Mentoring Teacher Candidates Through Co-Teaching

Northwest Missouri State University
Fall 2012
Co-teaching In- service

We think too much about effective methods of teaching and not enough about effective methods of learning. -- John Carolus

Dr. Joyce Piveral
Dean, College of Education and Human Services
piveral@nwmissouri.edu
660-562-1778

Dr. Cheryl Malm
Assistant Director of Teacher Education
cgmalm@nwmissouri.edu
660-562-1206

Dr. Vickie Miller
Director of Field Experiences
vmiller@nwmissouri.edu
660-562-1232

Mr. Michael McBride
Coordinator, Professional Education Unit Assessment
mam@nwmissouri.edu
660-562-1089

A special thank you to St. Cloud State University, Teacher Quality Enhancement Center for permission to reproduce and adapt materials found in this handbook.
Co-Teaching Workshop Agenda

1. Introductions/overview/goals

2. Co-Teaching Workshop
   - Why Co-Teach
   - Data—Quantitative and Qualitative
   - Shared Responsibilities
     - Shared Planning
     - Shared Instruction
     - Shared Assessment
   - Co-Teaching Strategies
     - One Teach, One Observe
     - One Teach, One Assist
     - Station Teaching
     - Parallel Teaching
     - Supplemental Teaching
     - Alternative Teaching
     - Team Teaching
   - Questions

3. Next Steps
History of Co-teaching

› Student Teaching hasn’t changed much in 80 years!!
  Guyton & McIntyre (1990)

› The co-teaching model is a return to the apprenticeship model that was historically used
to train student teachers and other professionals.

› PL94-142 (Now IDEA) - Least Restrictive Environment

› SPED and General ED teacher needed to work together

› 1995 - Cook and Friend - models of co-teaching

› Kansas State (1999)

› Virginia Consortium (2002)

› St. Cloud State University (2003 - 2010)

What is Co-Teaching?

› ...is defined as two teachers (cooperating teacher and teacher candidate) working
together with groups of students - sharing the planning, organization, delivery and
assessment of instruction, as well as the physical space.

› Both teachers are actively involved and engaged in all aspects of instruction
Co-Teaching Myths/Realities

Myth #1 - Co-teaching means having two teacher candidates in a classroom.
REALITY: Only one teacher candidate is in a classroom. The co-teaching occurs between the cooperating teacher and the teacher candidate.

Myth #2 - Teacher candidates must be left on their own to sink or swim.
REALITY: Teacher candidates in co-teaching settings are supported in their efforts to becoming a licensed professional. The cooperating teacher models and assists as the teacher candidate acquires the knowledge and skills of teaching. This is in sharp contrast to the sink or swim model that assumes the teacher candidate must learn how to become a teacher on their own.

Myth #3 - Co-teaching inhibits a teacher candidate’s ability to develop classroom management skills.
REALITY: Rather than having to manage a classroom all alone, a teacher candidate has the support necessary to implement effective classroom management strategies. As the skills are gained, the teacher candidate takes the lead to make sure he/she can manage the classroom without support.

Myth #4 - Teacher candidates don't get enough solo teaching time with co-teaching.
REALITY: Teacher candidates must have opportunities to teach all alone. The amount of time a candidate is left totally alone varies and is based on their skills in managing a classroom. It is important that the teacher candidate demonstrate that they can handle a classroom all by themselves.

Myth #5 - It takes too much time to co-plan.
REALITY: It may take more time to co-plan in the early stages of co-teaching. In order to co-teach effectively, the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate must have shared planning time. However, the benefits of co-planning are huge. Teacher candidates get a much deeper understanding of the entire curriculum through co-planning and co-taught lessons lead to increased academic performance of P-12 students making the time spent in planning beneficial for all.

Myth #6 - Teacher Candidates will never have full responsibility of the classroom.
REALITY: For a period of time, each teacher candidate will lead the planning, organization, delivery and assessment of instruction in a co-taught classroom. Candidates will also be responsible for directing other adults, including the cooperating teacher, thus learning the skills necessary for effectively managing the human resources in a classroom.
Myth #7 - Co-teaching is not the “real world”. When a teacher candidate becomes certified they will be alone in the classroom.

REALITY: To accommodate large class sizes, students with special needs, English Language Learners, and the push in model of title one and special education, today’s classrooms will often have special education teachers, paraprofessionals and volunteers working alongside the classroom teacher. It is rare to find a classroom where the assigned teacher is working solo. The need to collaborate with other adults in the classroom is a necessity in our schools.

Myth #8 - Co-Teaching doesn’t work at the secondary level.
REALITY: Co-teaching strategies have been used successfully at all grade levels and in every content area. Co-teaching can be especially effective at the secondary level as teachers are dealing with larger class sizes and greater diversity of students.

Myth #9 - Teacher candidates don’t have to write lesson plans for co-teaching because they co-plan.
REALITY: Co-planning takes place before formal lesson plans are written. Once a cooperating teacher and a teacher candidate co-plan, the candidate takes the information and writes up lesson plans, which will be reviewed by the cooperating teacher.

Myth #10 - Co-teaching can only work if the teacher candidate and cooperating teacher have the same learning or teaching style.
REALITY: No two people have the same style because we are uniquely different. Teacher Candidates entering the workplace must be able to work with a variety of learning and teaching styles. Through workshops, teacher candidates and cooperating teachers are made aware of many different types of learning and teaching styles, how they work, and how to work together with individuals who have different styles.

Myth #11 - The university supervisor should only observe a teacher candidate when they are teaching solo.
REALITY: When a supervisor observes a teacher candidate co-teaching with a cooperating teacher, they focus the observation on what the candidate is doing. If the candidate is leading a small group, it may be helpful to move closer to that group to observe him/her. If the teacher candidate is teaming with his/her cooperating teacher, focus the observation on the candidate’s teaching skills, ability to collaborate with the cooperating teacher, management skills, organization, etc.
1. **Subjects**
   a. District 742 - High needs partner district
      i. 9,800 students
   ii. Student demographics - 2004/2007
      1. Free/reduced lunch - 33%/38%
      2. Special Education - 17%/19%
      3. Students of Color -16%/21%
      4. ESL - 8%/12%

2. **Measures**
   a. MCA (entire population)
   b. Woodcock Johnson III Research Edition (sample)

3. **Procedures**
   a. MCA
      i. Agreement with district
   b. Woodcock Johnson
      i. Hired/trained subs
      ii. Sept/May
      iii. 10-15 minutes per test
      iv. Sampling procedures - random sample - matched teacher demographics

4. **Results**
   a. K-12 students
      i. Reading/math - MCA/WJIII (Grades 1-6)
      ii. 7-12 Data
      iii. Focus Groups
   b. Teacher Candidates
      i. Summative Assessment (university supervisor)
      ii. End of Experience Survey (online)
      iii. Focus Groups
   c. Cooperating Teachers
      i. End of experience survey (online)
      ii. Focus groups
   d._QUOTES
      i. TC/CT
      ii. SCSU
      iii. Partner districts

5. **Limitations**
   a. Single site
   b. Volunteer basis of cooperating teachers
   c. Secondary - lack of academic achievement data
Data Collection
- P-12 Learners
  - Academic Achievement (1-6)
  - 7-12 Survey
  - Focus Groups
- Teacher Candidates
  - Summative Assessment
  - End of Experience Survey
  - Focus Groups
- Cooperating Teachers
  - End of Experience Surveys
  - Focus Groups
- Teacher Candidates
  - Summative Assessment
  - End of Experience Survey
  - Focus Groups

Co-Teaching in P12 classrooms
- 826 Pairs
  - 2004-2005: 179 Pairs
  - 2005-2006: 203 Pairs
  - 2006-2007: 231 Pairs
  - 2007-2008: 243 Pair

Co-Teaching has impacted over 25,000 P-12 students in Central Minnesota
- 34 Pre-K classrooms
- 601 Elementary (K-6) classrooms
- 120 Secondary (5-12 & 7-12) classrooms
- 71 Special Education classrooms

Measuring Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA)</th>
<th>Woodcock Johnson III - Research Edition (WJIII)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Math - Grades 3-5-7</td>
<td>Reading/Math - Grades K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Administered</td>
<td>Individually Administered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can use as pre/post intervention</td>
<td>Results include raw score and standard score, but can also compute gain scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-6 Reading Gains:
- Woodcock Johnson III - Research Edition
- Individually administered
- Pre/Post test
- Statistically significant gains in all four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>Not Co-Taught</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1-6 Reading Proficiency

- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
- NCLB proficiency test for Minnesota
- Statistically significant findings in all four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>Not Co-Taught</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-6 Math Gains

- Woodcock Johnson III - Research Edition
- Individually administered
- Pre/Post test
- Statistically significant gains in two of four years; positive trend in each year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodcock Johnson III Research Edition</th>
<th>W Score Gains</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>Not Co-Taught</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-6 Math Proficiency

- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
- NCLB Approved proficiency test for Minnesota
- Statistically significant findings in all four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Math Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>Not Co-Taught</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of Classroom

**Reading Proficiency**

**MCA Reading Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Co-Teaching Candidate (N=261)</th>
<th>One Licensed Teacher (N=1977)</th>
<th>Non Co-Teaching Candidate (N=269)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insufficient Data to Analyze

χ² (2 df, N=2507) = 38.01, p < .001

Copyright 2011, St. Cloud State University, Research Funded by a US Department of Education, Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant

**Math Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Co-Teaching Candidate (N=317)</th>
<th>One Teacher (N=927)</th>
<th>Non Co-Teaching Candidate (N=105)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insufficient Data to Analyze

χ² (2 df, N=1349) = 8.31, p = .016
χ² (2 df, N=2355) = 7.35, p = .025

Cumulative Data

- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
- Compares Co-Taught and Not Co-Taught student teaching settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>One Licensed Teacher</th>
<th>Non Co-Teaching Candidate</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL (4 Year Cumulative)</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Eligible</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² (2 df, N=1939) = 26.04, p < .001

Copyright 2011, St. Cloud State University, Research Funded by a US Department of Education, Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant
Cumulative Data
Math Proficiency
- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
- Compares Co-Taught and Not Co-Taught student teaching settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Math Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught One Licensed Teacher</th>
<th>Not Co-Teaching Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL (4 Year Cumulative)</td>
<td>72.9% (N=1519)</td>
<td>63.7% (N=6467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>74.2% (N=1519)</td>
<td>67.5% (N=6467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Eligible</td>
<td>72.0% (N=1519)</td>
<td>54.7% (N=6467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>60.5% (N=1519)</td>
<td>56.8% (N=6467)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7-12 Survey
Cumulative Data 2004-2008
(N=1,686)

Benefits to K-12 Students
Focus Groups (N=546)
Increased student engaged time
- Able to work in smaller groups
- Receive more individual attention
- Get questions answered faster
- Get papers and grades back faster
- Students behave better
- Fewer class disruptions (for passing out papers, having projects checked, other housekeeping tasks)
### Teacher Candidate Evaluations
2005-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Co-Teaching Mean</th>
<th>Non Co-Teaching Mean</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Learners</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning/Environment</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Instruction</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Develop</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Disposition*</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant

### Benefits To Teacher Candidates
End of Experience Survey (N=157)

Teacher Candidates indicated that Co-Teaching led to:
- Improved classroom management skills (95.5%)
- Increased collaboration skills (94.9%)
- More teaching time (94.6%)
- Increased confidence (89.9%)
- Deeper understanding of the curriculum through co-planning (89.1%)
- More opportunities to ask questions and reflect (88.6%)

### Benefits to Teacher Candidates
Focus Groups (N=136)

Additional benefits of co-teaching:
- Being seen as a "real" teacher
- Equal partnership
- Sharing resources
- Mutual support and learning

### Benefits to Cooperating Teachers
End of Experience Survey (N=279)

Cooperating Teachers indicate that Co-Teaching led to:
- Ability to reach more students, particularly those with high needs (93.5%)
- Better relationship with their teacher candidate (91%)
- Experienced professional growth (89.2%)
- Enhanced energy for teaching (87.8%)
- Hosting a candidate without giving up my classroom (87.1%)
- Teacher candidate had a better experience than they would have through a traditional model (85.7%)
Benefits to Cooperating Teachers

Focus Groups

(N=92)

Additional benefits of Co-Teaching:

- Ability to do projects more successfully
- Class time is more productive
- Modeling and participating in teamwork
- Candidates become competent more quickly

1st, 2nd & 3rd Year Teachers

Co-Taught in Student Teaching

(Focus Group = 18)

- Comfortable and capable of collaborating effectively with colleagues.
- Equipped to deal with classroom management issues as they arise.
- Eager to receive feedback and seek out opportunities for internal and external reflection.

1st, 2nd & 3rd Year Teachers

Co-Taught in Student Teaching

(Focus Group = 18)

- Able to effectively differentiate instruction to better meet the needs of their students.
- Knowledgeable in ways to maximize the human resources that might be available, including paraprofessionals, volunteers and parents.

Thoughts From Teacher Candidates

- “I think that this is a great model for teaching; it is very empowering for the student teacher and creates a great relationship and future mentor.” - Teacher Candidate
- “We both were leaders in our own respects and at different times.” - Teacher Candidate
- “Certain lessons work really well when they are co-taught. It is a good feeling to pump out a great lesson cooperatively, knowing that the lesson would not have been as dynamic if it had not been co-taught.” - Teacher Candidate
- “There is more creativity because you are able to talk ideas through and make them great by having the two perspectives.” - Teacher Candidate
**Thoughts From K-12 Students**

- "They work together. If one gets tired of teaching, the other takes over, they help each other in tight situations. It's a lot different than past student teachers. I like this much better."
  
  Elementary Student

- "I think we learn more because there are two different teachers in the room - which means they teach different ways - which means they know different facts - which means you're going to learn a lot more."
  
  Elementary Student

- "When one is teaching, the other comes around and yells if we need help. It makes it easier to get around to everybody."
  
  High School Student

- "Double the teachers, double the learning."
  
  Middle School Student

---

**Thoughts from K-12 Students**

- "When the teacher's talking, or teaching, the other one can go around and make sure they're paying attention and not stop the whole lesson just to make sure that other kids are paying attention. It's kind of nice that she doesn't have to stop the lesson."
  
  Elementary Student

- "Everyone in our class is at a different stage. So if you have more trouble with reading, you can get more one-on-one time, and if you're advanced you can go ahead."
  
  Elementary Student

- "We've done a lot of different projects that we couldn't have done with just our regular teacher, we needed two grown ups. It's fun!"
  
  Elementary Student

- "If there's only one teacher it seems a lot more wild, but when there's two it seems more controlled."
  
  Elementary Student

---

**Thoughts from K-12 Students**

- "Yes, you definitely learn more quicker. You know you're not like 'I'm never going to get my question answered so I won't ask it. You're more willing to ask the question'."
  
  High School Student

- "I think we learned more because the student teacher has different things that they want to teach you that maybe the regular teacher didn't originally have in their curriculum."
  
  High School Student

- "They offered different techniques that they used so you could find out what worked for you the best."
  
  High School Student

- "They don't seem as nervous. They don't just stand there and go 'uh, uh, uh'. With co-teaching they're more active."
  
  High School Student

---

**What SCSU is saying...**

"The use of a co-teaching model of student teaching has made placing student teachers SO much easier!"

Kathy Watson, Assistant Director, Coordinator of Student Teaching Placements, Office of Clinical Experiences, SCSU
In 742, the compelling evidence is clear. Traditional student teaching is not conducive to maximizing educational benefits for our students.

Co-teaching, however, has transformed the student teacher and teacher relationship. Instead of throwing a student teacher into the complexities of teaching, without a lifeline, student teachers are coached as they practice the art of teaching. Teaching is rocket science, and co-teaching is the power source!

Dr. Julia Espe
Executive Director of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment
St. Cloud Schools ESD# 742

“[The results are proven as far as I’m concerned we have better student teachers, we have better cooperating teachers, so it’s the best of both worlds for me.”

“We really like the partnership I think it’s a blueprint for teacher preparation institutions to follow.”

“I can’t say enough good things about it [co-teaching], I would like to see all of our teachers, in order to have a student teacher, to be a part of this co-teaching program.”

Mike Spanier
Sartell Middle School Principal

“I know of a couple of other programs that are looking at co-teaching as a vehicle for student teaching, and it seems to have great potential. But your variation is unique—others have partnered general education and special education student teachers, not the student teacher and cooperating teacher. It’s a great idea!”

Dr. Marilyn Friend

(12/11/07)
Co-Teaching in Student Teaching
Northwest Missouri State University

What is Co-Teaching?
Co-Teaching is defined as two teachers (cooperating teacher and teacher candidate) working together with groups of students, sharing the planning, organization, delivery, and assessment of instruction, as well as the physical space.

Co-Teaching is an Attitude...
An attitude of sharing the classroom and students
Co-Teachers must always be thinking:
We’re Both Teaching!

Why Co-Teach?
- Increases Instructional options for all students
- Addresses diversity and size of today’s classrooms
- Increases instructional options for all students
- Enhances classroom management
- Provides mentoring and guidance throughout the experience
- Creates an opportunity to plan, teach, and evaluate as a team
- Helps develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching
- Improves the academic performance of students in the classroom

Data show Co-Teaching is a way...
- to build stronger connections between universities and school partners;
- to provide both support and professional development for cooperating teachers;
- to increase opportunities for placements;
- to better meet P-12 student needs;
- for teacher candidates and cooperating teachers to build strong relationships;
- for teacher candidates to have more opportunities to teach;
- for teacher candidates and cooperating teachers to enhance their communication skills;
- to induct and mentor teacher candidates.

Co-Teaching Strategies

One Teach, One Observe—One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other gathers specific observational information on students or the (instructing) teacher. The key to this strategy is to have a focus for the observation.

One Teach, One Assist—One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other teacher assists students with their work, monitors behaviors, or corrects assignments.

Station Teaching—The co-teaching pair divide the instructional content into parts and the students into groups. Groups spend a designated amount of time at each station. Often an independent station will be used.

Parallel Teaching—Each teacher instructs half of the students. The two teachers are addressing the same instructional material and present the lesson using the same teaching strategy. The greatest benefit is the reduction of student to teacher ratio.

Supplemental Teaching—This strategy allows one teacher to work with students at their expected grade level, while the co-teacher works with those students who need the information and/or materials extended or remediated.

Alternative/Differentiated Teaching—Alternative teaching strategies provide two different approaches to teach the same information. The learning outcome is the same for all students, however the instructional methodology is different.

Team Teaching—Well planned, team taught lessons, exhibit an invisible flow of instruction with no prescribed division of authority. Using a team teaching strategy, both teachers are actively involved in the lesson. From a student’s perspective, there is no clearly defined leader, as both teachers share the instruction are free to interject information and available to assist students and answer questions.

Co-Teaching won’t happen without PLANNING. Pairs are encouraged to:
Designate a co-planning time This time is used to determine what co-teaching strategies will be used and how you will teach collaboratively. You will be responsible for additional planning beyond this planning time; the focus is on planning for co-teaching.
Try a co-teaching strategy
Adjust the lead role Lead of the planning shifts from the cooperating teacher (early in the experience) to the teacher candidate as the experience progresses.

For more information contact:
Dr. Vickie Miller — vmiller@nwmissouri.edu — 660-562-1232

Adapted from Cook & Friend (1995)
Research and Results

A comparison of the MCA academic achievement scores in reading and math (grades 1-6) of students in co-taught classrooms (cooperating teacher and teacher candidate), students in a classroom with a single teacher, and classrooms where a non co-teaching model of student teaching was undertaken. Researchers reported that students in co-taught classrooms statistically outperformed students in either of the other settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught Candidate</th>
<th>One Teacher</th>
<th>Non Co-Teaching Candidate</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>MCA Math Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught Candidate</th>
<th>One Teacher</th>
<th>Non Co-Teaching Candidate</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 - 2005</td>
<td>82.1% N = 318</td>
<td>75.7% N = 934</td>
<td>65.3% N = 101</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>2004 - 2005</td>
<td>82.3% N = 317</td>
<td>75.8% N = 927</td>
<td>70.5% N = 105</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 - 2006</td>
<td>78.7% N = 484</td>
<td>73.5% N = 1597</td>
<td>65.0% N = 160</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>2005 - 2006</td>
<td>68.9% N = 524</td>
<td>64.7% N = 1660</td>
<td>57.9% N = 171</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - 2007</td>
<td>Insufficient Data to Analyze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006 - 2007</td>
<td>Insufficient Data to Analyze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 - 2008</td>
<td>80.8% N = 261</td>
<td>61.4% N = 1977</td>
<td>62.1% N = 269</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>2007 - 2008</td>
<td>74.5% N = 314</td>
<td>61.4% N = 1977</td>
<td>62.6% N = 278</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four Year Cumulative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught Candidate</th>
<th>One Teacher</th>
<th>Non Co-Teaching Candidate</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>MCA Math Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught Candidate</th>
<th>One Teacher</th>
<th>Non Co-Teaching Candidate</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall 4 Year Cumulative</td>
<td>78.8% N = 1461</td>
<td>67.2% N = 6403</td>
<td>64.0% N = 572</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Overall 4 Year Cumulative</td>
<td>72.9% N = 1519</td>
<td>63.7% N = 6467</td>
<td>63.0% N = 597</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>65.0% N = 477</td>
<td>53.1% N = 2684</td>
<td>49.5% N = 222</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>54.2% N = 513</td>
<td>47.3% N = 277</td>
<td>45.7% N = 23</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed. Eligible</td>
<td>74.4% N = 433</td>
<td>52.9% N = 1945</td>
<td>46.4% N = 179</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Special Ed. Eligible</td>
<td>72.0% N = 472</td>
<td>54.7% N = 190</td>
<td>48.9% N = 18</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>44.7% N = 76</td>
<td>30.7% N = 515</td>
<td>25.8% N = 31</td>
<td>&lt; .069</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>30.5% N = 118</td>
<td>28.8% N = 671</td>
<td>26.8% N = 41</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported Benefits

**Practicing Teachers who co-taught in student teaching report:**

They are comfortable and capable of collaborating effectively;
They are equipped to deal with classroom management issues;
They are eager to receive feedback and seek opportunities to reflect;
They are Able to effectively differentiate instruction;
They feel knowledgeable in ways to maximize the human resources available, including paraprofessionals and volunteers.

**Benefits to Cooperating Teachers:**

In an end of experience survey (N=279), cooperating teachers agreed they benefited from co-teaching in the following ways:

- Being able to reach high need students ................. 94.5%
- Better relationship with teacher candidate .......... 92.3%
- Professional growth through co-planning ............. 90.5%
- Enhanced energy for teaching ......................... 89.0%

**Benefits to Teacher Candidates:**

In an end of experience survey (N=249), teacher candidates agreed they had benefitted from co-teaching in the following ways:

- Improved classroom management skills .................. 92.4%
- Increased collaboration skills .......................... 92.0%
- Taught more ............................................. 90.0%
- Deeper understanding of the curriculum ............... 89.2%
- More opportunities for self-reflection ................ 88.8%

**Benefits of K-12 Students:**

In focus groups (N=546), K-12 students reported that in co-taught classrooms:

- Students became more engaged by working in smaller groups;
- They received more individual attention;
- They got their questions answered faster;
- They got papers, assignments, and grades back faster;
- Students behaved better.
Co-Teaching
A Flow Chart

Initial Co-Teaching Workshop

Cooperating Teacher
University Supervisor

Teacher Candidate
Classroom Presentations – all areas

TC/CT Paired

• Co-Teaching Essentials
  o Defining Co-Teaching
  o Why Co-Teach
  o Data on Co-Teaching
  o Expectations
  o Attitude

• The Triad
  o Roles of CT/TC/US
  o Stages of Concern for TC

• Implementing Co-Teaching
  o Co-Teaching Strategies
  o Co-Planning

Initial 3-Way Meeting
US/CT/TC
Overall Expectations
Co-Teaching Expectations
Student Teaching Handbook
Observation & Assessment Forms

Pairs Workshop

• Relationship Building
  o Gregorc – Styles Delineator
  o Colors – Personality Color Indicator (PCI)

• Communication and Collaboration
  o Collaboration Self Assessment Tool

• Co-Teaching and Co-Planning

Minimum - 1 hour weekly
Co-Planning to Co-Teach

Final 3-way Meeting
End of Experience Survey
Focus Groups
Summative Assessment
Roles of the Participants in the Triad

Role of the Cooperating Teacher:

Role of the University Supervisor:

Role of the Teacher Candidate:
Participants in the Triad

Role of the Cooperating Teacher

- Help the teacher candidate feel comfortable and welcome
- Review school policies and procedures
- Encourage teacher candidate to get involved in school activities
- Share materials and ideas
- Assist the candidate in developing standards based lessons
- Observe and provide constructive feedback
- Know and implement the co-teaching strategies
- Mentor and guide the teacher candidate
- Model effective teaching strategies and professional behavior
- Be flexible; allow the teacher candidate to try new ideas
- Communicate expectations
- Be understanding and patient
- Maintain consistency and accountability

Role of the University Supervisor

- Provide a systematic and consistent presence during the student teaching experience
- Provide program information to the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate
- Observe and provide feedback on a regular basis
- Act as a confidant for both the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate
- Be an advocate for the teacher candidate
- Help the team build good communication and facilitate positive interactions
- Set clear expectations; be honest about a student's performance
- Handle the difficult situations that might come up
- Schedule three-way conferences at the beginning and end of the experience
- Be knowledgeable in and supportive of the use of co-teaching strategies

Role of the Teacher Candidate

- Come ready to learn; be enthusiastic and show initiative
- Introduce yourself to team members and school personnel
- Ask questions and discuss professional issues
- Share ideas and work cooperatively; be flexible
- Help with all classroom responsibilities...record keeping, grading, etc.
- Know your content and be a continuous learner
- Plan engaging, standards based lessons
- Know and implement co-teaching strategies
- Accept feedback and put suggestions for improvement into practice
- Be proactive in initiating communication with your triad members
- Demonstrate respectful behaviors
- Be reflective about your practice
- Be patient with yourself and your cooperating teacher
- Be a sponge; learn all you can from everyone in the building
Co-Teaching as Best Practice in Student Teaching

Table Building

- Things you have in common
- 3 most unique things you have in common

Co-Teaching is defined as two teachers (cooperating teacher and teacher candidate) working together with groups of students - sharing the planning, organization, delivery and assessment of instruction as well as the physical space. Both teachers are actively involved and engaged in all aspects of instruction.
**Why Co-Teach?**

- Reduce student/teacher ratio
- Diversity and size of today's classrooms
- Enhance classroom management

**Why Co-Teach?**

- Greater student participation and engagement
- Increase instructional options for all students
- Enhanced collaboration skills

**How is co-teaching the same?**

- One teacher candidate per classroom
- Teacher candidate spends their total time in classroom
- Evaluation forms/student observations
- Both creating lesson plans
- Expectations for state requirements
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How is co-teaching different?

- Support and training for teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, and university mentors
- Structure
- Co-planning
- Permission for cooperating teacher to stay
- Enhanced collaboration and communication
- Focus on differentiation
- Increased opportunities for teacher candidate to bring ideas

Gradual Release of Responsibility in Co-Teaching

Co-Teaching Findings
Cumulative Data

Reading Proficiency

- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
- Compares Co-Taught and Not Co-Taught student teaching settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Classroom</th>
<th>Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Math Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Classroom</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Taught</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Licensed Teacher</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Co-Taught</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Teacher</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Co-Teaching</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 (2 \text{ df}, N=1353) = 12.79, \ p = .002 \]
\[ \chi^2 (2 \text{ df}, N=2241) = 12.54, \ p = .002 \]
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Cumulative Data
Math Proficiency

- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
- Compares Co-Taught and Not Co-Taught student teaching settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Math Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught One Licensed Teacher</th>
<th>One Co-Teaching Candidate</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL 4 Year Cumulative</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Eligible</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible
Eligible
Non Co-Teaching Candidate

7-12 Survey
Cumulative Data 2004-2008

- End of Experience Survey (N=279)

Benefits to Cooperating Teachers

- Cooperating Teachers indicate that Co-Teaching led to:
  - Ability to reach more students, particularly those with high needs (91.5%)
  - Better relationship with their teacher candidate (91%)
  - Experienced professional growth (89.2%)
  - Enhanced energy for teaching (87.8%)
  - Hosting a candidate without giving up my classroom (87.1%)
  - Teacher candidate had a better experience than they would have through with a traditional model (81.7%)
Benefits to Cooperating Teachers
Focus Groups
(N=92)

Additional benefits of Co-Teaching:
- Ability to do projects more successfully
- Class time is more productive
- Modeling and participating in teamwork
- Candidates become competent more quickly

Sharing Responsibilities
Cooperating Teacher
Planning
Teacher Candidate
Teaching
Assessment

Sharing Planning
- What content to teach
- What co-teaching strategies to use
- Who will lead different parts of the lesson
- How to assess student learning
- Materials and resources
**Sharing Instruction**
- Share leadership in the classroom
- Work with all students
- Use a variety of co-teaching approaches
- Be seen as equal partners
- Manage the classroom together
- Make changes as needed during a lesson

**Sharing Assessment**
- Both participate in the assessment of the students
- Share the workload of daily grading
- Provide formative and summative assessment of students
- Jointly determine grades

**The Student Teaching Triad**
Teacher Candidate
Cooperating Teacher
University Supervisor
Communication

What role does each person play?
So . . .

What does this look like?

The Teacher Candidate
- Contribute ideas from the very beginning of the experience
  - Come ready to learn, be enthusiastic and show initiative
  - Ask questions and discuss professional issues
  - Share ideas and work cooperatively
  - Engage with students assisting with their learning from the very first day
  - Help with all classroom responsibilities: record keeping, grading, etc.
  - Know your content and be a continuous learner

Demonstrate competencies as a teacher
- Plan engaging, standards-based lessons
- Evaluate progress and plan appropriate strategies
- Be reflective about your practice
- Have opportunities to teach alone
- Demonstrate respectful behavior
- Be patient with yourself and your cooperating teacher
- Be proactive in initiating communication with your triad members
- Be a sponge, learn all you can from everyone in the building

The Cooperating Teacher
- Help the teacher candidate feel comfortable and welcome
  - Review school policies and procedures
  - Encourage the teacher candidate to get involved in school activities
  - Share materials and ideas
  - Assist the candidate in developing standards-based lessons
- Be reflective and provide constructive feedback
- Know and implement the co-teaching strategies
- Mentor and guide the teacher candidate
- Model effective teaching strategies and professional behavior
- Be flexible, allow the teacher candidate to try new ideas
- Communicate expectations
- Be understanding and patient
- Maintain consistency and accountability
The University Supervisor

- Provide a systematic and consistent presence
  - Provide program information to the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate
  - Observe and provide feedback on a regular basis
- Act as a confidant for both the cooperating teacher and teacher candidate
  - Advise the team to build good communication and facilitate positive interactions
- Set clear expectations; be honest about a student's performance
- Handle the difficult situations that might come up
- Schedule three-way conferences at the beginning and end of the experience
- Be knowledgeable in and supportive of the use of co-teaching strategies

Building Administrator

- Be enthusiastic and show support
- Allow time for planning and collaboration
- Ask questions and discuss professional issues
- Advocate and explain co-teaching to your staff and parents
- Support your co-teaching teams, because sometimes change is hard
- Be that empathetic listener

Co-teaching Team Expectations

- One hour of dedicated planning per week
- Implementation of co-teaching strategies
- Weekly reflective journaling
- Complete End-of-Experience Survey
- Complete all Northwest Missouri State student teaching requirements
Co-Teaching Strategies/Approaches

- One Teach, One Observe
- One Teach, One Assist
- Station Teaching
- Parallel Teaching
- Supplemental Teaching
- Alternative (Differentiated) Teaching
- Team Teaching

One Teach, One Observe

One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other gathers specific observational information on students or the (instructing) teacher.

One Teach, One Assist

One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other assists students with their work, monitors behaviors, or corrects assignments.
**Station Teaching**

The co-teaching pair divide the instructional content into parts. Each teacher instructs one of the groups. Groups then rotate or spend a designated amount of time at each station.

**Parallel Teaching**

In this approach, each teacher instructs half the students. The two teachers are addressing the same instructional material using the same teaching strategies.

**Supplemental Teaching**

This strategy allows one teacher to work with students at their expected grade level, while the other teacher works with those students who need the information and/or materials extended or remediated.
Alternative or Differentiated Teaching

Alternative teaching strategies provide two different approaches to teaching the same information. The learning outcome is the same for all students, however the avenue for getting there is different.

Team Teaching

Well planned, team taught lessons, exhibit an invisible flow of instruction with no prescribed division of authority. Both teachers are actively involved in the lesson. From a student’s perspective, there is no clearly defined leader, as both teachers share the instruction, are free to interject information, and available to assist students and answer questions.

Video Clip

Co-Teaching Strategies
Co-Teaching is not simply dividing the tasks and responsibilities between two people.

Co-Teaching is an attitude of sharing the classroom and students.

Co-Teachers must always be thinking: **We're Both Teaching!**

**Questions?**

What do you think is the biggest hurdle to implementing co-teaching in your school?