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ABSTRACT

Today’s student with an identified learning disability is expected to meet the same academic standards as their peers with no identified disabilities. Co-teaching has emerged over the last decade as a way to address the needs of both special education and regular education students simultaneously in the regular education classroom. It is imperative that both teachers in a collaborative situation be adequately prepared to meet the needs of the special education student without hindering the progress of the regular education student. The researcher distributed a survey to several co-teaching teams. This study will help educators understand collaborating teachers’ perceptions of what is essential to ensure that the goal of maximally effective instruction is achieved as well as determining potential stumbling blocks.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 1997) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment, special needs students are more frequently being integrated into the regular education classroom. As a result, many schools are using collaborative teaching as a means to meet the needs of both student populations. The Division for Learning Disabilities (DLD) defines co-teaching as “a special education service delivery model in which two certified teachers, one general educator and one special educator, share responsibility for planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction for a diverse group of students, some of whom are students with disabilities” (Zigmond & Magiera, 2001). Inclusion enables special education students to have access to the general education teacher while providing accommodations required by the students’ IEPs (Magiera, Smith, Zigmond, and Gebauer, 2005). This “marriage” allows the regular education teacher, who has specialized knowledge of the subject(s) that they teach to be paired with a special educator who has in-depth knowledge of accommodations and individual student learning styles.

Despite the more prevalent use of inclusion classes in public schools which utilize various co-teaching models, there has been little consensus about the necessary conditions,
Successful Co-Teaching

relationships, and training required to make co-teaching successful for the students as well as an aide to both teachers. For this reason, the researcher has developed a survey which includes questions about collaborative teacher’s perceptions of collaboration and its effect on student learning. Being able to identify key factors in successful collaborations will enable administrators and educators to set up useful and effective co-teaching situations.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine under what conditions co-teaching is effective as well as which conditions act as a hindrance to sound instruction for special and regular education students in the regular education classroom.

Research Questions

The researcher will begin by asking the subjects questions about the demographics of their current teaching assignment. They will be asked to identify the age group with which they work, the subject or subjects they teach, the amount of time they are able to spend in common planning, what pre-service instruction in co-teaching each educator had received, and whether they had volunteered or were “drafted” into co-teaching. Next, the subjects will be asked for their perceptions about their co-teaching experience. Which teacher (regular education or special education) does most of the instruction? How important is it to plan together? Does co-teaching contribute to the students’ overall educational experience? To their own teaching? What collaborative practices would enhance the co-teaching relationship? How useful would pre-
service training be? How supportive of co-teaching is the building administration? Other staff members?

Limitations

This study will be limited by the size of the population to be surveyed as well as the relatively small number of school districts which the researcher will be able to contact.
Definition of Terms

CO-TEACHING- a teaching arrangement in which a special educator and a general educator work to direct the instruction of all students by having a special educator in a general education setting. Sometimes referred to as team teaching or cooperative teaching.

INCLUSION- a general education classroom in which students with identified learning disabilities is included in the regular education setting.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA, 1997): To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled, and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature of severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

“As professionals working within the field of special education search for increasingly effective ways to meet the needs of students with mild and moderate disabilities, service delivery options within the general education classroom have become more and more necessary” (Murawski & Swanson, 2001). Co-teaching is a way in which educators can meet the needs of students both with and without disabilities. The term co-teaching was initially cooperative teaching, and then shortened to co-teaching and sometimes referred to as team teaching. Cooperative teaching, team teaching, and co-teaching all refer to a similar instructional delivery system.
The emphasis on the co-teaching relationship, which pairs a special educator with a regular educator within the regular education classroom, is based on the principle that students with identified disabilities are best served when they are in the regular education classroom with their nondisabled peers (Murawski & Swanson, 2001).

According to one researcher, “As educators strive increasingly to include students with disabilities in the classroom, the need for regular educators to have greater expertise with students with needs -or to have greater support from specialists- increases as well” (Lawton, 1999). In a high school or middle school class, the regular education teacher is expected to have specialized training in their content area with little or no training in meeting the needs of special education students. On the other hand, the special educator brings to the classroom in-depth knowledge of the individual student learning styles, writing and following a student’s Individual Education Plan (IEP), and accommodations that can or must be made, but with limited knowledge of the subject matter content. Both teachers are expected to blend their areas of expertise to provide instruction to all students while meeting the needs of the learning disabled student (Magiera, Smith, Zigmond, & Gebauer, 2005). “This method of instruction is likely to increase the outcomes for all students in the general education setting, while ensuring that students with disabilities receive necessary modifications yet are provided instruction by a content expert” (Murawski & Dieker, 2004).

Secondary education has also been impacted by high stakes testing. Educators are being pushed to teach more material at a faster pace in order to meet minimum requirements on proficiency tests. Students with mild to moderate learning disabilities are being tested in a comparable fashion to those of their nondisabled peers (Dieker & Murawski, 2003).
In addition to high stakes testing, another assessment issue is fairness in the evaluation process. According to Dieker and Murawski (2003):

This issue seems to permeate the U.S. society, wherein equal rights are interpreted by many as equal (i.e., the same) treatment. However, teachers need to analyze what is fair, keeping in mind the fact that the meaning of “fair” actually denotes giving everyone what they need to learn, and that not every child learns in the same way. (pg. 8)

Regular and special educators can embrace the different learning needs of all students using a co-teaching model.

School populations today are becoming more and more ethnically diverse. As diversity within the classroom increases, so must the educator’s awareness of the need for accommodations for students with different languages and cultural backgrounds. General education teachers are often ill-prepared to deal with student’s diverse learning needs as well as those of students whose unique learning needs stem from a disability. Team teaching will enable teachers to collaborate on the best ways to accommodate the learning needs of both of these student populations. A special educator who is prepared to work with such diversity can assist the general educator in meeting the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds as well as with different learning disabilities (Dieker and Murawski, 2003).

Meeting the needs of all students in the classroom requires a cooperative teaching relationship that is well-defined and well-planned. “Critical issues for teachers clustered around three major areas: the nature of collaboration, roles and responsibilities, and outcomes” (Keefe & Moore, 2004, pg.77).

According to Marshall Welch, chair of the Department of Special Education at the University of Utah, there are five variations of the co-teaching model. The first variation has one teacher,
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usually the general educator, taking the instructional lead while the other moves around the room assisting students and answering questions. The second variation involves actually changing the physical arrangement of the room, dividing the room into two stations, with each teacher working with a segment of the curriculum and having students rotate from station to station. The third variation finds both teachers jointly planning the instruction but dividing the classroom into two heterogeneous halves, with each teacher working with just one half of the class. The fourth variation involves dividing the class into one small and one large group; one teacher provides instruction in the form of pre-teaching, guided practice, or review to the smaller group. The fifth variation finds the teaching model characterized by each teacher taking turns in leading discussions or having both teachers take part in demonstrations (Welch, 2000).

One researcher found that the general education teachers as curriculum experts were most frequently the dominant member of the partnership. It was rare to find the special educator delivering instruction to the entire class, most frequently performing tasks such as recording homework, writing on the blackboard, or conducting short oral reviews (Mastropieri et al. 2005).

According the Daniel J. Boudah, an assistant professor of psychology at Texas A & M University in College Station, co-teaching should not be just a chance for one educator to get coffee or run copies. “Teachers must also avoid relegating the special education teacher, especially, to a role of glorified aide” (Lawton, 1999, pg. 2).

There are other problems that can arise in a co-teaching situation. Most common of those is the lack of common planning time. Many schools are unable to give collaborating teachers time to plan together, forcing the teachers to plan on their own time or to not plan together at all. This puts the burden of planning on the shoulders of one teacher, usually the general educator. Another problem is the pairing of two teachers together who did not voluntarily choose to teach together. Clashing personalities and differences of opinions about educational philosophy can
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make the co-teaching pairing ineffective for the students and professionally frustrating for the teachers.

After reviewing the research, it is evident that there are many different ways to utilize co-teaching relationships. Co-teaching is becoming more prevalent in schools as educational requirements and high stakes testing make the way schools have always addressed students with diversity, whether cultural or learning, obsolete. Although research shows that there are many benefits to having both a regular educator and special educator in the same classroom, there are many factors to be considered in working collaboratively with another teacher. Which factors enhance the relationship, and which factors hinder it? It is not fully reported what makes the most successful partnerships. Therefore, there is a need to further investigate the co-teaching relationship. In order to help educators maximize their time in the classroom and most benefit both students with special needs as well as students without special needs.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Meeting the needs of students with learning disabilities or cultural diversities is a challenge to today’s educator. Co-teaching is rapidly becoming a more prevalent part of the public school system’s approach to meeting these needs. This study was conducted to determine under which conditions teachers can collaboratively teach students most effectively.

Study Design

This study was a qualitative research design in which the researcher surveyed teachers currently teaching collaboratively within the regular classroom. One teacher in the pair was a regular educator, the other was a special educator.

Procedure

The teaching teams being studied were located in Marietta City Schools and Washington County Schools and taught at either the middle school or high school level. The educators were asked to answer questions about the demographics of their current co-teaching assignment. Each teacher was asked to identify their area(s) of certification, ages and grades with which they work, and current teaching assignment.

Teachers were then asked about the amount and quality of common planning they have with their co-teaching partner. Depending upon their answers to these questions, the subjects were
asked for their opinions about the practices in place. Was there enough time for common planning? If there was common planning, were they able to work together effectively? Was there a need to rearrange the master schedule to accommodate common planning? If there was no common planning, how much of a hindrance was this to communication and instructional practices?

The subjects were asked to identify what, if any, pre-service instruction they received prior to co-teaching. How helpful would pre-service training be? Was their teaming a voluntary one, or were they assigned to each other by an administrator?

Next, the subjects were surveyed about their perceptions of the overall co-teaching experience. Did it seem that the regular educator or the special educator did most of the instruction? Does co-teaching contribute to the students’ overall educational experience? How professionally rewarding has the co-teaching experience been? How supportive has the principal been of the collaboration? Other staff members? What changes could/should be made to increase the efficacy of the collaboration?

**Potential Ethical Issues**

In all studies there are potential ethical issues. In order to limit these issues, the researcher gained permission from each district’s superintendent as well as the building principals before conducting the survey. The researcher numerically encoded each survey by building to indicate the building from which it was returned. This was for the sole purpose of insuring maximum return rate. After the initial requested turn-in date, a reminder was sent to teachers in the building(s) from which surveys had not yet been returned.

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, the researcher clearly established with the subjects that their responses were not singled out nor were their names or positions indicated
in the study. Upon final collection of the surveys, anonymity of the educators and their situations was protected.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine under what conditions a co-teaching relationship could be most successful. In order to determine this, surveys were distributed to teachers in Marietta City Schools, Warren Local Schools, and Frontier Local Schools. Thirty surveys were distributed, and twenty-three surveys were returned for a turn-in rate of 77%. All teachers who responded to the survey were currently teaching at the middle school or high school level. Of the surveys returned, 48% taught at the middle school level, and 52% taught at the high school level.

Of the middle school teachers who responded, 64% have elementary certification, and 36% have secondary certification in math, social studies, and science. Nearly one-third of these teachers (36%) have special ed. certification as well. Of the high school respondents, 33% had English certification, 33% had science certification, 16% had math certification, 16% had social studies certification, and 16% had special ed. certification. These statistics include the fact that some of the teachers have dual areas of certification. The middle school teachers worked with grades 6 through 8, and the high school teachers worked with grades 9-12.

When asked to respond to the amount of common planning time the teacher had with their co-teaching partner, all but one middle school teacher have a 42 minute daily planning period in which they can potentially plan with their partner. The high school teachers responding had a very different answer to this question. Only 16% had a common planning period with their co-
teaching partner. The other 84% did not have common planning. However, some of these teachers have created time to meet with their partner.

*There is virtually no common planning during the school day.*

*Before school. We both tutor before school and plan then.*

*We communicate before school and when time is available, during class.*

*We talk before class quickly for 1st period inclusion, after class quickly for 7th period inclusion, and as needed in the hall.*

*We confer on our own, but no time during the day is allotted for this.*

*We have no common planning time during the school week. We create a common planning time by staying after school once a week.*

When asked if the co-teachers who had common planning were able to effectively plan with their teaching partner, 54% said they were. The other 46% had varying reactions to this question.

*Planning is somewhat difficult.*

*We do not plan lessons together. I plan lessons and (the) co-teacher helps administer to IEP students.*

*Co-teacher would work with specific students. Did not plan together. Co-teacher followed my plans.*

*Some days we plan. Most often she just walks in and asks what we are doing.*

*My co-teacher informs me of plans and asks for my input. This occurs either during planning or during the day at another time.*

*When they are willing/cooperative, I can check on what they are willing to share, though I really do not teach. I may read tests, administer spelling tests, and I am often using my 26 year, Master’s Degree, teaching career to make copies and cover class.*
When asked about the hindrances of having no common planning time, most felt that it handicapped their effectiveness.

*Common planning would enhance the co-teaching partnership.*

*Planning together is a necessity!*

*Communication (is) minimum but 2nd year teaching with 2 of the teachers so that helps!*

*Because we don’t really co-teach it hasn’t been a problem.*

*If time were set aside for co-planning, we could much more easily confer. With common planning, we could more easily work toward a more time co-teaching situation instead of teacher and assistant teacher.*

*We plan “on the fly” during class. It is not a good way to do it. The resource co-teacher helps out with students but we find it hard to co-teach (without common planning).*

*We have to catch one another at times that are often inconvenient or too short to be effective.*

*Common planning time would make a significant difference in our organization of lessons, I believe. We are always able to “pull it together”, but this is especially a challenge for the special education teacher because she is in and out of so many classrooms in a day with no time to plan together for any of them.*

When asked if the master schedule had been rearranged to accommodate common planning, 16% of the secondary teachers and 55% of the middle school teachers said it had been.
Teachers were asked what, if any, pre-service training had they received prior to co-teaching. Of those who responded, 16% of the high school teachers and 73% of the middle school teachers said they had received no training. Those who had received some pre-service training had gotten it from many different sources.

**There has been very little training prior to co-teaching.**

*I may have had training years ago when inclusion first began.*

*I received some training 13 years ago.*

*During my first year here at a SEOSERC inservice and what used to be called ASDO Spec. Ed. training.*

*Seminars, conferences.*

*A couple one day workshops.*

*Two-three inservice days.*

*Two days (5 hours) of inclusion training.*

*One day of training before school. Two hour meeting during the 1st nine weeks.*

*School offered professional session led by an experienced local teacher. I also attended a BER seminar on co-teaching.*

*One hour as a part of a different workshop. My co-teacher did not come.*

*Small amount- learning as I go.*

*Two days at the end of school last year. Several meetings after school throughout this first inclusion year.*
When responding to how helpful pre-service training would be for effective co-teaching, 100% of the high school teachers said it would definitely be helpful, and 82% of the middle school teachers said it would be helpful with 18% responding that they were unsure how helpful it would be.

*Pre-service training would be very helpful.*

*This would be a big help. It would give both teachers an understanding about what is expected.*

*Pre-service training would have been very helpful. Administrators also need to share their expectations, and, at least for awhile, monitor progress.*

Teachers were asked if their teaming had been assigned or voluntary. Almost three-fourths (72%) of the middle school teachers and one-third (33%) of the high school teachers were assigned to their co-teaching.

*Most teachers are assigned to co-teach rather than having volunteered.*

*First experience- assigned- a disaster! Present experience- voluntary- a wonderful experience.*

*Voluntary for 1 year. Didn’t go well 1 of 2 periods with different teacher. They wouldn’t let me out of it 2nd semester. They had her remain in my room when she was not needed or wanted.*

Teachers were asked if it seemed that the regular educator or special educator did most of the instruction. Only 8% of the high school teachers said the teaching was shared and 100% of the middle school teachers said the regular ed. teacher did most of the teaching.

*The regular education teacher seems to do most of the instruction.*

*Regular (ed. teacher does most of the instruction) if they are controlling and domineering. The fight to be seen as equal is hardly worth the effort, after a point.*

*Regular ed. teacher. Co-teacher actually acted in the scope of “aide”.*
Surveyed teachers were asked if, in their opinion, does co-teaching contribute to the students’ overall educational experience. Although an amazing 100% of teachers surveyed agreed that co-teaching was helpful to the students, some expressed a few reservations about whom it was really helping.

**Co-teaching is beneficial to the students.**

*Depends on the situation. My partner was there for only her IEP students.*

*Proximity, two sets of hands and eyes give students the opportunity for help even if they are identified or not for services.*

*In some aspects- when extra help is needed- behavior management- work load- supervision.*

*It is such a benefit to our students! They have the opportunity to get one-on-one help whenever it is needed while still being in a “regular” class with their peers.*

When responding to how professionally rewarding the co-teaching experience has been for each teacher, 100% of the high school teachers and 82% of the middle school teachers have found their experience rewarding, even if they have reservations about their role as a co-teacher.

**Co-teaching is a professionally rewarding experience.**

*Because we have a low level of co-teaching, there has been minimal reward. But, increased contact between teachers is a plus.*

*Extremely rewarding. I have learned not only how to teach special ed. students, but all students more effectively.*

*I have enjoyed it very much, and it has prompted team planning in our department, which has introduced me to many new ideas.*

*Hasn’t (been rewarding) in social studies – more frustrating. Math- rewarding to see students advance in their skills.*

*To know my co-teacher is to love her.*
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When asked how supportive of the principal and other staff members were of the collaboration, 82% of the middle school teachers felt there was some level of support from the administration and staff while 100% of the high school teachers perceived some level of support.

Administrators and most staff members are supportive of co-teaching.

Both principal and staff are supportive. Some staff are jealous/disappointed that they aren’t in a co-teaching situation.

The principal is very supportive and has allowed us to go to workshops related to the experience of co-teaching. However, in the cases of unsuccessful team teaching as in my first experience, little was done to change the situation. My co-teacher in that case did nothing to help with planning, grading, or even classroom management.

The principal is in favor of it- but isn’t actively involved.

Finally, teachers were asked what changes could/should be made to increase the efficacy of the collaboration. The high school teachers who had suggestions all said that common planning time with their co-teaching partner was a must. Other suggestions which surfaced were to have more training, smaller class sizes, changing the master schedule to accommodate the teaming, and to not expect the special educator to work with too many different teachers.

Many changes could be made to improve the co-teaching experience at the secondary level.

Common planning is the key to improving our collaboration. If we had more time to talk and determine what we are doing, I think my co-teacher would “grow into” presenting more of the content.

I would appreciate planning time. I think it would help the special ed. teacher to work with two teachers a day instead of four or five, just for her own sanity!

Schedule class first. It has been done when the spec. ed. teacher is “free”. I am getting teachers for inclusion with only 1 or 2 spec. ed. students and am left on my own with classes of 10 or more because (the) teacher can’t come that period.

We need to decide earlier who will cover specific materials.

Co-teachers need to share all parts of instruction responsibilities. We do get paid for doing the same job. Joint planning time, even once a week, would be a big improvement.
The most prevalent suggestions from the middle school teachers was to have more training and to have the teachers share more of the teaching responsibilities.

**Middle school teachers have many suggestions to improve co-teaching.**

*Time prior to school starting to collaborate instead of being told you are doing this when school starts.*

*An inservice would be helpful. Maybe a form could be filled out at least every 9 weeks letting each teacher express comments i.e. how could this situation be more effective, etc.*

*Better planning between teachers. More working as a team—both teaching—both involved so the student doesn’t know who regular ed. and special ed. teachers are. More a team!*

*More of a feeling of shared responsibility.*

*Sometimes I wish we could just return to resource situations across the board. It is tiresome trying to “sell” these kids and their IEP’s to the regular teachers. But, I always slap a smile on my face, try to get more bees with honey as opposed to vinegar, and go home and either eat chocolate or dig a hole in my garden. And I keep hoping.*
Summary

Co-teaching is becoming more and more prevalent in the educational community as a service delivery option for special education students. Although the option of co-teaching as opposed to a separate resource room is becoming much more common, the pairing of the team and the mechanics of the actual pairing seem to be stumbling blocks to the effectiveness of the collaboration.

The researcher was not particularly surprised by the responses that she received from the teachers who filled out the survey; what surprised her was the vehemence with which several of the teachers responded. Beginning with the question about the amount of common planning time the teachers had, respondents wrote of their great frustration at not being able to meet with their partner or having to arrange a time outside the normal school day in which to plan. It seems to the researcher that, if people are going to “team” teach, they should be able to plan together. No sports team would expect their players to practice separately then come together for the game and perform effectively. Nor would you see this in a band. However, teachers are being asked to
teach in the same room without giving them the opportunity to really discuss what is being
taught or how the lesson would best be presented.

When asked about the effectiveness of the common planning for those who did share
planning with their partner, several teachers responded negatively about the actual use of this
planning time. It seems to the researcher that, even when given common planning, many teams
are unsure about their role in the collaboration. Part of this seems to stem from their co-teaching
partner having been assigned to them rather than volunteering to work with each other. Again, it
seems to the researcher that, if people are to be expected to teach together, there should be some
consideration of who will work well with whom rather than putting two people together simply
because it fits into the master schedule.

The respondents talked of the pre-service training they had as being non-existent or of having
had a bare minimum of training. Even those teachers who did have some training did not have a
great deal of it. Some teachers had had a day of training or maybe even two. However, the
researcher feels that observing co-teaching teams that are successful might be the most effective
way to actually get some training. Both special education and regular education teachers wrote of
their frustration at the responsibility in the classroom not being shared. The special educators do
not want to be treated as an aide, and the regular education teachers want their counterparts to
take a more active teaching role. Although both have a common goal, neither educator seems to
be able to put this into play. Observation of an effective team might guide other teams to a more
rewarding experience.

All teachers who responded seemed to agree that co-teaching is good for the students. Most
respondents mentioned the increased attention to both regular and special education students.
However, these teachers were also the ones who felt frustration over the way their current co-
teaching situation is working.
Future Implications

This study was given to teachers in three different districts but with very similar results from all schools. The researcher sees that there are several things that could be done to make teachers feel more comfortable who are being asked to co-teach with one another, beginning with pairing teachers together who are willing to work with one another, then providing them with training prior to the start of the school year. After receiving initial training, it seems that some sort of follow-up training or meeting might be effective. Finally, the master schedule should be rearranged to accommodate these pairings if the students are going to receive the best services possible.

Under these conditions, it would be interesting to redistribute this survey to the teachers who are co-teaching and do a follow-up on their feelings about the collaboration.
APPENDIX
Appendix A

March, 2007

Dear Fellow Educator:

I am completing my master’s program at Marietta College this spring. My thesis topic is co-teaching and the conditions under which a co-teaching relationship does or does not work. In order to complete my thesis, I would like to survey regular ed. and special ed. teachers who are currently co-teaching or have worked in a co-teaching partnership within the last five years.

These surveys are completely anonymous so your candid responses are welcome. I am surveying teachers in several schools and in various districts so no one teacher or position will be singled out.

I would like to have your responses by April 5. Please complete your survey and return it to the person in your building who gave it to you. That person will then return the completed surveys to me.

If you have any questions, please contact me at any of the phone numbers listed on the survey.

Yours in Education,

Paige A. Fleming
Marietta Middle School
Appendix B

CO-TEACHING SURVEY

Please respond to each question. Any questions you may have about the survey may be directed to Paige Fleming at Marietta Middle School (H: 740-374-5249; C: 740-336-4367; W: 740-374-6530).

1. What is your area of certification?
2. What ages and grades do you work with in your co-teaching classroom(s)?
3. What is your current teaching assignment?
4. How much common planning do you have with your co-teaching partner?
5. Are you able to work effectively with your co-teaching partner during any common planning period, or, if there is no common planning, how much of a hindrance is this to communication and instructional practices?
6. Was the master schedule rearranged to accommodate common planning?
7. What, if any, pre-service training did you receive prior to co-teaching?
8. How helpful would pre-service training be for effective co-teaching?
9. Was your teaming a voluntary one, or were you assigned to each other by an administrator?
10. In your co-teaching experience, does it seem that the regular educator or the special educator does most of the instruction?
11. In your opinion, does co-teaching contribute to the students’ overall educational experience?
12. How professionally rewarding has the co-teaching experience been for you?
13. How supportive has the principal been of the collaboration? Other staff members?
14. What changes could/should be made to increase the efficacy of the collaboration?
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