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Abstract

The following qualitative autoethnographic methods study examined the experience of two co-teaching faculty: one in childhood education and one in special education, as they planned and implemented a co-teaching model to prepare teacher candidates for inclusion. As a result of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1990), schools have implemented a greater number of inclusion settings and co-teaching models. This rise has increased the probability of new teacher candidates being placed in collaborative settings for their fieldwork experiences, student teaching placements, and eventually paid teaching positions. Research describes some of the struggles that teachers face when working with other professionals in a classroom setting; however, little has been researched about how faculty as co-teachers prepare teacher candidates for co-taught settings. Results from the methods were reviewed by comparing and contrasting data, revealing trends as well as the confirmation of beliefs and practices in the data. The main themes that emerged included the following: “Building Relationships”, “Implementing a Co-teaching Pedagogy”, “Modeling of Co-Teaching Pedagogy”, “Negotiating Roles, Responsibilities and Parity while Co-Teaching”, and “Setting the Stage and Using Space.” The results of this study indicate that co-teaching faculty in a school of education who demonstrate and model how they negotiate building a relationship, roles and responsibilities, co-teaching pedagogy, and staging and space, provide teacher candidates with the opportunity to see co-teaching in action and provide
opportunities to reflect upon, practice and better understand the complexities of co-teaching for faculty as well as for our teacher candidates.
Chapter 1: Introduction

This qualitative study examined the experience of two co-teaching faculty: one in childhood education and one in special education, as they developed and implemented a co-teaching model to prepare teacher candidates for inclusion. This research responded to the need for better undergraduate preparation for teacher candidates who will be working within inclusive settings. It has provided a model for teacher candidates learning about the necessary elements for an effective co-teaching relationship in an inclusive classroom. Voltz and Elliot (1997) found a discrepancy between the actual preparation and the ideal preparation for collaborative inclusion that teacher educators would like to provide for preservice level teacher candidates. They recommend that instructors of special education and elementary education methods courses model collaboration and make efforts to co-plan and co-teach. Future educators must gain first-hand experience in collaborative planning and consultation with other professionals who may have a different educational lens. The research offered the teacher candidates an opportunity to see first hand the modeling of co-teaching practices and how they may adapt those lessons and experiences when working with children identified with special needs.

Law and History

In today's schools, inclusive practices are being implemented as a greater number of students with disabilities are accommodated within the general education setting. These inclusive models are diverse classrooms where collaboration from all personnel involved is expected. This is a result of the first federal law regulating special education.
This law is the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL. 94-142), which was passed in 1975. This law was amended in 1990 and renamed as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The IDEA mandates that states establish procedures to assure that students with disabilities be educated in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The 1993 report of the New York State Regents Select Commission on Disability recommended the goal of LRE. The LRE directs states to establish procedures for placing students with disabilities in a general education setting. It requires schools to provide supplementary aids and services to accommodate the various disabilities. Schools may use special classrooms only when students cannot achieve satisfactory progress in a general education classroom (20 U.S.C. § 1412(a) (5) (b)). Courts often refer to this policy of placing students who are identified in these least restrictive environments as either “inclusion” or “mainstreaming”.

In the 1980’s, mainstreaming was implemented by having students with disabilities participate in the nonacademic portions of the general education program, such as music, art, and physical education. For many parents and students, this limited access to the general education setting was simply not enough. As a result of parents’ dissatisfaction, the initiative of a least restrictive environment was created in 1997 and caused significant changes in the approach to special education. The least restrictive environment mandate had been addressed by mainstreaming and including a greater number of students into the general education setting. A new term, “inclusion” and a new technique, “collaboration”, evolved (Turnbull, Turnbull, Shank and Teal, 2001). Inclusion is not specifically mentioned in IDEA. Inclusion generally refers to a situation where the home base of the disabled child is the general education classroom. The student receives
special education services within that classroom or is pulled out for services for a short period of time into a special classroom.

Historically, many events occurred that have redefined national public policy regarding the rights of children and adults with disabilities. In the late 1950’s and early 1960’s, new legislation (e.g. P.L. 85-926, P.L. 88-164, P.L. 89-313) provided access to education for many students with disabilities who had previously been denied. In the early 1970s, inclusion took shape in the courts with the case of Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. Pennsylvania. The district court ordered a school to place a mentally retarded student in a general education setting. It was the courts’ view that the school was violating the child’s due process and equal protection rights. This expressed a clear preference for mainstreaming by Congress and the courts. Mills v. Board of Education (1972) had established the legal precedent for the right to education for students with disabilities (Kleinhammer-Trammill, 2003).

Congress reauthorized The Rehabilitation Act of 1992 and closely aligned its purpose with the framework and tenets of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Under the Rehabilitation Act, Congress set forth goals of providing individuals with disabilities with the tools necessary to make informed choices and decisions a): achieve equality of opportunity, b): full inclusion and integration into society, c): employment, d): independent living and e): economic and social self sufficiency for such individuals. A greater focus was on how to meet the needs of students who are identified, and better prepare them knowing the exit outcomes expected after K-12 schooling. This resulted in a number of school to work initiatives, but little additional teacher training was provided.
The No Child Left Behind Act (PL. 107) of 2001 was created to close the achievement gap between students of different socioeconomic backgrounds, gender, and ethnicity. Its goal was to improve the academic performance of all students by providing a learning environment that is safe, drug free, and conducive to learning. Classes should be taught by highly qualified teachers and the expectation is that all students will graduate from High School. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) promote a student’s right to receive special education services necessary to access, participate, and progress in the general education curriculum. Although inclusion has gained support as a way of placing children with disabilities in the general education setting, there are many others who feel inclusion places students in non supportive environments, eliminating valuable time from their learning activities. This may be especially critical in environments where the classroom teacher is not properly trained to work with children with disabilities (Essex, 2006). The research study provided added training to help teacher candidates in inclusive settings and a collaborative model to use in the future.

As the educational reform movement continues to include more students with disabilities, the need for teacher collaboration has increased. In order for teachers to work together effectively, they need to acquire the necessary skills for successful collaboration (Kamens, 1997). In a study in which teachers received training in collaboration, Evans (1991) found that cooperation as a work style results in higher personal achievement, higher self esteem and more positive relationships at work. Walther-Thomas, Korinck, and McLaughlin (1999) agree that collaboration is a worthy goal. However, collaborative relationships in schools are difficult to develop and even more challenging to maintain.
because of competing priorities, limited resources, and lack of professional development.

The focus of the model they present is on the professional side of collaboration and describes support structures available to assist professionals in their work with students. They explore some fundamental features that foster the development of collaborative relationships and, in a broader sense, collaborative communities. They also present mechanisms for accessing and improving collaborative support networks. Some of the problems and barriers they found include lack of administrative support, inadequate professional development, resistance to change, imbalance in classroom rosters and specialists schedules, and limited planning time. They recommend perseverance and ongoing problem solving to help teams collaborate effectively to promote students' success.

Theoretical Rationale

Teacher candidates participate in field experiences at K-12 schools early on in their teacher certification programs at colleges and universities. Many are placed in inclusive, co-taught settings but have little experience in how to work in that setting. College and universities that provide teacher candidates with models of co-teaching can provide working examples of how to co-teach in inclusive classrooms. Experience in a co-taught environment can increase teacher candidates' awareness of the roles and responsibilities implicit in a co-teaching relationship.

In the language of teaching and learning, "teaching by example" is generally referred to as modeling (Jay, 2002). Through explicit teacher modeling, the teacher can provide teacher candidates with a clear idea of a skill or strategy by providing a visual, auditory, tactile, and/or kinesthetic instructional techniques while thinking aloud. Jay
states that, in order for teachers to learn complex ways of teaching, they must be able to
form new images and come to understand them in meaningful ways (2001).

Bandura’s Social Learning Theory emphasizes the importance of
observing and modeling the behaviors, attitudes and emotional reactions of others.
Bandura (1997) states, “Most human behavior is learned observationally through
modeling: from observing others one forms ideas of how new behaviors are
performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for
action” (p.22). Some of Bandura’s principles include: the highest level of
observational learning is achieved by organizing and rehearsing the modeled
behavior symbolically and then enacting it overtly; coding modeled behavior into
words, labels, or images, results in better retention than by simple observation;
individuals are more likely to adopt a modeled behavior if it results in outcomes
they value.

Bandura was able to demonstrate through a variety of experiments that the
application of consequences was not necessary for learning to take place.
Learning could occur through the simple processes of observing someone else’s
activity. Bandura’s best known experiment was called the “Bobo Doll” studies.
Bandura showed that children (ages 3 to 6) would change their behavior by
simply watching others. Bandura formulated his findings, which combine a
cognitive view and an operant view of learning, in a four step pattern.

1. Attention—the individual notices something in the environment

2. Retention—the individual remembers what was noticed
3. Reproduction—the individual produces an action that is a copy of what was noticed.

4. Motivation—the environment delivers a consequence that changes the probability the behavior will be emitted again (reinforcement and punishment).

In the research study, faculty modeled co-teaching strategies for teacher candidates. Modeling provided candidates the opportunity to observe the co-teaching faculty performing regular duties of a co-teaching team. It provided them with the opportunity to "watch it in action" and then dialogue about what they saw and how to reproduce it. The faculty made thinking visible to the teacher candidates using a "think aloud" method during the learning experience. Teacher candidates observed how it feels to participate in a class where the instructors believe in and use the strategies they teach. One way of understanding the influence of implicit modeling is through social learning theory, which suggests that "positive modeling influences can simultaneously change observers' behavior, thought patterns, emotional reactions and evaluations" (Bandura, 1986).

Statement of Purpose

The dissertation topic the author selected examined the modeling of co-teaching for teacher education courses at the undergraduate level. The focus was on a course devoted specifically to co-teaching practices and other forms of collaboration that prepare future teachers for inclusive classroom settings. According to Cook and Friend, "Co-teaching occurs when two or more professionals jointly deliver substantive instruction to a diverse, or blended, group of students in a single physical space" (Cook and Friend, 1995, p.1).
Co-teaching means both professionals are coordinating and delivering substantive instruction, and both teachers have active roles (Gately and Gately, 2001). It does not mean two adults are just present in a classroom at the same time or that the general education teacher plans and delivers all the lessons while the special education teacher circulates. Co-teaching allows teachers to better meet the diverse needs of students with a lower teacher-student ratio and expands the professional expertise applied to student needs (Hourcade and Bauwens, 1995).

There are advantages and disadvantages of co-teaching. The main advantage is that teacher candidates get to observe two experienced faculty teachers planning and teaching together. The presence of different practicing teachers with diverse styles and strengths lets teacher candidates get twice the support, resources and feedback. It is beneficial having a second teacher in the room to plan, manage behavior, and share ideas and resources to meet the varied needs of the teacher candidates. Some disadvantages to co-teaching are that some teachers are more comfortable working alone and putting another teacher in the room can be challenging when forced. Co-teaching requires communication and a working partnership between the teaching professionals and administration. Both teachers have to share a common philosophy and approach to the instructional process. Lack of a common planning time can prove to be a disadvantage if teachers are unable to meet, prepare and plan ahead (Zigmond and Magiera, 2001). Researchers argue that there is little evidence that inclusive classrooms are more effective placements for students with special needs than others. Zigmond (2003) states that, "Where should students with disabilities be educated?" is the wrong question to ask, that it is antithetical to the kind of individualized planning that should be embodied in
decision making for and with students with disabilities. Zigmond calls for conducting more research so that progress can be made on improving results for students with disabilities (2003).

When considering co-teaching, educators have a broad range of models to choose from. These models may be used simultaneously or individually depending on the students' needs. The models outlined by McLeskey and Waldron (1996) are as follows:

1. Each teacher chooses the specific information to teach to a small group or whole class.

2. The general education teacher delivers the content while the special education teacher teaches skills groups for reinforcement or remediation.

3. Each teacher instructs a group until mastery is attained.

4. One teacher delivers the information while the second teacher provides additional information and paraphrasing when needed.

5. One teacher works with individual students using alternative techniques and methods.

6. Teachers take turns teaching a low performing small group.

7. One teacher delivers academic information while the second teacher works on reinforcing social, behavioral and organizational skills.

Teachers must follow several procedures before commencing their co-teaching. The general education and special education teachers must collaborate and establish protocols for behavioral rules and techniques for handling discipline problems, and determine individual responsibilities such as evaluation and goals for instruction and students. Planning time is essential for creating schedules, deciding which methods of
instruction to employ and which co-teaching models will be used for each lesson (McLeskey and Waldron, 1996). These considerations are applicable to the research study the author conducted as they provide examples of procedures to use before implementing co-teaching. The researcher can avoid some of the pitfalls by creating a partnership with the co-teacher to create protocols, procedures and designate duties, roles and responsibilities.

Gately and Gately (2001) describe eight components of the co-teaching relationship and provide examples of what the teacher interactions of that component may resemble at each of the developmental stages of co-teaching: the beginning stage, the compromise stage and the collaborative stage. The eight components are:

1. Interpersonal Communication
2. Physical Arrangement
3. Familiarity with the Curriculum
4. Curriculum Goals and Modifications
5. Instructional Planning
6. Instructional Presentation
7. Classroom Management
8. Assessment

Teachers show uneven development across all the components. Teachers were more proficient at some components rather than others. Identifying the developmental level for each component helps teachers set specific goals that will let them move more quickly to the next developmental level. The authors present the Co-teaching Rating Scale (CtRS), an assessment tool used to identify a profile of strengths and weaknesses in
a co-teaching classroom. It can be used to develop appropriate objectives for co-teachers and helps them to focus on areas that need improvement. These considerations were applicable to the research study the author was conducting by providing an example of a tool the researcher could employ. It was an effective tool to start building a common vocabulary around co-teaching and collaboration.

Friend, Cook and Reising (1993) describe similar teaching structures for co-teaching in inclusive delivery models. The five teaching structures are:

1. **One teaches, one assists**- Both general education teacher and regular education teacher are present but one, often the general education teacher, takes the lead. The other teacher “drifts” around the room to assist students.

2. **Station teaching**- The teachers divide the content to be delivered and each teacher takes responsibility for a part of it. Some students may work independently and eventually all students will participate in all the “stations.”

3. **Parallel teaching**- Teachers will jointly plan instruction but each deliver it to half of the group.

4. **Alternative teaching**- One teacher instructs the large group while the other teacher works with a small group of students to pre-teach, re-teach, supplement, or enrich.

5. **Team teaching**- Both teachers share the instruction of general and special education students. They may alternate leading a discussion, demonstrate concepts or learning strategies, and model appropriate question-asking or conflict resolution.
The research used the Friend, Cook and Reising (1993) model which is consistent with the model currently used in the special education undergraduate methods course where the study took place. This delivery model is probably the most well known and frequently used.

Problem Statement

School law and implementation of inclusive practices have impacted how special education services are delivered and with whom special education and general education teachers instruct in elementary classrooms today. Inclusion continues to be a major challenge for most schools across the country. One reason is that the current classroom teachers were trained to either work in general education classrooms or in special education classrooms. Not many general education teachers have had any coursework in special education and few special educators have been trained in teaching in large group settings or have expertise in all the content areas.

There is great debate about the effectiveness of inclusion and whether students identified with special needs have equal or greater success in inclusive classrooms than resource rooms or "pull out" settings. The difficulty is that few teachers have been adequately trained to work collaboratively or to teach in co-teaching situations (Pugach and Johnson, 2002).

To date, research efforts have focused primarily on co-teaching experiences from the elementary school setting, and co-teachers' perspectives of those elementary classrooms, but few are from a college faculty perspective. Little is known about how higher education faculty negotiates co-teaching as a way to teach and promote co-teaching. The autoethnographic methods study describes the experiences of two
instructors in a school of education who co-taught for the first time in a course devoted to co-teaching among other collaboration topics. The study took place during the spring 2008 semester in an undergraduate special education methods course. One section of the course, which is traditionally taught by a single instructor, was instead taught by two instructors. The purpose of the study was to explore through the collection of multiple data the impressions and experiences of co-teaching faculty regarding how they prepared teacher candidates for inclusive settings.

Significance of the Study

A study that is somewhat similar to the area of research of examining how higher education faculty negotiates co-teaching as a way to teach co-teaching is by Kluth and Straut (2003). They studied collaborative teaching and shared the outcomes of their experiences researching how collaborative teaching in higher education courses impacts students in preservice courses. Specifically they were interested in how students understand collaboration as a result of their classes and eventually out in the field. The following study differs from Kluth and Straut's (2003) in the way that it examined co-teaching first hand through the lens of the instructors using autoethnographic methods. Kluth and Straut (2003) share, “Studies in this area are nonexistent, and research is needed to uncover why and how we should continue developing collaborative models in college and university teacher preparation programs.” (p. 238). If successful inclusion means that all students are progressing toward their individualized goals, then how can schools effectively address the varied and demanding needs of the inclusive classroom?

Marilyn Friend (2002) shared the following:
All preservice and in-service teachers should have knowledge and skills that contribute to effective collaboration. For example, preservice teachers should learn and experience in their initial training the concept that “effective teachers work together.” Thus, they should work with partners and in small groups in their methods classes and they should reflect on the advantages and potential problems of working with colleagues. In field experiences and student teaching, they should have opportunities to watch effective collaboration among experienced educators, and they should discuss what makes the interactions effective and how they could do the same. (p. 225)

Research Question

A review of the recent research on preparing teachers for inclusion by using a co-teaching faculty model yields minimal information relevant to the experiences of the co-teaching faculty and what they do to prepare teachers. Because of the lack of information related to how faculty experience co-teaching, this study proposed the following question: What are the experiences of two co-teaching faculty members assigned to teach pre-service teacher candidates the methods of co-teaching in elementary classrooms?

Limitations of the Study

The first limitation of the study is personal bias of the participant observer and the danger of her becoming a supporter of the group being studied. This was mitigated by time constraints of the study and little opportunities to discuss, promote, or support the project while participating in it simultaneously. The second limitation was that I as the participant observer may not have sufficient time to take notes as a direct observer might. This was mitigated by recording all sessions with videotape and reviewing for checks and
reliability. The third limitation was lack of control over the data collection environment. The equipment we used was videotape and audiotape. The Office of Information Technology provided a tutorial on working the equipment which mitigated recording difficulties.

Definitions of Key Terms

The definitions of key terms defined below are those operational definitions that the researcher used in application to the research study. The term 'collaboration' is widely used but not often understood. Friend, an educator and writer is an advocate for preparing preservice and inservice teachers as well as administrators and related personnel for roles in an effective collaborative practice. Friend (1995) states:

The word collaboration is used indiscriminately in school settings. It seems that every school mission statement mentions collaboration, that every group that meets is called a collaborative team, that every classroom in which two educators are responsible for instruction is called collaborative. Collaboration is claimed across audiences (e.g., parents, paraprofessionals, volunteers, student teachers), across activities (e.g., conferencing, teaming, assessing), and across settings (e.g., school-university partnerships, school-business partnerships, school-agency partnerships). But merely saying the word is not necessarily the same as carrying out the action. Collaboration requires commitment on the part of each individual to a shared goal, demands careful attention to communication skills, and obliges participants to maintain parity throughout their interactions. (p. 130)

Team teaching as defined by Learner.org is an instructional approach in which two or more instructors are jointly responsible for course content, presentations, and
grading; they may interact in front of the class, discussing specific topics from divergent perspectives, and take turns presenting material appropriate to their individual areas of specialization. (http://www.learner.org/channel/workshops/artsineveryclassroom/p?popup=s/vocabulary.html)

According to the St. John Fisher School of Education (2006-2007) Student Teaching Handbook, teacher candidate is defined as an undergraduate or graduate student enrolled in a teacher education program at St. John Fisher. For this study the use of the term teacher candidate is to refer to only those students enrolled in an undergraduate teacher education program at St. John Fisher.

Preservice education is defined as the programs at institutions of higher education (typically through schools or colleges of education) that prepare new teachers for grades K-12, according to The Glossary of Education Terms provided by the National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Additional terms used by the author are definitions provided by NCATE in their 2006 Revisions to the Unit Standards. NCATE defines best practices as the techniques or methodologies that, through experience and research, have proven to lead reliably to a desired result. They also define Clinical Faculty as P-12 school personnel and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. The researcher has adopted the NCATE terms which are consistent with the research setting in the School of Education.
Conclusion

This chapter introduced the research topic by briefly describing the problems preservice educators face as they prepare teacher candidates for teaching in inclusive settings. It includes a problem statement, significance of the study, statement of purpose, research questions, limitations and definitions of key terms. The dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter one presented the background of the study and research problem. Chapter two annotates the findings of the relevant literature related to the topic of co-teaching in higher education and its impact on preservice teachers. Chapter three describes the study setting and methods of research and data analysis. The results of the research are presented in chapter four. Chapter five discusses the results as presented in chapter four and makes suggestions and recommendations.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction and Purpose

This review of the literature examines empirical and descriptive studies related to:

a) co-teaching in the college or university setting and b) co-teaching in inclusive K-12 school settings. In order to conduct a comprehensive review of the relevant scholarly literature, the researcher consulted electronic databases, including Academic Search Premier, ERIC-EbscoHost, PsychINFO, WilsonSelectPlus, JSTOR, and ProQuestEducationJournals/WilsonEduAbs. Additionally, the search process included consulting research journals including Remedial and Special Education, Teacher Education and Special Education, Teaching Exceptional Children, The Journal of Special Education, and Exceptional Children.

To date, research efforts have focused primarily on co-teaching experiences from the elementary school setting and co-teachers’ perspectives of those elementary classrooms, but few are from a college faculty perspective, specifically related to the preparation of teachers for inclusive classrooms. Little is known about how higher education faculty negotiates and presents co-teaching as a way to teach and promote co-teaching for preservice teacher candidates.

Topic Analysis

College and university studies using co-teaching. Creating classrooms where teacher candidates can see two college faculty modeling co-teaching provides an opportunity to witness collaborative models first hand and discuss how co-teaching is
negotiated. Darling-Hammond (1994) suggests that preservice teachers should be placed in college and university programs similar to the tested medical models or teaching hospitals: learning experiences that can provide rigorous study, dialogue with master teachers, and in-depth interactions with children, families, and colleagues. These clinical experiences would engage preservice teachers in problem solving, observations, and studies of student learning, which would enable them to develop into reflective practitioners. Teacher candidates need time to reflect on the various roles and responsibilities teachers have in inclusive classrooms. My research study was an autoethnographic study of a preservice course that included modeling, and reflective dialogue, defining the roles and responsibilities of co-teaching by college faculty in a teacher education program, attempting to foster recommended practices for co-teaching in teacher candidates.

A similar description of one collaborative partnership to the research has been written by Kluth and Straut (2003). They are two professors in a pre-service, inclusive teacher education program in upstate New York. They implemented a collaborative model of teaching for four consecutive semesters. One specializes in the area of significant disabilities and the other has expertise in general education curriculum and instruction. Their model was developed and implemented in two core courses they taught collaboratively. They believed that by providing a collaborative model for candidates, they would be preparing teachers to function in diverse and progressive classrooms. They focused on offering general education and special education perspectives to candidates as they developed understandings of teaching and learning in their university methods courses.
After hours of co-planning for their shared classes and developing materials and activities for their students, Kluth and Straut (2003) found the following:

Although there are clearly many interesting and enjoyable elements of our collaborative partnership, teaching about and modeling co-teaching and an interdisciplinary curriculum are the primary reasons we continue to team and work together. We feel it is important to have class discussions about how we have planned course sessions, how we negotiate roles in our collaboration, how the courses were designed, and why we think our decisions are important for making our classroom more motivating, stimulating, and suitable for college students with a range of needs and strengths (p. 237).

Both Kluth and Straut acknowledge that they are in a unique situation where there are few barriers to their collaboration. They teach in a program that stresses practices and values of inclusive education and they have administrative support for their work. They clearly understand that many colleagues in their own university as well as other institutions of higher education nationwide are interested in co-teaching, but struggle to do so because of social, logistical, or ideological difficulties. They shared that their collaborative model may be impossible to replicate or that it might even be inappropriate in certain settings. This reality parallels the logistical difficulties with co-teachers in K-12 schools. Teacher preparation programs can incorporate discussions of these difficulties into the preservice education curriculum. Co-teaching not only benefited their students by providing modeling of the desired teaching practices, they also found that co-teaching revealed the inner workings of collaboration and for them it was a pleasurable and rewarding experience. Despite some of the struggles and difficulty experiencing it at that
level they found that by discussing it openly with preservice teachers, the teacher educators are not only modeling but providing rich insights into what it takes to co-teach. Capturing these rich insights was a part of the data collection in the study. These insights may benefit both teaching faculty and the preservice teachers in their courses today and in the future.

Kluth and Straut (2003) share, “Nothing in our collaborative arrangement requires additional resources. Because it does require creative thinking about the use of time and space, however, we encourage those interested in collaboration to look for university administrators and colleagues for help in constructing new ways of doing business” (p.237). Without the support of faculty and staff and the overall organization, a collaborative effort will not succeed. Resources must be devoted to new collaborative programs, and administrators need to be supportive of collaboration financially and operationally.

Kluth and Straut (2003) teach about diverse classrooms and present teaching strategies and models that can be replicated in the elementary education environments in which their students will eventually teach. The researchers would often implement various teaming structures that optimize expertise, increase interactions with students, and offer concrete models to observe and assess as students develop their own teaching styles. The co-teaching structures most often used were those based on the work of Cook and Friend (1995) and included parallel teaching, station teaching, and one teach and one assist teaching.

Feedback shared from course evaluations and the researcher’s own experiences recommended providing a variety of collaboration models in the course. The feedback
suggested making collaborations transparent by modeling the good, the bad, and the ugly of collaborative work. Students were expected to see the different delivery models that adults could interact within and the varied roles they could assume. One professor would model being the primary instructor for the lesson, and, at other times, would function as the floating instructor in a mini-lecture, or as a support person for the primary instructor.

Kluthe and Straut (2003) shared the following:

We found that students were most likely to use the collaboration models that they saw and experienced in the university classroom, in their own practice. We discussed with students the various roles that they see us play in the classroom. Dialogue focused on how we structured our time without doubling our load, how we set up systems that support communication about student progress, and how to cope with the stress of shared responsibilities. These are all essential elements of collaboration that we hope will help preservice teachers become effective co-teachers when they leave our program. Students it seems will be better prepared to co-teach and therefore function as effective teachers in inclusive education settings, if we teach about and model progressive practices. In other words, we believe teacher educators must both say and do when educating students about inclusive schooling, co-teaching, and other types of collaboration (pg. 236).

Recommendations by Kluthe and Straut. (2003) are to continue to conduct research in this area and particularly to explore how student learning is affected when college teachers co-teach and engage in other types of collaboration; how co-teaching and collaboration in the classroom affects student behaviors, actions, and decisions in the field; and what aspects of instructor collaboration (e.g., co-teaching, co-planning).
integrated curriculum, shared assessment) have the biggest effect on student behaviors and decisions related to co-teaching, Kluth and Straut (2003) demonstrate the effectiveness of co-teaching in a preservice education program as a way to support candidate understanding of the co-teaching process; however, because their efforts were limited to their informal reflections and preservice teacher course evaluations, we continue to lack an understanding of the co-teaching experience. The research served to address that gap. Their work differs from my research study in that it is not a research study but a description of a collaborative model used at a university setting. The two professors discussed how collaborative teaching in higher education courses impacted the teacher candidates in their preservice courses and how future studies were recommended to collect data. It is not an examination of the teaching faculty perspective however, although they provide many insights as to what they experienced.

Another study that examines a collaborative model where a general education faculty member and a special education faculty member deliver coursework through a teaming model is called, “collaborative infusion” by Voltz (2005). “Collaborative infusion is defined as an approach that “infuses” special education content throughout a teacher preparation program, rather than housing it in a separate course. Special education faculty and general education faculty deliver the coursework through a teaming model. Voltz examined the use of collaborative infusion approaches in teacher preparation programs across the country. A national survey was conducted of 432 four-year institutions of higher education that include both special education and general education teacher preparation programs. The survey solicited responses from participants regarding demographic information about their teacher preparation programs and
information regarding the primary manner in which special education content was delivered in their general education teacher preparation programs. Follow up interviews were also conducted of those willing to participate. The results of the survey reported that few respondents participating in this study reported that any of their teacher preparation programs relied solely on collaborative infusion approaches as a means of delivering special education content to general education majors. However, considerably more reported that collaborative infusion approaches were used in conjunction with other methods such as a separate class or infusion by general education faculty working alone. Meaning they would bring in the content but not use a teaming approach. Voltz (2005) states, while the separate course approach remains the single most dominant method of delivering special education content, many of those surveyed indicated that their programs did not rely solely on this method. This finding suggests that many programs across the country are seeking ways to integrate special education and regular education content throughout teacher preparation programs. Many colleges and universities are beginning to look at models that are research-based and encourage two professors to co-teach. Innovation, flexibility and a willingness to collaborate between departments of literacy education, adolescence education and childhood and special education can be ways to build partnerships and utilize the expertise of others.

In the surveys, it appeared that a number of factors enhanced the success of these collaborative infusion models. These included time for on-going planning during implementation, a shared understanding of desired outcomes between both faculty, and a shared vision of what their teaming should look like, and who should be involved in the
process. Many of these factors are the same challenges found in K-12 teacher collaborations in inclusive classrooms.

The studies thus far have discussed and demonstrate that co-teaching in preservice education courses are an effective means for helping candidates develop a realistic understanding of the strengths and challenges of the co-teaching model (Kluth and Straut, 2003), and that co-teaching in preservice programs is an emerging trend (Voltz, 2005).

The research of Hwang and Hernandez (2002) also show the growing awareness of co-teaching as an effective pedagogical tool in Institutions of Higher Education. Hwang and Hernandez (2002) organized a collaborative practice model and conducted research where they examined elementary teacher education students' thoughts, feelings and attitudes about university co-teaching. The researchers gathered data through formal and informal evaluations, overall perceptions of team teaching approaches and the students understanding of course concepts and learning environments. The method was adopted by a junior and a senior faculty member at California State University at San Bernardino.

The co-teaching effort was organized in a collegial structure where both professors worked together to teach an educational psychology course. They researched the topic of team teaching and committed to following a model designed by Bennett, Ishler, and O’Laughlin (1992). They met once a week over the winter quarter to plan the team teaching course. After reviewing the curriculum, they specified goals and objectives and designed the syllabus, and course projects. Schedules were coordinated based upon the expertise of each faculty member. Both were present in every class and formal and informal evaluations were administered.
The participants included 24 elementary teacher education students. The researchers used semi-structured interviews to gather the participants’ perceptions. A demographic survey was also administered at the end of the quarter. The results showed a dramatic change in the participants’ thoughts and feelings about teaching over time. Approximately 80% of the participants responded with negative feelings and thoughts about team teaching ideas at the beginning of the course. At the end of the quarter, approximately 88% of participants responded with positive feelings and thoughts about team teaching ideas. Many students attributed the team teaching approach to their better understanding of the content presented in class. (p. 249).

The results also showed that the majority of the participants felt that having two instructors affected the classroom environment and their understanding not only of course contents, but of environments and evaluation. While the results were mostly positive, the neutral and negative responses to the evaluation issues accounted for 50% of the responses. Hwang and Hernandez state that a great deal remains to be researched before we have a full understanding of how teacher candidates feel about team teaching.

Another study demonstrating a teaching partnership was conducted by Sprague and Pennell (2000). Sprague and Pennell (2000), two university faculty members at Christopher Newport University and school personnel at a Middle School in Newport News, Virginia, created a pilot preparation program for preservice teachers with a focus on inclusive classrooms. This was a result of feedback from program graduates feeling ill-prepared for the inclusive settings they were being employed in as novice teachers. The two institutions had a history of successful partnerships where students and teachers both benefited. University students received information about collaborative teaching
presented by teachers who were actually doing it. During the workshop teachers addressed practical strategies for planning and co-teaching. They demonstrated different co-teaching strategies, had the preservice students engage in a co-planning role play, and advocated the practice of collaborative teaching. The successful results showed that a concerted effort to prepare preservice teachers for the reality of today's teaching can be enhanced when schools and universities work together.

Sprague and Pennell (2000) shared that regular and special education teachers felt that they were being stretched in their professional capacity as models for entering teachers. Teachers enjoyed the opportunity to share the knowledge and experience they had gained. The university professor had opportunities to tie the theories and facts about special education to real practices observed in the classroom. Recommendations for improving the course included more time for observations and time for teachers to discuss adaptations. This research supports greater preparation for preservice teachers in the area of co-teaching and inclusive practices.

A study that attempted to improve teacher preparation and involved collaboration within a K-12 school was conducted by Bakken, Clark and Thompson (1998). Bakken, Clark and Thompson (1998) used collaborative teaching methods to meet the varied demands of teaching in a Professional Development School. One of the major dimensions of the school is that it conducts university courses onsite at the public school in an attempt to improve teacher preparation programs and build partnerships with area schools. In response to fieldwork requirements and the need for integrating content within a tight schedule, they used a collaborative approach to plan and instruct three courses. Each professor represented a different discipline and provided an example of
integrated curricula for teacher education. The team included two professors from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, who taught the multicultural education and special education courses; and one from Educational Psychology, who taught the human development course. They co-taught the content of the three disciplines (multicultural education, special education and educational psychology) in a four hour time frame. The perceptions and feedback from the course evaluations and their own assessments found the experience to be beneficial. The researchers found that the professors all experienced personal and professional growth, and gained respect for each other’s life experiences, personalities and knowledge of their field. Students stated that they saw the benefits that co-teaching had to offer. Instruction was less fragmented and they were able to see how library skills, reading, writing and speaking could overlap and be integrated into every curriculum.

According to Bakken, et al. (1998) the content of the three courses was not only taught, but integrated into the curriculum, so that students could see the weaving of growth and development, multicultural knowledge, and awareness of exceptionalities. This integration of content would help to prepare candidates for diverse classrooms. Although many of their decisions produced successful teaching and learning experiences there was a need for more meetings to occur to make them effective. They were committed to openness toward ideas, contributions and critiques. The professors freely discussed goals, decided which team member would lead during each topic, and worked well as a team. Decisions were based on areas of expertise. Each person’s skills and contributions were highlighted and acknowledged. Each professor taught in their specific discipline as they would in traditional teaching style and then two or three teachers led
discussions or presented information together. As they used collaborative or cooperative teaching approaches they collected their own self reflections from each experience as data.

As a result of their experiences the professors have committed to teaching this way again with revisions and an evaluation procedure in place. This study provided a method of collecting reflections of the faculty as they collaborate in a college setting. It provided the researcher with examples of some of the challenges and opportunities of creating a co-teaching model in a college university setting. It also showed the advantages of having more than one faculty member teaching and the added expertise it can bring. It differs from the research performed in that it was not conducted as a formal research study and they co-taught the content of three disciplines. The research performed focused on the content of one course with two instructors: one being from the special education faculty and one being from the childhood general education faculty.

Ford, Pugach, and Otis-Wilborn (2001) created a set of shared core values and design principles focused on preparing teacher candidates for urban schools as a collaborative partnership between special and regular education faculty. This was a result of a grass roots teacher education reform effort for the primary/middle grades at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Creation of the restructured preservice program was predicated on the core commitments that candidates upon graduation will embrace their responsibilities to work with students with disabilities in urban schools and be well prepared to do so by the end of their preservice experience.

Through extensive dialogue the faculty began a restructuring process based on the seven core values. This resulting program became known as The Collaborative Teacher
Education Program for Urban Communities (CTEPUC). The program moved beyond the mainstreaming course and provided teacher candidates with a more integrative and cumulative experience in working with learners with disabilities.

Ford et al. (2001) found that the teaching contexts where the teacher candidates would practice were changing. Classrooms were becoming more collaborative and inclusive. A dual certification program was considered in which teacher candidates would receive both a general and a special education license. This was rejected due to the belief that it did not adequately honor either the specialized expertise special education teachers should have or the time it would take to prepare a new teacher fully for both roles. The notion of moving to a five year program was also rejected due to length of program and teacher candidates work loads.

Several of the CTEPUC program features were created and implemented deliberately to connect teacher preparation for general and special education. Teacher candidates move through their coursework and field experiences in cohort groups and enroll in blocks of courses in a prescribed sequence. Faculty across departments who teach in these program blocks work as an integrated team. The team coordinates their teaching, participate in performance assessments, and contribute to continuous program improvement through regular meetings. The program defined the roles and responsibilities of both the general and special education teachers as well as where their roles overlap and how to best use their differentiated expertise.

A large component was a high presence of special education faculty throughout the four program blocks. Special education faculty participate directly either by teaching the linking seminar or by engaging in some level of co-teaching, particularly in courses in
literacy and on issues of curricular and behavior management accommodations during the student teaching semester. Graduates of the Collaborative Program now enter the profession with the experience of working in collaborative teams. The implementation of the program was not without challenges. Some of the clinical placements that teacher candidates participated in were poor examples of inclusion models. Some were placements where there was an unwillingness to participate completely and roles and responsibilities were not clearly identified and defined. The authors argue for differentiation in expertise and roles, but do not wish to return to the isolated practice of special education. Ford et al. states,

The challenge is to redefine the relationship between what it means to prepare general and special education teachers. By raising our own expectations for what is possible to accomplish in programs of preservice teacher education and by continuously refining our programs in light of the quality of our graduates' work with children and youth in schools, we can begin the task of understanding our complementary roles. (p. 285)

This research provides an example of a School of Education experiencing similar organizational changes in response to preparing teachers to be able to teach students who are identified with special needs as well as those students who are not identified with special needs within the same classroom.

Tobin and Roth (2005) have been involved in the development of a new model for the education of science teachers that aims to address teacher turnover and retention, low job satisfaction, and struggles arising from cultural and ethnic diversity in urban settings. The science teacher education program at an urban university was built around a yearlong
field experience, where all prospective teachers learned to teach in an urban high school while co-teaching at the elbow of a mentor teacher or one or more peers. The model is based on two complementary fields, which the authors denote as co-teaching and cogenerative dialoguing.

Tobin and Roth (2005) state, our approach is described as “peer teaching” although this is not our preferred term. In our model those who co-teach may not be regarded as peers in terms of their teaching or other professional experience. Co-teaching is premised on the idea that by working with one or more colleagues in all phases of teaching (planning, conducting lessons, debriefing, grading), teachers learn from others without having to stop and reflect on what they are doing in the moment and why.

Initially each new teacher was assigned a mentor teacher. The two were expected to plan and teach together with the intention of improving the science learning of the students. Over the course of the year the new and mentor teachers were expected to use a model of co-generative dialogue. Co-generative dialoguing when associated with co-teaching, is a practice where co-teachers and a selection of teacher candidates reflect on a lesson they shared with an emphasis on articulating what worked well and what did not work well for the purposes of designing strategies for improvements, starting with the next lesson (Tobin and Roth, 2005). In this practice all the stakeholder groups talk about specific experiences occurring in the classroom. A typical group would consist of the co-teachers, two to three teacher candidates and frequently the college supervisor, or school administrator talking about specific lessons. The research showed that in situations where there was structural support provided by co-teaching and cogenerative dialoguing, teachers were more likely to stay in their profession. They were better prepared and felt
less isolated in urban settings. Working in a collaborative team provided a greater opportunity to dialogue with another professional and reflect on their teaching practice.

In this study the two college faculty had the opportunity to dialogue and reflect on their co-teaching practice during a course on collaboration for inclusion with undergraduate special education teacher candidates. They had the opportunity to provide support to each other, define and model their roles and responsibilities and capture what they do to foster teacher candidates to co-teach.

*K-12 studies using co-teaching.* The previous section discussed the growing awareness of the need for co-teaching in preservice teacher education courses. In order to gain a greater understanding of how to prepare future elementary school teachers for co-teaching in inclusive classrooms the researcher looked at a number of studies that used a co-teaching model in K-12 schools. These studies demonstrate some of the popular models used in K-12 school settings but also share some of the common barriers and struggles that occur during co-teaching.

A study conducted by Titone (2005) examined the knowledge teachers need for successful implementation of inclusion in K-12 schools. The participants were individuals that were experienced with inclusion. In structured focus groups, participants discussed what prospective teachers need to know and be able to do to be successful in inclusive settings. The data collected highlights the importance of teacher preparation and collaboration skills among educational professionals and parents. Participants stated that the typical role-specific teacher training models do not adequately prepare all teachers for inclusion. Titone (2005) shared that parents, staff development specialists, administrators, and teachers all perceived that special educators, through training and habit, tended to
focus on specific techniques to help individual children, while general educators focus on curriculum development and content to teach the class as a whole. Themes that emerged during the data analysis identified as the most significant were: learning to monitor one's own attitudes towards a "teaching all children approach", adapting curriculum and pedagogy, and collaborating with others.

Participants often used the term "teaming" to describe collaboration. For these participants, teaming involved two teachers (especially the general education teacher and the special education teacher) taking the initiative to plan and work together for the benefit of their students with special needs. Recommendations that emerged from the study included changes in courses and field experiences in preservice teacher education and suggestions for enhancing adaptations to curriculum and instruction such as planning, curriculum mapping, clarification and articulation of professional roles and use of student observations for assessment. Titone (2005) recommends that schools of education establish a team-teaching system so that faculty teaching general education classes will work with special education faculty. This will set up opportunities for general education faculty to practice and demonstrate skills in collaboration as they solidify their own knowledge of how to adapt curriculum and pedagogy. Titone (2005) states, "A spirit of collaboration must be passed on to preservice teachers, not only by studying and talking about it but also by modeling it" (p. 12).

Wood (1998) investigated teachers' perceptions of their educational roles and collaborative teaching efforts in elementary inclusive classrooms. Semi-structured interviews were used in this qualitative study regarding collaboration, roles and communication. Three educational teams comprised of a general education teacher,
special education teacher and included student were interviewed and audio taped at the beginning of the school year and then three more additional times throughout the school year. The research sites were inclusive classrooms in elementary school programs within a central California coastal school district serving approximately 5,500 students within 11 elementary schools. To insure validation and trustworthiness, triangulation of data and peer debriefing were included.

The findings showed that in the initial stages of inclusion, teachers maintained discrete role boundaries through a clear division of labor. As the year progressed, role perceptions became less rigid and teaming became more cooperative. The group's eventual ability to diminish role distinctions and form more cooperative alliances at the end of the school year had implications for the success of their inclusion programs and local training efforts. Inclusion demands that both special education and general education teachers work together. The author states that it is imperative to restructure preservice and inservice teacher training programs to provide a shared language and shared philosophies among teachers regarding inclusion. Wood recommends a greater awareness of the inherent difficulties in role change, a need for empowerment, a clear and well articulated mission, and facilitators with familiarity of the community of learners as well as the institution and the personalities within it.

Friend (2002) shared the following about the preparation of collaborative teachers:

All preservice and inservice teachers should have knowledge and skills that contribute to effective collaboration. For example, preservice teachers should learn and experience in their initial training the concept that "effective teachers
work together.” Thus, they should work with partners and in small groups in their methods classes and they should reflect on the advantages and potential problems of working with colleagues. In field experiences and student teaching, they should have opportunities to watch effective collaboration among experienced educators, and they should discuss what makes the interactions effective and how they could do the same. (p. 225)

Collaborative relationships in schools are difficult to develop and even more challenging to maintain because of competing priorities, limited resources, and lack of professional development. However, Walther-Thomas, Korinek, and McLaughlin (1999) agree that collaboration is a worthy goal. The focus of the model they present is on the professional side of collaboration and describes support structures available to assist professionals in their work with students. They explore some fundamental features that foster the development of collaborative relationships and, in a broader sense, collaborative communities. They also present mechanisms for accessing and improving collaborative support networks. Some of the problems and barriers they found include lack of administrative support, inadequate professional development, resistance to change, imbalance in classroom rosters and specialists schedules, and limited planning time. Walther-Thomas et al. (1999) recommend perseverance and ongoing problem solving to help teams collaborate effectively to promote students’ success.

A study that gained insights from students, administrators and parents about the implementation of a co-teaching model is by Luckner (1999). Luckner (1999), a professor in special education at University of Northern Colorado, conducted a qualitative study on two elementary classrooms that used a co-teaching approach to
provide services to students who were identified as deaf, hard of hearing, and hearing. The classes were co-taught by general education teachers and a teacher of students who are deaf or hard of hearing. The study participants were 2 teachers of students who were deaf or hard of hearing, 4 general education teachers, and 2 administrators, 10 students who were deaf or hard of hearing, 10 hearing students, 5 parents of hearing children, and 5 parents of children with a hearing loss. Two administrators, one general education principal and one special education administrator, who supervised the services for students in the district, were interviewed. The author used observations and a series of semi-structured interviews with students, administrators and parents. The purpose of the study was to take an in-depth look at co-teaching as it was being implemented in an educational setting and to build a literature base that would permit other professionals to examine this approach for students who are identified as deaf or hard of hearing.

An inductive analysis was used to examine the data and then coded into meaningful insights, themes and patterns using a constant comparison method. Analyses of the two co-teaching classrooms from the data revealed seven sub themes about co-teaching. These sub themes are:

1. Co-teaching can benefit students and teachers.
2. Students are exposed to age appropriate content responsibilities, and study skills.
3. Students acquire communication skills.
4. A sense of belonging, specialness, and community exist.
5. Co-teaching is time consuming and increases work demands.
6. Teachers need strong interpersonal skills and a commitment to the relationship.

7. Not everyone shares the same language.

The information obtained in the study suggests that co-teaching may be a beneficial alternative delivery model for some students who are deaf or hard of hearing, as well as for teachers. Six recommendations were made for other professionals who are implementing co-teaching. They included co-teaching relationships should be voluntary and not mandated, teachers should start small while in the experimental stage of co-teaching, secure a classroom that is on neutral ground and not one already belonging to one teacher and participate in ongoing professional development to meet the ongoing co-teaching teams needs.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there are many experts in the field of education who support co-teaching and collaborative practice in schools, colleges and university settings. Research data indicates that preservice teachers benefit from participating in classrooms where collaboration methods of co-teaching are modeled and discussed. There is current research on preparing teachers for co-teaching but there is little written on what the experience is like from the “inside” or from the co-teaching faculty perspective in colleges and universities. Kluth and Straut (2003) provided a description between a special education professor and a general education professor. It included details about the model as well as information related to their integrated curriculum and assessments and offered recommendations for those considering co-teaching partnerships in higher education institutions. Research conducted by Voltz (1997) analyzed and compared
perceptions of a national sample of general and special education teacher educators of actual and ideal emphases placed on specific collaborative roles in teacher preparation programs. The findings of the study suggested that that greater emphasis should be placed on the collaborative roles in teacher preparation programs. Kamens (1997) analyzed and described a model in which student teachers are placed in collaborative situation at a participating elementary school. Teachers were called upon to implement school programs through collaborative work, particularly in the field of special education (Kamens, 1997). The literature indicates that for teachers to successfully work together they need to acquire the experience and skills necessary to collaborate early in their teacher preparation programs. The amount of research on the topic of elementary classroom collaborative practice and inclusion is vast but research with the focus on the examination of higher education practice is not prevalent.

The researcher proposed to answer this question following the study: What are the experiences of two co-teaching faculty members assigned to teach pre-service teacher candidates the methods of co-teaching in elementary classrooms?
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

Introduction

This qualitative autoethnographic methods study was initially designed as a case study but adjustments were made as it became more aligned with the design of an autoethnography, where I, acting as a full member in the research group or setting, engaged in a continuous cycle of data collection (Anderson, 2006). The study was conducted during the Spring 2008 semester, co-teaching a course titled Collaboration for Inclusion, which provided an opportunity to capture the experiences of two co-teaching faculty, Marlene and me, as we taught pre-service candidates the methods of co-teaching. In this narrative, I present a qualitative research design and methodology based on the research problem identified in my dissertation study. Qualitative research allows the researcher to make knowledge claims based on constructivist perspectives or participatory perspectives (Creswell, 2003). The narrative includes a research context, research participants, and the instruments used for data collection and analysis.

Perspective and Problem Statement

This qualitative autoethnographic methods study began with a case study design to describe the experiences of two instructors in a school of education who were co-teaching for the first time in a course devoted to collaboration for inclusion. In that one of the instructors was also the researcher, the implementation of the study took on elements of autoethnography (Anderson, 2006) and action research (McTaggart, 2004). The study took place during the spring 2008 semester in an undergraduate special education...
methods course. The research offered the teacher candidates an opportunity to see first hand the modeling of co-teaching practices and how they may adapt those lessons and experiences when working with children identified with special needs. The study explored through the collection of multiple data the impressions and experiences of the two co-teaching faculty regarding how they prepare teacher candidates for inclusive settings. These impressions and experiences framed themes that Marlene and I as co-teachers implemented and demonstrated in order to teach about co-teaching.

A case study design was originally selected as the most appropriate method for this research because case studies allow for a detailed, in-depth data collection over time using multiple sources of information (Creswell, 1998). The case study method allows the researcher to examine a real life situation in a holistic manner. Therefore, the intent of this case study was to examine instructional practices related to my own experience co-teaching and my perceptions and experiences in preparing teachers for inclusive settings through a systematic process of collecting and analyzing data from multiple sources. The School of Education currently does not have a practicing co-teaching model, so I sought and gained permission to act as a co-teacher in order to capture the experience.

There are a number of definitions of case study. Creswell (2002) defines it as a problem to be studied, a "case" or bounded system involving an event, activity, process, or one or more individuals; Merriam (1998) defines it as a means of investigating complex social units; and Yin (2003) defines a case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context. The researcher must consider what to study, what data is relevant, what data to collect and how to analyze the
data once collected. This helps form a blueprint for getting from the beginning of the study to the end of the study.

As the study progressed, I found myself drawing from methods more closely aligned with autoethnography and action research. Over the past fifteen years there has been an impressive growth of research that has been variously referred to as autobiographical ethnography, auto-anthropology or sociology, personal or self-narrative research and writing, and perhaps most commonly, autoethnography (Anderson, 2006).

Anderson (2006), proposes the term analytic autoethnography to refer to research in which the researcher is (1) a full member in the research group or setting, (2) visible as such a member in published texts, and (3) committed to developing theoretical understandings of broader social phenomena. According to Anderson, analytic autoethnography includes five key features: (1) complete member researcher (CMR) status- the researcher is a complete member in the social world under study, (2) analytic reflexivity- expresses researchers awareness of their necessary connection to the research situation and hence their effects upon it, (3) narrative visibility of the researchers self- the researcher is a highly visible social actor within the written text which includes feelings and experiences, (4) dialogue with informants beyond the self-calls for dialogue with ‘data’ or ‘others’, and (5) commitment to theoretical analysis- use of empirical data to gain insights into some broader set of social phenomena than those provided by the data themselves.

Anderson (2006) said, “Autoethnography must orient (at least for significant amounts of time) to documenting and analyzing action as well as to purposively engaging in it”. Although I originally defined my role as a participant observer within a case study,
The School of Education (SOE) provides programs of study for teacher candidates preparing for professional careers in education. There are four undergraduate programs and six graduate programs, one being a new doctoral program in Executive Leadership. The SOE includes programs in Adolescence Education, Childhood Education, Educational Leadership, Literacy Education, Special Education and Executive Leadership. There are twenty seven fulltime faculty and nine staff members currently employed. The Dean supervises all faculty and staff and is directly responsible for the Director of Assessment, Certification and Accreditation, Education Advisory Council, the Professional Education Unit (PEU) and Candidate Advisory Committee. The Associate Dean supervises the Director of Field Experiences and Student Teaching, the Director of Candidate Advisement and Services, and two Senior Administrative Assistants.

The SOE's Conceptual Framework is based on the theme of social justice and characterized by five tenets: diversity, compassion, knowledge, achievement, and service. The faculty is committed to modeling this philosophy in interactions with teacher candidates, colleagues and the community. To accomplish this purpose, candidates must know how and be able to: (1) provide all learners with equitable access to knowledge about themselves and the world in which they live; (2) engage in caring and effective pedagogical practices that support the acquisition of new knowledge and skills; (3) help students become independent and lifelong learners, and active participants in a social and political democracy; and (4) advocate for the interests of the students that they serve. (http://soe.sjfc.edu/about/framework.asp)

As an aspect of this advocacy role faculty and staff in the SOE have been considering moving toward a dual certification program where students will be qualified
to receive certification for both general education (1-6) and special education (1-6). This move towards an inclusive program lends itself well to a co-teaching model where the delivery is conducted by two teachers. In designing this study, I proposed that by placing two instructors in the classroom, teacher candidates would benefit from observing the model and preservice instructors would gain insights into how to better prepare teacher candidates for inclusive classrooms and collaboration. Furthermore, by conducting this study, I would be able to provide further insights into the co-teaching experience.

Currently, the Childhood and Special Education Departments within the School of Education offer a dual certification for undergraduates seeking certification in both special education and childhood education. Undergraduate students will have concluded three semesters of their required coursework and two field experiences prior to enrolling in third year education courses which includes Collaboration for Inclusion. Teacher candidates will have completed six courses in the core Childhood Education curriculum, including courses in Children's Literature; Human Exceptionalities; and Curriculum, Instructional and Assessment Strategies for Social Studies. In addition, candidates will have completed two courses in the Special Education curriculum, including Language Acquisition and Literacy Development, and Assessment and Instructional Strategies. Further, their field experience assignment gave them hands-on experience in both general education and inclusive settings. (see Appendix A)

The Collaboration for Inclusion curriculum embraces standards set forth by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), and the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI). The curriculum organizes these standards in terms of their topics, assessments.
rubrics, and learner outcomes. Topics include models of consultation, teamwork, interagency collaboration, communication skills and strategies, benefits and barriers to collaboration, and demonstration of co-teaching skills. Assessments include a collaboration project, co-teaching lesson plans and presentation, reflective journal, and professional dispositions and co-teaching lesson plan rubrics.

Collaboration for Inclusion is a course where preservice teacher candidates collaborate with others to make educational decisions regarding the curriculum, assessment, planning, instruction, and coordination of services for and with students with exceptional learning needs, and their families. Candidates participate on a self-managed educational team that co-plans and co-teaches; identifies student needs, seeks out resources, and generates possible solutions; and interdependently completes tasks and maintains the health of a team (Wischnowski, 2007). Part of the course and fieldwork requirements are that teacher candidates are assigned to work with a partner and present an assigned model of co-teaching and co-teach a lesson out in the field. Collaboration for Inclusion is preceded by the following courses; Human Exceptionalities, Language Acquisition and Literacy Development, Adaptive Technology and Assessment and Instructional Strategies and 35 hours of field experience. Courses that run concurrently with Collaboration for Inclusion are, Classroom Management, Diversity in Education, and 15 hours of field experience. Teacher candidates participate in twelve weeks of student teaching following the semester they are enrolled in Collaboration for Inclusion. Only undergraduate special education/childhood education majors who will be working towards dual certification and teaching in K-6 elementary settings are required to take Collaboration for Inclusion.
According to Cook and Friend:

Ideally, readiness for co-teaching and other collaborative approaches will be promoted in preservice programs, which also should provide some initial experiences with collaborative planning and instruction. The most intensive professional development for co-teaching will occur when teachers and other specialists are in service and have opportunities to implement what they learn (p. 13).

Currently few courses are being team taught in the School of Education. Historically, the School of Education has used a team teaching model to teach their Educational Administration courses as well as the newly developed Executive Leadership Doctoral courses. In the undergraduate methods courses in the Childhood Education and Special Education Departments, the courses have traditionally been taught by a single instructor.

Many frameworks for inclusive teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Friend, 2000; Kluth and Straut, 2003; Luckner, 1999; Sprague and Pennell, 2000) encourage schools of education to provide models of classrooms where two instructors teach one class and co-teach using inclusive collaborative practices. The following research examines two teachers that co-teach a special education undergraduate course, EDUC 440: Collaboration for Inclusion, as a co-teaching team.

Research Participants

Participants consisted of two fulltime faculty members from the Special Education and Childhood Education Departments of the School of Education. Marlene was assigned to teach two sections of the course, Collaboration for Inclusion during the
spring 2008 session. I asked permission to join her co-teaching during her Monday and Wednesday 4:00 section and she granted me permission as part of my doctoral research study.

The co-teaching team consisted of me, the researcher, and Marlene, a new faculty member in the School of Education. I am female and have been employed as a clinical faculty member in the SOE for the past four years and a past and present supervisor of student teachers in the field. I have twelve years classroom teaching experience and three years experience as a school administrator in the capacity of an assistant principal and principal and have taught the following graduate and undergraduate courses for the School of Education: Behavior Management in the Classroom, Practicum in Special Education: Small Group Instruction, Practicum in Special Education: Inclusion, Capstone Project in Special Education, Capstone Project in Literacy Education, Children’s Literature, Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment in Social Studies, Student Teaching and Seminar, Childhood, Student Teaching and Seminar, Special Education, and Methods and Assessments: Social Studies.

Marlene has been employed as an Assistant Professor in the SOE for the past year and a half. She has nine years experience in urban schools as a social studies teacher and a special education teacher at the middle school level. Marlene worked for the State Education Department as a training specialist in special education and school administrator in several capacities in a large urban district: special education coordinating administrator at the secondary level, elementary principal, supervising director of special education and student support services, and assistant superintendent. She has taught the following graduate and undergraduate courses for the School of Education: Special
Instruments Used in Data Collection

To obtain as complete a picture as possible of the participants, case study researchers employ multi-modal methods and approaches. A variety of data collection instruments are used to ensure better understanding and greater credibility of the findings (Merriam, 1998). Yin suggests six sources of evidence for data collection in the case study protocol: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation and physical artifacts. Not all need to be employed in every case study. I used a collection of these sources as evidence for data collection in this study including participant observation, interactive interviews, and field notes.

**Participant observation.** Observations are a valuable data gathering tool in case study as they occur in the natural field and provide a first hand encounter with the phenomenon of interest (Merriam, 1998). In this research, strict observation was impossible because I was involved as a complete member of the phenomenon being studied; however, participant observation provided opportunities for me to gather data as it happened and to have the ability to perceive reality from the viewpoint of someone “inside” the case rather than external to it (Yin, 1984). This mode of repeated participant observation allowed me to take on a variety of roles within the autoethnographic methods study and participate in the events being studied. The focus was on my experiences.
during the co-teaching model and how Marlene and I co-teaching constructed pedagogy to prepare teachers for collaborative settings and co-teaching.

Interactive interviews. Videotape of class sessions was collected during the spring 2008 school session. This data was collected during ten classes throughout the semester which started January 10, 2008 and ended April 26. The videotape was reviewed within the same week it was taken and used along with interactive interviews to gain insights on the co-teaching experience as they prepared teacher candidates for collaboration and inclusion.

According to Kvale, a qualitative research interview attempts to understand the world from the subjects' points of view, to unfold the meaning of peoples' experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanation. (Kvale, 1996 p.1) Anderson wrote that a central feature of autoethnography is that the researcher is a visible social actor within the written text. “The researchers own feelings and experiences are incorporated into the story and considered vital data for understanding the social world being observed” (Anderson, 2006). The research data for this study was collected ten times throughout the spring 2008 semester in order to generate narrative from Marlene and me about how we went about teaching collaboration and co-teaching. The interactive interviews were conducted while viewing the videotape of each class session to gain opinions about events and insights into certain occurrences.

A protocol was used for the interviews but remained open ended and assumed a conversational manner. Use of the Co-Teaching Rating Scale was used as springboard for reflective dialogue for the last session due to lost videotape equipment failure. The
protocol was a detailed plan for the research. It included details of the resources required, interview schedules, and field procedures. All interactive interviews were taped, transcribed and analyzed. Interactive interviews lasted approximately two hours and scheduled when convenient for both Marlene and me.

Field notes. I wrote field notes after each class, and included recording of what I observed, connections, common vocabulary, key words and phrases, and a presentation of Marlene’s and the teacher candidates views during class dialogue and social interactions. Anderson (2006) says the researchers should have enhanced textual visibility of the researcher’s self and openly discuss changes in their beliefs and relationships. According to Anderson, the researcher reveals themselves as a person grappling with issues relevant to membership and participation in a fluid rather than static world. A field notes journal was maintained that included insights, questions, ideas, and decisions made during the study. It presented a heightened visibility of my self and discussed changes Marlene and I experienced as co-teachers throughout the course.

Data Analysis

Data analysis procedures for the participant observations, videotape, and interviews included selective and open coding, categorizing, and summarizing. Charmaz (2006) states that to gain analytic insights from observations of routine actions in ordinary settings, first compare and code similar events, define subtle patterns and significant processes and then compare dissimilar events that may give you further insights. Data analysis began with identifying common classification themes and patterns from the perspective of the participants and then formulating an explanation of the major
ideas that resulted. Data was analyzed working inductively from the particulars to more general perspectives to derive themes of categories (Creswell, 1998). I identified a priori codes to name, classify and distinguish important concepts of particular observations including: planning and preparation, roles and responsibilities, rules, routines and classroom management, student assessment, and communication. These are themes adapted from Gately and Gately (2001) Co-Teaching Rating Scale. (See Appendix B)

After agreement by me and professional colleagues on the categories chosen, coding was applied to the data. Revisions were made as necessary and the categories were edited to the point that maximized exclusivity and exhaustiveness (Weber, 1990) by coding and refining themes.

One method to conduct an inductive analysis of qualitative data is the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In the constant comparative method each category of meaning selected for analysis is compared to all other categories of meaning and grouped (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). Because it is a continual evolving process, fitting a qualitative autoethnographic methods study, the constant comparative method was chosen as the process for refining categories and deriving themes for this study.

Results from the methods were reviewed and forms of interpretations such as comparing and contrasting, revealing trends and confirmation of beliefs and practices were used. Consistent with qualitative research, some data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously. Merriam (1998) affirmed the interactive nature of data collection, analysis, and reporting. Other data was collected in a simple time series fashion over time as the course progressed throughout the semester and provided insights
into the adoption of new practices. Conducting cross-checks of facts and discrepancies were used to gather additional data to verify key observations or check a fact by reviewing video and audio transcription and field notes. Stake (1995) says case study research is fraught with danger, primarily due to the problem of subjectivity when interpreting the data after it has been written. Emphasis was placed on transparent interpretation of the experiences in order to ensure trustworthiness and credibility.

The research was conducted so that others would not be able to match the results with the participants. All material were stored in a locked file cabinet and coded to ensure anonymity. The proper informed consent forms, sample introductory letters of proposed research and purpose, protocols and sample questions for interviews were included in the packet for Institutional Review Board approval. Prior to conducting the research in the selected course and section, a research proposal was submitted to the Dean of the School of Education. The proposal included a brief summary, background and introduction, methodology, instruments, participants, data collection, data analysis and time lines for the proposed study.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this narrative presents a qualitative analytic autoethnographic study and methodology based on the research of Anderson, (2006), Yin (1984; 2003) Merriam, (1998) Stake, (1995), and McTaggart (2006), and appropriate for the identified research problem. It includes a discussion of the research context within the School of Education, research participants and instruments used for data collection and data analysis including participant observation, videotaped class sessions, audiotape reflections of participants as they dialogue while watching the video and field notes collected after each class session.
taken after each class. It also includes the research question, findings, unanticipated results, and a summary of findings.

Research Question

A review of the recent research on preparing teachers for inclusion by using a co-teaching faculty model yielded minimal information relevant to the experiences of the co-teaching faculty and what they do to prepare teachers. Because of the lack of information related to how faculty experience co-teaching, the study proposed the following question: What are the experiences of two co-teaching faculty members assigned to teach preservice teacher candidates the methods of co-teaching in elementary classrooms?

Findings

An inductive analysis and the constant comparative method were chosen as the process for refining categories and deriving themes, patterns or trends for this study from the collected data of discussions of our class sessions while reviewing videotape as well as my personal field notes. Results from the methods were reviewed by comparing and contrasting data, revealing trends as well as the confirmation of beliefs and practices in the data. The main themes that emerged included the following: “Building Relationships”, “Implementing a Co-teaching Pedagogy”, “Modeling of Co-Teaching Pedagogy”, “Negotiating Roles, Responsibilities and Parity while Co-Teaching”, and “Setting the Stage and Using Space.” These themes emerged frequently in the majority of videotaped sessions and were the basis for our dialogue as we reviewed videotape and co-planned class sessions. See appendix A and B to see greater detail of how and when the themes emerged in each video session.
Building Relationships

In this study, one of the most important themes to emerge was building relationships. Building Relationships is defined operationally for this study as the progression of the attachment that formed between the two faculty as they co-taught the course. This definition is developed from inductive analysis of the data and the a priori codes.

Co-teachers build relationships by committing to meet frequently and getting to know each other well over time. Due to time constraints, Marlene and I had three weeks to begin building our relationship and plan for the course. Marlene agreed to being videotaped while co-teaching the course to capture both of our experiences and understood that we would be audio taping our conversations while reviewing the videotape of class sessions. Trust began to evolve as Marlene and I learned more about each other professionally through planning and organizing each class session. We learned about each other personally through our informal interactions and planning meetings, and quickly formed a comfortable working relationship. By comfortable I mean I felt mutual respect from her and she showed a keen interest in what I had to say by her responses and demeanor. She also used humor and a gentle teasing when she conversed which I enjoyed. We had met only once prior when I proposed the research study and asked for her participation as a co-teacher within the course. Marlene was a new faculty member in the Special Education Department and we had been formally introduced, but had no prior relationship at the start of the research study. We were essentially strangers.

Our first meeting was similar to a blind date where you are full of expectations and hopeful that this person will compliment your personality, style, and beliefs, but
know there's a chance that you might not be compatible. The difference here was that we were both committed to working together for the semester whether we were compatible or not. We were both committed to demonstrating successful co-teaching methods and sharing our experiences as co-teachers. Marlene, while viewing videotape session one, articulated what our charge was, with which we both agreed:

If we are modeling co-teaching, and then the students are going to be observed perhaps co-teaching in their student teaching or first job, I am looking at this as well, how would that observation go? Have they been prepared? If they are going to model what we do, we should be modeling what they should be doing, so they are getting an opportunity to observe us doing it first.

At the beginning of our co-teaching relationship, Marlene invited me to participate in an initial meeting with the Advocacy Center. The Advocacy Center is an organization that provides a speaker's bureau of parents with children who are identified with special needs. These parents work with our teacher candidates in the Collaboration for Inclusion course throughout the semester as part of a team. Marlene included me from the start at that meeting and on that initial day we set up planning times to meet. Marlene had previously taught two sections of the Collaboration for Inclusion course the semester prior. She was familiar with the course syllabus, content, and teacher candidate learning objectives. It was a completely new course for me. The course had originally been designed by another faculty member and Marlene aligned her syllabus, small group activities, presentations, rubrics, and assessments with the syllabus that had been previously created. We adopted the same syllabus and format for our co-teaching section.
due to time constraints and because we both felt the course was well designed as it was.

Marlene said during our final audiotape session:

Well, to be honest, to be realistic, I think if we had had more lead time, I think we would have developed the syllabus together and everything would have had both our names. Because of the time factor, the materials that were already developed from the fall were used. Let's say we're both co-teaching a course neither one of us had taught before and we're doing it this fall, I think we would meet this summer, we would develop the syllabus together, and we would take turns developing the materials. And so I think in that sense, it could have been the amount of lead time that impacted the creation of a new syllabus.

This reflection demonstrated Marlene's willingness to collaborate and that even though materials were already prepared she would have been willing to co-create them had the circumstances been different.

Together Marlene and I charted out ten feasible times on the calendar where we would be able to videotape both of us co-teaching versus times when students or parents from the Advocacy Center were presenting. Ten videotaped sessions versus twelve were discussed and ten sessions were chosen as the best fit for syllabus and schedule. Marlene and I easily found compromises when confronted with time constraints due to teaching schedules, department meetings and personal obligations. During the planning for the first two class sessions, we discussed agendas, course content, teacher candidates' course goals and objectives, roles and responsibilities, and a shared grading method. Both faculty would take part in scoring teacher candidate reflection papers and participate in feedback meetings with the candidates after performing co-teaching presentations.
Marlene was open to new ideas. For example, when I introduced the idea of a ‘Read Aloud’, providing a children’s literature connection for each class, she supported the idea. She began to use literature in her other course section and sometimes it was the same children’s literature choice or a different selected adult oriented poem or reading. I was receptive to her ideas for other types of read alouds and she had me thinking about how we could use them in our co-taught section in addition to the children’s literature.

Marlene reflected from videotape session two:

I like the way that we’ve both been receptive to bouncing off each other’s ideas and kind of playing off the strength of each other. Since I haven’t done this content umpteen times, it’s nice to hear some of your ideas for playing with the content differently. You know what I mean, like just the introduction of the literature reading. I would have never thought of that. I would have thought of reading something that wasn’t children’s literature. I liked that and the students liked it obviously.

This set the stage for genial conversations around planning and flexibility in how we would present the course material. I felt she respected my ideas but was able to question my choices when needing clarity. I sensed a letting go of ownership of some of the content of the course when she realized the candidates would still gain the objective.

During our course sessions, we began to benefit from having two perspectives and we shared these ideas and views with the teacher candidates. Marlene would often share her perspective on a topic through the lens of a special educator or urban administrator and I would often share my perspective through the lens of a general educator and
suburban administrator. We let the teacher candidates be a part of our developing relationship by sharing our varied experiences as new co-teachers.

Marlene during the first session mistakenly called me Amy and the teacher candidates who knew me corrected her. This demonstrated that we had a new working relationship as co-teachers and that some of our candidates in the class had a more familiar relationship with me than Marlene did. This quickly changed as Marlene and I frequently met each week to plan or review videotape. Our relationship continued to grow once we started teaching, planning and reviewing the videotape. It grew into a running joke within the class where I was called the wrong name purposefully by Marlene or I could blame anything that went wrong on the fictitious Amy and not the real me.

After watching our second videotape session, Marlene and I were reflecting on the class session. Marlene referred to my read aloud portion of the class where I read a children's book called, 'Do Unto Otter's' by Laurie Keller, a book about manners using proverbs and how well the teacher candidates enjoyed the story. As she complimented my oral reading of the story she called me melodramatic. I remember feeling unsure whether that was a compliment or not and putting that word down in my field note journal. I went back to my office and looked up melodramatic in the dictionary and sure enough it described me. I have a degree in theatre and love reading aloud to students so I embraced it as a compliment and committed to reading aloud at each class session, time permitting. Marlene began to start using the same children's literature in the section she taught by herself that was held in the time slot prior to our co-teaching class. I was
flattered that our co-teaching experience was starting to have an impact on how she taught the same course as a single instructor.

During the second and third week, Marlene and I always reviewed roles and responsibilities as we wrote our agenda prior to each class session. We began to organize ourselves and our materials as a result of viewing videotape. We created a space on the side walls to put our materials so we would not distract from whoever was leading or facilitating at the time. We moved the easel to the front and we moved the groups in closer. We experienced smoother transitions from task to task and began to look at each other for non-verbal cues for handing over the lead. I noted in my fieldwork journal after week session three that 'teaming was reciprocal and cyclical.' We are learning from each other as we teach the course and the students are learning from the two of us and each other as they prepare to co-teach to complete the cycle.

By the fifth session Marlene and I were working more cohesively as a team. In my field notes afterward I noted:

Our conversations flowed smoothly and we both felt at ease extending each other's ideas. We used space better and were not a distraction by moving back and forth in front of each other locating materials. We are starting to learn each other’s teaching style and pace.

As our co-teaching relationship grew during week sessions six through eight, Marlene really opened up to me personally. We were sharing more about our personal lives and what we were interested in beyond educating future teachers. We both agreed that on videotape we both looked heavy and shared the goal of losing weight and committing to exercise during the course of the semester. Being confronted by our
another planning session together. I think even though there are challenges that happen all the time out in K-12 co-teaching classrooms. I think if you have a trusting relationship and you both believe in the content, then it is a mutually beneficial experience. I really think my semester would have been very different without this co-teaching experience.

Now that the course has concluded, Marlene and I still have a strong relationship and still seek each other out. I wish the pseudo marriage of co-teaching could continue in the Collaboration for Inclusion course, but for the upcoming course semester the course will be taught by Marlene alone. Marlene and I both believe the course was better co-taught and many of the teacher candidates’ course reflections and final evaluations shared that belief. Due to lack of institutional support, funding and a poor economy the course will be taught alone and teacher candidates will no longer have that opportunity to watch two teachers “in action”. I am unsure whether this will truly be the end of co-teaching in that course because we both feel strongly advocating for further research and may co-teach again in the future as a part of a research or faculty grant. Our relationship will continue whether we co-teach again or not.

Implementing a Co-teaching Pedagogy

The previous section discussed how Marlene and I built our relationship over the course of the semester. This section will describe the instructional strategies and methods developed in order to teach co-teaching. As our relationship and trust grew over time, we became more comfortable talking about our methods of instruction and how we should co-teach with each other. We created a co-teaching pedagogy that included a common vocabulary, modeling, cueing systems and a focus on how we used space and staged
ourselves within the classroom. Co-teaching pedagogy for the purposes of this research study refers to the field of study that deals with the methods we used to teach candidates about co-teaching. This is a new term and is derived from inductive analysis of the data and the experiences from the research study.

Marlene noted a change in our language in videotape session two. ‘You started out talking using ‘I’ and then all of a sudden it was ‘We’. I do not remember when it changed over.’ We became a more proficient working team. As we moved through the weeks of classes we became more aware of each other’s strengths and weaknesses. We trusted each other enough to reflect and chime in if we missed an important point or had another way to provide meaning to the teacher candidates. At times we both forgot our point or got off track. When this occurred we would simply cover each other by adding to the dialogue since both of us were prepared and could get us back on track. Marlene said while viewing videotape from session two:

There were a couple of moments that I felt they saw modeled that turnover responsibility but yet not this disengagement kind of thing. I think that’s one of the values of co-teaching is that you can help bring closure to the other’s content because you are listening to it. For example, during the first class session the one thing that I forgot to do, you helped me out with. During the creation of the class commitments, I had forgotten to close the deal and ask them whether they all agree to these commitments. When you had jumped in and said that, and asked them I was like – that is the missing link! They have got to agree to this. They must have bought in to the commitments or else they will not have ownership over them. That was really important that you chimed in.
This demonstrates the ‘give and take’ and reciprocal learning. Marlene and I established within the classroom setting from the start. While team teaching, we were always willing to let each other speak to the point if we were not leading at the time by giving a verbal or non-verbal cue. Had I not been an experienced faculty member and educator, I might not have felt as confident jumping in. I acknowledge that someone else might not be as comfortable interjecting with a shy demeanor or Marlene could have taken offense to the interjection, but it seemed to naturally evolve between the two of us. How we did it changed through the weeks as well. Stronger cues were needed when we first started teaching together since we were unfamiliar with each other’s teaching style. It was more overt, bold and visual. I might step closer, raise my hand or give a verbal interruption to clue Marlene in that I wanted to share and take the stage. When I took the stage, Marlene would turn her body and her face to me and model attending and listening. I would give a verbal or non-verbal cue when ready to turn it back over to Marlene. I wrote in my field notes after my fifth class co-teaching with Marlene:

Today went great. The content, the pedagogy, the modeling, everything seemed to work ‘right’. We started with a share of any celebrations. Students were then asked in groups of two to share a family tradition or ritual. Then we put them in two large groups and modeled Parallel Teaching. The students were able to easily share their ideas rituals and it really helped to reinforce the idea of fostering close relationships by being organized into two smaller groups. Then I read aloud “Swimmy” by Leonni. The students made a number of teacher inclusive classroom connections with the children’s book. They grasped that working together and collaborating can be a key to success and that together they can come
up with solutions that you may not have thought of on your own. Marlene and I ‘pinged’ better – the idea of locating a sub underwater and making contact is similar to what we do in the classroom to locate each other. We used our teacher instincts such as listening, proximity, verbal and non-verbal cues such as meeting eyes, nodding our heads or moving closer to each other to signal a change in role or to cue us to move forward in our agenda. Students are beginning to see that we are modeling the content and making connections by what they say and share. We showed the DVD, the Power of Two, which introduced collaboration and co-teaching models by Marilyn Friend. We closed with a check of clarity on next week’s assignments.

Note: Used space better, switching of facilitator went smoothly. Felt like both of us had equal purpose and standing in the class. The teacher candidates are accepting that we are both their teachers.

Marlene and I communicated often during the research study and a common vocabulary emerged. Creating a common vocabulary of co-teaching language gave greater clarity to our conversations between each other and our teacher candidates. A vocabulary of co-teaching terms were used to define models or best practices, and to name the strategies we were demonstrating. Teacher candidates were introduced to Friend, Cook and Reising’s models of co-teaching including: station, team, parallel and alternative teaching and an assessment tool by Gately and Gately called the Co-Teaching Rating Scale.

During the sixth videotape session Marlene and I took part in modeling station teaching. My station centered on the vocabulary of co-teaching. I posted ten vocabulary
words on the board and asked them to use post-it notes to put down their ideas, thoughts, and perceptions of each word. For example, under the word ‘grouping’ students posted: homogenous, heterogenous, grouping ability, together. Most of the responses were through the lens of teacher to child and not through the lens of co-teacher to co-teacher. They seemed to not realize there was pedagogy or methods of instruction for co-teachers. This tells us that part of the experience of co-teaching is a heightened awareness of our instructional strategies so that we make the best use of the two co-teaching adults in the classroom. I then shared the Gately and Gately Co-Teaching Rating Scale with them as an assessment tool for supervisors and general education and regular education teachers to use as a way to rate how they are doing as co-teachers. I introduced the idea of “Ping”, and how submarines communicate under water, sending signals to each other as an analogy of how co-teachers communicate visually, verbally and non-verbally to each other. Each group came to a new meaning on that term as a result of being a part of the station. This provided a shared definition and vocabulary with the teacher candidates and both instructors throughout the rest of the classroom sessions.

**Modeling Co-Teaching Pedagogy**

As a result of our relationship building we began to look closely at our co-teaching pedagogy and made decisions on how we would demonstrate the models of co-teaching. During the course of the semester the teacher candidates were exposed to modeling which included transitions between instructors, and co-teaching models of instruction including station teaching, one leads/one assists, parallel teaching, alternative teaching and team teaching (Friend, Cook and Reising, 1993). The operational definition of modeling for this study means to produce a representation or simulation of a co-
teaching model. We provided a live visual model to examine and reflect upon, that paralleled real teaching experiences. According to Bandura (1977):

Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do.

Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action.

Teacher candidates were able to watch demonstrations of the turnover of responsibility, how we “pinged” or located each other in space to take the stage, and how we negotiated joint agreements. I said while reviewing videotape session five:

They certainly had the opportunity to see more modeling than they ever could before with two teachers in there and learned about the Social Learning Theory of Albert Bandura. I think we’re really acting, we’re actually showing them, demonstrating, letting them see it in action and it seems like they’re able to pick it up with ease when they are doing it within their own presentations.

Marlene explained:

In metacognition, ‘being on the balcony’ is a term used for being involved in the process but also being able to step back and explain the process, so the image is you’re on the balcony looking down on the stage and explaining what the action is.

This made it clear and specific that what we were modeling or describing were strategies teacher candidates may employ and experience in co-teaching classrooms. In session two Marlene said:
I think when the teacher candidates start in with their family presentations and we have a little bit of time to plan, we might start thinking ahead about our co-teaching and whether we can simulate the models. That is an 'aha' moment for me right now. Why aren't we always talking about the models of co-teaching when planning our co-teaching class sessions for the candidates? This is the first time we talked about it as a part of our planning.

As a result we began to plan in a whole new way using the Friend, Cook and Reising's (1993) co-teaching models as our framework. This occurred early in the research while planning for our second week. Had we not been experienced educators we might not have used the metacognitive strategies and taken a 'balcony view' of our experiences. Marlene and I might have missed or reached the 'aha' moment about using the co-teaching models to deliver the course content much later in the course or not at all had we not been reflective practitioners.

Teacher candidates were able to see us demonstrate a number of Friend, Cook and Reising's co-teaching models including team teaching, parallel teaching, station, one teach one assist, and alternative teaching (Friend, Cook and Reising, 1993). The co-teaching models we demonstrated most frequently were team teaching or one teaches while the other assists. We pointed out during our demonstrations what model they were seeing and why the activity was best suited for that choice of model. We did not model alternative teaching since the model did not lend itself well to our content. However, teacher candidates and instructors discussed attributes of the method and described how it would look and operate. Alternative teaching can sometimes be referred to as pulling a small group of students out of their classroom for remediation. We wanted them to look
at the model as another way to group students and not necessarily a way to group students academically. We also demonstrated the transitions of moving from one model to another within the same class session. In some classes we modeled up to three different co-teaching models with varied groupings by demonstrating team teaching, than one teach one assist and then transition to parallel teaching where we would split the class in half and each instructor then lead a group.

The first model we demonstrated was team teaching and the candidates were able to see us demonstrate the flow of roles and responsibilities and how we ‘passed the chalk’ when ready to turn over the lead. The second model we demonstrated was parallel teaching. We split the groups in two and each of us facilitated a group. Marlene said while viewing videotape session five:

We’re demonstrating to them one of the models of co-teaching that they’re going to have to present. Parallel Teaching was a good model to use because it gave us an opportunity to hear from every single person about the experiences they shared using this model. Had we had one large group, we wouldn’t have been able to get through every person.

I said:

I think it’s interesting when they finally get that ‘aha’ connection. Candidates were able to see an effective way to dialogue, but not only is this a model of what we are trying to teach them to adopt in classrooms, but also telling them why it benefits their students.

Marlene said:
I think now as they are preparing for their presentations on the different co-teaching models they are referring back to Friend, Cook and Reising’s work. I think they are looking at co-teaching models with a heightened awareness of how effective it is to use because they are now going through it themselves.

Marlene and I modeled Station Teaching. We had four different stations set up. Two were independent activities teacher candidates completed as a group and the other two stations were facilitated by Marlene and I. We had time allotments for each station and specific directions and charges. The teacher candidates clearly enjoyed participating in all of the stations but the ones that were led by either Marlene or I were opportunities for them to reflect on the model we were using and why. I said while viewing the video of session seven:

There is evidence of a deeper level of understanding when the students begin to refer to Bandura’s work or Friend, Cook and Reising’s models of co-teaching while in the stations. They easily transitioned into the stations and they are communicating, talking and enjoying themselves.

Marlene noted:

Not only did we model station teaching, but the way we explained it did not leave them with lots of questions about it because we explained initially what each station was going to involve and how they were going to move, and so there is no getting up and asking us what they need to do.

I then said:

And at the same time demonstrate how the stations can be uniquely different in relationship to each other but still have the common theme of collaboration and
co-teaching. For example, we had a station that had directions posted and no facilitator where teacher candidates created a group collage that was representative of the parents and their personal stories of having a child with a disability, and another station where I was facilitating in the corner, introducing the Co-Teaching Rating Scale by Gately and Gately (2001) and co-teaching vocabulary.

Teacher candidates understood that they would face varied settings where co-teaching may look very different from what we were modeling for them. I said while viewing videotape session five:

There has got to be a point where students are confronted with the reality of co-teaching. Right now there may not be many good examples of co-teaching in schools. It may be that either they're doing it truly as partners using team teaching, station teaching, parallel and some alternative teaching models, or they are saying they are team teaching but they are really taking turns instructing, or they are moving throughout two different physical spaces. Students are going to come to a point where they are going to realize they learned about one scenario and then see something very different in schools. We want them to make a shift where they do not embrace what is currently going in schools if co-teaching and collaborative efforts have been unsuccessful.

Although we did not demonstrate other models of co-teaching besides Friend, Cook and Reising’s models, we did introduce the teacher candidates to Gately and Gately’s Co-teaching Rating Scale (2001) during the station teaching demonstration as a
tool to evaluate and reflect upon their co-teaching efforts. It was used as a springboard for conversation around communication and co-teaching vocabulary.

*Negotiating Roles, Responsibilities and Parity while Co-Teaching*

As Marlene and I continued to grow together as a team we became better at communicating which roles and responsibilities we enjoyed most and began to delegate specific tasks to each other to balance the work load. These roles and responsibilities were fluid positions and we both could easily switch if needed. The roles and responsibilities are operationally defined for this research study as the duties and obligations we perform as part of a particular process. As a result of our continual planning, Marlene and I easily communicated what specific roles and responsibilities we would assume for each class and brainstormed a number of ideas of how we wanted each part of our agenda to be facilitated. However, after watching the video of the two of us instructing we began to see areas for growth and immediate improvement. These were mostly in how we arranged ourselves and our materials within the classroom and what kinds of things the second teacher could be doing when not co-teaching the lesson.

When Marlene was facilitating a part of the lesson we frequently discussed what role I had during that time in the lesson or vice versa. We would try to support each other when not facilitating by providing visuals, handing out or collecting papers, or being a scribe on the easel or board. Other times the role would be passive and she or I would be out of the way and cueing students non-verbally to attend to the facilitator leading at the time. It was helpful to have a second set of eyes and ears able to check, clarify and provide cues when we got off track or students needed more explanation of the content.
We tried very hard not to have a hierarchy where one teacher would have more power or responsibility than the other. I have a more dominant personality and had to play a more submissive role. Even so I did feel that it was Marlene's classroom and course and I was the one being 'included' rather than me 'including her' but I do feel we approached and provided many new learning opportunities together as a team. We also tried not to represent traditional roles of the general educator and special educator. In elementary classrooms, often the special education teacher has the role of being the one responsible for the special education modifications and goals on the student's Individualized Education Plan. The general educator is thought of as the content specialist. We wanted our teacher candidates to understand that what we were modeling would work with collaborating with a parent, an occupational therapist or speech teacher as well as a fellow classroom teacher. This educational objective of collaboration with all professionals and adults working in classrooms was stated in the syllabus and fostered throughout the semester.

During class sessions we would focus our lens on co-teaching and specifically the lens of co-teacher to co-teacher rather than classroom teacher to student. We wanted them to understand that there were methods to co-teaching. We discussed the time we spent out of class communicating and preparing what we would teach each class session and what role we would take in each part of the agenda.

At times I felt an unbalance of workload since Marlene had pre established graphic organizers and handouts she had used the semester before and labeled with her name. The materials were well planned and organized so I was able to let go of the responsibility and ownership and not have the need to recreate them or have the two of us
co-create them. I am unsure of what message the teacher candidates received when they saw only Marlene’s name on all handouts but I can assume they realized she created them. I reflected while viewing video session six:

They know that co-teaching is this commitment to planning together, to deciding who is going to say what when. It takes open communication negotiating those roles and responsibilities. I think our prowess together as co-teachers has evolved as we learn to trust each other. I share with you that I’ve let the ego go and know that I do not have to control everything or feel the obligation to teach everything. Now I have another expert in the room and I have that trust in you. I understand that the students are going to have an exciting learning experience, even though I am not leading it. And at times I may be the facilitator, the assistant or leader of a small group, but other times I may be quiet and that is the role needed at that time.

No matter what role we had, teacher candidates benefited from two instructors checking their understanding and assessing their progress. We were able to double their feedback for their co-teaching presentations and we had two of us to assess their writing, parent team presentations and reflections. When co-teaching we were able to exchange roles and take the lead on a subject we were more familiar with. Although we had assigned jobs and responsibilities for each course session, we were both open to “teachable moments”. This flexibility enabled us to share our experiences and provide two perspectives as both the general educator and the special educator.

The strategy of “Thinking out loud” was used to cue teacher candidates when we were sharing our own personal experiences co-teaching the course to the experiences they may have in elementary classrooms. We shared our agenda, time allotments, time
management and the idea of pacing when planning a class session. We always tried to make the comparison of our course sessions versus planning a lesson in a co-taught classroom. I said while viewing videotape session one:

I think the more we can make it clear, overt, explicit, and specific as to what are those practices that two people do when they are in a co-teaching role including those things they do not see us do behind the scenes, will help inform teacher candidates. As instructors we must clearly "think aloud" so that they know that it takes planning, flexibility, compromise and establishing roles and responsibilities in addition to what they are seeing modeled.

Marlene said while viewing videotape session two:

See now, here's an example where you're sharing with them the approach as a teacher. And so I'm thinking can we use the class to notice how Wendy and I are in different parts of room. We're in proximity to two different groups so that if anyone needed assistance, both of us are available to half the class.

I added:

I think that it is really important that I frame it from the lens of co-teaching. I get in this teacher head and I just want to teach them everything that comes up at that moment. Instead I really need to filter it and focus on co-teaching and collaboration strategies.

Marlene responded:

Well I think both are appropriate but we should strive for the meta-cognition around collaboration. Throughout the sessions we would both share how our
experiences could be related to their co-teaching presentations and their future fieldwork and student teaching placements.

We continued to share our experiences as new co-teachers with the teacher candidates and how they could relate it to upcoming co-teaching presentations they would have to perform. As we moved through the first couple of weeks, a routine and rituals developed within the classroom. Teacher candidates and instructors co-created class commitments that were a guideline on how we would operate as a class. Some examples of our commitments were a daily read aloud, opportunities for clarification, review of the hand-outs and any assignments for the following week and an interactive activity.

As our relationship grew, we were better able to read verbal and non-verbal cues from each other. Marlene said while reviewing videotape session five:

One thing I noticed is that it seems more relaxed, our back-and-forth between each other, the dialogue that we are having, that kind of pinging effect and passing of the chalk and taking turns. We’re communicating openly about the class and we have shared responsibility for planning. We use humor and the important thing, too, is we are using several different ways of measuring the students’ progress, which is good.

This pinging effect happened often where we would locate each other within the classroom and cue each other either verbally or visually by moving closer to gain each other’s attention. Sometimes we would pipe in with a verbal cue but eventually we often looked into each other’s eyes when finished speaking to check to see if we wished to add anything.
During most lessons both of us took the stage. We often stood up at the front of the room side by side. At times it was not for very long, but I think that we presented a united front. The video showed we often mirrored each other’s stance, body language or hand motion and these gestures were visible starting in video session two. When we shifted to a single facilitator or to a one-leads-and-one supports teaching model, we had to trust that the facilitator would deliver the content proficiently. I continued to experience feelings of letting go of the ideas of how I would facilitate the lesson if doing it alone or leading as we worked more together. I enjoyed learning from Marlene as much as the students appeared to. She was articulate, analytical, reflective, and always professional. I said in our last audiotape session:

Honestly, you know I love being up in front. I love teaching. I love facilitating. I love the control of it all. I mean I can’t help but say that. For me to give up all that responsibility was a big shift. It really helped me see what it must be like to be in a classroom where the special educator is almost shut down. I have observed this as a student teacher supervisor in a number of classrooms where the special educator has the role of a glorified aide and rarely allowed to ever take the stage, team, or co-teach. In the beginning it was hard for me to stay quiet. I talk about being humble and open to what I can learn from others. I think being quiet, listening and reflecting is really important for me to do. In the beginning I needed to just be quiet and listen and get a feel for your teaching style and how you operated. I learned to build trust by letting go and watching someone who was experienced, articulate, and funny. So as I saw that I became even quieter. I think it demonstrated to me that you need to leave the ego at the door when co-teaching.
I was now thinking about what I could learn from my teaching partner and how could I enhance the lesson in a supporting role not necessarily the leading role.

This was a new perspective for me. I had always had the lead role in my classrooms, even in collaborative settings it was typically someone coming into my classroom to collaborate and this was a new and different experience. The transitioning or a ‘passing of the chalk’ is something we improved upon over time. Marlene said in our last audiotape session:

Trust had to be established so that I could let go and I think that happened very quickly with you. I think in all fairness the structure of the course is meant to do that because even without co-teaching we have to give it up because the parents are really the passers of the information. You know, parents come in pretty early in the course and tell their story. It really is all about servant leadership. I think that both college professors and students due to the design of the course have to give up control of the class over to the family they are working with. They change perspective from themselves as teacher candidates to what a parent’s view might be of schools and teachers. They build empathy and a clearer understanding of what they are experiencing as a family with a child with special needs. So I think in that sense, the course lends itself to what Stephen Covey says, ‘Listen first to understand’. So letting go is a good thing.

Marlene and I enjoyed the changing roles and letting go after seeing our teacher candidates demonstrate station, parallel, team or alternative teaching in teams. They had to demonstrate one of Friend, Cook and Reising’s models of co-teaching with another class member as a presentation for the class to deliver a specific content. On our
observation forms we noted how they used many of the strategies we modeled earlier in class sessions, and they all met with great success delivering the content using one of the assigned models.

As we got farther into the class sessions, I really grew to enjoy Marlene’s sense of humor. One of our co-teaching presentations that we would describe as unsuccessful was a PowerPoint we both created on presentation skills. We used humor and a team teaching model to present the material. We thought it was funny, lighthearted, and a good representation of what not to do when presenting in a top ten list format. The students had little response, laughter, or affect.

While watching our ninth video session, we couldn’t help but be reminded how disengaged the teacher candidates were when we conducted a top ten list of what not to do when presenting as a team. I wrote in my field notes after viewing this session:

Marlene and I provided time for planning and presented our expectations for presentation skills. This was the first time what we had planned was unsuccessful, and it was a healthy conversation that followed between the two of us on why it failed. Could be generational, or that they already felt prepared delivering their presentations. Marlene and I have developed a comfortable rapport that enables us to be honest and reflective. Communication is open and flows freely. Marlene is thought provoking and looks at our teaching with a fresh lens of someone new to higher education. She is analytical and thoughtful. She thinks before she speaks, unlike me. I am learning so much from working with her.

We reflected after the class session why that lesson might have failed. It was probably generational but it was evident that both Marlene and I had a relationship that
enabled us to be honest and reflective about our methods of instruction and how we could better engage the students.

Setting the Stage and Using Space

As a result of our negotiation of roles and responsibilities we examined how we could better use our classroom space. We discussed how we physically filled the space with the arrangement of ourselves, desks and location of our materials. From our first viewing of videotape session one, the topic of space and staging were discussed. Staging and space is defined operationally for this study as the arrangement of the two instructors as far as distance between each other, teacher candidates, and their materials within the classroom setting. This definition is developed from inductive analysis of the data and the a priori codes.

We also incorporated the words staging and using upstage and downstage to describe when we moved forward or back. Downstage in the theatre means the front of the stage nearest the audience. Upstage refers to the very back of the stage. In context of our classroom, downstage was closer to the students and exit and upstage referred to the front of the classroom near our computer and large whiteboard. Home base was in the middle front of the room towards the whiteboard.

We talked about our positioning in the room, how students and materials were organized and arranged and whether the video was capturing our collaborative efforts. We changed the seating arrangements dependent on what co-teaching model we were using for each class session.

In the beginning, where we were staged within the classroom caused a distraction to the teacher candidates. It was hard for them to be focused on who was speaking when
we were both moving around the room. Marlene stated while watching videotaped session one:

Well, I think that is what I meant by understanding where we are in the space. Not that we're a distraction to each other, but maybe to the students we are. I don’t feel uncomfortable with it, but they might just because people get distracted.

We learned through watching the video that we needed to learn to maximize or minimize our movement depending on which model of co-teaching we were using. We needed fluid positioning of ourselves as instructors as we moved from team teaching to individual facilitator back to other models of co-teaching.

At times where we were positioned demonstrated whether we were leading or not. Visual cues could be confusing when first co-teaching. We needed to be very clear that where we were staged and standing was a clue to which instructor they should direct their focus on. Sometimes we would both head up to the front especially in our early class sessions as if it was home base. That changed as we figured out how to detract from one of us by staging the other at the front of the room and the other sitting in a corner. We began to always put materials in a part of the room that provided greater accessibility to the teacher candidates. We moved materials from the front to the sides since we both had a tendency to hover by our materials. I offered while viewing videotaped session one:

I wonder if I was trying to establish myself as part of the team. You know what I mean; I think maybe I’m trying to figure out where I fit in the space. I tried to pick up the papers and caused a distraction. Maybe we can always establish a place where we put handouts and materials so we will always know where they
are and that they have been distributed. I think, when two teachers are negotiating a space, it is good for us to model exact organization of materials.

This emphasis on replicating a real classroom scenario kept us focused not only on our lens from teacher to teacher but how candidates are viewing us as co-teachers and partners of a teaching team. We shared these strategies when modeling the varied models of co-teaching pointing out how we arranged ourselves and our materials dependent on the model. Marlene remarked while viewing videotape session one:

Look at our staging here. At this point we did well because you were sharing at the front of the room and I was at the back of the room. It was a nice juxtaposition.

We modeled moving up and down stage in order to “ping” and provide cues from co-teacher to co-teacher. We also demonstrated the use of proximity to teacher candidates to manage behavior and transitions. How we looked on video impacted the way we used space and staging. We worked towards becoming more proficient at knowing where we were in space in relationship to each other and how our materials could be organized to make the best use of space.

Our experience of two co-teaching faculty members assigned to teach preservice teacher candidates the methods of co-teaching, involved the building of a relationship and creation of a co-teaching pedagogy that included the negotiation of roles, responsibilities, parity, and staging and space.

Unanticipated Result

As in most research studies, there are often some unanticipated results that emerge. The unanticipated results of the study were that teacher candidates viewed the
instructors as learners. While modeling station teaching with the teacher candidates, the lesson was focused around the vocabulary that co-teachers use. The teacher candidates immediately started talking about how this vocabulary related to K-6 students. I started to go over the Co-Teaching Rating Scale and had them now look at the vocabulary through the lens of professor to professor and that these vocabulary words and examples are from what Marlene and I experienced as co-teaching partners.

As a result vocabulary changed on how they talked about co-teaching. It changed from what am I doing with the students to what am I doing with the co-teacher or other professional in the room I am working with first, then move that lens next to a student focus. They noticed that I would say when Marlene and I were looking at the tape and reflecting on our co-teaching practice we would see ourselves moving around too quickly, that we were distracting and we were not directing you where to look or focus. We learned how to better use space by watching ourselves and the teacher candidates. Teacher candidates found it interesting to see us fine tune our co-teaching pedagogy and surprised that we were learning along side of them and many shared that in their written reflections.

Summary of Findings

The results of this study indicate that co-teaching faculty in a school of education who demonstrate and model how they negotiate building a relationship, roles and responsibilities, co-teaching pedagogy, and staging and space provide teacher candidates with the opportunity to see co-teaching in action, and provide opportunities to reflect upon, practice and better understand the complexities of co-teaching for faculty as well as for our teacher candidates.
Building a relationship throughout the semester by meeting and communicating frequently enabled us to co-plan co-teaching activities that involved the use of demonstrations and ‘think alouds’. We were able to make it explicit when we were modeling co-teaching practices for the teacher candidates and they modeled it back to us when they were presenting co-teaching models.

We shared our experiences as we negotiated roles, responsibilities and parity so that teacher candidates could gain understanding as to how we made co-teaching work. We modeled co-teaching methods and groupings so that teacher candidates had an opportunity to see them live and practice these methods prior to student teaching next semester. We discussed space and staging with each other as new co-teachers and with the teacher candidates as well. We arranged ourselves, teacher candidates and our materials according to which co-teaching model we were demonstrating. A more detailed discussion of the results and implications of the findings will be presented in chapter five.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 4, the purpose of the study is to describe the experience of two co-teaching faculty members assigned to teach pre-service teacher candidates the methods of co-teaching in elementary inclusive classrooms. The study involved the collection of data through field notes and transcription of audiotape of the two co-teaching faculty while they review videotape from ten course sessions. An inductive analysis and a constant comparative method were chosen as the process for refining categories and deriving themes, patterns, or trends for this research study from the collected data. The data includes discussions of our class sessions while reviewing videotape as well as my personal field notes. Because of the lack of information related to how faculty experience co-teaching, the study proposed the following research question: What are the experiences of two co-teaching faculty members assigned to teach pre-service teacher candidates the methods of co-teaching in elementary classrooms?

Implications of Findings

The analysis of the qualitative data in this study resulted in the following themes emerging: “Building Relationships”, “Implementing a Co-teaching Pedagogy”, “Modeling Co-Teaching Pedagogy”, “Negotiating Roles, Responsibilities, and Parity while Co-Teaching”, and “Setting the Stage and Using Space”.

In this chapter, I discuss the Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1997) as my theoretical framework, parity issues, implications for teacher education and future
research, and recommendations for the School of Education. I then discuss the limitations of the study and review the conclusions drawn from the study.

Social Learning Theory

Social Learning Theory was used as a theoretical framework for this research study (Bandura, 1997). He stated that, “most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms ideas of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action” (p.22). The theory emphasizes the importance of observing and modeling the behaviors, attitudes, and emotional reactions of others.

By reflecting upon these co-teaching experiences while watching the videotapes and through my own reflections, Marlene and I were able to articulate these strategies and methods as we were demonstrating to the teacher candidates. Bandura (1997) states, “The highest level of observational learning is achieved by organizing and rehearsing the modeled behavior symbolically and then enacting it overtly. Coding of modeled behavior into words, labels, or images, results in better retention than by simple observation.”

Jay (2002) states, “Modeling communicates a message to students about what is important in teaching” (p.11). Teacher candidates had the opportunity to see us demonstrate co-teaching models and methods that Marlene and I thought important for teacher candidate’s to know and be able to do.

When Marlene and I were demonstrating co-teaching, the teacher candidates were able to see us enact them overtly. We modeled our behavior and put the images into words as Bandura (1997) recommends.
My research conformed to the theory by including demonstrations of the co-teaching models established by Cook, Friend and Reising (1993). Marlene and I demonstrated examples of one teach/one assist, station teaching, parallel teaching, and team teaching. Demonstrating the co-teaching models provided teacher candidates the chance to watch experienced collaborators employ and reflect upon a variety of co-teaching methods. Marilyn Friend (2002) stated:

All preservice and inservice teachers should have knowledge and skills that contribute to effective collaboration. For example, preservice teachers should learn and experience in their initial training the concept that "effective teachers work together." Thus, they should work with partners and in small groups in their methods classes and they should reflect on the advantages and potential problems of working with colleagues. In field experiences and student teaching, they should have opportunities to watch effective collaboration among experienced educators, and they should discuss what makes the interactions effective and how they could do the same. (p. 225)

Whereas Friend (2002) calls for preservice teachers to experience co-teaching during the field experience and student teaching experience, this co-taught course provided the teacher candidates with an even earlier opportunity to observe co-teacher collaboration and consider the possible uses and abuses of models through a semester-long, pre-service faculty demonstration. Teacher candidates were able to dialogue about the pros and cons of each co-teaching model with their peers and instructors after a particular model was demonstrated. They also had the opportunity to practice most of Friend, Cook and Reising's (1993) models during class presentations and in field work.
placements. This study also provided opportunities for the two to better understand the advantages and potential problems that can arise during co-teaching and share their experience with teacher candidates as they occurred. A key issue for us to address was one of parity.

Parity

Cook and Friend (2007) suggest that parity signals exist in a co-teaching relationship. They state:

A goal in co-teaching is to have students respond to the teachers as classroom equals. To achieve and maintain this parity, teachers can arrange visual, verbal and instructional signals that convey their equality. For example, teachers who co-teach daily can put both teachers' names on the board and on correspondence that goes to parents. They can arrange for two teachers' desks, or share a large work table instead of having one teacher camping at a student desk. They can be sure that both take the lead on delivering instruction, and they both can grade papers to make clear to students that both contribute to grades or other student evaluation. In new co-teaching programs in particular, listing all the ways that parity can be signaled sometimes is helpful (p. 11).

As Marlene and I began to build our relationship we had negotiated our teaching roles and responsibilities before, during, and after each class session. While planning lessons, we made a conscious effort to distribute equitable responsibilities between the two of us to create a parity of workload. We demonstrated parity to the teacher candidates by taking turns facilitating and using staging to establish ourselves as equals within the
classroom space. We demonstrated we were equal partners by shared planning for our
course sessions and grading of teacher candidates assignments.

We both articulated that it was important to share the workload. However, due to
the fact that many of the materials were previously created by Marlene from last
semester, I felt I was at a slight disadvantage not being familiar with the pre-made
materials. Marlene also had familiar relationships with some of the parents who presented
in our class that worked with our teacher candidates on teams previously. I experienced
some feelings of an imbalance of power and authority. This was perceived at times as a
disadvantage since I did not recognize the parent guests when they first entered the
classroom nor did I know about their background and experiences of having a child
identified with special needs prior to their visits. Some may argue that it was an
advantage that at least one of us was familiar with the parents from the Advocacy Center.
I often introduced myself as the co-teacher of the course after their arrival and most
greeted me as if they were surprised I was co-teaching the course with Marlene.

I believe when in front of the teacher candidates we physically arranged ourselves
so that we presented parity with a couple of exceptions. An example of parity would be
when either Marlene or I were leading; the other co-teaching instructor would be
gathering key points on a white board or demonstrating materials near by. When both co-
teaching, we would locate ourselves at the middle of the room, leading the candidates’
eyes to look at both of us, while sharing the stage. The exceptions were when Marlene
handed out materials that she had previously created for the course that had her name
only on them. It might have sent a message to the teacher candidates that I was not an
equal partner instructing the course. Another exception was that the course was officially
listed as having one instructor on the website and listed Marlene's name only as the instructor of record instead of both of our names.

I often felt that Marlene had the advantage of being more familiar with the course activities, goals and objectives having taught the course the semester before. I deferred to her experience if the teacher candidates asked me a procedural question that Marlene and I had not discussed. However, I came to realize that I did not need to have all the answers to establish my role as a co-teacher in the classroom. This probably mirrors what happens in classrooms where a special educator may feel like they do not have the same level of understanding of the content, and therefore feel like they are not an equal partner in the inclusive classroom as reported by Cook and Friend (2007). The settings where parity does not exist can be a reason why teachers are reluctant to co-teach. Another co-teacher not committing to her share of the workload can affect a co-teaching relationship. In our situation it was more about feeling the need to compensate knowing that Marlene had already completed a part of the work by creating materials prior to my participation as a co-teacher in the course. We found that due to busy schedules and conferences out of town that we would distribute all charges and responsibilities with parity, but were sensitive to what each of us could achieve dependent on our individual schedules for each week.

If Marlene and I were to continue our co-teaching relationship. I would insist upon revising materials that would reflect both instructors' learning and teaching styles, and philosophical beliefs. I would want us to take the time needed to take a closer look at the syllabus and see if we could embed greater opportunities to share all the responsibilities that go along with planning for and teaching the course. We have built a
strong working relationship with parity and are now better able to assign each other tasks that best fit our strengths in an equitable way. Working through this relationship this research study revealed a number of implications for teacher education.

Implications for Teacher Education

During the course of the study, teacher candidates were able to observe our modeling of co-teaching strategies and methods. These demonstrations were to guide them as they practiced co-teaching themselves. The opportunity to see co-teaching first hand and then try it themselves was a new experience and consistent with a recommendation from Kluth and Straut (2003). Kluth and Straut studied collaborative teaching and shared the outcomes of their experiences researching how collaborative teaching in higher education courses impacted students in preservice courses. Kluth and Straut’s study is the most similar to my research of examining how higher education faculty negotiates co-teaching as a way to teach co-teaching. They were specifically interested in how students understand collaboration as a result of their classes and eventually out in the field. My autoethnographic methods study differs in the way that it examined co-teaching first hand through the lens of the instructors and not from the lens of how the course impacted their teacher candidates.

Kluth and Straut (2003) share, “Studies in this area are nonexistent, and research is needed to uncover why and how we should continue developing collaborative models in college and university teacher preparation programs.” (p. 238). This research study furthered the research of Kluth and Straut by using a collaborative model in a college setting and teacher preparation program. Themes emerged from the conversations of Marlene and me as we attempted to model co-teaching effectively. We shared the themes
and outcomes of our experiences with the teacher candidates of building relationships, creating parity, implementing co-teaching pedagogy, modeling co-teaching, and setting the stage and using space for co-teaching.

The research of Voltz and Elliot (1997) found a discrepancy between the actual preparation and the ideal preparation for collaborative inclusion that teacher educators would like to provide for preservice-level teacher candidates. They recommend that instructors of special education and elementary education methods courses model collaboration and make efforts to co-plan and co-teach. These recommendations of Voltz and Elliot were further developed within my research as Marlene and I co-planned and provided teacher candidates the opportunity to see us model collaboration and co-teaching. The research study offered the teacher candidates an opportunity to see first hand the modeling of co-teaching practices by two instructors, and how they may adapt those lessons and experiences when working with all children, whether identified with special needs or not.

Voltz (2005) states that while the separate course approach remains the single most dominant method of delivering special education content, many of those teachers surveyed indicated that their programs did not rely solely on this method. This finding suggests that many programs across the country are seeking ways to integrate special education and regular education content throughout teacher preparation programs. My study continues Voltz’ investigation of seeking ways to integrate special education and regular education content in teacher preparation programs by examining the experience of two co-teaching faculty.
The research of Hwang and Hernandez (2002) also shows the growing awareness of co-teaching as an effective pedagogical tool in Institutions of Higher Education. Hwang and Hernandez (2002) organized a collaborative practice model and conducted research where they examined elementary teacher education students' thoughts, feelings and attitudes about university co-teaching. Their research provided a method of collecting reflections of the faculty as they collaborated in a college setting. It provided the researchers with examples of some of the challenges and opportunities of creating a co-teaching model in a college/ university setting. It also showed the advantages of having more than one faculty member teaching and the added expertise it can bring. It differs from my research study in that it was not conducted as formal research and more like a pilot study and they co-taught the content of three different disciplines. My study focused on the content of collaboration and co-teaching with two instructors, examining their own co-teaching practices, while modeling co-teaching for teacher candidates.

Collaborative relationships in schools are difficult to develop and even more challenging to maintain because of competing priorities, limited resources, and lack of professional development (Walther-Thomas, Korinek, and McLaughlin, 2000; Titone, 2005; Wood, 1998). However, Walther-Thomas, et al (1999) agrees that collaboration is a worthy goal. The focus of the model they present is on the administrative side of collaboration (e.g. whom teaches with whom and composition of students within inclusive classrooms), and describes support structures available to assist professionals in their work with students. Some of the problems and barriers they found include lack of administrative support, inadequate professional development, resistance to change; imbalance in classroom rosters and specialists schedules, and limited planning time. The
authors (1999) recommend perseverance and ongoing problem solving to help teams collaborate effectively to promote students' success. Marlene and I experienced some of the same problems and barriers that the authors discuss including resistance to change and limited planning time, however we were able to communicate and compromise and found solutions to obstacles we encountered.

Titone (2005) recommends that schools of education establish a team-teaching system so that faculty teaching general education classes will work with special education faculty. This will set up opportunities for general education faculty to practice and demonstrate skills in collaboration as they solidify their own knowledge of how to adapt curriculum and pedagogy. Titone (2005) states, 'A spirit of collaboration must be passed on to preservice teachers, not only by studying and talking about it but also by modeling it' (p.12).

My study provided an experience where two school of education faculty attempted to model skills specific to co-teaching and create "a spirit of collaboration". Teacher candidates had the opportunity to see us grow as a co-teaching team and watched us demonstrate models they could use in the field. We also tried to heighten awareness that sometimes lessons are unsuccessful and we modeled how we assess and evaluate our process and progress in order to continuously improve. When we first started co-teaching the two of us were scattered across the room and confused the candidates by how we were staged within the classroom space. We shared with candidates how our movements and staging changed in order to direct them where to focus. Marlene and I shared with the teacher candidates how we assessed and evaluated our process in order to continuously improve.
Even when our lesson proved to be unsuccessful we were able to bounce back and continue our quest to find engaging ways to teach the candidates the content of the course. A less experienced teacher might have felt disappointment or feelings of failure. We knew through our experience that teachers make mistakes and that Marlene and I could improve upon the delivery of the content from that unsuccessful lesson. Teachers make changes and fine tune lessons, always assessing and evaluating student learning and teaching effectiveness. We shared the human side of teaching and admitted that Marlene and I were imperfect like everyone else and that we were learning along side of them.

From this study, a number of implications for research emerged.

*Implications for Future Research*

Implications for future research as a result of this study include suggestions for more empirical studies for teacher candidates and co-teaching practitioners. Future research is needed that compares the teaching of a course on co-teaching using a single instructor model versus one co-taught using two instructors. What are the experiences in the single instructor taught course when demonstrating co-teaching models that use more than one adult? Research is needed to see how they negotiate the other teacher roles when modeling.

Future studies may also want to look at the co-teaching relationship and what occurs over time as they continue to co-teach through a number of semesters or years. Recommendations by Kluth and Straut, (2003) are to continue to conduct research in this area and particularly to explore how student learning is affected when college teachers co-teach and engage in other types of collaboration including: actions, decisions in the
field: and what aspects of instructor collaboration have the biggest affect on student behaviors and decisions related to co-teaching.

Two instructors may benefit from gathering data using Gately and Gately's Co-Teaching Rating Scale or adopting a common co-teaching vocabulary, negotiation of roles, responsibilities, parity and use of staging, space and a cueing system.

Comparing data from both sections also could provide greater insights into the teacher candidate's perceptions of the experience. Some data that may be collected include: course reflection papers and course evaluations from the teacher candidates from both sections of the course.

It would also be interesting to gather the teacher candidate’s perceptions of the impact of the modeling demonstrations and whether they implemented them during their student teaching placements as well as gather data from the school based educators and their perceptions of the teacher candidates’ efficacy on co-teaching and collaboration.

Another recommendation would be to conduct a similar co-teaching study but have it continue through two semesters instead of one or even year one to year two. Conducting a longitudinal study will enable researchers to collect data of students while they are in the course and then collect data during their student teaching experience and eventually in their induction years.

Future research is recommended to examine whether this study has information for those instructors teaching any subject area using a co-teaching model. It would be informative to research whether the public or private school level with pre-k, speech language, occupational therapists, and physical therapists, reading specialists or any other
professional services being provided within the inclusive classroom is impacted by conducting a similar study with different personnel.

Further research would be recommended to see how this study could impact others in various fields that choose to co-teach or team with another. It may be interesting to note and compare what co-teachers do in a school of education versus two faculty co-teaching in a school of nursing, pharmacy or school of business. For example, as part of my doctoral course work I was assigned to conduct a professional development presentation to my two instructors on the topic of human resource development and continuous improvement. I decided since they were using a team teaching approach I would introduce them to the co-teaching vocabulary station I created for the teacher candidates during our station teaching lesson, and the Gately and Gately Co-Teaching Rating Scale, as a tool for dialogue about their team teaching efforts. The dialogue was lively and both professors agreed that the exercise enabled them to now have a common co-teaching vocabulary and a greater awareness of how they can better co-teach using grouping, co-planning, staging themselves, and organizing their materials better within the classroom space. Does co-teaching faculty in higher education have a need for professional development in the area of co-teaching?

Lastly, Marlene and I also questioned whether we were exceptional individuals and not typical of real co-teachers. Is co-teaching dependent on exceptional individuals, specific personality characteristics? Were Marlene and I experiencing the Hawthorne Effect (Landsberger, 1958) where our individual behaviors may have been altered due to knowing that we were being studied? We are both hardworking individuals, who have achieved success, so it is hard to determine. Were we successful because of our
knowledge, experience, and where we are in our careers? Would the study have been different if Marlene was a brand new faculty member that came from another background with limited experience? What would have happened if I did not have trust or respect for her early on in our relationship? Further research is needed to investigate whether these possible research questions hold true or false.

Recommendations for the School of Education

Many frameworks for inclusive teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Friend, 2000; Kluth and Straut, 2003; Luckner, 1999; Sprague and Pennell, 2000) encourage Schools of Education to provide models of classrooms where two instructors teach one class and co-teach using inclusive collaborative practices. As a result of this study our School of Education may revisit the idea of having two instructors co-teaching.

Collaboration for Inclusion

In our School of Education we currently have co-teaching models for all the courses taught in the executive leadership doctoral program and the educational administration Masters program. However, with a few exceptions, the undergraduate and graduate teacher education courses are taught by a single instructor. In some cases, co-teaching has resulted from the blending of two sections of the same course and the faculty volunteering to teach together. In another case, the college provided faculty development grant money to two faculty who were conducting research on the topic.

Marlene and I experienced some of the same problems and barriers that Walther-Thomas, et al. (1999) found including limited planning time, resistance to change, and limited administrative and financial support. I was able to get approval for a course release since I was conducting research as part of my doctorate as faculty and not as a
sign of them supporting two instructors co-teaching one course. As we continue to
investigate how to prepare teacher candidates for inclusive classrooms it is essential that
we also investigate how we can be supported by the college structurally, administratively,
and financially. It is a competitive market in our area for schools of education and for
teacher candidates. We have three teacher colleges’ close in proximity and all trying to
compete and attract the most highly qualified candidates to their schools. I recommend
that the School of Education implement new policy that supports co-taught methods
courses to provide a program that prepares teachers for the collaborative settings they
will eventually work in.

There are no specific policies written on co-teaching college courses and how it
may impact an instructor’s required course load and pay. Typically most collaborative
relationships occur from the instructors assigned to teach a particular course and then
faculty look for grants or alternative ways to get funding to support it. A poor economy
and limited resources have impacted the financial climate at the college and there is a
heightened awareness of added costs and spending. Putting two instructors in a co-taught
class is more costly and further studies will be needed to research the cost benefits that
may exist.

I recommend that our department and school of education further collaborative
efforts and investigate a merger of all departments in the School of Education to one
inclusive education department. As a School of Education we need to investigate other
teacher education programs that have successfully adopted an inclusive education model.
I recommend researching further collaborations with Professional Development Schools
and opportunities to foster co-teaching and collaboration within co-existing urban city
school partnerships. The research reveals that in order to succeed we must create structural changes within the college that foster increased cross-departmental interactions and commit to the financial resources needed for implementation (Walther-Thomas, Korinek, and McLaughlin, 1999; Titone, 2005; Wood, 1998). I recommend the administration of the School of Education conduct a cost-benefit analysis of a co-teaching model to provide pertinent fiscal data and information. Regardless, as a result of my research, I recommend that Collaboration for Inclusion is always co-taught. Committing to collaboration and co-teaching models is an effective way to make us more responsive to today’s inclusive classrooms. This recommendation would provide the school of education with a unique approach in the area of collaboration and co-teaching, and may make our School of Education more competitive and attractive to a greater number of potential teacher candidates.

Limitations

The first limitation of this study was the limited time I had getting the research study approved through the appropriate channels, and then seeking Marlene’s consent for participation. We had three and a half weeks to begin a relationship and prepare for our co-teaching experience. This was mitigated by meeting frequently once receiving approval. Marlene and I were well prepared by the first week of classes but I can not help but think it would have been beneficial to have a full summer to plan for the co-taught course.

The second limitation was personal bias of the participant observer and the danger of becoming a supporter of the group being studied. I was well aware of this trait at the start of the research study. During the actual study I felt immersed in the process of co-teaching and heavily vested. I was reminded by my committee to remain objective as
possible throughout the development of the research study. Had Marlene been someone who was not as hardworking or well planned and prepared as myself, I may have felt a greater obligation to promote the positives I knew about collaborating, and encourage my co-teaching partner to participate more, but that was not the case with Marlene. It appeared that in our case we might have experienced a “best case scenario”.

The third limitation was that I as the participant observer may not have had sufficient time to take notes as a direct observer might have during class time. Taking jottings during class sessions became virtually impossible for me as we co-taught the class. If I had stopped in the middle of a co-taught lesson to capture an insight it would have created a negative issue of parity and affected my positionality within the classroom. This was mitigated by writing field notes immediately following each class session.

A fourth limitation was due to equipment failure. I lost all videotape from the tenth and last session. To compensate we audio taped our recollections of that last class and used the Co-Teaching Rating Scale to discuss our growth as co-teachers instead of reviewing the last tape.

Conclusion

Teacher candidates participate in field experiences at K-12 schools early on in their teacher certification programs where they are placed in inclusive, co-taught settings. This study provided teacher candidates with models of co-teaching and provided working examples of how to co-teach in inclusive classrooms. This experience in a co-taught environment demonstrated the co-teaching models, roles and responsibilities, co-teaching pedagogy and use of staging and space that co-teachers should know and be able to do in a co-teaching relationship.
As an instructor, I emphasize to our teacher candidates the importance of building relationships and knowing our students well in order to have a better understanding of their interests and how they learn. I also emphasize the importance of building relationships with students, parents, and families. One area of relationship that I have not emphasized until participating in this research study is building relationships with other professionals that may work with us in our classrooms to provide special education services or academic support. As a preservice educator, I have an obligation to prepare teachers for today’s classrooms that often include students who are identified with special needs. More and more students are being included into the general education settings and teacher candidates need to be prepared to work with and support parents and other professionals that provide these services within the classroom. Building a relationship with a co-teacher, parent or other professional working in our classrooms fosters collaboration. This research study provided an opportunity for teacher candidates to see two instructors co-teach and demonstrate co-teaching models. They were able to reflect and practice those models prior to student teaching and gain a greater understanding of the complexities of co-teaching by watching us go through and share the experience.

Trust, mutual respect, and a genuine interest in a co-teaching partner’s knowledge and skills are essential when building a relationship in a co-taught classroom. Co-teachers learn from each other. There is flexibility and compromise when co-teachers begin to organize themselves as a co-teaching team. Clear communication and a commitment to co-planning are essential over the course of the semester. As faculty co-teachers, we met frequently and planned instruction by negotiating roles and responsibilities, distributing a
fair balance of work load, and planned the staging of ourselves, teacher candidates, and our materials within the classroom space.

Prior to co-teaching a course, co-teachers discuss agendas, course content, teacher candidates’ course goals and objectives, and a shared grading method. A co-teaching pedagogy emerges as co-teachers find a common vocabulary to describe and demonstrate models and methods of co-teaching instruction. Co-teachers create cueing systems to locate each other within the classroom space. Use of visual and verbal cues are established and implemented to alert the facilitator that the other member of the co-teaching team wishes to take the stage during a lesson. As co-teachers gain experience working together they become more fluid as they transition from instructor to instructor while demonstrating models of co-teaching.

Often candidates struggle when figuring out their roles and responsibilities within the group of adults providing instruction and support services for identified and non-identified students in an inclusive setting. Demonstrating a co-teaching relationship and co-teaching pedagogy that includes a common co-teaching vocabulary, modeling, verbal and non-verbal cues, staging and space, provides teacher candidates increased time to observe, practice and prepare for the classrooms they will most likely teach in.

This research study has provided insights and recommendations for successful collaborations in the future in order to create a more highly qualified teaching force. It is our belief that teacher candidates will have a greater willingness to co-teach having been exposed to co-teaching demonstrations of the models, strategies, and skills needed to foster collaboration during our class sessions.
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Appendix A

SPECIAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CHILDHOOD (GRADES 1-6)

Pre-Block
EDUC 230: Human Exceptionalities (3 credits)*
10 hours of field experience (0 credits)**

Block I
EDUC 229: Language Acquisition and Literacy Development (3 credits)
EDUC MSTI 260: Adaptive Technology (3 credits)
10 clock hours of field experience (0 credits)**

Block II
EDUC 330: Assessment and Instructional Strategies (6 credits)
15 hours of field experience (0 credits)**

Block III
EDUC 371: Classroom Management (3 credits)
EDUC 422P: Diversity in Education (3 credits)*
EDUC 440: Collaboration for Inclusion (3 credits)
15 hours of field experience (0 credits)**
Block IV: Student Teaching

EDUC 101: Issues in Student Health and Safety (0 credits)

EDUC 485: Student Teaching Seminar (1 credit)

EDUC 488: Student Teaching Childhood (6 credits)*

EDUC 498: Student Teaching Special Education, Grades 1-6 (6 credits)

* Indicates courses already completed as part of Childhood Education major.

** Field experience hours are in addition to hours completed as part of Childhood Education major.
### Co-Teaching Rating Scale for Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING:</th>
<th>1=rarely; 2=sometimes; 3=usually</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nonverbal communication is observed</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Both teachers move freely throughout the space</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers appear competent with the curriculum and standards</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers agree on the goals of the co-taught classroom</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spontaneous planning occurs throughout the lesson</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Both teachers take stage and present during the lesson</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Classroom rules and routines have been jointly developed</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Many measures are used for grading students</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Humor is often used in the classroom</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Materials are shared in the classroom</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Both teachers appear familiar with the methods and materials with respect to the content area</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Modifications of goals for students with special needs are incorporated into the class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Planning for classes appears to be the shared responsibility of both teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The &quot;chalk&quot; passes freely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A variety of classroom management techniques is used to enhance learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Test modifications are commonplace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Communication is open and honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. There is fluid positioning of teachers in the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Both teachers appear to feel confident in the content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Student-centered objectives are incorporated into the classroom curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Time is allocated (or found) for common planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Students appear to accept and seek out both teachers' help in the learning process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Behavior management is the shared responsibility of both teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Goals and objectives in IEPs are considered as part of the grading for students with special needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Coteaching Rating Scale
Special Education Teacher Format

Respond to each question below by circling the number that best describes your viewpoint:

1: Rarely 2: Sometimes 3: Usually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I can easily read the nonverbal cues of my coteaching partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel comfortable moving freely about the space in the cotaught classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I understand the curriculum standards with respect to the content area in the cotaught classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Both teachers in the cotaught classroom agree on the goals of the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Planning can be spontaneous, with changes occurring during the instructional lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I often present lessons in the cotaught class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Classroom rules and routines have been jointly developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Many measures are used for grading students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Humor is often used in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>All materials are shared in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am familiar with the methods and materials with respect to this content area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Modifications of goals for students with special needs are incorporated into this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Planning for classes is the shared responsibility of both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. The "chalk" passes freely between the two teachers.

15. A variety of classroom management techniques is used to enhance learning of all students.

16. Test modifications are commonplace.

17. Communication is open and honest.

18. There is fluid positioning of teachers in the classroom.

19. I feel confident in my knowledge of the curriculum content.

20. Student-centered objectives are incorporated into the curriculum.

21. Time is allotted (or found) for common planning.

22. Students accept both teachers as equal partners in the learning process.

23. Behavior management is the shared responsibility of both teachers.
# The Coteaching Rating Scale

**General Education Teacher Format**

*Respond to each question below by circling the number that best describes your viewpoint:*

1: Rarely 2: Sometimes 3: Usually

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

1. I can easily read the nonverbal cues of my coteaching partner.

2. Both teachers move freely about the space in the cotaught classroom.

3. My coteacher understands the curriculum standards with respect to the content area in the cotaught classroom.

4. Both teachers in the cotaught classroom agree on the goals of the classroom.

5. Planning can be spontaneous, with changes occurring during the instructional lesson.

6. My coteaching partner often presents lessons in the cotaught class.

7. Classroom rules and routines have been jointly developed.

8. Many measures are used for grading students.

9. Humor is often used in the classroom.

10. All materials are shared in the classroom.

11. The special education teacher is familiar with the methods and materials with respect to this content area.

12. Modifications of goals for students with special needs are incorporated into this class.

13. Planning for classes is the shared responsibility of both teachers.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. The &quot;chalk&quot; passes freely between the two teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A variety of classroom management techniques is used to enhance learning of all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Test modifications are commonplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Communication is open and honest.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. There is fluid positioning of teachers in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am confident of the special education teacher's knowledge of the curriculum content.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Student-centered objectives are incorporated into the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Time is allotted (or found) for common planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Students accept both teachers as equal partners in the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Behavior management is the shared responsibility of both teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Goals and objectives in IEPs are considered as part of the grading for students with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix C

#### Autoethnographic methods study Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preamble</strong></td>
<td>• Confidentiality and Data Storage</td>
<td>• The research will be conducted so that others will not be able to match the results with the participants and their privacy will be maintained. All material will be stored in a locked file cabinet and coded to ensure participants' anonymity. The proper informed consent forms, sample introductory letters of proposed research and purpose, protocols and sample questions for interviews will be included in the packet for Institutional Review Board approval. Prior to conducting the research in the selected course and section, a research proposal will be submitted to the Dean of the School of Education. The proposal will include a brief summary, background and introduction, methodology, instruments, participants, data collection, data analysis and time lines for the proposed study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Layout of Protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>• Overview of Research Project</td>
<td>• The study will explore through the collection of multiple data the impressions and experiences of co-teaching faculty regarding how they prepare teacher candidates for inclusive settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The case research method</td>
<td>• Participant Observation—This mode of repeated...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126
observation will allow the researcher to take on a variety of roles within the autoethnographic methods study and participate in the events being studied. Videotape of class sessions will be collected during the spring 2008 school session. The videotape will be reviewed within the same week it was taken and used along with a focused interview to gain insights on the co-teaching experience as they prepare teacher candidates for collaboration and inclusion. This data will be collected twelve times throughout the spring 2008 semester in order to generate narrative from the assigned faculty about co-teaching and their perceived attitudes towards co-teaching and collaboration. These will be focused interviews and conducted while viewing the videotape of each class session to gain opinions about events and insights into certain occurrences. All interviews will be taped, transcribed and analyzed by the researcher. Interviews will last approximately two hours and will be scheduled at the convenience of the participants. Field notes will be taken after each class and will include recording what is observed, making connections, jotting down common vocabulary, key words and phrases, and a presentation of others views during class dialogue and social interactions. Archival Records – Agendas, class lists, lesson plans, meeting minutes and email will be archived. This data will be collected as available during the
Table 1: Outline of Autoethnographic methods study Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities/ Tasks</th>
<th>People Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication of proposal to Dean,</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 2007-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean.</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Special Education, Childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Research Instruments:
  - Qualitative-interview guides with open ended questions

- Data Analysis Guidelines:
  - Overview of data analysis processes
  - Details regarding:
    - How convergence of data from multiple sources will be achieved
    - How triangulation of perspectives from multiple participants will be achieved
  - Data Schema:
    - Summary of primary data types, sources and purpose
    - A priori list of codes that will be used during qualitative analysis

- Field notes, participant observations, videotape and transcription of interviews while watching videotape of twelve co-taught class sessions.

- Interview Guide for review of Videotape

- Triangulation of data will be accomplished using four sources as a strategy to strengthen reliability and ensure internal validity.

- Conducting cross-checks of facts and discrepancies will be used to gather additional data to verify key observations or check a fact.

- A priori codes will be identified to name, identify and distinguish important concepts of particular observations including: planning and preparation, roles and responsibilities, rules, routines and classroom management, student assessment, and communication.

- These are themes adapted from Gately and Gately (2001) Co-Teaching Rating Scale. (see Appendix B)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Department</th>
<th>WGB/ Consenting Faculty Dean and Asst. Dean of School of Ed. Dissertation Chair and Committee Special Education Department Chair</th>
<th>Nov/Dec 2007-January 8 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan personnel and syllabi for co-taught courses</td>
<td>Pilot Co-Teaching in course 440 using a collaborative approach.</td>
<td>WGB Marlene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Week 1</td>
<td>1. Observation/Videotape/Audiotape</td>
<td>1. 1/14-1/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Week 2</td>
<td>2. Observation/Videotape/Audiotape</td>
<td>2. 1/18-1/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Week 3</td>
<td>3. Observation/Videotape/Audiotape</td>
<td>3. 1/28-2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Week 4</td>
<td>4. Observation/Videotape/Audiotape</td>
<td>4. 2/4-2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Week 5</td>
<td>5. Observation/Videotape/Audiotape</td>
<td>5. 2/11-2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Week 7</td>
<td>7. Observation/Videotape/Audiotape</td>
<td>7. 3/3-3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Week 8</td>
<td>8. Observation/Videotape/Audiotape</td>
<td>8. 3/10-3/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Week 12</td>
<td>12. Observation/Videotape/Audiotape</td>
<td>12. 4/7-4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Week 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>13. 4/14-4/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Timeline**

- **November 28**-Pending Dean's and Chair's approval committee members will meet and researcher will contact potential co-teacher to see about interest and consent to participate in the study.

- **December 8**-pending approval the researcher begins IRB process and collects co-planning and course preparation data. After IRB approval letters of consent for videotaping and introductory letters are mailed to teacher candidates.

- **December and Early January**—Co-plan and prepare for co-teaching course EDUC: 440-01. Gain familiarity with syllabus, audio and videotape usage and review pertinent research articles as a team. Set dates for videotaping, interviews, and together create plans for the twelve classes.

- **January through May—Data Collection.** Videotape of each class session when faculty is co-teaching will occur weekly. Interviews will be conducted following each class session while reviewing videotape. Field notes will be gathered by the participant observer after each class session.
• **January 10**-Pending IRB approval research study begins. First Class of EDUC:

440-01 Collaboration for Inclusion commences.

2. **Sample Focus Questions**

- What were the objectives of the lesson?

- Did the lesson go as planned?

- Were the roles and responsibilities of each teacher clear?

- What would you do differently next time teaching this lesson?

- What specific co-teaching strategies did you employ?

- What strategies did you model that reflect collaborative practice?

- What modes of communication were used?

- How were rules, routines and classroom management handled?

3. **Interview Schedules**-After each videotaped session the co-teachers will commit to reviewing and audio taping their perceptions of the videotaped lesson. These will occur at a mutually convenient time for both instructors no later than one week past each of the individually taped sessions.
4. **Field Procedures** - As a participant observer the researcher will share the duties and responsibilities of teaching the course with the other faculty member. They will share all teaching and grading duties and assume changing roles as needed. The researcher will be responsible for all duties in relationship to conducting the study.

5. **Resources Required** - Video camera, tripod, audiotape and cassettes. Paper and pens for memoing and field notes.
**Appendix D**

**Childhood Education Requirements**

- **PSYC 100C: Introduction to Psychology (3)**

**Pre-Block (12 credit hours)**
- **EDUC 210: Survey of Education (3)**
- **EDUC 230: Human Exceptionalities (3)**
- **MSTI 131: Introduction to Instructional Technology (3)**
- **EDUC 227C: Child and Adolescent Development (3)**

10 hours field experience in CHED

**Block I (9 credit hours)**
- **EDUC 225: Children’s Literature (3)**
- **EDUC 312: Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment S.S.(3)**
- **PHIL 230D: Philosophy in Education (3)**
- **EDUC 190: 20 hours field experience in CHED**

**Block II (6 credit hours)**
- **EDUC 313: CIA in Primary Literacy (3)**
- **EDUC 350: CIA in Math, Science, Technology (3)**
- **EDUC 290: 30 hours field experience**

**Block III (9 credit hours)**
- **EDUC 351: CIA in Math, Science Technology (3)**
- **EDUC 356: CIA in Intermediate Literacy (3)**
- **EDUC 422P: Diversity in Education (3)**
- **EDUC 390: 40 hours field experience**

**Block IV: Student Teaching (13 credit hours)**
- **EDUC 101: Issues in Student Health/Safety (0)**
- **EDUC 485: Student Teaching Seminar (1)**
- **EDUC 490: Student Teaching - CHED ONLY (12)**
- **EDUC 488: CHED SPED (w/ EDUC 498) (6)**

**Special Education Requirements**

**Pre-Block**
- **EDUC 230: Human Exceptionalities *  
  10 additional hours field experience in SPED**

**Block I (6 credit hours)**
- **EDUC 229: Language Acquisition/Literacy Level (3)**
- **MSTI 260: Adaptive Technology (3)**
- **EDUC 192: 10 hours field experience in SPED**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block II (6 credit hours)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 330: Assessment &amp; Instructional Strategies (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 292: 15 hours field experience in SPED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block III (6 credit hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 371: Classroom Management (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 422P: Diversity in Education *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 440: Collaboration for Inclusion (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 392: 15 hours field experience in SPED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block IV: Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 101: Issues in Student Health/Safety *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 485: Student Teaching Seminar *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 498: CHED SPED (w/ EDUC 488) (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates courses already completed as part of Childhood major. No additional hours needed.
Appendix E

The table below represents themes that were revealed and where within the series of videotape sessions they were revealed.

Table E

Co-Teaching Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video Session</th>
<th>Building Relationships</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
<th>Roles, Responsibilities</th>
<th>Staging and Use of Space</th>
<th>Time Allotment</th>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 M. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 M. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 M. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
<td>M. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 M. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 M. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
<td>W. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>W. 8</td>
<td>W. 7</td>
<td>W. 7</td>
<td>W. 2</td>
<td>W. 1</td>
<td>W. 9</td>
<td>W. 9</td>
<td>W. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

The chart below represents the major themes and their operational definitions including the positive and negative experiences related to each theme.

Table F

Co-teaching Themes, Definitions and Positives and Negatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme and Operational Definition</th>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Building</strong>&lt;br&gt;Operational Definition - The progression of the attachment that formed between the faculty as they co-taught the course.</td>
<td>• Earned trust and respect for each other’s knowledge and experiences&lt;br&gt;• Network expands by two&lt;br&gt;• New perspective and lens&lt;br&gt;• Trust evolved as we learned more about each other personally and professionally&lt;br&gt;• We let the students be a part of our developing relationship by sharing our experiences</td>
<td>• We were strangers. Had to get to know each other during the experience, not prior to the experience. Early on she called me the wrong name. Students knew me better than she did.&lt;br&gt;• Prior relationships with teacher candidates and speakers from Advocacy Center may cause favoritism or a familiarity that one has vs. the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modeling of Co-Teaching Pedagogy</strong>&lt;br&gt;Operational Definition - To produce a representation or simulation of a co-teaching model.</td>
<td>• Reflective teaching&lt;br&gt;• Providing a living model to examine and reflect upon&lt;br&gt;• Visible and visual model&lt;br&gt;• Parallels real teaching experiences&lt;br&gt;• Able to watch the turnover of responsibility and joint agreements&lt;br&gt;• Able to think aloud and share our experiences as they unfold</td>
<td>• May limit themselves to using only the models teacher candidates observed and practiced&lt;br&gt;• Need greater time to model two different approaches to the same content and then have teacher candidates compare&lt;br&gt;• Discrepancy from what we are modeling to struggling co-teaching settings in schools they do their field work in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation of Roles, Responsibilities and Parity while Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Definition- The duty and obligation to perform a part or a function within a particular process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Both able to check for understanding/assess
- Create and structure organization of class
- Model negotiation of roles, passing the chalk, time allotment, assigned duties, and distribution of materials
- Commitment to co-planning
- Voice-who says what, when
- Found a common language
- Bounce/Ping ideas off each other
- Routines and rituals are established, what we do at start and end of class are a result of class commitments we created together
- Agenda posted, allotted times and time management and pacing
- Develop class ground rules together

- Unbalanced work load between co-teachers
- Dominant vs. Submissive Roles
- Comfort level of sticking to traditional roles of generalist and specialist
- Letting go of responsibility and ownership
- Lens is focused on teacher to student interactions only and not on teacher to teacher interactions
- Hidden hierarchy-experience, special educator vs. content specialist
- Lack of accountability
- Dominant personality
- Uncomfortable taking lead when it is unfamiliar
- Both professor names listed on handout
- Grading difference
- Teacher/student ratio
- Assigned jobs
- Utilize each other's strengths/ideas/lens
- One manages while one instructs
- Second pair of ears/eyes
- Ability to check/clarify/cue each other
- Trust
- Learning alongside our candidates

**Setting the Stage and Using Space**
Operational Definition: The arrangement of the two instructors as far as distance between each other, teacher candidates and their materials within the classroom setting.

- Fluid Positioning of teachers as we moved from team teaching to individual facilitator to a co-teaching model
- Negotiate where we are in the room to guide teacher candidate focus
- Moving up and down stage provided cues to co-teacher when they wanted to speak or pass the chalk
- Model postures and organization of materials and easel
- Demonstrate transitions
- Provide greater accessibility, proximity to teacher candidates
- Increased awareness of where we are in the room in order to bounce or ping off each other

**Co-teaching Pedagogy**
Operational Definition: The field of study that deals with the methods of teaching and learning co-teaching.

- Time Allotment-setting time allotments and pace for each class
- Learned through progression of classes each others teaching styles and strengths
- Give and take between

- Distractions
- Learn to maximize or minimize movement
- Lack of synchronization
- Figure out if and where you fit
- Get in each other's way/stepping on toes
- Detract attention and standing still can be challenging

- Limits on teachable moments and flexibility
- Inability to get through all the material in the allotted time when flexible and teachable moment occurs
- Unequal roles and time "on stage" or facilitating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructors, flexibility, trust</th>
<th>Increased time commitment for co-planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Create a common co-teaching vocabulary and verbal and non-verbal cues</td>
<td>• No longer working in isolation, must be sensitive to schedules and conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-task—one shows prop while other describes its purpose and use</td>
<td>• Turning over of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective use of humor, similar sense of humor</td>
<td>• Visual cues can be confusing—need to be clear to teacher candidates who they should be directing their attention to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cues—we demonstrated a variety of visual, verbal and non-verbal cues that co-teachers can use when co-teaching</td>
<td>• Began to mirror each other and blend our styles and lose some of our individual style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Began to mirror each other and blend our styles created a fluid team</td>
<td>• At times it was hard to frame everything in the lens of a co-teacher and at times it was the lens of a general education teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of voice, proximity and staging to manage candidate behavior.</td>
<td>• Overtly shared when we managed the class by proximity. If a group was noisy either one of us could move in close and redirect them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>