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ABSTRACT

Mutual beneficial partnerships for teacher preparation are vital to universities. One of the untapped resources for teacher preparation are Informal Education Institutions (IEI). Some scholars believe that successful partnerships between universities and local IEIs are important for the future of teacher education (McKinnon & Lamberts, 2014; Kisiel & Anderson, 2010). Yet, there is little research to guide practice in this area (American Alliance for Museums, 2014; Buys & Bursnell, 2007). The purpose of this interpretive study is to add to the literature base reporting on university – IEI partnerships developed specifically to support initial teacher preparation and to make the connection between educators doing this type of work. Loyola University Chicago’s Cultural Institution in Teacher Education (CITE) partnership served as the focus of this study. Studying effective models of teacher preparation partnerships such as the CITE partnership is important for the future of teacher preparation. This study encourages open communication and research around these types of university-IEI partnerships. This study reveals the inner workings and relationships within the CITE partnership and makes recommendations for educators doing this type of partnership work.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Partnerships are a “close mutual cooperation between parties having common interests, responsibilities, privileges, and power” (Jacoby, 1996). According to Bringle Officer, Grim, and Hatcher (2003),

partnerships develop out of relationships and result in mutual transformation and cooperation between parties. They are motivated by a desire to combine forces that address their own best interest and ideally result in outcomes greater than any one organizational could achieve alone. They create a sense of shared purpose that serves the common good. (p. 44)

When relationships transition from personal outcomes to considerations of joint outcomes, communal attitudes, accommodations that support mutual trust, and long-term perspectives, transformation occurs (Bringle et al., 2003). Transformational partnerships reflect equity where both partners demonstrate growth in ways that are uniquely meaningful to each other. These effective partnerships are not just exchanges of resources; partners work together to create something new and valuable (Jacoby, 2003).

Institutions of higher education engaged in teacher preparation have focused on developing partnerships that are mutually beneficial and transformational, with many universities serving as the pioneers of these partnerships. Historically, many of these mutually beneficial partnerships were formed without the guidance of prior research or
experience; therefore, most of what was learned was through a trial and error basis (Holland & Gelmon, 1998).

Today, mutual beneficial partnerships for teacher preparation are vital to universities and teacher candidates. These partnerships give teacher candidates the opportunity to work with students during internships, field experiences, and student teaching in partner schools. In the past, the focus of university partnerships has been on K-12 schools in their surrounding communities. One of the untapped resources for teacher preparation are Informal Education Institutions (IEI). Some scholars believe that successful partnerships between universities and local IEIs are important for the future of teacher education (McKinnon & Lamberts, 2014; Kisiel & Anderson, 2010). Universities and IEIs have natural connections to each other (Kinsley, 2016) including both occupying the pedagogical fields of informal and formal education (Maloney & Hill, 2016). Despite a push toward more clinically-based initial teacher preparation (AACTE, 2010; NCATE, 2010), teacher candidates often have limited learning experiences in “informal”, out-of-school spaces (Fallik, Rosenfeld, & Eylon, 2013). Teacher educators and researchers are beginning to more seriously explore the possibilities of IEIs as places for teacher candidates to develop their professional practice as well as recognizing the value that informal educators can add to initial teacher preparation (Avraamidou, 2014; Kisiel, 2012). IEIs are not only are important for the future of teacher education; there are missed opportunities in failing to use existing community-based, out-of-school resources (Adams & Gupta, 2015; Saxman, Gupta, & Steinberg, 2010).
There is little research to guide practice in this area (American Alliance for Museums, 2014; Buys & Bursnall, 2007). Research and reporting on this type of partnership is needed to guide dialogue and cooperation between stakeholders across informal and formal contexts (Fallik, Rosenfeld, & Eylon, 2013; Kisiel & Anderson, 2010). The problem is a lack of communication from both realms. Innovative partnerships are occurring between institutions, but often they are not written about. With limited examples, this leaves museums and universities reinventing the wheel in terms of their partnership work (American Alliance for Museums, 2014). Many of the examples of university and IEI partnerships in the literature are focused on short term placements or programs that require partners to reveal little about themselves, do not generate new resources or knowledge, and make relatively little demands on the status quo of the partner institutions (Enos & Morton, 2003). According to Maloney and Hill (2016), although these examples are exemplary and inspiring they do not advance a broader and wider exploration of what makes these partnerships sustainable. There is an increasing demand for innovative partnership research (Chan, 2012) specifically showing how “IEIs and universities can work together to create partnerships that are effective and productive and also sustainable and even transformative” (Maloney & Hill, 2016, p. 247). Not all of the literature is focused specifically on teacher preparation, but the research around effective partnerships between universities and IEIs can help inform the field of teacher preparation.
Background for the Study

Cultural Institutions in Teacher Education Partnership

In the Fall of 2013, an innovative teacher education program was launched by Loyola University Chicago (LUC) as a mutually beneficial collaboration with local schools, IEIs and other community organizations. The overarching goal of the university and its partners was to better the education of pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade students in Chicago through strengthening teaching and learning, and preparing the next generation of educators. IEIs and their education staff have been integral partners from the start, serving as sites for coursework and as co-teacher educators.

The Loyola Cultural Institutions in Teacher Education (CITE) Partnership informally gathered as a working group in the Spring 2014 when Loyola faculty invited IEI education staff to come together outside of course time in pursuit of two goals: enhancing collaboration and disseminating findings. CITE sought to create a space for open communication about the work of teacher educators within and outside the university and how it might contribute to dialogue with others about this collaborative approach to initial teacher education. More details of the partnership will be discussed in the methodology section.

Theory of Partnership Development

The theoretical framework guiding this study was developed by Enos and Morton (2003) and offers a “lens in which to examine the developmental practice of relationship building” (p. 23). This framework provides a way to examine partnerships as they move from transactional to transformational relationships. Transactional relationships are
designed to complete short-term tasks and are often based on exchanges between participants who have something the other desires. In these partnerships both participants benefit but no long-term change happens. The idea of a transformational relationship is one in which participants grow and change because of deeper more sustainable commitments. In these transformational partnerships, there is an expectation that things will change. Enos and Morton (2003) believe that transformative partnerships do not evolve naturally from any other types of partnership but instead result from partners “recognizing and inviting the possibility that their joint work is likely to transform them both” (p. 30).

Enos and Morton (2003) explain that most university partnerships are transactional. Most of the commitments are limited and work within existing frameworks. Partners bring needs to the table and engage in mutually rewarding exchanges while their identity as members of their individual institutions remains intact (Enos and Morton, 2003). For example, when teacher candidates volunteer to help afterschool at a school in the community, often the interest in that school ends with the school year. These short-term or transactional relationships often do not develop into long-term partnerships and therefore are not the focus of this study. The Enos and Morton (2003) criteria of transformative relationships guided data collection and analysis and framed the findings of this study.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to add to the literature base reporting on university – IIEI partnerships developed specifically to support initial teacher preparation and to make
the connection between educators doing this type of work. Studying effective models of teacher preparation partnerships such as the CITE partnership is important for the future of teacher preparation. This study encourages more open communication and research around these types of partnerships. This study’s focus was to reveal the inner workings and relationships within the CITE partnership. This study will also provide insight into how the partnership has developed over time, something that has not been possible in studies about shorter-term partnerships (Enos & Morton, 2003). Scholars are calling for projects such as this dissertation that add to the body of knowledge around different mechanisms for IEI educators to be involved in preparing effective teachers (Gupta & Adams, 2012; McGinnis et al., 2012). According to Bringle, Clayton, and Price (2009), developing, understanding, and evaluating transformative relationships constitutes a key goal for researchers to enable more effective meaningful work for all partnerships. The findings of this dissertation's study will be informative to educators and researchers engaged in similar partnership-building work within their unique contexts. The hope is that sharing information about this partnership will inspire and encourage educators interested in this type of work to form partnerships in their own context and publish their own findings of partnership characteristics and relationships.

**Research Questions**

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1.) How did participants describe their personal and institutional involvement within the CITE partnership?
2.) Where on the relationships continuum did participants rate the current CITE partnership, and how did they explain their rating?

3.) What factors did participants indicate supported and/or constrained the partnership’s movement towards becoming more transformational?

Considerations

The study employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Mixed methods were specifically chosen to answer the research questions in this study because it allowed the researcher to use different types of data to measure the same complex phenomenon. Including multiple types of data strengthens the study.

One advantage and simultaneous concern for this study was that the researcher was an insider in the partnership. Because of that insider view, multiple validity and reliability strategies were used to increase the credibility of the findings. Throughout the research process several strategies were used to enhance validity and reliability and check for biases to allow for accuracy and credibility in the findings. Another strength of the study is the member-checking of data after the researchers’ completion of data analysis.

Study Definitions

The term “museum” refers to buildings where historical, scientific, artistic or cultural items are stored and exhibited. The term “museum” is not inclusive to other types of institutions such as aquariums, planetariums, and zoos. Therefore, the term informal education institutions (IEIs) will be used in this study to denote the range of these institutions.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher educators are faced with the monumental task of preparing teachers to be effective in the ever-changing landscape of diverse U.S. classrooms. For the past few decades, teacher educators have debated the best way to prepare teachers, yet teachers still report feeling inadequately prepared for the classroom (Riedinger, Marbach-Ad, McGinnis, Hestness, & Pease, 2011).

In order to prepare teachers for their future diverse classrooms, there needs to be profound shifts in where teaching and learning happens for teacher candidates. One of the untapped resources for universities and their teacher candidates are Informal Education Institutions (IEI). It can no longer be ignored that learning happens in many different informal contexts outside of school (Riedinger et al., 2011). University and IEIs, when partnered together for teacher preparation, prepare teachers who have expanded views of teaching and learning (Adams & Gupta, 2015; Traphagen & Traill, 2014; Aquino, Kelly, & Bayne, 2010; Anderson, Lawson, & Mayer-Smith, 2006). According to Nichols (2014), “teacher candidates experience profound, positive changes in their view on teaching and learning when exposed to learning in informal environments” (p. 3). These university-IEI partnerships have value and have been demonstrated to have impacts on teacher candidates.
University and IEI partnerships for teacher preparation are largely unexplored (Avraamidou, 2014) with very few studies documenting teacher candidate learning in informal learning environments (Avraamidou, 2014; Kisiel, 2013; Wallace, 2013; Wallace & Erik, 2012; Anderson, Lawson, & Mayer-Smith, 2006; Kelly, 2000). Current research suggests that teacher experiences could be expanded into IEIs. Researchers are encouraging formal and informal partners to collaborate together on how to use their affordances to expand opportunities and contexts for teacher candidates (Adams & Gupta, 2015). Reports have called for the design of more effective formal-informal collaborations which leverage the strengths of each institution and enhance curriculum and teacher development (Kisiel, 2013; Saxman et al., 2010).

This literature review is focused on University-IEI partnerships, specifically for teacher preparation. It begins with a justification of the value of university-IEIs for both university teacher candidates and for IEIs. One of the goals of this study is to add to the literature on partnerships; therefore, the gaps that exist in the area of university-IEI partnerships will be presented through a review of current literature in the field. Due to the research gap and this study's focus on the essential features of transformative relationships, a discussion of the themes that emerged in the partnership literature around partner relationships will also be discussed.

**Value of University-Informal Education Institution Partnerships**

**Benefits for Teacher Candidates**

Many researchers have found that university-IEI partnerships for teacher education have many benefits for teacher candidates. IEIs are perfect settings for teacher
education, with Gupta and Adams (2012) describing them as a rich lab for future teachers. IEIs are non-threatening environments where teacher candidates can develop their professional skills, learn new teaching methods, and naturally lend themselves to inquiry (McGinnis, Hestness, Riedinger, Katz, Marbach-Ad, & Dai, 2012; Middlebrooks, 1999). In IEIs teacher candidates have the opportunity to connect their clinical experience to the theory they studied during coursework and have multiple opportunities to observe, practice, and reflect on theory in action (Gupta & Adams, 2012).

Another value of university-IEIs partnerships is the ability for teacher candidates to use IEIs to practice their instructional skills. Preservice teachers that practice teaching in these environments have the opportunity to practice teaching in a low-stakes environment and that serve as a motivation for teachers because they are positive safe environments (Avraamidou, 2014; Gupta & Adams, 2012; McGinnis et al., 2012). Nichols (2014) states that teacher candidates' self-confidence about teaching is improved when informal experiences are built into their preparation. While practicing in these environments, they also have the opportunity to practice teaching to diverse audiences and ages and informally assess learning over a short period of time. This environment allows them to revise and re-teach the same content very quickly, trying different strategies with different learners (Adams & Gupta, 2015; Gupta & Adams, 2012; Saxman et al., 2010; Chin, 2004; Middlebrooks, 1999). Active engagement and participation in low stakes teaching activities within IEIs helps with reflection, content knowledge, development of practices, theory, and understanding about teaching and learning (Avraamidou, 2014; Gupta & Adams, 2012).
Teacher candidates placed in IEIs have the valuable opportunity to interact with IEI education staff. These interactions afford teacher candidates different teaching styles and pedagogies, more examples of best practices, and valuable connections and resources for their future classroom (Adams & Gupta, 2015; Middlebrooks, 1999).

**Benefits for Informal Education Institutions**

Despite the fact that it seems teacher candidates and universities are the only ones that benefit from these partnerships, research has shown that IEIs can also benefit by partnering with universities. Partnerships with universities allow them to heighten their role and visibility within the community (Middlebrooks, 1999) and give them the opportunity to advance their own missions while impacting how the informal education field is perceived and valued (Maloney & Hill, 2016). Another benefit for IEIs is that these partnerships open the lines of communication to the next generation of teachers (Kisiel, 2013). This access to preservice teachers gives them a low-cost way to build new, potentially influential audiences, which is often a key component of their institutional missions (Kisiel, 2013; Middlebrooks, 1999). In these partnerships, IEI educators are often partnering with other university faculty who have the same educational goals and give them a way to grow professionally (Middlebrooks, 1999). Lastly, IEIs have something that universities do not that complements the curriculum: objects, specimens, and themed exhibits (Middlebrooks, 1999).

Reports of teacher education programs at universities that include extended placements in IEIs are limited (Avraamidou, 2014; Kisiel, 2013; Anderson, et al., 2006). The literature that does exist around university-IEI partnerships for teacher preparation is
focused in two main areas: IEIs as clinical sites for teacher preparation and IEIs as places for teacher candidate learning. The research gap in the literature is the background and functioning of the actual partnerships. To better understand the research gap, a review of the current literature in the area of university-IEIs for teacher preparation follows below. First, a critique of the literature that does exist will be presented. Next, an example that includes an overview of design, process, and structure will be presented to show the type of literature that could address the research gap in the area of university-IEI partnerships.

**University-Informal Education Institution Partnerships**

There are several of examples of universities using IEIs as a site for clinical fieldwork. This clinical fieldwork often involves the teacher candidates at the IEI sites involved with the interpretation aspects of IEIs. Interpretation consists of communicating information to visitors and can include using themed carts or objects to engage visitors. Other examples included here have teacher candidates engaged in other aspects of the education department, including curriculum development and co-teaching. These examples of university-IEI partnership articles were included in the review of literature because they are the most similar to the CITE partnership.

Anderson, Lawson, Mayer-Smith (2006) presented a study about a partnership between the University of British Columbia’s teacher education program and the Vancouver aquarium. The goal of their study was to pilot their innovative program and to document the experiences of the teacher candidates while involved in the practicum (Anderson et al., 2006). The three-week practicum in the aquarium had teacher candidates involved in both co-teaching and developing materials for curriculum-based
school programs. Teacher candidates also had the opportunity to co-teach with members of the aquarium education staff and also teach school groups on their own.

Researchers conducted a qualitative interpretive case study, conducting focus groups and observations and collecting reflective pieces from the teacher candidates. The common theme they found was that because of this experience, there was a transformation of the preservice teachers’ thinking about education, teaching, and learning. This innovative program described many of the values and benefits of teacher candidates experiencing a practicum in an IEI, but failed to describe the relationship between the university and the aquarium or how their model works. Although it confirms that IEIs are valuable for teacher candidates, it does not include specific information about the partnership. The only mention of the partnership work is that it is the first Canadian cohort model between a university and museum partner and that “the partnership was initiated as an attempt to re/form this traditional classroom only model of extended practicum” (Anderson et al., 2010, p. 342).

There are multiple examples in the literature similar to the Anderson et al. (2010) study that present findings from IEI partnership but are focused on the teacher candidate outcomes with little to no mention of the inner workings of the partnerships. Here are some of the other examples that do not include background knowledge about the partnership.

Maulucci and Brotman (2010) published a design-based research study around their seminar, which brought together in-service teachers and undergraduates enrolled in a science content and pedagogical methods course in a teacher education program. The
goal of their research sought to understand how teacher learning impacts the way teacher teams plan and implement science lessons, and how IEIs impact teacher learning. Over 14 weeks preservice teachers complete forty hours in their cooperating teacher’s classroom observing, co-planning, and co-teaching science lessons. They develop hands-on science lessons that complement what is already being implemented in schools. The findings from their study highlight the linkage between teacher education, teacher practices, and student learning, through novel use of the IEI as a place to learn science connected to the mandated curriculum. It also highlights clear connections between student learning in the IEI and in the science classroom. This is another example of a study focused on the teacher education outcomes that includes no discussion of the background of the partnership. The only mention is that the “teacher education program partners with the museum to model how to use the city as a resource for science teaching and learning” (Maulucci & Brotman, 2010, p. 197).

Aquino, Kelly, and Bayne’s (2010) partnership between American Museum of Natural History and Lehman College developed and taught a class for alternate certification secondary science teaching. This course was developed to address science content and pedagogical content knowledge as it applied to the use of informal environments. Their reflective mixed-methods study found that exposing teacher candidates to these practices, while still in teacher preparation programs, expanded their science pedagogical content knowledge by learning about students and how to use appropriate resources in two distinct contexts, both classrooms and museums (Aquino et al., 2010). Although there is not a detailed description of the inner workings of this
partnership, the authors included a brief history of the partnership between Lehman University and the American Museum of Natural History. The partnership is based on an experimental college course for alternative route teachers that engaged in discussions about pedagogy and explored museums exhibits. Faculty recognized the museum component of the course was essential for teacher training, and therefore it was approved as a requirement for all master’s degree science teacher candidates.

The Collaboration for Leadership in Urban Science Teaching Evaluation and Research (CLUSTER) is a National Science Foundation (NSF) funded research project between the New York Hall of Science and City College of New York. In CLUSTER, secondary science educators work as explainers at the New York Hall of Science for at least seven weeks through the third and fourth year of their undergraduate work. The goal of their research was to document the growth of teacher candidates compared to a control group (or the group who did not have the Hall of Science experience). Overall, they found the teacher candidates enrolled in the university-IEI partnership showed enhanced teaching skills and performance. This example included an important aspect that the Anderson et al. (2006) study did not mention: collaboration between formal and informal educators. Saxman et al., (2010) described that while co-teaching mandated courses with college faculty, they learned about important standards and developed a formal framework as a reference to assist preservice teachers in developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions as praxis (Saxman et al., 2010). This example from the literature highlights the other impacts of these collaborations for teacher preparation. It does not,
however, explain how the partners interact to develop their framework, or any of the context of the inner workings of the partnership.

One example in the teacher preparation partnership literature that includes a description of the design process and structure is the Teacher Renewal for Urban Science Teaching (TRUST). TRUST is a National Science Foundation (NSF) funded Earth Science teacher preparation partnership between the American Museum of Natural History and Brooklyn and Lehman Colleges of the City University of New York. The authors of the TRUST model included an entire section of their article to a detailed model and explanation of each of the TRUST model’s components. Macdonald, Sloan, Miele, Powell, Silvernail, Kinzler, and Simon (2008), explained that the first year of their program was reserved for planning and partnership development including finalizing logistical and curricular planning. A detailed description of the objectives of the four-year project included project design, implementation, recruitment, induction, and certification of new Earth science teachers. Macdonald et al. (2008) also included what was essential to the project’s success. For example,

“at the museum, the vice president for education, a team of scientists, and the directors of professional development and online instruction strongly believed in the concept and their ability to make the AMNH dimension of the program a core part of the museums work” (p. 270).

This example highlights the inner workings of the TRUST model and what could be included in partnership literature to understand more about the development of university-IEI partnerships.

Through this literature it has been shown that the literature that currently exists focuses on only the teacher candidate outcomes for University-IEI partnerships,
but includes very little information into the background, functioning, and relationships of these partnerships. The TRUST example demonstrates what could be included to fill the gap around partnership characteristics. For university faculty or IEI educators engaged in this type of work, there is a gap in the research for IEI educators or faculty that are partnering together for teacher preparation. This dissertation’s purpose is to fill the gap in the literature around partnership characteristics for transformative partnerships. The background of transformative partnerships will be described below in the theoretical framework that guides this study.

**Theory of Partnership Development**

A partnership development theory by Enos & Morton (2003), was used to guide the theoretical assumptions of this study. This theory was built on the work of James Burns (1978), who distinguished between two basics types of leadership: transactional and transformative. Burns (1978) defines the most common type of leadership as transactional, which is the exchange of one thing for another. Transforming leadership, according to Burns (1978), is more complex and creates significant change in people and organizations. It restructures perceptions, values, and changes expectations. The process involves leaders and followers helping each other to advance to a higher level of morale and motivation (Burns, 1978).

Enos and Morton (2003) adapted Burns’ theories to show that “partnerships have the ability to not just get things done but to transform individuals, organizations, institutions, and communities” (p. 23). They proposed a framework that researchers can use to examine the developmental practice of relationship building (see Figure 1, Enos &
Morton, 2003, p. 25). They provide a way to examine partnerships as they move from transactional to transformative relationships.

As defined by Enos and Morton (2003), transactional partnership relationships are those that are “instrumental, designed to complete a task with no greater plan or promise” (p. 24). These types of partnership relationships usually work within the organizations’ existing organizational structures, and the organizations engage because each has

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of relationship</strong></td>
<td>Exchange-based and utilitarian</td>
<td>Focus on ends beyond utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End goal</strong></td>
<td>Satisfaction with exchange</td>
<td>Mutual increase in aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Satisfaction of immediate needs</td>
<td>Arouses needs to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles played by partners</strong></td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support of existing institutional goals</strong></td>
<td>Accepts institutional goals</td>
<td>Examines institutional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundaries</strong></td>
<td>Works within systems to satisfy interests of partners</td>
<td>Transcends self-interests to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner identity</strong></td>
<td>Maintains institutional identity</td>
<td>Changes group identity in larger definition of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope of commitment</strong></td>
<td>Limited time, resources, personnel to specific exchanges</td>
<td>Engages whole institutions in potentially unlimited exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Enos & Morton’s (2003) Transactional and Transformational Relationships*

something that the other finds useful. Relationships that are transactional in nature
usually occur within the normal work of the organization, and individuals leave satisfied with the outcome, but not much has changed. In contrast, transformational relationships function with “less definition, an openness to unanticipated developments, with a deeper more sustained commitment” (p. 24). Individuals in transformative relationships reflect deeply on their institutions and examine how they do business and how they define and understand problems. There is an expectation that things will change and new relationships and values may emerge (Enos & Morton, 2003).

This theoretical framework was chosen for this study as a lens to evaluate the CITE partnership with the criteria for transformative relationships. The framework was beneficial for the study during the inductive approach to data analysis where it served as a comparison from previous research of categories and themes of transformative relationships.

### Essential Features of Partnerships

The TRUST model was an example of partnership literature that included an explanation of the development and functioning of their project. An additional important component of partnership literature is the inclusion of a description of the essential features of the partnership. Similar to the TRUST model, Walsh and Backe (2013) presented an example of a partnership and included in their article what they determined to be the four requirements of effective partnerships. They explain that successful partnerships are ones that develop out of relationships and result in mutual transformation and cooperation between parties. Their study focused on a partnership between Boston Public Schools and Boston University through the City Connects Intervention. The goal
of the intervention was a tailored set of prevention, intervention, and enrichment services that students need to thrive (Walsh & Backe, 2013). Their experience with the school-university partnership that led to their program City Connects, combined with research on partnerships in general, left them to describe some of the “key ingredients, challenged and opportunity that effective partnerships present” (Walsh and Backe, 2013, p. 599).

In their article, they also describe the four main characteristics that effective school-university partnerships reflect: shared conceptual understanding, mutuality in roles and responsibilities, sound operational strategies, and evaluation of both the partnership and its outcomes. Although this partnership is not an example from a university-IEI partnership, it is focused on mutual transformational partnerships and demonstrates the importance of presenting study findings on the essential features of partnerships and what has been learned from the partnership work.

It is important to understand the literature for relationships and partnerships that exist in between these ends of the relationship continuum. Understanding the essential features of partnerships that exist in the literature helps frame the essential features of all types of partnerships that lie on the relationship continuum. Partnerships are multidimensional and vary greatly with context and situation; therefore, it is difficult to use a one-size-fits-all list of the essential features of more or less successful partnerships. The other difficulty is there is not specific literature on university-IEI partnership characteristics. This led the researcher to review the literature for examples of general features of partnerships across disciplines. The articles selected for inclusion were studies that exemplified similar criteria to those included in the Enos and Morton
(2003) framework. A variety of examples across different contexts, groups, and researchers were selected for inclusion in the literature chart (See Appendix A). Below is a description of four of the features that were included across the partnerships articles: shared goals, mutual respect and trust, communication, and infrastructure.

**Shared Goals**

Many scholars who have described the characteristics of successful partnerships specify the importance of clear shared goals (Maloney & Hill, 2016; Bosma, Sieving, Ericson, Russ, Cavender, & Bonnie, 2010; Ramaley, 2000; Torres, 2000; Middlebrooks, 1999; Holland & Gelman, 1998). Ramaley (2000) states that partners must have agreed upon mission, goals, and measurable outcomes for the partnership to function effectively. Shared goals not only should be clearly articulated but also must be developed cooperatively (Torres, 2000). Most partnerships are organized around a common theme by individuals with a shared need or shared vision. This includes being specific about the expectations of each partner and how each partner will benefit. The literature on partnerships emphasized that these goals must be clear, founded on a shared vision, and mutually understood by all partners.

**Mutual Respect and Trust**

Mutual trust and respect are fundamental to successful partnerships (Walsh & Backe, 2013; Seifer, 2000; Torres, 2000; Thorkildsen & Stein, 1996). Thorkildsen and Stein (1996), from their experiences working with Center for Disability for literature review, found the enabling strategy for successful partnerships was creating an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Often tensions that develop early on in
partnerships stem from the issue of developing trust rather than from difficulty in solving problems. Truly collaborative relationships are based on co-construction rather than power and are oriented toward building and working together (Walsh & Backe, 2013). At the heart of developing mutual relationships is the formation of trust (Walker, 1999).

**Communication**

Communication is an essential feature of successful partnerships (Seifer, 2000; Torres, 2000; Middlebrooks, 1999). “Effective partnerships are characterized by consistent communication and dialogues throughout all aspects of the partnership process” (Jones, p. 160, 2003). Consistent, clear, and open communication is key because as things change with partners, it allows for renegotiation of expectations as necessary (Jones, 2003; Seifer, 2000; Middlebrooks, 1999).

**Infrastructure**

An organized and well-developed partnership infrastructure is an essential feature of partnerships (Walsh & Backe, 2013; Anderson-Butcher, Lawson, Bean, Boone, & Kwiatkowski, 2004; Ramaley, 2000). Infrastructure must also be discussed as part of the planning process for partnerships. According to Walsh and Backe (2013), this includes developing a detailed proposal for the operational infrastructure and plan for sustainability. This infrastructure includes how the goals and objectives are going to be achieved. The structures (committees, advisory board, etc.) and the processes (meeting schedules, notes, etc.) should be clearly articulated. These structures should also be modified as the partnership work changes and develops (Walsh & Backe, 2013).
Challenges of Partnerships

Understanding the essential features of successful partnerships is important, but developing these partnerships is not easy; consequently, it is important to think about partnership challenges (Kisiel, 2013; Noam & Tillinger, 2004). Highlighted here are some of the common challenges of partnerships that involve universities included in the partnership literature.

One of the challenges for partnerships is the “culture clash” between universities and other institutions (Birge, Beaird, & Torres, 2003). Often times universities and IEI have their own unique culture, and this culture can lead to the potential for high conflict because of these institutional differences (Adams & Gupta, 2015; Gupta & Adams, 2012; McGinnis et al., 2012, Noam & Tillinger, 2004; Thorkildsen & Stein, 1996). These institutional differences can include incompatibility of institutional missions and philosophies, which make collaboration much harder to negotiate (Anderson-Butcher, Lawson, Bean, Boone, Kwiatkowski, et al. (2004); Gupta & Adams, 2012). Institutions are protective of their own expertise, and often self-interest can get in the way of successful partnerships.

Partnerships often include multiple stakeholders; therefore, there are often different sets of expectations, beliefs and opinions about what the partnership should be focused on (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2014). Some partnerships fail to spend time and energy on thoughtful planning in the initial phases of development of shared mission, goals, and roles (Noam & Tillinger, 2004). Another challenge is a lack of resources and limited time dedicated to supporting and sustaining partnerships. A lack of dedicated
staff, support, and involvement from upper administration can lead to challenges for partnerships (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2014; Noam & Tillinger, 2004). Partnerships can also run into challenges when there is a lack of or no communication between the partners. Maintaining partnerships and long-term sustainability are some of the biggest challenges for university and IEIs partnerships, especially when they are connected to funding (McGinnis et al., 2012). There are challenges to partnerships, but if partners build the foundational components and are intentional in addressing these challenges, the partnerships can have significant results (Noam and Tillinger, 2004).
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this interpretive study was to gain a deeper understanding of the functional relationships within Loyola University Chicago’s Cultural Institutions in Teacher Education (CITE) partnership.

The research questions guiding this study were:

1.) How did participants describe their personal and institutional involvement within the CITE partnership?

2.) Where on the relationships continuum did participants rate the current CITE partnership, and how did they explain their rating?

3.) What factors did participants indicate supported and/or constrained the partnership’s movement towards becoming more transformational?

This chapter reviews the context of the study, the research design and methods, and detailed descriptions of the study’s phases including data collection and data analyses.

Context

Loyola University Chicago’s Teacher Preparation Program

Loyola University Chicago (LUC)’s Teaching, Learning, and Leading with Schools and Communities (TLLSC) program is an entirely site based urban teacher
preparation program. TLLSC was designed around four cornerstones: mutual-beneficial partnerships with schools and communities, teacher preparation for diverse classrooms, authentic teaching practice, and participation in professional learning communities (Ryan, Ensminger, Heineke, Kennedy, Prasse, Smetana, 2014). TLLSC was designed to recognize that the successful development of future teachers requires an all hands-on-deck partnership approach with those constituents vested in the learning, achievement, and success of PK-12 students. Local schools, communities, and cultural institutions are sites for teacher candidate learning experiences as school professionals, museum educators, and community leaders share the responsibility of preparing teachers. Teacher candidates engage in a wide range of learning experiences, across varied authentic contexts developing the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to make a positive impact on youth and their communities (Ryan et al., 2014).

**Cultural Institutions in Teacher Education Partnership**

The redesign and implementation of TLLSC’s program involved input from community partners who were already working with Loyola prior to the partnership. As part of this collaborative approach to initial teacher preparation, CITE initially formed as a working group in the Spring of 2014 when Drs. Lara Smetana and Danny Birmingham invited interested university faculty and cultural institution education staff to come together outside of course time in pursuit of two goals: enhancing collaboration and disseminating findings. CITE sought to create a space for open communication about the joint work as teacher educators and how the group might open and contribute to dialogue
with others about this collaborative approach to initial teacher education (Smetana, Birmingham, Rouleau, Carlson, & Phillips, 2017).

Officially, regular CITE partnership meetings began in the Fall of 2014. Currently, there are six institutions and 13 individuals involved in monthly CITE meetings, which alternate across the member organization locations. There is a half-hour set aside for “coffee and conversations” to start each meeting to allow for socializing and catching up on any individual concerns; then two hours are set aside for the regular agenda which is set by the two faculty leads with input from other members. This core group provides overall leadership and organization, but there are additional university faculty and IEI staff involved in class sessions. LUC serves as the central partner and a LUC graduate assistant – the author of this study – serves as the coordinator of the partnership. This position is in charge of overall communication, organization, and logistics. This includes sending out meeting reminders, organization of the shared files, website and newsletter creation, as well as other required logistics. The coordinator serves as the central point of contact for all members of the partnership. Table 1 describes the range of educators and institutions represented. Some of the institutions are more involved with elementary science education coursework and others with other program coursework (i.e. early childhood, history education). One of the first projects for the group was a collaboratively developed dynamic logic model that continues to guide the group’s long-term efforts (See Appendix B). This development process helped to build collective understanding of the intentions and goals of each member’s organization and of the group as a whole. It also helped to clarify roles of each institution in
supporting goals according to each member’s strengths and expertise, and highlighted and justified strengths of a partnership model for teacher preparation (Appendix C is a one page fact sheet about the goals of the institutions in the CITE partnership). Coming from different perspectives, it developed a shared vocabulary that facilitated work with candidates and adjunct faculty (Smetana, et al., 2017).

Table 1. Current Composition of the Cultural Institutions in Teacher Education Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Year Joined the CITE Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquarium</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquarium</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Museum</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Museum</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Museum</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Museum</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Museum</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural History</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetarium</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates that the member was involved with the university prior to the formation of CITE

Loyola teacher candidates visit the CITE partners five times during the exploration (beginning) sequences of their teacher education program (See Figure 2). The focus of these beginning sequences serves as an introduction to IEIs and their
educators and also exposes them to learning in out-of-school contexts. Elementary teacher candidates also visit partner IEIs during the science and social studies method modules in the second semester of their sophomore year (Figure 2, Loyola CITE, 2015). In this concentration stage, the teacher candidates visit the IEIs multiple times to develop their content skills engaging in activities as learners. These teacher candidate sessions are a topic on the agenda during some of the monthly CITE meetings. Meeting time is used to discuss and refine the candidate experiences in the IEIs and serves as time to debrief the experiences after each semester. Each sequence has gone through iterative processes for development and are constantly being refined.

**Research Design**

The three-phase study was situated in the interpretivist paradigm. Rooted in the traditions of hermeneutics and phenomenology, the interpretivist approach emerged in the United States during the 1970s (Erickson, 1985). Traditionally, interpretivists argue for the “uniqueness of human inquiry” (Schwant, 1994, p. 119) and consequently are primarily concerned with explaining the complexities of lived experience from the
perspectives of those who lived it (Schwant, 1994). Furthermore, interpretivists believe that to understand the complex world of meaning requires that one interpret it through rigorous data collection and analysis (Schwant, 1994). A goal of Interpretivism is to capture the unique features of the context under study.

Interpretivism was selected as this study’s guiding paradigm because of its potential for uncovering and explaining hidden phenomena such as partnership relationships. The CITE partnership is unique and complex which made it unlikely to be understood through a positivist or hypothesis testing approach. The experiences of each partnership member were different and unique for many reasons (e.g., personal history, professional ambitions, philosophies, etc.) and this made it important to understand the partnership via each participant’s subjective views. The researcher held an emic view of the partnership by being embedded in the partnership, which afforded access and insights about the context and partnership activities. An interpretive analysis allowed the researcher to capture individual participants’ experiences surrounding the partnership while also providing explanations of the entire partnership writing using thick description.

**Research Phases**

This study consisted of three distinct phases to progressively deepen the understanding of the functions and relationships of the CITE partnership. This interpretive study utilized a sequential mixed method design to address three research questions - a method specifically chosen to offer complementarity while examining a phenomenon (Greene, 2007). Complementarity in mixed methods served to elaborate,
enhance, deepen, and broadened the overall interpretations and inferences of the study (Greene, 2007). The sequential mixed method approach was promising because this study sought a broader, deeper and more comprehensive view of the participants’ experiences in the partnership. The dominant method in this study was qualitative because it was important to obtain a detailed account of relationships within the CITE partnership. This study also made use of quantitative information gathered within a survey about relationships between institutions. The study’s qualitative and quantitative data collection phases are presented below (see Figure 3). Although each phase employed one single method, the initial analysis and final analysis made use of the mixed methods of qualitative and quantitative data.

**Figure 3. Phases of Data Collection and Analysis**

Phase one used semi-structured interviews to uncover information about the participants and their motivations for being in the partnership. During Phase two, survey data was collected about the participants’ transactional and transformational relationships. Following Phase two data collection, an in-depth analysis of all were conducted. These preliminary findings were reported back to the participating CITE partners during Phase three for member checking via participants’ written commentaries.
and discussions during a focus group. The connections between the phases, data sources, and the study’s three research questions are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Research Questions, Phases, and Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.) How do participants (CITE members) describe their personal and institutional involvement in the CITE partnership?</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>Interviews, Participant Notes, Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) How and why do the participants rate the current CITE partnership in terms of the continuum of relationships from exploitative to transformational?</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>Survey, Participant Notes, Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) What partnership factors have supported and constrained the movement towards a more transformational type of partnership?</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>Interviews, Participant Notes, Focus Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study also involved both inductive and deductive approaches. A deductive approach was used to test the Enos and Morton (2003) criteria for transformative relationships to the data from the CITE partnership derived from data from all phases of the study. At the same time, an inductive approach was also used to generate modifications to the Enos and Morton (2003) framework based on the important criteria for transformative partnerships that emerged from analysis of data from all three phases of this study.

Participants

The study’s 15 participants were members of Loyola’s Cultural Institutions in Teacher Education (CITE) Partnership with the partnership as a unit of analysis because it represented a unique sample of interest (Merriam, 2016). These participants represented six distinct IEIs in Chicago and were approached by the researcher because they were members of the CITE Partnership. To recruit participants, they were asked in
person and told that participating would involve an individual interview of half-hour in
duration, a study-specific survey that would require 30 minutes, and a request to provide
written/verbal feedback about the interpretations from the initial phases of the study.
Every member of the CITE partner who was invited agreed to participate in this study.
Thus, the final sample was 15 participants.

During phase one, participants were interviewed about their experiences in the partnership including questions about: how they became involved in the partnership, their work with teacher candidates, and their experiences in the partnership. Three participants withdrew from the partnership after the phase one interviews and did not participate in the remainder of the study. Their reasons for withdrawing were due to changes in their job situation and not because they were not interested in the study. In their place, three new members joined the partnership and they participated in the final two phases of the study. For phase two, the same 12 participants were given a nine-question survey in which they were asked to rate the CITE partnership on an index of relationship quality. For phase three, six participants participated in the focus group, five of which supplied completed participant notes and five members provided their completed participant notes to the researcher because they could not attend the focus group.

Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

Phase One Data Collection

Semi-structured interviews were selected for phase one of this study to gain a deeper understanding of the participant experiences in the partnership. Semi-structured interviews were chosen for this phase because they are flexible, less structured questions,
and require more specific data from respondents (Merriam, 2016). The goal of this phase of the study was to learn more about the participant’s experiences in the partnership.

Semi-structured interviews during phase one of this study were conducted by the researcher. The researcher traveled to each institution to conduct in person interviews. Before the one-on-one interviews, participants were consented for their participation. This data was collected under the CITE group Instructional Review Board (IRB) (Loyola IRB Project #1436) (See Appendix D for research consent forms). The researcher used the same seven question semi-structured protocol for each interview, which focused on collecting the experiences of the participants (see Appendix E). The researcher asked participants to explain how they became involved in the partnership, what kept them coming back, the role of IEIs in teacher education, characteristics of sustainable partnerships, and what they believed were the biggest success and challenges of the partnership from their point of view. The interviews were audio recorded and the researcher completed field notes during and after completion of the interviews on the same day, noting interesting experiences, and varying and negative examples. Audio files were downloaded and coded by participant number. All audio files were stored in a password protected Google Drive folder that only the researcher had access to. The transcripts were sent to a professional transcription service to be transcribed verbatim or the researcher transcribed them verbatim. After the transcripts were completed they were checked for errors and then saved into the Google Drive folder.
Phase One Data Analysis

In total, 12 participants were interviewed during phase one of this study. The first stage of data analysis used a general inductive approach. An inductive approach to data analysis is determined by both the research questions and multiple readings and interpretations of the raw data (Thomas, 2006). The findings were derived from both the research questions and findings that arose directly from the analysis of raw data. The primary mode of analysis is the development of categories from the raw data into a framework that captures key themes and processes.

Phase one of inductive coding consisted of the researcher reading over all of the interview transcripts multiple times. The large amount of interview data led the researcher to use flash cards to organize the data. All the interview transcripts were printed and assembled onto flash cards, each individual thought or experience of the participant was included on individual cards. If a participant’s response involved two separate ideas they were split onto two different flash cards. The researcher then sorted the flash cards by the categories and themes that emerged from data set. First, general categories were derived to answer the purpose and questions of the study. This process was completed until a majority of the flash cards were compiled into five main categories (See Appendix F for more detail): role in CITE partnership, reasons for being involved in the CITE partnership, successes, challenges, and goals for the future.

The next stage of inductive coding involved deriving the lower level codes or subcodes within each category. For example, all the flash cards that were sorted into the challenge category were sorted to derive the subcodes that emerged for challenges. For
example, subcodes that were found within the category challenges were: staff and faculty turnover, funding, capacity, and connections across institutions. The subcodes were revised and refined through multiple rounds of coding. Below are examples of the five main categories and subcodes with examples from participant interviews (Appendix G shows the researchers results from the inductive coding process).

Category one, *role in the CITE partnership*, was uncovered as participants talked about the role they had in the partnership. Transcripts revealed there were differing views of the partnership depending on their role at their institution. For example, this participant’s transcript was coded as teacher role because of the direct involvement in the teaching of Loyola teacher candidates.

I think it’s really interesting to hear what other institutions are doing because I feel like my primary touch point is with the teacher candidates. I feel like I am definitely more facilitation and working with the teacher candidates so I kind of always have that lens and so when I hear what other institutions are doing it’s really valuable (*Participant 5 – Interview*).

Participant four held more of an administrative position at the institution therefore, it was coded as administrative.

We might be a little different than some of the other organizations primarily in that, I don’t have a huge role in the implementation of sequence one and group I play more of an advisory role on the planning of those sessions. I’m more in an administrative level but I can speak to both.

Category two, *why they are involved in the partnership*, was coded when participants described their reasons for being involved in the partnership. For example, participants who spoke about being involved in the partnership to change the views of informal institutions, be more involved in teacher preparation, or professional development were coded as this category. Participant six’s interview was coded as why
they are involved in the partnership because it explains their experiences working with Loyola’s teacher candidates.

I think we provide another environment for them to see learning happen in. The focus we have had this past year is how the field sites are anchors for them to see learning theory applies. I think pedagogy too because we share ways of social science instruction that might be new or that they haven’t seen before or maybe never experienced in their own schooling (Participant 6 – Interview).

Category three, characteristics, was coded when participants talked about the successes of the CITE partnership. Examples of these successes included when participants mentioned: the logic model, the importance of central partner, open communication, engagement, and shared vision.

Category four, challenges, was coded when participants talked about the challenges CITE partnership currently faces or might face in the future. Some of the example subcodes in this category are: funding, capacity, staff turnover, and expansion. Participants expressed concern about the capacity of their institutions if the program were to grow and were also concerned about turnover at the university and at their own institutions.

Category five, goals for the future, was coded when participants discussed the goals they had for the future of the partnership. Some of the example subcodes were: more time with the Loyola teacher candidates, connections to Loyola’s school partners, and following teachers to in-service. Many of the participants expressed interest in more time with the Loyola teacher candidates. Participants would like to see the teacher candidates have more observation or clinical time in their institutions. Participant one explains,
Providing a venue where they can do observations and do some initial contact with visitors and really tests out some of these theories and ideas that they’re learning at school. And their coursework here at the museum, it's a different type of learning experience then in a formal venue like a classroom. They also have access to a wide range of ages, where in the classroom its really specific (Participant 1 – Interview).

Each phase of the inductive analysis was done in collaboration with the dissertation chair and included discussion of codes, emergent themes, and the relationship of the findings from the CITE partnership to the Enos and Morton’s (2003) framework for transactional and transformational relationships.

**Phase Two Data Collection**

The quantitative data for this mixed method study was collected from the participants using a cross-sectional survey called the Transformational Relationship Evaluation Scale (TRES) which was created by Clayton, Bringle, Senor, Huq, & Morrison (2010). The purpose of the survey was to assess the current CITE partnership in terms of its transformational potential. The survey was developed by Clayton and her colleagues from a review of literature and through feedback from practitioners and researchers studying service learning partnerships. TRES was developed based on the analysis of attributes of transactional and transformational relationships and the relationships literature related to universities and communities working together (civic engagement). This instrument was designed to measure the dimensions of relationships in terms of the degree to which a relationship displays properties associated with being transactional and transformative on nine issues: outcomes, common goals, decision making, resources, conflict management, identity formation, power, significance, and satisfaction, and change for the better (Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2009). The responses
reflect different possibilities on the relationship continuum from exploitative to transactional to transformational (Clayton et al., 2010). If participants chose options in the exploitive range of the continuum, it reflects negative outcomes to one or both. Transactional selections reflect net benefit to one or both but no growth. Selections in the transformative range capture growth and enhanced capacity in and through the relationship (Clayton et al., 2010).

The instrument was used “as-is” with the exception of the wording CITE partnership which was added to the survey for clarity. The survey consisted of participants marking with an X the alternative that best characterizes the actual nature of the CITE partnership (See Appendix H for a copy of the participant survey). The researcher traveled to each participant’s home institution to administer the survey. Before the survey, participants were consented for their participation. This data was collected under the researcher’s dissertation Instructional Review Board (IRB) (Loyola IRB Project # 2298) (See Appendix D for research consent forms). The paper surveys were dropped off and participants were given 30 minutes to fill them out, they were collected by the researcher the same day. The surveys were identified by participant number only.

**Phase Two Data Analysis**

Twelve participants completed the surveys for phase two of the study. The first step to the phase two analysis was the digitization of the survey raw data into excel by the researcher. The letter scores of the participants where then converted into numerical format. An alternative of “a” received a score of 1, alternative “b” a score of two, and so
on for each participant. After all participant data was converted into numerical format, the numerical responses for all nine of the survey questions were summed together for a total score for each participant (TRES total score). After all the TRES total scores were calculated for each participant, a basic descriptive analysis was conducted. The participant responses were averaged across the nine questions to acquire the mean TRES score for each participant. The mean for all 12 participants was then calculated by averaging TRES mean score all participants. Other mean scores were also calculated for specific groups including: mean TRES score by years in the partnership (year one through four separately), and mean TRES score for university faculty and IEI educators separately.

**Phase Three Data Collection**

**Participant notes.** The qualitative data for phase three served two purposes to collect qualitative data around two other relationship indicators and served as the member checking for the initial findings of the study. A document, Participant Notes, was created after the analysis of the phase one and phase two data was completed. The participant notes consisted of a summary of the findings from phase one and two of the study and open-ended questions to solicit participant ideas about these findings (See Appendix I for the participant note sheet used in the study). The participant notes also included bar graphs of the results from the survey for participants to review.

Besides checking the initial findings from phase one and two the participant notes also asked participant to answer two questions on the relationship quality within the CITE partnership. The Venn Level of Closeness (Mashek, Cannaday, & Tangney, 2007)
used circles to measure the relationship between institutions in the CITE partnership.

And participants were asked to rank the CITE partnership along the relationship continuum, by Bringle, Clayton, & Price (2009). The closer the relationship (towards the top of the continuum) the greater the integrity and equity, and with transformational partnerships having high degrees of all three characteristics. More information about these measures will be discussed in Chapter IV.

One month prior to distribution of the participant notes, all participants were consented for participation both for the collection of participant notes and the focus group. This data was collected under the researcher’s dissertation Instructional Review Board (IRB) (Loyola IRB Project # 2298) (See Appendix D for research consent forms). The participant notes were e-mailed to the participants one week prior to the scheduled focus group which took place during the October 2017 monthly CITE meeting.

Participants were asked to answer the questions included in the participant notes and also review the initial findings from the first two phases of the study as explained above. If participants were able to attend the focus group the participant notes were collected upon completion of the focus group so they could use them during the focus group conversation. If participants were unable to participate in the focus group hard copies were collected from participants by the researcher or e-mailed to the researcher. All participant notes were transcribed by the researcher into digital format and combined into one single document.

**Focus group.** A focus group is an interview that occurs in a group setting with participants who have knowledge of the topic (Merriam, 2016). Member checking is a
common strategy for ensuring internal validity and credibility and was used for member checking during phase three of the study (Merriam, 2016). The focus group was conducted during the first hour of the monthly October 2017 CITE meeting. Participants were consented for participation in the focus group and the participant notes, one monthly prior to the focus group. The data was collected under the researcher’s dissertation Instructional Review Board (IRB) (Loyola IRB Project # 2298) (See Appendix D for research consent forms). The focus group was audio recorded consisted of semistructured discussion questions relating to the preliminary findings (See Appendix J for the discussion questions from the focus group). This included reviewing both phase one and phase two findings to make sure it was representative of the participant ideas and fine-tuning some of the results. The researcher used the two qualitative questions (Venn Level of Closeness and relationship continuum) and their reasoning behind the selection to provoke conversations around transformational relationships in the focus group. After completion of the focus group the audio file was downloaded to a password protected google drive folder and transcribed verbatim by a professional transcription company. Participant numbers were used instead of the participant names. After completion of the transcription the researcher checked the transcript for errors.

**Phase Three Data Analysis**

**Participant notes.** Participant notes were collected from the six participants that participated in the focus group and six participants that provided their completed participant notes to the researcher. The focus of the phase three analysis was on the two qualitative questions that were asked of the participants: Venn Level of Closeness and the
relationship continuum. The participant responses were combined into figures to display the overall results from these questions. The data that was collected as part of the member checking process was used to in the final analysis.

**Focus group.** The focus group consisted of six participants. The researcher printed a hard copy of the focus group transcript and assembled each participant thought onto flash cards in exactly the same process described for the phase one interview analysis. The note cards from the focus group were marked with a black dot to indicate the data source was from the focus group. The researcher then sorted the data into the categories and subcategories defined in phase one of the study (See Appendix G). The codes were revised based on the findings from phase three of the study (See Appendix K for the revision of the codes and subcodes).

**Final Analysis**

After the completion of the phase three data analysis, the focus of the final analysis was to review the themes and claims and refine them. The focus of the final analysis was to highlight the areas of disagreement and also to clarify the additional data uncovered during member checking. The initial findings can be found in Appendix L.

**Considerations**

**Validity**

Internal validity hinges on the meaning of reality and based on the fact that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing. Multiple means of establishing internal validity for the qualitative study were used to increase the credibility of the findings because it is very hard to capture the objective truth reality (Merriam, 2016). Internal
validity strategies were incorporated to enhance the researcher's' ability to assess the accuracy of findings (Merriam, 2016). The main strategy used in this study was triangulation. Triangulation is the use of two or three measurement points to enable congruence. According to Patton (2015) “triangulation in whatever form, increases credibility and quality by countering the concern that a study’s findings are simply an artifact of a single method, a single source, or a single investigator’s blinders” (p. 674).

For this study, multiple methods of data collection were used including interviews, surveys, and a focus group. Triangulation was used by examining evidence from both qualitative and quantitative data sources and was used to build a coherent justification for themes (Merriam, 2016).

Another common strategy used for internal validity used in this study was member checks. Member checks are soliciting feedback from your preliminary or emergent findings from participants. For this study, the entire set of preliminary findings was presented to all participants for member checking purposes through participant notes or the focus group. According to Maxwell (2013), “this is the single most important way of ruling out the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of what participants say and the perspective they have on what is going on, as well as being an important way of identifying your own biases” (pp. 126-127). Other strategies for internal validity that this study incorporated were spending adequate time collecting data along with looking for variation in the understanding of the phenomenon (Merriam, 2016) which is to “look for data that support alternative explanations” (Patton, 2005, p. 653). The researcher specifically looked-for data during analysis that might disconfirm or challenge
expectations or emerging findings. These negative examples were labeled during analysis and incorporated into Chapter IV. The last strategy used was peer review or examination. During all three phases of the study the dissertation chair and other peers were asked to review raw data or preliminary findings from this study. This peer review allowed the researcher to assess if the findings were plausible based on the data (Merriam, 2016).

To ensure consistency and dependability an audit trail was used (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). An audit trail describes in detail how data was collected and how categories were derived (Merriam, 2016). The researcher used a journal to record memos during the entire research process and included recording reflections about interviews, issues or questions that arouse during interview, surveys or analysis, detailed accounts of how the data was conducted and how the data was analyzed.

Reliability measures suggested by Gibbs (2007) were also used in this study. Specifically, all transcripts were checked for mistakes that might have been made during transcription. A qualitative code book was also used for this study to make sure there was not a change in the definition of codes (Gibbs, 2007). Detailed memos and definitions were written during analysis and compared, therefore a cohesive code book was created (Gibbs, 2007).

Generalizability is not the target of qualitative research; therefore, this study was thought of in terms of “reader generalizability”. As Merriam (2016) states, this means “leaving the extent to which a study’s findings apply to other situations up to the people in those situation” (p. 256). It is up to the reader to decide if it applies to other situations
or their own situations. To enhance the possibility of transferring of this study to other situations a rich, thick description was used. It is a highly descriptive, detailed presentation of the setting and in particular, the findings of the study (Merriam, 2016). A detailed description of the setting, context, and participants along with participant quotes was used in this study to enhance the transferability.

**Researcher’s Position**

Reflexivity, or a researcher’s position, which relates to how the researcher affects and is affected by the research, was taken into account during this study to increase validity. The position of the researcher in this study is vitally important because I had three different roles during this study. I hold an emic view of the partnership since I have been a member since the Fall of 2014; I am a faculty member that teaches in the courses that take place in the IEIs; and I serve as the coordinator of the CITE coordinator, organizing the communication and logistical aspects of the partnership. As a researcher, managing these roles I hold in the partnership was difficult and took a conscious effort.

There were advantages and disadvantages to being an insider in the partnership. One of the advantages was that the participants knew me ahead of time and felt comfortable sharing their experiences with me. One of the disadvantages was balancing all the roles I had in the partnership and making sure I was checking my biases throughout data collection and analysis. As a researcher, I found myself constantly checking my bias throughout the study. One example, is writing about how the participants described the logic model in Chapter IV. Because I knew so much about the logic model and how it was developed from being part of the process as a CITE member,
I had to make sure I was focusing my analysis on what I was learning from the data and not from my extensive background and experience in creating the logic model.

The biases due to the emic position of the researcher were mitigated in multiple ways. One of the most important ways biases were mitigated was the critical friend’s discussion with my dissertation chair throughout the process. The dissertation chair, or critical friend, provided honest and candid feedback about themes and findings throughout the process. Another important component was member checking of the initial findings from the first two phases of the study to reduce the bias. Member checking with the participants reduced biases by making sure all the data was correctly represented. Triangulation or use of multiple data sources was also used to reduce researcher bias

**Limitations**

The primary limitation for this study was the researcher as the instrument of qualitative data collection. If the judgments and biases of the researcher are left unchecked it could lead to findings that are limited by researcher’s views. This limitation was reduced by strategic designs implemented throughout the study including: member checking of the data findings at the end, a detailed audit trail, and discussion of emerging themes and findings with the dissertation chair.

The second limitation of the study was the number of study participants. The small number of participants represents the current members of the CITE partnership at the time this study was conducted. The goal of qualitative research and this study was not generalizability to other contexts therefore the small number of participants and focus
on the CITE partnership might not be of concern. Due to time constraints, this study represents only a snapshot of the participant experiences and a small piece of the overall CITE partnership.

The final limitation of the study was the use of the specific Enos and Morton (2003) framework on transformative relationships which was used to guide the findings from the study. The framework was used to explain the findings in Chapter V but the data from this study used an inductive approach to analysis. To elevate the concern of possibly omitting important findings outside of this framework the researcher was open to other findings outside of the theoretical framework.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview of the Study

This study consisted of three distinct phases. The first phase of the study involved one-on-one interviews to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences of the participants involved in the CITE partnership. In the second phase of the study, a nine-question survey called the Transformational Relationship Evaluation Survey (TRES) (Clayton, Bringle, Senor, Huq, & Morrison, 2010) was completed to understand the types of relationships (across a continuum of transactional to transformational) that exist between the institutions in the CITE partnership. In the study’s third phase, participants were presented with two other relationship indicators and the initial findings from the first two phases of the study. The final focus group and participant notes served as a member check for clarity and triangulation purposes. To follow is a description of the study participants, the research questions, and the findings for each research question.

Participants

The participants in this study consisted of active members of Loyola’s Cultural Institutions in Teacher Education (CITE) Partnership. All participants in this study consented to participate prior to beginning the study (see Appendix D for consent forms used in the study). The total of 15 participants in this study reflects changes in the membership of the partnership over the course of the research. Three of the original 15
participants withdrew from the partnership after the phase one interviews and therefore did not participate in phase two and three. After the completion of phase one, three new members joined the partnership and participated in the final phases of the study.

**Research Questions**

The research questions that guided this study were the following:

1.) How did participants describe their personal and institutional involvement within the CITE partnership?

2.) Where on the relationships continuum did participants rate the current CITE partnership, and how did they explain their rating?

3.) What factors did participants indicate supported and/or constrained the partnership’s movement towards becoming more transformational?

**Results**

**Research Question 1: How did participants describe their personal and institutional involvement within the CITE partnership?**

To investigate this research question, 12 participants were interviewed using a seven-question protocol developed by the researcher (see Appendix E). The participants were asked how they initially became engaged in the group, what keeps them coming back, and what were their personal and institutional reasons for being involved in the partnership. The findings for this research question were also member checked through a focus group and participant notes.

Although each participant stated personal and institutional reasons for participating, the final finding is that it is difficult to tease apart one’s personal reasoning
from the institutional reasoning, given that these participants’ goals were well-aligned with those of the institution they represent.

Personal and institutional. Initial analysis of the phase one data revealed both personal and institutional reasons that participants described being involved in this partnership. Yet, further analysis of participant notes and focus group data revealed that there is a blurring between personal and institutional reasons for being involved. Member checking was used to clarify whether the reasons for involvement were more personal or more institutional goals. During the focus group participants had a hard time categorizing their reasoning as one type (personal) or the other (institutional).

Participant 1 explained,

> It is hard for me to separate that personal and institutional goal because I really joined this partnership for a personal perspective and kind of merged with institutional perspective, but I really think it has a lot to do with like-mindedness – we have similar goals and passions and interests (Participant 1-Focus Group).

When asked about their reason for describing their involvement as more of a personal versus institutional motivation, Participant 10 suggested,

> “Maybe there is a blurring of the line because the group has a strong personal connection with each other and that we’re willing to share things about who we are as educators and people and that is part of our identity comes out” (Participant 10-Focus Group).

The connections between personal and institutional reasons for being involved in the partnership will be discussed further in Chapter V.

Participant reasons for involvement. Several common themes emerged about why participants described being involved in the CITE partnership and the TLLSC program overall. These included: wanting to change the perception of informal education,
wanting to impact K-12 students, and for professional development. Each individual finding is discussed separately below.

**Changing perceptions about informal education.** Every year IEIs provide more than 18 million instructional hours for educational programs (field trips for students, outreaches to schools, teacher professional development, etc.), yet these institutions still have to prove themselves as educational institutions, even though learning is a central part of their missions (American Alliance of Museums, 2014). Participants in the CITE partnership were found to have those same stereotypical experiences trying to explain the importance of IEIs as educational institutions. Participants are personally invested in teacher education and wanted to expand the work they do with teachers into the preservice realm. Participants want recognition for their institutions and to be seen as partners in learning. They want to change the views of IEIs as just fun places to go on a field trip and focus more on the important role IEIs can play as valuable partners in learning and resources for teachers.

**Personal investment in teacher education.** Six participants discussed their personal investment in teacher education because they wanted to impact and stay connected to the teaching profession. Eleven participants stated they were involved in the partnership because of Loyola University Chicago’s innovative approach to teacher education. In the Loyola model, approximately 80 percent of instructional time is spent in the field, and CITE partners are involved in the program from the very first semester. They appreciate the design of the field-based teacher education program because it aligns to their personal educational philosophy. “You want to feel like you are making a change and doing something new and innovative, and I feel like this is very
new and innovative” (Participant 2 - Interview). Describing their own experiences in teacher preparation, participants believed they could make a difference in teacher preparation by participating in the CITE partnership. Participant 13 felt a commonality between their personal philosophies and Loyola’s teacher education program.

I think a lot of things of what I value in informal education and what I do in this job I see reflected in the program that Loyola has for preservice teachers. Those commonalities are what really make the partnership work and continue to grow (Participant 13-Interview).

IEI institutions have a history of working with in-service teachers for professional development, workshops, programs, or open houses. Through interviews, five participants stated they wanted to be involved in this partnership because they wanted to expand their role with preservice teachers. Their focus is on expanding their teacher work into the preservice teacher realm and focusing on exposing preservice teachers to IEIs before they are in their own classrooms. Participant four explained the expansion into preservice in terms of remediation. “We have traditionally been in remediation mode with teacher professional development but we’re looking more and more to how do we shift some of our resources to working with preservice teachers” (Participant 4 – Interview). The IEI educators believe there are many benefits of working with preservice teachers, “…so that we are building a strong foundation and we can invest early on rather than later on as a remediation kind of situation” (Participant 4 - Interview). Another benefit for IEIs educators is having teachers more focused on their institutions from the beginning of their teacher preparation. As Participant 6 explained, “I do think we are going to have teachers that are attuned to museums and are building it into their practice from the very beginning. That is my biggest hope” (Participant 6-Interview).
Participating in this partnership, participants believed, could inform their institution about the strategies for working with teachers. For example, participant nine believed this partnership could inform the teacher strategy or focus at their institution. “Maybe it’s more important we’re in the preservice area as opposed to actually actively in-service. I think this is going to help inform that teacher strategy” (Participant 9 - Interview).

Participants wanted to expand their work with preservice teachers to build a foundation and interest for IEIs from the beginning. It was also found that participants believed IEIs were important to in-service teachers as well as partners in learning and assisting with standards and interdisciplinary learning.

Participants explained they wanted to expand with this partnership the importance of IEIs are valuable resources for classroom teachers. In this partnership, participants believed in exposing teacher candidates early, so in the future they will see IEIs as important resources for them. “It is really critical, and I think the sooner that they get used to this ideas that it is such a critical part and that we are here and that we want to work with them” (Participant 5 - Interview).

Participants during the phase one interviews believed that IEIs can support teachers in important such as standards, gap areas, and interdisciplinary areas of learning. Participant five explained,

The sooner they [teacher candidates] recognize that these informal institutions are here and the resources they offer both for students… the more they will become comfortable in coming here and seeing us as even beyond just a resource but seeing us as a partner in their students’ learning (Participant 5-Interview).
The IEI educators wanted to be not only resources for these areas but also partners in teachers' learning.

Four participants believed they could support teachers precisely in meeting the required standards, specifically Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). “Showing how cultural institutions can support that [standards] and how those are places where you can find that information” (Participant 7-Interview). IEIs educators are focused on the standards-based movement that is taking place in schools right now and want to help teachers make the connections.

“And in this standard's based movement period, it is important that we are exposing our teachers to this…. if they really see how to take these informal learning experiences and bring it back to their classroom and make those connections” (Participant 14-Interview).

IEIs are often developing standards-based programs prior to it taking hold in schools. For example, the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) and NGSS related programs were common in IEIs prior to it becoming a wide spread in schools. “We have STEM programming that’s been built throughout the years before STEM was a thing, and it really lends itself well to NGSS and crosscutting concepts and these things that formal education started to embrace” (Participant 13-Interview). IEIs are often focused on authenticity and application of experiences. “I feel like museums, especially with NGSS and all these other things that are coming out, provide direct application of a lot of concepts as well as authentic experiences” (Participant 9-Interview).

Five participants also thought that IEIs could help teachers with interdisciplinary learning and filling gap areas. IEIs are places where interdisciplinary happens.
naturally. “That is part of the informal learning – interdisciplinary approach that schools should really be doing more but we have the freedom to do more of that too” (Participant 1 - Focus Group). IEIs also help teachers fill gap areas such as science and social studies that do not get as much needed time because there are not any standardized tests associated with these areas. “The emphasis on science and social studies in terms of who we’re partnering with, that those are often the subjects that feel forgotten…” (Participant 1-Focus Group).

Overall, participants believed they could be assets to preservice and in-service teachers including both introductions to IEIs as important to learning and resources for standards and interdisciplinary learning.

*Not Just for Entertainment.* Five participants explained that they are involved in the partnership to help shift the views of informal institutions away from being perceived as just places for entertainment. “Learning is occurring in these institutions; it’s not just for entertainment purposes” (Participant 14 - Interview). Going one step further, participants want to focus on “expanding their [teacher candidate] understanding of what teaching and learning is and where learning can happen” (Participant 11-Interview).

The participants also wanted to expand the notion of where learning takes place to IEIs. “We provide another environment for them to see learning happen in” (Participant 6-Interview). The partnership focuses on teacher candidate learning, specifically having them experience what it is like to be a learner in these informal settings. As Participant 11 explains, “I think that there is the potential to help teacher candidates both experience what it is like to learn in this setting and also expanding their conception of where learning takes place” (Participant 11 - Interview).
Having teacher candidates experience IEIs as learners in the future will hopefully shift their views of where learning can happen and will bridge the gap between formal and informal learning.

I think people try to silo things off, there are things that are done in the classroom and things that are done out of the classroom, and why you go to the museum. I think it’s important for them to see that they do complement each other and intersect (Participant 2-Interview).

Through this partnership participants believed that exposing teacher candidates to informal learning environments will shift their views of informal learning, IEIs, and where learning can take place.

Along the same lines as shifting views of informal learning, three participants from the IEIs stated one of their main goals for being involved in the partnership was to shift the view “that cultural institutions are not just for field trips” (Participant 3-Interview). Participant 2 stated that much of the reasoning for field trip centers around, “Does this align with my curriculum so I can take a field trip?” (Participant 2-Interview), instead of all that IEIs have to offer. As participant three stated, during an interview, “there's a lot that informal institutions have to offer, not just a place go on a cool field trip”. According to these participants, they wanted IEIs to be seen more connected to lessons, classrooms, and teachers, instead of just a day off from school to go on a field trip. IEIs want teachers to be more than just once a year field trip users and use IEI educators as experts and resources. Participant two explained,

I think it’s really important and I see this even with full-time teachers that I work with, is getting them to see institutions beyond taking a field trip for the day. That the staff, a lot of the people that are working there, a lot of the departments, a lot of the resources that we have, can be so helpful to what’s going on in the classroom. Whether that's lesson, teaching strategies, instructional strategies, that they do complement each other (Participant 2-Interview).
Removing the once a year field trip stigma and changing views around IEIs is one of the many reasons participants stated for being involved in the partnership. Participants described teachers becoming users of the institutions to make direct connections to their exhibits and visit the institutions more than just once a year.

Recognition. Participants explained that they are interested in the partnership for recognition: getting their institution name out and also adding additional users to their institutions. They are focused on the teacher candidates and hoping in the future they become users of their institutions after graduation. “I hope we see more memberships from those teacher candidates who are now in their own classrooms. The ultimate goal is that they are continuing to be engaged in the offerings we have at the museum” (Participant 5 – Interview). Having the teacher candidates engaged prior to graduation and then going out into their own classrooms adds student users to the institutions. “I think we’re interested in how Loyola has flipped that model and hoping that will lead to new audience and users for us at the institutions (Participant 7-Focus Group).

They are also attentive to recognition for their institution. Being involved in this partnership gets their name out there, not only on documentation of the partnership, but also with conference presentations and publications areas they normally do not have access to. “And I think it's always good just for us to get recognition, to get our institutions name out there, in different areas of Chicago” (Participant 2-Interview).

Impacting K-12 students. Morton and Enos (2013) describe transformative partnerships as those that have a “purpose that arouses need to create larger meaning” (p. 25). For this partnership, part of that larger meaning is impacting K-12 students. “That we have a shared vision around experiences of K-12 students; we have shared vision of
preparing better teachers, which I think is unique” (Participant 10-Interview). Although only one participant stated during the interviews that a reason for being involved in the partnership was to impact K-12 students, during the focus group multiple participants stated this was an important piece of data that had not been highlighted enough in the findings. Further probing revealed that participants believed that K-12 student impact is sometimes implied because everyone is an educator and the end goal of educators is to impact K-12 students, whether that is working with preservice teachers or in-service teachers. Participant 11 explains, “It is part of, I think, that it is implied if you’re working with teachers then you are going to be influencing students later on…I think it is implicit that there’s an outcome for students” (Participant 11-Focus Group). Another participant stated the implicit nature of this reason for being involved. “Just from my perspective, just an underlying implicit assumption of what we do. So, it might not come out when we are writing out goals; it might be inherent. Working with teachers of course that transfers to students” (Participant 13- Focus Group). The larger meaning for this group is the impact, as participant 10 explains,

This partnership has taken on something uniquely different. One of the things I think that's taken on is a perspective that we have the opportunity and the ability to really make an impact on future teachers and by doing so have an impact on K-12 students (Participant 10-Interview).

Although impacting K-12 students is sometimes implicit in the work of educators, it was found during the focus group that this was an important reason for participants involved in this partnership.

**Professional development.** All 12 participants stated they were involved in the partnership as an opportunity for professional development. The types of professional development participants referred to in their interviews were participating in
collaborative research and conference presentations. Professional development also referred to the opportunity for all participants to meet other educators that are engaged in the same type of work. IEI educators often do not have time to collaborate and share what is going on at their institutions with their fellow IEI colleagues. “On a personal level, being able to grow professionally is one of the benefits of this” (Participant 7 - Interview). Below is a description of the participant experiences in professional development within the CITE partnership.

**Research, publications, and conferences.** Participants during the interviews, gave specific examples of the types of professional development they were benefiting from in this partnership. Researching, publishing, and presenting at conferences were reasons for involvement. Participant six explained,

> There’s been a lot of professional development…writing together, researching together, and going to conferences together, to have Loyola share its resources with us in those ways has been meaningful and also just the networking getting to know counterparts at other museums and finding other way to collaborate with them outside of the Loyola program and just getting those relationships formed is always a good thing (Participant 6 - Interview).

The aspect of collaborative research was mentioned as important by five participants, with six participants mentioning publishing together and attending professional conferences was also important to them. Participant eight makes reference to many of these types of professional development and the mutual benefits in their interview. “I think by moving it towards making presentations or publishing articles makes it mutually beneficial to get out names out there to get that esteem” (Participant 8 - Interview).
The types of professional development stated above are benefits for the IEI educators, as they stated in interviews that they may not have access at their institutions because of the small staff and capacity constraints. Some participants even stated that researching and publications was one of their institutional goals for the future.

Not only does the professional development benefit the IEI educators, but it also helps them enhance their programs at their own institutions. Executing experiences and activities for teacher candidate and university faculty has allowed them, for example, to bring learning theory to the forefront of their mind, which impacts their work with other students, visitors, and in-service teachers.

They have a deeper understanding of teacher preparation. They have a deeper understanding of learning theory and having to have that brought back to the forefront of their mind they’re thinking about it more…and bring theory back as an explicit component of there where it may have been implicit before (Participant 10-Interview).

**Networking.** The other type of professional development, nine participants revealed, was networking.

It has been affirmative in relationships that largely exist already. It has been really interesting for us to work with organizations that we don’t have as much of an opportunity to work with. I have so much more clear understanding of the philosophy and vision that drives their museum and education program. (Participant 4-Interview)

These networking opportunities have a range of advantages that participants point out as part of networking. It allows the participants to get to know the six institutions that are in the partnership more closely. Although, some of the institutions already had relationships prior to the partnership, it strengthened those relationships as well as forged new relationships between institutions. As participants get to know each other, they have learned about each other’s areas of expertise and will call on them for help in the
future. For example, one institution was running a preschool age workshop (an area they were not familiar with), so they called upon another partner to assist in the workshop. Having that contact person is important for networking in the IEI circle. Some of the institutions are members of other partnerships because they are on city owned land. This partnership gives the institutions that are not on public owned land to network with each other. One of the last benefits participants stated was access to Loyola’s university network, including resources and faculty they would normally not work with or have contact with.

Research Question 2: Where on the relationships continuum did participants rate the current CITE partnership, and how did they explain their rating?

The Enos and Morton (2003) framework was used as a guide to the second research questions specifically because their framework provided a way to examine partnerships as they move from transactional to transformational relationships. Transactional relationships are designed to complete short term tasks and are often based on exchanges between participants who have something the other one desires. Transformational relationships are where both participants grow and change because of deeper, more sustained commitments.

To investigate the second research question, a nine-question survey was administered to all participants in the study. The instrument used was the Transformational Relationship Evaluation Scale (TRES) developed by Clayton, Bringle, Senor, Huq, and Morrison (2010). The survey was used to measure dimensions of relationships in terms of the degree to which the relationship displays properties associated with being exploitive, transactional, or transformational (Bringle, Clayton, &
Price, 2009). The items for TRES were written around nine key attributes of relationships: outcomes, common goals, decision making, resources, conflict management, identity formation, power, significance, and satisfaction and change for the better. In construction of the nine items, variable numbers of options were included to capture different possibilities and nuances across the continuum for a possible attribute. The uneven number of response choices for different items was used to present respondents with reasonable choices spanning the conceptual continuum (Clayton et al., 2010). For example, question nine has nine choices as there are many choices for satisfaction and change while question four has 4 choices as it deals with resources which has less choices. The TRES raw survey score was used for analysis in this study to assess the actual relationships that exist in the CITE partnership at this snapshot in time. The results for this research question will consist of a breakdown of the nine individual survey questions and a summary of the scores across each participant. Then, some themes from the data will be presented along with quotes from participants to clarify the findings. Finally, two other relationship indicators (Venn Level of Closeness and relationship continuum) will be used to analyze the transactional or transformational partnership.

**TRES survey results breakdown.** Each question of the survey will be reviewed individually with the conversations from the focus group and participant notes included. The entire survey in included in Appendix I.

**Outcomes.** Survey question one asked participants about the outcomes of the partnership. The options for response varied from one of the partners benefiting more than the other, or partners equally benefiting from the partnership, and many variations in between (See Figure 4). Nine of the participants chose a selection where it stated the
partners benefited equally with a majority (five participants) selecting “h - We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and both grow and the relationship itself grows”. During the member checking process, participants explained that it was “great to see, given that folks endorsed H so highly” (Participant 3 – Participant Notes).

Three participants mentioned in their participant notes and three participants in the focus group that they were surprised by the one participant that selected “b”, which stated that “one of us benefits but at a cost to the other”, and that two participants that selected “d - one of us benefits much more than the other, although not at a significant cost to either of us”.

I think as educators and not-for-profit workers we try to not place an emphasis on costs (monetary and time) that might be associated. Overall, I do think we benefit from this, but others (in our home institutions) probably would like to see more monetary compensation (Participant 7 – Participant Notes).

**Relationship among goals.** The second survey question dealt with the relationship among the goals in the partnership focusing on the extent to which there was

![Figure 4. TRES Survey Results Question 1 – Outcomes](chart.png)
common goals between the partnering institutions. Selection choices ranged from "our goals are at odds" to" we have common goals", with a majority of participants choosing, “c - Our goals converge at some points” (See Figure 5). The remaining four participants chose “we have common goals”.

During member checking participant 7 stated, “I would agree with this, and I think it’s ok they don’t fully align” (Participant Notes).

![Figure 5. TRES Survey Results Question 2 – Relationship Among Goals](image)

**Decision making.** Survey question three asked participants to think about the decisions that have been made in the partnerships and the amount of collaboration between the institutions. Response choices varied from no consideration of the other partners when making decisions to collaborative decisions involving consensus between both parties. Responses from participants all included variations of collaboration in terms of decision making (See Figure 6). Six participants chose “f” and agreed that decisions are made collaboratively and are generally reached through a consensus that reflects the shared commitment to shared goals. Four participants chose “e”, which still
meant collaboration, but generally driven by the interest one or the other. Finally, two participants chose “d – decisions about this partnership are made in consultation of the other partners.”

**Resources.** Survey question four asked participants, who has contributed the most resources to the partnership: equal contribution from all institutions or one institution contributing more than the others. A majority of participants chose “c – both of us have contributed significant resources to the work” (See Figure 7). The results of this survey question were discussed during the focus group because of the differing views of participants. Ten participants stated they thought the other institution got more out of the partnership than they did and vice versa. From the IEI side, “That's really interesting; it was an average is both of us contribute significant resources, and I was like, I think Loyola contributes much more” (*Participant 13-Focus Group*).

And from the university side,
I definitely think that we get way more out of this than any of the museums... I think I might be one of the ones who's there saying that we are taking a lot more than we are giving in this. It's encouraging to see that (Participant 11 – Focus Group).

**Figure 7. TRES Survey Results Question 4 – Resources**

**Conflict management.** Question five of the survey dealt with conflict management, asking participants to explain what would happen if there were to be a conflict. A majority, nine participants, chose “d - we would both deal with the conflict openly, with the shared expectation of resolving the issue” (See Figure 8). There was discussion around survey question five in regards conflict management; five of the participants could not recall there being any conflict. Participant 1 explains, “I thought number five, conflict management, was interesting, because I can't really recall any conflict” (Participant 1-Focus Group). One participant even shared they looked at that question from a hypothetical situation (Participant 14-Focus Group). Participant three
thought this was for the future stating, “very strong showing, bodes well for future group as it faces new decisions about depth/breadth” (Participant Notes).

![Figure 8. TRES Survey Results Question 5 – Conflict Management](image)

**Identity formation.** Question six asked participants about identity formation in the partnership, specifically asking if the partnership hindered or helped them define their identity. None of the participants said the partnership hindered their work. The responses for this question varied and were concentrated between “d” and “h”, with a majority (five participants) choosing “h - has helped both of us do our work, has helped define 'who I am' for both of us and has enhanced the ability of both of us to contribute in significant ways through our work” (See Figure 9). Three participants stated it has it helped them define “who I am” for both institutions, but only enhanced the ability of one of us to contribute in significant ways. During the member checking, Participant 7 helped explain what has happened in the partnership around identity formation. “I think the partnership has made our efforts with regard to preservice teachers more meaningful.
It’s not one and done kind of thing. It sets up museums as partners, not a place to check off the field trip list” (Participant 7-Interview).

![Figure 9. TRES Survey Results Question 6 – Identity Formation](image)

**Power.** Survey question seven asked participants which institution had more power in the partnership. Six participants stated one institution had more power than the other, and six participants said the power was equally shared (see Figure 10). This question led to an interesting discussion during the member checking of the survey data. During the focus group participants discussed this question because the high number of participants that chose “the power is equally shared in the partnership”. Participants were surprised by this response stating, “It cracks me up that these are even. I’m sure to some Loyola is seen as having more power, but I think it’s ok because you have to answer to accreditation orgs, and to your deans to show that this is working” (Participant 7-Focus Group). While other participants believe it was an equal
power share, stating, “I think that for me, when I think of power dynamics…I see it as more of an even power share” (Participant 14-Focus Group).

![Figure 10. TRES Survey Results Question 7 – Power](image)

**What matters in the CITE partnership.** Survey question nine asked participants to answer what matters in the CITE partnership. The range of choices were from nothing of significance to either of us really matters, to the other end of the spectrum, where both institutions care about not only what both institutions get, but also about growth (See Figure 11). Six participants chose “f - What both of us get, the extent to which both of us grow, and the capacity of our partnership to nurture growth around us matters”. Three participants chose “e. What both of us get and the extent to which both of us grow matters”.

Satisfaction and change. The final survey question asked participants about satisfaction and change as a result of the CITE partnership. Response choices that could be chosen ranged from dissatisfied and nothing has changed, to satisfied and changed for the better. Eight participants chose “h. Both of us are satisfied and are changed for the better and the relationship itself is changed for the better” (See Figure 12). Two participants said they were satisfied and one of us was changed, and two participants chose both institutions are satisfied and changed and the relationship and world is changed for the better.

Figure 11. TRES Survey Results Question 8 – What Matters in the CITE Partnership
The results of the survey questions was discussed during the member checking process in phase three of this study. During the member checking process, participants hypothesized about this trend. Participant 11 discussed different roles in the partnership and explained “…people have different roles within [the partnership] ... The way that people engage with the partnership is different” (Participant 11-Focus Group). While other participants believe it has to do with longevity in the partnership,

I think you're right that how long you've been in the partnership. You can see that evolution and how it has grown over time, how the partnership has grown and changed, so it might be easier to look and go "Now we're to this place where we're both benefiting" (Participant 7-Focus Group). There was general discussion over the three questions where there was not consensus by the participants in the focus group. Participant 1 theorizes the reasoning behind the varied responses.

It just seems the range is very vast, so I’m wondering if it has a lot to do with where you are in that partnership, that relationship in terms of entry point and

**Figure 12. TRES Survey Results Question 9 – Satisfaction and Change**

The results of the survey questions was discussed during the member checking process in phase three of this study. During the member checking process, participants hypothesized about this trend. Participant 11 discussed different roles in the partnership and explained “…people have different roles within [the partnership] ... The way that people engage with the partnership is different” (Participant 11-Focus Group). While other participants believe it has to do with longevity in the partnership,

I think you're right that how long you've been in the partnership. You can see that evolution and how it has grown over time, how the partnership has grown and changed, so it might be easier to look and go "Now we're to this place where we're both benefiting" (Participant 7-Focus Group). There was general discussion over the three questions where there was not consensus by the participants in the focus group. Participant 1 theorizes the reasoning behind the varied responses.

It just seems the range is very vast, so I’m wondering if it has a lot to do with where you are in that partnership, that relationship in terms of entry point and
your perspectives; I’m sure it has a lot to do with it (Participant 1 – Focus Group).

Another participant agrees why there are varied responses for these questions. “I think you’re right that how long you have been in the partnership, because you might have seen that evolution and how it has grown over time and how the partnership has grown and changed” (Participant 7 – Focus Group).

**TRES results.** The TRES score yields an index of the quality of the relationships and permits interpretation of the numerical value in terms of the relationship continuum, the highest score TRES average score is 5.8 (Clayton et al., 2010). For example, if a participant’s TRES score average is 3.0 that would indicate that across the nine attributes the relationship is perceived as transactional. The results of the survey in this study showed an average index of relationship quality of 4.9 out of a possible 5.8 (See Table 3). The overall interpretation of relationship quality for the CITE partnership was found to be in the 4 range which according to the survey developer, Clayton et al. (2010), indicates relationships that are mutually transactional and, in addition, transformational for one stakeholder but not the other. An average in the 5s would indicate mutually-transformational. All 12 participants’ averages fell within the range of 4.2 to 5.6, with five participants having averages in the 5 range and seven participants falling within the 4 range.

**Trends.** After an initial analysis of the survey results it was found that select participants had higher averages than others. After further analysis, a trend emerged, suggesting a connection between the number of years in the partnership and the overall
score. That is, the longer a participant had belonged to the partnership, the higher the overall average

Table 3. TRES Scores for the CITE Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Total TRES Score <em>Out of 52</em></th>
<th>Average TRES Score <em>Out of 5.8</em></th>
<th>Years in the Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Average</em></td>
<td><em>44.3</em></td>
<td><em>4.9</em></td>
<td><em>3.2</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

raw score was. The more years, the higher the relationship score, and thus the closer the relationship was to being categorized as transformational (see Table 4).

Table 4. Trend Between Average TRES Score and Years in the Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in the Partnership</th>
<th>Average TRES Score <em>Out of 5.8</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noteworthy that no difference was uncovered between the raw score of university faculty versus informal education institution educators. The average of 4.9 is the same for both groups in the study, indicating there is no relationship between one’s institutional affiliation and TRES score (see Table 5).
Table 5. Grouped Average TRES Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Average TRES Score Out of 5.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Education Institution</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other relationship indicators.** The results of the TRES survey ranked the partnership as transformational for one partner. To verify this ranking, two other relationship indicators were collected and analyzed during phase three of the study.

**Venn level of closeness.** The Venn Level of Closeness (Mashek, Cannaday, & Tangney, 2007) was used as a second measure for the relationship between institutions (See Figure 13). This instrument is a graphic measure of the perceived degree of closeness in the relationship as represented by the overlap between two circles.

Participants were asked to choose the Venn diagram they believed represented the current degree of closeness in the CITE partnership. The most frequent selection for the 10 participants that answered this question was “C”, equal overlap in the middle for both institutions (see Figure 14). Five participants selected more overlap between the two circles, indicating they thought relationships within the CITE partnership were closer.
The reasoning behind their selection was collected through participant notes. Two participants chose “D” as the perceived degree of closeness. Participant 4 explains the reasoning behind this selection.

I chose “D” as it represents roughly equal overlap and non-overlap in our work. While we share a great deal in our overall goals, it recognizes that each organization is involved in distinct work and may have different motivations, while working towards similar overall goals. It also shows there is a great deal of shared vision, and benefit (*Participant 4 – Participant Notes*).

The participant responses on the Venn Degree Level of Closeness were compared to the overall TRES scores. It was found that the TRES score was not an indicator of what they would select on the Venn Level of Closeness diagram. For example, Participant 1 chose option c of equal overlap yet scored a 5.3 on the TRES survey, while Participant 3 chose c as well and scored a 4.4 on the TRES survey.

*Relationships continuum.* Bringle, Clayton, & Price (2009) put forth a relationship continuum for categorizing different types of partnerships. The types of relationships on this continuum vary in closeness, integrity, and equity. The closer the relationship (towards the top of the continuum), the greater the integrity and equity, and with transformational partnerships having high degrees of all three characteristics (Bringle, Price, Clayton, & Price, 2009).
graphic was used for Phase 3 of this study (See Figure 15). Participants were asked to mark on a participant notes sheet where they believed the current CITE partnership ranked along the relationship continuum and include a justification of why they chose that selection.

**Figure 15.** Relationships Continuum

Figure 16 on the next page, indicates each of the 12 participant selections on the continuum. Some participants chose one indicator or circled various indicators. Over half the participant responses were centered around the portion of the continuum labeled “working for common goals” and “working for shared resources”. None of the
Figure 16. Participant Responses on Relationship Continuum

*Indicates participant chose in between the two indicators. P11 and P13 circled three indicators on their participant note sheets.
participants selected “transformational” to describe the partnership and only one participant marked between "transformational” and “synergistic”.

Participants had various reasons for choosing their selections (See Table 6).

Table 6. Relationship Continuum Selection and Reasoning for Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection on Relationship Continuum</th>
<th>Reasoning for Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>“working for common goals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I chose “working for common goals” because we have well established, co-constructed common goals across the partnership. While we all have expressed an interest and desire to “work with shared resources” I don’t think we’ve been able to fully realize it yet. I think we’re definitely moving in that direction though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>In between “planning and formalized leadership” and “working for common goals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I would place my mark between Planning and Formalized Leadership and Working for Common Goals (closer to common goals). I feel as though as a partnership we have grown beyond coordinating activities with each other and moved into a deeper process of planning collaboratively and tapping into participants’ expertise across the group. Working through the logic model is an example of the type of activity that has helped formalize our work and guide us to have defined and shared language and goals so that we can strategically continue to work toward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>In between “planning and formalized leadership” and “working for common goals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think we are somewhere between these two points (Integration of goals and working for common goals) because we’ve identified the goals and we are together but again we aren’t fully there yet. With some integration of goals too.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 14</td>
<td>“integration of goals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I chose the integration of goals level because we have done an activity in the past where we discussed our goals and have prioritized our goals. I don’t think we’ll reach transformational until we reach the K-12 students and our teacher candidates bring their future students back.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For example, some participants thought that the partnership had common goals and felt there were desires to work with shared resources, but the partnership was not quite at that point yet. Participant 4 explains their reasons for selection,

I chose “working for common goals” because we have well established, co-constructed common goals across the partnership. While we all have expressed an interest and desire to “work with shared resources”, I don’t think we’ve been able to fully realize it yet. I think we’re definitely moving in that direction though (Participant 4 – Participant Notes).

The ranking of the partnership was also discussed during the focus group discussions. The transformational ranking of the partnership was something participants believed the partnership was striving for in the future, but agreed that the CITE partnership was not currently at that transformative ranking. Participants 7 and 4 explain:

I think we aspire to be very transformational, but I think that's what is really cool about this because I don't think we started at the bottom by any means, because we had done some work before...we really began to coordinate these things so much better working our way up the ladder (Participant 7 – Focus Group).

Other participants agreed with Participant 7 and believed that once CITE reached the shared vision of impacting K-12 students, the partnership would be closer to transformative (Participant 14 – Focus Group).

Although the survey indicated that the partnership was close to transformational, the other two indicators and the conversations with participants around those indicators revealed that the partnership was lower on the relationship continuum in the range of working for common goals and shared resources.
Research Question 3: What factors did participants indicate supported and/or constrained the partnership’s movement towards becoming more transformational?

To investigate this research question, 12 participants were interviewed using a seven-question protocol (see Appendix E). The results for this research question were also member checked through a focus group and collection of participant notes after the data had been preliminarily analyzed. The participants were asked to explain, from their point of view, the successes and challenges of the CITE partnership. First, common factors that participants believed to have supported and constrained the movement of the partnership towards transformational are outlined.

Supported movement. The following factors were found to have supported the movement of the partnership towards a more transformative relationship: shared vision, future common goals, mutual respect and trust, infrastructure, and a diversity of roles. Each individual factor will be described in detail to follow.

Shared vision. Enos and Morton (2003) describe the importance of a common purpose and end goal for a transformative relationship, explicitly that there needs to be a “mutual increase in aspirations and need to create larger meaning” (p. 25). Five participants in this study stated they believe the partnership has been successful because there is a common purpose, end goal or shared vision that is accepted by all participants. Participant 13 explains, “I think what I found with this partnership is shared goals and values and a way of doing things that makes sense” (Participant 13-Interview). According to 10 participants, the development and creation of a logic model guided the development of this shared vision. A logic model was jointly created by all members of the partnership during the first year of the partnership and served to guide the
long-term efforts of the partnership (See Appendix B). “I think coming together to really have so many voices at the table but have that logic model emerge from that has been really amazing for me to see because that is quite an undertaking” (Participant 5-Interview). Participants believe this is the cornerstone of the partnership and has led the movement towards a more transformational partnership. This was articulated best by Participant 5 who said,

Engaging in the logic model process and then having that as a cornerstone that really gives us a document we can continue to look to…it keeps us focused on those things and provides a framework for however many meetings it will take to chip at it (Participant 5-Interview).

The logic model is also responsible for keeping members focused and engaged with the shared vision of the partnership. “I think it also keep us, keeps me, at least, engaged in the partnership for sure, to know that there’s a long-term goal that we’re working for” (Participant 2 – Interview). Overall, the logic model was found to be an important factor of the movement of the CITE partnership towards a more transformative type of relationship.

**Future common goals.** One of the reasons participants believed that the partnership was successful and has been moving forward are the common goals for the partnership. There were three common goals that a majority of the participants shared in their interviews: more time with teacher candidates, more involvement in K-12 school partners, and future in-service connections.

Eleven participants stated they would like more time in IEIs for the teacher candidates, whether that be in later sequences of the teacher education program or having teacher candidates serve as volunteers or interns on site at the IEIs.
How do we create more opportunities for them to tap into programs so that they just become general users of the resources and programs, but really exemplar users of those resources and programs? That’s the main motivator from the institutional perspective as far as moving forward the partnership (Participant 4-Interview).

Another common goal among six participants was more involvement with the university’s K-12 school partners. Many institutions see value in following teacher candidates to in-service so they can make future connections. Three participants brought this forward in their interviews and participant notes, stating that this is what their institutions are interested in for the future (Participant 15 & Participant 3-Participant Notes) and that they see this as a major benefit for them in the long term (Participant 4-Participant Notes).

Enos and Morton’s (2013) transformative relationship research states that transformative partnerships proceed with a deeper more sustained commitment and that there is mutual definition of the issues on which they the group is devoting their joint energy towards. This joint creation of common goals for the future among participants show the transformative criteria present in the framework.

**Mutual respect and trust.** Eleven participants stated that respect and trust have helped to transform the relationships within the partnership. Participants feel that mutual respect and trust was an important foundational piece of the partnership. “…[T]he trust aspect is really what is the foundation for a good partnership. I think we already have that” (Participant 1-Interview).

The participants feel they are valued, their institution is valued, and the time spent doing partnership work is valued (Partnership 6 – Interview). That value leads to participants also feeling respected.
I really appreciate the respect around the table that everyone shares for one another and the true spirit of partnership round the table that, we’re not all around the table because…we’re around the table thinking about what’s best for learning in this situation, which is not sadly always the first thing driving partnerships. That’s just super refreshing to see and definitely something that motivates me to come to those meetings and really be a full participant in those meetings (Participant 4 - Interview).

Examples of the mutual respect and trust are exemplified in the participants experience around co-planning and co-teaching for the teacher education aspect of the partnership. Three participants cited the benefits of co-planning and co-teaching. “I think it comes out a mutual respect and willingness to believe that we recognize each other’s abilities and see each other as experts” (Participant 10 - Interview). That mutual respect and co-teaching aspect has impacted participants’ own practices. As described here by Participant 11, “It is wonderful to have them [IEI educators] help me think through my own practices as a science educator and I think I am a better teacher because I have been working with these amazing teacher educators” (Participant 11-Interview).

**Infrastructure.** The importance of infrastructure to the CITE partnership was an evident criterion for supporting the movement towards more transformative relationship participants. Specifically, participants stated the consistent monthly meetings, importance of the central partner, and iterative and slow capacity-building as important parts of the overall infrastructure of the partnership.

**Consistent monthly meetings.** Participants consistently cited the regular monthly meetings as essential to the partnership’s successful functioning. Data indicates that nine participants felt regular meetings helped them get to know one another, stay connected,
The regular meetings are absolutely essential especially that they are in person. They are a chance for us to continue to build our relationships professionally with one another but also a check in for us...both formally through the logic model ...and informally for us to do those check-ins to see how we are doing (Participant 4-Interview).

Participants described feeling engaged and motivated as members of this partnership. Some cited regular meetings as important to engendering these sentiments: “People come together on a regular basis so I think that engagement and motivation make this group really outstanding and unique” (Participant 12-Interview).

*Importance of central partner.* Although there are shared voices at the table and participants feel that not one organization is leading the conversation or agenda, four participants mentioned that having a central university partner is important for the success and sustainability of the partnership. The central partner serves as the convener and is consistent and accessible (Participant 3 – Interview). In terms of the organizational structure, Loyola University Chicago serves as the central partner where the entire partnership is coordinated logistically. A graduate student serves as the coordinator and is charge of consistent communication across all aspects of the partnership, including meeting reminders and logical considerations. The importance of this central partner was discussed during interviews because, based on the experiences of the IEI participants involved, they have voiced concerns around very few educational staff and large workloads, which make it difficult to support a large partnership of this size. The central partner running the organizational aspects of the partnership was important to the scope of commitment for the institutions.
Iterative and reflective process. Another factor that has been part of the infrastructure of the partnership is how each aspect of the partnership is iterative and reflective, specifically the teacher education components of the partnership. Sequence 1 has gone through many different iterative cycles since it began in 2013. Over half of the participants in this study have been with the partnership since it began and mentioned that as an important part of their experiences in the partnership. Eight participants in this study believe that it is the iterative and reflective process that has led to success of the partnership overall and with the teacher education aspect of the partnership. Not only does co-planning go into every semester, but a debrief and thoughtful changes are incorporated after the completion of each sequence each time (Research memos).

“There is a framework that we follow each time. I think a lot of the tenets have stayed the same but specific sequencing, obviously it has been a moving, iterative process, so I think we are getting to the point where we can say this is what we always do” (Participant 6 – Interview).

Steady capacity building. One of other important pieces of infrastructure that four participants brought forth in the interviews has been the thoughtful, steady capacity building in the partnership. “Jumping back to another big success is that there has been this steady thoughtful capacity building…it’s been a good pace and I think it has worked for everyone” (Participant 13 – Interviews).

Consistent monthly meetings, the central partner, consistent communication, and iterative and steady capacity building through the well-planned infrastructure has supported the movement of the partnership towards being more transformative.

Diversity of roles. Phase one revealed that participants hold different roles in the partnership depending on their role at their institution. Participant 5 was found to have
more of a teacher role in the partnership because of the direct involvement with the instruction of the teacher candidates and less involvement with the administrative functions of the partnership and their institution.

I think it’s really interesting to hear what other institutions are doing because I feel like my primary touch point is with the teacher candidates. I feel like I am definitely more facilitation and working with the teacher candidates so I kind of always have that lens and so when I hear what other institutions are doing it’s really valuable (Participant 5-Interview).

Other participants are not directly involved with the instruction of the teacher candidates but are involved in the administrative functions. Therefore, they have a differing view of the partnership.

We might be a little different than some of the other organizations primarily in that, I don’t have a huge role in the implementation of sequence one and group I pay more of an advisory role on the planning of those sessions. I’m more in an administrative level but I can speak to both (Participant 4-Interview).

It was found that participants are not one or the other. In some cases some participants serve a dual role of teacher and administrator because some institutions only have one member from their institution (See Table 7). The figure demonstrates the variety of roles each participant holds within the partnership. Most participants hold a dual role because they are involved in the administrative and teaching aspects of the partnership.

The other aspect of the diversity of roles is each individual’s expertise they bring to the partnership. In subsequence phases, participants suggested that the diversity of roles and thus perspectives is important to the partnership’s functioning and movement along the relationship continuum. According to Birge, Beaird, & Torres (2003) valuing the expertise or strength of each institution and individual is an important aspect of
successful partnerships. If each institution can openly recognize their distinctions and strengths and creatively incorporate them into the partnership more likely to be a stronger partnership (Birge et al., 2003). For the participants in this partnership they feel it is the different perspectives that can fill different needs within the partnership. Experts in areas such as logic modeling and strategic planning are important to the movement of the partnership towards a co-created shared vision and goals. As explained by Participant 11, “Maybe that’s another benefit or success is that we have those multiple roles – not who fills them but that there are those different perspectives that are coming together” (Participant 11- Interview).

Table 7. Participant Roles Within the CITE Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Role in CITE Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase three focus group discussed that diversity of roles within the partnership along with the educator mindset has led to transformative relationships in the partnership. “I think to me, one thing that's nice about seeing this data is that, more or less, we’re all the same, we’ve got similar mentalities. Our mindsets are in a similar place. We see the potential and we see how it’s working now in a similar way (Participant 7).

**Constrained movement.** Analysis revealed that capacity and funding are the two factors that participants believed had constrained the partnership’s movement towards being more transformative. Capacity referred to the maximize level of work partners institutions can manage including supporting teacher candidate visits and other required partnership time.

**Capacity.** All of the institutions would like to expand into more experiences for the LUC teacher candidates but capacity is a barrier for doing so. Eleven participants discussed the issue of capacity, specifically around staff time to support class visits and for other partnership work. “Our staff is small, so supporting multiple projects is a challenge (Participant 1 - Interview). Currently, only two LUC courses involve visits to the partner institutions, but further expansion brings up issues of capacity both in terms of being able to accommodate more teacher candidates visiting and dedicate staff time for those visits. The university does not reimburse these institutions for the teacher education programs so adding more classes is a challenge five participants explicitly stated they worried about for the future. The participants feel at the moment their workload is manageable but additional teacher education classes or logistical work would make it difficult for the IEIs involved in the partnership (Participant 3 – Interviews).
Funding. The partnership since its inception has operated with no external funding. The time and resources have all been donated in-kind by the university and the six institutions (Research Memos). Seven participants noted that a lack of funding was a challenge for the partnership.

Another conversation we should be having in the future is funding aspect. It we want this to build even more so, and being more connected to schools and administrators and teacher there has to be that funding component that is missing too” (Participant 1 – Interview).

Funding was described during the focus group and in participant notes as a “key piece” (Participant 7 – Participant Notes) for continued conversation and work if the partnership is to be maintained and expand.

Challenges solved. One of the most interesting findings from the data was that over the course of this study two of the challenges participants noted in phase one were solved and, just over less than a year later, were no longer seen as challenges when the initial analysis was completed and preliminary findings were brought back to the participants for member checking. These two challenges were turnover of faculty and cohesion of the experiences.

Participants in this study look at challenges differently. Participants realize that there will always be challenges in any partnership and consider the challenges as more for “goals for the future” rather than road blocks.

“And it’s good to see even though we have a lot of goals our list of challenges are small. It shows our philosophy and perspective about this is very positive we see things more as “goals are things we need to work on for the future” rather than challenges (Participant 14 – Focus Group).

Turnover. When the interviews were conducted in phase one, participants identified adjunct faculty turnover each fall semester as a challenge. They found it
difficult to adjust to new faculty and especially challenging if those faculty were not familiar with the partnership or the institutions. Participant 7 describes,

“I’ll say one of the challenges is faculty changes, that can be a challenge I think for us because in our meetings we get an idea of how this should be and then if a faculty member comes in who’s maybe not as familiar, it's a little bit tricky and there is a disjoint there (Participant 7 – Interviews).

In the Fall of 2016, a university faculty member and the CITE coordinator decided that all Sequence 1 faculty were to attend the CITE meeting that takes place right before the start of the visits so that faculty and IEI educators could meet, review agendas and plan for the visits together. This practice was also replicated during the Fall of 2017 because of the successes as stated by the members of the partnership (Research Memos). Participants feel that that challenge of turnover of Sequence 1 faculty is no longer a problem thanks to this change.

Connections across institutions. Another initial challenge was that lack of continuity of class experiences across all six institutions. It was difficult for each IEI and university faculty to know what was happening at all institutions. This was creating overlap between the experiences at the various institutions. Initially, in phase one, Participant 1 described this challenge by saying:

“We want the partnership to evolve so I think keeping the activities we are all doing connected…just keeping those activities connected not separated. I think that's maybe something we are not doing as well” (Participant 1 – Interview).

However, prior to the start of the Fall 2017 semester, the CITE coordinator compiled all agendas for all six institutions and made binders for each faculty and IEI member. During the meeting prior to the start of the teacher candidate experiences, university faculty and IEI educators met to review the agendas and talk through the
experiences (Research Memos). Therefore, the issues of continuity across institutions and keeping everything connected was solved.

“The sequence one binders, I think they were really helpful. It took what we did last year [meeting with adjunct faculty] and took it to another step because everyone can see what is going on at every institution and it is just really organized it. I think it’s just evolving as we really perfect some of these sequences. It is just going to become part of what we are doing” (Participant 7 – Focus Group).

**Summary**

In summary, this three-phase study sought to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences of the participants and relationships within the CITE partnership. This included investigating why participants initially got involved and their reasons for staying involved. The study also examined where, on a relationship continuum from transactional to transformational, participants felt the CITE partnership was located. The factors that participants believed contributed to the movement of the CITE partnership toward transformational was investigated, along with the factors that have constrained the relationships of the partnership.

The primary reasons participants stated for being involved in the partnership were: to change views of informal institutions, impact K-12 students, and professional development. Although each participant stated personal and institutional reasons for participating the final finding is that it is difficult to tease part the personal reasoning from the institutional reasoning.

The results from the research questions around transformative relationships found that the index of relationship quality for the CITE partnership was 4.9 out of 5.8, indicating the CITE partnership was close to transformational. Other themes from analysis found that the longer participants had been in the partnership the higher their
index score for relationship quality, suggesting that the longevity impacted their responses on the survey. Using two other relationship indicators the present relationship of the CITE partnership is found not to be transformational but more along the lines of working for common goals and shared resources.

The following factors were found to be what has supported the movement of the partnership towards being more transformative: shared vision, mutual respect and trust, infrastructure, future common goals, and diversity of roles. The following factors were found to be what has constrained the movement of the partnership towards being more transformational: capacity and funding. Two factors (disconnect between institutions and turnover) that participants had originally reported as constraining the partnership at the beginning of the study were found to have been solved by the partnership by the end of the study.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview
This purpose of this study was to gain a deeper understanding of the CITE partnership and to add to the literature based about the inner workings and relationships within the partnership. The three-phase interpretive study included interviews, surveys, participant notes, and a focus group. The first research question focused on gaining a deeper understanding into how the participants described their personal and institutional involvement in the partnership. The second research question used a relationship survey and two additional indicators to rank the partnership along a continuum of transactional to transformational relationships. The third research question focused on the factors that have supported or constrained the movement of the partnership toward being more transformative.

Key Highlights
One of the important findings from this study was that each participant stated both personal and institutional reasons for participating, and that it was difficult to tease apart personal reasoning from the institutional reasoning given that these participants’ goals were well-aligned with those of the institution they represented. The results of the Transformational Relationship Evaluation Survey (TRES) indicated that the CITE
partnership was close to transformational, but through further investigation, it was established that the partnership can be characterized as working with shared resources and common goals, moving towards transformative. It was also discovered that shared vision, mutual respect and trust, infrastructure, common goals, and diversity of roles all contributed to the movement of the partnership towards transformative.

This chapter presents a summary of the highlights, including the unexpected findings from Chapter IV. The findings will then be discussed through the lens of Enos and Morton’s (2003) framework for transformative partner relationships. The unexpected findings from this study of one university-IEI partnership puts forward an iteration of the Enos and Morton framework that applies specifically to university-IEI partnerships. The implications for educational researchers and Informal Education Institution (IEIs) educators as well as recommendations for future research will be discussed.

**Discussion of Findings**

Enos and Morton (2003) differentiate between transactional and transformative relationships (See Figure 17). Transactional relationships are designed to complete a specific task with no greater plan or promise. They work within existing organizational structures to accomplish this task, and the normal work of the organization stays the same. Enos and Morton (2003) express that transformative partnerships, in comparison, “have the ability to not just get things done but to transform individuals, organizations, institutions, and communities” (p. 23). Their continuum applies to partnerships in the service learning sector. Service-learning partnerships are where students engage in activities in the community that are intentionally designed to promote student learning
and development. Service-learning partnerships work with community partners.

Although service–learning partnerships share the goal of enhancing student learning and bringing resources to the community, it was found from the results of this study that they are slightly different than university-IEI partnerships. At the beginning of this study, I hypothesized that one of the findings from the study would be that the CITE partnership was transformational. One of the unexpected findings from Chapter IV was that the CITE Partnership is not considered transformational, according to this framework and to the participants. It was found that the CITE partnership, although not transformative according to the Enos and Morton (2003) framework, that it was a unique type of transformative partnership. It differs from other partnerships because it is imperative for the members of the partnership to maintain their institutional identity, which is a strength of the CITE partnership. It is also special from other partnerships because there are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis of Relationship</td>
<td>Exchanges-based utilitarian</td>
<td>Focus on ends beyond utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Goal</td>
<td>Satisfaction with exchange</td>
<td>Mutual increase in aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposes</td>
<td>Satisfaction of immediate needs</td>
<td>Arouses need to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Existing Institutional Goals</td>
<td>Accepts institutional goals</td>
<td>Examines institutional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Works within systems to satisfy interests of partners</td>
<td>Transcends self-interest to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Identity</td>
<td>Maintains institutional identity</td>
<td>Changes group identity in larger definition of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Commitment</td>
<td>Limited time, resources, personnel to specific exchanges</td>
<td>Engages whole institution in potentially unlimited exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 17. Enos & Morton’s (2003) Transactional and Transformational Relationships*
multiple partners involved.

**Evolved Model for University-Informal Education Institution Partnerships**

Over the course of this study, it was found that not only was it difficult to separate participants’ personal versus institutional goals, but for this partnership in particular maintaining institutional identity was a criterion specific to university-IEI partnerships.

The Enos and Morton framework applies to service-learning specifically. It does not consider multiple institutions and institutions where they must maintain their instructional identity. The findings from this study indicate that these partnerships are unique in that it is imperative that institutions maintain their institutional identity. This Enos and Morton (2003) framework does not specifically apply to university-IEI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>University-Informal Education Institution Transformative Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis of Relationship</td>
<td>Mutual respect and trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Vision &amp; Common Goals</td>
<td>Common shared vision and clear goals co-created by all members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles played by partners</td>
<td>Distributive leadership with a diversity of roles and a central partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Existing Institutional Goals/Boundaries</td>
<td>Engages partner institutions at the appropriate level while still maintaining its identity– if possible engages whole institution to create larger meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Identity</td>
<td>Changes group identity in larger definition of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Commitment</td>
<td>Engages IEI education departments at the appropriate commitment level as decided individually by each partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Organized operational plans, coordinated by a central partner, open communication, iterative process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 18. Transformative Partnerships for University-IEI Partnerships*
partnerships; therefore, a framework for university-IEI partnerships has been created based on the findings from this study and relevant literature in the field of partnerships (See Figure 18). The unique context of university-IEI partnerships as applied to the framework will be described in greater detail below.

**Basis of relationship.** According to Enos and Morton, the basis of a transformative relationship is a “focus on ends beyond utilitarian” (p. 25). It is important for partnerships to be practical and relevant. Based on the findings from this study, the basis of the relationship should also be built on mutual respect and trust, especially when there are multiple institutions involved in the partnership. A relationship built on trust has a better chance of success in the future if issues might arise because they have “faith that the partner will stay with the relationship, despite obstacles or difficulties that will surely arise” (Enos & Morton, 2003, p. 34).

In this study, mutual respect and trust was found to be an important factor that had supported the movement of the partnership to be more transformative. Prior to the redesign of the teacher preparation program and to the formation of the CITE partnership, select faculty members had been working with the IEIs to incorporate informal learning experiences and sites into their coursework with their teacher candidates. Therefore, when those partners who were asked to assemble in the beginning of 2014 to formalize the CITE partnership, these trusting relationships were already in place. As Participant 1 explains,

> The communication and the trust aspect is really what is the foundation for a good partnership. I think we already have that. We’ve patterned and done other types of experiences in the past, so already having that foundation and that understanding has been helpful in moving forward and building (*Participant 1 – Interview*).
Not only does mutual respect and trust lead partners to better understanding each other, but it also leads to true collaboration because having this foundation reduces the risk of engaging in partnerships. Thorkildsen and Stein (1996) clarify that a true collaboration happens when one institution is willing to entrust the other group with activities which might ordinarily be performed by the first group.

In the CITE partnership, evidence of mutual trust and respect is shown in the collaboration on research studies as well as the importance placed on co-planning and co-teaching of the teacher candidate sessions. Members of the CITE partnership that are not from the university feel like they are important pieces to the teacher preparation program and are seen as experts as well as the university faculty. On days when teacher candidates are visiting the IEIs, the educators lead the sessions with input from the faculty to connect to other course experiences. This foundation is vital to university-IEI partnerships especially because there are multiple institutions involved.

**End goal and purpose.** End goal and purpose are discussed as two separate criteria in Enos and Morton’s (2003) theoretical framework for transformative relationships. The end goal in the transformative relationship framework is defined as a “mutual increase in aspirations”, and the purpose is defined as “the aroused need to create larger meaning”. Many scholars, who have described the characteristics of partnerships, state the importance of agreed upon shared mission and values, clearly articulated goals, and measurable outcomes (Maloney & Hill, 2016; Torres, 2000; Middlebrooks, Holland & Gelman, 1998). Often times if there is a lack of clarity among the shared vision and common goals within a partnership this can lead to their dissolution (Birge, Beaird, &
Torres, 2003). For university-IEI partnerships, the criteria end goal and purpose can be condensed into one criterion, shared vision and common goals.

It was found that all participants share the same vision for the partnership and have the opportunity to contribute their ideas and shape the partnership. “Even from the beginning…everybody feels that they have a place to contribute their ideas and everybody has the potential to shape whatever this group is going to be” (Participant 11 - Interview). The members of the CITE partnership strongly believe in the shared vision of preparing the next generation of teachers to impact K-12 students.

Participant 10 explains the uniqueness of this,

The fact that we have a shared vision around experiences of K-12 students [means] we have a shared vision of preparing better teachers, which I think is unique. I can definitely say they [CITE members] bought into that responsibility that they see part of their responsibilities as preparing the next generation of teachers (Participant 10 – Interview).

Besides a shared vision, the partnership was found to have common goals that were created by all members of the partnership. Those common goals were formally shared in a jointly created logic model. This logic model includes the long-term impact and states common long-term goals around six components (see Appendix B for the six components and goals). The logic model led to the development of one-page fact sheets about the CITE partnership that were jointly created between the university and IEI educators. They state the broader impacts for the teacher candidates, IEIs, and connect back to the shared vision of impacting K-12 students and their schools along with vital information about the partnership (See Appendix C for an example of one of the fact sheets). These tools have become references for the members of the partnership as Participant 4 explains. “The opportunity to look at where we’re growing towards - we
have these goals and outcomes that we set forth for ourselves…that continues to propel us forward because we’ve got these larger goals in mind” (Participant 4 - Interview).

The combination of a shared vision and common goals are an important criterion for unique multiple institution transformative relationships. These institutions must maintain their institutional identity and therefore must jointly create a shared vision and common goals that everyone helps to create.

**Roles played by partners.** According to Enos and Morton (2003), partners play a leadership role in a transformative relationship. Some scholars suggest leadership is one of the characteristics of a successful partnerships (Bosma, Sieving, Ericson, Russ, Caende, & Bonnie, 2010; Birge, Beaird, & Torres 2003; Thorkildsen & Stein, 1996), while other scholars include a balance of power among all partners (e.g. collaborative leadership, distributed leadership) as the key to partnerships (Anderson, Butcher, Lawson, Bean, Boone, Kwiatkowski et al., 2004; Seifer, 2000). It was found in this study that the leadership in the CITE partnership is more of a distributed leadership. Distributed leadership is a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group who work within and through relationships (Bennett, Wise, Woods, & Harvey, 2003). Bennett et al. (2003) also explain that there are three properties of distributive leadership: leadership is an emergent property of a group, there is an openness to the boundaries of leaderships, and a variety of expertise is distributed across the many. In the CITE partnership, Loyola University Chicago (LUC) serves as the central partner which guides the agenda and manages the logistics of communication and organization. The central partner does not set the vision or goals; those are set by all the institutions. The power is equally distributed across all institutions. This is demonstrated in the fact that
the monthly CITE partnership meetings rotate between all institutions. This is one way that the partnership balances the power.

A property of distributed leadership is a variety of expertise spread across the members of the group. It was found that within the CITE partnership, each member has a specific role that they fill, and that each individual brings to the partnership their own expertise. Jones (2003) stresses the importance of acknowledging expertise and that it exists in many forms and resides in multiple places in a partnership. Often times this requires a shift in thinking from one person serving as the expert to everyone bringing their expertise. For example, during the logic model creation two members of the partnership with expertise in the area led the partnership through its development. They organized the materials and worked to consolidate all of the ideas. In the partnership, different members serve as experts depending on what charge the group is undertaking. Having a diversity of roles and ensuring there is distributed leadership in the CITE partnership is key to this distinct type of transformative university-IEI partnership.

Support of existing goals and boundaries. Enos and Morton’s (2003) category of support of existing institutional goals has a different meaning when considering the importance of maintaining distinct institutional identities within multi-pronged university-IEI partnerships, such as the one investigated in this study. Partnerships can be successful when institutions openly recognize their distinctions and creatively bring them to bear on partnerships (Birge, Beaird, & Torres, 2003). As stated by Bosna, Sieving, Ericson, Russ, Cavender and Bonnie (2010), when partners recognize each other’s priorities and adjust to each other’s needs, it causes a back and forth between the two.
Related to the *supporting existing institutional goals* criterion is the *boundaries* criterion, that Enos and Morton (2003) define as “transcending self-interest to create larger meaning” (p.25). These two criteria were combined in the proposed iteration of the framework because they both are different in the university-IEI partnership in this study, where the institutional identity must be maintained.

**Scope of commitment.** *Scope of Commitment*, which Enos and Morton define as “engaging the whole institution in potentially unlimited exchanges” (p. 25), is another criterion that differs in the university-IEI partnership studied here. Findings from this study suggest that specific departments within IEIs may be involved in the partnership, but not necessarily the entire institution. For example, in the CITE partnership, most interactions are between the education departments and the university. Therefore, for this proposed model specific to university-IEI partnerships, it is important that each institution engages IEI education departments at the appropriate commitment level, as decided individually by each partner.

**Partner identity.** Partner identity, as defined by Enos and Morton (2003), is “changing the group identity in larger definition of community” (p. 25). One of the findings from this study was that participants were unable to distinguish between personal goals and the goals of the institution they work for. The reasoning behind this is that individuals were connecting both personally and professionally with the partnership. Participant 10 hypothesizes the reasoning behind the blurred line between personal and institutional goals, saying “if they are unable to distinguish between the two then there’s a real identification with the group as part of their identity both as a person and an institutional component” (*Focus Group*). Being involved in this partnership has shifted
the identity of the participants to where they feel connected to the group. Identity is a key component of university-IEI partnerships.

**Additional criterion – infrastructure.** One of the additions to the criteria for transformative partnerships, based on the overall findings of the study, would be having an organized infrastructure (Walsh & Backe, 2013; Ramaley, 2000). Walsh and Backe (2013), state that as partnerships are developing shared goals and visions it is also important to engage in “planning specific structures that will support the partnership. This includes a detailed proposal for operational infrastructure, identification of funding resources, and a plan for sustainability” (p. 601). The infrastructure within the CITE partnership encompasses many different aspects including a central partner, regular meetings, communication, and shared files. This infrastructure has been built since the beginning of the partnership. One of the most often mentioned components of infrastructure was consistent monthly meetings. Participants mentioned these were essential for connecting with each other and maintaining the momentum of the partnership. Consistent and regular communication is also understood to be an important characteristic of successful partnerships (Bosma, et al., 2010; Anderson et al., 2004 Seifer, 2000; Middlebrooks, 1999). Types of communication between meetings within the CITE partnership include sending meeting reminders along with additional logistical information around projects happening within the partnership.

Another key aspect of organized infrastructure, according to participants in this study, was the importance of the shared files. Since the beginning, all documents related to the partnership are housed in a single shared internet file folder that all members have access to. This organized folder allows all members to access all documents related to
the partnership including agendas, meeting notes, meeting schedules, articles, and documents related to the teacher candidate programs. The findings of this study indicate that building and having an infrastructure to keep the group organized including regular meetings, communication, and shared box folders, were important components. In the CITE partnership the organized infrastructure is run by the central or university partner, and has been since the beginning of the partnership. As described above, they do not control the agenda or goals; they serve as the coordinator, e-mailing meeting reminders, organizing agendas, and running logistics for the partnership. Infrastructure is important to all partnerships and therefore is a criterion that was included in the model from this study.

**Unexpected Findings**

**Resources.** According to many scholars, funding is fundamental to sustaining partnerships (Maloney & Hill, 2016; Walsh & Backe, 2013; Birge, Beaird & Torres, 2003). One of the interesting findings from this study was that the CITE partnership has been successful in the absence of outside funding specific to the partnership. Up to this point, each institution has individually donated in kind their educator time to the partnership when attending meetings, or completing tasks related to the partnership or working with the teacher candidates. Therefore, funding was not added above as a criterion necessary for transformative partnerships. After completion of this study, the question remains: did the lack of funding during the beginning stages (first four years) of the partnership support the movement of the partnership closer to a transformative relationship? Even though lack of external funding was brought up as a challenge by half the participants in the study, up to this moment funding has not impacted the functioning
of the partnership. It has impacted capacity to expand into more teacher candidate sequences for some institutions but has not constrained members being able to attend monthly meetings or work with select sequences in the teacher education program.

**Longevity impacts view.** The average amount of time the participants of this study have been members of the CITE partnership was found to be 3.2 years. One of the findings from this study was that longevity impacted their views of the partnership. This interesting finding was a theme from the analysis of the survey and brought up by participants during the member checking focus group. This can be because some members have been involved since the beginning and have a better idea about the history of the partnership. It also might be they are more optimistic about the partnership the longer they have been a part of it. Participant 1 explains during the focus group why there is a range of possibilities for some of the survey questions related to the longevity of the partnership.

> It just seems the range is pretty vast, so I'm wondering if it has a lot to do with where you are in that partnership, that relationship, in terms of entry point. And your perspectives, I'm sure that has a lot do with it. *(Participant 1 – Focus Group).*

Although it needs further investigation, longevity and how it impacts the view of the partnership is interesting to consider if it has moved the partnership to be viewed as more transformative.

**Study Limitations**

One limitation for this study was confusion about how to respond to the survey in phase two of the study. For example, some participants explained they struggled with
certain parts of the survey because they were not sure which view they should answer from, the institution’s or the educational department’s. As explained by Participant 13,

In other questions, I kept going back and forth when it was "your institution" - I have a different answer if it's my department or if we're talking about my whole institution. So, although we're all based on one mission, the way we operate, our thinking might be a little different (Participant 13 – Focus Group).

For future investigations, this could be alleviated by being specific about which viewpoint the participant should answer the question from. For example, the researcher needs to be specific in the questions on the survey describing specifically what they want answered; if they mean the overall institution’s viewpoint, then they should state that specifically in the question.

This study spans a one year time frame, due to the dissertation timeframe, so it represents a particular point in the history of the partnership. A strength of this study is that it captures about a one-year span in the evolution of this partnership. A longitudinal study would be needed to be able to determine how the partnership continues to develop. In future investigations, with a longer timeframe, multiple follow-up surveys would be useful for distinguishing changes in the attributes measured in the survey over a longer period of time. More time would allow for more in-depth investigation of some of the outliers in the survey that were different from a majority of the other participants into the reasoning behind their responses, which would have added to the study.

The emic view of the researcher was strength of the study but also a limitation in this study. The researcher has been with the partnership since 2014 and serves as the partnership coordinator. Therefore, there needed to multiple considerations in place to ensure the findings from this study were representative of the members of the partnership.
and were not impacted by the researcher’s history with the partnership. The member checking and discussion of themes with the dissertation chair were put in place to ensure the findings were not biased in anyway.

**Implications**

The purpose of this study was to investigate and report on the CITE partnership and the inner workings and characteristics of this specific partnership in order to add to the literature base on partnership characteristics for university-IEI partnerships. The findings from this study have implications for educational researchers and for informal education institution (IEI) educators who are engaged in partnerships for teacher presentation.

**Educational Researchers**

Educational researchers are constantly forming partnerships within their communities for a multitude of reasons, such as practicum opportunities for teacher candidates or placements for observations. There are implications for university faculty who are engaged in this type of partnership work, specifically ones involved in partnerships with IEIs. Every partnership context is different, but the model put forth in this study can be used by university faculty when starting conversations with partners, especially ones centered around teacher preparation. Understanding that it is important for institutions to maintain their identity and have common and shared vision and goals is important. This study adds to the literature on developing understanding and evaluating relationships to become more effective and meaningful work for all involved in partnerships. Analyzing the forces that shape these relationships and the ways these relationships shape the work and outcomes will help improve partnership work. This
study also helps in the evaluation of theories about both the dynamic and structural nature of these relationships (Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2009).

**Reporting guidelines.** This study adds to the literature on understanding and developing university-IEI partnerships but also puts forth guidance for those reporting on these partnerships. A majority of the literature in this area focuses on teacher candidate outcomes but a missing piece in that literature is a description of the context and functioning of the partnership that these teacher candidate experiences are embedded in. Specifically, it is recommended that the context of the study include: who is involved, the relationships that exist within the partnership, functioning of the partnership, infrastructure in place to support the partnership, and the overall objectives of the partnership. Including these components as part of research reports will help educational researchers and IEIs understand the functioning of these partnerships and how to build and sustain them.

**Informal Education Institution Educators**

A lack of system information about the inner workings of partnerships between institutions within the IEI education field leads to reinventing the wheel over and over until the “aha” moment when someone connects individuals doing similar work (American Alliance of Museums, 2014). It is important to add to the literature base of partnership criteria. This study can encourage IEI educators engaged in this work to share their information, both successes and challenges, to better understand the nature of partnerships. The other implication for this study is for more involvement of IEI educators in teacher education to begin to see informal institutions as partners in learning for teachers and university faculty. The goal is getting the information out about these
powerful elements that can benefit all innovative and exemplary partnerships and impact learning (American Alliance for Museums, 2014). In the end, this study adds to the literature about the inner workings of university-IEI partnerships in hopes of inspiring educators in either area to form thoughtful transformative partnerships. The lessons learned from this partnership and what has been put forth in the model will help educators both at the university and IEI level to open up the discussion about partnerships and what is needed for them to be sustainable.

**Recommendations for Future Investigations**

The first recommendation for future investigations would be a continuation of data collection and research within the CITE partnership around relationships and the important elements of transformative relationships. A follow-up study focused on the history of partnership development through the analysis of shared artifacts would bring to light more about the development of the partnership to the level it is today. A researcher could continue to develop the criteria for university-IEIs by bringing it back to the partnership for further development.

The survey from phase two of this study could be used as a baseline for continued work around transformative relationships within CITE. Clayton et al. (2009), the creators of the TRES survey, suggest using the survey to track yearly increases or decreases in the nine attributes. These changes can “benchmark progressive and regressive longitudinal changes in relationships and can be used to describe and analyze strengths and deficiencies on each of the dimensions” (Bringle, Price, & Clayton, 2009). Using the survey with the CITE partnership can help with development and the refinement of the
instrument especially ways to accurately measure the strengths and deficiencies of the partnership factors presented in the survey.

The recommendations for educational researchers centers around not only more examples of successful partnerships between universities and IEIs, but also more information about the background and characteristics of these partnerships. Specific questions should focus on refining the criteria for transformative university-IEI partnerships. Further investigation around the role context has on partnerships and relationships are all continuations in the field of partnership development that can be researched further.

**Summary and Final Words**

I started my career in informal education working for a non-profit marine science focused organization. I knew back then the importance of informal learning and the impact it has on individuals of all ages. After leaving informal education to be a high school science teacher for six years, never did I imagine that my dissertation research would bring me back to informal learning. I have learned so much since those initial days working in the informal education field. This partnership between a university teacher preparation program and six IEIs sets a precedent for what a group of university and IEI educators can accomplish together. The opportunity to study this unique assemblage of dedicated individuals in the CITE partnership has impacted my views of informal learning, partnerships, and teacher preparation. Learning in informal settings is vital to teacher candidates. The implications from this study I see being important to faculty and IEI educators who want to partner together for teacher preparation.
Additionally, I hope the reporting guidelines put forth in this study are used to guide researchers who seek to publish partnership literature.

I have learned so much as researcher from this study. One of the profound changes has been the shifting of my epistemology. I came to LUC as a marine biologist and science teacher. As a scientist, quantitative data and spreadsheets are central to what scientists do in the field. Entering the LUC and engaging in various qualitative focused research projects and this dissertation study have shifted my epistemology to that of a qualitative researcher. As I reflect back on my study it would be impossible to collect what I did from my participants solely through quantitative data. Their personal experiences and the discussions with my participants were vital to understanding the CITE partnership.

Not only has this research impacted my epistemology, is has also impacted my understanding about how partnerships are built and the importance of dedicated individuals who have a shared vision. In the future, I plan to continue my research in the area of university-IEI partnerships for teacher preparation. I also plan to continue exposing my teacher candidates to IEIs and the plethora of opportunities and resources they have available for teachers.
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LITERATURE REVIEW CHART
### Literature Review Chart - Essential Features of Partnership Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Partnership Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maloney & Hill (2016) | • Purposeful investment in collaboration by all parties  
• Realistic and mutual understanding of goals  
• Accountability for activities  
• Clear institutional agendas  
• Investment in time and resources |
| Walsh & Backe (2013) | • Shared conceptual understanding  
• Mutuality in roles and responsibilities  
• Sound operational plans: infrastructure funding, and sustainability  
• Evaluation of outcomes and process |
| Bosma, Sieving, Ericson, Russ, Cavender, & Bonnie (2010) | • Communication  
• Shared decision making  
• Shared resources  
• Expertise and credibility  
• Sufficient time to develop and maintain partnerships  
• Facilitators and administrators  
• Being present  
• Flexibility  
• A shared philosophy  
• Recognition of other partner’s priorities |
| Bringle, Officer, Grim, & Hatcher (2009) | • Closeness  
• Equity  
• Integrity |
• Core Responsibilities: accountable, results oriented, sustainable  
• Win-Win Arrangements: mutually beneficial, both independent and interdependent, reciprocity, synergy  
• Structural Considerations: collaborative leaderships, intermediary people and/or organization, policy/power connections  
• Grounded in the community: history and awareness, norms and values, driven by community stakeholders  
• Focused on building connections: engaging strategies, communication, relationships, welcoming environment |
| Enos & Morton (2003) | • Basis of Relationship  
• End goal  
• Purpose  
• Support of existing institutional goals: examines institutional goals  
• Roles played by partners: leaders  
• Boundaries: transcend self-interest to create  
• Partner identity  
• Scope of commitment |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Partnership Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Seifer (2000) | • Partners have agreed upon mission, goals, and measurable outcomes  
• The relationship between partners is characterized by mutual trust, respect, genuineness, and commitment  
• The partnership builds upon identified strengths and assets, but also address areas that need improvement  
• The partnership balances power among partners and enable resources among partners to be shared  
• There is a clear, open, and accessible communication between partners, making it an ongoing priority to listen to each need, develop a common language, and validate/clarify the meaning of terms  
• Roles, norms, and processes for the partnership are established with the input and agreement of all partners  
• There is feedback to, among, and from all stakeholders in the partnership, with the goal of continuously improving the partnership and its outcomes  
• Partners share the credit for the partnership's accomplishments |
| Ramaley (2000)| • Partnership must be based on the academic strengths and philosophy of the university.  
• Needs and capacities of the community must define the approach that the university should take in forming a partnership  
• An ideal partnership matches up the academic strengths and goals of the university with the assets and interests of the community  
• Mutual learning: partnership should be built on new patterns of information gathering, communication, and reflection that allow all partners to be participants in decision making and learning  
• Additional talent brought in to avoid fatigue and burnout  
• Strong commitment to culture of evidence tracing the process of a project or collaboration as it develops.  
• Help smaller organizations create the capacity to be an effective partner  
• Create an infrastructure necessary to support community based work |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Partnership Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Torres (2000)          | • Founded on a shared vision and clearly articulated values  
                          • Beneficial to partnering institutions  
                          • composed of interpersonal relationships based on trust and mutual respect  
                          • Multidimensional: they involve the participation of multiple sectors that act in service of a complex problem  
                          • clearly organized and led with dynamism  
                          • integrated into the mission and support systems of the partnering institutions  
                          • sustained by a partnering process for communication, decision-making, and the initiation of change  
                          • evaluated regularly with a focus on both methods and outcomes |
| Middlebrooks (1999)    | • Mutual benefit  
                          • Clear goals  
                          • Competent partners  
                          • Open and frequent communication  
                          • Clear roles and responsibilities  
                          • Trust between partners |
| Holland & Gelman (1998)| • Mutually agreed upon goals  
                          • Success is defined and outcomes are measured in both institutional and community terms  
                          • Control of the agenda is primarily in community hands  
                          • Effective use and enhancement of community capacity are based on clear identification of community resources and strengths  
                          • Educational component has clear consequences for the community and institution  
                          • There is ongoing commitment to evaluation that involves all partners |
| Thorkildsen & Stein (1996)| • Well-defined Admin Structure  
                          • Mutual Self Interest and Common Goals  
                          • Participant Commitment  
                          • Time Commitment  
                          • Clear Focus  
                          • Shared Decision Making  
                          • Information Sharing  
                          • Manageable Agenda  
                          • Mutual Trust & Respect  
                          • External Support  
                          • Dynamic Nature  
                          • Ongoing Process of Evaluation |
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LOYOLA CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION LOGIC MODEL
Loyola Cultural Institution in Teacher Education (CITE) Logic Model

**Long-term Impact:** TLLSC class sessions with cultural institution partners will develop effective, *(interdisciplinary)* teaching and learning practices informed by learning theories, understanding of learning processes, research-based pedagogical strategies, and community partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th>Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Learning Theories</td>
<td>Teacher candidates have awareness of learning theories</td>
<td>Teacher candidates can observe and report learning theories in practice</td>
<td>Teacher candidates begin to use learning theories when practicing teaching and/or analyzing learning</td>
<td>Teachers can provide rationale for learning experiences they design, drawing on multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Developmental, Cultural, Social)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Learning Processes</td>
<td>Teacher candidates are self-aware of their own learning process</td>
<td>Teacher candidates can analyze others’ learning processes and recognize it’s different than their own</td>
<td>Teacher candidates can design learning experiences specific learning and analyze its efficacy</td>
<td>Teachers engage in continuous recognition and engagement in an iterative design process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Personal/Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-based Pedagogical Strategies</td>
<td>Teacher candidates can identify (unique) characteristics of learning in museum settings</td>
<td>Teacher candidates analyze characteristics of informal pedagogy: object-based learning, play, free-choice learning, inquiry, authentic/real-world learning, place-based learning</td>
<td>Teacher candidates can identify and analyze the relationship between learning in formal and informal settings</td>
<td>Teachers apply informal pedagogy into classroom teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnerships</td>
<td>Teacher candidates recognize that because learning happens in multiple contexts, museums are partners in learning for teachers and students.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates understand how museum partnerships benefit teachers, students, and school communities.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates look for opportunities to work in partnership with cultural institutions.</td>
<td>Teachers work in partnership with museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Identities</td>
<td>Teacher candidates see themselves in science, social science, other disciplines</td>
<td>Teacher candidates recognize their expertise in science, social studies, and other disciplines.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates see themselves as teachers of science, social studies, and other disciplines.</td>
<td>Teachers are recognized as having expertise in teaching and learning science and/or social studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Perspectives</td>
<td>Teacher candidates recognize that real-world challenges are interdisciplinary. Teacher candidates expand their understanding of disciplines, especially science and social studies</td>
<td>Teacher candidates value and make use of varied knowledge bases and sources in their own investigations</td>
<td>Teacher candidates recognize interdisciplinary lessons in practice</td>
<td>Teachers provide rationale for interdisciplinary lessons they design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
LOYOLA CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION
INFORMATION SHEET
Cultural Institutions in Teacher Education (CITE) Partnership

Loyola University Chicago’s Teaching, Learning and Leading with Schools and Communities

PARTNERSHIP OVERVIEW: A comprehensive, entirely site-based urban teacher preparation program. Teaching, Learning and Leading with Schools and Communities (TLLSC), is founded on four cornerstones: mutual-benefit partnerships with schools and communities, teacher preparation for diverse classrooms, authentic teaching practices, and participation in professional learning communities. TLLSC recognizes that the successful development of future teachers requires an all hands-on-deck partnership approach with those constituents involved in the learning, achievement, and success of PK-12 students. Local schools, communities and cultural institutions become sites for teacher candidate learning experiences at school professionals, museum educators, and community leaders share the responsibility of preparing teachers. Teacher candidates engage in a wide range of learning experiences across varied authentic contexts, developing the professional knowledge, skills and dispositions required to make a positive impact on youth and their communities.

Broader Impacts

FOR TEACHER CANDIDATES
- Expand perspective on where teaching and learning occur
- Develop greater appreciation for museums’ collections, spaces, education materials, personnel
- Learn to transfer pedagogical approaches and other elements of free-choice learning to the classroom
- Utilize cultural institutions and their educational resources during preparation program and in future classroom
- Develop professional collaborations with museum educators and other cultural institution staff

FOR PK-12 STUDENTS AND PARTNER SCHOOLS
- Increase collaboration with museums and museum educators
- Gain awareness about and access to museum collections, spaces, education materials, personnel
- Integrate museum resources into instructional plans with teacher candidates and cooperating teachers collaboratively delivering instruction.

FOR CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS
- Build sustained relationships with beginning teachers during their four year preparation
- Develop collaborations among partner schools, teachers, and university instructors
- Deepen relationships and network with other local cultural institutions
- Refine educational materials and programs with input from candidates, university instructors
- Stay informed of current needs of schools and classroom teachers

INSTRUCTIONAL SITES: PK-12 Schools, Local Community, and Cultural Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM STAGE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SEQUENCES</th>
<th>TEACHER CANDIDATE EXPERIENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPLORATION</td>
<td>1. Introduction to TLLSC</td>
<td>Explore the varied contexts where learning occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Exploring Schools as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Environments &amp; Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Policy and Practice in Urban Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCENTRATION</td>
<td>4. Specializing in an</td>
<td>Develop content-specific pedagogical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEVELOPING)</td>
<td>Area of Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Deepen content knowledge, interdisciplinary thinking and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Literacy &amp; Data Use</td>
<td>Access resources for classroom applications during coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Integrating Content,</td>
<td>Strengthen partnerships with cultural institutions and educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultures &amp; Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIALIZATION</td>
<td>7. Putting it Together: Developing &amp; Implementing Rigorous and Relevant Instruction and Assessment</td>
<td>Apply developmentally appropriate, content-specific and interdisciplinary pedagogical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MASTERING)</td>
<td>Student Teaching Mastery</td>
<td>Integrate resources in student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching, Learning &amp; Leading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Website: www.luc.edu/CITE
E-mail: LoyolaCITE@luc.edu
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RESEARCH CONSENT FORMS
Consent to Participate in Collaborative Research

Project Title: Collaborative Research with Community Partners Involved in the Teaching, Learning and Leading with Schools and Communities (TLLSC) program

You, along with other school community partners and faculty members in the Loyola University School of Education, are being asked to participate in a collaborative research study. This collaborative study intends to document and examine the ongoing partnerships that are a part of the TLLSC teacher preparation program. Please read this consent form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have before you decide whether to participate in this study.

Description and Purpose of the Research The current research seeks to study the nature of the TLLSC partnerships, examining how these partnerships are working, examining the benefits of these partnerships and the School of Education, and exploring ways to improve and expand these relationships. This study will involve a collaborative participatory design. Individuals who agree to participate as researchers will serve as both participants and researchers by engaging in data generation, analysis, and dissemination.

Research Procedures

Beginning Summer 2014 Teaching and Learning faculty and community partners will engage in small and large group meetings to examine the nature of these relationships and explore the continuing opportunities and impacts of the partnerships on the organizations and the participants (i.e. Loyola faculty and community partner members)

During these meetings participants will produce artifacts (e.g., reflections, program documents, outputs and outcomes of programs) that will become data for this study. Meetings will be audio recorded in order to capture the group discussion; recordings will be transcribed as necessary for data analysis, presentation and publication or results. Occasionally, informal focus groups will be conducted around central areas of interest for participants and these focus groups will be audio recorded and transcribed.

Participants will be asked to keep personal reflection journals. These journals will provide participants the opportunity to reflect on the current research and the nature of the relationships. Participants will be given the opportunity to share their reflective journals, during group meetings, informal focus groups and to use the reflective journals as data for analysis.

Voluntary Nature of Participation Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may participate, decline, or withdraw from participation without any effect on your professional status, or your partnership involvement. You may withdraw from this study at any time. To withdraw, please inform David Ensminger, Lara Smetana, or Daniel Birmingham.

You also have the option to participate as a researcher in the study, engaging in data collection and analysis, presentation and publication of results.
Confidentiality Participants in collaborative research inherently know the identity of the other participants who take part in meeting discussions and focus groups. We are not able to guarantee confidentiality, since there is no way to control what participants share. However, we request that each participant respect the confidentiality of the other participants.

In this study, every effort will be made not to reveal personally identifiable information in publications based on this research. To accomplish this, no records will be created or retained that could link you to personally identifiable descriptions, paraphrases, or quotations. Your actions or things you say may be presented without specific reference to you, referenced only by pseudonym, or combined anonymously with the actions and words of other participants. All discussion audio and transcription data related to this study will be destroyed within 3 years of its completion. Until that time, they will be stored either in password-protected computer files on secure computers or in locked file drawers. Only researchers on this project will have access to this material.

Risks and Benefits Your participation in this project should not involve risks beyond those of ordinary professional conversations. It is hoped that the researchers will benefit from this project by gaining greater insight into the process of developing partnerships to support teacher preparation programs.

Compensation You will receive no direct compensation for your participation in this research project.

Contact Information This study has been approved by the Loyola University Chicago Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689. If you have any questions about the study itself, please contact David Ensminger (312-915-7257), densmin@luc.edu, Lara Smetana (312-915-6273), lsmetana@luc.edu, or Daniel Birmingham (312-915-7305), dbirmingham@luc.edu.

Consent Statement I have read the foregoing description of this research project, including information about the risks and benefits of my voluntary participation, and all of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study as a participant.

☐ Yes    ☐ No

Additionally, I voluntarily agree to participate in this study as a member of the research team.

☐ Yes    ☐ No

__________________________________________  __________________________
Participant Signature                        Date

__________________________________________  __________________________
Researcher Signature                         Date

Loyola University Chicago, Lakeside Campus
Institutional Review Board for
The Protection of Human Subjects

Date of Approval: 02/09/2016

Approval Expires: 02/08/2017
Consent to Participate in Dissertation Research Study

**Project Title:** University and Informal Education Institution Partnerships: A Mixed Methods Study

**Introduction:** You are being asked to take part in a dissertation research study being conducted by Jenna Carlson under the supervision of Dr. Lara Smetana, faculty member in the School of Education at Loyola University of Chicago. You are being asked to participate because you are current member of Loyola’s Cultural Institution in Teacher Education (CITE) Partnership. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study. There will be 13 participants included in this study.

**Purpose:** This dissertation study seeks to study the nature of the CITE partnership, examining how the partnership works, and its relationships. This study will involve a sequential mixed methods design.

**Research Procedures:** If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:

- Complete 1 paper survey which will take 10-15 minutes to complete and will be administered at your home institution

**Voluntary Nature of Participation:** Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may participate, decline, or withdraw from participation without any effect on your professional status, or your partnership involvement. You may withdraw from this study at any time. To withdraw, please inform Jenna Carlson (jcarlson6@luc.edu).

**Confidentiality:** All data will be confidential. No records will be created or retained that could link you to personally identifiable descriptions, paraphrases, or quotations. Your actions or things you say may be presented without specific reference to you, referenced only by pseudonym, or combined anonymously with the actions and words of other participants. Because of the nature of focus groups, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed but instructions will be explained so participants understand what is said in the focus group should not be talked about outside of the group. All discussion audio and transcription data related to this study will be destroyed within 5 years of its completion. Until that time, they will be stored either in password-protected computer files on secure computers or in locked file drawers. **Only the researchers on this project will have access to this material.**
**Risks and Benefits:** There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but the results may be helpful to the researchers studying university – informal education institution partnerships.

**Compensation:** You will receive no direct compensation for your participation in this research project.

**Contact Information:** This study has been approved by the Loyola University Chicago Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689. If you have any questions about the study itself, please contact Jenna Carlson, jcarlson6@luc.edu or Lara Smetana (312-915-6273), lsmetana@luc.edu.

**Consent Statement**
I have read the forgoing description of this research project, including information about the risks and benefits of my voluntary participation, and all of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I voluntarily agree to participate in the survey.
☐ Yes ☐ No

_____________________________________________________
Participant Signature                                      Date

_____________________________________________________
Researcher Signature                                      Date

Loyola University Chicago Lakeside Campuses
Institutional Review Board for
The Protection of Human Subjects

Date of Approval: 09/12/2017
Approval Expires: 07/20/2018
Consent to Participate in Dissertation Research Study

**Project Title:** University and Informal Education Institution Partnerships: A Mixed Methods Study

**Introduction:** You are being asked to take part in a dissertation research study being conducted by Jenna Carlson under the supervision of Dr. Lara Smetana, faculty member in the School of Education at Loyola University of Chicago. You are being asked to participate because you are current member of Loyola’s Cultural Institution in Teacher Education (CITE) Partnership. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study. There will be 13 participants included in this study.

**Purpose:** This dissertation study seeks to study the nature of the CITE partnership, examining how the partnership works, and its relationships. This study will involve a sequential mixed methods design.

**Research Procedures:** If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:

- Participate in one 20-30 minute participant note activity prior to the focus group.
- Participate in one 60-minute audio recorded focus group during one of the fall 2017 CITE monthly meetings

**Voluntary Nature of Participation:** Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may participate, decline, or withdraw from participation without any effect on your professional status, or your partnership involvement. You may withdraw from this study at any time. To withdraw, please inform Jenna Carlson (jcarlson6@luc.edu).

**Confidentiality:** All data will be confidential. No records will be created or retained that could link you to personally identifiable descriptions, paraphrases, or quotations. Your actions or things you say may be presented without specific reference to you, referenced only by pseudonym, or combined anonymously with the actions and words of other participants. Because of the nature of focus groups, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed but instructions will be explained so participants understand what is said in the focus group should not be talked about outside of the group. All discussion audio and transcription data related to this study will be destroyed within 5 years of its completion. Until that time, they will be stored either in password-protected computer files on secure computers or in locked file drawers. Only the researchers on this project will have access to this material.
Risks and Benefits: There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but the results may be helpful to the researchers studying university–informal education institution partnerships.

Compensation: You will receive no direct compensation for your participation in this research project.

Contact Information: This study has been approved by the Loyola University Chicago Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689. If you have any questions about the study itself, please contact Jenna Carlson, jcarlson6@luc.edu or Lara Smetana (312-915-6273), lsmetana@luc.edu.

Consent Statement
I have read the foregoing description of this research project, including information about the risks and benefits of my voluntary participation, and all of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

I voluntarily agree to participate in the audio recorded interview.
☐ Yes  ☐ No
I voluntarily agree to participate in the audio recorded focus group.
☐ Yes  ☐ No

_______________________________________________________
Participant Signature Date

_______________________________________________________
Researcher Signature Date
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PHASE ONE SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Phase One Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. How long have you been involved in the partnership specifically working with our teacher candidates and the collaborative work group?

2. How do characterize the work you to with teacher candidates and in the group?  
   *Probe: How long, what capacity (teaching, planning/execution, collaborations, research efforts, etc.)*

3. Why did you get involved and what keeps you coming back?  
   *Probing: What are the immediate and long-term benefits for you? For your organization?  
   Follow up question: How has the working group influenced your understanding of the other institutions and the relationship between your institution and the others?*

4. What role do you see informal institutions playing in teacher preparation?  
   *Probe: Examples - Past involvement – programs, etc.*

5. Sustaining university-museum partnerships is a topic of interest. From your participation in the program what do you see as important for success in that area?  
   *Probe – specific examples – what has and has not worked*

6. What do you see as the greatest success and challenges of the partnership thus far? What do you feel has contributed to these successes or challenges?

7. What goals do you have for the future of this group, personally and/or organizationally?  
   *Probe for specific examples and clarify examples*
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PHASE ONE INITIAL CATEGORIES
Phase One Initial Categories

Category 1: Role in CITE Partnership

Category 2: Reasons for Being Involved in the CITE Partnership

Category 3: Successes of the CITE partnership

Category 4: Challenges

Category 5: Goals for the Future of the Partnership
APPENDIX G

PHASE ONE CATEGORIES AND SUBCODES
Phase One Categories and Subcodes

Category 1: Dual Role

- **Subcode: “Teacher Role”/Facilitator**
  - "I think it’s really interesting to hear what other institutions are doing because I feel like my primary touch point is with the teacher candidates. I feel like I am definitely more facilitation and working with the teacher candidates so I kind of always have that lens and so when I hear what other institutions are doing it's really valuable" (P5)

- **Subcode: “Administrative Role”**
  - "We might be a little different than some of the other organizations primarily in that, I don’t have a huge role in the implementation of sequence one and group I pay more of an advisory role on the planning of those sessions. I’m more in an administrative level but I can speak to both (P4)."

Category 2: Why they are involved in partnership?

- **Subcode: Change Views of Informal**
  - Expand/engage with Preservice/invest rather than remediation
    - "I think for our institution it’s just that service to teachers before they are even practicing, I feel we won’t know until years from now but I do think we are going to have teachers that are attuned to museums and are building it into their practice from the beginning. That is my biggest hope" (P6)
  - Change views of field trips
    - Moving away from “seeing institutions beyond taking a field trip for the day(P2)” once a year to relationship (exhibits connection) “learning partner above and beyond that one field trip” (P3) *
      - Does this align with my curriculum so I can take a field trip?” (P2)
      - “There’s a lot that informal institutions have to offer, not just a place to go on a cool field trip” (P3).
  - Museums spaces for support and resources, elementary content knowledge, pedagogical strategies
    - Use in the future, enhance what you are already doing in the classroom
    - Be engaged in museums programs as in-service teachers
    - Checkout resources, a place to go for support, be engaged in PD
      - “I think the sooner our preservice teachers are aware of that [resources available in informal] the more they will be able to become comfortable in coming here and seeing us as even beyond just a resource but seeing us as a partner in their students’ learning” (P5)
- Expand view of where learning happens
  - Learning happens beyond the walls of a classroom – identify and connect resources in their communities
  - Provide authentic experiences and application a lot of concepts (i.e. NGSS)
  - See learning in multiple places – provide environment for them to see learning happen and how learning happens
    - “I think that people try to silo things off, there are things that are done in the classroom and things that are done out of the classroom, and why you go to the museum, I think it’s important to see that they complement each other and intersect” (P2).
  - Think about themselves as learners
    - Expand ideas of what they can do with their degree

- Subcode: Recognition
- Subcode: Professional Development
  - Research, Publish, Conferences
    - Another level of commitment
    - Writing together, researching together, conferences
    - Getting it out there
    - Part of the university job – not a requirement – get their voice out there (P11)
      - “I think by moving it towards making presentations or publishing articles makes it mutually beneficial, to get our names out there to that esteem” (P8).
    - Be able to attend conferences**/present at conferences (Language Matters)
    - Personally interested in research, do something different
    - Institution invested in research* – to inform what they do wants to get into this
  - Networking
    - Has had an impact on the relationships between other institutions
      - Learned what other institutions do and their focus
      - Meet other educators, build stronger relationships
      - Share ideas/ask each other questions (teacher PD, age groups)
      - Often times do not see each other (especially if not museum in the park)
    - Work with Loyola***

- Subcode: Personally Invested in Informal/Formal Partnership for Teacher Education
  - Informs work with current in-service teachers/other educators
  - Connection to teacher preparation/Engage with teacher candidates
  - Research agenda
Category 3: Characteristics

- **Subcode: Engagement and Motivation in the Partnership**
  - **Engagement & Motivation** *
  - **Commitment**
    - “I attribute it to the museum partners – their level of commitment has been really incredible” (P11)
  - **Existence/Investment** *
    - “The fact that this has kept going and its gaining momentum people are really invested” (P6)

- **Subcode: Logic Model**
  - Everyone contributed/engaged in the development of logic model *
    - Developed as a group (so many voices at the table) Everyone’s had similar ideas
  - Helped define what we are trying to do
  - Long term goal/larger goals in mind/theory driving the project/ cornerstone
    - “Engaging in the logic model processes and then having that as our cornerstone that really gives us a document we can look to both for our development of other sequences and what our goals are...it keeps us focused on things and provides a framework” (P5)
  - Trying to learn from it and eventually how it is impacting students (research/data driven aspect)
  - Development of one-pagers – what the partnership means

- **Subcode: Mutual Respect & Trust**
  - No personal agendas
  - Everybody has a reason to be there/place to contribute/potential to shape/everyone brings something to the table
  - Mutual respect & trust between organizations (value each other)
  - Time valued/institution is valued
    - “The partnership is so valued – I feel valued, I feel the institution is valued and our time is well used” (P6)
  - Rich conversations/open communication
  - Growth mindset
  - Enjoy working with everyone/learn from on another
  - Respect around the table/Interested
    - “I really appreciate the respect around the table that everyone shares for one another and the true spirit of partnership round the table that, we’re not all around the table because...we’re around
the table thinking about what’s best for learning in this situation, which is not sadly always the first thing driving partnerships. That’s just super refreshing to see and definitely something that motivates me to come to those meetings and really be a full participant in those meetings” (P5)

- Play on each other strengths
  - Subcode: Shared Vision/Innovative Approach/Aligns with Ed Philo
    - Forward thinking about working with teacher candidates
    - Field work and community resources matched our philosophy
    - New and innovative approach to teacher preparation(model)
      - “You want to feel like you are making a change and doing something new and innovative, and I feel like this is very new and innovative” (P2)
    - Aligns with instructional ed philosophy/relevant
    - In on the ground floor of program/ground breaking (brand new)
    - Common goal of role of informal education and preparing teachers
  - Subcode: Central Partner
    - Dedicated staff/central partner/personal contributions
      - “One is that there is dedicated staff booked against it – it doesn’t always mean that they are paid to be doing this but there is dedicated staff so we always know at least 3 people who either sending out minutes, sending out links” (P3)
      - Convener is consistent and accessible and that convener has a stake in the project” (P3)
  - Subcode: Collaboration for Teacher Candidates Programs
    - Co-Planning - Tweaking agendas/co-planned together
    - Co-teaching – professor connects to readings/give and take
    - Iterative - Constantly evolving
    - Debrief – share experiences with each other
    - Incorporating student voice/exit slips/student at meeting
  - Subcode: Logistics
    - Shared File Folder – Everyone contributes
    - In person Monthly meetings – “shared investment (P6)” at different institutions
      - “The regular meetings are absolutely essential especially that they are in person, they are a chance for us to continue to build our relationships professionally with one another but also a check in for us to say, both formally through the logic model ...and informally for us to do those check-ins to see how we are doing” (P4).
    - Staying connected - Communication – email reminders
Category 4: Challenges

- **Subcode: Turnover**
  - Loyola faculty changes (adjuncts)
  - Turnover/flux at partner institutions

- **Subcode: Expansion into more sequences (6,7,8)**
  - “Don’t want to commit more that I can dedicate timewise”
  - 7-8 Risk between teacher candidate and cooperating teacher, culture of school
  - getting other faculty to invest in this partnership as we expand
  - staying involved after Sequence 4

- **Subcode: Keeping up the energy**
  - Long-term and as we expand more

- **Subcode: Capacity**
  - Expansion into 6,7,8 would require a full-time museum person
  - Same level of involvement
  - Busy schedules/workflow/small staff/cannot customize too many requests so few people
  - Scheduling visits
  - Overlapping university requests
  - Adding projects on that interrupt work time/extra things

- **Subcode: Funding**
  - Been doing for 2-3 years without could be difficult one of our biggest challenges
  - We want to expand need funding

- **Subcode: Keeping everything connected between sequences, etc.**

Category 5: Goals for the future

- **Subcode: More time with Loyola teacher candidates**
  - Further Sequences 6,7,8
    - Increasing collaboration with Loyola partnership
  - Clinical Component
    - Getting involved on site more personal relationships – on the floor energetic with kids
    - Observations, contact with visitors test out learning theories they have learned
      - “Providing a venue where they can do observations and do some initial contact with visitors and really tests out some of these theories and ideas that they’re learning at school. And their coursework here at the museum, it’s a different type of learning experience then in a formal venue like a classroom. They also have access to a wide range of ages, where in the classroom its really specific” (P1).
  - Volunteers, Jobs (getting them more involved on site before the graduate make more personal connection)
- Focusing more on their interests by working for an informal institution
- Get them volunteering in the museums
  - “How do we create more opportunities for them to tape into programs so that they just become general users of the resources and programs but really exemplar users of those resources and programs. That’s the main motivator from the institutional perspective as far as moving forward the partnership” (P4)
- **Subcode: Get involved with Loyola’s school partners**
  - Direct connection (hands-on) with classroom teachers and admin involved in Loyola’s program
- **Subcode: Follow teacher candidates to in-service/contact us in future**
  - Develop teacher advisory board
  - Develop relationship so contact us in the future
  - Be able to engage with them in the future – easily updated and accessed
- **Subcode: Other**
  - Add additional partners
  - Publishing our outcomes
APPENDIX H

PHASE TWO SURVEY
CITE Partnership

For questions 1-9:
Mark with an X the option that best characterizes the actual nature of the partnership from your point of view as it is now.

1. Outcomes of the CITE partnership
   ____ a. There are more costs than benefits for both of us in this partnership
   ____ b. One of us benefits but at a cost to the other
   ____ c. Neither of us benefits to a significant degree from this partnership, but neither experiences a significant cost either
   ____ d. One of us benefits much more than the other, although not at a significant cost to either of us
   ____ e. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) from the partnership
   ____ f. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and one of us grows through the partnership
   ____ g. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and both grow through the partnership
   ____ h. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and both grow and the relationship itself grows
   ____ i. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and both grow, the relationship itself grows, and the systems (e.g. organizations) that we are part of become more capable of generating growth because of our partnership

2. Relationship among goals in the CITE partnership: To what extent would you say that your institution and the other partner institutions do or do not have/did or did not have common goals?
   ____ a. Generally our goals are at odds
   ____ b. Generally our goals are not connected, although not at odds
   ____ c. Our goals converge at some points
   ____ d. We have common goals
3. Decision-making: When decisions have been made about CITE partnership activities, to what degree has your institution and the other partner institutions collaborated?
____ a. Decisions about this partnership are made in isolation and without any consideration of the other partner
____ b. Decisions about this partnership are made in isolation but with some consideration of the other partner
____ c. Decisions about this partnership are made in isolation and with significant consideration of the other partner
____ d. Decisions about this partnership are made in consultation with the other partners
____ e. Decisions about this partnership are made collaboratively and are generally driven by the interest of one or the other of us
____ f. Decisions about this partnership are made collaboratively and are generally reached through a consensus process that reflects our shared commitment to our shared goals

4. Resources: In the CITE partnership
____ a. One of us has contributed most or all of the resources to the work, and other have contributed very little or no resources
____ b. One of us has contributed more resources than the other, but the other has contributed some resources
____ c. Both of us have contributed significant resources to the work

5. Conflict Management: If (or when) conflicts arise about the work of the CITE partnership
____ a. Both of us would actively avoid dealing with conflict
____ b. One of us would attempt to deal with conflict while the other would avoid it
____ c. We would both deal with the conflict, but it would be uncomfortable for us
____ d. We would both deal with the conflict openly, with the shared expectation of resolving the issue
6. Role of this partnership in work and identity formation: The CITE partnership

___ a. Has on balance hindered work for both of us
___ b. Has on balance hindered work for one of us
___ c. Has helped one of us do our work but has no impact on the other’s work
___ d. Has helped both of us do our work
___ e. Has helped both of us do our work and has helped define “who I am” for one of us, but not the other
___ f. Has helped both of us do our work and has helped define “who I am” for both of us
___ g. Has helped both of us do our work and has helped define “who I am” for both of us and has enhanced the ability of one of us to contribute in significant ways through our work
___ h. Has helped both of us do our work, has helped define “who I am” for both of us and has enhanced the ability of both of us to contribute in significant ways through our work

7. Power: In the CITE partnership

___ a. One of us has most or all the power, and the other has very little or any power
___ b. One of us has somewhat more power than the other
___ c. The power is equally shared in this partnership

8. What matters in the CITE partnership

___ a. Nothing of significance to either of us really matters
___ b. What one of us gets from this relationship matters
___ c. What both of us get from this relationship matters
___ d. What both of us get and the extent to which one of us grows matters
___ e. What both of us get and the extent to which both of us grow matters
___ f. What both of us get, the extent to which both of us grow, and the capacity of our partnership to nurture growth around us matters
9. Satisfaction and change: As a result of the CITE partnership

   a. Both of us are dissatisfied and both of us have been changed for the worse
   b. Both of us are dissatisfied and one of us has been changed for the worse
   c. Both of us are dissatisfied but neither of us is changed for the worse
   d. Only one of us is dissatisfied and neither is changed for the worse
   e. Both of us are satisfied and neither of us is changed for the better or the worse
   f. Both of us are satisfied and one of us is changed for the better
   g. Both of us are satisfied and both of us are changed for the better
   h. Both of us are satisfied and are changed for the better and the relationship itself is changed for the better
   i. Both of us are satisfied and are changed for the better, the relationship itself is changed for the better, and the world around us is changed for the better
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PHASE THREE PARTICIPANT NOTE SHEET
Phase Three – Participant Note Sheet

Please answer the following questions before participating in the focus group activity. The researcher will collect these at the end of the focus group. If you cannot attend the focus group the researcher will arrange to pick the notes up from you at your convenience. Thank you for participating.

1.) Looking at the circles below. You and your institution are the circle on the left. Which picture best describes the relationship between you and your institution and the Loyola teacher preparation program?

![Circle Options]

2.) On the below relationship continuum make a mark where would you rank the CITE partnership along the continuum. Why did you choose this ranking?

![Relationship Continuum Diagram]
Below are the results from Phase 1 (Initial Interviews) and Phase 2 (Surveys). Please look over the results, writing comments or questions.

Phase 1 Results
Finding 1: There are multiple institutional and personal reasons that our CITE partners are involved in this partnership.

- **Change Views of Informal Education** *(personal or institutional goal?)*
  - Expand and engage with preservice teachers, change views of field trips, Cultural Institutions as spaces for teacher learning, expand views of where learning happens, and expand ideas of cultural institution education

- **Institutional Recognition** *(Explain further?)*

- **Professional Development** *(personal or institutional goal?)*
  - Research, Publish, Attend Conferences

- **Personally Invested in Teacher Education**
  - Informs work with current in-service teachers/other educators, connection to teacher preparation/Engage with teacher candidates, Research agenda, Stay connected to profession, and was not present in their preparation

Finding 2: Successes of the CITE partnership

- **Engagement & Motivation**

- **Group Created Logic Model**

- **Mutual Respect & Trust (Mutually Beneficial)**

- **Shared Vision**
  - Innovative Approach to Teacher Education/Alignment with Educational Philosophy

- **Central Partner/Dedicated Staff Including Logistics**
  - Shared File Folder, In person Monthly meetings, E-mail Communication

- **Collaboration between Institutions and Loyola Faculty for teacher preparation**
  - Co-Planning, Co-Teaching, Iterative - Constantly evolving

Finding 3: Our Challenges

- **Capacity**
  - Expansion into more sequences (6, 7, 8) and connections between them

- **Turnover** (Loyola Faculty/Partner Institutions)

- **Keeping up the energy**

- **Funding**

Goals for the Future of the CITE Partnership

- **More time with Loyola teacher candidates**
  - Further Development of Sequences 6, 7, 8
  - Clinical Component
  - Volunteers, Jobs

- **More involvement with Loyola’s K-12 school partners**

- **Follow teacher candidates to in-service/contact us in future**
Phase 2 - Below are the results of the 9-question quantitative survey. Feel free to write comments and mark interesting points.

1. Outcomes of the CITE partnership

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. There are more costs than benefits for both of us in this partnership
- b. One of us benefits but at a cost to the other
- c. Neither of us benefits to a significant degree from this partnership, but neither experiences a significant cost either
- d. One of us benefits much more than the other, although not at a significant cost to either of us
- e. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) from the partnership
- f. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and one of us grows through the partnership
- [Average] g. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and both grow through the partnership
- h. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and both grow and the relationship itself grows
- i. We benefit equally (in terms of getting something we value) and both grow, the relationship itself grows, and the systems (e.g. organizations) that we are part of become more capable of generating growth because of our partnership
2. Relationship among goals in the CITE partnership: To what extent would you say that your institution and the other partner institutions do or do not have/did or did not have common goals?

- a. Generally our goals are at odds
- b. Generally our goals are not connected, although not at odds
- [Average] c. Our goals converge at some points
- d. We have common goals
3. Decision-making: When decisions have been made about CITE partnership activities, to what degree has your institution and the other partner institutions collaborated?

- Decisions about this partnership are made in isolation and without any consideration of the other partner
- Decisions about this partnership are made in isolation but with some consideration of the other partner
- Decisions about this partnership are made in isolation and with significant consideration of the other partner
- Decisions about this partnership are made in consultation with the other partners
- Decisions about this partnership are made collaboratively and are generally driven by the interest of one or the other of us
- Decisions about this partnership are made collaboratively and are generally reached through a consensus process that reflects our shared commitment to our shared goals
4. Resources: In the CITE partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. One of us has contributed most or all of the resources to the work, and other have contributed very little or no resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. One of us has contributed more resources than the other, but the other has contributed some resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Average] c. Both of us have contributed significant resources to the work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conflict Management: If (or when) conflicts arise about the work of the CITE partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Both of us would actively avoid dealing with conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. One of us would attempt to deal with conflict while the other would avoid it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. We would both deal with the conflict, but it would be uncomfortable for us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Average] d. We would both deal with the conflict openly, with the shared expectation of resolving the issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Role of this partnership in work and identity formation: The CITE partnership

![Bar graph showing the distribution of responses to the role of the partnership in work and identity formation.]

- a. Has on balance hindered work for both of us
- b. Has on balance hindered work for one of us
- c. Has helped one of us do our work but has no impact on the other’s work
- d. Has helped both of us do our work
- e. Has helped both of us do our work and has helped define “who I am” for one of us, but not the other
- f. Has helped both of us do our work and has helped define “who I am” for both of us
  [Average] g. Has helped both of us do our work and has helped define “who I am” for both of us and has enhanced the ability of one of us to contribute in significant ways through our work
- h. Has helped both of us do our work, has helped define “who I am” for both of us and has enhanced the ability of both of us to contribute in significant ways through our work

7. Power: In the CITE partnership

![Bar graph showing the distribution of responses to the power dynamics in the partnership.]

- a. One of us has most or all the power, and the other has very little or any power
- b. One of us has somewhat more power than the other
  [Average] c. The power is equally shared in this partnership
8. What matters in the CITE partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Nothing of significance to either of us really matters
- b. What one of us gets from this relationship matters
- c. What both of us get from this relationship matters
- d. What both of us get and the extent to which one of us grows matters
- [Average] e. What both of us get and the extent to which both of us grow matters
- f. What both of us get, the extent to which both of us grow, and the capacity of our partnership to nurture growth around us matters

9. Satisfaction and change: As a result of the CITE partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Both of us are dissatisfied and both of us have been changed for the worse
- b. Both of us are dissatisfied and one of us has been changed for the worse
- c. Both of us are dissatisfied but neither of us is changed for the worse
- d. Only one of us is dissatisfied and neither is changed for the worse
- e. Both of us are satisfied and neither of us is changed for the better or the worse
- f. Both of us are satisfied and one of us is changed for the better
- g. Both of us are satisfied and both of us are changed for the better
- [Average] h. Both of us are satisfied and are changed for the better and the relationship itself is changed for the better
- i. Both of us are satisfied and are changed for the better, the relationship itself is changed for the better, and the world around us is changed for the better
After reviewing all of the data from these questions what are your initial thoughts/observations.

Are there questions you still have after reviewing the data from Phase 1 & 2?
APPENDIX J

FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL
Focus Group Protocol

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this focus group. Focus Group Confidentiality Reminder: As a reminder focus group participants' confidentiality cannot be guaranteed due to the group setting. During the focus group, please be respectful of others’ contributions and confidentiality.

This focus group is being used as a member checking process. The purpose of the focus group is to make sure the data is a representative of your ideas and to help with fine-tuning of my results.

I will be collecting your participant notes after the completion of the focus group but first I want to talk over the data from both phases. We are going to start with the Phase 1 data and then move on to the Phase 2.

**Phase 1**
1.) What are your overall thoughts about the data from Phase 1?
2.) Are there any interesting points that stood out to you?
3.) Is there anything you want to add and/or change about the data set?

**Phase 2**
1.) What are your overall thoughts about the data from Phase 1?
2.) Are there any interesting points that stood out?
3.) Is there anything you want to add and/or change about the data set?

Overall, how well do you believe I have captured the nature of the relationships in the CITE partnership?

Referring to the continuum I included on page 1 of the participant notes. Where do you think we fall along this continuum and why did you choose this ranking?

How does this data help the CITE partnership moving forward?

What do we need to move forward?
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PHASE THREE REVISED CATEGORIES AND SUBCODES
Phase 3 Revised Categories and Subcodes

Category 1: Purpose/Support of Institutional Goals
- Subcode 1a: End Goal – Impacting K-12 Students
- Subcode 1b: Change Views of Informal Education
  - Expand/change views of CIs specifically: work with preservice, places for teacher learning, highlighting the learning happens in CIs, views of field trips
- Subcode 1c: Professional Development for CI Educators
  - Research, Publish, Attend Conferences, Networking, Institutional Recognition
- Subcode 1d: Personally Invested in Teacher Education
  - Engage with teacher candidates before classroom, stay connected to profession, impact

Category 2: Supported Movement
- Subcode 2a: Examines Institutional Goals
  - Logic Model & Strategic Plan
- Subcode 2b: Basis of Relationship
  - Mutual Respect & Trust (Mutually Beneficial)
- Subcode 2c: Scope of Commitment: Engagement & Motivation
- Subcode 2d: End Goal
  - Shared Vision (Innovative Approach/Alignment of Ed Philo)
- Subcode 2e: Partner Identity Collaboration for Loyola’s Teacher Education Programs (Co-Planning/co-teaching, iterative)
- Subcode 2f: Roles Played By Partners
  - Subcode: Teacher, Admin, Dual
  - Subcode – Leader – Central Partner (Running Logistics)

Category 3: Constrained Movement
- Subcode 3a: Capacity (i.e. Expansion into more sequences (6,7,8))
- Subcode 3b: Funding
- Subcode 3c: Already solved during study: Keeping Everything connected between teacher candidate experiences & turnover

Category 4: End Goals
- Subcode 4a: More time with Loyola teacher candidates (internships, volunteer, etc.)
- Subcode 4b: More involvement with K-12 school partners
- Subcode 4c: Follow teacher candidates to in-service/future connections
APPENDIX L

PHASE THREE INITIAL FINDINGS
Phase Three Initial Study Findings

1. Participant Reasons for Involvement/Experiences in CITE Partnership
   1) Change/Expand Views of Informal Education (Mixed)
      a) Expand work with preservice
      b) Change views as places for teacher learning
      c) Highlight the learning that happens in IEIs
      d) Change views of field trips
      e) IEIs as interdisciplinary
      f) IEIs to support standards
      g) Fill areas of gap (social sciences)
   2) Professional Development for IEI Educators (Mixed)
      a) Research & Publications
      b) Attend Conferences
      c) Networking
   3) IEI Recognition (Institution)
      a) Expand audience or add users (more teachers as users in future classroom)
   4) Educators are Personally Invested in Teacher Education
      a) Engage with teacher candidates before in the classroom
      b) stay connected to profession
      c) impact profession not what they experienced or how they were trained
   5) End Goal/Outcome (Mixed)
      a) Impacting K-12 Students

2. Supported Movement
   1) End Goals – Shared Vision
      a) Logic Model
      b) Strategic Plan
   2) Mutual Respect & Trust (Mutually Beneficial)
      a) Open Communication
   3) Engagement & Motivation in Partnership
   4) Logistics
      a) Monthly meetings
      b) Coordinator
      c) Resources
   5) Innovative Approach to Teacher Education/Alignment of Ed Philo
   6) Teacher Education
      a) Co-Planning
      b) Co-teaching
      c) Iterative & reflective process
      d) Steady capacity building
   7) Future Common Goals
      a) More time with Loyola teacher candidates (internships, volunteer, etc.)
      b) More involvement with Loyola’s K-12 school partners
c) Follow teacher candidates to in-service/future connections

8) Roles Played By Partners – Impacts View
   a) Teacher
   b) Admin
   c) Dual
   d) Importance of Central Partner
   e) Like-mindedness – Educators
   f) Different areas of expertise/diverse experiences

3.) Constrained Movement
   1) Capacity
      a) Expansion into more sequences (6,7,8)
   2) Funding
   3) Already solved during study
      a) Keeping everything connected between teacher candidate experiences & turnover
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