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ABSTRACT

Co-Teaching is when two or more licensed educators create and implement lessons together to meet the needs of all students in the classroom (Friend & Cook, 2009). Due to the recent laws passed this decade requiring students with special needs to be incorporated into the general curriculum (NCLB 2004) it is important to properly accommodate those students with special needs. This can be done by using co-teaching in the classroom. This case study illustrates co-teaching in one classroom at an urban high school. The results indicate if co-teaching was conducted properly and which approaches were used in the classroom. From the results, it will illustrate if the classroom used co-teaching properly and how to achieve advanced collaboration in the future.
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CHAPTER I
Introduction and Statement of the Problem

Special education and general education students collaborating in one classroom are referred to as inclusion. One form of inclusion is referred to as co-teaching, which is becoming a norm in the education world today (Walther-Thomas, 1997). The idea of teachers collaborating together ultimately allows the student to benefit and have opportunities for success in the classroom. The literature of Friend and Cook (2009) explains that the concept of co-teaching is two teachers working together to team teach. “Co-teaching involves at least two appropriately credentialed professionals (e.g., a general education teacher and a special education teacher who may be highly qualified only in special education or in special education and a specific content area)” (Friend & Cook, 2009, p. 109).

Murawski and Dieker (2008) delineated how teachers can work well together and offered several cautions: “one of the most common mistakes of co-teaching is that neither educator is willing to loosen the corset and be more flexible in this new relationship” (p. 41). It is important to understand that the purpose of co-teaching is to help the students become more successful in their academic curriculum and work together as educators to help the students absorb the most information possible in a short amount of time.

Many authors in the field of education underscore the work of co-teaching. This is because it is a relatively new idea, which has become semi-popular only in the past decade (Gerber & Popp, 1999). It is becoming a trend in preservice teaching institutions to discuss co-teaching in great detail. Because of this, many future teachers expect that they will one day co-teach in public schools (Stang & Lyons, 2008). Many veteran educators seem to be leery of co-teaching and have reasons why it should not be incorporated into the curriculum. For example,
general education teachers do not feel that they are qualified to teach special education, and intervention specialists feel they are not qualified to teach particular subjects. However, the definition of co-teaching is truly broad and can be used with any combination of educators in one classroom (Blanton & Pugach, 2009). Educators also fear that the addition of special education students adds to an already large number of students in a single classroom (Murwaski & Dieker, 2008).

There are many different ways to approach co-teaching in a classroom. It is important to note that different co-teaching approaches are implemented in a classroom based on the varying needs of particular classrooms and students. These approaches include one teacher leading/one teacher assisting, station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching (Isherwood & Barger-Anderson, 2008). Even though co-teaching is beginning to be accepted in schools, there may be disadvantages, which are heightened in strictly urban settings. “Many barriers can inhibit effective collaboration in high-poverty urban environments. Some barriers stem from broader needs within large, under-funded school districts that serve high numbers of students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds” (Murray, 2004, p. 46). It is a hindrance when the school is large and it is located in a low socioeconomic area. Thus, the urban setting can hinder co-teaching as a successful teaching strategy.

Purpose and Research Question

The main purpose of this research is to examine how different types of co-teaching approaches work in one urban high school setting. This will be done through a qualitative collective intrinsic case study. The case study will analyze teacher understanding of the various approaches to co-teaching, as well as student reaction to the collaboration method of co-teaching.
The researcher is especially interested to observe the classroom dynamics when one special education teacher collaborates with one general education teacher.

**Research Question**

1. How is co-teaching being used in a classroom at River High School?

**Variable**

*Co-Teaching:* The collaboration of two educators teaching in one classroom to assist all students in the classroom. This is done with two licensed professionals planning and implementing a lesson together. (Descriptive Variable).

**Study Context**

The school observed for this research is an urban school in the Midwest, which this study will refer to as “River” High. River High is in a grade nine through twelve building and has been deemed effective by the state. In years past, the school has been rated below effective status. Effective status has been achieved with the help of a grant funded through a local university. This grant is called Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs, or “GEAR UP”. GEAR UP provides the students and staff at River High School with opportunities to aid in their academic and professional development. The main purpose of GEAR UP is to assist the students of River High in graduation requirements and to attend a post-secondary institution. Through this grant, the students are able to work with graduate assistants from the local university, who assist the students with college access, the Ohio Graduation Test, and ACT preparation. The students are also given an opportunity for financial assistance after graduation from GEAR UP funds. The educators at River High who participate in GEAR UP have the opportunity to take graduate level courses from the university, as well as obtain funding for extracurricular and classroom activities.
Significance of Study

In November 2009, the researcher conducted a pilot study in order to understand how the staff at River High School views co-teaching in the classroom. As a result of the pilot study, insight was gained into the knowledge and attitudes of the staff which revealed generally positive attitudes yet little actual implementation of co-teaching. In addition, two teachers were located who currently utilizing co-teaching in their classroom, who agreed to allow the researcher to conduct further, more pointed, research in their urban high school classroom setting. An important element of this research is the diverse urban setting. The researcher believed that the findings would provide an awareness of co-teaching, for the teachers at River High School collaboration with colleagues is a new experience and it may very well open the students’ eyes to diversity in their own school. In this research, it is important to understand that there are many variables involved in co-teaching. In the end, the methodology of co-teaching will not remain foreign to those in the school because the educators will hopefully see their colleagues using valuable different approaches to teaching students with special needs in the classroom. See Appendix A for full Co-Teaching Beliefs Survey.
CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Co-teaching is an approach to teaching where two or more teachers work together to assist students in succeeding in their academics. Friend and Cook (2009) elaborated in their text by stating “co-teaching is where two or more adults in the same room are responsible for the learning of a group of students” (p. 109). It is with this idea that struggling students and/or students who are on an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) can receive assistance for their particular disabilities. Walther-Thomas (1997) stated, “For many students with disabilities, this does not mean separate classes in the same building with their peers. Today, this means full-time participation in general education classrooms with typical peers” (p. 395). Co-teaching is a teaching method that can be implemented in various ways. Co-teaching allows the students, especially those on an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), to meet their goals and accommodations. Incorporating co-teaching into a classroom with special needs students could potentially benefit all students because there are two educators in the classroom working together to meet the needs of all students.

Special education has evolved over the years. Many lawsuits have occurred to ensure that students with special needs are given the most appropriate education possible. Villa et al. (2004) elaborate by stating, “students with disabilities have been forced to file lawsuits in order to receive free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment as guaranteed by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001” (Isherwood & Barger-Anderson, 2008, p. 121). Students who are identified as students with special needs can fall into many different categories such as mild, moderate, and intensive disabilities. These students can be incorporated into the general education classroom in many
ways. They are usually placed in a classroom with a general education teacher and receive services with either small group instruction or an intervention specialist (e.g. Special Education Teacher). Alternatively, the intervention specialist will go into the classroom and participate in co-teaching with the general education teacher (Friend & Cook, 2009). The literature regarding co-teaching has grown over the years. Murawski and Dieker (2008) cited Dr. Lynn Cook and stated “Co-teaching is not simply having two teachers in a classroom with one acting as a glorified paraprofessional or an in-class tutor for one or two students” (p. 41).

Throughout this literature review, the role of special education students and teachers will be explained, as well as what is typical of a special education classroom in an urban setting. The topics addressed will cover special education, special education in urban settings, co-teaching approaches in the classroom, the benefits of co-teaching, and the disadvantages of co-teaching.

Special Education

Integration of students with special needs is necessary in order for students to be successful in their academics. Integration also assists in ensuring that schools comply with the requirements of the IEP. There are many steps in creating a positive co-teaching experience. According to Friend and Cook (2009), there are three steps to successful co-teaching. First, a teacher must view collaboration by carrying out the responsibilities of the job. The second step involves improving communication skills. The third and final step focuses on the interaction processes, namely the interaction of the teachers from the beginning of the lesson to the end. In a typical classroom using a co-teaching approach, both the intervention specialist and the general educator work together teaching all students, with an emphasis on students with special needs. Each approach used in co-teaching allows the educators to accommodate all students and give
the special education population an opportunity to work with their typical peers (Gerber & Popp, 1999).

Response to Intervention (RTI) and Differentiated Instruction (DI) are concepts that many educators use while teaching a wide variety of learners. Hanson (2009) created a manipulative that outlines the importance of RTI and DI. (Hanson broke down the importance of the two approaches in a classroom.) RTI and DI are approaches that are utilized to instruct students in a classroom with a wide range of learners. “RTI and DI are effective for all students but are particularly significant with those populations who have special needs such as a student with a learning disability. RTI and DI hold to the premise that these students can be educated in the general education classroom settings with appropriate support and services” (p. 1). These two approaches merged together are considered an idea of Best Practice because of “addressing classroom diversity within a standards-based curriculum” (Hanson, 2009, p. 3). “The best elements of RTI and DI reflect the best practices that have a direct and positive effect on the teaching/learning environment. When considered in the planning process, these elements have the potential of maximizing instruction for all students, including the struggling learner” (Hanson, 2009, p. 4).

Hanson (2009) continued to explain the definition of Response to Intervention as a “problem solving process which includes the provision of systematic, research-based instruction and interventions to struggling learners” (p. 1). When RTI is used in a classroom of diverse learners an RTI team meets regularly to discuss concerns of students and different types of assessments are used. These assessments include report cards, standardized test results, informal assessments, classroom observations, and behavioral logs (Hanson, 2009).
Hanson (2009) also described DI as an “approach to more effectively address the needs of a wide range of learners by providing multiple pathways in the teaching and learning process” (p. 1). The role of a teacher in a classroom that uses DI and RTI is important; Carol Ann Tomlinson (2001) illustrated this point in her text: “Teachers who become comfortable with differentiated classrooms would probably say their role differs in some significant ways from that of a more traditional teacher. They move away from seeing themselves as keepers and dispensers of knowledge and move toward seeing themselves as organizers of learning opportunities” (p. 16). Hanson (2009) stated that DI is based on the idea that every child in the classroom has the ability to learn if the “instruction is responsive to their needs” (p. 4).

Special Education in Urban Schools

Special education in urban schools tends to segregate students with special needs from the general curriculum. “Our nation’s federal special education law addresses this issue in its definition of the term ‘least restrictive environment.’ In defining this term, the IDEA states that students with disabilities are to be educated in regular education classes to the maximum extent possible” (Morse, 2001, p. 4). Urban schools have a laundry list of problems occurring in their schools. Many factors such as student’s home life, work schedules, socioeconomic status, and other issues affect the student success rate (Voltz, 1998). Voltz continued to explain in his research the challenges in urban education: “Challenges in urban teaching also have been framed in terms of urban school personnel. For example, teacher burnout, high teacher attrition rate, teacher reluctance, and/or unpreparedness to teach in urban areas have been cited as problematic in many urban districts” (p. 212). It is because of the unpreparedness that the urban students are at an even bigger disadvantage in their academics. The U.S. Department of Education explains, “Many schools in high-poverty urban environments serve greater portions of students with
disabilities than do schools in other environments” (Murray, 2004). Students who are in the special education classrooms are at an even greater disadvantage because they may not have the proper amount of accommodations due to lack of funds, number of special education students in the school or classroom, and/or parent involvement (Voltz, 1998). “Special educators have long recognized the necessity of family involvement in children’s education as presented in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. IDEA mandates the inclusion of families of children with disabilities in education programming” (Munn-Joseph & Gavin-Evans, 2008, p. 378). With a nurturing environment students with special needs in the urban schools can excel. Using a co-teaching approach in this environment would be a positive way to make sure that the students’ needs and accommodations are being met.

Deaf Education

Students with special needs all require accommodations and modification in the classroom. Students who communicate nonverbally may also have social implications and in some cases are considered bilingual (McKee, 2008). “Traditionally, deaf/hard of hearing students were educated in segregated settings, separate from their peers . . . Today the number of deaf/hard of hearing children in mainstream schools has increased” (Angelides & Aravi, 2007, p. 64-65).

Kelman and Branco (2009) illustrated how some teachers create a positive environment for their students who are deaf/hard of hearing. “When a teacher bends her knees to stay closer to hear deaf students, helping them with extra explanations, she is showing her desire to promote her students’ understanding” (p. 379). Students who are classified in deaf education do not require more or less work for the deaf education teacher (Janssen M. J., Riksen-Walraven, J. M., Van Dijk, J. P., Ruijssenarrs, W. A., & Vlaskamp, C., 2007). The main difference between a
A deaf education teacher and an intervention specialist for those with cognitive disabilities is simply a difference of the types of goals and accommodations that must take place in the lessons and classroom (McKee, 2008).

Approaches to Co-Teaching

There are many different types of co-teaching approaches that can be used in the classroom. Team teaching is a popular approach where two teachers are doing the same lesson in front of the students and work together with groups of students in the classroom. The two educators can also take on roles such as one teacher leading the lesson and the other assisting the lessons by explaining a topic further and/or giving directions (Nurnberger-Hagg, J., Huziak-Clark, T. L., Van Hook, S. J., & Ballone-Duran, L., 2008). The authors continue to discuss other approaches of co-teaching such as the One Teaching-One Supporting Model, which is “one partner leads while the other partner facilitates individuals/groups”; Station Teaching, which is “one teacher leads one station and another teacher leads another station, and at other stations students work independently; the students rotate through the stations;” and Parallel Teaching, which is, “each partner instructs half the class on the same lesson” (Nurnberger-Hagg et al, 2008, p. 30). All of these approaches show a variety of ways that two educators can work together to assist numerous students during one lesson. It is important to see how these different models work in order to determine which one would fit best in a particular classroom. Many of the approaches such as team teaching, station teaching, and parallel teaching can be used while an intervention specialist is practicing inclusion with the general education teacher. Figure 1 displays a visual of different approaches to co-teaching. When students have a specific learning disability, such as a hearing or seeing impairment, there are some approaches that have proved to accommodate those students with their academic needs. “Diagnostic Intervention Model is used
as a guide for conducting interventions to foster harmonious interactions between children who are deaf-blind and their educators (parents, teachers, and caregivers) in different settings” (Janssen et al., 2007).

Figure 1: Co-Teaching Approaches Model

Benefits of Co-Teaching

Teachers who have participated in co-teaching studies report numerous benefits when one or more teachers are working together in a classroom. These benefits include “increased opportunities for teacher time and attention, elimination of the stigma associated with fixed-ability groups, opportunities for all children to learn the strategies used by effective readers, writers, and learners” (Indrisano, Birmingham, N., Garnick, S., Maresco, D. K, 1999, p. 94). Mastropieri, Scruggs, Garetz, Norland, Gardizi, & McDuffie (2005) identified more benefits of co-teaching in the classroom, including outstanding working relationships, strengths as
motivators, time allocated for co-planning, appropriate curriculum, effective instructional skills, disability-specific teaching adaptations, and expertise in the content area. Mastropieri et al. elaborated on the benefits of two teachers working together: “overall, the notion that general educators provide content knowledge while special educators contribute pedagogical knowledge and learning strategies, as equal partners” (p. 268).

Students without disabilities have also been shown to benefit from co-teaching in their classrooms. Walther-Thomas (1997) illustrates the results of the benefits that general education students reaped because of co-teaching. “Five major benefits were identified for most students in the co-taught classrooms: improved academic performance, more time and attention from teacher, increased emphasis on cognitive strategies and study skills, increased emphasis on social skills, and improved classroom communities” (p. 400). In the same study, Walther-Thomas also stated that both the general education and intervention specialist can benefit from working in a co-taught classroom. “The benefits for general and special education teachers included increased professional satisfaction, opportunities for professional growth, personal support, and increase opportunity for collaboration” (p. 401).

In another study by Murawki and Swanson (2001), the authors identified further benefits from co-teaching, including the sharing of resources, positive interaction together, and shared responsibility. The Munn-Joseph and Gavin-Evans (2008) study, which was conducted in an urban setting, explains the benefits that the parents believed were occurring in their child’s co-taught classroom. One mother was very happy with the attention that she and her child received due to two teachers working with her student. She stated that the two educators in the classroom “pushed for accountability in the education of her children” (p. 386).
Students who are classified as deaf education benefit from co-teaching because it offers them an opportunity to learn from their typical peers. This helps the students who are deaf or hard of hearing in social situations, as well as in reaching their accommodations and modifications in the classroom (McKee, 2008).

Disadvantage of Co-Teaching

When using co-teaching in the classroom some believe that there are many disadvantages and particular co-teaching approaches fail because of lack of knowledge on the academic content. Smith, Frey, and Tollefson (2003) explained in their study, “research has found that critical collaboration principles, which could lead to the implement of adaptive instruction, are often not understood and thus, not integrated into classrooms as frequently as teachers, parents, and students would like” (p. 55). Walther-Thomas (1997) came to the conclusion regarding some disadvantages that co-teaching can bring into the classroom, such as lack of scheduled planning time, lack of student scheduling, caseload concerns, administrative support, and staff development. It is important to note that many of these issues were resolved after the first year and by the third year some problems were non-existent.

A large problem that occurs in a co-taught classroom is the potential of a power struggle between the two educators. “Teachers are often accustomed to being the only expert in their own classroom” (Nurnberger-Hagg, et al., 2008, p. 27). Many teachers feel that if they allow another educator to come into their classroom they will no longer be the teacher in the environment. However, some special educators have expressed feelings that general education teachers use the time of co-teaching to catch up on their own work. Friend and Cook (2009) explained a resolution for a situation such as this:

If a classroom teacher repeatedly leaves the room or withdraws from instruction during co-teaching, the special services provider should approach that person with words like
these: “I’m concerned that I’ve miscommunicated what co-teaching is about.” If the teacher continues to leave the special services provider should alert the teacher that a problem-solving secession is needed (p. 121).

As this quote states, if the intervention specialist approaches situations such as these in a mature and compromising way, then the conflict should be resolved. The approaches, ideas, benefits, and awareness of disadvantages will students with special needs accomplish their academic goals (Friend & Cook, 2009).

Summary

The topics discussed in this literature review help to understand themes that can occur in a co-taught classroom. Different co-teaching approaches help educators set up their classroom environment and help to create well-managed lessons involving both educators. It is important to understand the benefits and disadvantages that can occur when two teachers begin teaching in one classroom, as well as keeping in mind how the students will best benefit from the arrangement.
CHAPTER III

Research Design and Methods

This study was designed to examine how a co-teaching approach works in one urban high school setting. This study also investigated how staff beliefs and knowledge impacted staff opinions. Methodology included a pilot survey that was conducted in the beginning of the school year. Research indicates that co-teaching is beneficial for both the special education and general education students if done correctly. For co-teaching to be successful, the educators working together must have a positive working relationship, as well as an established co-teaching approach. Research question asked was answered based on the classroom observations as well as the semi-structured interview. The research question that will be discussed is:

1. How is co-teaching being used in the classroom at River High School?

Research Design and Methodology

While conducting the research on co-teaching in an urban setting, a qualitative case study design was implemented. Deciding upon the type of case study design was based on whether “it [was] prudent to conduct a single case study or if a better understanding of the phenomenon [would] be gained through conducting a multiple case study” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 550). Glesne described Glaser’s (1978) method of case studies as “the need to focus on the concepts and processes relevant to the study. Places, people, and their interactions are constantly changing, but concepts and processes have duration and are the building blocks to developing theory” (p. 166). For this particular research, the case identified is one classroom with two educators: a general education teacher and intervention specialist. Further, the case study design is considered instrumental because the researcher is using the case as a vehicle to investigate the topic of interest which is approaches to co-teaching being used in urban high school classrooms.
Sampling Method and Sample

Qualitative Participants

To be involved in this study, two inclusion criteria existed: 1) participants must teach full-time at River High School, and 2) participants need to currently participate in some form of co-teaching. Only two educators, who fit the inclusion criteria, volunteered to be observed in their co-teaching environment. The general education teacher was a Caucasian male who taught ninth and tenth grade science. An intervention specialist that volunteered to be observed was a Caucasian female who worked with the students with hearing impairments and taught all subjects across the curriculum. The interpreter and student teacher were involved in this research because of their presence in the room. While the interpreter was included in the interview she was not included in the observation data. Use of an interpreter to collect data was used to illustrate the environment of the co-taught classroom. This was to help illustrate how co-teaching occurred in the classroom by two active participants working with the students full time.

Instrumentation and Procedures

Research began during a planning phase by exploring and reviewing the available research. During this initial phase, the researcher collected data through a staff survey designed to determine teacher knowledge of co-teaching at River High School. After the initial pilot data were reviewed, teachers who agreed to interviews and observations were selected. While developing the research questions, the literature was reviewed to clarify terms, different approaches of co-teaching, and current trends in special education and urban education. It is also during this first phase that the Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) application at Bowling Green State University was filed and approved to proceed with the research at River High School.
During this research, the different approaches of co-teaching in the classroom are displayed. Observations also provide an inside look into one classroom that is practicing co-teaching with a general education teacher and an intervention specialist. The pilot study, which was conducted for a master’s level research class, included a survey where teachers at River High School were asked basic, non-threatening questions to ascertain the teachers’ understanding of the definition of co-teaching and co-teaching approaches. These data were used in this research to help understand the context and setting of the school in which this case study was conducted.

Observation

The instrument used to conduct the observations was an observation protocol, a design that was titled, “Co-Teaching Collaboration Scale.” This scale rated the level of teacher collaboration on the lesson that was being taught. Levels included minor collaboration (1), moderate collaboration (2), advanced collaboration (3), and not applicable. There was also space for the researcher to write comments about the observed lesson. Minor, moderate, and advanced collaboration was rated if the collaborating teachers did not attempt to meet the said criteria. Such as, educators moved freely about the room; if both educators did not circulate the room to work with each student they would be rated minor collaboration; if one of the educators circulated around the room to work with all students they would be rated moderate collaboration; and lastly, if both educators circulated around the room they would be rated advanced collaboration. Over the course of three weeks, eight observations were made. The researcher collected the data by sitting in the back of the classroom and following the co-teaching collaboration scale. Involvement of the researcher was not implemented into the lessons and was
only in the room to observe the educators interactions in regards to co-teaching the lesson. See Appendix B for the full observation protocol.

**Interview**

The educators in the classroom being observed agreed to participate in a semi-structured interview based on their experience with co-teaching, their approach to co-teaching, how the lesson was planned, and the benefits and disadvantages of co-teaching. In semi-structured interviews, “the researcher asks several base questions but also has the option of following up a given response with an alternative, optional questions, that may or may not be used by the researcher depending on the situation” (Mertler, 2009, p. 110). In the observed classroom, there was an interpreter present who worked with the special education students in their classroom and a student teacher who had spent the year with the special education teacher. These two additional individuals also agreed to be interviewed in a semi-structured interview on the co-teaching approach being utilized, the benefits and disadvantages of co-teaching, and their prior knowledge of co-teaching approaches. Each interviewee was interviewed one time during the three week observation period. The interviews were conducted in the teachers’ classroom during a planning period. All of the interviews conducted took less than thirty minutes, consisted of approximately twenty questions, were tape recorded, and took place one-on-one. See Appendix C for interview questions.

**Setting, Population, and Phenomenon**

The setting that was chosen was a large urban high school in Northwest Ohio. Previous research had already been conducted with the teachers at this high school to obtain their beliefs and knowledge regarding co-teaching. Forty-one educators (special education and regular education) at this high school that participated in the pilot survey results indicated that while a
favorable impression of co-teaching exists in general for both regular education and special education students and teachers, there is a lack the knowledge necessary to effectively incorporate co-teaching into classrooms. On a positive note, more teachers agreed that co-teaching lesson plans should be created collaboratively 58.5% \((n = 59)\) rather than solely by the general education teacher \((39.0\%; n = 39)\). Further, 41.5% \((n = 42)\) agreed that there are opportunities to teach with other educators in the school and 48.8% \((n = 49)\) agree that co-teaching would make their job as a teacher easier overall. Appendix D displays the full results of this pilot survey illustrating the overall feelings in this school toward co-teaching.

Data Analysis

The method that will be used to analyze this data will be assertions, codes, and warrants to create a narrative analysis. Assertions are comparable to a definition or statement of the term that is being used, such as “co-teaching.” Codes are how the researcher uses evidence to enhance the assertion made. Lastly, warrants are the narrative that describes how the assertion and code are important to the research (Erickson, 1986). Open coding is used to help tag what is useful to the study, axial coding relates the categories together, and selective coding develops the hypothesis (Merrian, 2009). The researcher used the observation protocol to rate each observed day on the level of collaboration.

The researcher first began by comparing the interview responses of each interviewee. To begin, three codes were chosen: co-teaching beliefs, co-teaching approaches, and positive working relationship of educators in the building. This was done to help organize the thoughts of the interviewees compared to the literature and co-teaching collaboration scale. This was then written in narrative form to illustrate the co-teaching that took place in the classroom.
Observations were analyzed by calculating an average for each criteria on the co-teaching collaboration scale. The results were then compared and graphed using Microsoft Excel.

Researcher’s Role and Limitations

**Limitations**

Limitations of this study were primarily due to the researcher’s role in the school. By using data triangulation methods—multiple sources to collect data (Merriam, 2009)—this limitation is lessened. The data sources include classroom observations, observation notes, and interviews with educators in the classroom to assist in the interpretation of results. Another limitation with this study is the lack of external generalizability because only one school is being used. As such, one cannot generalize the results to other schools beyond those in similar demographics (urban, high schools).

**Researcher’s Role**

The researcher’s role in this study was that of observer and interviewer. This is considered a typical role in the different forms of research methods that were used. Stringer (1999) stated “The role of the researcher is not that of an expert who does research, but that of a resource person” (p. 25). The researcher acquired a bachelor’s degree in moderate to intensive special education from in May 2009, as well a teaching license in the areas of moderate to intensive intervention services, along with the reading endorsement. After graduation, the researcher immediately began her Masters of Education in Curriculum and Teaching. In the past, the researcher has worked with children and adults with a wide range of disabilities. Involvement in GEAR UP allowed the researcher to be in the school all year working with the students.

Because the researcher was in the school all year and developed a working relationship with the educators at the school this could result in a bias of the interpretation of the data. Biases
were minimized by allowing the educators to be involved in the purpose of the research and by keeping the researcher’s opinions of co-teaching private.

*Trustworthiness Features*

While researching this topic, it is understood that the idea of co-teaching is new in this particular school and not necessarily accepted in many classrooms. The researcher kept opinions of co-teaching to herself and let the teachers express their opinions of the controversial topic in a safe environment. This enables the researcher to provide recommendations on accommodations and modifications for all learners at River High School. To accomplish, the researcher used thick descriptions of the classroom observations, maintained an observation journal, and explained thoroughly to those being observed the purpose of the research.
CHAPTER IV

Data Analysis

This research study was designed to understand how co-teaching worked in one classroom at River High School. Data were also collected by observations and interviews of those involved in one science classroom at River High School. Eight observations took place over a three-week period. Each observation was rated on the amount of co-teaching collaboration and assigned a score of “minor,” “moderate,” or “advanced” collaboration. The educators in the classroom participated in interviews with the researcher on the topic of co-teaching. The educators included the general education teacher, the intervention specialist, the interpreter, and the student teacher. Each interviewee was asked the same questions. Because of the semi-structured interview, questions were deleted and added due to the role each interviewee played in the classroom. This triangular data collection was compared and analyzed for common relationships of co-teaching.

Results

Data collected over the course of this study were analyzed in several different ways in order to understand how co-teaching occurred in this one classroom. Classroom observations and interviews were first analyzed separately. Classroom observations were analyzed to investigate the elements of co-teaching in the classroom. Interviews were analyzed using assertions and codes to understand the themes of co-teaching in the classroom. After observations and interviews were analyzed individually, they were compared to investigate how co-teaching takes place in the classroom. Observation data were graphed with the averages of the eight days of observation, as well as each individual observation day.

Observation Findings
After analyzing the observation protocols separately, results showed that minor collaboration was present in that both educators took responsibility for instructional delivery, three out of the eight days observed. There was moderate collaboration in the areas of evidence that a co-teaching approach was being used, five out of eight days observed, and co-teachers appeared to work collaboratively together in the planning and preparation of the lesson, six out of eight days observed. Advanced collaboration was noted in the areas of both educators moved about freely in the classroom, five out of eight days observed both educators taking responsibility for instructional delivery, three out of eight days observed, the physical environment did not segregate special education students, eight out of eight days observed, both teachers worked with all students during the lesson, seven out of eight days observed, both teachers were responsible for classroom management, seven out of eight days observed, students appeared to view co-teachers as equals in the class, eight out of eight days observed, and modifications for special education students are present in the classroom and are the responsibility of both educators, six out of eight days observed.

Each day observed was rated based using the Co-teaching Collaboration Scale based on the literature researched (Friend & Cook, 2009). Figure 6 shows that on the first day of observation the educators showed advanced observation in five out of the ten areas of collaboration. The educators showed moderate collaboration in four out of ten areas of collaboration. There was no indication of minor collaboration and one out of ten areas was not applicable. The average of the classroom observations and observation day one are displayed in Figures 2-3. The Co-teaching Collaboration Scare Regarding Observations is displayed in Appendix E and observation days two through eight are displayed in Appendix F.
Figure 2: Co-Teaching Observation Averages

![Co-Teaching Observation Averages](image)

Figure 3: Co-Teaching Observation Day One

![Observation Day One](image)
Interview Findings

After analyzing the interview responses separately, results showed many common themes of co-teaching in the classroom. The analyzed data illustrated that the co-taught classroom was running smoothly, and both educators were willing to learn new approaches of co-teaching for future use. Three main topics expressed in the interview process were how co-teaching came about in this particular situation and the beliefs that the teachers had regarding co-teaching. The educators co-teaching, student teacher, and interpreter painted a picture of the classroom throughout the year. Educators were asked to elaborate on their lesson planning process, teacher prep time, and approaches of co-teaching used in the classroom. The interpreter was used to give a view of how co-teaching took place in the classroom as another adult in the room who had the student’s best interests in mind. Three main themes expressed in the interview process were: 1) how co-teaching came about in this particular situation and the beliefs that the teachers had regarding co-teaching, 2) the co-teaching approach(s) being used in the classroom, and 3) the benefits of a positive working relationship of the educators in the classroom regarding planning and student success.

Co-Teaching Beliefs

The educators’ beliefs of co-teaching play a major role on how the classroom is run. When asked how the idea of co-teaching came about the special education teacher stated, “I approached the administration. Usually I approach the teacher first because not all teachers like to work with other teachers. When they assigned me with Mr. Jones I was nervous because I didn’t know him, but it turned out to be really good.” The general education teacher agreed that the special education teacher took the reins in collaboration. “She kind of gave me a jumping off point and I kind of pick and choose what the intern program wants” (Mr. Jones, General
Education Teacher). Both teachers participate in co-teaching each day in the first hour of the school day. The interpreter in the classroom explained her former co-teaching experiences as follows, “Besides this classroom, in science I have been in an elementary school that does co-teaching with the math teacher who has a full classroom and then the deaf education teacher comes over and has like five students and so she works with them while the other teacher works with the other students, but they kind of work together” (Interpreter).

When asked how co-teaching has made them more successful teachers, both educators believed that they benefited from collaborating with each other.

She has the experience so I feel like you get a break in the monotony because there are two people bouncing ideas off each other and that helps the students a lot overall because I might have some flaws and she might have some flaws but if we help each other figure out of the flaws we can have an pretty perfect lesson and work out the kinks between two people and I think you really see some variety in your lessons and the students benefit immensely from that (General education teacher).

Supporting this notion of co-teaching making them more successful teachers, the special education teacher indicated that “The work load is also easier which is a plus and it gives me an opportunity to interact with hearing peers”. The student teacher also benefited from her experience in this collaboration, “I think that it is great that I have this experience” (Student Teacher).

The general education teacher expressed how he would like to change the co-teaching experience in the future. “Just the fluidity on how we deliver some of the lessons. Also we have finally found our comfort zone with each other so now I know what she is better at explaining and we will want to incorporate her skills into the future where they weren’t this year and vice versa to really keep the kids interested” (General education teacher). Overall, all of the educators who were observed and interviewed believed that co-teaching was positive in this environment. “I’d say I have a positive opinion about it and I tell people give it a shot I don’t care if you have
been teaching for 25 years or 0 years just give it a shot” (General education teacher). The interpreter also felt the learning environment was positive for the students: “I think for our students it really helps because if they miss something and the teacher is continuing the deaf education teacher can step in and help that student. That way they don’t miss anything and they can still keep up with the hearing kids and they don’t fall behind” (Interpreter). Further, the student teacher saw advantages as she believed “there are more benefits than disadvantages with it. The students and teachers they just have more of a variety and diversity in everything that they do. Two minds are better than one. There is more creativity and different ideas so make it more versatile so I think it is a really great way to teach”.

**Co-Teaching Approach in the Classroom**

In this classroom, the teachers employed the “one teacher leading and the other assisting” approach; however, it was not as structured as the literature described. The general education teacher stated:

I think that we do a lot of me leading the classroom and she jumps in and assists me and we will group the kids up a lot and she works with groups that have the deaf education students and keep on them and I work on the other students in the classroom. She will circle around though and go from group to group. But whenever I start something she always is great with giving her input and ideas.

The special education teacher’s view on the approach being used was illustrated when she stated, “I just think that we do whatever feels natural. I think that one day I’ll be in the back or walking around. So I don’t think we follow a model we just do what comes naturally and I think that is what a good teacher will do when you are teaching effectively.

Both educators also stated that they would like to learn and implement other approaches in a future co-taught classroom. “We have talked about if stuff works out where I’m here next year and she’s here next year that she wants to bring more hearing impaired students into my
classroom. . . . I think six of them and work with me. So yah I would be very interested for professional development or just reading stuff provided for me over the summer” (General education teacher).

Positive Working Relationship of Educators Co-Teaching

With regard to working collaboratively, the general education teacher stated, “There is usually a day during the week where I have an in-class assignment for the kids to do and because this class is a little bit smaller and so well behaved we sit up there and take time to talk and say this is what I want to cover next week and I usually try to have my lessons done by Thursday or Friday for the next week and ask her what she thinks and usually she will say that interests me maybe I can chip in on that or maybe I can make a PowerPoint for that specific section she is comfortable with and we will kind of do it that route. I’ll give her the general idea and then she will say let’s do this or this might be cool or a teacher I worked with in the past did this and that’s how we kind of put our heads together and do things together.” Adding to the way they plan, the special education teacher explained, “He has to follow the PACING guide. He will tell me what is coming up and if it is something I really like I’ll ask him if I can teach”.

Students who learn in a classroom that is co-taught have opportunities to be successful whether they are the regular education or special education students. “The one thing that makes it easier for me to answer questions because you know she knows what I expect because there is a rubric that she has seen or has a copy of, but that is the one thing that kids like to know because they can get that instant gratification” (General education teacher). Further, special education students “just have more access to things that I can’t provide for them and I think that’s why they are successful. Also there is a little more pressure when they (special education students) are in the mainstream classrooms to work really hard. When they come into my classroom it is really
laid back and comfortable and I want everyone to feel happy and comfortable in here, but sometimes the kids will get too comfortable” (Special education teacher). The different aspects of the interview showed the positive relationships that occur in the co-taught classroom.

**Discussion of Results**

This research study was designed to examine how co-teaching is displayed in one urban high school setting. This study also investigated the beliefs and knowledge of co-teaching at River High School. Based on the results from this study, it is determined that the educators at River High School have an understanding of co-teaching in a classroom. The observation protocol data also determined that co-teaching is present at River High School. The co-teaching that took place in the observed classroom showed a positive working relationship between the educators’ use of a co-teaching approach, and modifications for the students with special needs were present. Data from the observation protocol displayed six out of ten categories as advanced collaboration in the classroom.

The data sources determined that co-teaching is positive for the students involved if done properly and the educators in the room displayed equal roles in teaching the co-taught lesson. 75% of the observations showed proper modifications for the students with special needs. The modifications were the responsibility of both teachers in the classroom. Additionally, the interviews displayed the teachers’ understanding that they must have a positive working relationship for co-teaching to be successful.

**Summary**

This research study was conducted to examine how co-teaching occurs in one urban classroom. Also, this study investigated the baseline knowledge of co-teaching at River High School. Based data collected, collaboration was present at River High School and was properly
implemented in the classroom observed. The results of the data displayed a relationship between the interactions of the co-teaching educators and the success of the students. Overall, the educators are using advanced collaboration skills in their classroom with the special education and general education students. However, the educators in the room need to understand how to properly execute co-teaching. The teachers can use the revised Co-teaching Collaboration Scale to understand how to reach advanced collaboration in their co-taught lessons. See Appendix G for revised Co-teaching Collaboration Scale (Friend & Cook, 2009).
CHAPTER V

Conclusion, Implications, and Recommendations

Integration of students with special needs into the general education classroom is the ultimate goal of co-teaching. In order to include students with special needs in the classroom, accommodations and modifications must be made. The use of an intervention specialist can make this possible. However, when the intervention specialist and the general education teacher collaborate, all students in the classroom benefit (Mastropieri, et al, 2005).

Summary

The main purpose of this research was to examine how different types of co-teaching approaches work in one urban high school setting. Understanding how co-teaching worked in this classroom was the ultimate goal of this study. The beliefs and prior knowledge of the educator’s views of co-teaching are necessary to figure out if the co-taught classroom was successful. All of the prior knowledge of co-teaching was understood by the optional survey in the pilot study. This study found that advanced collaboration was present in the classroom. In addition, the staff has a clear belief that co-teaching is positive for all involved. The two types of data collected for this study and survey results from a previous study of this school displayed co-teaching to be possible at River High School.

Integration of special education and general education classrooms gives students the opportunity to reach their full potential (Friend & Cook, 2009). In addition, students are able to experience a different level of diversity (Walther-Thomas, 2008). Many special education students face problems meeting the state curriculum standards, but by being incorporated into the general education classroom, with the presence of an intervention specialist, these standards may be met (Friend & Cook, 2009).
The pilot study showed that the educators at the River High School agreed overall that the idea of co-teaching in their school would be a positive. Of the survey responses, “Agree” was selected by the participants more than any other answer. The lowest percentage was in the Strongly Disagree category, which shows that the majority of the educators at the school do not reluctant to use co-teaching in their classrooms. Some participants noted that they agree with the survey and co-teaching being positive only if they were co-teaching with another educator that they felt worked well with their personality and teaching styles, otherwise it had the potential to be a very negative experience. The “Not Applicable” also had a low response rate, which shows that there is a basic understanding of what co-teaching is and how it can be effective.

Overall, this survey showed that the educators at River High school believe that co-teaching is beneficial and can aid in the learning of all students in the classroom. This illustrates that the educators have a basic knowledge of co-teaching in their classrooms; however the teachers in the room need to understand how to properly execute co-teaching in their future classroom. This can be done by properly planning lessons together and defining the roles of each educator during the lesson. While many of them do not practice co-teaching, they seem to be willing to explore the idea and possibly use it in their classroom in the future. The diversity of the age of those who took the survey, based on their years teaching, suggests that co-teaching can be accepted even by those who have been an educator before co-teaching was practiced in the classrooms. It is because of this survey that the researcher believes co-teaching can be successful in this particular school. Overall, the educators are willing and open to allowing another teacher, such as a special education teacher, into their classroom. The educators are willing to collaborate, not only in lesson planning, but in the teaching of students in both regular and special education.
The findings in this study showed many commonalities with previous literature. For example, the educators at River High school believe that co-teaching would not be successful if the two teachers did not work well together or if they lack time in the day to plan together (Walther-Thomas, 1997). When planning a lesson, the two educators in this study plan occasionally and display a well working professional relationship. It is imperative that the teachers find time in their day to plan the lesson and define the roles of each educator. Other findings confirmed that both special education students and general education students benefited from the presence of two teachers in the classroom. Indrisano et al. (1999) concluded that teachers who are co-teaching should plan the lessons together, but it is usually the general education teacher who creates the lesson and the special education teacher assists. This finding is also discussed by Isherwood and Barger-Anderson (2008), in which the authors explained that special education teachers have a lack of content knowledge. As a result, planning the lesson together is more time consuming because the general education teacher has to teach the material to the special education teacher. While it is more challenging to plan together, the teachers who co-taught at River High School did find time to work together in planning when they could.

This study also found that after eight days of observations over the course of three weeks, the general education science teacher and the deaf education intervention specialist were successful in their attempts to co-teach. The Co-Teaching Collaboration Scale allowed the lessons to be rated on a scale of one to three. The number one representing minor collaboration, the number two represents moderate collaboration, and the number three representing advanced collaboration. Overall, the educators being observed need to educate themselves on co-teaching to successfully plan lessons together and implement the lessons with the proper co-teaching.
Conclusion and Implications

Based on the classroom observations and interviews of the educators being observed, the opportunity to implement co-teaching into the curriculum is possible as long as willing participants choose to do so. Co-teaching will be successful in the future once the educators in the room implement a procedure to planning each lesson and create defined roles for each educator during the lessons. However, co-teaching cannot be successful if there is a power struggle between the two educators (Nurnberger-Hagg, J et al., 2008). In the classroom observed, it is plain to see that the relationship between the general education and special education teacher is positive and makes the co-taught classroom successful. It is important for all students in the classroom to view each educator in the room as an equal. This is necessary to determine if the proper co-teaching approach being used during the lesson (Smith et al., 2003). Data from this study did not show the students’ beliefs and opinions of two teachers in the same classroom at the same time. However, based on research observation, all of the students appeared to treat the two educators as equals. At least there were no blatant acts of disrespect or unequal treatment from the students to any of the teachers in the classroom observed.

The co-teaching approach primarily used was one teacher leading/one teacher assisting. This was successful for these teachers in this classroom, but could be modified, however, by the teachers changing who leads and who assists as well as more equal and defined roles during the lesson. A combination of different approaches can be used on different days (Janssen et al., 2007). Allowing the intervention specialist to lead part of the lesson and/or taking the lead in planning more of the lessons would have shown a true sharing of educator responsibility.

Overall, the general education teacher did all of the planning, as stated in the interviews by both educators; however, the special education teacher was given opportunities throughout
the year to plan lessons and teach them to the class as a whole. Making time outside of the classroom allows each educator to know their role in each lesson (Friend & Cook, 2009). One conclusion that can be drawn about the teachers in this school in general is that they have an understanding of how co-teaching operates, or at least how it operates best for them with their personalities and in their specific situation.

River High School teachers are willing to co-teach if the opportunity presents itself. The staff surveyed, 53.7%, believe that co-teaching is positive for the special education students in the classroom and 48.8% believe that co-teaching is positive for the general education students in the classroom. Another conclusion that can be drawn from the classroom observations is that the classroom observed used co-teaching methods in many aspects of the co-taught classroom; such as the positive working relationship, the use of a co-teaching approach, and the equal accommodations and modifications for all students in the classroom. By understanding that co-teaching is beneficial for all students in the building it would be positive to implement more co-teaching into other classrooms throughout the building.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Co-Teachers

The classroom observed showed many positive features of a co-taught classroom. According to the research, one of the biggest hurdles in co-teaching is the educators’ relationship and style of teaching. Educators that were being observed worked very well together and portrayed a perfect working relationship while co-teaching together. Integration of students with special needs into the classroom seemed to be positive for all present in the classroom. In the future, teachers should work with each other regarding the lesson planning process. The two educators should make time each week and/or day to plan lessons that will take place when they
are co-teaching. By doing this, both educators will have equal roles in the classroom and will be better equipped to teach the lesson. Along with lesson planning, the two educators should learn other co-teaching approaches (e.g., one teach/one assist, parallel teaching, team teaching, and/or station teaching). By doing this, the students may be more engaged in the lesson and understand the educators’ roles in each lesson. This will also help with the fluidity of the lesson and the classroom activities. The teachers should use the revised co-teaching collaboration scale to understand how to achieve advanced collaboration in the future.

**Recommendations for Staff**

The staff at River High School should continue to educate themselves on the research and approaches to co-teaching. This will help the staff if they are asked to use co-teaching in the future. This will also help the staff at River High School to be more aware of the benefits that co-teaching can provide their students, both those on IEPs and those in general education. It is important to understand the time commitment that co-teaching requires if co-teaching is implemented into more classrooms in the future.

**Recommendations for Administration**

Providing the staff at River High School with professional development regarding co-teaching would be beneficial for the staff to understand how to approach co-teaching, as well as to understand the benefits that co-teaching provides all students in the building. Administration should take advantage of educators who are willing to use co-teaching in their classroom and aid in the lesson planning process by allowing the educators involved the time to plan together.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

Because aspects of advanced collaboration were used in one classroom at River High School, further research is suggested in other classrooms and/or the use of specific co-teaching
approaches. It would be interesting to see which approaches are best suited for the urban environment. Due to the time constraint for the present study, it would be beneficial to research a classroom for the course of an entire school year to see the longitudinal effects that co-teaching has on the special education and general education students in the classroom at River High School.

Summary

The integration of special education students into the general education classroom will continue to grow and the collaboration of intervention specialists and general education teachers will make the process easier for all involved. It is important to understand the different approaches so that the proper approach is chosen based on the needs of the students in the classroom. According to research, co-teaching can be beneficial for all students in the classroom and this study shows that if the educators working together have a positive working relationship and plan and implement lessons together it is possible for the special education students to be in the general education classroom while all their goals and accommodations are being met. This study illustrates that this one classroom is evidence that co-teaching can be positive in the urban environment.
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Appendix A

Co-Teaching Beliefs Survey
Co-Teaching Beliefs Survey

Co-Teaching is defined as an approach to program delivery where two or more teachers (general and special education teachers) share teaching responsibilities within a general education classroom.

Co-Teaching Beliefs

SD = Strongly Disagree  D = Disagree  A = Agree  SA = Strongly Agree

Circle All That Apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
<th>Not Applicable (NA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Co-Teaching provides a positive learning environment for all students in the classroom.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Co-Teaching provides a positive learning environment for the regular education students in the classroom.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Co-Teaching is positive for the general education teachers.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Co-Teaching is positive for the Special Education Teachers.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my experience, co-teaching means both teachers create lessons together.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my experience, co-teaching means the general education teacher creates the lesson and the special education teacher assists.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like to interact with other teachers during the school day.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like to collaborate with other teachers while instructing the students.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There are many opportunities to teach other educators in this school.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I believe that co-teaching makes my job as a teacher easier.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, how often do you co-teach in the school you are in?
Never  At least once a week  At least once a month  At least once a quarter  At least once a year

**Grade Level Taught:**  9  10  11  12

**Subject Area:**  Math  Science  Social Studies  Reading  English  Special Education  Other ________________

**Gender:**  Male  Female

**How Long Have You Been Teaching:**  ______ Years
Appendix B

Observation Protocol
Co-Teaching Collaboration Scale

The observer will circle the number that best corresponds with his/her viewpoint. The rating scale is non-evaluative and is meant to provide feedback to the co-teachers. Scores will be reviewed by the researcher and strategies for improvement will be discussed.

1: Minor Collaboration    2: Moderate Collaboration    3. Advanced Collaborative

1. Both co-teachers moved around the room freely.  1 2 3 N/A

2. Both teachers took responsibility for instructional delivery.  1 2 3 N/A

3. There was evidence that a co-teaching approach was utilized.  1 2 3 N/A

4. The physical arrangement did not segregate special ed students.  1 2 3 N/A

5. Both teachers worked with all students during the lesson.  1 2 3 N/A

6. Both teachers were responsible for classroom management.  1 2 3 N/A

7. Students appear to view co-teachers as equals in the class.  1 2 3 N/A

8. Modifications for special education students are present in the classroom and are the responsibility of both teachers.  1 2 3 N/A
9. Co-teachers appeared to work collaboratively together in the planning and preparation for the lesson.  

   1  2  3  N/A

10. The co-teachers utilized adaptive assessment techniques that were appropriate for the special education students.  

   1  2  3  N/A
Appendix C

Interview Questions
Interview Questions

1. How many students on an Individualized Education Plan do you come in contact with on a daily basis?

2. How many regular education students do you come in contact with on a daily basis?

3. How did the idea to co-teach with another educator in the school take place?

4. In what ways did you as an educator plan this lesson?
   a. Did you plan it with the other educator or by yourself?

5. How often do you co-teaching during each quarter?

6. Do you co-teach with the same educator or different educators throughout the year?

7. What method of co-teaching do you prefer to use when working with another teacher in the classroom?

8. How familiar are you with the different types of co-teaching models?

9. Are you interested in using other co-teaching models in the future?

10. How do you think the students respond to two teachers teaching in the classroom together?
11. Do you think that the students with disabilities benefit by having two teachers in the classroom?

12. What are the benefits of co-teaching this lesson as opposed to teaching it alone?

13. What are the disadvantages of co-teaching this lesson as opposed to teaching it alone?

14. How do you feel co-teaching has made you a more successful teacher?

15. Give some reasons that you believe co-teaching works for you and your students.

16. Give some reasons that you believe co-teaching does not work for you and your students.

17. Will you use co-teaching in the future?

18. What will you change if you were to co-teach in the future?

19. What will you keep the same if you were to co-teach in the future?

20. Overall what is your opinion on Co-teaching that you have not already mentioned?
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Co-Teaching Beliefs Survey Results
## Co-Teaching Beliefs Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
<th>Not Applicable (NA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Co-Teaching provides a positive learning environment for the special education students in the classroom.</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
<td>22 (53.7%)</td>
<td>11 (26.8%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Co-Teaching provides a positive learning environment for the regular education students in the classroom.</td>
<td>2 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
<td>22 (53.7%)</td>
<td>10 (24.4%)</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Co-Teaching is positive for the general education teachers.</td>
<td>2 (4.9%)</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
<td>20 (48.8%)</td>
<td>10 (24.4%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Co-Teaching is positive for the Special Education Teachers.</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
<td>21 (51.2%)</td>
<td>11 (26.8%)</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my experience, co-teaching means both teachers create lessons together.</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>24 (58.5%)</td>
<td>5 (12.2%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my experience, co-teaching means the general education teacher creates the lesson and the special education teacher assists.</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
<td>12 (29.3%)</td>
<td>16 (39.0)</td>
<td>2 (4.9%)</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like to collaborate with other teachers when designing curriculum.</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
<td>23 (56.1%)</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like to collaborate with other teachers while instructing the students.</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
<td>24 (58.5%)</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There are opportunities to teach with other educators in this school.</td>
<td>2 (4.9%)</td>
<td>14 (34.1%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
<td>5 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I believe that co-teaching makes or would make my job as a teacher easier.</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
<td>9 (22.0%)</td>
<td>20 (48.8%)</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Co-Teaching Collaboration Scale Regarding Observation
# Co-Teaching Collaboration Scale Regarding Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Collaboration</th>
<th>Moderate Collaboration</th>
<th>Advanced Collaboration</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days</td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
<td>Number of Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both co-teachers moved around the room freely.</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both teachers took responsibility for instructional delivery.</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was evidence that a co-teaching approach was utilized.</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical arrangement did not segregate special education students.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both teachers worked with all students during the lesson.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both teachers were responsible for classroom management.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students appear to view co-teachers as equals in the class.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications for special education students are present in the classroom and are the responsibility of both teachers.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teachers appeared to work collaboratively together in the planning and preparation for the lesson.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The co-teachers utilized adaptive assessment techniques that were appropriate for the special education students.</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Revised Co-Teaching Collaboration Scale
Co-Teaching Collaboration Scale

The observer will circle the number that best corresponds with his/her viewpoint. The rating scale is non-evaluative and is meant to provide feedback to the co-teachers. Scores will be reviewed by the researcher and strategies for improvement will be discussed.

1: Minor Collaboration  2: Moderate Collaboration  3. Advanced Collaborative

**Minor Collaboration:** Little or no aspects of statement were illustrated in the classroom

**Moderate Collaboration:** One of the teachers illustrated this statement in the classroom and/or was only illustrated for part of the lesson

**Advanced Collaboration:** Both teachers illustrated the statement from the beginning to the end of the lesson.

1. *Both co-teachers moved around the room freely.*
   
   1  2  3  N/A

   **Minor Collaboration:** Both teachers were stationed in one place and did not move about the room

   **Moderate Collaboration:** One teacher moved about the classroom and/or teachers moved about the room for part of the lesson

   **Advanced Collaboration:** Both teachers moved about the room from the beginning of the lesson to the end of the lesson

2. *Both teachers took responsibility for instructional delivery.*
   
   1  2  3  N/A

   **Minor Collaboration:** One teacher took responsibility for instructional delivery and the other was not prepared for the content that was being taught

   **Moderate Collaboration:** One teacher took responsibility to delivery while the other seemed knowledgeable, but did not deliver during the instruction

   **Advanced Collaboration:** Both teachers were well versed on the content and equally delivered the content of the lesson.

3. *There was evidence that a co-teaching approach was utilized.*
   
   1  2  3  N/A

   **Minor Collaboration:** No co-teaching approach was used.

   **Moderate Collaboration:** Aspects of a co-teaching approach was used but was not displayed correctly.

   **Advanced Collaboration:** Use of an approach was present and was presented correctly.

4. *The physical arrangement did not segregate special ed students.*
   
   1  2  3  N/A

   **Minor Collaboration:** Special education students were placed in one area of the classroom together.

   **Moderate Collaboration:** Special education students were seated together in small groups.
**Advanced Collaboration**: Special education students were integrated into the seating chart with the general education students

5. *Both teachers worked with all students during the lesson.*

**Minor Collaboration**: Both teachers worked with all students in the classroom.

**Moderate Collaboration**: One teacher worked with all students in the classroom.

**Advanced Collaboration**: Both teachers worked with all students in the classroom.

6. *Both teachers were responsible for classroom management.*

**Minor Collaboration**: Neither teacher took responsibility for classroom management.

**Moderate Collaboration**: One teacher took responsibility for classroom management.

**Advanced Collaboration**: Both teachers took responsibility for classroom management.

7. *Students appear to view co-teachers as equals in the class.*

**Minor Collaboration**: Students did not acknowledge both teachers in the classroom.

**Moderate Collaboration**: Students acknowledged one teacher in the classroom.

**Advanced Collaboration**: Students acknowledged both teachers in the classroom.

8. *Modifications for special education students are present in the classroom and are the responsibility of both teachers.*

**Minor Collaboration**: No modifications were present.

**Moderate Collaboration**: Modifications were present, but only the responsibility of one teacher.

**Advanced Collaboration**: Modifications were present, and were the responsibility of both teachers.

9. *Co-teachers appeared to work collaboratively together in the planning and preparation for the lesson.*

**Minor Collaboration**: No lesson was planned

**Moderate Collaboration**: Lesson was planned, but only one teacher was prepared to teach the lesson.

**Advanced Collaboration**: Lesson was planned and both teachers were prepared to teach the lesson.

10. *The co-teachers utilized adaptive assessment techniques that were appropriate for the special education students.*

**Minor Collaboration**: No adaptive assessment techniques were used.

**Moderate Collaboration**: Adaptive assessment techniques were used, but not appropriate for the students with special needs.
Advanced Collaboration: No adaptive assessment techniques were used and appropriate for students with special needs.
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Teacher Consent Form
Teacher Consent Form

Bowling Green State University Thesis Project

Collaboration is Key: Co-Teaching in Urban Education

Informed Consent

Participants- teachers

I have been asked to participate in the research of the Thesis project concerning Co-Teaching in Urban Education. The main purpose of this research to is to see how particular approaches of co-teaching models work in this one urban high school setting. The benefits of this project will be to educate the staff at this particular high school on co-teaching approaches as well as helping the educators to use co-teaching in their classrooms. This document will explain to you the evaluation methods and procedures that will be used to collect evaluation materials.

I have been informed that by giving consent I will be participating in all evaluation activities of this Thesis project, including interviews, classroom observations, and content assessments. The content assessment will take about 15 minutes to complete. Overall, the researcher will be using your services in this study for up to ten observation secessions and one interview over the course of three weeks. Each of these evaluation methods is described below.

The interviews will take the form of a casual conversation, last approximately thirty minutes, will be audio taped and transcribed. The classroom observations will take place once scheduled with the observer. The observer will not participate in the classroom activities and will be looking only at the approach of co-teaching that is being used in the classroom as well as how the lesson was taught in regards to the co-teaching approach. The content assessment will take place by the researcher reviewing the lesson plans and materials at the teacher’s convenience.

Information I provide for any interviews, observation, and content assessments will be used to develop a better understanding of how co-teaching models work in urban education.

I have been informed that my responses in interviews and any information I provide during the evaluators’ observations will remain confidential. Confidentiality will be protected by elimination of teacher’s names and school. That means names and institutions that I am associated with will not appear on any papers that contain recorded information. Participation in this study will not impact the relationship with the school, school district, or the institution of Bowling Green State University.

I agree to participate in the research study about Co-teaching in Urban Education through Bowling Green State University Masters Program. I have been informed of the purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits of my participation. My participation in the research and evaluation of this program is voluntary and I have the right to discontinue participation in the research and evaluation of this program, at any time with a verbal or written request for termination.
If I have any questions or concerns regarding the research I may contact:

Julia Doubrava, Gear Up Graduate Assistant, BGSU, (440) 823-3032 JDoubra@bgsu.edu or Project Advisor, John Fischer, Bowling Green State University, (419) 372-9491 if any problems or concerns arise during the course of the study.

I can also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Board, Bowling Green State University, (419) 372-7716, hsrb@bgsu.edu, if I have questions or concerns regarding participant rights.

I ________________________________ give my consent to participate in the research of Co-Teaching in Urban Education.

Signature (Participant): ____________________________ Date: ___