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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

“I not only use all of the brains I have, but all I can borrow” – Woodrow Wilson

My interest in moving into English as a Second Language (ESL) teaching began before I had my first classroom. My experiences abroad, immersed in foreign cultures, piqued my interest in forever continuing my understanding of people from around the world. As a mainstream classroom teacher I had the opportunity to teach a high number of English Language Learners (ELs) and realized my passion for teaching and love for diverse cultures could be combined into a career as an ESL teacher. As I reflect on my learnings from the Masters in ESL program, my experience as a mainstream teacher, long-term ESL substitute, and first year Kindergarten (K) through fifth grade ESL teacher, I realize there is a disconnect. The disconnect is between the research-stated need for collaboration between teachers to ensure the success of ELs and the actual practices in schools that serve ELs.

A recurring message in teacher education programs is the need to no longer close your door and teach, but instead, collaborate with colleagues. With this collaboration is shared knowledge, bigger ideas, clearer communication, and goal setting. However, when I think back to my years as a first grade teacher I see positives and negatives in regards to my practice of collaboration. I was spending hours with teachers on my first grade team, combing through standards, analyzing assessments, and creating lessons to best meet the
needs of our students. I even connected on a weekly, and at times daily, basis with the special education teachers who played a huge role in the success of my students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). When did I collaborate with my ESL colleagues? Rarely. The first grade ESL teacher would come to weekly professional learning community (PLC) meetings, but often only for a short portion of the meeting. Many times she would not say anything because we were so involved in another topic. I honestly do not really know what my ESL students did when they were pulled out of my class to their ESL class. Did those teachers connect to what I was doing in my classroom? They may have tried, but I cannot imagine they knew enough of what was going on in my classroom because conversations between us were lacking. Even though 90% of my students spoke a language in addition to English, and at least 50% of my students were in direct ESL services, the collaboration between the ESL teacher and me was not at the forefront of my never-ending teacher to-do list.

Later, in a long term ESL substitute position in a K-5 setting, I was excited to learn that the majority of my day would be in the push-in setting instead of the pull-out setting. The push-in model used was cooperative teaching (co-teaching). This was my opportunity to see firsthand how to better my communication with colleagues about our shared students. Except now I would be in the ESL role. How quickly this excitement diminished. A forewarning by the ESL teacher, for whom I was covering, included comments about the wide variety of co-teaching I would experience. She told me not to feel discouraged if I felt like I was in more of an assistant role. She was in the second or third year of working on strengthening the collaboration relationship with some of her mainstream co-teachers. I experienced just that. The most teaching I did in those co-
taught classes was in the second grade writing courses where I was the lead teacher. This did not mean co-teaching. My meetings with the second grade team were weekly. The relationships between the other teachers and me were positive, but the meetings were short, only 20-30 minutes. I was left to do all the planning after our brief conversations. The problem I saw was that I was planning as a mainstream teacher, not an ESL teacher. I felt overwhelmed by content objectives, which prevented me from being fully focused on the language objectives—the essence of an ESL teacher’s role. I was left wondering, ‘how is co-teaching any better than the pull-out model?’ They both seem to lack clear communication and collaboration. Would pull-out groups be more effective in focusing on the needs of ELs? Research continues to state otherwise, which led me to this capstone.

As I began this capstone, I was starting my current position as a K-5 elementary ESL teacher. My current position is a crossover, which means I split my time between two schools. I wanted to be prepared to implement best-practice teaching strategies for my ELs. I wanted to be prepared to inform my colleagues of research-based practices that would benefit and serve the growing number of ELs in our schools. I also wanted to enhance my ESL teaching by incorporating strategies that research has shown are effective. I planned to do this through research in the literature review and surveys of ESL teachers and mainstream teachers. This chapter will introduce increasing diversity, ELs’ academic achievement, increasing accountability in schools, the shifting role of the ESL teacher, co-teaching as a proposed option, and my guiding research question.
Increased Diversity in US Schools

U.S. schools are becoming increasingly diverse, reflecting our increasingly diverse society (Friend & Pope, 2008). According to the ELL Information Center (2016), roughly 30 million authorized and unauthorized immigrants have settled in the US in search of a better life in the past three decades. From 1993-1994, there were two million EL students enrolled in K-12 schools, and this number increased to three million in 1999-2000 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). As of the 2012-2013 school year, 4.85 million ELs were enrolled in public schools, equaling 10% of K-12 students (Ruiz Sota, Hooker, & Batalova, 2015). This number continued to climb to 5 million in 2013-2014 (ELL Information Center, 2016). Although much attention has been on national- and state-level immigration laws, little attention is given to how immigration has affected US schools (ELL Information Center, 2016). National and state accountability in public schools has increased as the EL population has increased.

Increased Accountability

In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was signed by President Johnson (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). The ESEA is our nation’s education law and commitment to an equal educational opportunity to all students (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). The ESEA offered grants and funding to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education (U.S. Department of Education, 2015).

In the last 50 years, reauthorization of this law has continually changed and improved how schools are required to offer equal education (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). In 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), implemented changes to the Elementary and Secondary Act. Schools were required to show students’ annual
progress. This would highlight where students needed support, regardless of race, income, zip code, disability, home language, or background (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). At a time when EL populations in US schools were the highest in history, schools were expected to have English proficiency standards linked to academic standards. Schools had to assess and report ELs’ English language proficiency yearly, and assess and report on ELs as a subgroup for annual yearly progress (AYP) in state content knowledge assessments (Center for Public Education, 2007). Reporting that was broken into these subgroups helped ensure that no group was left behind, and showed schools where they need improvements (American Speech, Language, & Hearing Association, 2009).

While the emphasis on closing the achievement gap for all students was important, the requirements of NCLB became unworkable for schools. President Obama’s administration reauthorized ESEA to focus on the goal of fully preparing students for college and career success; the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Trippett (2015) authored a statement on ESSA on behalf of the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) organizations, describing how ESSA made overdue improvements to NCLB. In regards to ELs, the ESSA commits to continuing federal funding to support instruction for ELs and continuing statewide accountability systems under Title I that require states to prioritize English language development (Trippett, 2015). In addition, Title I regulation requires states to report on the academic performance of ELs, long-term ELs, and ELs with special needs. Furthermore, states are allowed to exclude test results for newly arrived ELs and include the performance of former ELs up to four years after they exit ESL
(Triplett, 2015). Triplett explains how these changes help reflect the diversity of the EL population and the complexity of second language acquisition.

Lindahl (2015) echoes Triplett’s remarks in a blog post on the TESOL website. She describes the importance of using multiple measures to track improvement, instead of only standardized assessments, which previously marginalized students who needed more support. Lindahl acknowledges that overall, the increased state accountability for ELs is a positive step in the right direction. However, TESOL statements acknowledge that more support for teacher professional development is needed. ESSA is lacking in its description of how to expand the knowledge base of teachers working with ELs, as well as how to increase the number of ESL teachers. Lindahl explains that a shift needs to occur in how we educate teachers to instruct ELs. If this shift does not happen, ESL programs will continue to be an add-on to mainstream education, which will continue to marginalize ELs. This leads to the restructuring of ESL programs in our schools.

The ESEA and subsequent reauthorizations bring about a need for change in the structuring of school systems (Friend & Cook, 2004; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). Strom and Strom (2013) describe the following alarming statistics: Lee, Rawls, Edwards, and Menson (2001) state that a generation ago, the U.S. ranked first in percentage of 25-34 year olds who had postsecondary credentials, but as of 2011, we ranked 12th (as cited in Strom & Strom, 2013). This drop in postsecondary success is due in part to students feeling underprepared for college despite their high school diploma. Furthermore, Hispanics, the minority group in the U.S. that is increasing the most rapidly, have one of the highest group failure rates for obtaining a high school diploma (Strom & Strom,
This is one snapshot of the achievement gap between immigrant and/or EL students and white students.

The Minnesota Department of Education (2015) shows that nationally, 68% of fourth grade EL students scored ‘below basic’ in reading state assessments, and only 7% are ‘proficient.’ However, only 21% of their white peers scored ‘below basic’ in reading state assessments and 35% are ‘proficient’. The achievement gap continues to show in national eighth grade reading state assessments. A mere 3% of EL students scored ‘proficient’, while 72% of EL students scored ‘below basic.’ However, 16% of white eighth grade students scored ‘below basic’, while 38% were ‘proficient’. The achievement gap between white students and EL students will be explained more in the literature review, including a detailed description of EL achievement in Minnesota.

**Shifting Role of the ESL Teacher**

The previously mentioned statistics and increased accountability from federal legislation show the need for the role of ESL teachers to shift. ELs are not performing at successful levels compared to their white peers, and according the ESEA, ELs must receive equal education. Currently, many ESL program models are pull-out models, meaning students are pulled out of their mainstream classroom for a short period of time to have English language instruction (Collier, 2010). However, this instruction is often disconnected from the classroom content and does not provide adequate time for ELs to make the gains in language and content they need to be successful. Instead of being isolated and separated, ESL teachers need to be in a role of collaboration with colleagues. This will support a push-in and inclusive program model of ESL, one in which
professionals in a school collaborate and share the responsibility for all students’ success (Friend & Pope, 2005).

In my new role as a crossover EL teacher, I have experienced the challenge of staying connected with many teachers’ daily and weekly lesson plans and attempting to connect my instruction with their classroom content. In addition, I am often met with frustration and anxiety from my students as I pull them out of their classroom for their small group EL instruction. “It’s already group? I don’t want to miss this!” “Can we stay in class today?” “When will I get to catch up on this work?” “I don’t like EL class.” This is especially true for those students who are at higher levels of English language proficiency. However, once we are in group it is clear that they enjoy group and what we are learning. These reactions and initial comments show me how scattered an ELs day can feel when they are removed from their classroom for ‘disconnected’ instruction, even when what I teach is connected to their grade level standards.

**Co-teaching as an Alternative Option**

One alternative option to moving from pull-out ESL models to inclusive, push-in models is cooperative teaching. Cooperative teaching is not a special education strategy, but was used in special education first. It is an instructional model that provides direct services for ELs in the mainstream classroom (Gerber & Popp, 1999). A variety of terms are used for cooperative teaching, such as team teaching, collaborative teaming, partner-teaching, and most prevalent and will be used throughout the rest of this capstone, co-teaching (Bronson & Dentith, 2014; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). In addition to a variety of names, co-teaching has a variety of instructional models. These models can be used by ESL and mainstream co-teachers to best meet the needs of diverse learners, benefiting
students with and without English language needs (Bronson & Dentith, 2014; Friend, 2008; Friend & Cook, 2004). These models will be discussed in great detail in the next chapter.

**Role of Researcher**

My role in this research project will be a participant researcher. I will interact with my colleagues through surveys to obtain information regarding their perceptions about co-teaching. During my research methodology course, I learned research techniques to eliminate my bias. I will also use data collection methods to gather data that reflects the voices of the teachers I survey. My research will use both quantitative and qualitative questioning, and my research method technique will be described in greater detail in Chapter Three.

**Guiding Questions**

The focus of this paper is to find out perceptions of co-teaching from mainstream teachers and ESL teachers in my school district. I will be asking teachers to reflect on their current or past co-teaching practices, their beliefs about successful co-teaching partnerships and instructional models, and their willingness to be a part of co-teaching in the future. This is important because it can inform my school about what adaptations it could make to improve the co-teaching program we are using, depending on the willingness and knowledge of my colleagues. My research question is: What do ESL and mainstream teachers perceive as successful co-teaching relationships and instructional models? The sub questions that support my research question include:

a. What are characteristics of successful co-teaching relationships?
b. Which co-teaching instructional models do teachers believe are the most successful for teaching ELs?

c. What conditions do teachers perceive as necessary to successfully co-teach?

**Summary of Chapter**

This capstone will focus on mainstream and EL teachers’ perceptions of successful co-teaching models. In this chapter I have described the increasing diversity in U.S. public schools, summarized the history of federal legislation in regards to public school’s accountability, and described national statistics that show the achievement gap between white students and EL students. I also connected this information to the shifting role of the ESL teacher, discussed the need for collaboration, and introduced co-teaching as an alternative option. My role as a researcher was discussed, and the guiding questions and purpose of this study were introduced.

**Overview of Chapters**

In Chapter Two I will provide a review of current and relevant literature in regards to increasing diversity and accountability, the achievement of ELs, various ESL programs, the shifting role of the ESL teacher, an explanation of co-teaching, and the benefits and challenges of co-teaching. Chapter Three will describe how I will conduct my research and the methodology I will use to guide this study. Chapter Four will present the results of the study. In Chapter Five I will include my reflections on the data collected in this study, the limitations of the study, and recommendations and implications for further research.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to investigate mainstream and EL teachers’ perceptions of co-teaching relationships and models in my school district. This knowledge will help the educators in my district best plan for implementing co-teaching, plan for professional development, and develop co-teaching models and relationships that best meet the needs of the EL students in the district. This chapter will give an overview of research related to co-teaching. The topics that will be discussed are the increasing number of ELs in U.S schools, increased accountability of schools, a variety of ESL program models, the shifting role of ESL teachers due to changing dynamics in student populations, a description of co-teaching models and what is essential to co-teaching success, as well as the benefits and challenges associated with co-teaching. This chapter will also identify gaps in the current research in relation to my research question.

The Achievement Gap

Classrooms today reflect our society; they are becoming increasingly diverse (Friend, 2008; Friend & Pope, 2005; Li & Selena Protacio, 2010; Short & Echevarria, 2004). However, schools have made little changes to their teaching staffs, organization, or resources to support ELs (Li & Selena Protacio, 2010; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Thomas and Collier (as cited in Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008) claim that by 2030, 40% of students in U.S. public schools will be ELs, and this number is ever increasing in places that have not traditionally served ELs, such as Midwestern states. This may mean that teachers and districts are ill-prepared to serve the new populations in
their schools (Li & Selena Protacio; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008). Because of this, many diverse learners are disadvantaged because they experience education that is marginalized from mainstream resources, opportunities, and networks (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). An example of this is when EL students only receive English instruction in the pull-out model. They may have limited access to the mainstream curriculum and lower expectations (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Another example is the small, if any, attention that is given to ESL strategies in teacher preparation programs to prepare mainstream teachers for instructing ELs (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Many states are working to improve this, including Minnesota. There are new English language learn requirements for licensure renewal as of 2015 (Minnesota Department of Education, 2015).

Current statistics on the achievement of ELs compared to their white peers shows the urgency of improving the instruction of ELs. The National Center for Educational Statistics (2011) compared scores between Hispanic and white students, and then compared non-EL Hispanic scores to EL Hispanic scores. When looking at the reading achievement gap between Hispanic and White students in fourth and eighth grade from 1998 to the most recent report card in 2009, the gap has narrowed, but still shows at least a 15 point gap. Furthermore, when comparing the EL Hispanic students’ reading scores to non-EL Hispanic students’ reading scores, non-EL Hispanics scores increase was larger. The achievement gap between white students’ scores and EL students’ scores in 2009 is 49 points in fourth grade reading and 54 points in eighth grade reading (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2011).
The Minnesota Department of Education (2015) gives a detailed look at how ELs are achieving in state assessments on the Minnesota Report Card. ELs represent 8.3% of students in Minnesota schools in 2016. From 2012-2015, ELs in all grades did not meet the adequate yearly progress target (AYP) in math, reading, or in graduation rates. These NCLB mandates were recently eliminated by the ESSA. The percent of ELs in all grades on track for success in making expected growth in math scores decreased from 47% in 2011 to 40% in 2015. The percent of ELs on track for success across all grades in reading decreased from 51% in 2011 to 37% in 2015. In all grades for the year 2015, 25% of ELs were proficient in state math assessments, 17% of ELs were proficient in state reading assessments, and 9% were proficient in state science assessments. On the following page, Figure 1 shows Minnesota state trends for ELs in all grades in reading, and Figure 2 shows Minnesota state trends for white students in all grades in reading.
Taking a closer look at the **elementary** level, the following statistics are from the 2015 scores of Minnesota **fourth graders** on the Minnesota Report Card. In **reading**, 0% of ELs were *advanced*, 6% were *proficient*, 22% were *basic*, and 72% *below basic*. Compared to their white peers, in which 11% were *advanced*, 36% were *proficient*, 32% were *basic*, and 21% were *below basic*. These trends continue in **math**. ELs’ scores
showed 1% were *advanced*, 18% were *proficient*, 44% were *basic*, and 37% were *below basic*. Their white peers’ scores showed 17% were *advanced*, 46% were *proficient*, 31% were *basic*, and 6% were *below basic*. The statistics described here from the Minnesota Department of Education (2015) show a large gap between the achievement of ELs across multiple subjects and grade levels compared to their white peers.

These trends hold true in Sunshine School District (a pseudonym for my school district). According to J. Johnson (pseudonym) (personal communication, April 11, 2016), our districts’ Multicultural Coordinator, recent data analyses have shown that we have a high percentage of long-term ELs in the Sunshine School District. Roughly 60% of middle school EL students have been in the ESL program for six or more years, and are still currently receiving interventions and enriched language and content courses. J. Johnson explained that she believes co-teaching could be part of the solution to helping ELs succeed academically. She described how co-teaching, when implemented successfully, can make academic language and content accessible in the mainstream classroom, so students are not receiving instruction at a remedial level in interventions. Currently, our district offers two days of professional development for co-teachers, but J. Johnson said it is not enough to help prepare teachers to effectively co-teach. Currently, the Sunshine School District has a co-teaching cohort that is designing a more effective co-teaching program to be implemented at the district level in the future.

Despite the alarming statistics of EL achievement, as described in the introduction, the ESEA, and its’ most current reauthorization, the ESSA, have increased schools’ accountability to be responsible for the success of all students, including ELs (Friend & Cook, 2004; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001; Howard & Potts, 2009). In addition,
school districts must increase the rigor of their implementation of standards-based curriculum to help all students achieve success. This means that all teachers need to be willing to teach ELs, be knowledgeable about ESL strategies, and be properly prepared to help ELs be successful because the majority of an EL’s day is spent with content teachers—in essence, every teacher should be trained to be a language teacher (Coady, Hamann, Harrington, Pacheco, Pho, Yedlin 2008; Maxwell 2014; Staehr Fenner, 2014). However, the trends in data show that a high percentage of ELs are not being successful.

With all of this knowledge, districts should no longer be asking themselves if ELs should be included in the general education classroom, but how can instruction be provided effectively for all students (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). However, as previously mentioned, the clarity on how to improve ESL and mainstream teacher training, and thus improving ESL instruction, is lacking in ESSA language (Linahal, 2015). The effectiveness of an ESL program can range between classrooms, schools, and districts, depending on the program model and how it is implemented, and thus can affect the success of ELs academically.

**Programs Models for ELs**

Program models for ELs range from bilingual to English-only instruction. As Collier (2010) explains, it is difficult to decide on the best program for ELs because there are so many options, and when looking at how effective they are, one must be careful in knowing exactly what was being measured. Collier continues by stating there is no “one size fits all bilingual approach. Each school district has their own culture of learning and interacting that has to be taken into account” (p.1).
Schools districts have a variety of program models for ELs to consider based on their student needs and staff resources, ranging from traditional to nontraditional models (Collier, 2010; Rennie, 1993; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Program models that are ideal when bilingual speaking staff are available include integrated bilingual, transitional bilingual, two-way immersion, and developmental bilingual programs (Collier, 2010). All of these programs include varying levels of instruction in the native language and English, meaning that a large number of ELs speaking that language need to be present, as well as staff who speaks that language. According to Collier’s research, these types of programs have the highest percentage of achievement gains and success rates due to the focus on L1 literacy, yet are difficult to implement due to a wide range of languages and lack of bilingual staff. This is the case in my district, so bilingual programs will not be a part of my research. Instead, I will look closer at ESL programs that focus on instruction in English only.

ESL programs are used in districts that are diverse and serve many different languages (Rennie, 1993). ESL programs accommodate students from different language backgrounds in the same class, so teachers do not need to be proficient in any of the home languages of their students because the instruction is in English (Rennie, 1993). A variety of ESL program models exist and can be effective (Collier, 2010; Rennie, 1993), although the debate continues over which K-12 ESL program is most effective (Bell & Baecher, 2012).

Two different service program models of ESL instruction include pull-out and push-in, and one form of push-in is co-teaching. While these models differ, one ESL program can implement one to three of these models simultaneously. For example, in my school
district, students at English proficiency levels 1-3, pull-out is required, while co-teaching is preferred. At English proficiency levels 4-5, co-teaching is preferred, and pull-out is up to the teacher’s discretion. On the following page, Figure 3 shows the ESL program model handout in the Sunshine School District, imported from the district website.

**Figure 3. ESL Program (Service) Model Handout for Sunshine School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL Service Model</th>
<th>WIDA Level 1</th>
<th>WIDA Level 2</th>
<th>WIDA Level 3</th>
<th>WIDA Level 4</th>
<th>WIDA Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELD pullout</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Per EL teacher recommendation (based on WIDA, MCAs, MAPs)</td>
<td>Per EL teacher recommendation (based on WIDA, MCAs, MAPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-taught Classroom</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para Support</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an ESL pull-out model, generally used in the elementary setting, students spend most of their day in a mainstream classroom, but are pulled out for English instruction, sometimes related to classroom content (Rennie, 1993). The pull-out groups are small and take place in a different location than their mainstream classroom (Bell & Baecher, 2012). The instruction in the pull-out model may follow an ESL curriculum based on
language and academic needs, or it may be a curriculum aligned closely with the general-education curriculum (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010).

To date, the pull-out model is the most widely used, yet has the lowest impact on achievement, does not support a cohesive program, separates ELs into proficiency leveled groups, and the effectiveness is greatly questioned by recent researchers (Collier, 2010; Hourcade & Bowens, 2001). Honigsfeld and Dove (2016) describe the pull-out model as fragmented. Results from Bell and Baecher’s (2012) study on perceived benefits and challenges of ESL programs echo these concerns with the pull-out model, stating that students miss content instruction, ESL teachers often do not know how to teach the content students are missing, students feel stigmatized, and advanced-level ELs may not benefit as much as beginning level ELs. However, Honigsfeld and Dove (2010) acknowledge that positive aspects of the pull-out model include the small group environment and instruction that offers unique adaptations to best fit the students’ needs. In addition, despite the perceived challenges, Bell & Baecher’s (2012) study about teacher’s beliefs about teaching models, found that 64% of teachers preferred to teach in the pull-out model because the small groups allowed for focused instruction, the ESL teacher had more control, and it was the best service model when EL students were spread between many classrooms.

In the push-in ESL model, the ESL teacher goes into the students’ content or grade-level classroom to provide instruction. However, depending on the content the ESL teacher is teaching and the level of collaboration between the ESL and mainstream teacher, push-in models can vary greatly. Honigsfeld and Dove (2010) outline the options within the push-in model. In option one, the ESL teacher may pull ELs aside to a
designated areas in the classroom to teach a stand-alone ESL curriculum. In the second option, the ESL teacher may pull ELs aside to a designated area in the classroom to support the lesson the mainstream teaching is teaching. In the third option, differentiated strategies will be used to integrate the ESL teacher’s instruction into the mainstream lesson. In the fourth push-in model, the ESL teacher and the mainstream teacher collaboratively plan and teach using one of many co-teaching instructional models.

Bell and Baecher (2012) reported on perceived benefits and challenges of the push-in model, which was in a separate category than co-teaching in their study. Because students are in the classroom for the mainstream curriculum, they have language models and gain important content information. In addition, the ESL teacher has the opportunity to learn more about content and grade level student expectations. Despite the benefits, only 13% of teachers in their study preferred the push-in model. Challenges such as the ESL teacher not knowing what to plan for or not having the plans, thus feeling like an aide instead of a valued teacher, and the mainstream curriculum moving too fast for ELs makes the push-in model an un-favored model.

Co-teaching, the most collaborative form of the push-in model, on the other hand, was favored by 23% of teachers in Bell and Baecher’s (2012) study of teacher’s beliefs about ESL program models. Teachers liked co-teaching because ELs are included in mainstream curriculum, content and ESL teachers share a responsibility for all students, and content and ESL teachers collaborate to set content and language goals for lessons (Bell & Baecher, 2012). However, the challenges teachers reported include lack of planning time, personality conflicts, lack of administrative support, and the difficulty of
releasing teaching control (Bell & Baecher, 2012). The benefits and challenges described here will be elaborated on in a later section.

Lately, many schools are moving to push-in and co-teaching models because they are believed to be more collaborative than pull-out models, yet studies investigating EL academic achievement in various ESL program models is mixed (Bell & Baecher, 2012). This may be due to the importance of collaboration between teachers. Fearon (2008) found that both push-in and pull-out models can provide ELs with learning opportunities, but the most important factor was the quality and extent of collaboration between mainstream and ESL teachers (as cited in Bell & Baecher, 2012).

While it can be difficult to decide on a best model, there are key components to a successful ESL program. To ensure ELs’ academic success, a systematic language program must be implemented (Short & Echevarria, 2004). Successful ESL programs promote academic achievement, develop academic skills while simultaneously developing English skills, offer access to general education, value inclusion, value teacher collaboration, and have program coherence (Collier, 2010; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). By developing academic skills and English together, ELs experience high expectations and rigorous content, best preparing them for success in their education. When ESL teachers and mainstream teachers collaborate, the communication allows a cohesive program to be achieved because the education of diverse students becomes a focal point of the school (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Honigsfeld and Dove (2008) support this, explaining that ELs have specific needs, different from remedial needs of special education students, so a strong ESL program should enhance ELs understanding of English while learning classroom content. They describe an added
benefit of offering ELs the opportunity to interact and learn with their native English-speaking peers who can act as models of the language, as opposed to consistently working with peers at their same proficiency level or peers struggling academically.

The issue schools face is making dramatic changes to the structure of their school’s instruction to meet the needs of the increasing EL population. York-Barr, Ghere, and Sommerness (2007) explain that the range of EL services fall on a continuum of traditional to nontraditional structures. Traditional structures include “fragmented instruction of subjects, a fragmented schedule, little teacher collaboration, and top-down decision-making” (p. 304). The aforementioned pull-out model and variations of the push-in model would fit this traditional program structure description, as these are the most common. Nontraditional structures are preferred, and include “integrated instruction of subjects; differentiated scheduling including longer time blocks, teacher teaming, and collaboration; and a context for shared decision-making by teachers” (p. 304). Push-in models with high levels of teacher collaboration, such as co-teaching, fit the nontraditional program structure. Nontraditional structures support a cohesive program in which all teachers are committed to the success of ELs, recognize themselves as language teachers, and collaborate to continue to improve instruction to best meet the needs of the students (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). However, to transition from the traditional ESL program models, to the preferred, nontraditional program models, is complex and can be a long process.

This increasing number of ELs, the achievement gap, and the increased accountability of schools proves that we must begin restructuring our educational models to better prepare our learners, beginning in elementary school. One way to restructure
includes shifting the role of the ESL teacher from an isolated specialist to a more collaborative role to help students access academic vocabulary and content at their grade level rigor.

**Shifting Roles of the ESL Teacher**

With the increasing diversity in schools, an ESL teacher’s role continues to evolve as one that has previously been separated, misunderstood and undervalued to collaborator, expert, and advocate (Staehr Fenner, 2014). In addition, the variety of ESL programs can promote or prevent opportunities for ESL teachers to collaborate and advocate. Maxwell (2013) explains how difficult it is for ESL teachers to step into the role of expert and advocate when they are splitting their time between schools or teaching in a pull-out model because of the lack of time available to collaborate with mainstream teachers.

There is a growing need for collaboration because of the reauthorization of ESEA now requires schools to report on EL achievement growth in English and content standards. Teachers and schools are now held accountable to show success of all students, including ELs (Friend & Pope, 2005; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Maxwell, 2013). Similar to the need for special educators to collaborate with mainstream teachers, ESL teachers need to do the same. This will help schools meet the federal obligation of providing high quality instruction for all students, and utilize a more inclusive school belief system in which all staff members share the responsibility for all learners (Friend & Pope, 2005). ESL educators that met at a TESOL event in Washington agreed that the role of an ESL teachers needs to shift to include both language teacher and mainstream teachers’ consultant to share strategies and knowledge for educating ELs (Maxwell, 2014). As a consultant and collaborator to mainstream teachers, ESL teachers could share
their knowledge about how language is acquired, the importance of academic language, and share understandings about cultures with the mainstream teachers who instruct ELs for a majority of their day (Maxwell, 2014).

To help ESL teachers share their ESL knowledge to help mainstream teachers be better prepared to instruct ELs, researchers offer a few solutions: provide better professional development to prepare all teachers to meet the needs of ELs (Li & Selena Protacio, 2010); create and share school wide resources that focus on student communication (Maxwell, 2013); and most importantly, encourage collaboration between ESL and mainstream teachers so that language, literacy, and content become infused (Coady et al, 2008; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001; Li & Selena Protacio, 2010). Hourcade and Bauwens (2001) explain that often collaboration is indirect, in which the mainstream teacher receives support outside the classroom, but is left to implement the instruction on their own. This type of indirect collaboration reflects pull-out and some push-in models. However, educators need to shift to direct collaboration, when two teachers work together in the general classroom to best meet the needs of a diverse group of students (Friend & Pope, 2005).

The best example of direct collaboration that is becoming more widespread is the most collaborative form of the push-in model: co-teaching (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). Co-teaching allows ESL teachers, who are best equipped with strategies to address the various linguistic needs of ELs, and mainstream teachers, who are best equipped with content and grade specific knowledge, to combine their expertise to infuse language and content together (Hongisfeld & Dove, 2008).
**Co-teaching**

Co-teaching is defined as two (or more) educators sharing instructional responsibility for a single group of students that includes students with disabilities, language, or gifted needs in a single classroom with shared resources and accountability (Bronson & Dentith, 2014; Cook & Friend, 2004; Cook & Pope, 2005; Friend, 2008). Murawski and Dicker (2008) give more detail to the definition, defining co-teaching as a “service delivery option designed to address the needs of students in an inclusive classroom by having a general education teacher and a special service provider teach together in the same classroom” (p. 40). Gately and Gately, Jr. (2001) expand the definition of co-teaching to note that when co-teaching, teachers “share the planning, presentation, evaluation, and classroom management in an effort to enhance the learning environment for all students” and “develop a differentiated curriculum that meets the needs of a diverse population of students” (p. 41).

While co-teaching is not a special education model, traditionally, it has been used as a program model for special education in which special education teachers team with general education teachers to provide services in the mainstream classroom (Gerber & Popp, 1999). It is now becoming more widespread in ESL instruction.

**A Variety of Co-Teaching Instructional Models**

Garnett (1996) states that when co-teaching, the presence of two educators in the same room should result in a significant restructuring of the classroom instruction environment, not simply more of the same (as cited in Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). This restructuring can take place through a variety of co-teaching instructional models.
described by several researchers (Cook & Friend, 2004; Friend, 1993; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001; Murawski & Swanson, 2001). Honigsfeld and Dove (2016) and Friend and Cook (2004) describe the various co-teaching models as follows:

1) **One teach, One observe** is a co-teaching method used when co-teachers are wanting in depth observations of students engaged in learning to analyze together. The amount of planning is low and is best used in a new co-teaching situation or when questions arise about students.

2) **One teach, One assist** is a co-teaching method in which one teacher is the lead teacher, often the mainstream teacher, and the other teacher drifts around the room to observe and assist students in an unobtrusive manner as needed. The planning for this approach is low, and may be used when the lesson lends itself to one teacher instructing, when one teacher is an expert in the content, in new co-teaching situations to learn about each other’s teaching styles, or when student work requires close monitoring.

3) **Parallel teaching** is a co-teaching approach that divides that class into two groups and both teachers teach the same content simultaneously. A medium amount of planning is needed for parallel teaching. This approach is best when students need extra teacher supervision or the lesson lends itself to more student interaction and responses.

4) **Station teaching** is a co-teaching model where the co-teachers divide the content to be delivered and divide the students into small groups. The small groups rotate through all of the stations, which may also include independent activities. This
approach requires a medium amount of planning. Station teaching is best when content is complex, but not hierarchical or several topics are included in the lesson.

5) **Alternative teaching** is an approach that is utilized when instruction needs to be differentiated to meet the specialized needs of groups of students. One teacher leads instruction for the larger group, while the other teacher works with a small group of students, either for a short time or the whole class period. Alternative teaching requires a high level of planning, and is best when students’ mastery of content varies tremendously, enrichment is desired, re-teaching is needed, or students are working in a parallel curriculum.

6) **Team teaching** is a model in which both teachers are delivering instruction together, thus requiring a high level of planning. This approach is most dependent on teachers’ styles, but can be the most satisfying way to co-teach. It is best utilized when instructional conversation is needed, demonstration of an interaction is needed, or when co-teachers are both experienced in the content and comfortable with each other.

On the following page, Figure 4 shows a visual of each co-teaching instructional model.
Figure 4. The Co-teaching Approaches visual is cited from Manitoba Educator’s (2013) “Collaborative Teacher” website.
Co-teaching is a process. Co-teaching is a developmental process that may seem like a simple strategy, but in reality is a complex and sophisticated strategy that includes developmental stages that teachers proceed through (Friend, 2005; Gately & Gately, Jr., 2001; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Gately and Gately, Jr. (2001) summarize the process into three stages. When starting co-teaching, colleagues are at the beginning stage and may be guarded and careful in their communication as they develop a new professional relationship. Next, in the compromising stage, teachers begin to give and take communication, both having a sense of ‘giving up’ and ‘taking.” Finally, in the collaborating stage, both co-teachers feel confident to communicate and interact openly. It is important to note that partnerships may move through these stages at different rates, ranging from a few weeks to a few years.

Hourcade and Bauwens (2001) acknowledge the initial discomfort that can come with trying a new teaching strategy, but believe the outcome is worth it. It is important to remember that teachers are creating a learning situation that could not be produced by a single teacher, often creating a more positive and student-centered learning environment (Bronson & Dentith, 2014; Friend, 2008). In addition, the model of two adults working together as a team is a powerful model to children about teamwork (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016). Co-teaching helps schools meet the requirements of ESSA, ensuring all students have high standards and quality teachers (Friend, 2008). Co-teaching supports inclusion, and to create a true partnership that successfully meets the needs of all students will take time and effort (Gately & Gately, Jr, 2001; Murawski & Swanson, 2001).

Literature on effectiveness of co-teaching. While there is a plethora of literature about the benefits, challenges, and need for co-teaching, literature is lacking when it
comes to the effectiveness of co-teaching, especially in regards to student performance and co-teaching studies on ELs. Murawski and Swanson (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of co-teaching research. The limits of their study included a small sample size, due to the lack of sources that fit the needed requirements of time, and amount of quantitative data. The results of their meta-analysis suggest that co-teaching is a moderately effective in producing positive results in regards to student achievement for students with special needs (including linguistic needs) in a general education setting.

Welch (2000) conducted a study on the academic gains of all students in a co-taught classroom in word recognition and fluency, but did not include a comparison to results in a self-contained or pull-out classroom (as cited in Fearon, 2008). In another example, Orland, Florida, Portacarrero, and Bergin (1997), describe a successful co-teaching model in which an ESL teacher and a content teacher co-taught a writer’s workshop (as cited in Fearon, 2008). In addition to teachers’ observations and anecdotal notes, standardized test scores were monitored and showed that within three years, 90% of second graders were reading at grade level. However, this study does not state whether this increase was statistically different from classrooms that did not use co-teaching (Fearon, 2008).

The following section will discuss the benefits described in numerous qualitative studies and research articles on co-teaching.

**Components of Successful Co-teaching**

Co-teaching relationships are built on commitment, negotiation, and flexibility, so researchers often compare co-teaching to a successful marriage, but sadly one that often results in struggle, separation, or divorce (Friend, 2008; Howard & Potts, 2009;
Murowaski & Dieker, 2008). To be successful, researchers offer a variety of components needed to help co-teaching foster successful partnerships.

**Planning time.** The number one theme researchers point out that is necessary for successful collaboration in co-teaching is planning time (Cook & Friend, 2004; Friend, 2008; Friend & Pope, 2005; Hang & Rabren, 2009; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001; Howard & Potts, 2009; Maxwell, 2013; Murawski & Dieker, 2008; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). This time should be spent getting to know each other, learning about each other’s skills and philosophies, and co-planning for instruction (Hang & Rabren, 2009). Teachers should plan to take notes documenting their discussions and allot time for self-reflection (Howard & Potts, 2009).

Time should be provided for long term planning before school begins, and then weekly throughout the school year (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). At the beginning of the year, teachers should use a backward design framework to first identify desired results, determine acceptable evidence (assessments), and then map out learning experiences that will enable students to meet the desired results (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). This time can also be used to review and select the co-teaching method most appropriate for the students’ needs, and then modify textbooks, assessments, and activities to be differentiated to meet varying levels of language proficiency (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). Teachers must also decide on clear classroom expectations and how they will communicate information about co-teaching to parents (Gerber & Popp, 1999; Murawski & Dieker, 2008). During weekly meetings, co-teachers can co-plan, modify instruction for differentiation, plan for assessment, share resources, and divide the workload (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Howard & Potts 2009; Maxwell, 2014; Murawski
& Dieker, 2008). Howard and Potts (2009) offer a checklist that condenses this information and will help co-teachers keep their planning time focused and meaningful (see Appendix A). Through this co-planning, both teachers can share equal responsibility in ensuring true collaboration, and again, a checklist can be helpful in holding co-teaching partnerships accountable (Friend & Cook, 2004) (see Appendix B).

**Administrative support.** Another common theme to ensure the success of co-teaching is administrative support (Hourcade & Bawens, 2001; Maxwell, 2004; Murawski & Dieker, 2008). Administration can also help coordinate professional development that is necessary to ensuring teachers are knowledgeable about the best practices in co-teaching and how to implement co-teaching (Friend, 2008; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001; Maxwell, 2014; Murawski & Dieker, 2008). They can also help inform the community, school board, and entire staff about co-teaching and its benefits (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). Administrators have a say in the setup of classrooms, which means they can ensure that co-taught classes do not have more than 30-40% of students with language needs (Murawski & Dieker, 2008). Lastly, administrators can help with scheduling and resources. Administrators need to “structure the school schedule around this partnership, providing the time, space, and instructional resources for it to flourish” (Bell & Baecher, 2012, p. 492). They can ensure consistency in a co-taught classroom by making sure the ESL teacher is not pulled away for meetings or substituting, which sends a message of the importance and value of co-teaching (Murawski & Dieker, 2008). It is important that administrators realize the time it takes to be in a co-teaching partnership, so they need to carve out adequate planning time in the building schedule, as well as not over-extend the ESL teacher by having them travel
between schools, grades, and multiple classrooms with the expectation that they will be co-teaching in each situation (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Many researchers describe ideal scenarios for co-teaching to be successful, however it is not always the reality of what happens in schools. My study seeks to better understand the realities of real world classrooms.

**Classroom composition.** Another component of successful co-teaching is the classroom composition. Beninghof (2012) describes the delicate task of composing classrooms to be ideal for co-teaching. Ideally, the classroom reflects the community at large (Beninghof, 2012). For example, if 15% of the community is EL, than a classroom should have no more than 15% of ELs in it. However, if ELs are spread across many classrooms, there may not be enough ESL teachers to adequately co-teach. Another option is cluster grouping students. Cluster grouping “refers to the process of assigning a higher than natural proportion of the targeted students to a class for the purpose of efficient and effective service delivery” (Beninghof, 2012, p. 35). Beninghof advises to be sure that clustering does not result in a dumping ground for all students in need. If the targeted student group exceeds 30 percent of the class, the benefits of co-teaching can dwindle. However, a challenge with clustering is ensuring that teachers have a positive attitude and are willing to have a higher number of EL students with language needs. This could be more difficult with the high pressure testing culture of schools today.

**Beliefs and mindsets of co-teachers.** Another component to creating a successful co-teaching partnership is the teachers involved because certain beliefs, mindsets, and qualities can be beneficial (Bronson & Dentith, 2014; Cook & Friend, 2004; Friend, 2008; Hongsfeld & Dove, 2008; Murawski & Diker, 2008; York-Barr, Ghere, &
Sommerness, 2007). Success can vary depending on teacher personalities and style, disciplines, and rapport (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). The first step is looking for volunteers before principals involuntarily place teachers in a co-teaching set up (Cook & Friend, 2004; Friend, 2008). Both teachers need to be willing to try new things, be equal and listen to each other (Murawski & Deiker, 2008). There needs to be equal power because underutilization of one teacher undermines the success and purpose of co-teaching (Friend, 2008; Murawski & Dieker, 2008). Teachers must accept and embody the belief that two heads are better than one, and co-teaching does not mean that one teacher is the primary leader (Bronson & Dentith, 2014).

Murawski and Dieker (2008) describe many mindsets co-teachers should have to embark on a successful partnership. Both co-teachers must ensure that they are setting high standards, and differentiating instruction, but not watering it down. They must be engaged at all times, utilize small groups (both heterogeneous and homogenous), and try out a variety of strategies together. Lastly, both teachers need to be prepared to share success and avoid blame or venting, but constructively work through challenges. In a study by York-Barr, Ghere, and Sommerness (2007), they concluded that desirable qualities of a collaborative team member include: being student-centered, being competent; understanding classroom etiquette, willing to share ideas and change, be flexible, be respectful, and be a nice, professional person with a passion for learning.

Honigsfeld and Dove (2016) describe the importance of trust in a co-teaching relationship. They acknowledge that both mainstream and ESL teachers are not eager to give up the leadership role in teaching lessons, but co-teaching requires a delicate balance. Trust can be built from opportunities to collaborate, allowing teachers to learn to
value each other. Trust can also come from shared goal setting, shared decision making, shared risk-taking, holding each other to high expectations, and relying on each other. Once trust is developed, then teachers can focus on the students instead of their collaborative work relationship (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016).

**Maintenance of the collaborative cycle.** To prevent co-teaching from becoming an ineffective push-in model, teachers must maintain the entire collaborative instructional cycle (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016). This includes co-planning, co-teaching, co-assessment of student work, and reflection (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016). While this may seem time consuming and unrealistic in terms of finding this much mutual planning time, Honigsfeld and Dove (2016) explain how portions of this can be done separately and shared through email or other forms of technology. Step one, pre-planning, is completed separately. This is a time both teachers use their expertise to review curriculum, identify necessary background knowledge, and create language and content objectives. Step two, collaborative planning, is completed together. Teachers use this meeting to negotiate and finalize language and content objectives, assign roles and responsibilities, and how they will address and evaluate concepts and skills. Step three, completed separately, teachers complete their designated roles, such as finding resources, differentiating materials and assessments, or preparing materials. After the lesson, teachers can reflect independently or collaboratively to assess the effectiveness of the lesson and make adjustments for future instruction.

Combining these components will ensure a successful co-teaching environment, which will reap the many benefits co-teaching can offer.
Benefits of Co-teaching

Researchers have described a multitude of benefits that the co-teaching model offers. Friend (2008) states, “The tremendous potential of co-teaching to enable students with disabilities and other special needs to access the same curriculum as their peers and achieve equally high standards make the effort eminently worthwhile” (p. 17). Hourcade and Bauwens (2001) support this quote, stating that co-teaching allows educators and students opportunities to reach their full potential. Friend (1993) adds that co-teaching allows for more individualized and diverse learning experiences while allowing teachers to support and complement each other’s expertise.

Students. Co-teaching gives students who are at-risk for academic failure an opportunity of higher achievement as they learn mainstream content along with their monolingual peers (Bronson & Dentith, 2014 & Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). Instead of being grouped with struggling students or students at the same proficiency levels, as in pull-out models, co-teaching allows students to work with students with a variety of proficiency levels and academic abilities (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). This helps reduce stigmas for ELs and supports academic and social gains (Friend & Cook, 2004; Friend & Pope, 2005; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Not only will students have the chance to work with a variety of educators with different skills, but all students will benefit from more diversity in their learning environment, encouraging understanding, empathy, and appreciation (Gerber & Pope, 1991; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001).

Teachers. For teachers, co-teaching offers a cohesive structure to their planning and instruction, minimizing fragmentation that is often connected to pull-out models (Cook & Friend, 2004; York-Barr, Ghere & Sommerness, 2007). ESL teachers can
demonstrate strategies for ELs that the mainstream teacher can implement into other areas of their instruction (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). Mainstream teachers can help ESL teachers see the appropriate content learning benchmarks for ELs (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). Co-teachers will benefit from blending resources and knowledge, taking risks, and being innovative (Friend & Pope, 2005; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). Overall, teachers will be able to share strategies and offer each other continued professional development through a meaningful, ongoing, and contextualized manner. (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). In addition, co-teachers will be a part of a support system that offers a sense of camaraderie and responsibility to ensure the success of all students (Cook & Friend, 2004; Friend & Pope, 2005). In a co-teaching instructional model, teachers will be supporting an inclusive environment that values each and every member.

**Challenges and Realities in Many Schools**

Despite the numerous benefits, research has shown many challenges that schools and teachers face to make the co-teaching marriage successful (Friend, 2008; Friend & Pope, 2005; Hang & Rabren, 2009; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Gerber & Popp, 1999; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001; Murawski & Dieker, 2008; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Co-teaching is similar to other ESL program models because it can vary in the setup, the shared planning, and the amount each teacher is contributing to instruction (Friend, 1993). This can lead to ambiguity in structure, teacher roles, and implementation. Depending on the professional development, commitment, and effectiveness of implementation, the results of co-teaching can be unsuccessful (Gerber & Popp, 1999). Some teachers may struggle giving up their lead role in the classroom, disagree on various class matters, or wait for the other teacher to give permission, causing
one teacher to seem more like an assistant. (Friend & Pope, 2005; Hourcade & Bawens, 2001). This can create a situation that is not truly collaborative. The absence of administrative support and understanding can make scheduling, classroom composition, and adequate professional development needed for co-teaching difficult or unsupportive of successful co-teaching implementation (Bell & Baecher, 2012). Also, without proper collaboration time and trust, Arkoudis (2006) notes that ESL teachers may end in a role inferior to the classroom teacher, which underutilizes their expertise and diminishes opportunities that co-teaching can offer (as cited in Bell & Baecher, 2012). In addition, if there is a lack of time during the school day to meet for co-planning, co-teaching can be difficult (Hang & Rabren, 2009; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). This would include scenarios where the ESL teacher is spread between buildings, grades, and classrooms (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). To overcome the challenges presented by lack of time, co-teachers must be realistic in their model of choice, possibly choosing one that requires lower amounts of planning time, and become creative in their communication (use email or google documents, and share planning templates) (Gately & Gately, Jr., 2001; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008). Despite these challenges, it is important that educators refer back to components of success for co-teaching, keep the benefits in mind, and be creative and reasonable with their solutions.

**Gap in Research**

While the research presents information about co-teaching models, how to implement co-teaching models, and the benefits and challenges of co-teaching, there are two important gaps in research. The first one will not be explored through my research, but is important to note. More information is needed on the effectiveness of co-teaching
on student achievement. It would be beneficial to see the comparison of student achievement between ESL pull-out models, ESL push-in models, and ESL co-teaching models. This type of research would help convince mainstream and ESL teachers that co-teaching is a worthwhile instructional model.

The second gap in research, the one that I investigated through my research, is teachers’ perceptions of co-teaching. Teachers are the pivotal factor in successful co-teaching. Research describes components needed for success and challenges teachers will need to overcome, but literature on teachers’ perceptions and beliefs on co-teaching is lacking.

By considering these teacher perspectives, schools could be better equipped to implement co-teaching effectively. My research project investigated the perceptions of teachers in my district on co-teaching, and from this information, provided suggestions about improving current co-teaching practices, professional development, and the role co-teaching could play in the overall ESL programming.

**Research Questions**

To address the gap in research and fulfill the purpose of my research project, I sought to answer the following research question:

1) What do ESL and mainstream teachers perceive as successful co-teaching relationships and instructional models?

The sub questions that support my research question include:

a. What are characteristics of successful co-teaching relationships?

b. Which co-teaching instructional models do teachers believe are the most successful for teaching ELs?
c. What conditions do teachers perceive as necessary to successfully co-teach?

Summary

This chapter has described the need for collaboration through co-teaching models due to the increasing diversity in schools and increased federal accountability in schools. A thorough description of ESL programs, co-teaching instructional models, benefits, and challenges were explored.

Overview of Chapters

Chapter Three will explain the mixed research methods I used to investigate co-teaching perceptions in my district. It will describe the surveys I used to collect my data. My procedure, data analysis, and ethical considerations will also be explained.
CHAPTER THREE
Methodology

This chapter will describe the methodologies I used in this study to answer the following research question:

1) What do ESL and mainstream teachers perceive as successful co-teaching relationships and instructional models?

The sub questions that support my research question include:

a. What are characteristics of successful co-teaching relationships?

b. Which co-teaching instructional models do teachers believe are the most successful for teaching ELs?

c. What conditions do teachers perceive as necessary to successfully co-teach?

This chapter will first describe my research design plan, along with a description of the mixed methods research paradigm, then explain how I collected and analyzed my data, and conclude with a description of how I ensured this study was ethical, valid, and reliable.

Research Paradigm

The goal of this study was to understand the perceptions of co-teaching from 29 mainstream teachers at two elementary schools, and 17 elementary ESL teachers at sixteen elementary schools in my district. I used mixed methods research. Mixed methods incorporates qualitative and quantitative research techniques and data to answer a particular research question (Hesse-Biber, 2014). Johnson and Onwegbuzie (2004)
describe mixed methods as a rich field because words, pictures, and narrative can be used to add meaning to numbers (as cited in Hesse-Biber, 2014). One reason to use mixed methods is triangulation—using more than one method when studying the same question (Hesse-Biber, 2014).

Qualitative research is used to understand “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experience” (Merriam, 2009, p. 9). Qualitative research is commonly used in education because knowing more about and improving one’s practice can be achieved through this type of research (Merriam, 2009). This connects to the purpose of my study because I asked my colleagues to reflect on their perceptions of past, current, and future ESL instructional models to improve academic success for EL students. The qualitative research design evolves over time as the researcher searches for patterns in the data collected from the purposeful, limited number of participants (McKay, 2006).

Quantitative research differs from qualitative research. Quantitative data involves numerical responses to surveys (McKay, 2006). The surveys included several questions that were be analyzed statistically because respondents had to choose one answer (McKay, 2006). The use of both quantitative and qualitative data will strengthen my results.

Data Collection

Data for this study was collected over a two-week period. I used two surveys to collect data from two different perspectives: mainstream and ESL teachers. These surveys mirrored each other. The surveys for mainstream and ESL teachers followed the same sequence and had the same questions. The only difference was the wording of some
questions to best fit the teaching role of the respondent. The surveys included two types of questions: quantitative (forced-choice) and qualitative (open-ended) (Bell & Baecher, 2012).

**Participants.** The participants in my study included 29 mainstream teachers and 17 ESL teachers. The mainstream teachers were from two elementary schools and teach grades K-5. The ESL teachers were from sixteen elementary schools in my district and teach grades K-5. There were more mainstream participants than ESL teacher participants because of how many teachers I had available to contact. I wanted to invite as many mainstream teachers as I could to represent a wide range of grade levels and experience. I invited every elementary ESL teacher in our district to participate in our survey.

**Location.** The setting for this study was a large, suburban district in the Midwest. There are sixteen elementary schools with seven hundred and two LEP (Limited English Proficient) students. There are sixteen full time EL teachers and six part-time EL teachers.

**Data Collection Technique: Surveys.** I used two mirrored surveys as the data collection technique. Mckay (2006) notes that surveys are an effective research technique that help teachers find out more information about student or teacher backgrounds, habits and preferences. One survey was designed for mainstream teachers and the other was designed for ESL teachers. The surveys incorporated quantitative (forced-choice) and qualitative (open-ended) questions related to perceptions about co-teaching. Dornyei (2003) explains that surveys can give three types of information: factual, which gives information about characteristics of individuals; behavioral, which gives information on what individuals have done regularly; and attitudinal information, which gives
information on individual opinions, beliefs, and interests (as cited in McKay, 2006). I included all three types of questions in my survey to gather a wide range of data. This allowed respondents to reflect on past co-teaching experiences, as well as their opinions and beliefs about co-teaching.

The participants were a “sample of convenience,” which is a group representative of the larger population, but not a true random sample because it included participants I had access to in my school district (McKay, 2006). To represent the larger population, I gathered information from K-5 teachers, at two elementary schools, as well as ESL teachers from the sixteen elementary schools in the entire district.

The questions on my survey were open-ended and close-ended. Open-ended questions can be fill-in or short answer (McKay, 2006). The open-ended questions I used were short answer. Respondents were asked to elaborate on answers from close-ended questions, describe experiences co-teaching, and share their perceptions and opinions (McKay, 2006). I included a few types of close-ended questions that required participants to choose one of several answer options (McKay, 2006). First, I used multiple-choice questions to gather demographic information from respondents. This helped me categorize the data when I analyzed responses. Some closed-ended questions used the Likert-scale, in which respondents select one of several response choices that showed how much they agreed or disagreed with statement (McKay, 2006). Other closed-ended questions asked participants to rank answers or simply answer yes/no questions.

There are advantages and disadvantages to both types of questions. Close-ended questions offer uniformity of responses, which helps make categorizing and analyzing easier, yet they give a narrower range of answers and can be difficult for the researcher to
write (McKay, 2006). Open-ended questions, on the other hand, are easier for the researcher to write and provide rich data, but they can be difficult to categorize and analyze (McKay, 2006). By incorporating close-ended and open-ended questions into my survey, I balanced the advantages and disadvantages of both types of questions.

**Procedure**

I first connected with 41 mainstream teachers and 18 ESL teachers. Each one verbally agreed to participate in my research and gave me their contact information. I verbally connected with each participant to increase the participation in the survey and clarify any questions about the participation process. I then created the two surveys on Survey Monkey, an online tool. A copy of the surveys are attached in Appendix C and D. The next step was completing my pilot study. The final step in my data collection was sending out the surveys to mainstream and ESL teachers.

**Pilot study.** I first piloted the study with two friends; a mainstream teacher and an ESL teacher. The pilot study helped check for any problems that existed in the clarity and difficulty of the questions (McKay, 2006). Both participants gave me feedback on the time it took to take the survey, grammar, and the flow of the survey. Piloting my study first helped to ensure that my questions were clear for participants, which helped to ensure I received valid data.

**Surveys.** I sent out the link for the electronic survey to all participants that verbally agreed. In the email, I included a description of my study, a consent form they electronically signed, a handout with definitions of co-teaching, the six different instructional models, and a visual to explain these models (see Appendix E). This helped
to ensure that all respondents answered the survey questions with the same definitions of co-teaching in mind. The survey included twenty-eight questions.

I informed participants they would have a two-week window to complete the surveys. I sent email and text reminders on day one, day six, day eight, and day thirteen of the two-week reminder. After the survey was closed, 29 of the 41 mainstream teachers and 17 of the 18 ESL teachers had completed the survey.

**Data Analysis**

After the two-week response window closed, I spent three weeks analyzing the data. First, I read through individual responses. This helped me to get an initial idea of the responses. I then went back through the individual responses and created a card for each respondent. On this card, I used numbers and symbols to show their respondent number and answers to demographic questions. I used these cards to see themes in responses that connected demographic answers, such as years of experience teaching or experience co-teaching (McKay, 2006). This was most useful when I analyzed questions that asked respondents to share their opinions. To continue analyzing the data quantitatively, I used the graphs and percentages from Survey Monkey.

Then I analyzed the data qualitatively using an informal coding method. I started by reading through the responses multiple times to find emerging themes. Then I transcribed the open ended-questions, found in Appendix F. I grouped these themes into mainstream and ESL teachers’ responses and summarized the data (McKay, 2006).

Using these strategies to analyze my data allowed me to see different themes in the responses based on different teacher backgrounds, such as those who have co-taught and those who have not, different grade levels, years of experience teaching, or levels of
education. I also grouped many responses into mainstream and ESL teachers’ responses, again helping various themes to emerge. By analyzing the results of the data in two ways, I strengthened the reliability and validity of the results.

**Verification of Data**

I employed various data collection techniques to ensure validity and reliability of the data I collected. Validity refers to how research findings match reality, while reliability refers to the extent the findings can be replicated (Merrian, 2009).

A well-known strategy to strengthen internal validity of a study is triangulation (Merriam, 2009). Denzin (1978) describes four types of triangulation: the use of multiple methods, multiple sources of data, multiple investigators, or multiple theories (as cited in Merriam, 2009). An example of using multiple methods includes checking what someone says in an interview or survey to what you read about in documents relevant to the topic (Merriam, 2009). I compared the responses to researched literature on co-teaching. In addition, I used multiple sources of data to triangulate the results of surveys by analyzing “data collected from people with different perspectives,” from the point of view of ESL teachers and mainstream teachers at different grade levels and schools (Merriam, 2009, p. 216). The surveys include qualitative and quantitative questions, allowing me to analyze two forms of data (Hesse-Biber, 2014).

To ensure reliability in my data, I focused on the more important question: “whether the results are consistent with the data collected” (Merriam, 2009, p. 221). To ensure consistency, I explained my method of analyzing the data and deriving themes, thus showing how I was able to present dependable results.
Ethics

Merriam (2009) notes that validity and reliability depend largely on the ethics of the investigator. This study employed the following safe guards to ensure protection of informant’s rights:

1) The purpose and objectives of this study were shared with informants.

2) Consent was obtained from all participants.

3) Prior to beginning research, this study was approved by Hamline University and my school district through a human subjects review.

4) Data was analyzed to find emerging themes.

5) Participants were ensured anonymity.

6) All data obtained from this study was kept secure in a password protected computer and Google drive.

7) All data obtained from this study was destroyed within year.

Summary

In this chapter, I described the methodology I used in my study of teachers’ perceptions of co-teaching. I surveyed mainstream and ESL teachers in my district to gather data. I incorporated a variety of question forms on the surveys. Once I collected and transcribed the data, I used themes that emerged from the data to identify recurring ideas. The next chapter presents the results of this study.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

This research project on co-teaching took place in a large, suburban district in the Midwest. Data was collected from mainstream and ESL teachers over the course of two weeks. The participating mainstream teachers are from two different elementary schools, and the participating EL teachers are from thirteen of the sixteen elementary schools in the district. An invitation to complete an electronic survey was sent out to 41 mainstream teachers and 18 ESL teachers. After two and a half weeks, 29 of the 41 mainstream teachers responded and 17 of the 18 ESL teachers responded. One of the ESL teachers only completed questions 1 through 14.

This chapter will report on the data that was collected for this study, which sought to answer the following research question:

1) What do ESL and mainstream teachers perceive as successful co-teaching relationships and instructional models?

The sub questions that support my research question include:

a. What are characteristics of successful co-teaching relationships?

b. Which co-teaching instructional models do teachers believe are the most successful for teaching ELs?

c. What conditions do teachers perceive as necessary to successfully co-teach?
Surveys

The two surveys used to collect data were mirrored surveys, meaning they included the same questions and sequence for mainstream and ESL teachers, but some questions differed slightly in the wording to fit the specific teaching roles of each group. The survey included some close-ended questions, such as yes/no and ranking questions, as well as some open-ended questions where respondents could elaborate on their opinions and experiences. Questions from the mainstream and ESL surveys can be found in Appendices C and D. The data from close-ended questions was analyzed quantitatively using percentages and charts. The data from open-ended questions was analyzed qualitatively by informally coding the responses to find commonalities. These commonalities were grouped into mainstream teacher responses and ESL teacher responses.

The survey questions were grouped into the following categories in regards to co-teaching: demographics of the teacher, program models, co-teaching experience, the teacher’s classroom (and opinions), and instructional models and logistics. As I analyzed the data, I used these categories to organize and discuss the results.

Demographics of Respondents. The first six questions asked respondents to state their years of experience, degrees, grades they currently teach, and years of experience teaching ELs.

The majority of mainstream teachers that responded to the survey have 11 or more years of teaching experience. Mainstream teacher respondents included one (3%) teacher that has taught for 1-5 years, four (14%) teachers that have taught for 6-10 years, 11 (38%) teachers that have taught for 11-15 years, ten (35%) teachers that have taught
for 16-20 years, and three (10%) that have taught for 21 or more years. Of these 29 teachers, 7% have Bachelor’s degrees, 90% have Master’s degrees, and 3% have a PhD.

ESL teachers that responded to the survey included three (18%) teachers that have taught for 1-5 years, six teachers (35%) that have taught for 6-10 years, four (24%) teachers that have taught for 11-15 years, two (12%) teachers that have taught for 16-20 years, and two (12%) teachers that have taught for 21 or more years. Of these 17 ESL teachers, 35% have Bachelor’s degrees and 65% Master’s degrees. Figure 5 and Figure 6 show this information visually on the following page.
The mainstream and ESL teachers also have a variety of teaching licenses and certificates, as shown in Table 1 on the following page, showcasing a wide range of knowledge and expertise.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License</th>
<th>Mainstream Teachers</th>
<th>ESL Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth-5 Elementary Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6 Elementary Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5 Elementary Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6 Elementary Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 Social Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 English Language Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-12 Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6 Gifted Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction in Second Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s License</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching 7-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 ESL</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both groups of teachers teach at elementary schools with grades K-5. All of the mainstream teachers teach one grade level, while all ESL teachers teach multiple grade levels. Figure 7 and Figure 8 show the grade levels mainstream and ESL teachers teach.

- 8 of the 17 ESL teachers teach six grade levels (K-5).
- 2 of the 17 ESL teachers teach five grade levels.
- 6 of the 17 ESL teachers teach four grade levels.
• 1 of the 17 ESL teachers teaches three grade levels.

Of the mainstream respondents, 14% teach Kindergarten, 17% teach first grade, 10% teach second grade, 21% teach third grade, 17% teach fourth grade, and 21% teach fifth grade. Of the ESL respondents, 71% teach Kindergarten, 82% teach first grade, 88% teach second grade, 94% of teach third grade, 88% teach fourth grade, and 76% teach fifth grade.

The number of years that mainstream and ESL teachers have worked with EL students range from zero to 21 or more years. Figure 9 and Figure 10 show this data on the following page.
The number of years mainstream teacher have worked with EL students range from zero to 21 or more years:

- 3% have worked with EL students for 0 years.
• 24% have worked with EL students for 1-5 years.
• 34% have worked with EL students for 6-10 years.
• 24% have worked with EL students for 11-15 years.
• 10% have worked with EL students for 16-20 years.
• 3% have worked with EL students for 21 or more years.

The number of years EL teachers have worked with EL students range from one to 21 or more years:

• 35% have worked with EL students for 1-5 years.
• 24% have worked with EL students for 6-10 years.
• 18% have worked with EL students for 11-15 years.
• 24% have worked with EL students for 16-20 years.

The number of EL students that teachers work with varies greatly from mainstream to EL teachers. The vast majority of mainstream teachers work with 1-5 EL students:

• 3% of mainstream teachers work with 0 EL students.
• 86% of mainstream teachers work with 1-5 EL students.
• 10% of mainstream teachers work with 6-10 EL students.

Naturally, this looks different for ESL teachers. Over half of ESL teachers have a caseload of more than 30 EL students, which is more than a typical classroom:

• 12% of EL teachers work with 16-20 EL students.
• 6% of EL teachers work with 21-25 EL students.
• 29% of EL teachers work with 26-30 students.
• 53% of EL teachers work with 31 or more EL students.

**Experience.** Respondents were asked if they have co-taught before, and if yes, for how long. Figure 11 and Figure 12 show the results on the next page.
There are eight mainstream teachers, of 29 total, who have co-taught representing 28%. The remaining 21 teachers who have not co-taught represent 72%. All 17 (100%) of ESL teachers have had experiences co-teaching. On the following page, Table 2 shows the number of years teachers have co-taught. It is noted in parentheses if more than one teacher responded.
Table 2. *Years of Experience Co-teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Mainstream Teachers Have Co-taught</th>
<th>Years ESL Teachers Have Co-taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year (5 respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years (4 respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years (on and off)</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>9 years (2 respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies from 1992</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program models.** In this section, respondents were asked first to report on program models used for their EL students. The graphs in Figure 13 and Figure 14 on the following page show weighted totals after respondents ranked the choices in order from 1-3. The graphs do not include not available (N/A) responses, meaning teachers do not have ELs in that specific program model, which represented 3% of mainstream teachers.
for pull-out, 10% of mainstream teachers for push-in, 31% of mainstream teachers for co-teaching, 6% of ESL teachers for push-in, and 6% of ESL teachers for co-teaching.

Figure 13. Mainstream Teacher Program Models

Figure 14. ESL Teacher Program Models

Pull-out was the most used program model for 65% of mainstream teachers and 65% of ESL teachers. Push-in was the most used model for 28% of mainstream teachers.
and 24% of ESL teachers. *Co-teaching* was the most used model for 7% of mainstream teachers and 12% of ESL teachers.

This data shows that *pull-out* is the most used program model by both groups of teachers, *push-in* is the second most used, and *co-teaching* is the least used program model.

Respondents were then asked to report on their opinions on the effectiveness of the three co-teaching models. Figure 15 and Figure 16 on the following page show their beliefs about the following four statements:

1) Pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.
2) Push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.
3) Co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.
4) Co-teaching benefits non-EL students in the classroom.

---

**Figure 15. Mainstream Teacher Opinions on ESL Program Models**
1) Pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction:

- 0% (0/29) of mainstream teachers and 6% (1/17) of ESL teachers strongly disagreed.
- 14% (4/29) of mainstream teachers and 41% (7/17) of ESL teachers disagreed.
- 17% (5/29) of mainstream teachers and 6% (1/17) of ESL teachers were not sure.
- 66% (19/29) of mainstream teachers and 74% (8/17) of ESL teachers agreed.
- 3% (1/29) of mainstream teachers and 0% (0/17) of ESL teachers strongly agreed.

The one ESL teacher who strongly disagreed that pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction teaches six grade levels, has a Bachelor’s degree, has co-taught, and pull-out is the least used program model for their EL students.

Of the four mainstream teachers who disagreed that pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, two are 3rd grade teachers, and two are 4th grade teachers; three have Master’s degrees and one has a PhD; three have co-taught; all four are willing to co-
teach; and for all four, pull-out is the most used or second most used program model, while co-teaching is the least used program model.

Of the seven ESL teachers who disagreed that pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, all teach four to six grade levels; two have Bachelor’s degree and five have Master’s degrees; all seven have co-taught, but five stated pull-out was the most used program model.

Of the five mainstream teachers who were not sure that pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, one is a Kindergarten teacher, two are 3rd grade teachers, and two are 4th grade teachers; all five have Master’s degrees; zero have co-taught, but all five are willing to co-teach; and for all five teachers, pull-out is the most used program model, while co-teaching is the least used.

The one ESL teacher who was not sure that pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction teaches three grade levels, has a Bachelor’s degree, has co-taught, and currently uses the pull-out program model the least and the co-teaching program model the most.

Of the 19 mainstream teachers who agreed that pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, two are Kindergarten teachers, five are 1st grade teachers, three are 2nd grade teachers, two are 3rd grade teachers, one is a 4th grade teacher, and six are 5th grade teachers; 17 have Master’s degrees and two have Bachelor’s degrees; only five have co-taught, but 18 are willing to co-teach; and the majority use pull-out as the most used model, while co-teaching is the least used model or not used at all.
Of the eight ESL teachers who agreed that pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, six teach 6 grade levels; two have Bachelor’s degrees and six have Master’s degrees; all eight have co-taught before, but six use pull-out as the most used program model and co-teaching the least.

The one mainstream teacher who strongly agreed that pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction is a Kindergarten teacher, has a Master’s degree, has never had an EL student in their classroom, and thus has never co-taught with an ESL teacher. However, this respondent stated they would be willing to co-teach.

A theme in mainstream teachers’ responses to the statement, ‘pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction’ is that those who disagreed teach mostly upper elementary and have had experiences co-teaching. Those who agreed were spread out throughout all grades, but most had not ever co-taught and use pull-out as the main program model for their EL students.

There were not consistent themes in ESL teachers’ responses to the statement ‘pull-out is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.’ Teachers that use pull-out the most both disagreed and agreed that pull-out is an effective mode of instruction. The majority of ESL teachers who agreed with this statement teach 6 grade levels, but so did the majority of ESL teachers who disagreed. The more education teachers had did not seem to influence their opinion on this statement either.

2) Push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction:

- 0% (0/29) of mainstream teachers and 0% (0/17) of ESL teachers strongly disagreed.
• 7% (2/29) of mainstream teachers and 24% (4/17) of ESL teachers disagreed.
• 10% (3/29) of mainstream teachers and 30% (5/17) of ESL teachers were not sure.
• 66% (19/29) of mainstream teachers and 41% (7/17) of ESL teachers agreed.
• 17% (5/29) of mainstream teachers and 6% (1/17) of ESL teachers strongly agreed.

Of the two mainstream teachers who disagreed that push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, one is a 3rd grade teacher and one is a 5th grade teacher; both have a Master’s degree; both have co-taught; one stated push-in is the most used ESL program model, while the other stated push-in is the second most used ESL program model.

Of the four ESL teachers who disagreed that push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, one teaches 4 grade levels, two teach 5 grade levels, and one teaches 6 grade levels; two have Bachelor’s degrees and two have Master’s degrees, all four have co-taught; two stated push-in was their most used ESL program model and two stated push-in was the second most used ESL program model.

Of the three mainstream teachers who were not sure that push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, one is a Kindergarten teacher and two are 1st grade teachers; all three have Master’s degrees; one has co-taught; one stated push-in is the most used ESL program model and two do not use push-in at all.

Of the five ESL teachers who were not sure that push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, one teaches 3 grade levels, one teaches 4 grade levels, and three teach 6 grade levels; three have Bachelor’s degrees and two have Master’s degrees;
all five have co-taught; one stated push-in is the most used ESL program model, two stated push-in is the second most used ESL program model, and two stated push-in is the least used model or not used at all.

Of the 19 mainstream teachers who agreed that push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, three teach Kindergarten, one teaches 1st grade, two teach 2nd grade, five teach 3rd grade, five teach 4th grade, and three teach 5th grade; two have Bachelor’s degrees, 16 have Master’s degrees, one has a PhD; five of these teachers have co-taught; four stated push-in is the most used model of ESL instruction, and the majority stated push-in is the second most used model of ESL; only one respondent did not use push-in as a program model.

Of the 7 ESL teachers who agreed that push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, four teach 4 grade levels and three teach 6 grade levels; one has a Bachelor’s degree and six have Master’s degrees; all seven have co-taught; one stated push-in is the most used ESL program model, five stated push-in is the second most used ESL program model, and one stated push-in is the least used ESL program model.

Of the five mainstream teachers who strongly agreed that push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, two are 1st grade teachers, one is a 2nd grade teacher, and two are 5th grade teachers; all five have Master’s degrees; zero have co-taught; one stated push-in is the used ESL instructional model and four stated push-in is the second most used ESL instructional model.
The one ESL teacher who strongly agreed that push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction teaches six grade levels, has a Master’s degree, has co-taught, and stated that push-in is the second most used ESL program model.

A consistency in mainstream teacher responses is that all of the teachers that disagreed, agreed, and strongly agreed currently use push-in as an instructional model. A theme is that the majority of upper elementary teachers agreed or strongly agreed push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.

There was not a consistent trend in ESL responses as far as number of grades taught or how much they use push-in as a program model. Respondents who stated push-in was the most or second most used ESL program model had responses that ranged from disagree to strongly agree.

3) Co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction:

- 3% (1/29) of mainstream teachers and 0% (0/17) of ESL teachers strongly disagreed.
- 0% (0/29) of mainstream teachers and 0% (0/17) of ESL teachers disagreed.
- 14% (4/29) of mainstream teachers and 12% (2/17) of ESL teachers were not sure.
- 52% (15/29) of mainstream teachers and 30% (5/17) of ESL teachers agreed.
- 31% (9/29) of mainstream teachers and 59% (10/17) of ESL teachers strongly agreed.

The one mainstream teacher who strongly disagreed that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction teaches 2nd grade and has a Master’s degree. This respondent has not co-taught and is not willing to co-teach, stating it “depends on compatibility” of the teachers.
Of the four mainstream teachers who were not sure that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, two teach 1st grade, one teaches 2nd grade, and one teaches 5th grade; all four have Master’s degrees; zero have co-taught, but all four are willing to co-teaching; and all currently use a mix of push-in or pull-out as their ESL program model.

Of the two ESL teachers who were not sure that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, one teaches 3 grade levels and one teaches 5 grade levels; both have Bachelor’s degrees; both have co-taught, but one stated it is the most used ESL program model and the other stated it is the least used ESL program model.

Of the 15 mainstream teachers who agreed that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, three teach Kindergarten, one teaches 1st grade, one teaches 2nd grade, two teach 3rd grade, five teach 4th grade, and three teach 5th grade; one has a Bachelor’s degree, 13 have Master’s degrees, and one has a PhD; four have co-taught, all 15 are willing to co-teach, and all 15 stated co-teaching is the least used ESL program model or not used at all.

Of the five ESL teachers who agreed that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, two teach four grade levels and three teach six grade levels; one has a Bachelor’s degree and four have Master’s degrees; all five have co-taught and are willing to co-teach; four stated co-teaching is the least used ESL program model and one stated it is the second most used ESL program model.

Of the nine mainstream teachers who strongly agreed that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, one is a Kindergarten teacher, two teach 1st grade,
four teach 4th grade, and two teach 5th grade; one has a Bachelor’s degree and eight have Master’s degrees; four have co-taught, and all nine are willing to co-teach; three stated they do not use co-teaching as an ESL program model, three stated is it is the least used ESL program model, and three stated it is the second most used ESL program model.

Of the ten ESL teachers who strongly agreed co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction, four teach four grade levels, one teaches five grade levels, and five teach six grade levels; three have Bachelor’s degrees and seven have Master’s degrees; all ten have co-taught and are willing to co-teach; one stated co-teaching is the most used ESL program model, four stated it is the second most used ESL program model, and five stated it is the least used or not used at all.

There were consistencies in the mainstream teachers’ data in response to co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction. A consistency in mainstream teachers’ responses included all respondents who strongly disagreed or were not sure that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction have not co-taught. However, all of the mainstream teachers who have had experience co-teaching either agreed or strongly agreed that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction. In addition, other respondents who agreed or strongly agreed had never co-taught, but stated they were willing to try co-teaching in the future. Also, all but one mainstream teacher from grades 3rd-5th agreed or strongly agreed that co-teaching is a highly effective ESL program model. Teachers in K-2 had responses spread out over four different responses: strongly disagree, not sure, agree, and strongly agree.
All but two ESL teachers either agreed or strongly agreed that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction. Responses were not affected by the amount ESL teachers were currently co-teaching because all of the ESL teachers have had experience co-teaching, whether current or previous to this study. Due to this, many ESL teachers that stated co-teaching was the least used model, or not used at all, still believed co-teaching is highly effective.

4) Co-teaching benefits non EL students in the classroom:

- 3% (1/29) of mainstream teachers and 0% (0/17) of ESL teachers strongly disagreed.
- 0% (0/29) of mainstream teachers and 0% (0/17) of ESL teachers disagreed.
- 7% (2/29) of mainstream teachers and 0% (0/17) of ESL teachers were not sure.
- 45% (13/29) of mainstream teachers and 35% (6/17) of ESL teachers agreed.
- 45% (13/29) of mainstream teachers and 65% (11/17) of ESL teachers strongly agreed.

The one mainstream teacher who strongly disagreed that co-teaching benefits non EL students in the classroom teaches 2nd grade, has a Master’s degree, has not co-taught and is also not willing to co-teach, stating it “depends on compatibility” between the co-teachers. This was also the only respondent who strongly disagreed with the previous statement, co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.

Of the two mainstream teachers who were not sure that co-teaching benefits non-EL students in the classroom, both teach 1st grade; both have Master’s degrees; both have not co-taught, but are willing to co-teach in the future.
Of the 13 mainstream teachers who agreed that co-teaching benefits non EL students in the classroom, three teach Kindergarten, one teaches 1st grade, two teach 2nd grade, one teaches 3rd grade, three teach 4th grade, and three teach 5th grade; one has a Bachelor’s degree; 11 have Master’s degrees, and one has a PhD; three have co-taught before, but all 13 are willing to co-teach in the future; all 13 stated co-teaching is the least used ESL program model or not used at all.

Of the six ESL teachers who agreed that co-teaching benefits non EL students in the classroom, two teach four grade levels, two teach five grade levels, and two teach six grade levels; two have Bachelor’s degrees and four have Master’s degrees; all six have co-taught before; two stated co-teaching is the second most used ESL program model and four stated it is the least used ESL program model.

Of the 13 mainstream teachers who strongly agreed that co-teaching benefits non EL students in the classroom, one teaches Kindergarten, two teach 1st grade, five teach 3rd grade, two teach 4th grade, and three teach 5th grade; one has a Bachelor’s degree and 12 have Master’s degrees; five have co-taught before, but all 13 are willing to co-teach in the future; three stated co-teaching is the second most used ESL program model and the other ten stated co-teaching is the least used ESL program model or not used at all.

Of the 11 ESL teachers who strongly agreed that co-teaching benefits non EL students in the classroom, one teaches three grade levels, four teach four grade levels, and six teach six grade levels; four have Bachelor’s degrees and seven have Master’s degrees; all 11 have co-taught before; two stated co-teaching is the most used program model,
three stated it is the second most used program model; and six stated it is the least used or not used at all.

A theme in mainstream teachers’ responses was that all teachers in grades 3-5 either agreed or strongly agreed that co-teaching benefits non-EL students in the classroom. All mainstream teachers that have had experience co-teaching either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. A commonality in responses was that all teachers who were willing to co-teach either stated they were not sure, agreed, or strongly agreed with this statement, so they had a neutral or positive response.

A theme in ESL teachers’ responses was that all ESL teachers either agreed or strongly agreed that co-teaching benefits non-EL students in the classroom. Again, it did not matter if co-teaching was the second most used ESL program model, the least used, or not used at all because all of the ESL teachers had prior or current experiences co-teaching. The number of grade levels ESL teachers taught and how much they currently used co-teaching varied amongst both groups of responses.

Successes and areas of improvement. Teachers that had experience co-teaching were asked to elaborate on what was successful and what could have been improved to make their experience more successful. A list of all responses can be found in Appendix F, Questions 11 and 12. On the following page, Table 3 and 4 show common responses from mainstream and ESL teachers’ responses.
Table 3. *Reflections on Areas of Success from Experience Co-teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Responses</th>
<th>Additional Mainstream Teacher Responses</th>
<th>Additional ESL Teacher Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two teachers offered better instruction and support for students</td>
<td>When both teachers stuck to the schedule and plan</td>
<td>Time to plan together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong relationships between teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to build on each other’s strengths and learn from each other</td>
<td>Reduced stigma for ELs being pulled-out and both teachers working with all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with teachers who were willing and share ideas and responsibility</td>
<td>Ability to integrate language objectives into grade level content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to use multiple forms of co-teaching instructional models when there was adequate time to co-plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. *Reflections on Areas that Need Improvement from Experiences Co-teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Responses</th>
<th>Additional Mainstream Teacher Responses</th>
<th>Additional ESL Teacher Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More co-planning time to plan effective language and content instruction</td>
<td>More ESL teachers to make it possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication</td>
<td>Teachers need to be on the planned schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance from administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continual evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More sharing of EL and non EL students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared power so one teach, one assist is not always used—it is a waste of time and reduces ESL teacher to paraprofessional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Willingness to co-teach.** In the next section, respondents were asked if they were willing to co-teach in the future. Next, mainstream teachers were asked if they would be willing to have a higher number of ELs in their classroom in order to have that opportunity, and ESL teachers were asked if they would suggest classes have higher number of ELs in one classroom. Despite many mainstream teachers lacking experience co-teaching, 97% (28/29) stated they would be willing to co-teach. The one mainstream teacher that stated they were not willing to co-teach has not had experience co-teaching and stated it would “depend on who the ESL teacher was and if our teaching styles were similar. It would also depend on their classroom management capabilities and their understanding of the curriculum.” All 17 (100%) of ESL teachers stated they would be willing to co-teach in the future. Co-teaching involves having a higher number of ELs in the classroom. Despite the high percentage of willingness to co-teach, 17% (5/29) of mainstream teachers stated they would not be willing to have a higher number of ELs in their classroom in order to have the opportunity to co-teach with an ESL teacher. Again, 100% (17/17) ESL teachers stated they would suggest higher numbers of ELs in the classroom in order to have the opportunity to co-teach with a mainstream teacher.

Respondents were asked to support and elaborate on their answers to these two questions. Table 5 and Table 6 on following pages show commonalities that emerged from their responses on the following page. While mainstream teachers stated reasons why they are willing to co-teach, many voiced concerns. Mainstream teachers are hesitant for a number of reasons. These reasons include compatibility of teachers, effort from the ESL teacher in planning and leadership, and the difficulty of having EL students the other
hours of the day when the ESL teacher is not there to support. ESL teachers described concerns about forcing co-teaching, which makes it unsuccessful. Also, ESL teachers stated lower levels of English proficiency often need more than just co-teaching, such as a safe space to take risks and talk without peers judging them.

Table 5. *Why Teachers are willing to Co-teach*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Responses</th>
<th>Additional Mainstream Responses</th>
<th>Additional ESL Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embeds language instruction and academic language</td>
<td>Exposes ESL teacher to mainstream curriculum, which improves instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL students will stay in class and not miss important class time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic language is best taught in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two licensed teachers in class benefits all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, many teachers were willing to cluster ELs in one classroom, yet many voiced concerns. Mainstream teachers feel pulled in too many directions when they also have special education and gifted students. In addition, some teachers worry that clustering causes the other classrooms to miss out on diversity. Another concern was the hours outside of the co-taught subject each day, so one teacher suggested if they take on the cluster, the co-teaching is spread out over many content areas. Both mainstream and ESL teachers again mentioned concerns about the compatibility of teachers and the success of working together. Table 6 on the following page shows commonalities from their responses.
Table 6. Why Teachers Are Willing to Have or Suggest Higher Numbers of ELs in a Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Responses</th>
<th>Additional Mainstream Responses</th>
<th>Additional ESL Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows more time for the ESL teacher to be in the classroom</td>
<td>Teachers enjoy having ELs in their class and the rich diversity</td>
<td>If ELs are not clustered, it is too difficult to align schedules and service to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better for students with similar needs to be grouped together and offers them more support</td>
<td>If ELs are not clustered, ESL teachers are forced to do pull-out, which is not as effective</td>
<td>Much easier to work with fewer teachers and have better communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Co-teaching instructional models.** Respondents were asked to rank six types of co-teaching models from least likely to use to most likely to use. The choices were *one teach, one observe; one teach, one assist; parallel teaching; station teaching; alternative teaching; and team teaching.* Definitions of each instructional model can be found in Appendix E. The responses for both mainstream and EL teachers varied greatly. However, weighted totals show the most favored and least favored instructional models among each group, shown in Figures 17 and 18 on the next page.
Mainstream teachers preferred one teach, one assist (weighted total of 8.66), then station teaching (weighted total of 8.10), then alternative teaching (weighted total of 8.00), then parallel teaching (weighted total of 7.90), then team teaching (weighted total of 7.69), and finally the least favored model was one teach, one observe (weighted total of 6.72).

ESL teachers also preferred one teach, one assist (weighted total of 9.25), then station teaching (weighted total of 8.63), then alternative teaching and team teaching (weighted totals of 7.94), then parallel teaching (7.63), and the least favored model was one teach, one observe (weighted total 6.63).

The order of preference for both groups was very similar. Both groups ranked one teach, one assist as the most favored and one teach, one observe as the least favored. They both ordered station teaching as second most preferred, alternative teaching as third most preferred, and parallel teaching as fourth most preferred. The only difference
is mainstream teachers ranked *team teaching* as fifth preferred, while ESL teachers ranked *team teaching* as third preferred, equal with *alternative teaching*.

**Content areas for co-teaching.**

Respondents were asked to rank their opinion on what content area they believed co-teaching would be most beneficial. Their choices were *social studies*, *science*, *math*, *reading*, and *writing*. The responses from mainstream and ESL teachers were very similar. The weighted totals from their rankings show the areas that all respondents believe are best suited for co-teaching, shown in Figure 19 and Figure 20.

Mainstream teachers thought *reading* (weighted total of 4.24) would benefit the most from co-teaching, and *writing* (weighted total of 3.93) was a close second. They ranked *math* (weighted total of 2.79) as third. Fourth was *social studies* (weighted total of 2.24). Fifth was *science* (weighted total of 1.79).

ESL teachers’ ranking looked very similar, however they ranked *writing* (weighted total of 4.06) as the content area they believed would most benefit from co-
teaching. Next, they ranked reading (weighted total of 4.00). Third ranked was math (weighted total of 2.50). Next was social studies (weighted total of 2.31). The area they ranked as last was science (2.13).

**Time needed for collaboration.** When asked how much time was needed weekly to plan with a co-teacher, mainstream and ESL teachers had similar responses. Figures 21 and 22 show this information visually on the following page.

Figure 21. Mainstream Teachers’ Beliefs on Time Needed for Weekly for Planning

![Diagram showing time needed for planning]

Figure 22. ESL Teachers’ Beliefs on Time Needed for Weekly Planning
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- **1-30 minutes:** 17% (5/29) mainstream teachers and 6% (1/16) ESL teachers
- **31-60 minutes:** 58% (17/29) mainstream teachers and 88% (14/16) ESL teachers
- **61+ minutes:** 24% (7/29) mainstream teachers and 6% (1/16) ESL teachers

**Role of administration.** Respondents were asked to share their opinions on the role administration plays in the success of co-teaching. They ranked the following from most important to least important: providing professional development about co-teaching, creating class lists that ensure enough ELs for co-teaching, but not more than 40% of the classroom, and creating schedules that allow for adequate common planning times.

Figure 23 and Figure 24 show the weighted results.
Figure 23. Mainstream Teachers’ Beliefs about Roles of Administration in Co-teaching

**Q18 What role do you believe administration plays in the success of co-teaching? Rank from most important (1) to least important (3).**

Answered: 29  Skipped: 8

- Providing professional...
- Creating class lists first...
- Creating schedules first...

Figure 24. ESL Teachers’ Beliefs about Roles of Administration in Co-teaching

**Q18 What role do you believe administration plays in the success of co-teaching? Rank from most important (1) to least important (3).**

Answered: 16  Skipped: 1

- Providing professional...
- Creating class lists first...
- Creating schedules first...

- **Providing professional development**
  - 17% (5/29) of mainstream teachers and 13% (2/16) of ESL teachers ranked this number one.
  - Overall weighted scores for mainstream teachers was 1.52 and ESL teachers 1.44
• **Creating class lists with high numbers of ELs**
  o 28% (8/29) of mainstream teachers and 44% (7/16) of ESL teachers ranked this number one.
  o Overall weighted scores from mainstream teachers was 2.07 and ESL teachers 2.19.

• **Creating schedules that allow for common planning times**
  o 55% (16/29) of mainstream teachers and 44% (7/16) ESL teachers ranked this number one.
  o Overall weighted scores from mainstream teachers was 2.41 and ESL teachers 2.38.

Both groups overall thought *creating schedules* was the administration’s most important role, *creating adequate class lists* for co-teaching was the second most important role, and *providing professional development* was the least important role of these three choices.

Respondents were then asked to elaborate on their ranking of administrative roles or share other roles of administration they believe are necessary for the success of co-teaching. On the next page, Table 7 shows common themes from their response. A list of all responses to this question can be found in Appendix F, Question 19.
Next, teachers were asked to share what types of professional development they believe is needed to support co-teaching. Although many teachers believe professional development is less important than other roles, it is still necessary. Many mainstream and ESL teachers believe there has been enough basic co-teaching professional development offered in the district. Now they need professional development that guides effective planning and implementation, time to plan and collaborate, opportunities to observe successful co-teaching in other classrooms or schools, and ongoing observations and feedback. A table of all responses can be found in Appendix F, Question 20.

**Qualities of a co-teaching partner.** Respondents were asked to rank nine qualities of a co-teaching partner in order from most important to least important. The responses show that certain qualities are valued much more over others. Figures 25 and
26 show their responses visually, and Table 8 reports the weighted scores on the following page.

Figure 25. Qualities in a Co-teaching Partner Valued by Mainstream Teachers

Figure 26. Qualities in a Co-teaching Partner Valued by ESL Teachers
Table 8. Qualities Valued in a Co-teaching Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstream Teachers’ Responses (with weighted scores)</th>
<th>ESL Teachers’ Responses (with weighted scores)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trusting (6.66)</td>
<td>1. Cooperative (7.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Flexible (6.38)  Cooperative (6.38)</td>
<td>2. Flexible (6.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student centered (6.07)</td>
<td>3. Open to change (6.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Respectful (5.10)</td>
<td>4. Respectful (5.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Open to change (4.52)</td>
<td>5. Trusting (5.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledgeable in content area (3.90)</td>
<td>6. Student centered (5.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Understanding (3.07)</td>
<td>7. Knowledgeable in content area (3.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Passionate (2.93)</td>
<td>8. Understanding (3.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Passionate (1.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both mainstream and ESL teachers want a co-teaching partner who is cooperative, flexible and respectful. Mainstream teachers view trusting and student centered as more important than ESL teachers. ESL teachers view open to change more important than mainstream teachers. Both groups ranked knowledgeable in content area, understanding, and passionate as the least important qualities in a co-teaching partner.

However, based on their open-ended responses, many teachers value many or all of these qualities in a partner, but agree that certain qualities play a larger role in the success of a co-teaching relationship.

Respondents had the opportunity to share any other qualities of a co-teaching partner they believed were important. Common responses included compatible personalities and similar teaching styles, open communication, prompt and reliable with schedules, and strong student management skills.
Successful Co-Teaching. Respondents were asked to rank what they believe is most important to be successful in co-teaching. The answer choices were time to collaborate, compatible personalities, specific co-teaching model, support from administration, and professional development. Figure 27 and Figure 28 show the weighted totals visually on the following page.
Mainstream and ESL teachers both agreed that *compatible personalities* is the most important factor in the success of a co-teaching relationship. The number of
mainstream teachers that ranked *compatible personalities* as number one was 48% (14/29) and the number of ESL teachers that ranked it number one was 63% (10/16). The second most ranked was *time to collaborate*, with 34% (10/29) and 31% (5/16) ESL teachers. The third most ranked was far behind, *support from administration*, with 10% (2/29) mainstream teachers ranking it number one and 6% (1/16) ESL teachers.

Mainstream teachers’ weighted average showed that fourth ranked was *specific co-teaching model*, and the last ranked was *professional development*. ESL teachers’ weighted average showed the opposite, with *professional development* ranked fourth and *specific co-teaching model* ranked last.

When respondents were asked to share what they need to be a successful co-teacher the following themes emerged. Most mainstream and ESL responses connected to the relationship and qualities of the co-teacher. Common descriptions of a co-teaching partner included someone who is a team player, trusting, willing, flexible, respectful, reliable, and knowledgeable in their specific content area. Time to plan, collaborate, and build relationships was another theme. In addition, administration and support from the staff was described. ESL teachers’ also stated that they need more ESL teacher support and fewer grade levels on which to focus. The full list of responses are in Appendix F, Question 24.

Teachers were then asked how their co-teacher can best support their success in co-teaching. Their responses again showed themes that have to do with the relationship of the co-teachers. They both want a co-teacher who is present and dedicated. They want a co-teacher who openly communicates so they can be clear on plans and expectations, as well as help each other understand and learn about the others’ areas of expertise. A
common theme of ESL teachers was that they need a mainstream teacher who is welcoming in their classroom so it feels like a shared space and an equal partnership. Appendix F shows all responses in Question 25.

**Challenges to co-teaching.** Respondents were asked to rank challenges to co-teaching in order from most challenging to least challenging. The five choices were *sharing space, planning time, collaborating, sharing teaching, scheduling, and knowledge/professional development.* Figures 29 and 30 show their responses visually.

Mainstream and ESL teachers both ranked *planning time* as number one, with a weighted score of 5.03 for mainstream teachers and 5.06 for ESL teachers. The second most ranked was *scheduling*, with a weighted score of 4.55 for mainstream teachers and 4.69 for ESL teachers.

Mainstream teachers ranked *collaborating* third, weighted score of 3.52, followed by *sharing teaching*, weighted score of 3.21, then *knowledge/professional development*, weighted score of 2.59, and finally *sharing space*, with a weighted score of 2.10.
ESL teachers ranked *sharing teaching* third, weighted score of 3.88, then *collaborating*, weighted score of 3.38, followed by *sharing space*, weighted score of 2.13, and finally, *knowledge/professional development*, weighted score of 1.88.

Respondents were asked to elaborate on any of challenges to co-teaching. Common responses included teachers noting multiple interruptions that can disrupt co-teaching plans, personalities not meshing, the fear of trying something new and the additional workload that comes with it. In addition, mainstream and ESL teachers discussed the challenge of not having enough ESL teachers to meet the caseload needs, thus allowing limited time for co-teaching collaboration. Clustering and scheduling was another concern associated with challenges. Mainstream teachers also mentioned a challenge would be letting go of control in their classrooms. ESL teachers stated another challenge can be newcomers that require more time, which can interfere with a co-teaching schedule. A complete list of responses can be found in Appendix F, Question 27

**Summary**

Overall, the study went well. A high number of mainstream (28/41) and ESL (17/18) teachers completed the survey with thoughtful responses. I analyzed the data quantitatively using percentages and graphs. I analyzed the open-ended responses qualitatively by using an informal coding method to identify commonalities in responses. The data shows the majority of mainstream and ESL teachers are interested and willing to utilize co-teaching as a form of ESL instruction. Teachers in both groups showed a wide range of knowledge about the benefits, types of instructional models, and components needed for success. The next chapter will discuss key findings and implications of the
results of the surveys reported in this chapter, the limitations of this study, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions

In this research project I attempted to answer the following questions:

1) What do ESL and mainstream teachers perceive as successful co-teaching relationships and instructional models?

The sub questions included:

   a. What are characteristics of successful co-teaching relationships?

   b. Which co-teaching instructional models do teachers believe are the most successful for teaching ELs?

   c. What conditions do teacher perceive as necessary to successfully co-teach?

The main research question and all three sub-questions were answered by the results of this study. A detailed discussion of the answers is in the section on “Themes and Implications.”

This chapter will discuss the results of the study, the themes and findings that answer my research questions, the implications for teachers, administrators, and district leaders in my school district as we continue to improve instruction for ELs, the limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research on co-teaching.

Results of the Study

The data presented in Chapter Four revealed some interesting commonalities and anomalies. First, the opinions about different ESL program models showed that mainstream teachers who disagreed that pull-out is an effective ESL program model
mostly taught upper grade levels and have had experience co-teaching. They may think pull-out is an ineffective model because as content is more rigorous in upper elementary, mainstream teachers feel it is important for students to be in the classroom for all instruction. Also, they have most likely seen the positive benefits of co-teaching and value the cohesiveness of co-teaching instead of the fragmented effects of the pull-out model (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016). Many mainstream teachers who agreed that pull-out is an effective ESL model have never co-taught, so would not know first-hand the benefits co-teaching can offer. Also, most of the mainstream teachers who agreed that pull-out is an effective ESL instructional model use it the most. This may cause them to believe it is effective because it is all they know for ESL instruction.

An anomaly is that there was not a trend in ESL teacher responses. ESL teachers that currently used pull-out both agreed and disagreed that pull-out is an effective ESL instructional model. This may be due to different experiences, personalities, and preference of ESL instruction. The study by Bell & Baecher (2012) also found that a high percentage of ESL teachers preferred the pull-out model due to small groups, scheduling conflicts, and the control the ESL teacher had over their instruction.

Respondents had a wide range of answers when asked if push-in is a highly effective model of instruction, even though most respondents stated it is a highly used ESL program model. This may be due to the ambiguity of push-in and wide range of experiences the respondents have. Push-in is more inclusive than the pull-out model, and allows the ESL teacher to be exposed to and support grade level content. However, if implemented unsuccessfully, the ESL teacher can feel they are not effectively collaborating and feel inferior to the mainstream teacher (Bell and Baecher, 2012).
There were exciting commonalities in responses to the effectiveness of co-teaching. Teachers who disagreed or were not sure that co-teaching is effective did not have experience co-teaching. However, teachers who agreed or strongly agreed that co-teaching is an effective ESL program model had experience co-teaching. This means that once teachers have been exposed to co-teaching, they are more likely to believe in its benefits, but if they have not co-taught, they are less likely to believe in its benefits. The exciting commonality is that almost every respondent said they were willing to try co-teaching, meaning many teachers would then see first-hand how effective co-teaching can be. To gain more support of co-teaching, schools could rely on experienced co-teachers to share their knowledge with the staff.

Another interesting trend is that mainstream teachers in upper grades were more likely to support inclusive models of ESL instruction. ESL teachers may want to spend more time building co-teaching relationships in the upper grades in the schools first because there is more support of inclusive models. These teachers could share their successes with the school, slowly transitioning into a more collaborative ESL approach school wide, a process that is complex and long (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007).

The commonalities that emerged about components of successful co-teaching and the challenges of co-teaching are supported by research. Researchers state that planning time, administrative support, classroom composition, and the qualities of co-teachers play a role in the success of co-teaching (Bronson & Dentith, 2014; Cook & Friend, 2004; Friend, 2008; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Murawski & Diker, 2008; York-Barre, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). The responses of mainstream and ESL teachers match the
research. Both groups of teachers agreed they need adequate planning time to be successful, a compatible co-teaching partner, and support from administration in regards to scheduling and classroom make-up that reflects a manageable EL to non EL student ratio. In addition, both groups of teachers wanted there to be shared responsibility in planning and responsibility. However, both groups of teachers expressed that a challenge in previous experiences co-teaching was there was not always shared responsibility. This causes the ESL teacher to feel inferior to the mainstream teacher, and the mainstream teacher to feel they are not being supported by the ESL teacher. Both groups acknowledged that a cause of this was the large caseload of the ESL teachers, the lack of classroom clustering, and the lack of common planning time. Interestingly, four mainstream teachers stated they were not willing to have more ELs in their classroom. This was due to concerns about lack of support for most of the day. This is a key point because while mainstream teachers were on board with co-teaching, they stated the need to have longer periods of help throughout the day to support the needs of a high number of ELs in a clustered classroom. All ESL teachers supported clustering because they are aware that if students were clustered, they would be able to give more time to each classroom, reducing this concern of mainstream teachers.

Another interesting trend is that while mainstream and ESL teachers both want more equal power and responsibility in co-teaching, both groups of teachers stated that one-teach, one assist was the ESL instructional model they were most likely to use. One teach, one assist is an instructional model that can easily cause one teacher to stay in the lead role, while the other stays in the assistant role (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016; Friend & Cook, 2004). Respondents may prefer to use this model due to the fact that many teachers
find it difficult to give up power (Friend & Pope, 2005); Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). However, I believe that if teachers were given the additional planning time they need, teachers would feel more prepared to try other instructional models that better utilize the expertise of both teachers.

Lastly, teachers’ responses to the content areas they believed would benefit the most from co-teaching were somewhat surprising. Both mainstream and ESL teachers ranked areas of literacy, reading and writing, as the content areas that would most benefit from co-teaching. However, math was ranked third by both groups, in front of science and social studies. This could be due to the nature of the content areas. Science and social studies already have academic vocabulary embedded into the curriculum, which may cause teachers to feel more confident in the English instruction. However, they may feel concerned about the large number of abstract ideas and vocabulary in math and believe that more ESL support could benefit ELs in their math achievement. In addition, math is an important content area in regards to standardized assessments that may cause teachers to want co-teaching support to increase student success.

**Major Themes and Implications**

This section discusses the overall findings and implications of the study, connecting to the main research question and sub questions. The main findings are:

1) The majority of mainstream and ESL teachers believe co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction and also co-teaching benefits non-EL students in the classroom.

2) Despite a low number of mainstream teachers with co-teaching experience, all but one mainstream teacher are willing to try co-teaching in the future.
3) A successful co-teaching relationship is one in which both teachers are willing, trusting, cooperative, flexible, and have compatible teaching styles and personalities.

4) Administration must support co-teaching, create schedules that allow teachers time to be successful, and design class lists in which EL students are clustered.

5) Teachers are more comfortable in ‘traditional roles’ within co-teaching models. It will take time to develop co-teaching relationships in which teachers feel comfortable using a variety of co-teaching instructional models to best meet their students’ needs.

6) ESL teachers feel that co-teaching is not enough for all EL students and that some students also need instruction in the pull-out model.

**Theme one: Teachers believe co-teaching is highly effective and beneficial to all students.** Theme one shows the respondents overall perception of co-teaching, which leads to the main research question: *What do ESL and mainstream teachers perceive as successful co-teaching relationships and instructional models?*

The majority of mainstream and ESL teachers *agreed* and *strongly agreed* that co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction. In addition, the majority of mainstream and ESL teachers also *agreed* and *strongly agreed* that co-teaching is beneficial to all students in the classroom, including non-ELs. Interestingly, most of the mainstream teachers who believe this have not actually had experience co-teaching. However, it seems teachers are optimistic that two teachers are stronger than one. Research supports this, describing the benefits of collaboration between mainstream and
ESL teachers to better infuse language, literacy, and content together to strengthen instruction (Coady et al, 2008; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001; Li & Selena Protacio, 2010).

Also, as EL populations continue to increase, more teachers are learning about ESL. Currently, co-teaching is a strong trend in ESL research. Many educators value the belief that an inclusive classroom is beneficial to all learners, and having two teachers in the classroom to support students can strengthen the learning environment (Murawski & Dicker 2008.)

Teachers who have had experience co-teaching were asked to elaborate on what makes co-teaching so successful. Overall, mainstream teachers thought building on each other’s strengths and weaknesses improves instruction. In addition, they appreciated sharing ideas and responsibilities of instruction with another professional. ESL teachers agreed, adding that co-teaching allows ELs to have support in their classrooms which allows their language instruction to be integrated into grade level content.

**Theme two: Teachers are willing to try co-teaching.** This theme also answers the main research question: *What do ESL and mainstream teachers perceive as successful co-teaching relationships and instructional models.* Respondents must first be in support of co-teaching and willing to co-teach, before sharing perceptions about components of successful co-teaching.

Almost every respondent, mainstream and ESL, stated they were willing to try co-teaching. A mainstream teacher stated they were willing to try co-teaching because they are “always willing to try new things in my classroom.” Another mainstream teacher continued that thought, stating “it is the best delivery model for children.” An ESL
teacher agreed, describing how co-teaching helps ELs succeed in the mainstream classroom, which is the ultimate goal of an ESL program. Another reason both ESL and mainstream teachers are willing to try co-teaching is they believe it brings together the content expertise of the mainstream teacher with the language expertise of the ESL teacher. A mainstream teacher added that co-teaching would be “a great reminder to support EL students as it can be easy to forget they need language support because they seem high functioning in other aspects.” Co-teaching has the ability to help both teachers involved continue to improve their instruction and knowledge.

Another reason teachers stated they were willing to try co-teaching is because it is inclusive. Mainstream teachers liked the fact that their students stay in the classroom all day, meaning they are not missing out on instruction. ESL teachers support this, commenting that co-teaching ensures their ELs are not missing important class time. This helps keep an EL students’ day consistent and not fragmented. ESL teachers also realize it is beneficial for EL students to have their classroom teacher and ESL teacher on the same page with academic and behavioral expectations, again, giving the students consistency throughout their day. Overall, teachers seem very positive and optimistic about the potential benefits co-teaching can have on their development as teachers and the instruction of all students in the classroom, EL and non-EL.

The responses from teachers in my surveys for why they were willing to co-teach are supported by research. Co-teaching helps teachers and students reach their potential (Hourcade & Bauwens 2001). Also, co-teaching allows all students access to mainstream curriculum while receiving more individualized and differentiated instruction (Friend, 1993 & 2003).
Theme three: A successful relationship between co-teaching partners is key to the success of co-teaching. Theme three answers this first part of the main research questions: *What do ESL and mainstream teachers perceive as successful co-teaching relationships?* It also answers sub question A: *What are characteristics of successful co-teaching relationships?*

Teachers involved in co-teaching play a large role in its success (Bronson & Dentith, 2014; Cook & Friend, 2004; Friend, 2008; Hongsfeld & Dove, 2008; Murawski & Diker, 2008; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). The results of my study show that mainstream and ESL teachers also believe this. When experienced co-teachers were asked what could have been improved to make their co-teaching experience more successful, common answers were better communication, increased trust, shared power, and shared responsibility for all students. These comments directly related to the relationship between the co-teaching partners.

Mainstream and ESL teachers believe that the most important qualities of a co-teaching partner include being trustworthy, flexible, and cooperative. Other highly valued qualities include being respectful, open to change, and student centered. In essence, teachers want a teammate. Both mainstream and ESL teachers want a co-teaching partner who will support them, collaborate in a positive manner, and strengthen their instruction by combining areas of expertise.

A common concern that was expressed throughout open-ended responses was the need for compatible personalities. However, while compatible personalities are important, researchers seem to put more emphasis on building trust and a strong professional relationship (Friend, 2005; Gately & Gately Jr., 2001). Researchers
acknowledge it will take time to create a successful co-teaching relationship (Gately & Gately, Jr., 2001; Murawski & Swanson, 2001). If both teachers set clear expectations from the start and work in a respectful, professional manner while keeping the focus on student needs, potential personality conflicts can be avoided. Another suggestion is starting the co-teaching process by finding teachers who are willing to co-teach, and then the principal can help make decisions, if needed, about which partnerships can be most successful.

Another common concern was equality. Both mainstream and ESL teachers voiced the need for equal amounts of planning, work, and prep. Neither group wants to feel they are more responsible for the co-teaching than the other, or feel as though they are in a mentor/mentee relationship. Setting clear expectations from the start of collaboration can help, especially when using a checklist, such as in Appendix A, that can keep the planning and preparation tasks focused and equally divided.

ESL teachers voiced concerns about being treated as an equal by the mainstream teacher and students. This means presenting a united stance to all students, in which both teachers are responsible for the instruction and behavior of all students during co-teaching. A challenge some mainstream teachers mentioned is giving up ‘power’ in their classroom. Honigsfeld and Dove (2016) acknowledge that neither teacher is eager to give up the lead role, but successful co-teaching requires a delicate balance of power. One way to start the co-teaching relationship off in an equal manner is using expectation checklists, such as the one in Appendix B, to ensure both teachers take the lead at different times.
A final suggestion to help co-teachers develop trust and strong collaborative skills is to have a designated co-teacher per grade level for co-teaching. In the district where this research took place, this can work for many grade levels because the number of EL students is low enough that they could often be clustered into one classroom. However, it may later need to expand to more than one designated co-teacher per grade as EL numbers increase. The benefit of having a consistent teacher in each grade level who has the EL cluster is that that mainstream teacher and ESL teacher will have years to develop their co-teaching relationship. Gately and Gately Jr. (2001) state that teachers may take years to get to a truly collaborative level. It is something that takes time, and becomes better over time. Both teachers will get to know each other’s strengths and weaknesses, build on each other’s ideas, and be more willing to try new co-teaching instructional models if they can consistently work with the same co-teacher. Also, the mainstream teacher will become more knowledgeable about strategies for helping ELs, which will help strengthen their instruction throughout the entire day. In addition, the ESL teacher will know more about the curriculum, which will help strengthen the integration of language instruction.

Theme four: Administration has an important role in the success of co-teaching. Theme four answers sub question C: What conditions do teachers perceive as necessary to successfully co-teach?

Many researchers state that administrative support helps ensure the success of co-teaching (Hourcade & Bawens, 2001; Maxwell, 2004; Murawski & Dieker, 2008). Both mainstream and ESL teachers’ responses show that they believe administration plays a big role in creating conditions conducive to successful co-teaching. They pointed out that
the first role of administrators in supporting co-teaching by setting a tone in the school that is supportive of collaboration and selling staff on the benefits and goals of co-teaching. Researchers state that successful ESL programs are those that value inclusion and teacher collaboration (Collier, 2010; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007).

Overall, the respondents in this survey feel they have had adequate professional development about the co-teaching. Some feel administration should support ongoing professional development for varying levels of the co-teaching process. Others feel that observations and feedback should be a part of a professional development plan in which the administrator formally observes co-teachers throughout the year.

More importantly, mainstream and ESL teachers believe administration needs to create schedules that give co-teachers common prep time. The most consistent concern throughout the survey was that lack of planning time causes co-teaching to fail. This aligns with research that found planning time is the most important factor in the success of co-teaching (Cook & Friend, 2004; Friend, 2008; Friend & Pope, 2005; Hang and Rabren, 2009; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001; Howard & Potts, 2009; Maxwell, 2013; Murawski & Dieker, 2008; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Without time to collaborate, plans are not as effective, one teacher is in the lead, typically the mainstream teacher, and then the expertise of the ESL teacher is lost. Teachers need the support of administration to carve out this common planning time. Most respondents believe they need 31-60 minutes weekly to plan with their co-teacher. Respondents in both groups stated that at the beginning of the year, they need more time to get to know each other and prepare a scope and sequence for the year.
Residents also believe administration plays a role in clustering ELs to create classrooms in which co-teaching is an option. As one ESL teacher said, “When elementary ESL teachers cover 6 grades it is near impossible to co-teach with more than one teacher.” Clustering also helps with the daily schedule, allowing ESL teachers to work with one teacher per grade instead of two, three, or even four. With the multiple interruptions, timing, and different lessons, it is difficult to create an effective ESL program, let alone incorporate co-teaching. Teachers also believe that clustering will allow ESL teachers more time in one classroom, again making the instruction more effective for all students. Lastly, ESL teachers will be able to build stronger co-teaching relationships when they have fewer teachers they need to connect with throughout the day.

**Theme five: Strong co-teaching relationships take time to develop.** Theme five answers sub question B: *Which co-teaching models do teachers believe are the most successful for teaching ELs?*

Respondents consistently described successful co-teaching as a strategy that uses a collaborative instructional model in which both teachers share the responsibility of all students. Instructional models that fit this description are *parallel teaching, station teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching*. However, the responses to the type of co-teaching instructional model the majority believed they would be most likely to use does not reflect this. Both mainstream and ESL teachers stated they would be most likely to use the instructional model *one teach, one assist*. However, in this instructional model, one teacher is naturally the lead. Unless the co-teachers planned on alternating the lead teacher, it seems it would be easy to fall into an unequal partnership in which the
planning, instructing, and preparation is not shared equally. A benefit of using one teach, one assist in the beginning of a co-teaching relationship is teachers can see each other’s teaching styles and strengths, as well as become comfortable with sharing a classroom (Honigsfeld and Dove, 2016; Friend & Cook, 2004). However, researchers suggest for co-teachers to consider the various six instructional models each time they plan, utilizing the one that best fits the lesson plan (Honigsfeld and Dove, 2016; Friend & Cook, 2004). If teachers intentionally incorporate a variety of instructional models into their co-teaching, they will do a better job of utilizing both expert teachers in the room, as well as differentiating instruction to best meet the needs’ of the learners in the room. This is not something that will happen quickly, it may even take more than one school year.

Researchers acknowledge that co-teaching is a complex strategy that includes stages teachers work through as they strengthen their co-teaching skills (Friend, 2005; Gately & Gately, Jr., 2001; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Co-teachers need to be comfortable in this fact, and acknowledge that the more experience they have, the more they will trust their co-teaching partner, and the better their co-teaching instruction will be.

**Theme six: ESL teachers feel that co-teaching is not enough for all EL students and that some students also need instruction in the pull-out model.** Theme six also answers sub question C: What conditions do teachers perceive as necessary to successfully co-teach?

In ESL teachers’ open-ended responses, concerns about whether co-teaching was appropriate for students with lower levels of English proficiency emerged. One respondent stated “for lower levels of proficiency, co-teaching is not enough. They need
a safe space where they can talk and take risks without peers judging.” Another ESL teacher indirectly supported this, stating “I like helping higher ELs in the whole class.”

In addition, another comment brought up the fact that newcomer ELs with lower levels of English proficiency levels need more time with an ESL teacher. While it is beneficial for ELs of all proficiency levels to be exposed to the language of their peers in the mainstream classroom, these ESL teachers are emphasizing the need for more direct and individualized language instruction to meet language needs of students with lower English proficiency levels.

**Limitations of Study**

This study included limitations. The first limitation was the sample size. I contacted as many mainstream and ESL teachers that I had immediate contact with in the district. However, only 46 teachers responded out of 59 contacted. I was pleased that 46 followed through on their participation, especially because many of the mainstream teachers have not co-taught due to the low percentage of ELs compared to non-ELs in both schools. The small sample size limits the ability to make generalizations from the results of this study.

A second limitation to this study was the data collection time period and data collection technique. I originally planned on incorporating surveys with interviews and/or focus groups, but realized that I was taking on too much for the scope of this study. Instead, I incorporated two types of data collection techniques, quantitative and qualitative, into one survey. This expanded the depth of data I collected. However, respondents were only required to respond electronically, which may have hindered the length and detail of responses.
Lastly, some of the questions on the survey required respondents to rank answers. Some questions may have had answers that were too similar or difficult to accurately rank. A few respondents mentioned they were not confident in their ranking because they thought some answers were equally important or could have been grouped together.

If I were to do this study again, I would like to incorporate interviews to further explore teachers’ experiences and opinions. It would be great to hear experienced co-teachers give clear, detailed examples of co-teaching, and the steps they took to make it successful.

**Further Research**

While researching information for the literature review and collecting data, I realized more research on co-teaching is needed to fill in gaps. Co-teaching can look different from classroom to classroom, school to school, and district to district. Because of this, it would be beneficial to survey and interview more teachers on their opinions and beliefs about co-teaching as an ESL instructional model. This would be helpful in discovering common themes and creating generalizations that can improve co-teaching practices. In addition, more research is needed about how much co-planning time is adequate for both groups of teachers to feel successful in co-teaching.

More research is needed on the various types of co-teaching instructional models. Teachers could benefit from learning more about how the instructional models may look based on different grade levels, content areas, and English language proficiency levels.

In addition, educators need more research on the effectiveness of co-teaching and specific co-teaching instructional models. Research states co-teaching is beneficial to ELs and non-ELs, but more educators would be willing to put time and effort into trying co-
teaching if there was concrete evidence of its effectiveness. This may include comparing pull-out, push-in, and co-teaching assessment scores, writing samples, student participation, and even student perceptions. Evidence on the effectiveness of co-teaching could help convince more teachers that it is not another ‘trend’ in education, but a worthwhile instructional model.

**Summary**

I began this study in hopes of increasing my knowledge of co-teaching and strengthening my understanding of research-based best practice strategies for instructing ELs. When I began this study I was somewhat skeptical of co-teaching, and wondered if it truly had the capabilities of being more effective than pull-out or push-in ESL instruction. I have now gained knowledge through research of literature and surveying my colleagues that co-teaching can be successful. To be successful, teachers need support from administration, time to plan and collaborate, clustered classrooms, and a compatible co-teaching partner who is willing to communicate and put forth effort to make it successful. However, co-teaching is not a ‘one-size fits all’ instructional model, and educators must take into account the English language levels and educational needs of the students. In addition, educators must be realistic in their expectations and realize that lack of ESL staff and large caseloads may make co-teaching infeasible, despite the fact that it may be best practice in that circumstance.

Lastly, co-teaching is a process. Mainstream and ESL teachers need time to build relationships and confidence in collaborating. Both teachers must be willing to take risks and learn from mistakes. Both teachers must recognize that there will be challenges, yet both teachers involved in co-teaching must have a team mindset. They must put all
students’ needs first, EL and non-EL, and utilize the expertise of both teachers to strengthen the instruction and delivery of content during co-teaching.

The high number of teachers who believe co-teaching is an effective strategy and are willing to try it make me feel optimistic for the future of ESL instruction. In addition, mainstream teachers stated a need for more time throughout the day allotted for co-teaching, and ESL teachers agreed. This shows that both groups of teachers have a positive view on co-teaching overall. The results of this survey have helped me learn about next steps to continue to improve the ESL program in my district, my own ESL instruction, and take the initiative to help my district, and specifically the two elementary schools I work in, to incorporate more co-teaching into ESL instruction.
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Appendix A

Co-Teaching Planning Checklist for Co-Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Accommodations/Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did we...</strong></td>
<td><strong>Did we...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the standards as the focal point of the lesson</td>
<td>Address any non-content-related IEP goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include opportunities to connect to IEP goals</td>
<td>Address appropriate content-related IEP goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Did we...</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start with the end in mind</td>
<td>Consider needs of individual students for assignments and classwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include formative assessment</td>
<td>Discuss how to provide accommodations/modifications without alienating students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include summative assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Assess in a variety of formats</strong></th>
<th><strong>Instructional Strategies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper-and-pencil</td>
<td>Did we consider including...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based</td>
<td>Mnemonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>Graphic Organizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Cooperative Learning Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agree on grading procedures</strong></th>
<th><strong>Logistics</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible</td>
<td>Who will prepare...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating grading based on student needs</td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of rubrics</td>
<td>Tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Talk about homework</strong></th>
<th><strong>Did we plan for...</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much to assign</td>
<td>Seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often to assign</td>
<td>Roles in instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to grade</td>
<td>Roles in discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting late work</td>
<td>Classroom movement patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for turning in homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Co-Teaching Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Already Do</th>
<th>Should Do</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers’ names are on the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers’ names are on the report cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers’ handwriting is on student assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers have space for personal belongings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers have adult-size furniture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers have a lead role in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers lead whole group and small group instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers give directions or permission without checking with the other teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both teachers work with all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All students consider both teachers as ‘teachers’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Survey for Mainstream Teachers

Demographics
1. How many years of experience do you have as a teacher?
   a. 1-5 years
   b. 6-10 years
   c. 11-15 years
   d. 16-20 years
   e. 21 or more years
2. What is the highest degrees you have received?
   a. Bachelor’s
   b. Master’s
   c. PhD
   d. Other: ____________________
3. List all teaching license(s) you hold.
4. What grade(s) do you currently teach? (choose all that apply)
   a. Kindergarten
   b. First Grade
   c. Second Grade
   d. Third Grade
   e. Fourth Grade
   f. Fifth Grade
5. How many years have you taught ELs? (consecutively or non-consecutively)
   a. 0
   b. 1-5 years
   c. 6-10 years
   d. 11-15 years
   e. 16-20 years
   f. 21 or more years
6. How many ELs do you currently teach?
   a. 0
   b. 1-5 students
   c. 6-10 students
   d. 11-15 students
   e. 16-20 students
   f. 21-25 students
   g. 26-30 students
   h. 31 or more students

Program Models
7. Rank the program models in order from most used (1) to least used (3) for your ELs.
   a. Not applicable
   b. Pull-out
   c. Push-in
   d. Co-teaching

8. State your opinion on the following ESL program models.
   a. Pull-out is a highly effective model of EL instruction.
   b. Push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.
   c. Co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.
   d. Co-teaching benefits non EL students in the classroom.
      i. Disagree
      ii. Somewhat disagree
      iii. Not sure
      iv. Agree
      v. Strongly agree

Experience
9. Have you co-taught ELs with an EL teacher before
10. If yes, for how long?
11. If yes, what was successful?
12. If yes, what could have been improved?

My Classroom
13. I would be willing to co-teach with an ESL teacher.
   a. Yes
   b. No
      i. Why?
14. I would be willing to have a higher number of ELs in my classroom in order to have the opportunity to co-teach with an ESL teacher.
   a. Yes
   b. No
      i. Why?

Co-teaching Instructional Models and Logistics
15. Rank the following co-teaching instructional models in order from most likely to use (1) to least likely to use (6). Please see letter of invitation for definitions and visuals of each model.
   a. One teach, one observe
   b. One teach, one assist
   c. Parallel teaching
   d. Station teaching
   e. Alternative teaching
   f. Team teaching
16. What content area do you think co-teaching would be most beneficial? Rank from most beneficial (1) to least beneficial (5).
   a. Social Studies
b. Writing  
c. Math  
d. Reading  
e. Science  

17. If you were co-teaching, how much time do you believe is needed for weekly co-planning?  
   a. 1-30 minutes  
   b. 31-60 minutes  
   c. 61 or more minutes  

18. What role do you believe administration plays in the success of co-teaching?  
   Rank from most important (1) to least important (3).  
   a. Providing professional development about co-teaching models, strategies, etc.  
   b. Creating class lists to ensure enough ELs for co-teaching, but not more that 40%  
   c. Creating schedules that allow for adequate common planning times  

19. Please elaborate on your choices and/or add other roles of administration for the success of co-teaching.  

20. What type of professional development do you believe is needed to support successful co-teaching?  

21. What qualities do you believe are most important in a co-teaching partner? Rank from most important (1) to least important (9).  
   a. Flexible  
   b. Cooperative  
   c. Understanding  
   d. Student centered  
   e. Knowledgeable in content area  
   f. Passionate  
   g. Open to change  
   h. Respectful  
   i. Trusting  

22. What other qualities do you believe are important in a co-teaching partner?  

23. What do you believe is most important to be successful in co-teaching? Rank in order from most important (1) to least important (5).  
   a. Time to collaborate  
   b. Compatible personalities  
   c. Specific co-teaching model  
   d. Support from administration  
   e. Professional development  

24. What do you need to be a successful co-teacher?  

25. How can the ESL teacher best support this?  

26. What do you see as challenges to co-teaching? Rank in order from most challenging (1) to least challenging (6).  
   a. Sharing space  
   b. Planning time  
   c. Collaborating
d. Sharing teaching
e. Scheduling
f. Knowledge/Professional development

27. List any other challenges to co-teaching.

28. Is there anything more you’d like to add or elaborate on regarding challenges in co-teaching?
APPENDIX D

Survey for ESL Teachers

**Demographics**
1. How many years of experience do you have as a teacher?
   a. 1-5 years
   b. 6-10 years
   c. 11-15 years
   d. 16-20 years
   e. 21 or more years
2. What is the highest degree you have received?
   a. Bachelor’s
   b. Master’s
   c. PhD
   d. Other: ______________
3. List all teaching license(s) you hold.
4. What grade(s) do you currently teach? (choose all that apply)
   a. Kindergarten
   b. First Grade
   c. Second Grade
   d. Third Grade
   e. Fourth Grade
   f. Fifth Grade
5. How many years have you taught ELs? (consecutively or non-consecutively)
   a. 0
   b. 1-5 years
   c. 6-10 years
   d. 11-15 years
   e. 16-20 years
   f. 21 or more years
6. How many ELs do you currently teach?
   a. 1-5 students
   b. 6-10 students
   c. 11-15 students
   d. 16-20 students
   e. 21-25 students
   f. 26-30 students
   g. 31 or more students

**Program Models**
7. Rank the program models in order from most used to least used for your EL students.
   a. Not applicable
   b. Pull-out
   c. Push-in
   d. Co-teaching

8. State your opinion on the following ESL program models.
   a. Pull-out is a highly effective model of EL instruction.
   b. Push-in is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.
   c. Co-teaching is a highly effective model of ESL instruction.
   d. Co-teaching benefits non EL students in the classroom.
      i. Disagree
      ii. Somewhat disagree
      iii. Not sure
      iv. Agree
      v. Strongly agree

**Experience**
9. Have you co-taught ELs with a mainstream teacher before?
10. If yes, for how long?
11. If yes, what was successful?
12. If yes, what could have been improved?

**My Classroom**
13. I would be willing to co-teach with a mainstream teacher.
   a. Yes
   b. No
      i. Why?
14. I would suggest classes a higher number of ELs in one classroom (cluster) in order to have the opportunity to co-teach with a mainstream teacher.
   c. Yes
   d. No
      i. Why?

**Co-teaching Instructional Models and Logistics**
15. Rank the following co-teaching instructional models in order from most likely to use (1 to least likely to use (6). Please see letter of invitation for definition and visual of each model.
   a. One teach, one observe
   b. One teach, one assist
   c. Parallel teaching
   d. Station teaching
   e. Alternative teaching
   f. Team teaching

16. What content area do you think co-teaching would be most beneficial? Rank from most beneficial (1) to least beneficial (5).
   a. Social Studies
b. Writing  
c. Math  
d. Reading  
e. Science

17. If you were co-teaching, how much time do you believe is needed for weekly co-planning with each co-teaching partner?
   a. 1-30 minutes  
b. 31-60 minutes  
c. 61 or more minutes

18. What role do you believe administration plays in the success of co-teaching?  
   Rank from most important (1) to least important (3).
   a. Providing professional development about co-teaching models, strategies, etc.  
b. Creating class lists to ensure enough ELs for co-teaching, but not more that 40%  
c. Creating schedules that allow for adequate common planning times

19. Please elaborate on your choices and/or add other roles of administration for the success for co-teaching.

20. What type of professional development is needed to support successful co-teaching?

21. What qualities do you believe are most important in a co-teaching partner? Rank from most important (1) to least important (9).
   a. Flexible  
b. Cooperative  
c. Understanding  
d. Student centered  
e. Knowledgeable in content area  
f. Passionate  
g. Open to change  
h. Respectful  
i. Trusting

22. What other qualities are important in a co-teaching partner?

23. What do you believe is most important to be successful in co-teaching? Rank in order from most important (1) to least important (5).
   a. Time to collaborate  
b. Compatible personalities  
c. Specific co-teaching model  
d. Support from administration  
e. Professional development

24. What do you need to be a successful co-teacher?

25. How can the mainstream teacher best support this?

26. What do you see as challenges to co-teaching? Rank in order from most challenging (1) to least challenging (6).
   a. Sharing space  
b. Planning time  
c. Collaborating


d. Sharing teaching  

e. Scheduling  

f. Knowledge/Professional development  

27. List any other challenges to co-teaching.  

28. Is there anything more you’d like to add or elaborate on regarding challenges in co-teaching?
Definitions and Visuals for Survey

**ESL Teacher:** English as a Second language teacher (also known as EL teacher)

**EL:** English language learner

**Pull-out:** Students spend most of their day in a mainstream classroom, but are pulled out for English instruction, sometimes related to classroom content.

**Push-in:** The ESL teacher goes into the students’ content or grade-level classroom to provide instruction.

**Co-teaching:** Two (or more) educators sharing instructional responsibility for a single group of students that include students with disabilities, language, or gifted needs in a single classroom with shared resources and accountability.

**Co-teaching Instructional Models**

1. **One teach, One observe** is a co-teaching method used when co-teachers are wanting in depth observations of students engaged in learning to analyze together. The amount of planning is low and is best used in a new co-teaching situation or when questions arise about students.

2. **One teach, One assist** is a co-teaching method in which one teacher is the lead teacher, often the mainstream teacher, and the other teacher drifts around the room to observe and assist students in an unobtrusive manner as needed. The
planning for this approach is low, and may be used when the lesson lends itself to one teacher instructing, when one teacher is an expert in the content, in new co-teaching situations to learn about each other’s teaching styles, or when student work requires close monitoring.

3. **Parallel teaching** is a co-teaching approach that divides that class into two groups and both teachers teach the same content simultaneously. A medium amount of planning is needed for parallel teaching. This approach is best when students need extra teacher supervision or the lesson lends itself to more student interaction and responses.

4. **Station teaching** is a co-teaching model where the co-teachers divide the content to be delivered and divide the students into small groups. The small groups rotate through all of the stations, which may also include independent activities. This approach requires a medium amount of planning. Station teaching is best when content is complex, but not hierarchical or several topics are included in the lesson.

5. **Alternative teaching** is an approach that is utilized when instruction needs to be differentiated to meet the specialized needs of groups of students. One teacher leads instruction for the larger group, while the other teacher works with a small group of students, either for a short time or the whole class period. Alternative teaching requires a high level of planning, and is best when students’ mastery of content varies tremendously, enrichment is desired, re-teaching is needed, or students are working in a parallel curriculum.
6. **Team teaching** is a model in which both teachers are delivering instruction together, thus requiring a high level of planning. This approach is most dependent on teachers’ styles, but can be the most satisfying way to co-teach. It is best utilized when instructional conversation is needed, demonstration of an interaction is needed, or when co-teachers are both experienced in the content and comfortable with each other.

**CO-TEACHING APPROACHES**

![Co-teaching Approaches Diagram](source)

Appendix F
All Responses to Open-Ended Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstream Teacher Responses</th>
<th>ESL Teacher Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 11: What was successful in past co-teaching experiences?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was most successful when we used <em>one teach, one assist</em>, as well as <em>parallel teaching</em> and <em>alternative teaching</em>.</td>
<td>One year we had three teachers in a room using multiple forms of co-teaching: <em>one teach, two assist, parallel teaching</em>, and <em>station teaching</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students had the benefit of two teachers and the understanding from two people.</td>
<td>The students had extra support and the classroom teacher had extra support to help the EL students. We also planned each lesson together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having two teachers in the room working together to support the students, having another pair of eyes for observations, to help make adjustments, and to add to the lesson.</td>
<td>Building on each other’s strengths so that students receive excellent content and language instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was successful because I had a good relationship with the ESL teacher and we worked well together.</td>
<td>It was successful when we found common planning time to fully prepare effective lessons—with a variety of grouping models (<em>parallel teaching, centers, team teaching</em>, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ideas and responsibility of lesson planning and teaching. Collaborating and learning new strategies from each other.</td>
<td>When the teacher was doing what we had discussed they would do, it worked because the mainstream teacher was on schedule. It also semi worked when I would come in to pre-teach math for the day to a group of ELs while the mainstream teacher read a book to her whole class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of us were trained together and very willing to try. We also felt very</td>
<td>When we planned together and tried differently styles. Also, when our targets (language objectives) were clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comfortable with each other and knew our strengths and weaknesses.

**Question 11 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It was somewhat successful. It was nice having another adult to assist in the lesson.</th>
<th>Teaching to each other’s strengths. Students were engaged by different approaches. There were varied lenses for viewing content/supporting all students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The most successful years were the ones where the ESL teacher was a part of planning the lessons so that we were on the same page. That way the lines of communication were open and we had time to talk through the lesson and how to teach it together.</td>
<td>When the mainstream teacher wanted to co-teaching and was willing to communicate and problem-solve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We learned how to work very well together by the end of the school year. We learned each other’s strengths and weaknesses, and we were able to balance them. Through co-teaching, one of us was always able to read the students and react if needed.</td>
<td>I provided visuals that otherwise would not have been there as the content teacher lectured. We co-planned as much as possible to talk about vocabulary and academic language to integrate into the lessons. I provided sentence frames and Tier 2 vocabulary word banks for students during various writing projects and to use while having class discussions. Co-teaching somewhat removed the stigmas of being pulled out for EL instruction, as I helped many students in the classroom and didn’t overtly single out the EL students. I learned a lot by being in the classroom and was able to integrate my language instruction with content. The classroom teacher in turn was helped by my focus on vocabulary and culturally relevant teaching style to integrate into classroom practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I thought it helped all students.

**Question 11 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breaking up the large group into smaller focus groups.</th>
<th>It was very successful.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve had some really successful co-teaching partnerships over the years, but I have also had some that I would not consider successful.</td>
<td>Our teaching styles complemented each other. We had great respect for each other’s abilities and we felt comfortable with one another to the point of finishing each other’s sentences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 12: What could have been improved in past co-teaching experiences?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Even more time to plan what we were doing on a daily basis.</th>
<th>Unfortunately, the EL teacher usually ends up mainly using the <em>one teach, one assist</em> model which is not as effective as it could be. Common planning time would improve this issue, but when one teacher has 35-40 students on her caseload, this becomes impossible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More time in the classroom together and more time for planning.</td>
<td>More time to plan. Less <em>one teach, one assist</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing needed to be improved, it worked well because I worked well with the ESL teacher.</td>
<td>I think we needed more opportunity for better planning. Sometimes it was just an email the day of the lesson about what we were doing. A common prep would have helped a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time for planning and developing the ‘co-teach’ model in further depth.</td>
<td>More time for planning. Less time doing the <em>one teach, one assist</em> model because it feels like a waste of the EL teacher’s time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing.</td>
<td>If we had more common planning time I’m certain we could deliver very effective language and content instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12 Cont’d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication and planning.</td>
<td>More EL teachers for effective co-planning time. Teaching 6 grade levels makes it impossible to effectively co-plan for every grade’s ELs or to devote sufficient time to all grade levels to support the needs of ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, we need time set aside to be able to plan together and this gets to be touch when you don’t have like prep times.</td>
<td>Sometimes we would plan, but the mainstream teacher would change what they were doing because she was never on schedule. Another did not work because I felt like we had to work quietly at a small table in the room which was usually full of stuff. There was not much time to work with the students, about 25 minutes. All of the other times I felt like I had to get in the classroom and out and bringing materials and unloading materials wasted some time, and if the teacher was 5 or so minutes behind, it wasted our time. All situations could have improved if we had any planning time. None of my push-in times did I have common planning time. It was via email, passing in the hall, or after school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fidelity.</strong> Continual evaluation and adjustments made. Trading was good, but we could not maintain the planning and evaluation to keep the new emphasis or addition of learned concepts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidance from administration.</strong> Increased trust. Consistent planning time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning time, access to materials and training, getting non-EL students placed in groups, behavior management, administration acknowledgement and support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish we would have started earlier in the year!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 12 Cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>We need more time to meaningfully co-plan together. It is difficult to maintain academic rigor while scaffolding for ELs if we do not have sufficient time to plan. It also helps when teachers have the idea that they are responsible for all the students—that the EL students are not just the ESL teacher’s responsibility, and vice versa. Co-teaching doesn’t work if I had gone into the classroom with the intent of only helping the EL kids. Also, many times, EL teachers are reduced to the role of paraprofessional in the mainstream classroom, helping students with classroom work that is not appropriate or helpful for their English development. This sometimes happened as I was ‘co-teaching’ because we didn’t have time to plan lessons, so I ended up trying to help students with a worksheet that was not useful for them, but that the students viewed as legitimate because it came from the classroom teacher. In order for co-teaching to really work, students need to get the idea that both teachers are legitimate and there is equal shared power.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More time for planning would have made it better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We did not sit down much to discuss what was going to be taught—we needed more planning time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting back on our lessons, we both agreed we needed more planning and collaboration time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having more purposeful planning time together would have been helpful. Also, establishing better communication from the beginning would have led to more trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More planning time would have been amazing. Exchanging a few sentences in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the hall as we passed by one another is sometimes all the planning time we had.

**Question 13: Why Are You Willing to Co-teach?**

<p>| I am always willing to try new things in my classroom. | I know that co-teaching is the best way to help our EL students succeed in the mainstream classroom, especially in the older grades. |
| Co-teaching would keep everyone on the same page and benefit the needs of my EL students. | It is a great way for me to gauge where my ELs stand in comparison to the mainstream students. I am directly exposed to the mainstream curriculum and common core standards. It is also a great way to develop rapport with the mainstream teachers and give them insight to what I do and how it can directly affect their teaching. |
| I feel like it is the best delivery model for the children. | I think both EL and non EL students get a lot out of co-teaching. |
| I believe it is helpful to all students EL and non EL. | I have co-taught with many different teachers and find that it can be very valuable. |
| Having another teacher in the room would allow us to better meet the needs of the EL students, often times there is vocabulary or directions that need more explaining. Also, I would benefit from the ESL teacher’s experience in making sure that I am giving clear, easy to understand directions, that the students are understanding the vocabulary, etc. | It’s highly effective! The results of my longest co-teaching relationship (3 years) produced slightly higher MCA scores than the other classes in that grade level. Using the expertise of the mainstream teacher for the content, and the ESL teacher for providing language scaffolds needed for all students to access the content pays of in student understanding and retention. |
| The expertise the ESL teacher has is so beneficial to me as a classroom teacher! Co-teaching is exciting to me since we would have two expert, experienced teachers helping all kids most effectively. | I believe that academic language is best taught in the classroom. Teachers get a better picture of how that can be taught when co-teaching. Good collegial conversations take place. Great discussions about how second language learners learn and the value of teaching academic language intentionally to all students is important, but essential for ELs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 13 Cont’d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes willing, but my concern would be how long the co-teacher would be in the room. Usually the ESL teachers only work with students for a short time out of the day. It may be difficult with a high number of EL students without support for most of the day. The same would be true for ANY other special category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it would allow me to keep my students in the classroom with their peers and they would not need to miss out on any instruction. It would also be a great reminder to support EL students, as it can be easy to forget that they need language support because they seem so high functioning in other aspects. Also, I would like to learn from the ESL teacher and would appreciate additional classroom support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having more eyes and more hands can help not only ELs, but all learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel it benefits the students to have two teachers in the classroom teaching. It gives them a better understanding of the subject because the teachers can teach their way to meet the needs of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would appreciate having another voice, with a different area of expertise in the classroom. Co-teaching supports more students in the classroom, clarifying instruction and academic language for ELs and non-ELs alike. I also appreciate having another set of eyes and instructional strengths of another teacher in my classroom. It is important, however,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that both teachers have compatible teaching styles. every day so that they can access the content. That being said, when students have a lower level of proficiency, I don’t think co-teaching is enough to meet their needs. Kids also benefit from a safe space whether it is pull-out or a small group within the classroom (push-in) where they can talk and take risks without worrying that their peers are judging them.

**Question 13 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would be willing, as long as there was a good relationship established between the classroom teacher and the ESL teacher. I think that co-teaching is best if there are more than just a couple of ESL students in the classroom. If the numbers are low, then I think it would be more beneficial to combine the ESL students with other classrooms and work on their specific needs as a pull-out.</th>
<th>I feel like co-teaching is a great way for me to get to know the non EL students, classroom teacher, and grade level standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel the benefits of two licensed teachers in the classroom is extremely powerful.</td>
<td>When I have done it, my EL students have benefitted, as well as the other students. Two teachers are better than one. My co-teaching classes are my favorite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it would be very helpful to have another teacher in the room. He or she may have ideas I wasn’t aware of.</td>
<td>Co-teaching is best practice for all students, not just EL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing, but with hesitations. Two teachers that do not agree on teaching styles, do not particularly get along, don’t have personalities that mesh, it will not work. If all of the above do work, it is great.</td>
<td>Co-teaching enables all students in the classroom to receive more feedback, not just ELs. The ELs are also able to have a higher level of comfort during the lesson if they have a strong relationship with their EL teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There would be some form of co-teaching that could work and still let me and the other teacher feel comfortable.</td>
<td>I love co-teaching for several reasons. First of all, my EL students are not missing important class time. They are getting grade level content with scaffolding to assist in their language learning. Also, I believe all students in a co-teach class can benefit from two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers using various co-teaching models.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I think it’s beneficial to students, EL and non EL. I enjoy the collegial partnership.</strong></td>
<td>All students benefit from the presence of another effective teacher in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy co-teaching and I believe the students benefit from having another teacher in the classroom. I always learn new things while I’m co-teaching and students experience their lessons from more than one source. When co-teaching is done effectively, everyone learns more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the change it can have in the classroom. I also believe teachers learn more from each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would depend on the ESL teacher. I would definitely do a push-in/assist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always willing to do what is best for kids, as long as I can manage it. I do worry about the planning piece and how to manage co-teaching in the size of school I teach in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would depend on who the ESL teacher was and if our teaching styles were similar. It would also depend on their classroom management capabilities and their understanding of the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only if the ESL teacher is committed to working together, planning and co-teaching. It can be a wonderful thing if both are truly working together. It can also be a huge burden if they’re not. I’ve experience both.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think working as a team to reach kids’ needs is much better than working alone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESL teachers have a great understanding of language acquisition that would benefit ALL students, not just EL students.

**Question 13 Cont’d.**

I think this would benefit all learners in my classroom. Also, my EL students would not feel like they are different or there is something wrong with them, as some do now because of pull-out.

I think it would be interesting to see how overall student achievement would be affected in the classroom with more planning and co-teaching with the ESL teacher. I know that when we received a new math curriculum, the language for relating the information to my students was poorly written. I used the ESL manual for the first two years to relate the information better to all my students.

EL language development and the breakdown of lessons could greatly benefit all students, not just EL students. Two teachers in a classroom can make for smaller groups and more individualized attention to students.

I co-taught 1st and 2nd grade multi-age years ago and there were a lot of benefits. I think I saw recent research that shows it’s effective for ELs. I suppose it depends on the situation…

**Question 14: Why Are You Willing to Have or Suggest Higher Numbers of ELs in a Classroom?**

I get concerned about clustering any group of students (EL, SpEd, etc.) for fear that other students miss out on the diversity these students add to the classroom. With that being said, I would be willing to entertain the idea to see if it would work.

Each year I try to facilitate this to have the opportunity to co-teach or use one of the forms of co-teaching. This is the first step to co-teaching. It becomes too difficult to align classroom schedules so that I can pull one student from another classroom into the main cluster classroom.
As long as there is enough time to plan, and both sides are very dedicated to making it work well. I feel like it is better for the children then to have them spread into numerous classrooms with limited support or pull-out.

I cannot justify giving 45 minutes of my teaching day to a group of 2-3 students (ELs) when I have so many to service. To solve this problem, I push-in the reminder of the ELs from other classrooms, so I can service them at the same time. Teachers know this ahead of time, so they plan their teaching of content times accordingly, so this can happen (common teaching schedule). My co-teacher and I then become responsible for that grade for those pushed-in students.

I don’t really have a choice as to what students and how many are placed in my classroom.

I like that it gives the EL teacher a better opportunity to provide more service time for the students. Having the students clustered allows the EL teacher to focus on communicating with one classroom teacher and improves the planning because the EL teacher has less teachers to try to connect with.

I enjoy having EL kids in my class and usually do.

My school currently clusters EL students for the purpose for me being able to co-teach and I would recommend it to other buildings.

EL students bring great diversity and personality to a classroom. I truly enjoy learning from them as well. Having more students would only add more richness. And if I could co-teach, it would be a win win for me.

In today’s fast-paced classrooms that move through dense curriculum, it’s most effective for students and teacher if the ELs are clustered together.

Again, the opportunity for the EL students to stay in the class and the chance to either create small group stations or team teach would be beneficial to so many of the kids. The chance for English speakers to learn from the ELs and vice versa in a small group setting creates a rich learning environment.

Time spent working with multiple teachers per grade level reduces the ESL teacher’s already limited co-planning time. However, ELs need the examples of English-proficient peers as well, so I generally try to follow the “no more than 1/3 of a class should be exceptional” rule I found suggested in research.

Same answer as prior.

This is much easier to work with a grade level teacher when clustering students. When elementary ESL teachers cover 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 14 Cont’d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A cluster works well in this situation. I think it would be nice for students to be with others who might need the same support. It would be nice to try co-teaching…although intimating at first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, having another qualified and professional adult in the classroom will benefit a variety of students, not just ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered classrooms bring students with similar needs together and can be more effective in providing academic support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had an EL cluster in my classroom, than I would see co-teaching as beneficial to my students. More students would be reached and extra support would be beneficial, and their specific needs could still be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would enjoy having a teaching partner, especially if the co-teacher was in the mainstream classroom more than the short amount of time I’ve experienced in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m open to having other people in my room and I’d be willing to have more EL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am also the gifted cluster classroom and would be pulled too many ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students would benefit from it. If all of my students were spread out to all seven sections of a grade level, it would not be physically possible for me to co-teach in each of their classrooms.

**Question 14 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EL students take more time to work with than the average student. The co-teaching model may work with one subject, but what happens the other 5 hours of the day??</th>
<th>Absolutely. When students are spread out 1 or 2 EL students to a teacher is NOT an effective way to service EL students. This allows for no opportunities for co-teaching and a nightmare to try to do a push-in model.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This might be a ‘yes,’” but support would need to be spread out across the day (reading, writing, math, etc.) The ESL level of my cohort of students would matter then. I always worry about a large group of low ESL students grouped together without adequate support throughout the day.</td>
<td>It is impossible to co-teach when students aren’t clustered because it is a waste of the EL teacher’s time. For example, this past ear I tried to cluster my 5th grade students in one classroom to co-teach. However, during the summer, three new EL students moved in and were placed in another 5th grade room. I co-taught in one classroom Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and the other on Tuesday and Thursday. Each classroom had only three EL students. The result was, even though co-teaching was beneficial to me, my co-teacher, and to some extent my students, the students did not truly receive enough EL service. If clustering is to be done right, the office needs to know which rooms have EL clusters so that they can place new students during the summer accordingly. I am part of the class building in grades 3, 4, and 5 at the end of the school year and cluster EL students according to proficiency levels. But if new EL students move in during the summer, all of my efforts can be undone in a flash, leaving co-teaching the following year unattainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are already spread thin. Co-teaching requires a lot of commitment and planning. This would be accomplished</td>
<td>When students are clustered in reasonable numbers, it creates more opportunities to co-teach. If EL students are scattered in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more efficiently when students are clustered. It would also provide more classroom time for the ESL teacher. small numbers in multiple classrooms, pull-out may become the only viable option.

**Question 14 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I really enjoy working with EL students and learning about their backgrounds. I also enjoy co-teaching!</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to learn/participate in a co-teaching model. Having two teacher teach the same group could be a positive for students who need a lesson taught or talked through a second time. The lesson could be explained differently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, I am open to teaching all students and meeting all of their needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as above. It would depend entirely who that teacher was.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, only if it’s truly a co-teaching experience. There’s been years when I’ve had an ESL teacher that just wanted to be a para in the room, they didn’t have time to plan with me so they’d should up late, then interrupt my lesson to either answer the questions I’d posed to the kids, or they’d talk through a lesson and it would take double the amount of time allotted so that now I was behind in what needed to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply having another adult in the room allows for more resources for students. The ESL teacher can help me grow in my teaching, and vice versa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same reason as above. Teaching is a life journey of learning for myself. I am also looking to improve my understanding and teaching skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 14 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 14 Cont’d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a harder question because in order for it to be an effective co-teaching experience, the teachers must work well together. I think that it could work amazingly if you have the right teacher in the co-teaching experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to try. I haven’t tried it yet, but am flexible. If it something that might be better for kids.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 19: Please Elaborate on Your Choices and/or Add Other Roles of Administration for the Success of Co-teaching.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 19: Please Elaborate on Your Choices and/or Add Other Roles of Administration for the Success of Co-teaching.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin needs to be on board or “buy-in” to this concept to help make it successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My first choice is the most crucial. ELs need to be clustered to help with the scheduling. It’s impossible to have a common planning time because EL teachers never have a set schedule from year to year. Having the ELs placed before the classroom teachers make class lists has been so beneficial these last couple of years. These are at-risk learners, so if clustering assures them the ample amount of help they need, then it should become a common practice every spring. Principals are the ones who can make that happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules are the toughest thing to manage, especially in a small building when there are a number of teachers that cross over to other buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching is difficult without seeing how others have do it and without discussing the different forms and when they are most useful. Common planning time is a must or else you revert to one teach, one assist. It is difficult to align schedules to pull one student from another class into the main cluster class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing up possible additional time to plan together is really important, along with making sure the class that has a high concentration of ELs does not also have numerous other needs in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling the staff on the benefits/goal of co-teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that the role of an administrator is to let the teachers run their classroom. So I do not believe that administrators have a big role.

**Question 19 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe the best way admin can provide support to co-teaching is to provide time to plan together. You cannot co-teach without planning together. Professional development is important, but so many of us learn by doing, so I firmly believe time to coordinate and plan is crucial.</th>
<th>My principal supports clustering EL students, which is extremely important in allowing me to co-teach. Common planning times would be an important change that would lead to much better instruction for all students, but a principal would need to involve themselves in creating that time for teachers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern about the number of students and how much time is spent co-teaching. How can an EL teacher co-teaching in multiple classrooms/grade levels?</td>
<td>I feel I’ve had ample professional development opportunities, which is great! However, my co-teachers and I consistently lack common planning time. Administration needs to take initiative here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall buy-in of a program.</td>
<td>Observing and giving feedback on areas where the partnership is working successfully; giving opportunities for partnerships to share techniques with others—coordinating partnerships for brief sharing once they’ve been able to teach together for a while.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and giving the time to be able to collaborate.</td>
<td>Acknowledge contribution of ESL staff, allocate space and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 19 Cont’d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL teachers often support students in multiple grade levels. It is important that the teacher co-teach with only one or two teachers. Adapting to the styles of more teachers and managing the prep time required for co-teaching would be overwhelming beyond this. If necessary, pull-out instruction can be provided for other classes.</td>
<td>I feel like administration first and foremost needs to support co-teaching. They are ultimately why this will or will not work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of ESL students in the classroom should determine whether or not co-teaching is warranted and beneficial.</td>
<td>We don’t need more training, we need time to plan and a school culture that is open to collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think providing enough time for co-teaching is the most important. It would allow the teachers to build a relationship and get to know one another’s strengths and feel comfortable with each other. It would also set a tone in the classroom that each teacher is important.</td>
<td>Communicating and building relationships with select classroom teachers. Then the principal is the way I started clustering ELs. Then I tried co-teaching with certain and realized some are not able to trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There must be common preps to plan. After school gets way too busy.</td>
<td>It is great when administration is on board for clustering students. It makes scheduling and servings EL students more effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the teachers would be able to do most of the planning, scheduling, and class building.</td>
<td>In my experience, co-teaching has been most successful when I have had time to plan with the other teachers. When I tried to co-teach with a teacher I didn’t have a common planning time with, our model quickly turned into one teach, one assist. The model is still successful, but the potential for an even greater experience was evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that teachers should also be paired according to their teaching style and ability to effectively communicate.</td>
<td>Co-teaching ability starts with administration. If you do not have cluster classrooms, co-teaching is impossible. If you do have cluster classrooms and no common planning time, co-teaching will ultimately not be as successful unless you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 19 Cont’d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME is difficult to come by for any elementary staff member. If your schedules do not coincide, it makes co-teaching less effective.</td>
<td>I work with administration on class lists each year by completing informational forms on each EL and suggesting class makeups and teachers (i.e., those trained in SIOP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are resourceful. We can find planning time when needed. The principal needs to set the tone on the importance of co-teaching. He/she needs to provide training and the resources needed to be able to implement the program effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning could always be done after school, so common prep time would not be needed. At our school common prep times are hard to get with the times our specialists are at our school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration needs to be supportive and allow time for co-teachers to work together and plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If administration is not behind co-teaching, than co-teaching will not exist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, like planning time is essential to success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing planning times and opportunities in the daily schedule for ESL teacher to be available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone wants to co-teach, I would hope the administration would be supportive of that and offer any ideas he/she might be able to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worry about students with other needs also placed in the classroom. Next year I will have EL, LD, ASD, EBD, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GT… Seems like too many different needs put into one classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Question 19 Cont’d.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time is always a major factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and scheduling for co-teaching will be the biggest challenge because of how stretched out EL teachers are with their caseloads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be difficult to pull off without administration supporting the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Question 20: What Type of Professional Development is Needed to Support Successful Co-teaching?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A general knowledge of what it is exactly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d love to visit a classroom to see it in action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further discussion of co-teaching approaches to make sure everyone has the same expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly just time to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing the different types of co-teaching models is very important and knowing that you can change and use different ones depending on the lesson and/or content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 20 Cont’d.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to observe classrooms that use co-teaching effectively. PD about the different ways to co-teach and when each is most effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Time. | Surveys of teaching styles/approaches so you have an idea where your instruction already aligns. |
| I would like to watch how it works. It would be nice to observe a team that works well together. | Depends on the content area. |
| Workshops to understand. | Examples of positive co-teaching experiences that people can watch. |
| Modeling of different co-teaching models and opportunities to observe these different models would be important to understanding successful co-teaching. | For ESL co-teaching specifically, I think PD on language acquisition, culturally relevant teaching and vocabulary instruction is necessary. |
| Professional development on the models and strategies of co-teaching. | I would like our workshop days to have professional development to support co-teaching. Viewing videos of successful models in action would be good to see and discuss. |
| Examples of co-teaching models and strategies, and time to work together. | I think being observed by someone who knows how to co-teach would provide lots |
of support. It’s always nice to have information that relates directly to you and your students.

**Question 20 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t believe I need any. I have done all of the models, with EL teachers, basic skills teachers, SpEd teachers, etc. over the years.</td>
<td>A quick review of the models, real-life examples of how it can work, and solid planning time to be able to ask for advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to do each type of co-teaching.</td>
<td>At the school I currently work at, most of our staff has had training and professional development in co-teaching. Most are familiar with roles, methods, etc. It is more time to plan that is needed and ways to be more purposeful in planning and communicating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective planning for effective co-teaching.</td>
<td>All teachers are language teachers. Training needs to support that. Also, PD needs to stress that co-teaching can be approached in small increments. One doesn’t successfully become a co-teacher all at once. It’s done a little at a time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt the district workshop was very informative in explaining the models and strategies for co-teaching. I took it three years ago. Many good ideas were presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going is key. A general background is important, but co-teaching needs to be a part of observation protocol, as well as incorporated at PLCs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing examples of each step of co-teaching. This would be everything from planning to actually co-teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective co-teaching styles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The types of co-teaching and knowing that you do not have to do all of them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 20 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Both teachers need to be trained and understand what co-teaching is and isn’t.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None for me, I think the time to plan is more important; especially for experienced teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before you can reach the professional development point, I think it would first be more important to make sure the two teachers would be a good team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am looking forward to one day in the summer and one mid-year. Common planning time would be great as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release time in the early part of the school year to map out planning and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the teachers have not really seen a successful co-teaching experience in our building, so we would need to be shown how to set one up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 22: What Other Qualities Do You Believe are Important in a Co-teaching Partner?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similar teaching styles, a good working relationship.</th>
<th>Willingness, desire, level of comfortability with the co-teacher; it won’t work if you can’t be yourself.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-teachers need to respect the varied experiences and knowledge they bring to the classroom. They need to work together to resolve any difference of opinion and to be professional in the classroom, putting students’ needs first.</td>
<td>From the beginning, co-teachers need to treat the ESL teacher as an equal partner, not a guest, in their classroom Being treated as an equal colleague is essential and the students will pick up on it. A third grader non-EL told me once, “So you’re a teacher now in our classroom? Last year, in 2nd grade, you were just a helper.” I wasn’t doing anything differently—it was all in the way I was introduced and treated by the classroom teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities have to be compatible, as well as teaching styles. I have to like the other person and trust they know the content and will teach the correct information.</td>
<td>A team player who wants to work together for the good of the entire class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 22 Cont’d.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating often and honest about what they need and like, etc.</td>
<td>That they want to be a part of co-teaching and see value in it, rather than just being ‘forced’ into it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humor. Also, several of the above should be grouped/prioritized together.</td>
<td>Likes the EL teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone who is easy to approach and willing to listen to ideas.</td>
<td>Need to be on time with their schedule—that is #1 for me. If they aren’t, it’s not effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked knowledge of content area lower because if an educator has all of the other qualities, the knowledge will come.</td>
<td>Being open to thinking outside the box; Humor; Appreciating the other teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone who connects with me personally. This person would need to be someone I can talk freely with. One who can problem solve together.</td>
<td>I found the ranking of these qualities difficult—I don’t know that I put some of these above others. I feel like a co-teaching partner has to be all of these things equally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality…share the amount of work/prep.</td>
<td>Being open to others being in their classroom in integral. Also, to be open to new ideas and not fixated on one way to do things because that’s the way it has always been done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student management!</td>
<td>Building relationships with ELs. Able to accommodate tests and grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of those qualities are important. That was hard to ‘rank’ because I do feel that you need to have bits of all of them to be successful.</td>
<td>Willingness to have another in the room and to see them as an equal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above!</td>
<td>The ranking of qualities was difficult for me. You need to have several of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
qualities in order to have a good co-teaching relationship. It was hard to prioritize with a ranking. I think another quality that is important is a shared vision and teaching philosophy.

**Question 22 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It always works best when there is a close bond between the two teachers. I did some team teaching with our reading specialist who is a good friend. We’re like a comedy tag team together and feed off of each other’s energy.</th>
<th>Knowing the other person’s teaching style and being able to anticipate the direction they will take next.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the qualities in question 21 are almost all equally important…except maybe the knowledge of the content area—that one is least important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 24: What Do You Need to be a Successful Co-teacher?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not sure, I’ve never taught EL students with this concept before.</th>
<th>A co-teacher who is willing to put in the extra time and maximize the time spent together, so the most students are affected directly by this model.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People who are willing to work together, given the time to work together, and share a similar vision for the students.</td>
<td>Time to plan and a mainstream teacher who wants to collaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to plan with the co-teacher, clear expectations, and open dialogue.</td>
<td>Time to collaborate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to plan with the co-teacher.</td>
<td>I think the ESL teacher needs to be conscientious and respectful. She needs to be a good and patient listener as well. Much of the success of co-teaching relies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 24 Cont’d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A co-teacher I trust and who trusts me, time to plan.</td>
<td>Time to plan and examples from successful co-teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship building time and flexibility.</td>
<td>A curriculum, a teacher on time, and planning time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of how it works and what my EL students need.</td>
<td>Belief in the value of the model and that it is worth the effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and TIME.</td>
<td>I feel like I would need support from the whole staff. If only some are on board, it cannot be respected and supported. I also feel like mainstream teachers should be aware that ESL teachers and teachers too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the above.</td>
<td>Planning time, mutual respect, and shared expectations for yourselves and for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to plan with my co-teacher and shared learning goals, as well as compatible teaching styles.</td>
<td>The right fit teacher! Fewer grades on which to focus!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for collaboration with my co-teacher. Also, time for both the classroom teacher and the ESL teacher to get to know our EL students to find out what their specific needs are.</td>
<td>Time and understanding of the grade level content standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough time with the right person.</td>
<td>To be a successful co-teacher, I need my partner to buy into it as much as I am. I also need the support of the other teacher, so students know that I am also in charge of the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to change, respectful, open to new ideas.</td>
<td>For successful co-teaching, I need open communication, shared planning time, and mainstream teachers who have a passion for teaching ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone I like to work with and help from them. I don’t want to plan everything for them.</td>
<td>Time to plan and additional ESL teaching support to handle the large caseload. This year, too much of our teaching has been pull-out during grade level intervention times because the caseloads were too large.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 24 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone I get along with and can be open and honest with. Someone who is respectful and knows how to teach a variety of children.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time to plan and a teacher who is willing to work together for the sake of student growth. Someone who is willing to share the work load and be creative. Someone who is strong in their content knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to collaborate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had training and started to establish a relationship with my partner. What I need is more common planning time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone I can trust to teacher my students. Hard to give that up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to collaborate. A good relationship with the co-teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The understanding of all the students not just the EL students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like planning time and personalities that mesh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A partner that is willing to share and help me stay on task. I am a big picture thinker and it is helpful when someone can plan with me and look at more of the finer details.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to collaborate with the other teacher, trust in the other person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Someone to look at my class list for next year and make sure it is manageable. Administration support! Time to collaborate and plan.

**Question 24 Cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good preparation, time, trusting and respectful relationship with co-teacher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A teacher I can work with and trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relationship with a co-teacher and time to work and plan together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 25: How can the ESL/Mainstream Teacher Best Support You?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not sure.</th>
<th>Be in it fully; not to use the time as an extra prep.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a part of grade level planning time.</td>
<td>Be open to change and have open communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally dedicated, prepared.</td>
<td>Including ESL teachers on meetings and PLC’s if and when possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of content.</td>
<td>Be willing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be flexible in arranging planning time.</td>
<td>Having some of the same qualities of the ESL teacher—patience, conscientiousness, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure, it would all depend on whether our personalities and teaching beliefs meshed.</td>
<td>Blocking out a chunk of time each week to meet with the ESL teacher. Frequent communication via email. Planning ahead and communicating with the ESL teacher about what is coming up next. Treating ESL students as ‘our’ students, not just the ESL teacher’s students. Introducing the ESL teacher as an equal and treating them as such in front of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in the classroom. Teach me strategies and content I should cover or support.</td>
<td>Be on time with their schedule and know what they are doing, so I can support!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and ideas.</td>
<td>Open communication, established planning time together, keeping resources (classroom or otherwise) available to both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively with the teachers.</td>
<td>By being open and willing to listen. Sometimes the opinions of the ESL teachers seem as though they are not as important as those of mainstream teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ESL teacher can be a good listener, work cooperatively and be willing to assist in planning lessons.</td>
<td>Finding time to check in, being open and flexible with someone being in their classroom, and being flexible with modifying assignments for EL students based on ESL teacher recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would ask that co-teaching not begin right away in the school year so that we can best determine the specific needs of each student.</td>
<td>Scheduling weekly planning time. Developing trust with ELs. Giving the wait time needed for ELs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have enough time in the classroom.</td>
<td>Meet regularly and help me understand the scope and sequence of the content area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with teachers, open to new ideas, work together.</td>
<td>In the past, this has worked best when the teacher preps the class before our time together and we go over classroom expectations together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have knowledge of the content and how I run my classroom (procedures).</td>
<td>Mainstream teachers should be willing to take SIOP and Culturally Responsible Teaching training or learn more about EL students and how they learn. They can make the classroom where we teacher feel like a shared space, not like I am coming into ‘her’ classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They cannot hold their ideas or comments in, but will tell the teacher when they need or don’t like something.</td>
<td>Work with the ESL teacher to find common planning time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication and flexibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 25 Cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By knowing their content, methods, and procedures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a huge struggle because this teacher is a cross-over. We will need to make sure to find a consistent time in the schedule and make a commitment to that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A gradual co-teaching model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible, open-mined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By observing first and then getting involved in small groups and moving forward to whole groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like planning time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a ‘right-hand’ for me and all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be flexible with the time we have to collaborate, be honest with what they need and what they would like to see happen in the co-teaching experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to dive in and take on the challenge. Plan with our team/me. Teach/assist all students in the classroom when you are in there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the special ESL knowledge that the ESL teacher brings to the planning table will bring better in-depth teaching for all the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language development is a big support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work cooperatively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 27: List Any Other Challenges to Co-teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interruptions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When personalities don’t mix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 27 Cont’d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we don’t mesh well together, it could be terrible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When two teachers are not compatible, having resources to mediate or switch teaching assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities may need to be similar, but not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the hardest for me would be to let go of the control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough ESL teachers to meet the caseload needs using an effective co-teaching model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having adequate time to co-teach. I know the ESL teacher has other kids in the school, not just my class. Also, other student needs and time to be prepared and plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes other adults don’t realize how loud their voice is in a classroom when working in stations/small groups. This can raise the noise levels of the whole classroom. The co-teacher has to have a perspective of the general climate of a classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting along with the other teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student receptiveness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 28: Is there anything more you’d like to add or elaborate on regarding challenges in co-teaching?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of the unknown and potential additional work makes co-teaching less appealing. Most likely worth it, but slightly daunting to add to the to-do list. I think these are a few mental obstacles many teachers struggle with.</th>
<th>The main things are time to collaborate and an openness from both teacher to work together and change things up a bit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time is the biggest hurdle in planning lessons effectively with a co-teacher.</td>
<td>It is also challenging when kids are pulled for Special Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve worked with the ESL teacher in my building and we have a great relationship which has made it very enjoyable and fun. I would love to have her in my classroom more than 30 minutes a day.</td>
<td>I think your questions covered it. This was a wonderfully written survey and I truly am very interested to read your paper and see your opinions and research on co-teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior management might be tricky if teachers don’t see eye to eye.</td>
<td>I’ve noticed a definite link between caseload size and opportunities for co-teaching. When my caseload was more manageable, more of my time was spent co-teaching. Large caseloads in multiple classrooms recently has meant more pull-out than usual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would take a lot of time to collaborate and plan. That is hard to do. We don’t get a lot of time to plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s difficult when one teacher is more of a mentor than a co-teacher. This experience can be somewhat burdensome for senior teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most ESL teachers I have worked with have been trained/educated in co-teaching and know the positive effect it can have on students. Mainstream teacher have not received this same training. It is important to have a common understanding before starting implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules are a mess and having the time to plan and then finding a time to come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
into the classroom that works for both teachers will be difficult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, it was very hard to rank all these items. I probably would second guess many of these choices. From past experience, I know that a trusting and comfortable relationship with the co-teacher makes it all work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>