanding. Also known as "Heterogeneous Sampling," it involves selecting candidates across a broad spectrum relating to the topic of study (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, (2016). This method of sampling was appropriate for this research because the intent was to explore the perception of participants who occupies a cross sections of roles within the PDS partnerships, in order to gather comprehensive data on the aspect most focused on by their professional development school partnerships, at the current stage of implementation.

The population for this research consisted of faculty, staff and interns of the University of North Florida’s College of Education and Human Services, along with their counterparts from eight (8) k-12 schools within Duval and Clay County of which a PDS partnership has been established. Some of these partnerships have been ongoing for over a twenty-five-year period. However, it was important to note that since 2016, UNF’s professional development school
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Partnerships have gone through a rejuvenation exercise to improve on existing partnerships and establish new partnerships in order to better utilize resources and widen its’ reach within the wider communities in which it serves. These UNF PDS partnerships included Duval County Public Schools (Kings Trail Elementary, Woodland Acres Elementary, Terry Parker High School, and Lake Shore Middle School), Clay County Public Schools (Groove Park Elementary, Orange Park JHS, and Orange Park High School) and Charter and Private Schools (Tiger Academy, Arlington Community Academy).

The total population of potential participants for the study specifically included fifty (50) UNF education interns placed within eight professional development schools, twenty (20) administrative staff from these PDS which included principals and vice principals and twenty (20) mentor teachers assigned by the PDS to assist interns. From the University of North Florida, participants included eight (8) resident clinical faculty, assigned to coach and supervise interns; and ten (10) professors in residence, whose role was to engage in professional development and facilitate education courses to UNF students at the PDS. These participants represented a large cross-section of individuals that were directly involved in the PDS partnership, striving to ensure that there was relative balance among the role-holders. Although members of the broader community and students attending the PDS were also considered important role-holders, I felt that in regard to the research question, these role-holders would not be in a position to meaningfully address what aspect of the PDS partnership was the most focused on currently. Therefore, they were excluded from the population to prevent potentially skewing of the data.
This population was narrowed to 36 sorters through the advice of the program coordinator, ensuring that there was a somewhat balanced ratio between the different roles held within the PDS partnership and the partner schools.

**Research Instrument**

The main interest of a Q study was to identify viewpoints, behaviors, attitudes, or preferences among participants and the extent to which these perspectives are similar or different (Brown, 1980). To provide their perspectives, participants sorted a collection of items regarding the topic. The development of the collection of items was the starting point for conducting the Q study. This collection of items is known as concourse and should represent all communications (e.g., statements, pictures) the individuals can possibly make about the topic (van Exel & de Graaf, 2005). Brown (1993) explained that in Q methodology, concourse refers to “the flow of communicability surrounding any topic” in “the ordinary conversation, commentary, and discourse of everyday life” (Brown, 1993). For this study, concourse statements were collected from two sources. The research utilized a short questionnaire that consisted of one (1) concourse development statements.

1. At this current stage of your PDS partnership, list the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on.

This questionnaire also contained demographic questions regarding the participant’s gender, race and role within the PDS partnership (See Appendix C).

Along with the questionnaire, concourse statements were extracted from the literature review. A verbal concourse may be obtained in a number of ways: interviewing people; participant observation; popular literature, like media reports, newspapers, magazines, novels; and scientific literature, like papers, essays, and books (Van Exel, & De Graaf, 2005). This is
referred to as a Naturalistic Q-sample. The researcher reviewed the literature extracting statements based on the findings from other researchers investigating similar topics.

**First Phase Data Collection and Procedure: Concourse Development**

A Q study, as summarized by VanExel and DeGraaf (2005), consist of five steps. These steps are listed as “(1) Definition of the concourse; (2) development of the Q sample; (3) selection of the P set; (4) Q sorting; and (5) analysis and interpretation” and then defined the concourse as “all of the possible statements the respondents can make about the subject at hand” (p. 16). This study encompassed these steps within two phases of implementation: (1) the communication concourse development and (2) Q sorting and analysis of data.

In the first phase, referred to as the communication concourse development, I recruited 50 participants and invited them to respond to an open-ended questionnaire that included the prompts:

1. At this current stage of your PDS partnership, list the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on.

In addition to the open-ended prompt, background and demographic information were collected from participants. This information included gender, race role within PDS partnership and years involved in the PDS partnership. Responses were anonymous as no personally identifiable information were collected. This concourse development questionnaire was distributed and administered via Qualtrics (See Appendix C). The participants were recruited via email provided by entities involved in the UNF PDS partnerships, i.e. UNF PDS director and school administrators. The recruitment emails included a brief description of the study's purpose, the estimated time required to complete the questionnaire (5-10 minutes) and the study's
exempt status as determined by UNF's Institutional Review Board process (See Appendix F).
The collection of opinion statements provided by participants during the concourse development
phase was then combined with other opinion statements collected from other sources, namely the
professional literature on the topic. I continued to collect concourse statements until 'saturation
point' was reached (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Saturation point refers to when the statements or
materials began repeating what had already been collected rather than adding new elements.

These concourse statements, along with those extracted from the literature review was
then sorted into groups of statements that expressed similar or related ideas. In the case where
groupings contain only one statement; only one statement was used. In cases where one group
had multiple statements, I selected one representative statement from each group. The subset of
statements is called the Q-sample or Q-set (Valenta & Wigger, 1997). This systematic process
of instrument development resulted in Q-sample opinion statements that ensured
comprehensiveness, balance, and representativeness. The exact size of the final Q set is dictated
by the subject matter. However, a Q set of somewhere between 30 and 80 statements is
considered satisfactory (Stainton Rogers, 1995). Any less than this and issues of adequate
coverage may be a problem. Anymore and the sorting process can become unnecessarily
unwieldy (Watts& Stenner, 2005). In this study, the final size of the Q set was 36 statements
(See Appendix A).

**Second Phase Data Collection: Q Sorts**

In the second phase of data collection, Q sorting and analysis of data, I recruited 36
participants to perform a Q sort of the opinion statements comprising the Q Sample. As with the
previous phase, these participants were recruited via email provided by entities involved in the
UNF PDS partnerships, i.e. UNF PDS director and school administrators. As before, the
recruitment emails included a brief description of the study's purpose, the estimated time required to complete the Q sort (20-30 minutes), and the study's exempt status as determined by UNF's Institutional Review Board process. To perform a Q Sort, participants were invited to first sort the Q Sample statement into three piles: one for statements that are like their perspectives, one for statements that are unlikely their perspectives and a pile for items that fall somewhere in the middle or that they are unsure of. After this initial sorting, participants were then asked to make finer distinctions reflecting their perspectives by placing the Q Sample statements within a symmetrical sorting grid resembling a semi normal distribution. Within this sorting grid was one space for each statement. Participants were prompted to sort the Q Sample statements with the prompt (called the condition of instruction): “At this current stage of your PDS partnership, list the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on.” The columns of this distribution ranged from -4 to +4 with the anchor statements “Most unlike my perspective (-4) to “Most like my perspective (+4).

**Figure 2** Q distribution grid
In addition to the Q Sort, demographical information was requested. This included gender, race, role within PDS partnership, and years involved in the PDS partnership. Responses were anonymous, as no personally identifiable information were collected.

Finally, each participant was asked post sorting questions related to the decisions they made while performing the Q Sort. Specifically, participants were asked to elaborate on why they chose the three statements that were most like and unlike their perspective (See Appendix D). These questions were referred to as post-sort questions. As with the concourse development questionnaire, each response was anonymous, as no personally identifiable information such as names or emails were collected. This Q sort process was facilitated and administered through an online freeware program called FlashQ (Hackert, 2007).

Data Analysis Procedures

Following the collection of participant Q Sort, each Q Sort was entered into a specialized Q Methodology software package called PQMethod (Schmolck, 2012). After the sorts are loaded, PQMethod was used to determine the correlation among the individual sorts. These correlations were then factor analyzed using Principal Component Analysis (PCA). PCA assumes that each item is invariant (correlated at 1.00 with itself as represented using 1’s in the diagonal) (Newman & Ramlo, 2010). In PCA the first principal component accounts for as much of the variability in the data as possible (Ho, 2006). This factor analysis method was chosen for this research because PCA is a dimension-reduction tool that can be used to reduce a large set of variables to a small set that still contains most of the information in the large set (Friedman, Hastie, & Tibshirani, 2001). Also, PCA is the default extraction method in many popular statistical packages such as SPSS, providing a level of convenience for the researcher.
Factor rotation typically follows factor extraction. The rotation “sharpens” the factor structure and provides simple structure. In this study, factors were rotated using Varimax rotation. Varimax is generally accepted as the best rotation method for producing simple structure (Rummel, 1970). Varimax’s popularity is based on its ability to mathematically provide the clearest, maximized separation of factors and, therefore, the simplest structure (Ho, 2006). The result of these statistical procedures was the identification of distinct factors which were composite perspectives shared by individual sorters. These factors were then represented by factor arrays which resemble individual Q Sort. According to Watts and Stenner (2012), “a factor array is a single Q sort configured to represent the viewpoint of a particular factor. This factor array always conforms to the same distribution used in the original data collection and it is constructed by reference to the size and ultimately the rank order of the Z score” (p.140). The Z score or the standard score is the signed fractional number of standard deviations by which the value of an observation or data point is above the mean value of what is being observed or measured. Observed values above the mean have positive standard scores, while values below the mean have negative standard scores (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

I then examined and made holistic meaning of the composition of the factor arrays in order to generate an understanding of the perspectives they represent. This involved examining the holistic patterns that exist among the configurations of Q Sample statements, within the respective factors. In addition to the factor arrays, I also used post sort responses and demographic and background information affiliated with participants’ sorts who loaded significantly on the resultant factors. These post sort responses were a vital part of the Q Methodological procedure, for they aided the later interpretation of the sorting configurations (and viewpoints) captured by each of the emergent factors (Watts & Stenner, 2012), since it
allowed the participants to provide their own idiosyncratic understanding of the items being sorted.

The InQuiry process was the final and most important step in the analysis of this data, as it allowed the participants to participate in all aspects of the evaluation including the data analysis. It entailed the convening of the participants for them to interpret the emergent factor array. Participants were grouped according to who loaded on the same factor. Instead of evaluators interpreting these group’s factors, we invited these groups to sit together as a family; the participants did not need any knowledge about factors or factor analysis (Militello, Janson & Tonissen, 2016). Each group was taken through a protocol in order to reach a deeper understanding on the thoughts, feelings, and opinions around the sort. This included participating in a group discussion around 5 questions.

1. Discuss and record below: What do you notice about you and the others in your PDS family? Who are you? What do you do? What do you seem to have in common that may have influenced your views on this topic similarly?

2. Work together to analyze your family sort. Discuss and record here and also on a poster. What is the story your collective card sort tells you about your shared perspective of the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on at this current stage of your PDS partnership?

3. What are the implications of this perspective for: Principals, Teacher Candidates, Resident Clinical Faculty, Professors in Resident, PDS Administrators?

4. 5 years from now what do you hope the focus of your PDS partnership will be? What would be the three +4 and three +3 if you would to sort again in 5 years’ time?

5. What needs to happen within your partnerships for above change to happen?
Validity

Due to its qualitative aspects, questions of research validity in Q-methodology are assessed differently than in quantitative research methods (Friedman, Hastie, & Tibshirani, 2001). The Q-sorting operation is wholly subjective in the sense that it represents my point of view. There is no external criterion by which to appraise an individual's perspective (Brown, 1993). Everyone’s rank-ordered set of statements was considered a valid expression of their opinion.

Content validity of the Q-sample was addressed thorough literature review and by eliciting expert advice of those associated with the field under investigation. For this study, I worked alongside content and methodological experts. Face validity of the text and statement wording was addressed by leaving the statements in the participants' words, editing only slightly for grammar and readability. Item validity, as understood in more traditional survey research, did not apply to the study of subjectivity. In Q-methodology, one expects the meaning of an item to be interpreted individually. The meaning of how each item was individually interpreted becomes apparent in the rank-ordering and in follow-up interviews (Valenta & Wigger, 1997)

Reliability

Reliability of Q-methodology was proven through test-retest studies and assessment of reliable schematics. For test-retest reliability, studies have shown that administering the same instrument (Q-sample) to the same individuals at two points in time have typically resulted in correlation coefficients of .80 or higher (Brown, 1980). Q-methodology has also produced consistent findings in two more types of study comparisons: first, when administering the same set of statement to different person samples; and second, when pursuing the same research topic, but using different sets of statements and different person samples Dennis, (1988). For reliability
and stability of identified opinion clusters (schemas), findings were consistent when the instrument was administered to different person samples, and even when different Q-samples and person samples were used (Valenta & Wigger, 1997).

Summary of Chapter

Chapter 3 of this study encompassed why Q-methodology was chosen as the medium for the investigation of the research question. This decision was driven behind the idea, according to Brown (1993), that Q methodology provides a foundation for the systematic study of subjectivity, a person’s viewpoint, opinion, beliefs. Also, Van Exel (2005) explains that Q Methodology allows researchers to quantify qualitative statements such as viewpoints, opinions, and attitudes. Q Methodology also allowed participants’ voices to be heard which would normally be marginalized with the use of other conventional research methods. In addition, as an Inquiry process, Q methodology allowed participants to be involved in all stages of the evaluation process, from the development of the instrument to the analysis of the data.

This chapter also presented a rationale behind using purposeful sampling techniques in order to gather a diverse range of perceptions, which was fulfilled the purpose of this research study, to develop and apply a participatory process to examine professional development school partnerships’ implementation and progression. Finally, this chapter described the population that was involved in the study.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

This study applied and explored a participatory process to examine PDS educator perspectives regarding the aspect of their professional development school partnerships most focused on, at the current stage of implementation. Q methodology, particularly the InQuiry
process, was utilized to answer the research question, “What are the shared educator perspectives that emerge through the InQuiry process, regarding the aspect of PDS partnership most focused on, by their professional development school partnerships, at its current stage of implementation?” Q methodology provides a method for the scientific study of human subjectivity (McKeown & Thomas, 1998). InQuiry as explained by Militello, Janson and Tonissen, (2016) achieves this by “fully engaging stakeholders as participants in the collection of individual beliefs and the subsequent analysis of their collectively held beliefs” (p.89).

The population for this research consists of faculty, staff and teacher candidates of the University of North Florida’s College of Education and Human Services, along with their counterparts from eight (8) k-12 schools within Duval and Clay County of which a PDS partnership has been established. Some of these partnerships have been ongoing over a twenty-five-year period. These UNF PDS partnerships includes Duval County Public Schools (Kings Trail Elementary, Woodland Acres Elementary, Terry Parker High School, and Lake Shore Middle School), Clay County Public Schools (Groove Park Elementary, Orange Park JHS, and Orange Park High School) and Charter and Private School (Tiger Academy). The total population of potential participants for the study specifically included fifty (50) UNF education interns placed within eight professional development schools, twenty (20) administrative staff from these PDS which includes principals and vice principals and twenty (20) mentor teachers assigned by the PDS to assist interns. From the University of North Florida, participants included eight (8) resident clinical faculty, assigned to coach and supervise interns; and ten (10) professors in residence, whose role is to engage in professional development and facilitate education courses to UNF students at the PDS. These participants represent a large cross-section
of individuals that are directly involved in the PDS partnership striving to ensure that there is relative balance among the role-holders.

From this population, thirty-six (36) participants completed the Q-sort. These 36 participant consisted of fourteen (14) UNF education interns, seven (7) mentor teachers, three (3) principals of PDS, three (3) resident clinical faculty, four (4) professors in residence and five (5) UNF PDS administrators. Of these 36 sorters, sixteen (18) participated in a reflective retreat to examine the collective results of the process.

Chapter 4 included the results of this study. A description of the statistical data received of the 36 Q sorts by the participants was provided, which included specific information regarding the correlation between the 36 Q sort, analyses of these correlation, factor extraction, factor rotation, and the redistribution of Q sample statements within the resultant 3 factors. Finally, each of the 3 factors were interpreted and named based on the factor arrays, based around each perspective accompanying participant responses to post Q sort questions, available demographic information for participants on each factor and factor interpretation made by participants during InQuiry workshop.

**Factor Description and Characteristics**

From the analyses of the 36 Q sorts provided, three (3) factors were identified and extracted (See Appendix B). The explained variance, eigenvalues, and defining sorts for these factors were calculated by PQMethod and can be found in the tables below. The Eigenvalues for the factors are as follows: Factor 1: (16.7), Factor 2: (3.1362) and Factor 3: (1.8665). Factor 1 represented 31% of the explained variance, Factor 2 represented 13% of the explained variance and Factor 3 represented 16% of the explained variance, totaling 60% of the total explained variance. 32 out of the 36 sorts loaded significantly on a factor. Of the remaining sorts, 2 sorts
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did not load on any of the factors and 2 loaded on more than 1 factor, therefore as per convention of a Q methodology, these 4 sorts were omitted from factor analyses. In addition, because I was using applied InQuiry process 3 sorts were hand flagged in order to include them in the factors in which they had very high significant loads. Thus these 3 sorts would be considered exemplars on the factor on which they were the highest load, despite also loading on 1 other factor. For this study a significant load was calculated at .430086, using the formula \(\frac{1}{\sqrt{36}} \times 2.58\) (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Factor 1 was reported to have eighteen (18) sorts above the .430086 threshold. Factor 2 reported seven (7) sorts above the .430086 threshold. Factor 3 reported seven (7) sorts above the .430086.

**Correlation between Factor Relationships**

Correlations between factor relationships are calculated to determine the degree of relationship between one factor and another. Correlation statistics are used to determine the amount of “likeness” between two sets of data (Watts & Stenner, 2012). Correlation strength is measured from -1.00 to +1.00. These correlations were generated by PQMethod. As seen in Table 1 below, there were high positive correlations between Factors 1, 2, and 3 where \(r \geq 0.430\) is the threshold for significance. Correlation between factor scores were as follows: Factor 1 and Factor 2 had a correlation score of 0.5518; Factor 1 and Factor 3 had a correlation of 0.7123; Factor 2 and 3 had a correlation of 0.5651.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

*Correlation between Factors*
While all factors showed a statistically significant correlation, Factor 1 and Factor 3 displayed a high correlation of 0.7123, with Factor 2 displayed a lesser correlation to Factor 1 (0.5518) and Factor 3 (0.5651).

PQMMethod also reported seven (7) Consensus Statements. These are statements that do not distinguish between any pair of factors, in other words they were statements that were ranked or valued in more or less the same way (Watts & Stenner (2012). These statements along with the Distinguishing statements paint a portrait which helps to conceptualize the high correlation between the Factor Arrays. As seen in Table 2 below seven (7) statements were reported as Consensus statements.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Providing quality educational support to intern ing student-teachers: It's important that while participating as a PDS mentoring teacher that I can help the next generation of intern ing teachers acquire the knowledge and experience needed to transition into a professional setting as seamlessly as possible.
As shown in Table 2, **statement 36**, *coaching the teacher candidates*, was ranked 4 in all three factor arrays. This indicates that across all the factors arrays, participants considered this statement to be the aspect of the PDS partnership that they are most focused on at this current stage of their PDS partnership. This consensus within participants’ perceptions, contributes to the high correlations between factors, showing an overwhelming agreement that the current focus of their PDS partnership was the development of the teacher candidate.

However, as seen in the table above, a good deal of the correlations are not so much as a result of what participants believe was the aspects of the PDS partnership most focused on at this current stage, but rather, these consensus statements show, to a greater extent, the agreement of participants on the aspects that were least focused on by their PDS. These items were ranked at the left end of the distribution grid (-1, -2, -3, -4). This was seen in **statement 6**, *engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants*, which was ranked by Factor 1 (-2), Factor 2 (-1) and Factor 3 (-2); **statement 12**, *PDS investigating how PDS is impacting student's success in grades and attitudes*, was ranked 0 in all three factor arrays. This indicates that across all the factors arrays, participants considered this statement to be the aspect of the PDS partnership that they are least focused on at this current stage of their PDS partnership. This consensus within participants’ perceptions, contributes to the high correlations between factors, showing an overwhelming agreement that the current focus of their PDS partnership was the development of the teacher candidate.
the PDS partnership engaging with other institutions and policymakers to influence policies and practices related to PDS work, which was ranked by Factor 1 (-3), Factor 2 (-4) and Factor 3 (-4); **statement 16**, PDS partners presenting data to the professional and policymaking community showing the ways in which they have decreased the gaps in achievement, which was ranked by Factor 1 (-2), Factor 2 (-3) and Factor 3 (-3). These statements show an agreement that the PDS partnership was least focused on generating and sharing data based on the partnership and collaborating with other institutions and policymakers to influence policies and practices. This agreement contributed greatly to the high correlation between the factors.

Despite these high correlations they were still discernable differences between the 3 perspectives represented by the extracted factors, enough to distinguish distinct meaning from each.

Additional data produced through PQMethod included the number of defining variables, the average reliability coefficient, composite reliability, and standard error of factor scores as seen below.

Table 3  
*Factor Characteristic*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Characteristic</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Defining Variables</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rel. Coef.</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>0.9686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. Factor Scores</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of defining variables is the number of individuals who had significant loading on each factor. As seen in the above table, Factor 1 had eighteen (18) defining variables or Q sort that loaded significantly on that factor. Factor 1 family group was significantly the larger than Factor 2 and Factor 3, showing statistical agreement in the perspectives amongst more than half of the P set (participants in the study), who sorted around the aspects of the PDS partnership most focused on at this current stage of their partnership. Factor 2 had seven (7) defining variables and Factor 3 had seven (7) defining variables. The reliability coefficient refers to the likelihood that a participant completing this sort would complete the sort the same way in successive sorts, the composite reliability score is (.80). The composite reliability score ranged from 0.966 to 0.986, lending one to conclude that the computed factors are of a reliable nature.

**Factor Interpretation**

In a Q Methodology study, extracted factors are examined and described holistically. This is done primarily through the examination of each factor array, as well as the descriptive comments participants who loaded on each factor provided through the post-sort responses. The demographic or background information of the participants who loaded on each factor also can contribute to an understanding of the perspective it represents. While it is the distinct location of the Q Sample statements within the factor arrays that provide the basis for describing and understanding a factor, distinguishing statements, or “statements that a particular factor has ranked in a significantly different way to all the other factors” (Watts & Stenner 2012, p.213), provide information about what makes each factor distinct from the others in the study. I used distinguishing statements in the study in order to further distinguish the distinct meanings of each factor. Additionally, as this was an applied use of Q Methodology, or the InQuiry process, an
additional data source was the collective meaning made and recorded by participants during the reflective retreat.

Factor arrays are a single Q sort configured to represent the viewpoint of a particular factor (Watts & Stenner, 2012). It is these factor arrays that form the foundation for the factor interpretation. According to Watts and Stenner (2012), the Q statement and factor arrays provide a simple, but holistic approach to identifying factor interpretations. The entire factor interpretation process uses “many clues contained in a factor array to lead us back to the viewpoint and to a full explanation of the whole viewpoint” (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 149). To understand a factor, the researcher should first examine the relative placement of statements within the factor array as well as the responses provided by the participants when answering the post-sort questionnaire. Finally, the collective meaning of the factor array expressed by those that participating in the reflective retreat, along with available demographics, was taken into consideration in the development of a holistic understanding of each factor.

From the analysis of the study, three (3) Factors were identified from 36 sorts. The following is the interpretation these factors within the context of the aspect of the PDS partnership that they are most focused on at this current stage of the PDS partnership.

**Factor 1: “A Focus on University/ PDS Teacher Candidate Preparation”**

Factor 1 had an eigenvalue of 16.5 from the unrotated factor matrix and explains 31% of the explained variance. Of the 36 participants, 18 loaded significantly on Factor 1. These 18 participants consisted of 8 teacher-candidates (interns), 5 professors in residence (PIR), 1 PDS principal, 1 resident clinical faculty (RCF), and 3 UNF PDS administrators. Sixteen (16) of the participants who loaded on Factor 1 identified as Caucasian/White and 2 identified as African Americans.
Factor 1 was named “A Focus on University/PDS teacher candidate preparation”. This name reflected the emphasis of this shared perspective around the development of teacher candidates. This emphasis is reflected by many of the Q Sample statements this perspective perceived to be the dominant areas of focus of the PDS partnership (+4s, +3s, & +2s). These statements stressed the importance of the development of the teacher candidates in a teacher educational setting. **Statement 3**, *Providing quality educational support to interning student-teachers: It's important that while participating as a PDS mentoring teacher that I can help the next generation of interning teachers acquire the knowledge and experience needed to transition into a professional setting as seamlessly as possible*, reflects this emphasis on the core purpose of programs: preparing students to be well-prepared teachers. This statement also reflects not only an emphasis on teacher preparation, but in doing so acknowledging that cohorts of teachers who have matriculated through preparation programs together can represent whole generations of educators. This perspective, that the core focus of the PDS partnership should be teacher preparation, was further exemplified by **Participant 25**, a White, female student-intern who referred to statement 3 when she wrote in her post-sort responses that “the university’s real focus in the schools are the interns.” This response was echoed by **Participant 3**, also a White female student-intern, who contextualized this statement by writing that “the support provided to interns is essential as without this support interns are doomed to failure which would defeat the purpose of the partnership. A lot of the efforts of the PDS partnership are focused on the success of the interns.”

**Statement 36**, *coaching the teacher candidates*, which was sorted as a +4, further places the focuses of the PDS program on the development and strengthening of the teacher candidate, mentioning specifically coaching as the preferred method used to offer support to these teacher
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candidates. **Participant 9**, a White male, professor in residence in his post-sort response stated “Interns are the priority. Because they are new to the profession coaching is really important to get them through any frustration they might face.” Likewise, **Participant 7**, a White female, student-intern stated “the PDS partnership focuses on coaching interns through their internship and encourages the schools to do their best to support them as well.”

Even statements, such as **statement 8, Building mentor teacher capacity**, also ranked in a +4 slot within factor 1, which may appear on the surface as lending its focus towards the development mentor teachers within the PDS, was perceived by participants within this factor as providing a characteristic or processes that are in service of the teacher candidate. Therefore shifting the focus of the statement away from the mentor teachers towards the teacher candidate, conceptualizing that the end result of building mentor teacher capacity would be a means of providing quality service to the teacher candidate. **Participant 6**, a White female, mentor teacher stated in her port sort statements, “The partnership works to build mentor teacher capacity because these are the people who have direct contacts with the interns.” While **Participant 32**, a White female, professor in residence stated, “increase the number of PDS teachers, then you increase the understanding of the PDS vision and mission and will gain more teacher buy-in towards the work of educating student-teachers in a diverse learning environment.” These perspectives emphasize that educating and supporting the teacher candidate is the “work” of the PDS partnership, particular the “work” of those within the university and PDS setting. This perspective was summed up in one overarching statement recorded by the group which loaded on Factor 1 during the reflective retreat. This group, when asked to make meaning of their shared perspective of the aspect of the PDS partnership that they
are most focused on at this current stage of their PDS partnership, stated, “development of the teacher candidate.”

This emphasis on the development of teacher candidates is also reflected by many of the Q Sample statements this perspective perceived as the aspects being the least focus of the PDS partnership (-4s, -3s, & -2s). These statements focused less on the teacher candidate and more on the partnership of the PDS within the families and communities for which they serve.

Statement 21, the PDS partner institutions playing a leadership role in the larger community, and statement 22, helping to ensure full engagement of Families, community members, policymakers, and the business community, puts into perspective the idea that the PDS partnership goes beyond the education of teacher candidates. Changing the illustration from a dual partnership between university and PDS to a trinity, where the involvement of the community is as important as the university and the PDS within the partnership. The perspectives within this factor perceived this aspect of the PDS as least focused on at the current stage of their partnership as stated by Participant 13, a White female, UNF PDS administrator in her post sort statement, “this has not happened yet.” This perception resonates across the different roles within the partnership as similar post sort statements were recorded. Participant 7, a White female, student-intern stated, “I don’t think the community is aware of what the PDS partnership is about,” as well as Participant 32, a White female, professor in residence who further stated: “The PDS partner has not demonstrated involvement within the community.” Although these 3 participants hold different roles within the partnership (i.e. administrator, professor in residence and student intern), they all recognized that the involvement of the community within the scope of the PDS partnership is not the focus of their PDS partnership at this current stage.
The community aspect of the PDS partnership was perceived as the aspect least focused on by participants who loaded on this factor since it does not fall into the perceived parameters of teacher education. These parameters being the idea that the teacher candidate education and support is the sole responsibility of the university experts. **Participant 35**, a White female, senior professor in residence, explained in reference to **statement 22**, *helping to ensure full engagement of Families, community members, policymakers, and the business community*, “it is rare that we (faculty) involve anyone outside of our own “expertise”. There is a general feeling of faculty that they know what is best… and that community members, policy makers and business community don’t.” Consequently, the community is not the focus of the PDS partnership at this current stage because the current focus is the education and support of the teacher candidate which can only be done, according to these participants, within the structure and expertise of the university and PDS.

The remaining statements that were ranked at zero or near the zero ranking (1s, 0s, -1s) in this factor also supports the perception of this factor, which places education and support of the teacher candidate as the current focus of this PDS partnership. Watts and Stenner (2012) warns against the tendency to assume that a zero or near zero ranking in a distribution is, “on occasion an item sitting right in the middle of the distribution can act as a fulcrum for the whole viewpoint being expressed”(p.156). In the case of Factor 1, **statements 9**, *PDS investigating how PDS is impacting student's success in grades and attitudes*; and **statement 18**, *Furthering the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools*, were perceived as being more distal, having a possible impact on teacher candidate but not a direct impact. While these statements did not trigger strong emotions towards what was perceived as the current focus of the PDS partnership, they were not placed to the extreme left of the sort (having the least impact).
because a secondary impact on teacher candidates could be deciphered. In his post sort response **Participant 9**, a White male, professor in residence commented “this I don’t see as the focus of the PDS.” This perception can also be applied for **Statement 19**, being committed to multi-racial and multicultural education, also ranked in the middle of the sort, were participants perceived this statement as not so much an action to be implemented in the PDS partnership, but more as a disposition of individuals within the partnership. **Participant 19**, an African American female, resident clinical faculty, stated, “I do not think this happens (outside of a few individualized example).” This disposition, if incorporated in the education of teacher candidates could be perceived as being beneficial and therefore providing that link to the development of the teacher candidate.

**PQmethod** also identified distinguishing statements for Factor 1. These are statements that a factor has ranked in a significantly different way to all the other factors, indicated by a $p < 0.01$ level (Watts and Stenner, 2012). Factor 1 ranked **statement 8**, Building mentor teacher capacity, and **statement 11**, strengthening relationship between university and PDS, significantly higher than the other factors, indicating that strong perception that the current focus their PDS is the education and support of the teacher-candidate. **Statement 11**, reiterates the perspective, as previously mentioned, that the education and support of the teacher candidate is the sole responsibility of the university experts. Illustrating, once again, the perspective that the PDS partnership is dual, between the university and PDS, rather that the trinity which includes the community as an equal partner.

**Factor 2: “A Focus on Cultural Responsive Education”**
Factor 2 had an eigenvalue of 3.1 from the unrotated factor matrix and explains 13% of the explained variance. Of the 36 participants, 7 loaded significantly on Factor 2. These 7 participants consist of 1 resident clinical faculty (RCF), 1 mentor teacher, and 5 teacher candidates (interns). Two (2) of the participants who loaded on Factor 2 identified as African Americans and 5 participants identified as Caucasian/White.

The name “A Focus on Cultural Responsive Education” reflected the shared perspective around the development of teacher candidates using a culturally responsive lens, the response to education in a multicultural world. Like Factor 1, this factor also perceived the development of the teacher candidate as the aspect most focused on by their PDS partnership, at this current stage. This is reflected in the consensus statement 36, *coaching the teacher candidates*. Consensus statements, as previously stated, are statements that were ranked or valued in the same way by all factors. This statement, *Coaching the teacher candidates*, ranked by the participants comprising of Factor 2 as a +4, emphasized the shared perceptive for which the realm of the PDS partnership is the development and support for teacher candidates, as stated by Participant 18, a White female, student intern, who contextualized this statement by saying, “There are numerous coaching cycles that occur both with both the university supervisors as well as with the mentor teacher.” Participant 17, an African American, resident clinical faculty, explains further what is meant by “coaching”. She stated, “the COEHS teacher preparation program has moved away from evaluative assessments to a three-phase coaching model.” This statement indicates the ongoing work being done by the university to elevate their teacher education programs within the PDS in order to provide better support for the teacher candidates. Statement 4, *Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need*, complements this perception of the PDS partnership striving to meet the needs of its
members to ultimately offer a teacher education programs which develops and supports the student candidate. Participant 29, an African American, mentor teacher, in regard to this statement expressed that she “feels as though UNF thrives in professional development and the trainings that I've attended have been beneficial and things that I needed to hear.” This professional development, as stated by Participant 22, a White female, student intern, “is essential for teacher growth.”

What distinguished Factor 2 from the other factors was the incorporation of that perception of education in a multicultural world. Statement 33, PDS partners model for the professional community the ways in which they teach from multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and diverse cultural backgrounds of all people, was flagged by PQmethod as being a distinguishing statement for Factor 2. These are statements that a particular factor has ranked in a significantly different way to all the other factors (Watts and Stenner, 2012). As explained by Participant 17, an African American, resident clinical faculty, in her post sort statements, “All PDS are Title I with a diverse student demographic, predominantly students of color. Yet most of the teacher candidates are white female with very contrasting backgrounds. It is important to be intentional when preparing teacher candidate to effectively teach students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.” This intentionality was demonstrated by the participants who loaded on this factor at the reflective retreat. When asked to name their factor, the name chosen was “we are the world” explaining that their PDS partnership “uses leadership roles to support the different cultures within the classrooms.” This explanation is a combination of statement 19, being committed to multi-racial and multicultural education and statement 34, fostering leadership from within the classroom, which were ranked at the far right of the distribution grid (+4 and +3). The 3
participants combined these statements in order to emphasize the shared perceptive of their PDS partnership currently being a leader in cultural responsive education. **Participant 22**, a White female, student intern further stated, “The key to effectively teaching diverse student populations is multicultural and social justice education.”

Statements ranked at the opposite end of the distribution grid (-4s, -3s, -2s), helped in the development of this narrative by providing an illustration of what this perspective perceives as currently being the aspects least focused on by their PDS partnership. According to this perspective, these statements did not directly involve the education of student candidates nor did they reflect culturally responsive education. **Statement 12**, *the PDS partnership engaging with other institutions and policymakers to influence policies and practices related to PDS work* and **Statement 17**, *Encouraging Partner institutions to change policies and practices as a result of work done in PDSs*, reflects that aspect of PDS partnerships working to further education by influencing policy changes and practices within education system. The participants comprising the Factor 2 family group perceived these aspects as beyond the scope of their responsibilities, as a result, these statements were ranked at the far left of the distribution grid. This was reflected in **Participant 14**’s, a White male, student intern, post sort statements who explained, “This was not something I was aware of happening as I am an intern and not involved in this part of the PDS work. I was unsure and decided to put it in least focused since I was completely unaware of it.” **Participant 17**, an African American female, resident clinical faculty, further stated, “I do not see where any policies are changing or being challenged” implying that these policies changes or challenges are the responsibilities of entities other than themselves, from which they are not “seeing” it be done. **Participant 22**, a White, female, student intern, simply stated “Not a direct impact to my school”, emphasizing the perception that the current aspect being focused on
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by their PDS partnership is the work being done within the PDS, which comprises of the
development of culturally responsive teacher candidates.

The statements ranked in the middle of this factor (1s, 0s,-1s) supports this perspective’s
narrative of the PDS partnership developing student candidates to be culturally responsive in a
multicultural world. **Statement 32, PDS partner institutions create mechanisms to disseminate
curricula in the university and school programs that reflect issues of equity and access to
knowledge by diverse learners,** emphasized the shared perspective of the PDS, at this current
stage of implementation, being instrumental in creating programs, consisting of culturally
responsive curriculum, to equip their teacher candidates to meet the needs of diverse leaners.
Specifically focusing on equity within these “Title I with a diverse student demographic,
predominantly students of color” as previously stated by **Participant 17**, an African American
female, resident clinical faculty. These statements also emphasized aspects of the PDS
partnership that was considered, by these participants as least focused on by their PDS
partnership. In regards to **statement 21, the PDS partner institutions playing a leadership role in the larger community**, **Participant 18**, a White female, student intern stated, “I do not think
this is something that the PDS partnership is highly focused on when compared to some of the
other statements that were presented.” **Participant 17**, an African American female, resident
clinical faculty, also stated, “Right now I see more of the work being done within the schools and
not so much in the communities with an exception of a couple of the PDSs.” Rather than acting
“as a fulcrum for the whole viewpoint being expressed”(Watts & Stenner, 2012,p.156), these
statements ranked in the middle (-1s, 0s, +1s) of this factor array seem to be the overflow of the
aspects being perceived as being most focused on (+4, +3, +2) and least focused on (-4, -3, -2)
currently by their PDS partnership.
Factor 2, “A Focus on Culturally Responsive Education”, reflected the shared perspective around the current focus of the PDS partnership being the development of teacher candidates using a culturally responsive lens. While the participants comprising the Factor 2 family group agreed with the Factor 1 family group that the current focus of the PDS partnership was the development and support of teacher candidates within the PDS, the incorporation of that perception specifically focused on the education of teacher candidates to be culturally responsive in a multicultural world, is what distinguished Factor 2 from the other factors within this study.

Factor 3: “A Focus on Furthering Education”

Factor 3 had an eigenvalue of 1.9 from the unrotated factor matrix and explains for 16% of the explained variance. Of the 36 participants, 7 loaded significantly on Factor 3. These 7 participants consisted of 4 teacher candidates (interns), 1 assistant principal, 1 mentor teacher and 1 professor in residence. One (1) of the participants who loaded on Factor 3 identified as African American and 6 identified as Caucasian/White.

Factor 3’s name, “A Focus on Furthering Education”, reflected the shared perspective around the furthering of the education profession using data and improving the capacity of all stakeholders. This factor, as previously stated in Table1, scored a very high correlation to Factor 1 (0.712). This correlation was due to the shared perspective that the current focus of the PDS partnership was the development and support of the teacher candidates. Factor 3, much like Factor 1, ranked statement 3, providing quality educational support to interning student-teachers: It's important that while participating as a PDS mentoring teacher that I can help the next generation of interning teachers acquire the knowledge and experience needed to transition into a professional setting as seamlessly as possible, as a +4. Both emphasizing the perspective that the development and support of the teacher candidate was the primary focus of the PDS
partnership. **Participant 2**, a White female, student intern, along with **Participant 10**, a White male, student intern, both corroborated this perspective by stating, “This is the number one priority of the university” and “the university and PDS is committed in producing well trained teachers as a result we strive to support them in every way” respectively. However, the participants comprising the Factor 3 family, interpretation of this statement and other similar statements within the Q-sort, was extended to encompass the development and furthering of education. **Participant 10**, continued by explaining, “creating a culture which supports future educators contributes to the longevity of the education system. This is the goal of the university and elementary schools within the PDS partnership.” This perspective of the development and support of the teacher candidate, is the primary focus of the PDS partnership, recognizing that in building the capacity of these teacher candidates, the education system will likewise be growing in capacity.

This perspective could also be seen in the post sort statements regarding statement 36, *coaching the teacher candidates*. **Participant 33**, an African American female, mentor teacher, stated, “Coaching is important. Without coaching the teacher candidates cannot be successful teachers in the future” and **Participant 36**, a White female, professor in resident stated, “providing support for teacher candidates so that they are able to handle the myriad of challenges in the future.” Both participants placed the success of the teacher candidate as a priority for the PDS partnership, while echoing the perspective that this success should contribute to the future of the education.

The Factor 3 family perspective also included statements that focused on furthering education through research data produced, as a result of the work being done within the PDS partnership. Data production, which serves to impact education, as an aspect focused on by the
PDS partnership was truly what distinguished Factor 3 from the other 2 factors. Factor 1 and Factor 2 ranked this aspect of PDS partnership at the far left of the distribution grid (-4s and -3s), perceiving it as one of the least focused on currently by their PDS partnership. However, the participants comprising of the Factor 3 family emphasized its importance as a current focus of their partnership. This emphasis was seen in the post sort statements regarding sort items such as statement 7, *the PDS partnership producing outcome data that drive changes in how P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals learn.* **Participant 1**, a White female, student intern, explained “data should be what is driving practices within the classroom, as a result is important to PDS.” **Participant 33**, an African American female, mentor teacher, also explained “Data is important over everything when content planning reflecting and moving students forward.” Both participants placed into perspective a focused on the PDS partnership as a change agent through the production of data. This data would drive changes in learning within all aspects of the partnership.

Statements ranked at the far left of the distribution grid (-4, -3, -2), illustrated “furthering education” within the confinement of a university/PDS partnership. Much like Factor 1, the participants comprising of Factor 3, perceives the work of the PDS partnership from a dual aspect (university and PDS) and not that of a trinity (university, PDS, community). These participants, when asked to name their shared perspective at the reflective retreat, stated, “Within these walls.” This response accentuated their perception of their PDS partnership doing their part, to facilitate the furthering of education, from within silos positioned apart from the wider community, which included families, business community, policy makers and educational institutions. **Participant 1**, a White female, teacher intern, explained that “there isn’t much collaboration between other institutions and the PDS at this point. Most of the work is limited
between PDS and the University.” This explanation was stated in her port sort statement in response to Statement 24, PDS partners engage family members in focusing on identifying students’ needs. This perspective was also expressed by Participant 10, a White male, teacher intern, who stated, “while community is important due to time constraints there is not much interaction with the wider community outside the PDS.”

Participant 33, an African American female, mentor teacher, in responses to Statement 12, the PDS partnership engaging with other institutions and policymakers to influence policies and practices related to PDS work, accounts for the lack of engagement between other institutions, policymakers and the PDS partnership, being a result of stakeholders not understanding each other roles. She stated, “Unless policymakers understand all stakeholders’ roles, engaging with other institutions and policymakers to influence policies and practices related to PDS work, would be one of the least important tasks for their PDS partnership.”

Participant 36, a White, female, professor in resident further stated, “State restrictions and policies and other mandates make this challenging.” This perspective reveals some of the inner tremolos within PDS partnerships, where members of the PDS partnership perceive that their roles and work are not fully understood or appreciated by all within the partnership. This then results in members compartmentalizing their work giving way to a lack of collaboration between members.

Statements that ranked in the middle of the distribution grid (1s, 0s, -1s) of Factor 3 were a combination of the overflow of the aspects of PDS partnerships being perceived as being most focused on (+4, +3, +2) and least focused on (-4, -3, -2) currently by their PDS partnership, and those that were “indicative of neutrality, total indifference or a general lack of significance or meaning” (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p.156). Statements such as statement 9, PDS investigating
how PDS is impacting student's success in grades and attitudes, were like those that were perceived in this factor array to be the aspects of the PDS partnership most focused on currently. Participants in this perception perceived the current focus of their PDS partnership being the furthering of education through research data produced, as a result of the work being done within the PDS partnership. While statements such as statement 22, helping to ensure full engagement of Families, community members, policymakers, and the business community, mirrors those statement that were ranked by the participants comprising of Factor 2, as least focused on (-4, -3, -2) currently by their PDS partnership. The perception that the work of the PDS partnership exited between the university and the PDS, totally excluding families, community member, policymakers and the business community. Subsequently, statement 26, Partner schools celebrating diversity and statement 19, being committed to multi-racial and multicultural education, did not evoke any strong reaction from the participants comprising of Factor 2 on either end of the distribution grid. These statements highlighted cultural responsiveness and multicultural education within the PDS partnership.

Factor 3, “A Focus on Furthering Education”, reflected a shared perspective which focused on the furthering of the education profession through the use of data and improving the capacity of all stakeholders. Like Factor 1, this factor emphasized the importance of building the capacity of the teacher intern through coaching and institutional support, however, the participants comprising of Factor 3, perceived that building the capacity of student interns, may lead to the furthering of the education system. These participants also accentuated their perception of their PDS partnership doing their part to facilitate the furthering of education, from within silos positioned apart from the wider community, which included families, business community, policy makers and educational institutions.
Participants’ Perspective Regarding the InQuiry Process

Of these 36 Participants, sixteen (16) participated in a reflective retreat to examine the collective results of the process. This reflective retreat was based on the applied approach to Q methodology. These 18 participants consisted of 6 intern teacher, 3 mentor teachers, 2 resident clinical faculty, 3 professors in residence, 2 school administrators and 2 UNF PDS partnership administrators. At the conclusion of the reflective retreat, these participants were asked to reflect on the entire InQuiry process by responding to 3 statements. These responses were given anonymously. The responses were as follows.

1. Briefly describe how this InQuiry process helped further your understanding of what you perceived to be the current area of focus of the PDS partnership. In response to this statement, participants stated that the InQuiry process provided them with clarification and understanding of their perspective. These participants expressed that the rigor of the sorting process allowed them to narrow their perspective to what they truly perceived was the current focus of their PDS partnership. One participant stated, “I think the process of sorting is an excellent method to gauge PDS information on where “we” are at”. While another participant stated, “the sorting process really helped me to prioritize what I thought the current focus was. I had to make tough decisions on what was the most focused on and least focus on.” These participants also felt that by providing an opportunity for them to discuss within their factor family groups, they gained further clarification and understanding of their individual perspective. This emphasized by a participant who stated, “this experience allowed me to collaborate with others who had similar thinking as me, I was able to get clarification on certain ideas, as well as reinforce what I already thought was true in regard to PDS.” This perspective was shared by another participant who explained that “the process helped me get clarification about the areas of
focus. Talking with others helped me understand and articulate my thoughts about the statements.”

Participants also expressed that the InQuiry process allowed them to reflect on the entire PDS partnership. These participants expressed that while they are encouraged to be reflective within their individual roles within the PDS partnership and the PDS to which they were assigned, they are rarely asked to reflect on the partnership. A participant stated, “it was very difficult at times to look as a whole rather than focus on the one school where I do my work.” The result of this reflection was them focusing on where they perceived their PDS partnership focus was, helping them to formulate actions needed to further the collaborations within the partnership, as stated by a participant, “it made me think of specific actions that was needed to move the PDS work forward.”

Finally, participants felt that the InQuiry process helped them to validate the reasoning behind their sort. One participant stated, “discussing the factors with the group allowed me to solidify the reason for how I sorted the way I did, it was validating.” Likewise, another participant stated, “this activity has helped me confirm my perspective.” This validation of their perspective was achieved through the discussions held with other participants, at the reflective retreat, who shared similar perspective. Through these discussions, participants realized that they were not alone in their perspective and provided them with a sense of confidence, as stated by one participant, “this process made me see how some people had the same view points as me, even though they worked in different roles.” Yet another participant stated, “the fact that other people saw the focus of the PDS partnership the same way I saw it made me feel that my contribution was meaningful.”
2. Briefly describe how this Inquiry process helped further your understanding of what others perceived to be the current areas of focus of the PDS partnership. In response to this statement, participants expressed that the InQuiry process helped them develop a deeper and true understanding of the current focus of their PDS partnership. Participating in the InQuiry process helped them come to the realization that “although separated in different groups, all groups were on the same page”, as stated by a participant. This realization was acquired by understanding the context from which others responded. One participant stated, “sharing out of each group’s perspective at the reflective retreat provided me with the reasoning behind their responses that might have differed from mine.” This perspective was collaborated by another participant who stated, “seeing where members of the other groups where station and the roles they held in their PDS made me understand why they came to a different conclusion.”

Participants also explained that the InQuiry process revealed to them the focus of different role holders from within the PDS partnership that they would normally not be exposed to. This perspective was expressed by a participant who stated, “this process allowed me to consider the vantage point of the other individuals involved in the PDS work.” According to these participants, the InQuiry process also highlighted other areas of focus within the PDS partnership they were unaware of, since it was beyond the scope of their personal roles. This insight allowed them to view the PDS partnership, instead of individualized units with individualized tasks. One participant stated, “very rarely do I think about the entire PDS partnership. I am usually focused on my day to day activities. I think this process brought us back to the depth of the PDS mission.”

3. Overall, how useful was this process in helping you understand your own and others perspective regarding the current areas of focus of the PDS partnership. Overall, all
participants concluded that the InQuiry Process was very useful. They expressed that while the sorting of the statements helped them to determine their individual perspectives on the current areas of focus of their PDS partnership, the discussions conducted at the reflective retreat solidified their stance. One participant stated, “the face to face dialogue helped a lot versus just getting a report in an email.” The participants also explained that the discussions were helpful in allowing them to expand their perspectives by incorporating other viewpoints expressed at the reflective retreat, as stated by a participant, “it’s always encouraging to discuss similar perspectives and also stretch one’s views by incorporating other.”

Finally, the participants expressed the shared perspective that the InQuiry process was useful as the visuals provided of each factor arrays facilitated the comparison between family groups which revealed the commonalities amongst the groups. These commonalities helped the envisioning of where the PDS partnership current focus was and triggered discussions on future foci. One participant stated, “discussing what the PDS partnership is most and least focused on helps us to see where we are and where we need to go next.”

Chapter Summary

Chapter 4 described the results of this study, which explored a Participatory Process to examine educator perspectives of the aspect of the PDS partnership most focused on by their Professional Development School Partnerships, at its current stage of implementation. A total of 3 significant factors were identified. These factors were named as followed: Factor 1: “A Focus on University/ PDS Teacher Candidate Preparation”, Factor 2: “A Focus on Cultural Responsive Education” and Factor 3: “A Focus on Furthering Education”. All 3 factors expressed the shared perspective of their PDS partnership being currently focused on the development and support of teacher candidates within the PDS. Also, all 3 factors agreed that their PDS partnership existed
between the university and the PDS, excluding that community and education partners. What differentiated these factors from each other was the context in which they visualized their current focus. Factor 1’s perceived their focus as the university/PDS providing developmental support for teacher candidates. This support was exclusively provided by the “exports” within the university and the PDS. Factor 2’s perceptions were divergent due to the focus on developing and supporting student candidates to be culturally responsive in a multicultural world. Finally, Factor 3’s perspective, while very similar to Factor 1, emphasized a focus of furthering education through the use of data and research.

Table 4

*Overview of Factors’ Shared Perspective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Perspective on aspects of PDS currently focused on</strong></td>
<td>development and support of teacher candidates within the PDS</td>
<td>development and support of teacher candidates within the PDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose for current focus</strong></td>
<td>Fulfillment of the university purpose and goals, ultimately benefiting the university and its programs</td>
<td>developing teacher candidates using a culturally responsive lens, in order to serve a multicultural world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Perspective on aspects of PDS least focused on currently</strong></td>
<td>Collaboration with family and community</td>
<td>Collaboration with family and community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perceptions of the participants regarding the InQuiry Process was also reported in Chapter 4. Overall, the participants expressed that the sorting of the concourse statements, to determine their perspective on the current focus of their PDS partnership, provided them with a process that encouraged intense self-reflection. They also showed their appreciation for the
discussions within factor families and between factor families. These discussions were classified as beneficial, by the participants, since they felt that it allowed them to solidify and validate their perspective. Finally, participants perceived the InQuiry process as being useful in helping them envision where the PDS partnership current focus was and triggered discussions on future foci.

Chapter 5 - Discussion

General Overview
The main purpose of this study was to apply and explore a participatory process to examine educator perspectives regarding the aspect of the PDS partnership most focused on by their Professional Development School Partnerships, at its current stage of implementation. In Chapter 1 of this study, I placed the study within context by providing a brief definition of the concept of PDS partnerships. This partnership was defined as a place where teachers candidates could continue learning while allowing for continual research and professional development (Holmes, 1990). The reader was also presented with the purpose and significance of the study, calling attention to the gaps in the literature in terms of the need for a formative participatory process which examines the implementation and progression of PDS partnerships. The CLE axioms were also presented in this chapter, as the theoretical lens in which I would examine the perceptions of participants within the study, conceptualizing the PDS partnership as the community and the participants of the study as the members of that community.

In Chapter 2, I examined the literature around the origin and benefits of PDS partnerships. Focus was also given to methods used over time to evaluate and monitor the implementation and progression of the PDS partnerships. Finally, I explored Participatory Evaluations as a viable alternative to examine the implementation and progression of the PDS partnership. The literature that was examined suggested that PDS partnerships have positive impacts on stakeholders such as intern teachers, administration and institutions and even on students within the k-12 schools. In the contemporary debate on the quality of teacher education, the use of the PDS model has emerged as a highly acclaimed model of teacher preparation (Book, 1996). However, there was a gap in the literature of studies that examined the implementation and progression of a PDS partnership. This gap reflected a lack of participatory
processes which specifically focusing on the fundamental premises and standards of a PDS partnership.

In Chapter 3 of this study, I explained why Q-methodology was chosen as the medium for the investigation of the research question. This methodology was chosen because Q methodology provides a foundation for the systematic study of subjectivity, a person’s viewpoint, opinion, beliefs (Brown, 1993). Van Exel (2005) explains that Q Methodology allows researchers to quantify qualitative statements such as viewpoints, opinions, and attitudes. Q Methodology also provides participants’ voices to be heard which would normally be marginalized with the use of other conventional research methods. In addition, as an InQuiry process, Q methodology would allow participants to be involved in all stages of the evaluation process, from the development of the instrument to the analysis of the data, allowing this process to be truly participatory in nature.

In this chapter, I also presented a rationale behind the use of purposeful sampling techniques. Using these techniques, I was able to gather a diverse range of perceptions, which is one of the purposes of this research study. Finally, I describe the population which was involved within the study.

In Chapter 4, I described the results of this study, which explored a Participatory Process to examine educator perspectives on aspect of the PDS partnership most focused on by their Professional Development School Partnerships, at its current stage of implementation. A total of 3 significant factors were identified. These factors were named as followed: Factor 1: “A Focus on University/ PDS Teacher Candidate Preparation”, Factor 2: “A Focus on Cultural Responsive Education” and Factor 3: “A Focus on Furthering Education”. All 3 factors expressed the shared perspective of, their PDS partnership, being currently focused on the development and support of
teacher candidates within the PDS. Also, all 3 factors agreed that their PDS partnership existed between the university and the PDS, excluding that community and education partners. What differentiated these factors from each other was the context in which they visualized their current focus. Factor 1’s perceived their focus as the university/PDS providing developmental support for teacher candidates. This support was exclusively provided by the “exports” within the university and the PDS. Factor 2’s perceptions were divergent due to the focus on developing and supporting student candidates to be culturally responsive in a multicultural world. Finally, Factor 3’s perspective, while very similar to Factor 1, emphasized a focus of furthering education through the use of data and research.

The perceptions of the participants regarding the InQuiry Process was also reported in Chapter 4. Overall, the participants expressed that the sorting of the concourse statements, to determine their perspective on the current focus of their PDS partnership, provided them with a process that encouraged intense self-reflection. They also showed their appreciation for the discussions within factor families and between factor families. These discussions were classified as beneficial, by the participants, since they felt that it allowed them to solidify and validate their perspective. Finally, participants perceived the InQuiry process as being useful in helping them envision where the PDS partnership current focus was and triggered discussions on future foci.

**Discussion of Findings**

As reported in Chapter 4, all 3 factors displayed a high statistical correlation to each other. This correlation was attributed to all 3 factors perception of, the development and support of teacher candidates, being the aspect, most focused on by their PDS partnership currently (see Table 1). This perception was seen in the consensus statements listed in Table 2. As shown in Table 2, all factors ranked **statement 36, coaching the teacher candidates**, as a +4, classifying
this statement as an aspect most focused on by their PDS partnership. This perspective was shared by participants regardless of the role held within the PDS partnership. These roles included university faculty, teacher candidates and PDS personnel. This overwhelming consensus did not come as a surprise to me; however, it did create the foundation behind the narrative of UNF PDS partnership’s current focus. In 2001, NCATE established a list of standards to guide PDS partnerships. These standards provided a set of criteria for PDS partnerships at 3 stages of development and implementation (Beginning, Developing and At Standard). Keeping in mind that the UNF PDS partnership recently underwent a renewal and rebuilding process in 2016, their partnership would be classified at the beginning stages, and therefore, the shared perspective expressed by the participants could be considered consistent with the NCATE standard. According to NCATE (2001), a PDS partnership at the beginning stage should create a plan the “includes the creation of field experience and clinical practice to provide candidates with opportunities for full immersion in the learning community” (p.17). The placing of these teacher candidates within these PDS could be viewed as a means of establishing relationships within these schools, which could then result in the development of a partnership from which other aspect of PDS partnerships could then be explored.

Unfortunately, the exploration of other aspects of PDS partnerships beyond the University/PDS dynamics has not been developed by UNF PDS partnership. As expressed by many of the participants, the development and support of the teacher candidates was the primary focus of partnership. Participants comprising of Factors 1 family groups, placed emphasis on the perception that this development and support of the teacher candidate is the sole responsibility of the university “exports”. Adding that anyone outside of the university was not considered to have the expertise to assist with teacher candidates’ development. Support, for these candidates,
could be provided by the role holders within the PDS, such as administrators and mentor
teachers, however, these role holders had to undergo professional development, facilitated by
these university “exports”. This perception resulted in the limited understanding of the PDS
partnership to just 2 members, the university and the PDS. In my opinion, this perception could
only have a crippling effect on the further development of the PDS partnership, as it excludes an
entire facet of PDS Partnerships, which is the Broader Community.

This exclusion was also reflected in the consensus statements that were ranked to the left
of the matrix (-4s, -3s and -1s), aspects least focused on currently by the PDS partnership. These
statements reflected the engagement of policymakers and the broader community to influence
practices and policies in education. The dual perception of PDS partnership (university and
PDS) is contrary to the intended concept of PDS partnerships as described by NAPDS in their
Nine Essentials (2008), and severely narrows the scope of the UNF PDS partnership. According
to NAPDS (2008), “PDSs may also extend themselves to the community outside the
school/district and college/university gates. Ultimately, local businesses, agencies, and
policymakers can become participants in the work of a PDS” (p.4). Standard 1 of the Standards
of PDSs, presented by NCATE in 2001 describes this broader community as “the school district,
teacher union or professional teacher education association, other interested schools and
university faculty, family members, community members” (p.17). Both documents were
referenced in UNF PDS documentations, which indicates, at the very least, that the
administrators of this partnership were aware of these expectations. In reference to the Extended
Learning Community (Standard 1) in the NCATE Standards for PDS, at the beginning stage of
PDS development, there should be at minimum “a plan for extending the learning community; a
plan for creating a forum to share practices and policies with other PDSs in the partnership and
affiliated schools” (NCATE, 2001, p.19). Based on the perceptions complied within this study, there was no evidence that this “plan” existed. Participants, comprising the factor family groups, continuously interpreted the statements which referenced the inclusion of the extended learning community as non-existent. They were unaware of any such collaboration or any plans for these collaborations. Their sole vision of the UNF PDS partnership was a collaboration between the university and PDS to support and develop the teacher candidate. It is noted however, that school-community collaboration is a facet of the education system that is often ignored by schools and is not unique to the UNF PDS partnership. Bryan (2005), explained that although Title 1 schools are required by the Department of Education to work jointly with family and community members to develop a school-family-community involvement policy, that the provision concerning school-family-community partnership is being overlooked.

Each factor group displayed a characteristic that distinguished them from each other. Factors 1, 2 and 3’s perceptions on the current focus of their PDS partnership was the development and support of the teacher candidate, however, their interpretation of the purpose of this current focus was different (See Table 4). The participants comprising the Factor 1 family, perceived the purpose for the development and support of the teacher candidate as an extension of the overarching goals of the university teacher preparation programs. As a result, the work being done in the PDS served to fulfill the university’s goals, which ultimately benefited the university and its programs.

The participants comprising the Factor 3 family, however, perceived the purpose, of supporting and developing the teacher candidate, as a means to furthering the education profession, through the use of data and improving the capacity of all stakeholders. These participants viewed well prepared and supported teacher candidates through a wider lens. They
shared the perspective that well prepared and supported teacher candidates would result into more effective teachers in the classrooms, which ultimately would result into the furthering of the education profession. As a result, the participants comprising the family group of Factor 3, did not solely consider the focus of the PDS partnership as a fulfillment of the purpose of the university, but perceived it as benefiting education on a whole.

Factor 2, like Factor 1 and Factor 3, shared the perspective that the development of the teacher candidate was the aspect most focused on by their PDS partnership, at this current stage. However, Factor 2’s shared perspective of the purpose of the focus of their PDS partnership was unique, as Factor 2 was the only family group which perceived that their PDS partnership was developing and supporting teacher candidates using a culturally responsive lens, in order to serve a multicultural world.

The difference in perceptions could be explained by the common characteristics shared within each family group. Interestingly, included in the 18 participants who significantly loaded on Factor 1, was the 3 UNF PDS administrators that participated in the sorting process, 5 professors in residence and 1 resident clinical faculty. Therefore, 50% of the members of the Factor 1 family, held significant roles within the administrative team of the university teacher preparation programs, as well as supporting roles. The nature of these roles could explain why the fulfilling of the university goals, was placed as a priority when reflecting on the aspect most focused on currently by their PDS partnership.

On the contrary, of the 7 participants comprising the Factor 3 family group, only 1 was a professor in residence. The other members comprised of teacher candidates, principals, and mentor teachers. The members of this family group, for the most part, held roles outside of the spectrum of the university and therefore perceived the work within the PDS partnership as
potentially having a greater impact on education. Their role as mentor teachers and teacher candidates was based on the building capacity within education. Therefore, it could be concluded that the roles they held within the PDS partnership, also influenced their perception on what they interpreted was the current focus of their PDS partnership.

Similar to Factor 3, the family group comprising Factor 2 had 7 participants who significantly loaded on this factor, and of these 7 only 1 participant held a role within the university (a resident clinical faculty), the other members were mentor teachers and teacher candidates. As a result, this family group also shared in a wider view around the purpose of developing and supporting the teacher candidates, looking at this purpose beyond the walls of the university. For Factor 2, this viewpoint was to serve a multicultural world, rather than merely fulfilling the goals of the university. However, another characteristic of this group could have further influenced their unique perspective. This was, that all members of this family group worked within a Title 1 school with a high ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages) population. Therefore, their perspective could have been influenced by the overall focus and environment created within the schools in which they worked. This focus was then manifested when reflecting on the purpose of developing and supporting of teacher candidates within the PDS partnership.

The overall picture painted by these findings illustrates a PDS partnership that is in its “Beginning” phase (NCATE, 2002). The idea of an overarching shared perspective by all participants, regardless of the roles they held within the PDS partnership, indicated that these participants were working with one common vision (the development and support of teacher candidates). According to Kotter (2012), a common vision is necessary within an organization because “it motivates people to take action in the right direction, even if the initial steps are
personally painful” (p.71). Kotter further explained that the combination of trust and a common
goal shared by people with the right characteristics can make for a powerful team (Kotter, 2012).
Although each factor had different perceptions of what the purpose of the aspect focused on was,
they were still moving in the same direction. However, the findings also indicated a consensus
on what UNF PDS partnership perceived was the aspect least focused on at the current stage of
their PDS partnership. This was the engagement of policymakers and the broader community to
influence practices and policies in education. While this is not expected of a PDS partnership in
its beginning stages, it is expected that the partnership would have a plan of how it intends to
engage policy makers and the broader community. This is where UNF PDS partnership is
deficient, and perhaps should be the foundation of any future plans formulated for the
partnership.

**Participant Responses and Researcher Observation of the InQuiry Process**

This study also explored the usefulness of InQuiry, as a Participatory Process, to examine
educator perspectives on the aspect of the PDS partnership most focused on by their Professional
Development School Partnerships, at its current stage of implementation. I utilized a theoretical
framework based on the CLE axioms, to conceptualize the PDS partnership as the community
and the participants of the study as the members of that community. By using the CLE axioms
as the lens for which post reflective retreat responses and researcher observations of the InQuiry
process was analyzed, 3 themes emerged. These themes were: InQuiry as a reflective process;
the broadening of perspective through the InQuiry Process; and the InQuiry Process as a
planning tool.

*InQuiry as a reflective process*
The overall perspectives of the participants, who took part in the entire InQuiry process, was that the process was very helpful and useful. These participants especially commented on the reflectiveness of the entire process. Participants mentioned, that InQuiry process provided them with an opportunity in which they could reflect on their perspective on the entire PDS Partnership. This, according to the participants, was unique since they are rarely expected to reflect outside their individual roles within the PDS partnership. Evidently, I observed, during the sorting process, that participants’ perspectives were influenced by the individual roles that they played within the PDS partnership. I anticipated this since it was in accordance to Smith (2001) who stated, by Q sorting, people give their subjective meaning to the statements and by doing so reveal their subjective viewpoint or personal profile (Brouwer, 1999). By using their personal experiences within their individual roles, the participants, in this study, were able to reflect and conceptualized their perspectives on the aspect of the PDS partnership most focused on by their Professional Development School Partnerships, at its current stage of implementation. According to Militello, Janson and Tonissen (2016), during the InQuiry process, participants develop a new normative language around a topic through the introspective process of the individual sorts (understanding of self). This normative language were essential to this study, as they were the perceptions of those entrenched in the work of the PDS partnership. As stated in the CLE axioms, “the people closest to the issues are best situated to discover answers to local concerns” (Guajardo, Guajardo, Janson and Militello, 2016, p25). The participants within the study held a wide array of roles within the PDS partnership, their everyday functions and activities were the most impacted by the current foci of the PDS Partnership. Therefore, making their perspective, in my opinion, the most relevant to the study.
The development of these individualized perspective, as emphasized by the participants, was facilitated by the reflective characteristic of the InQuiry process.

Broadening of Perspective through the InQuiry Process

The CLE axioms, “conversations are critical and central pedagogical processes” (Guajardo, Guajardo, Jansen & Militello, 2016, p.24), became evident as I analyzed the data collected through observations of the discussions at the reflective retreat, and the post reflective retreat questionnaires. During the reflective retreat, participants commented that the discussions within their family groups and between other family groups, allowed them to both validate and broaden their perspective. According to Militello, Janson and Tonissen (2016), “what begins as an individual experience becomes a group activity through the InQuiry process. When participants are grouped into families with members who have similar viewpoints, positive discourse ensues” (p.105). However, participants felt that the discussions facilitated outside of their family groups, also gave them the opportunity to hear the rationale behind how others sorted, which allowed them to develop a deeper understanding of the shared perspectives expressed by their family group and other family groups in the room. This deeper understanding enriched and broadened their individual perspectives, as stated in the CLE axiom, “crossing boundaries enriches the development and educational processes” (p.26).

The development of this deeper understanding from discussions, is also a signature characteristic of the InQuiry Process. As stated by Militello, Janson and Tonissen (2016), “Knowing that their family members share viewpoints allows participants to communicate more openly and effectively, resulting in a deeper understanding on the phenomenon in question” (p.105). By broadening their perspective, the participants developed a holistic understanding of their PDS partnership. In their post reflective retreat questionnaire, the participants expressed
that they were able to broaden their own perspective from a narrow viewpoint influenced by their role or by the PDS for which they were assigned to a viewpoint which encompassed the entire PDS partnership. According to Cooper (2017), through engaging in participatory evaluation, stakeholders learned more about the organization and about themselves in the context and situation in which they are participating (Cooper, 2017), therefore, in the case of this study, the reflective retreat, facilitated through the InQuiry process, was very useful to the participants, since it was through the discussions at the reflective retreat that their shared perspectives evolved. This step in the InQuiry process transformed Q methodology into a truly participatory evaluation process, a process in which the collaboration between stakeholders is required through dialogue, critical reflection and negotiation (Cooper, 2017).

**InQuiry Process as a planning tool.**

Finally, the participants emphasized the usefulness of the InQuiry process for future planning purposes. According to Militello, Janson and Tonissen (2016), through the InQuiry process, participants develop a focus on the actionable work that can be done to better the whole community. In this study, through the lens of the CLE axioms, I conceptualized the PDS partnership as the community and the participants of the study as the members of that community. Participants expressed that the process gave them an insight on where they were as a partnership and therefore gave them a focal point from which they could create an action plan for future foci. The CLE axiom, “hope and change are built on assets and dreams of locals and their communities”(p.27), explained that’s by identifying, naming and constructing the assets within your communities, participants would start to view their work and communities in different ways, and as a result they begin to build hope and see possibilities. The participants also explained, that the InQuiry process was considered useful since the process could be re-
administered in the future to examine the aspect of the PDS partnership most focused on by their Professional Development School Partnerships, at its current stage of implementation. After which a comparison could be made to determine if the foci had changed or remained the same.

**Implications for Practice**

According to Polly, Smaldino and Brynteson (2015), there is a need for an updated document and a systematic process for both educator reparation programs and P-12 schools to use in the evaluation and refinement the PDS partnership process. This study supports this conclusion. The Q sample established in this study could be used to implement the InQuiry process within any PDS partnerships in order to examine their current focus, since these statements were derived mostly from the literature presented on PDS partnerships, NCATE standards for PDS partnerships and NAPDS *Nine Essentials*. These types of studies could be done to collect data from PDS partnerships that could be used in comparative data analysis, which could result in standards for PDS partnerships implementation. This type of study could also be used as a benchmark, to simply examine the perspectives of the members within the partnership in regards to the aspect currently focused, by the PDS partnership, to ensure alignment with NAPDS standards and expectations.

On the other hand, the PDS partnerships could personalize their Q sample by collecting concourse statements from their members, making the process more applicable and relevant for their individual partnerships. These personalized statements could then be combined with those concourse statements derived from the NCATE standards and NAPDS *Nine Essentials*. This data could be used as base line data for these partnerships to formulate action plans to determine future foci. This InQuiry process could then be repeated throughout the different stages of implementation in the PDS partnership to monitor progression. The results of these applications
could then be compared to previous results, as well as the partnerships’ action plan, to determine how the partnership has evolved.

Also, congruency between different role holders’ sort could be established. By having groups, determined by the role held within the PDS partnership, sort individually, a comparison could be made to determine the congruence of the sorts between role holder. Partnerships could explore the importance within their organization for role holders to have congruent focal points and also, facilitate discussions around what could have influenced divergent perspectives, as well as have discussions around how then to move towards the convergence of these perspectives.

Based on the compilation of the results, from the repeating of the InQuiry process, using the concourse statements established in this study, a set of comprehensive rubrics or implementation checklists could be formulated. These evaluation tools could be organized by stages of implementation of PDS partnerships, in which each rubric or checklist would encompass the expectation of a PDS partnership at that given stage, providing PDS partnerships with a tool to guide and give feedback as they proceed with the implementation of their partnership.

**Implications of Policy**

The results from this study brings into perspective several issues that could have implications on policy. The high correlation between all 3 factors, as seen in Chapter 4, was not only the result of the shared perspective, that the current focus of UNF PDS partnership was the development and support of the teacher candidates placed in the PDS, but was also the result of the shared perspective of the aspects least focused on by their PDS partnership. This shared perspective centered on the incorporation of the broader community as an active partner within the PDS partnership and that the PDS partners should be influencing policy and curriculum
based on research and practice within their partnerships. The broader community entailed, “the school district, teacher union or professional teacher education association, other interested schools and university faculty, family members, community members” (NCATE, 2001, p.17). Those who influence policy and the policy makers should consider the implications behind why these aspects were not considered to be the current focus of the PDS partnership. The results of this study imply that the role holders, within the PDS partnership, do not perceive a relationship that includes the broader community as a priority nor do they feel that it is within their capacity to influence policy and curriculum. If this is indeed the shared perspective of all PDS partnerships, then, policy makers should consider leaving this aspect out of the expectations and definition of a PDS partnership. Instead of a trinity which includes the university, PDS and the broader community, simply define the partnership as a dual partnership between the university and the PDS. Based on the collective data from the repetition of this study on multiple PDS partnerships throughout the country, a new set of essentials could be formulated that more accurately represents PDS partnerships.

If NAPDS and other policy makers ultimately perceives the inclusion of the broader community and influencing policy and curriculum as beneficial and essential to the work of the PDS partnership, serious considerations should be made towards changing the preparation and professional developments of the role holders within the partnerships. This includes the university faculty and staff, the PDS faculty and staff and the teacher candidates placed within the PDS. This preparation and professional development should then focus on the importance and the value behind the inclusion of the broader community as an equal partner within the PDS partnership. Also, the organizations within the PDS partnerships should promote research and
research-based practice within their PDS, which by publicly sharing and publishing could lead to policy and curriculum change.

Future Research

Based on the results of this study, it would be beneficial for UNF to repeat the InQuiry process using the Q sample used in this research. This could be done within one to two years of this study, since using the result of any study to influence policy or program change will take time. As explained by Giancola (2014), “People need to process the findings, determine for themselves how the findings impact policy and practice, decide how to proceed based on your evidence” (p. 20). However, ultimately the time frame for duplicating this study lies with partners themselves. The purpose of repeating the study would be to compare the results of both studies in order to determine how much the foci have changed as the PDS partnership develops and matures. This should help the administrators of the PDS partnership to evaluate their partnership in order to make informed decisions on how to continue to move forward.

Another research that could be beneficial would be to repeat this research using 30 to 40 leading scholars of PDS partnerships within the country. This research would provide comparative data from which a policy maker could determine the most important foci of PDS partnership at certain stages of implementation. If we have these leading scholars’ sort multiple times, responding to the statements:

1. At the beginning stage of a PDS partnership, list the aspects of PDS partnership that should be most focused on.

2. At the developing stage of a PDS partnership, list the aspects of PDS partnership that should be most focused on.
3. At the developed stage of a PDS partnership, list the aspects of PDS partnership that should be most focused on.

This study could then provide data that PDS partnerships could use to plan while implementing their PDS partnerships and programs.

Also, from these studies, a secondary factor analysis could be done. For this secondary factor analysis, the factor arrays are entered as individual sorts, along with sorts from selected individuals, for example the director of the PDS program, to determine the correlation of their sorts to the factor arrays. This study would be important in order to examine if the members of the organization shares the similar perspectives to the selected individual.

Limitations and Recommendations

The main limitation encountered while conducting this study, was the lack of participation from members of the PDS partnership. This lack of participation occurred both at the gathering of the concourse statements and the Q sort stage. While gathering the concourse statements, less than half of the population responded to the concourse question. As a result, I had to extract the rest of the concourse statements from the Literature, NAPDS documents and NCATE standards of PDS partnership.

Also, key role holders, within the partnership, opted not to participate in the sorting process and the reflective retreat. The result of this was that the voices of an important group within the partnership were not heard. These voices included the male participants, as less than 5% of those who participated were males, and role holders within the secondary schools of the PDS partnerships. These included the professors in residence, the resident clinical faculties, mentor teachers and administrators from the PDS. I recommend that before embarking on the InQuiry process in the future, the administrators of the PDS partnership conduct information
sessions to acquaint the roles holders, of the partnership, with the process and to emphasize the importance of participating in the entire process.

Another limitation encountered while conducting this study, was the time allotted for the reflective retreat. In the post retreat questionnaires, many participants expressed that they would have preferred more time to be allotted to the discussions within their family group and between family groups. They shared that these discussions were robust with information and revelations, and that they found it difficult to adequately complete these discussions within the given time. While I recognized that due to the nature of the discussions this limitation might always exist, the time allotted to the reflective retreat could be extended to encompass an entire day.

**Concluding Thoughts**

I determined, through this study, that at this current stage of implementation, UNF PDS partnership has taken on a dual perception of the components of a PDS partnership. This dual perception encompassed building a relationship between the university and the PDS, in order to support and develop teacher candidates placed within the PDS. The inclusion of the broader community, the third component of a PDS partnership, and the work to influence policy and curriculum, is virtually nonexistent. This shared perception, limited the scope and depth of this PDS partnership. By only focusing on the development and support of teacher candidates, the purpose of the PDS relationships was reduced to merely an extension of the teacher preparation program of the university, rather than a collaboration between university, PDS and the broader community to further education and influence policy, through practice and research. This conclusion leads me to question, “What would it take for the PDS partnership to transcend beyond being merely a teacher preparation program?”; “What do the leaders within the partnership need to do to further the focus of the PDS partnership?” and “How could the
university adjust its curriculum within the teacher preparation programs to become culturally responsive and community orientated?” I recommend that the leadership and the role holders within the partnership participate in a reflective retreat in which they could have discussions around these questions and from these discussions an action plan could be formulated to facilitate the progression of the PDS partnership. However, if one of the aims is to address curriculum, then discussions with the wider teacher preparation faculty has to also take place.

The implementation of the InQuiry process in this study, also revealed that the perceptions of the participants were influenced by the roles that they held within the partnership and the PDS environment or schools in which they work. These factors did not influence the shared perception on the aspect most focused on, which was the support and development of the student candidates, however, it did influence the participants’ understanding of the purpose behind the focus. Each Factor family group perceived the purpose differently. Factor 1, consisting of UNF administrators and faculty, shared the perspective that the purpose was to fulfill the goals of the teacher preparation programs. Factor 2, consisting of mentor teachers and teacher candidates from ESOL schools, shared the perspective that the purpose was to develop teacher candidates to be culturally responsive within a multicultural world. Factor 3, consisting of assistant principals, mentor teachers and teacher candidates, shared the perspective that the purpose was to further education through research and practice. While I believe that a common focus for any organization is necessary to achieve their set goals, it is equally as important for members of that organization to understand the purpose behind that focus in order to support collaboration between role holders. Also, since the perceptions of these role holders were influenced by the role itself and the environment or school in which the role holder works, I believe it is important that serious consideration be placed on where and which schools are
chosen to be a partner in the PDS partnership. If it is deduced that one focus of the partnership should be culturally responsive teacher preparation, then the schools in partnered with must share that focus also.

I also concluded that the result of this study sufficiently achieved its purpose of adding to literature discourse on PDS partnership. In my examination of the literature, I discovered gaps in the literature in terms of the need for a formative participatory process which could examine the perspective of the participants around the implementation and progression of PDS partnerships. While I found many studies that focused on the outcomes and benefits of PDS partnerships, there were a lack of studies that examined the implementation and growth of the PDS partnerships. Furthermore, in my opinion, this study is the first to examine the current focus of a PDS partnership using a participatory method such as InQuiry. As a result, this study adds a new and unique insights into PDS partnerships, which could only result in the strengthening of the literature.

Finally, the results of this study emphasized the usefulness of the InQuiry process, as a means to examine educator perspectives in regard to the aspects of PDS partnership most focused on by their PDS partnership currently. All participants that engaged in the entire InQuiry process emphasized that the process provided them with a medium which facilitated self-reflection on their individual perspective. They also expressed that the discussions facilitated at the reflective retreat, the final component of the InQuiry process, allowed them to validate and expanded their perspectives, as well as broaden their insight into the different roles held by members of the partnership. This study supported the findings of Militello, Janson and Tonissen (2016), which stated that the InQuiry process as an evaluation tool fulfills the need for: understanding participants’ perceptions; more quantifiable metrics, and participation in the
analysis of evaluation findings. Overall, I concluded that the InQuiry process provided an important tool which could facilitate growth and development for PDS partnerships.
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### Appendix A

#### Q sample Statements and Factor Arrays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Using a shared approach to candidate preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Establishing/Strengthening a school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Providing quality educational support to interning student-teachers: It's important that while participating as a PDS mentoring teacher that I can help the next generation of interning teachers acquire the knowledge and experience needed to transition into a professional setting as seamlessly as possible.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Building relationships with mentor teachers and student teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The PDS partnership producing outcome data that drive changes in how P–12 students, candidates, faculty, and other professionals learn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Building mentor teacher capacity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PDS investigating how PDS is impacting student's success in grades and attitudes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Establishing and encouraging collaboration between PDS and university faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Strengthening relationships between university and PDS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The PDS partnership engaging with other institutions and policymakers to influence policies and practices related to PDS work</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>encouraging the use of reflective practice by all participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>encouraging learners to use their new knowledge to inform practice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Establishing a communication mechanisms to disseminate information to various stakeholders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within the PDS partnership and to other constituent groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PDS partners presenting data to the professional and policymaking community showing the ways in which they have decreased the gaps in achievement</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Encouraging Partner institutions to change policies and practices as a result of work done in PDSs</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Furthering the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Being committed to multi-racial and multicultural education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Providing multiple avenues for collaboration between PDS partnership members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The PDS partner institutions playing a leadership role in the larger community</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Helping to ensure full engagement of Families, community members, policymakers, and the business community</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ensuring that family members of PDS students are fully informed as stakeholders in PDS work</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PDS partners engage family members in focusing on identifying students’ needs.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The PDS partnership functions as an extended learning community for all participants, including faculty, family members, and other community, district, and university members</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Partner schools celebrating diversity</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>establishing a school environment prepared to enculturate learners for participation in a democratic society</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Engaging non PDS affiliated faculty in the PDS work-encouraging faculty to research with the PDS teachers and administrators</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Engaging in the development of the Residence clinical faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ensuring that the use of university resources provided are maximized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>PDS partner institutions provide leadership in shaping the discussion about public accountability</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>PDS partner institutions create mechanisms to disseminate curricula in the university and school programs that reflect issues of equity and access to knowledge by diverse learners</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>PDS partners model for the professional community the ways in which they teach from multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories,</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences, and diverse cultural backgrounds of all people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>fostering leadership from within the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Enhancing the PDS school's performance as measured by state accountability processes (e.g. Florida school grades)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Coaching the teacher candidates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

Factor Matrix with X Indicating a Defining Sort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant No.</th>
<th>Participant Race</th>
<th>Participant Sex</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.5322</td>
<td>0.0858</td>
<td>0.6297X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.4411</td>
<td>0.2185</td>
<td>0.6374X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.6711</td>
<td>0.1233</td>
<td>0.4046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.7075X</td>
<td>0.1960</td>
<td>0.2171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.7023X</td>
<td>-0.0238</td>
<td>0.3970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.6807X</td>
<td>0.0747</td>
<td>0.4548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.7670X</td>
<td>0.2201</td>
<td>0.2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.6857X</td>
<td>0.2817</td>
<td>0.1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.7893X</td>
<td>0.0779</td>
<td>0.3864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.4973</td>
<td>0.1377</td>
<td>0.5860X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.4399</td>
<td>0.3424</td>
<td>0.5512X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.7726X</td>
<td>0.0829</td>
<td>0.3721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.8070X</td>
<td>0.2795</td>
<td>0.1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.2917</td>
<td>0.7033X</td>
<td>0.3162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.2119</td>
<td>0.1670</td>
<td>0.3264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.5831X</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>0.4581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.3381</td>
<td>0.6488X</td>
<td>0.1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0901</td>
<td>0.04897X</td>
<td>0.2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.4882X</td>
<td>-0.4690</td>
<td>0.3231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.4932</td>
<td>0.4768</td>
<td>0.3729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>African American Female</td>
<td>0.5276X</td>
<td>0.3015</td>
<td>0.2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>African American Female</td>
<td>0.2810</td>
<td>0.6651X</td>
<td>0.5076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.7191X</td>
<td>0.1194</td>
<td>0.2617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.7100X</td>
<td>0.1180</td>
<td>0.4632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.6425X</td>
<td>0.2952</td>
<td>0.5495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.2534</td>
<td>0.2569</td>
<td>0.3572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.6901X</td>
<td>0.2067</td>
<td>0.3286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.3258</td>
<td>0.7325X</td>
<td>0.1412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>-0.2353</td>
<td>0.6448X</td>
<td>0.0393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.2280</td>
<td>0.2794</td>
<td>0.5625X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.4457</td>
<td>0.5981X</td>
<td>-0.0780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.7077X</td>
<td>0.2389</td>
<td>0.0814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.1742</td>
<td>0.2467</td>
<td>0.6321X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>0.5135</td>
<td>0.4763</td>
<td>0.4208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.7804X</td>
<td>0.1792</td>
<td>0.1230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>0.3106</td>
<td>-0.0186</td>
<td>0.7331X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Concourse Questionnaire

NOTE: This information will be collected via Qualtrics

Q Methodology as a Formative Tool for Facilitating Professional Development School Partnership Development
Naturalistic Concourse Items (From Participants)

"At this current stage of your PDS partnership, list the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on.” Please list and briefly describe up to eight (8) responses.

(Please list and describe as many as eight)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How do you describe your race/ethnicity? ______________________________

2. How old are you? ______________________________

3. What is your sex/gender? ______________________________
4. **How would you best describe the setting in which your PDS is situated (eg. rural, urban, etc.)** _____________________________

5. **What is your current role within your PDS partnership?**
   - ○ Principal of PDS
   - ○ Vice Principal of PDS
   - ○ Mentor Teacher
   - ○ Resident Clinical Faculty
   - ○ Professor in Residence
   - ○ Teacher Candidate

6. **What is the school level of the PDS you are currently affiliated with?**
   - ○ Elementary
   - ○ Middle school
   - ○ High School

7. **The value of a PDS partnership is worth the investment of time and resources.**
   - ○ Strongly Agree
   - ○ Agree
   - ○ Neutral
   - ○ Disagree
   - ○ Strongly Disagree

8. **I feel reasonably knowledgeable about the philosophy and affiliated best practices of a PDS partnership.**
   - ○ Strongly Agree
9. **PDS are spaces where all partners and participants work towards greater educational equity and social justice.**

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
Appendix D
Post-Sort Questionnaire

1) Please briefly describe why you agreed so strongly with the statements you placed under the "+4" column.

Statement #_______
Reason
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Statement #_______
Reason
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Statement #_______
Reason
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Statement #_______
Reason
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Likewise, please describe why you also felt strongly about the statements you placed in the ":-4".

Statement #________
Reason

Statement #________
Reason

Statement #________
Reason

Statement #________
Reason

Statement #________
Reason

Background Information

10. *How do you describe your race/ethnicity?* ________________________________
11. How old are you? ________________________________
12. What is your sex/gender? ________________________________
13. How would you best describe the setting in which your PDS is situated (eg. rural, urban, etc.) ________________________________

14. What is your current role within your PDS partnership?
   - [ ] Principal of PDS
   - [ ] Vice Principal of PDS
   - [ ] Mentor Teacher
   - [ ] Resident Clinical Faculty
   - [ ] Professor in Residence
   - [ ] Teacher Candidate

15. What is the school level of the PDS you are currently affiliated with?
   - [ ] Elementary
   - [ ] Middle school
   - [ ] High School

16. The value of a PDS partnership is worth the investment of time and resources.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

17. I feel reasonably knowledgeable about the philosophy and affiliated best practices of a PDS partnership.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

18. PDS are spaces where all partners and participants work towards greater educational equity and social justice.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
Participatory process to examine PDS partnerships

- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Appendix E
Inform Consent Letter

Welcome to this Q Methodology as a Formative Tool for Facilitating Professional Development School Partnership Development.

In order to better understand the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on at this current stage of your PDS partnership, you are invited to participate in the following anonymous sorting activity.

I would like you to sort ## different statements representing a distinct viewpoint on the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on at this current stage of your PDS partnership. It is estimated that this sorting process will take 30-40 minutes to complete. Notably, these statements were assembled from responses collected very recently from over ## people. That process yielded over ### responses which were then sculpted down into a representative sample that I hope is deep and broad enough for you to find statements to best represent your viewpoint. Many of you contributed to these statements so you may very well see one of your own statements here.

You must be 18 years or older to take part in this research study. Also, your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. All responses will be anonymous, as no personally identifiable data will be collected. Following data collection, all data and findings resulting from this study that are eventually described in writing or presented publicly will only be in the aggregate. In compliance with IRB requirements and to insure data security, your responses will be stored on a secure server and destroyed at the culmination of this research.

There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this study. However, your participation in this research may lead to a general advancement in understanding your PDS partnership and ultimately the creation of an action plan on how to move forward.

The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any concerns, questions, or requests regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board directly at 904-620-2498 or via email at irb@unf.edu. Should you have any questions regarding the design or purpose of this study or the research approach I am using, please feel free to contact me, Catherine Wade directly at Redacted or Dr. Christopher Janson (Dissertation Chair) at Redacted.
Completion of this Q sort and the accompanying requests for demographic and background information indicates that you have read the information describing the process and consent to take part in the research.

A few last notes: 1) This online process currently cannot be completed with a tablet or smartphone, 2) It will take up to 20-30 minutes, 3) No identifying data will be collected from you and all results will only be shown in the aggregate, and 4) I appreciate your help here - very much!

Thanks again for your time and participation. I think this research is important and is very timely. Your contributions are crucial.

Sincerely,
Catherine Wade M.Ed.
Appendix F
Recruitment Email

From: Catherine Wade
Date: September 1, 2019
To: Potential Participant
Subject: Q Methodology as a Formative Tool for Facilitating Professional Development School Partnership Development

My name is Catherine Wade and I am conducting dissertation research on the application and exploration of a participatory process to examine educator perspectives of the aspect of the Professional Development School Partnerships most focused on by their PDS partnership. I am requesting your participation in this research study. Your participation will involve you responding to one written prompt designed to elicit your perspectives toward the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on at this current stage of your PDS partnership. Your participation will involve sorting XX statements, each representing a perspective on the aspects of PDS partnership that you are most focused on at this current stage of your PDS partnership. Your participation in this sorting process and the accompanying background information questions will take approximately 30-40 minutes to complete.

You must be between the 18 years old to take part in this research study. Also, your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. All responses will be anonymous, as no personally identifying data (like names and emails) will be collected. Additionally, all data collected from this process will be kept securely by the researchers, and any data and findings resulting from this study that are eventually described in writing or presented publicly, will only be in the aggregate. In compliance with IRB requirements and to insure data security, your responses will be stored on a secure server and destroyed at the culmination of this research.
There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this study. However, your participation in this research may lead to a general advancement in how we understand and evaluate Professional Development School Partnerships.

The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any concerns, questions, or requests regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida’s Institutional Review Board directly at 904-620-2498 or via email at irb@unf.edu. Should you have any questions regarding the design or purpose of this study or the research approach I am using, please feel free to contact me directly at Redacted or Redacted @unf.edu or Dr. Christopher Janson (Dissertation Chair) at c.janson@unf.edu.

Completion of this concourse questionnaire implies that you have read the information describing the process and consent to take part in the research.

Please click the link below to go to the online sorting activity. Upon opening the link below, you will be asked to again read the consent information for this study. Once completed, the actual sorting activity and instructions will be launched.

Q Sort link:

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Catherine Wade M.Ed.
Principal Researcher
Appendix G
UNF IRB Approval Letter
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 12, 2019

TO: Ms. Catherine Wade

VIA: Dr. Christopher Janson
Leadsdhip, School Counseling & Sport Management

FROM: Dr. Jennifer Wesely, Chairperson
UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Declaration of Exempt Status for IRB#1485610-1
"An Application and Exploration of a Participatory Process to Examine Educator Perspectives of the Most Important Elements of their Professional Development School Partnerships"

Your research study, "An Application and Exploration of a Participatory Process to Examine Educator Perspectives of the Most Important Elements of their Professional Development School Partnerships," was reviewed on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board and has been declared exempt under categories 2 and 3. Criteria defined at 45 CFR 46 for this classification are as follows:

Exempt Category 2:
Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met:

(i) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects;

(ii) Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation; or

IRB FORM v 02.04.2019
(iii) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects can readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and an IRB conducts a limited IRB review to make the determination required by §46.111(a)(7).

Exempt Category 3:
Research involving benign behavioral interventions in conjunction with the collection of information from an adult subject through verbal or written responses (including data entry) or audiovisual recording if the subject prospectively agrees to the intervention and information collection and at least one of the following criteria is met:

(i) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects;

(ii) Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation; or

(iii) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects can readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and an IRB conducts a limited IRB review to make the determination required by §46.111(a)(7).

Please be advised that any subject complaints, unanticipated problems, or adverse events that occur are to be reported to the IRB as soon as practicable, but no later than 3 business days following the occurrence. Please use the Event Report Form to submit information about such events.

While the exempt status is effective for the life of the study, any substantive changes must be submitted to the IRB for prospective review, including personnel changes. In some circumstances, changes to the protocol may result in alteration of the IRB review classification.

To submit an amendment to your approved protocol, please complete an Amendment Request Document and upload it along with any updated materials affected by the changes via a new package in IRBNet. For additional guidance on submitting an amendment, please contact the IRB administrator.

Upon completion of this study, please submit a Closing Report Form as a new package in IRBNet. Please maintain copies of all research-related materials for a minimum of 3 years following study closure. These records include the IRB-approved protocol, approval memo, questionnaires, survey instruments, consent forms, and all IRB correspondence.

If you have questions regarding your study or any other IRB issues, please contact the Research Integrity Unit of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs by emailing IRB@unf.edu or calling 904) 620-2455.