

2008

Exploring effective co-teaching models

Lien M. Nguyen
Hamline University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_all



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nguyen, Lien M., "Exploring effective co-teaching models" (2008). *School of Education Student Capstone Theses and Dissertations*. 2057.
https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_all/2057

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at DigitalCommons@Hamline. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Education Student Capstone Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Hamline. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@hamline.edu, lterveer01@hamline.edu.

EXPLORING EFFECTIVE CO-TEACHING MODELS

by

Lien M. Nguyen

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Education

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

May 2008

Primary Advisor: Michael Anderson
Secondary Advisor: Theodora Moon
Peer Reviewer: Sara Quick

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
Chapter One: Introduction	
Overview of Capstone Inquiry.....	1
Background on Capstone Question.....	2
Significance of the Capstone Question.....	7
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	8
Introduction.....	8
Laws Which Influenced Programming for Students with Disabilities.....	9
Laws Which Influenced Inclusion.....	10
Definition of Full Inclusion.....	10
Benefits of Full Inclusion.....	13
Definition of Co-teaching.....	14
Five Models of Co-teaching.....	15
One teach and One assist	15
Station teaching.....	16
Parallel teaching.....	16
Alternative teaching.....	16
Team teaching.....	17

Benefits of Co-teaching.....	17
Benefits for students with disabilities.....	17
Benefits for students without disabilities.....	19
Benefits for general and special education teachers.....	21
Conclusion.....	21
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	23
Participants and Location.....	23
Purpose and Time Line.....	24
Nature of Involvement of Human Subjects.....	24
Data Collection.....	25
Chapter Four: Results.....	27
Overview.....	27
Pre-Planning.....	27
Survey results.....	27
Co-Teaching Models and Lessons.....	29
Red class.....	29
Blue class.....	31
Results of the Lessons.....	32
Red class.....	32
Blue class.....	33

Conclusion.....	34
Red class.....	34
Blue class.....	35
Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	37
Overview.....	37
What I Have Learned.....	38
Literature Review.....	39
Implications.....	40
Limitations and Future Research.....	40
Reflection on Capstone.....	41
Appendix A: Sharing Hopes, Attitudes, Responsibilities, and Expectations (S.H.A.R.E)	
Questionnaire.....	43
Appendix B: Co-teaching Survey.....	46
Appendix C: Co-Teaching Lesson Planning Sheet.....	50
Appendix D: Teacher Consent Form.....	52
Appendix E: Parent Consent Form.....	55
Bibliography.....	58

Nguyen, L. Exploring Effective Co-teaching Models (2008)

The research question addressed in this project was, what is an effective co-teaching model between mainstream and special education teachers and the impact on the kindergarten classroom environment? It documents one teacher's exploration of the five models of co-teaching. The author documents the benefits of co-teaching and full inclusion. She documents details of the surveys, lesson plans, and outcomes of the three models of co-teaching that were used in two kindergarten classrooms. She concludes that: (1) it is important to gather background information from participating colleagues, (2) students with disabilities and at risk learners benefit most from co-teaching, and (3) students' abilities determine which co-teaching model is effective.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Overview of Capstone Inquiry

After graduating from high school, I wanted to be a pediatrician since I loved working with young children. I wanted to quit college after the first quarter but took on a work-study position at an elementary school as an American Reads Tutor. As an American Reads Tutor, I worked with students who needed extra help with reading. I enjoyed being a tutor and talked to a teacher about possible careers which involved working with children. She suggested I become a teacher. This was a possibility since I loved working with children. One room they assigned me was the resource room which helped students who were at risk. This was rewarding as the children truly wanted to learn. After completing the work-study, my career path moved in the direction towards Early Childhood Education. Working with students who were at risk opened the door for me to specialize in Early Childhood Special Education. It is amazing to see a child overcome milestones that a doctor or teacher said they would not be able to complete. Every year, I try to find different ways to further my professional career and working in a kindergarten classroom will aid in my professional development.

I am an Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) teacher working in a co-teaching environment. The purpose of this capstone is to explore “What is an effective

co-teaching model between mainstream and special education teachers and the impact on the kindergarten classroom environment?”

Background on Capstone Question

Co-teaching, applied to inclusion, commonly results in a general educator and a special educator (and possibly other related-service staff) sharing the teaching responsibilities within the classroom to include children with and without identified special learning needs (Wischnowski, Salmon, & Eaton, 2004). Investigating this question would be beneficial by showing how the mainstream teacher views their relationship with the special education team. I want to build a successful classroom and a strong foundation with the mainstream teachers.

This topic became important to me during my second year of teaching. I taught at a school district in a suburb of Minneapolis, with a population of 4,500 students. In the Early Childhood program, there were three preschool classrooms (morning and afternoon), three Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) classrooms, and classes for teen moms. ECFE is a program where children and parents enjoy activities together which can enhance home and school experiences. Parents can gain information, support, and encouragement from one another. In the Early Childhood program the ratio for students identified with special needs and non-identified students was 4:18, with each preschool and ECFE classroom having a special educational paraprofessional and education assistant.

In this school district, we made the choice to change the direction of special education programming. The special education director wanted to include all children with special needs in the mainstream classroom. With the full inclusion model, my role as the Early Childhood Special Education teacher was unclear. The special education director wanted the special education teacher and the mainstream teachers to work towards co-teaching. This was the first time mainstream teachers would have a special education teacher and paraprofessional in the classroom. All the teachers had been in the school district for ten or more years, and I was starting my second year of teaching. We had different teaching strategies to handle behavior situations, classroom management, and instruction.

In the ECFE and preschool classrooms, the mainstream teacher delivered the instruction, and I observed, monitored the classroom, and helped the children with special needs. The regular education staff was hesitant to move forward with the inclusion program. They were not sure what the program would look like for students who had multiple disabilities (i.e. physical impairments and behavioral issues). The mainstream classrooms had previously incorporated children with minimal special needs in their classrooms, but these children were able to function with little support from the special education staff.

I was assigned to three preschool classrooms and one ECFE classroom. My role was to assist the students with disabilities in the mainstream classroom. My time was divided equally between four classrooms. The mainstream classrooms also had a special

education paraprofessional to assist the children with disabilities. Through the planning process, the mainstream teachers were informed that the special education staff would work with the students who have special needs in the classrooms. If this was ineffective, then the students would be pulled to provide services on an individual basis.

Overall, my professional relationship with the mainstream teachers was positive, but it was also problematic at times. In the beginning, the relationship was positive because the teachers were open to implementing some interventions in their classrooms. One teacher used a picture schedule for all the students, so the children knew what was going to happen during the class time. If there was going to be a change in the schedule, she would let the children know. The teachers were also good at attending the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meetings for the students with special needs. My role was to assist the students with disabilities and develop adaptations to aide these students in order for them to be more successful in the mainstream classroom. Some students needed to be pulled out of the classroom to work on their goals and objectives in a quieter setting. It was hard working in the classroom because some of the non-identified children wanted to join the activity, and it became too distracting for the child who was identified. When playing games that addressed certain goals, such as socialization, then non-identified students would be involved. If the goal was more specific, such counting and social referencing, working with the child individually was more effective.

The first couple of months went well. When there was a concern, we met as a group to discuss resolutions. We tried to schedule meetings to discuss how things were going with the students, what was working, and what needed to be changed or modified. The meetings were part of the process of co-teaching. We also discussed students who were struggling and what could be done to help them. In addition, the special education paraprofessionals and I met once a week to get an update on the students' programming and determine if any modifications needed to be made. The special education team met as a group once a week to discuss the children we serviced as well as new referrals for special education services. Sometimes, the special education team that worked in a specific classroom would meet to discuss interventions that needed to be added or modified for a student.

The relationship became problematic when the mainstream teachers did not want to include students who had behavior issues in the classroom. They did not want to explore the underlying condition to discover why the student was struggling or what caused the behavior. For example, as a team we decided to implement sensory breaks for one student and transition objects to aide with transitions for another student. The special education team discussed the benefits of implementing these strategies and the mainstream teachers agreed. The mainstream teachers tried the interventions for a couple of weeks and after that, the teachers chose not to implement the strategies that were agreed upon. The special education team met with the mainstream teachers to reiterate why the interventions were beneficial for the students. We shared with the team that the

students would have been able to function in the classroom with minimal support from the specialists.

The following includes some of the results when the mainstream teachers did not implement the recommended interventions. One intervention incorporated sensory breaks to help a child have a successful day. We documented the results of not following through with the scheduled sensory breaks. If the student missed the sensory break, she would become very defiant at the end of the day from over stimulation. Another intervention used with a different student included the use of transition objects to make transitions successful for this child. If the student did not transition with the object, he would become defiant each time there was a transition.

The special education team met again with the mainstream teachers and tried to reiterate the importance of these interventions, but this was not successful. The mainstream teachers seemed to have made their decisions, and they stopped using the interventions. At the end of every meeting, we were unable to come up with a solution. The special education team felt like the situation was a vicious circle of the “blame game.” Due to the lack of teaming, I decided to leave the district at the end of the school year.

Researching this topic prior to my second year of teaching would have been beneficial for me. I could have assessed the views of the mainstream teachers to determine what they believed the relationship between themselves and the special education team should be. We then could have compared views and come to a

consensus. We could have decided on a co-teaching model that best meet the needs of the students.

Significance of the Capstone Question

What I learn from this process will be helpful to teachers outside of my school district (both mainstream and special education) because, as a team, teachers can choose a model of instruction that best meets the needs of their students. The administrators can have workshops where teachers can discover the learning styles of their team members. This would be helpful for teaming and building effective relationships with one another. Team members can determine if they have similar learning styles. If team members have different learning styles, they can brainstorm a variety of interventions they would be willing to try. The children in the classroom would benefit from having an environment that is less stressful and more cohesive. As the atmosphere in the classroom impacts students' behaviors, parents are more willing to have their child in a mainstream classroom when team members are working in a cohesive effort.

Chapter two provides research to support my question, "What is an effective co-teaching model between mainstream and special education teachers and the impact on the kindergarten classroom environment?"

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

The Eighteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) shows that more than 95% of all students with identified disabilities receive their education and related support services in the public schools (U.S. Department of Education [USDE], 1996). For many students with disabilities, this does not mean separate classes in the same buildings as their peers. Today, this means full-time participation in general education classrooms with typical peers. During the 1993-1994 school year, more than two million students with disabilities received all of their special education and related services within the context of their general education classrooms (USDE, 1994). This figure reflects an increase of more than 100,000 students in full-time general education placements from the previous year (USDE, 1996). In this chapter, the research will discuss the key components of my capstone, which are co-teaching and full inclusion. Before discussing the key components, it is important to examine laws, which influenced changes that impacted programming for students with disabilities.

Laws Which Influenced Programming for Students with Disabilities

Before laws were passed, students with disabilities were taught in separate classes and sometimes separate buildings. Students with disabilities were stigmatized by the general public and institutionalized. They were not given the opportunity to interact or socialize with the general public. Public Law 94-142 and Public Law 101-476 changed programming for children with disabilities. Public Law 94-142, passed in 1975, titled Education for All Handicapped Act, states that all school-age children have a free appropriate public education. Public Law 101-336, passed in 1990, titled Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, changed the wording from “handicapped children” to “individuals with disabilities.” This law mandated that children with special needs be entitled to a free and appropriate public education provided in least restrictive setting with services that support child's needs. According to Advocates for Children website (2004), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is defined as the educational setting where a child with disabilities can receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) designed to meet his or her education needs while being educated with peers without disabilities in the regular educational environment to the maximum extent appropriate. The key components of LRE according to Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) are [1] students are educated with children who are not disabled, and [2] the use of special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment should only be used when their education cannot be achieved with supplementary aids or adaptations. If LRE was not in place, teachers and

administrators would be able to put students with disabilities in a separate classroom away from their peers. With the right interventions and support, a child with disabilities can function in a mainstream classroom. When students are included in the least restrictive environment, all children are likely to improve their academic performance, and increase their communication and socialization skills.

Laws Which Influenced Inclusion

The laws and regulations governing the placement of students with disabilities do not imply that every student with a disability must be included in the regular classroom all of the time. Rather, the law requires that a continuum of services (of differing types and at different levels of inclusivity) will be available for every student, and emphasizes that the student's Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) is to be based on the student's specific needs. The law also describes how to determine the appropriate placement for a student. Information governing placement decisions can be found in the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 34 C.F.R. Section 300.552. Appropriate placement for the student is based on the decision of the special education team. The IEP defines what the team has decided as the least restrictive environment for the student.

Definition of Full Inclusion

The word inclusion is not a precise term, and it is often confused with similar concepts such as least restrictive environment (LRE) and mainstreaming. There are several definitions of inclusion. The National Center of Educational Restructuring and Inclusion (1995) define inclusion as:

The provision of services to students with disabilities, including those with severe impairments, in the neighborhood schools, in age-appropriate general education classes, with necessary support services and supplementary aids (for the child and the teacher), both to assure the child's academic-behavioral-social success and to prepare the child to participate as a full and contributing member of society. (as cited by Silliman, Ford, Beasman, & Evans, 1999, p. 1)

Full inclusion involves the teaming of general and special education teachers within a classroom. As stated earlier in this chapter, Public Law 101-336, entitled Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, influenced the movement for full inclusion. Many school districts are implementing the change of service delivery model for students with disabilities. They are decreasing the number of self-contained classrooms and enrolling students in the regular education classroom. Specialists (speech-language pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, special education teachers, etc.) are going into the regular education classroom and providing support. As long as a student is not pulled out more than 20% of the general education classroom, they are considered to be fully included. Individual instruction outside the classroom is determined by the student's needs. Bateman & Bateman state:

Inclusion implies that students will be taught outside the regular education classroom only when all available methods have been tried and failed to meet their needs. If a student is pulled out of the general education classroom for instruction in another placement, the intent is for the pullout to be temporary and

for the student to be reintegrated into the general education classroom as soon as possible. (2002, p. 2)

By allowing the student to be reintegrated in the general education classroom, teachers are able to see if the student's skills are demonstrated across all settings. Some students have mastered the skills on an individual basis but do not demonstrate them in the regular classroom. There needs to be flexibility with students programming to allow them to be successful.

Idol has the same beliefs as Bateman when discussing full inclusion. She states the purpose for the program evaluation was to examine and describe how special education services were provided in four elementary schools and four secondary schools (two middle schools and two high schools) in a large, metropolitan school district in a southwestern city. Idol used the following definition of full inclusion as a benchmark for determining the degree of inclusion in eight schools,

In the inclusive school, all students are educated in general education programs. Inclusion is when a student with special learning and/or behavioral needs is educated full time in the general education program. Essentially, *inclusion* means that the student with special education needs is attending the general school program, enrolled in age appropriate classes 100% of the school day. (2006, p. 77)

Idol also differentiates between 'mainstreaming' and 'inclusion':

Inclusion is when students with disabilities receive their entire academic

curriculum in the general education program. This is different from *mainstreaming*, which is when students with disabilities spend a portion of their school day in the general education program and a portion in a separate special education program. (1997, p. 4)

This is a key factor since there are skeptics who are opposed to full inclusion. They argue that full inclusion is not for everyone. It is important to know the difference between mainstreaming and inclusion and the effects on students with disabilities. Students involved in mainstreaming are in the general education classroom part of the day and special education classroom the other part of the day. Both inclusion and mainstreaming are different ways to provide programming for students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.

Benefits of Inclusion

The benefits of inclusion are similar to those of co-teaching as you will see. Researchers have stated multiple benefits for inclusion and they have positive impact on school districts and student with disabilities. Students with disabilities have opportunity to interact with peers who do not have disabilities. When students are included in the classroom, they do not miss any instruction. They have the opportunity to participate in all the activities planned for the day. The students with disabilities have positive self worth because they are with their peers. They do not feel stigmatized by their peers as compared to being in a separate classroom.

Another benefit of inclusion is geared toward the school district. The district will have more funding available because of state regulations supporting inclusion programs. The district is able to have appropriate funding to buy necessary equipment and curriculum utilized in the regular education classroom.

Full inclusion allows schools districts to implement co-teaching without restructuring classrooms. Students with disabilities are included in the mainstream classroom. Special education teachers are already providing services in the classrooms. Why not have both the mainstream teacher and special education teacher team together to provide instruction? It makes it easier for the special education teacher to ensure that a student's skills are carried over into the classroom.

Definition of Co-teaching

When conducting this research several different terms were used to define the teamwork between two teachers. Common terms used include *co-teaching* (Wischnowski, Salmon, Eaton, 2004; Bauwens, Hourcade, & Friend, 1998; Vaughn, Schumm, & Arguelles, 1997), *team teaching* (Merenbloom, 1991), *collaborative teaming* (Snell & Janney, 2000) and *cooperative teaching* (Hourcade, 2003). Each of these terms describes a specific instruction model used in a mainstream classroom. The most common instructional model used in education is co-teaching, and this will be the terminology used throughout this paper.

These are several definitions that researchers used to describe co-teaching. Bauwens, Hourcade and Friend (1989) define co-teaching as “an educational approach in

which general and special educators work in a coactive and coordinated fashion to jointly teach academically and behaviorally heterogeneous groups of students in educationally integrated settings” (p. 28). Cook and Friend (1995) define co-teaching as “two or more professionals delivering substantive instruction to a diverse, or blended, group of students in a single physical space” (p. 2). When applied to inclusion, co-teaching involves a general educator and special educator sharing the responsibilities of all students with and without disabilities in the classroom (Wishnowski, Salmon, & Eaton, 2004). Gately & Gately define co-teaching as “the collaboration between general and special education teachers for all of the teaching responsibilities of all students assigned to a classroom” (as cited by Keefe, Moore, and Duff’s article, p. 36).

Five Models of Co-Teaching

Several researchers use different terms for five models of co-teaching. Vaughn, Schumm, and Arguelles (1997) use (1) one-teach and one-assist, (2) station teaching, (3) parallel teaching, (4) alternative teaching, and (5) team teaching. Sands, Koleski, and French (2000) describe the same models but break team teaching into four parts: (a) tag team (one teaches a part and the other follows), (b) speak and add (one teaches and one adds information), (c) speak and chart (one teaches and one records), and (d) duet (teacher work in unison, finishing each others sentences and ideas), (as cited by Weiss & Lloyd, 2003, p 28).

One-teach and one-assist. In this model, one teacher takes the lead in delivering instruction while the other teacher walks around the classroom and assists and monitor

the students with the lesson. The teacher is able to help students who are struggling.

There is minimal planning time needed for this model. One teacher is able to familiarize him or herself with the curriculum.

Station teaching. In this model, two teachers divide the students into three groups and teach the lessons. Two groups work with the teachers directly and one group works independently. The students rotate between stations to cover the content in each group. The students have the opportunity to work with both teachers during the lesson. This model allows the students to be responsible and rotate between the stations on their own. Each teacher is responsible to plan and teach their lesson to all groups.

Parallel teaching. In this model, both teachers plan instruction together and then split the students into two groups and teach the same lesson to their groups within the classroom. With parallel teaching, teachers need to be familiar with the curriculum and be comfortable with teaching the lesson. Small group instruction allows the teachers to concentrate on specific students needs. Parallel teaching also lowers the student-teacher ratio, so it is often used when students need opportunities to respond aloud, to engage in hands-on activities, or to interact with one another.

Alternative teaching. In this model, one teacher works with a smaller group and helps the students learn the instruction presented in the larger group. This model allows the teacher to work with specific students who are struggling with the lesson. The teacher may also reiterate skills learned from the larger group. The students benefit from

the repetition, reinforcement, and re-teaching from the large group. All the students in the classroom should have the opportunity to work in the small group.

Team teaching. Both teachers teach all the students cooperatively. This model allows the teachers to work cooperatively and plan together. Students benefit from this model because both teachers are able to help all the students.

The models are not differentiated by grade level or ability of the students. The models are based on teacher planning time and instructional purpose. The teachers have the flexibility to use all the models or some of the models of co-teaching in their classroom. Scheduling a time to meet with one another is beneficial in order to plan and determine which model benefits the students and classroom environment.

Benefits of Co-teaching

There are multiple benefits of co-teaching in a mainstream classroom, including (1) benefits for student with disabilities, (2) benefits for students without disabilities, and (3) benefits for general and special education teachers. Everyone involved in a co-teaching classroom has opportunities to learn and learn from one another.

Benefits for students with disabilities. Children with disabilities are able to learn from their peers and develop age appropriate skills when they are included in the classroom. Children tend to learn more from each other and are more willing to learn. A teacher can only influence a child to an extent, and it is up to the child to obtain those skills. Children are motivated by their peers and want to be part of a group. When

students with disabilities are pulled out the classroom, they tend to feel isolated. They do not want the other students to segregate them from the group or want to be different.

Students develop self-confidence and self-esteem when they are included in the mainstream classroom. Students do not feel singled out, because they are not being pulled out of the classroom. Walther-Thomas (1997) conducted a three year study of 18 elementary and 17 middle school teams involved in the development and implementation of building-level programs designed to support students with disabilities in mainstream classroom. Walther-Thomas discovered that students with disabilities "lost" their labels when instruction was provided in the mainstreamed classroom. He states, "Teachers noted that many identified students developed better attitudes about themselves and others; they were less critical and defensive, more motivated, and more capable of looking at their own strengths and weaknesses objectively" (p. 399). These students paid more attention to their schoolwork and physical appearance and showed an increase in school attendance. The students also participated more in classroom and extracurricular activities.

A child's academic performance is increased when they are allowed to stay in the mainstream classroom. Over the 3-year study, teachers reported very few students who had failed to succeed in appropriately supported mainstream settings. Teachers used terms such as "blossoming," "soaring," and "taking off" to describe how many students with disabilities performed in their mainstream classrooms. A number of teachers

reported that students with disabilities learned that many of their skills were actually better than those of some of their non-identified peers.

Students with disabilities have opportunities to develop friendships with their peers and have role models for developing age appropriate social skills. Teachers reported that students with disabilities learned appropriate classroom behaviors from their peers and performed more appropriately in mainstream settings than they did in special education classrooms. Participants attributed students' improved social skills performance to a number of factors including good role models, direct instruction, structured practice experiences, and a strong desire by many students to "fit in" in the general education classroom. Students without disabilities are good role models and can be utilized for students with disabilities to develop socialization skills.

Participants reported that students with disabilities adjusted well socially in inclusive classrooms. These students developed friendships, visited peers' homes, played with classmates during free time and recess, and attended parties held by peers. They were also selected for classroom teams, activities, special awards, and several were elected to student council positions. I have seen students without disabilities take on the responsibility of helping their peer in the classroom. They enjoy being a helper and interacting well with one another.

Benefits for students without disabilities. There are many students who are at-risk and do not qualify for special education services. Many of these students are struggling due to environmental issues (i.e. poverty, lack of exposure to curriculum,

neighborhood violence). These students are able to get help and receive additional attention from both teachers. The special education teacher can help the classroom teacher adapt curriculum to meet the needs of all the students. Some of these students perform at a lower level compared to students with disabilities. Walther-Thomas states, “It was not surprising to find that many participants reported that their low-achieving students were more successful in their co-taught classes than they were during class periods when general educators taught by themselves” (2001, p. 400). Students who are not identified can benefit from adaptations for children with disabilities. For example a teacher can post a picture schedule to help all the children know what is going to happen next.

The reduced student-teacher ratio in a co-taught classroom allows each student more time and attention from the teachers. Teachers are able to monitor student progress and provide individual assistance. According to Walter Thomas (2001) study, the students who are at risk with their social development benefit from direct instruction, opportunities to practice skills, and receive feedback from teachers. Teachers can teach students various communication skills, coping strategies, and problem-solving skills in order to enhance social development. The teachers observed a strong community between all the students. There was not segregation between students with disabilities and students without disabilities. All the students felt they belonged in the classroom.

Benefits for general and special education teachers. Co-teachers have the opportunity to learn from one another. Opportunities to share their unique knowledge bases and professional skills had allowed many teachers to explore new ideas and content areas, and to expand their professional skills repertoires (Thomas, p. 401). Many teachers found it beneficial to have another teacher to share the responsibilities of the classroom. They enjoyed having a conversation and providing moral support for each other. It is difficult to teach a class by yourself and have the feeling of being alone and isolated from your peers.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the following laws and organizations: (1) Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), (2) Public Law 94-142 , (3) Public Law 101-476, and (4) Least Restrictive Environment Coalition made a huge impact on programming for students with disabilities. With these organizations and current laws, students with disabilities are able to be included in regular education classrooms. They no longer have to be isolated from their peers.

With the new era of co-teaching, students and teachers are able to benefit from one another. School districts are able to help students who are at risk and students can start interventions when the need is present. They no longer fall through the cracks and get behind. There is a light at the end of the tunnel for all student achievement.

In chapter three, research will guide me in implementing different co-teaching models in two kindergarten classrooms. I hope to find a model that is beneficial for the

students and the teachers. Conducting this research is important because I co-teach in two kindergarten mainstream classrooms. I want to have an effective school year and have a classroom environment that is beneficial for all the students and staff.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Participants and Location

The location of this study will take place at a public school west of Minneapolis. The participants are eight students from two kindergarten classrooms and two kindergarten teachers. I work in both kindergarten classrooms on different days. They are referred to as the red kindergarten and blue kindergarten classes. I work cooperatively with each teacher in her classroom.

The red kindergarten class attends Mondays, Wednesdays, and alternating Fridays. The kindergarten teacher from the red class has been co-teaching for fifteen years. The red class has seventeen students; six of these students are identified with a disability. In the red class, students are continually being redirected and provided with prompts to complete activities and stay on task.

The blue kindergarten class attends Tuesdays, Thursdays, and alternating Fridays. The kindergarten teacher from the blue class has been co-teaching for five years. The blue class has seventeen students; four of these students are identified with a disability. In the blue class, the students need minimal prompting from the teachers to complete tasks. Hopefully, through this process, we can find a teaching strategy that will change the students' behaviors.

All the students in both classrooms will be involved in the activities for this study. I will select four students from each classroom to collect data on each lesson to determine which co-teaching model was effective. The students who will be selected have a variety of abilities. The abilities of these students are as follows: (1) above grade level, (2) at grade level, (3) at risk, and (4) identified with special needs.

Purpose and Time Line

The purpose of the research is to find a co-teaching model that is effective in the classroom and meets the needs of all the students. The hope is to build a relationship with the mainstream teacher through this process of discovering which model is more effective for each class and if both classes use the same model. The research will take place over the duration of one month in both kindergarten classrooms.

Nature of Involvement of Human Subjects

My colleagues and I will complete a questionnaire related to co-teaching in order to gain background information. After completing the questionnaire, we will meet to discuss answers and then determine which model will be beneficial in the classroom. The tools that will be used are Sharing Hopes, Attitudes, Responsibilities, and Expectations (S.H.A.R.E) (Appendix A) and the Co-teaching Survey (Appendix B). After completing the surveys, we will cooperatively decide on which co-teaching models to try in the classroom. We will then develop a lesson using the Co-Teaching Lesson Planning Sheet (Appendix C) and plan the lessons according to the models we choose.

After we plan the lessons, the two of us will meet to determine the modes of instruction and our roles. My role will change with each model depending on which model will be utilized. The following is a description of the roles of the teachers with each co-teaching model. In the one-teach, one-assist model, the lessons are planned cooperatively. The mainstream teacher will provide the instruction and organizes the content and I walk around the classroom and assist the students or we may reverse roles. In the station teaching model, my colleague and I are responsible for planning our own lesson. The students will be divided into three groups. The special education teacher will teach one part of the lesson to a group of students and the kindergarten teacher will teach the other part of the lesson to a different group of students. The remainder of the students will work independently on a different part of the lesson. The students will then rotate between each station in order to receive the full lesson. In the parallel teaching model, the kindergarten and special education teacher will plan the lesson together, but we will teach the lesson separately. In the alternative teaching model, either the kindergarten or special education teacher will teach a large group of students. The other teacher will pre-teach, offer guided practice, or review the lesson in a smaller classroom environment. In the team teaching model, we will both cooperatively teach a lesson together and instruct the class.

Data Collection

Data will be collected through teacher surveys and student's work, and meetings with the teachers before and after the research. We will also meet to discuss student

progress, and documentation will be kept on any differences between classrooms. These methods are effective because it will provide a whole picture, and be able to determine which co-teaching model worked best. Student progress will be documented with samples of their work. Data will be collected before and after the implementation of the co-teaching models in order to develop a base line and document student growth.

Chapter four will report my findings of the research on co-teaching. I am hoping to discover a co-teaching model that is beneficial for each classroom. It will be interesting to see if both kindergarten teachers choose the same model of co-teaching and how the model impacts student learning.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine which co-teaching model was more effective between mainstream and special education teachers and the impact on the kindergarten classroom environment. In this chapter, I examine and summarize the findings of the data collection including the participants' work, teacher interviews and lessons.

Pre-Planning

Before deciding which model to use in the classrooms, I needed to gather background information from the kindergarten teacher in the red and blue classes. The three of us filled out the Sharing Hopes, Attitudes, Responsibilities, and Expectations (S.H.A.R.E.) Questionnaire (Appendix A) and the Co-teaching survey (Appendix B) to determine our co-teaching goals.

Survey results. The kindergarten teachers and I had similar responses on the S.H.A.R.E. Questionnaire. The three of us hoped to schedule time to plan lessons together and share responsibilities in the inclusion classroom. We all agreed teaching students with disabilities in a general education classroom allow children to learn from each other. With positive role models, much can be learned that we, as teachers, cannot

teach. The three of us want to share the planning, teaching, and documenting progress and behaviors. I would be responsible for setting up meetings for IEP's and documenting individual goals related to the IEP. The kindergarten teachers could help implement the goals and objectives in the classroom.

My colleagues and I also had similar responses on the co-teaching survey. We had to respond to each question by answering usually, sometimes, or always. We answered “always” to questions related to understanding the curriculum standards, being familiar with the methods and materials needed to teach the curriculum, open and honest communication, administration which encourages and supports both teachers and co-teaching, and feeling happy about the co-teaching relationship. The three of us answered “usually” to questions related to classroom rules and routines being jointly developed, different measures used for grading, humor often used in the classroom, all materials shared in the classroom, positioning of teachers in the classroom, and behavior management being the shared responsibility of both teachers. We answered “sometimes” to questions related to reading nonverbal cues of the co-teaching partner, having time for planning, and holding meetings and giving honest feedback about lessons. My colleagues and I had different to questions related to spontaneous planning with changes occurring during the instructional lesson, planning lessons being the shared responsibility of both teachers, being comfortable to move freely in the classroom, goals in the classroom, presenting lessons in the classrooms, modifications of goals for different levels of students, use of a variety classroom techniques to enhance student learning,

confident in knowledge of the curriculum content, and students accepting both teachers as equal partners in the learning process.

After reviewing the results of both surveys, we decided to set up bi-weekly planning time to discuss the lessons and assign responsibilities for each lesson. As part of sharing the responsibilities in the classroom, I was assigned a guiding reading group in both classrooms.

Co-teaching Models and Lessons

I met with both kindergarten teachers and filled out the co-teaching lesson planning sheet (Appendix C). The planning sheet was helpful in determining the roles of each teacher. First we picked a lesson and then decided which co-teaching model to utilize. Once we picked the co-teaching model, we planned the lesson accordingly. We were able to plan the whole lesson by using this sheet. The planning sheet has a section for strategies to be used, as well as topics/skills for the lesson, roles/responsibilities of each teacher, space considerations, materials necessary for the lesson, and who is responsible for those materials.

Red class. The kindergarten and I decided to use one-teach and one-assist, station teaching, and team teaching models. We used the one-teach and one-assist model with a phonics lesson. I took the lead role and taught the lesson while the kindergarten teacher assisted the students and maintained on-task behavior. The kindergarten teacher asked the students questions to keep them engaged in the activity. The phonics lesson involved the *-an* word stem. I provided an example of a word with an *-an* ending. The students

then took turns writing a word that had the *-an* ending and wrote it on the chart paper. They wrote the sounds they heard for each word. I provided the students opportunities to correct their answers if they misspelled a word. After the group lesson, the students worked on centers. There were two centers that involved the *-an* word family. At the first center, students took magnet letters and made new words with the *-an* ending. At the second center, students practiced writing words with the *-an* ending. The kindergarten teacher and I helped the students with the centers.

The second co-teaching model we utilized was station teaching for an art activity. The activity involved making "100" glasses with a fruit loop chain. At one station, the kindergarten teacher instructed the students to count out ten sets of ten fruit loops in order to count up to 100 fruit loops. At the second station, I instructed the students to trace the "100" glasses on a piece of paper, decorate the glasses, and cut them out. At the last station, students worked independently and laced the fruit loops on yarn. The students rotated between each station in order to finish the activity. Once the students finished their glasses and fruit loop chain, we tied the chain to the glasses.

The last model was team teaching, and my colleague and I taught the lesson "Where's Your Tooth?" The kindergarten teacher introduced high frequency words in a book. Each student took turns finding the correct word on the white board. After the kindergarten teacher went over the words, I read the book with the students using props. At the end of the story, the students had to draw a picture of where their tooth could hide. They could not use the same pictures mentioned in the book.

Blue class. The kindergarten teacher and I decided to use one-teach and one-assist, alternative teaching, and team teaching models. We used one-teach and one-assist with a phonics lesson on beginning sounds. Students had to match the correct picture with the matching sound. After the group lesson, students had to pick a letter of their choice and then draw four pictures that began with that letter and sound. After the students were finished drawing their picture, they colored it.

The two of us taught the lesson "Where's Your Tooth?" using the alternative teaching model. The kindergarten teacher took part of the class and read the story. I took the other students and read the story by introducing each sentence. Then the students found the matching sentence that was held up. Each student took a turn flipping over a bowl to see if the tooth was hiding underneath it. In the last page of the book, the students had to draw a picture of where the tooth could be hiding. An example was provided to demonstrate the expectations for the lesson.

My colleague and I used the team teaching model to teach morning meeting, which involved lunch count, calendar, piggy bank, and weather. The students wrote down their tally marks for lunch and took turns writing the correct number and word under each lunch choice. We then had the students figure out the pattern piece and number for the calendar. For the piggy bank, the students told us to add a penny and trade some coins. We also asked the students ongoing questions throughout the activity.

Results of the Lessons

The following is a summary of how the different teaching models impacted each class. The students overall behavior and type of instruction varied depending on the co-teaching model.

Red class. Overall, the students were able to participate in each lesson with minimal support from the teachers. The one-teach and one-assist model was effective because it allowed one of the teachers to help the students who had difficulty staying on task or understanding the lesson. The kindergarten teacher and I had the opportunity to take on a new role. The one-teach and one-assist model allows teachers to help students be successful as compared to teaching alone. Some students are less likely to contribute or will not ask for clarification if they do not understand the activity. They are more likely to ask questions later, when it is time to complete individual work. This model allows teachers to provide support before students are required to work independently.

The station teaching was effective because it was a smaller student-teacher ratio. The students were divided into groups, and it was easier to help students individually as compared to a larger group. Students were able to complete their activity and move on to the next group at their own pace. It would have been difficult for one teacher to monitor each station and help meet the needs of each student. In the red class, there are a couple of students who are able to complete activities independently. The majority of the students require some assistance from the teachers. Station teaching allowed those

students to get the help they needed in order to be successful. The students had the opportunity to get help from both teachers.

Team teaching worked well with the “Where's Your Tooth?” book activity. Each teacher had the opportunity to teach the lesson. The students enjoyed both parts of the lesson. Team teaching allowed the teachers to collaborate with one another and expand on each other’s responses and information. Both teachers were comfortable interjecting and providing a new aspect to the lesson. This model allowed both teachers to help all the students in the class.

Blue class. The one-teach and one assist model had the same results as the red class. The students who were struggling with the activity were able to get help from one of the teachers on an individual basis instead of being called on during the discussion and not being able to perform. Some of the students in the class wanted to participate in the group discussion but were resistant to share because they were unable to comprehend the question or provide an answer. In this model, students were able to perform because they had prompts provided by the teacher. The kindergarten teacher helped the students with the lesson by reviewing the pictures on the board. The children knew where the picture belonged before they were called on. This model was successful with the phonics lesson.

Alternative teaching was effective because students who had difficulty were able to learn the lesson in a smaller group. They would have struggled with the story in a larger group because it had unfamiliar words. The teacher would need to teach each word before reading the story. If the teacher had to spend more time introducing each word, it

would have been difficult to keep those students who knew the words engaged in the activity. This model allowed each student to work at his or her own level. With the alternative teaching model, both teachers had the opportunity to teach the lesson.

The team teaching model had the same results as the red class. The kindergarten teacher and I were able to expand on each other's responses. I had the students sing the days of the week in order to figure out which day belonged with "today is, yesterday was, and tomorrow will be." The kindergarten teacher expanded on this by having the students count out the syllables in the days of the week. By doing this, we covered calendar awareness as well as phonics in this lesson. The students had a little trouble adjusting to the team approach. They were not used to hearing information from both teachers at one time.

Conclusion

I met with both teachers after implementation of the co-teaching models. The kindergarten teachers answered the following questions: (1) Was there a co-teaching model you liked best? (2) Was there a co-teaching model you liked least? (3) Which model was more beneficial for the kindergarten classroom? and (4) Which model are you willing to implement again? I wanted to gain their insight into how effective each model was with the students.

Red class. The kindergarten teacher thought all the models were equally effective. The kindergarten teacher liked the team teaching approach and how we were able to collaborate with one another. She liked the part of the lesson where we introduced the

words in the story. Without the introduction of the words, she felt it would not have been successful for the students struggling with reading. The kindergarten teacher thought the station teaching was effective and believed without an additional teacher the lesson would have been unsuccessful. The activity needed adult supervision at both centers. She liked how the students were able to complete one activity and move on to the next.

The kindergarten teacher was pleased that during the *-an* phonics lesson we were able to interject with the one-teach and one-assist model. We were comfortable with one another since we have been teaching together since September. This model allowed us to take turns and monitor the students. The kindergarten teacher is willing to implement any of the co-teaching models in the future. She felt that the activity would determine which co-teaching model would work best and be most beneficial for the students.

Blue class. The kindergarten teacher liked the alternative co-teaching model. She was able to read the story with her group without spending too much time on teaching new words. The struggling readers were able to work in a smaller group to learn the new words. That allowed them to participate in the story and comprehend what was being read. The prompts helped them figure out the new words. She felt alternative teaching provided students who are struggling opportunities to receive individual instruction. The kindergarten teacher liked the one-teach and one-assist model because she was able to take on the role of monitoring the students. Because of our schedules, it is difficult to switch roles in the classroom. She liked the team teaching approach and would like to implement that model for future phonics lessons.

Chapter five reflects on what was learned through this process, review the literature, discuss possible implications, explore the limitations of this study and share my recommendations for future research, and reflect on the capstone process.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

Overview

The question that guided me through this research was “What is an effective co-teaching model between mainstream and special education teachers and the impact on the kindergarten classroom environment?” During my second year of teaching, I found myself in a position where I had to collaborate with four teachers. The special education director wanted to me to gain experience working in full inclusion classrooms. The four teachers were not comfortable with having me take part in teaching the lessons. I attended several of the lesson planning meetings but most of my suggestions were not utilized in the actual lesson. I could not decipher whether or not the teachers wanted the students to stay in the classroom or if they understood the benefits of providing individual instruction. The teachers were also uncomfortable with me helping other students in the classroom who were not on my caseload. When I was hired for my current position, I wanted to discover if there was a co-teaching model that was more effective in a full inclusion classroom.

When I began to study the literature on co-teaching models, the research revealed there are five co-teaching models that can be utilized in the full inclusion classroom.

Each model determines the roles of the teachers. I wanted to learn how many researchers recommended the same model.

In this chapter, I will reflect on what I have learned about co-teaching, review the literature, discuss possible implications, explore the limitations of this study and share my recommendations for future research, and reflect on this capstone process.

What I Have Learned

Through this process I have learned that there is not one co-teaching model that is most effective, but rather, the group dynamics, the lesson, and the relationship between the teachers help determine which model works best for the teaching team. I have also learned that co-teaching is effective when both teachers are willing to collaborate with one another. This would have been difficult to complete if the mainstream teachers were unwilling to participate in an inclusive classroom. Through this process, I was able to find techniques that were effective in the classroom. Co-teaching with my first school district could have been successful if there was more planning and training offered.

It is important to set the foundation for co-teaching and gather background information from both teachers participating in a co-teaching classroom. Teachers should provide each other with the opportunity to state what they want their responsibilities to be, and what they expect from their co-teaching partner. If there is a disagreement, it is important to compromise or agree to disagree.

Another key aspect that made my experience successful was open communication. The kindergarten teachers and I have been teaching together for almost

six months. We are comfortable with each other and feel we can communicate openly with one another. It also helped that both teachers have been co-teaching with a special education teacher or paraprofessional for five or more years and have experience working with children who have special needs.

Literature Review

There has been a great deal research on co-teaching in inclusive classrooms with mainstream and special education teachers. Some researchers use the terminology “collaborative teaching or mainstreaming” when discussing a teaming approach between the mainstream teacher and the special education teacher.

It is important to look at the benefits of full inclusion and co-teaching. Change is difficult for teachers and students, and it is important to make changes slowly and be willing to try new things. Walter Thomas did an excellent job of stating the benefits of full inclusion and how it impacts the students and the mainstream and special education teachers. As cited in chapter two, Walter Thomas (2001) stated the following benefits of co-teaching, (1) Many identified students developed better attitudes about themselves and others, (2) Low-achieving students were more successful in their co-taught classes, and (3) Co-teachers learned from each other and shared their unique knowledge and professional skills. By implementing co-teaching, many teachers were allowed to explore new ideas and content areas and to expand their professional skills repertoires.

With the numerous benefits listed above and discussed in chapter two, why would any school district or professional be opposed to co-teaching? It takes time, devotion and

much communication, but it is worth it. Schools need to do what is best for the students in order for them to learn and to feel like they are part of a group.

Implications

There are several implications related to co-teaching and how it can be implemented in a school district. Most important to implementing co-teaching is support from administrators and the school district. Teachers need to have time to collaborate with one another and plan lessons. Most often, teachers are scheduling meetings between classes and after hours in order to make the co-teaching relationships effective. It is difficult to utilize each teacher's knowledge and background for co-teaching when there is no time for planning. There have been situations where co-teaching experiences have not gone well due to lack of collaboration. Co-teaching workshops need to be offered to teachers to provide them with training on the five co-teaching models and how to use them effectively.

Another implication is the dynamics of the students in a classroom. Co-teaching works best in a classroom with a mixture of abilities. It works better for students who are at risk or students with disabilities because, without co-teaching, these students would be lost in the shuffle. The dynamics of the students in the classroom will determine which co-teaching model would be most effective.

Limitations and Future Research

This research involved the effects of using co-teaching models in the kindergarten classroom. One limitation was the time available to implement all the co-teaching

models and collect data in order to determine which model was more effective for the students. I would have liked to implement all five models in order to determine if there was a model that was most effective. Because of the time, the kindergarten teachers and I decided to choose three models and plan lessons accordingly. The models that were chosen were effective in the classroom.

Each model was utilized over a one-week period depending on when the students had class. I would have liked to extend the models over two weeks and collect data through observation. The students' behaviors did not seem to change much between the different co-teaching models.

Both kindergarten teachers and I are planning to continue the use of the co-teaching models. Once we plan the lessons, we will decide which model to use. As stated earlier, each co-teaching model can be utilized in an inclusive classroom. Teachers need to decide which model would be most effective and beneficial for their students.

Reflection on Capstone

When I started this capstone, I was unsure of my topic and where to begin. My goal was to pick a topic that would be beneficial to me. Once I decided on the topic of co-teaching, I often wondered what the outcome would be and if the kindergarten teachers would be willing to participate in the discovery of finding a co-teaching model that would be effective in the classroom. I was worried the outcome of this journey would be the same as my first school district. The professional relationship between the kindergarten teachers and me has grown through this process. We have a framework to

build from when planning lessons for each classroom. We can utilize the outcomes of this research and implement the co-teaching models successfully.

By completing the capstone process, my eyes have been opened to action research. I have gained the knowledge to find research relating to a topic of my choice, and I learned how to link it to my own knowledge. I am also more confident in the pragmatics of writing and re-telling what happened so that others may obtain a clear picture of my research.

APPENDIX A

Sharing Hopes, Attitudes, Responsibilities, and
Expectations (S.H.A.R.E) Questionnaire

S.H.A.R.E.

Sharing Hopes, Attitudes, Responsibilities, and Expectations

Directions: Take a few minutes to individually complete this worksheet. Be honest in your responses. After completing it individually, share the responses with your co-teaching partner by taking turns reading the responses. Do not use this time to comment on your partner's responses—merely read. After reading through the responses, take a moment or two to jot down any thoughts you have regarding what your partner has said. Then, come back together and begin to share reactions to the responses. Your goal is to either (a) Agree, (b) Compromise, or (c) Agree to Disagree.

1. Right now, the main hope I have regarding this co-teaching situation is:

2. My attitude/philosophy regarding teaching students with disabilities in a general education classroom is:

3. I would like to have the following responsibilities in a co-taught classroom:

4. I would like my co-teacher to have the following responsibilities:

5. I have the following expectations in a classroom:

- a) Regarding discipline:
- b) Regarding classwork:
- c) Regarding materials:
- d) Regarding homework:
- e) Regarding planning:
- f) Regarding modifications for individual students:
- g) Regarding grading:
- h) Regarding noise level:
- i) Regarding cooperative learning:
- j) Regarding giving/receiving feedback:
- k) Other important expectations I have:

APPENDIX B
Co-Teaching Survey

Co-teaching Survey

CIRCLE THE CORRECT ANSWER

1. I can easily read the nonverbal cues of my co-teaching partner.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
2. I feel comfortable moving freely about the space in the co-taught classroom.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
3. I understand the curriculum standards with respect to the content area in the classroom.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
4. Both teachers in the classroom agree on the goals of the classroom.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
5. Planning can be spontaneous, with changes occurring during the instructional lesson
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
6. I often present lessons in the co-taught class.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
7. Classroom rules and routines have been jointly developed.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
8. Many measures are used for grading students.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
9. Humor is often used in the classroom.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
10. All materials are shared in the classroom.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS

11. I am familiar with the methods and materials needed to teach the curriculum.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
12. Modifications of goals for different level students are incorporated into this class.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
13. Planning for classes is the shared responsibility of both teachers.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
14. The "chalk" passes freely between the two teachers.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
15. A variety of classroom management techniques is used to enhance the learning of all students.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
16. Communication is open and honest.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
17. There is fluid (changing) positioning of teachers in the classroom
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
18. I feel confident in my knowledge of the curriculum content
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
19. The administration encourages and supports both teachers and co-teaching.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
20. Both teachers share curriculum resources; audio-video, books, and tests.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
21. Students accept both teachers as equal partners in the learning process
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS

22. Time is allotted (or found) for common planning.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
23. Behavior management is the shared responsibility of both teachers.
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
24. I feel happy about my relationship with my co-teacher
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS
25. We hold meetings and give honest feedback about lessons
RARELY SOMETIMES USUALLY ALWAYS

SCORING: RARELY = 1 SOMETIMES = 2 USUALLY = 3 ALWAYS = 4

< 50 = a poor co-teaching relationship

50 – 75 = a satisfactory (but in need of improvement) co-teaching relationship

76 – 100 = a very healthy co-teaching relationship

**Discuss afterwards with your co-teaching partner. What differences did you see?
How can you improve those parts of your relationship?**

APPENDIX C

Co-Teaching Lesson Planning Sheet

Co-Teaching Lesson Planning Sheet

Date/Time of planning session: _____

Date(s) of lesson _____

Goal(s) for this planning session:

Strategy/ies to be used: Observe Drift Station Parallel
 Supplemental Alternative/Differentiated Team

Lead Teacher: _____ Support Teacher: _____

Topic/Skills for lesson:

Roles/Responsibilities:

Space (classroom set-up) considerations:

Materials necessary and who will be responsible:

Tips to remember:

- when planning together work on what you'll be teaching
- focus on communication; planning/teaming takes time
- divvy up the work
- don't use co-planning time to plan what you're doing on your own for the lesson
- outline questions for parallel teaching

APPENDIX D
Teacher Consent Form

Hamline University

Graduate School of Education Master of Arts in Education

Permission to use work for Professional Development

(Adults whose classroom participation and/or work may be included, as evidence of the teacher's professional development must complete this form)

Dear Teacher:

During the 2007/2008 academic year, I am gathering information from my classroom as a part of my participation in Hamline University Masters of Arts in Education program. The main purpose for my involvement in this process is to enhance student learning and to strive for excellence in teaching.

Documentation of my learning requires that I submit samples of classroom observation records, surveys, and interviews as demonstrations of my professional growth.

One component of the master's degree program expectations requires that I place samples of data collections tools (i.e. surveys or questionnaires) in a professional portfolio as documentation of inquiry into my professional teaching practice. In some instances, I may choose to use these learning materials for reference in writing that I submit for publication in professional journals. In such cases, individual learners will remain anonymous.

In all cases, last names will not appear on any materials that are submitted. All materials will be kept confidential. The attached form will be used to document your permission for these activities. If you have any questions or concerns about the research you can reach me at (763) 261-6330, ext. 1517 or e-mail at lnghuyen@becker.k12.mn.us.

Sincerely,

Lien Nguyen
ECSE-Kindergarten Teacher

PERMISSION SLIP

Name: _____

Address: _____

School/Teacher: Primary School/ Lien Nguyen

I am the teacher named above. I have received and read your letter seeking my permission and I agree to the following:

(Please check the appropriate box below)

YES, I DO give permission to reproduce materials that I may produce as part of classroom activities at **Primary School**.

* No last names will appear on any materials submitted by the teacher.

NO, I DO NOT give permission to reproduce materials that I may produce as part of classroom activities at **Primary School**.

Signature of Teacher

Date

APPENDIX E
Parent Consent Form

Hamline University
Graduate School of Education
Master of Arts in Education

Permission to use work for Professional Development

(Adults whose classroom participation and/or work may be included, as evidence of the teacher's professional development must complete this form)

Dear Parent/Guardian:

During the 2007/2008 academic year, I am gathering information from my classroom as a part of my participation in Hamline University Masters of Arts in Education program. The main purpose for my involvement in this process is to enhance student learning and to strive for excellence in teaching.

Documentation of my learning requires that I submit samples of classroom observation records, surveys, and interviews as demonstrations of my professional growth. These work samples could include some of your child's work. Child's work could include worksheets, name number story page, journal writing, or observation summary page.

One component of the master's degree program expectations requires that I place samples of data collections tools (i.e. surveys or questionnaires) in a professional portfolio as documentation of inquiry into my professional teaching practice. In some instances, I may choose to use these learning materials for reference in writing that I submit for publication in professional journals. In such cases, individual learners will remain anonymous.

In all cases, last names of students will not appear on any materials that are submitted. All materials will be kept confidential. The attached form will be used to document your permission for these activities. If you have any questions or concerns about the research you can reach me at (763) 261-6330, ext. 1517 or e-mail at lnghuyen@becker.k12.mn.us.

Sincerely,

Lien Nguyen
ECSE-Kindergarten Teacher

PERMISSION SLIP

Student Name: _____

Address: _____

School/Teacher: Primary School/ Lien Nguyen**I am the parent named above. I have received and read your letter seeking my permission and I agree to the following:**

(Please check the appropriate box below)

YES, I DO give permission to reproduce materials that my child will produce as part of classroom activities at **Primary School**.

* No last names will appear on any materials submitted by the teacher.

NO, I DO NOT give permission to reproduce materials that my child will produce as part of classroom activities at **Primary School**._____
Signature of Parent or Guardian_____
Date

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Advocates for Children*. A Parent's Guide to Least Restrictive Environment. Retrieved October 23, 2007, from <http://www.advocatesforchildren.org/pubs/2005/lreparentguide.pdf>
- Bateman, D. & Bateman, C. (2002). *What Does a Principal Need To Know about Inclusion?* Arlington, VA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED473828) Retrieved November 3, 2007, from ERIC database.
- Idol, L. (2006). Toward Inclusion of Special Education Students in General Education. *Remedial & Special Education*, 27(2), 77-94. Retrieved November 3, 2007, from Master FILE Premier database.
- Idol, L. (1997). *Creating collaborative and inclusive schools*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED. 4.
- Kim, S. G. (2005). Kevin: "I Gotta Get to the Market" The Development of Peer Relationships in Inclusive Early Childhood Settings. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. 33(3), 163-169. Retrieved October 16, 2007, from Academic Search Premier.
- Klein, M.D., Cook, R.E., & Richardson-Gibbs, A.M. (2001). *Strategies for Including Children with Special Needs in Early Childhood Settings*. Albany, NY: Thomson Learning, Inc.

- Kohler-Evans, P. A. (2006). Co-teaching: How to Make this Marriage Work in Front of Kids. *Education*. 127(2), 260-264. Retrieved October 13, 2007, from Academic Search Premier.
- Laframboise, K. L., Epanchin, B., Colucci, K. & Hocutt, A. (2004). Working Together: Emerging Roles of Special Education and General Education in Inclusive Settings. *Action in Teacher Education*. 26(3), 29-42. Retrieved October 13, 2007, from Academic Search Premier.
- Murawski, W.W., & Dieker, L.A. (2004). Tips and strategies for co-teaching at the secondary level. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 36(5), 52-58.
- Roth, W. M. & Tobin, K. (2002). *At the Elbow of Another, Learning to Teach by Co-teaching*. (J. L. Kincheloe & S. R. Steingberg, Eds.). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Silliman, E. R., Ford, C. S., Beasman, J. & Evans, D. (1999). An Inclusion Model for Children with Language Learning Disabilities: Building Classroom Partnerships. *Topics in Language Disorders*. 19(3), 1-18. Retrieved October 13, 2007, from Academic Search Premier.
- Weiss, M. P. & Llyod, J. (2003). Conditions for Co-Teaching: Lessons from a Case Study. *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 26(1), 27-41. Retrieved October 13, 2007, from Academic Search Premier.

Wischnowski, M. W., Salmon, S. J. & Eaton, K. (2004). Evaluating Co-teaching as a Means for Successful Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in a Rural District. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*. 23(3), 3-14. Retrieved October 13, 2007, from Academic Search Premier.