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ABSTRACT

With the push toward inclusion in public schools, districts are turning toward the co-teaching model of instruction to meet the many needs of special education students in regular education classes. Teachers involved in this shift are forced into environments in which they are sharing classrooms for the first time. Both teachers involved are required to balance instructional roles while building a relationship in front of the students. Collaboration is essential to effective co-teaching. This study investigated teaching staff and student perceptions of the co-teaching environment during the first year of the implementation of the program. The researcher distributed surveys to co-teaching teams and their students in a high school as a means of assessing the program. This study is to help educators in that school and similar situations maximize effectiveness of the co-teaching experience.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to serve all students in the least restrictive environment as determined by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1997), students with a wide range of disabilities who were once segregated from their peers are now integrated into the regular education classrooms. While this model of inclusion is meant to provide all students with the best opportunities for success, the regular education teacher is overwhelmed differentiating instruction for twenty to thirty students while the special education teacher is teaching fewer and fewer students. As a result, many school systems are recognizing that special education teachers can be valuable assets to the regular education teacher through collaborative teaching. Collaborative teaching, or co-teaching, is a teaching model in which two teachers share classroom responsibilities such as planning lessons, delivering instruction, and managing classroom procedures for a diverse group of students. The goal in any co-teaching environment is to share methods and knowledge of effective instructional practices that will best suit the needs of every student in the class.

The most common configuration of co-teaching is one special education teacher paired with a one regular education teacher. Because school administrations are requiring special education teachers to leave their contained classrooms, the co-teaching experience is often met with trepidation from both teachers involved because they are often thrown
into environments in which they are, at first, uncomfortable due to a lack of training and understanding of co-teaching practices. This uneasiness is often communicated to the students as the teachers involved work to build a relationship on a "stage" in front of the students.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to investigate teaching staff and student perceptions of the co-teaching environment in a rural secondary school setting during the first year of the implementation of the program.

**Central Phenomenon**

What do student and teaching staff perceptions of the co-taught setting reveal about the effectiveness of the experience?

**Research Questions**

The researcher first collected data through surveys given to all regular and special education teachers involved in a co-teaching experience in the secondary school. They were asked to identify student demographics for the classes being co-taught, their depth of understanding of what co-teaching involves, and their impressions of being assigned to a co-teaching experience. They were then asked about their current perceptions of the co-teaching experience. Questions included: to what extent did you share responsibility for what happens in the classroom, how important was communication, how confident were you in your role as co-teacher, what influence did the co-teaching experience have upon
the students, what were the benefits of the co-teaching experience, and what were the drawbacks of the co-teaching experience?

In addition, the researcher administered surveys to collect information based upon student perceptions of the co-teaching experience. Questions included: did one teacher have more influence than the other, what are the benefits of a class taught by two teachers, what are the drawbacks of a class taught by two teachers, and how is your academic performance affected by the co-teaching experience?
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Inclusion refers to the instruction of every student in the general education classroom unless there is evidence supporting that such placement would not be in the student’s best interest (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). Furthermore, changes in legislature through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004) require that students with diverse learning characteristics not only have access to the general education curriculum through inclusion but also achieve high academic performance within that setting. While the legislation is a positive step towards providing the best possible opportunities for students with disabilities, the inclusionary setting has its flaws.

Along with new legislation for student exceptionalities comes an increased emphasis on high-stakes testing. High-stakes testing often forces the pace of the curriculum, and many students with learning disabilities may have a difficult time demonstrating their strengths (Frase-Blunt, 2000). The demand for high standards places obligations upon teachers to tailor instruction to meet the needs of a diverse population of students within a regular education setting. General education teachers, while trained in specific content areas, are often ill-prepared to deal with the specific learning needs of students with disabilities. Whereas the special education teachers have the training and knowledge to accommodate the students but have limited access to the population since many students are no longer in special education classes.
A common worry is that special education students in the inclusion classroom may not receive the individualized attention commonly associated with special education. A likely intervention practice is to focus on remediation of skill deficits instead of the general education curriculum (Baglieri & Knopf, 2004). On the other end of the spectrum, is the push for content acquisition rather than basic skills leaving many students with deficits (Mastropieri et al., 2005).

Collaborative teaching, or co-teaching, is one way schools are working to meet the needs of all students utilizing the skills of both the regular and special education teachers. Co-teaching is a teaching service model involving two teachers in one classroom; usually it pairs one regular education teacher with one special education teacher. Through IDEA, co-teaching can be viewed as a supplementary service in a regular education classroom to meet the needs of students with and without disabilities (Villa, Thousand, & Nevin, 2004). Collaboration of strategies and expertise in the co-teaching environment enables teachers to effectively accommodate the learning needs of all students.

Researchers have found that co-teaching has been effective for students with a variety of needs, such as English language learners (Mahoney, 1997); the hearing impairments (Compton et al., 1998; Luckner, 1999); and learning disabilities (Rice & Zigmond, 1999; Trent, 1998; Welch, 2000). However, co-teaching critics have expressed concern that content is diluted to meet the needs of special education students rather than the average or high achieving students (Tomlinson et al. 1997; Vaughn & Schumm, 1994).
Other research has shown that collaboration in co-taught settings can provide the learning environments that empower students for success (King, 2003). Gerber and Papp (1999) researched student perceptions of the impact of the co-teaching experience through interviews of students with and without disabilities and their parents. Students and parents reported positive results in student learning.

Friend, Reising, and Cook (1993) present five models of co-teaching. In the one teach, one assist model one teacher takes the lead while the other assists the students. In station teaching the teachers divide the content and teach the students a given part either in small groups or whole-class instruction. Parallel teaching involves joint planning but each delivers to a small portion of the class. In alternative teaching, one teacher instructs the main group of students while the other works with a small group. Team teaching is the fifth model of co-teaching in which both teachers share instruction of students equally.

Co-teaching may not be effective if special education teachers merely take on the role of support personnel (Lenz et al., 2004). More often than not, however, that is the case. One researcher concluded that the regular education teachers are generally considered the experts and are more frequently the dominant member of the partnership. In addition, the special educator seldom delivers instruction to the entire class, but instead performs organizational and management tasks (Mastropieri et al. 2005). This scenario does not fully employ the combined strengths and abilities of both professionals, nor does it adequately accommodate student needs.

Regular and special education must forge a relationship to cultivate collaboration, identify roles and responsibilities, and determine outcomes (Keefe & Moore, 2004).
Problems that hinder the co-teaching experience include lack of common planning time and an inability to voluntarily choose to teach together. Teachers are often thrust into the experience with little direction or support, and yet they are expected to blend their skills to meet the needs of the students. “The concept of collaborative teaching can be extremely unnerving for teachers because it forces them to adjust their teaching styles to accommodate not only the students in the class, but also the extra adult in the room” (Keefe & Moore, 2004, p. 37).

Based upon the research, co-teaching is an emerging system for accommodating the diverse needs of the student population. Recent research suggests that co-teaching can positively increase overall student performance. However, the literature also suggests that the success of the co-teaching experience lies fully upon the collaborative relationship of the teachers involved. Important factors to consider when evaluating a co-teaching program include the implementation to models of instruction as identified by Friend, Reising and Cook (1993), the perceived roles of each teacher, the level of communication, and learning outcomes. King (2003) also suggests that student perceptions of the co-taught setting can provide valuable insight into program effectiveness. Therefore, there is need to investigate the link between student and teacher perceptions of the implementation of a co-teaching program.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Successful inclusion calls for different methods of meeting the needs of a diverse population of students within a regular education classroom, and co-teaching is emerging as one possible solution to meeting those needs. This study was conducted to investigate student and teaching staff perceptions of the co-teaching environment during the first year of implementation of the teaching model as a means of accessing the effectiveness of the program.

Study Design

This study was a qualitative research design in which the researcher surveyed teachers currently teaching collaboratively along with their students in the regular, secondary education classroom. Each pair of teachers included one regular educator and one special educator or two regular educators. Students included in the study were special or regular education students in grades nine through twelve who were being served in a co-taught classroom.

Procedure

The co-teachers and students studied were located in Morgan High School in McConnelsville, Ohio.
Regular and special education teachers were asked to identify their current teaching assignment and student demographics for the classes that were co-taught. They were asked to identify their depth of understanding of what co-teaching involved, the amount of pre-service instruction they received regarding co-teaching, and their impressions of being assigned to a co-teaching experience.

The teacher subjects were then asked about their overall perceptions of the co-teaching experience. They responded to the following questions: how much planning do you have with your co-teaching partner; how much of a hindrance is lack of planning to communication and instructional practices; what, if any, pre-service training did you receive prior to co-teaching; how helpful would pre-service training be for effective co-teaching; does it seem that the regular educator or the special educator does most of the instruction; what changes could/should be made to increase the effectiveness of the co-teaching experience; how does co-teaching affect student achievement; and how does co-teaching affect student behavior?

In addition to teacher input, the researcher collected information based upon student perceptions of the co-teaching experience. Students provided their responses to the following questions: what did you think of having two teachers in your classroom; what was the best part of having two teachers in the classroom; what parts didn’t you like about having two teachers; why do you think that two teachers were in your classroom; what seemed to be the job of each teacher; did you notice a change in your behavior; did you notice a change in your schoolwork; and would you like to have another co-taught class?
**Potential Ethical Issues**

The researcher obtained permission from the building principal before conducting teacher and student surveys. The principal waived the need for parent consent since the student posed no harm to the students participating.

All participants signed informed consent forms to signify their understanding of the purpose of the study and granting their approval to be included. Surveys were administered in the classroom by the researcher. Only students who wished to participate were included in the study. The teachers completed the surveys in a separate room from the students. The researcher established the importance of confidentiality with all subjects by ensuring identities would not be disclosed. All surveys were numerically encoded to ensure confidentiality.

All completed teacher surveys were included in the study. Within each class of students, one out of every three surveys was included in the study to limit the overall number of responses.

The co-teachers were debriefed on the findings of this study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate teaching staff and student perceptions of the co-teaching environment at Morgan High School during the first year of the implementation of the program as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of the intervention. In order to determine this, surveys were administered to teachers and students participating in the co-teaching experience.

Twelve surveys were distributed to teachers, and eleven were returned for a turn-in rate of 92%. All teachers responding to the survey were currently certified and teaching at the high school level. Of the respondents, 55% have special education certification, 36% have mathematics certification, 9% have science certification, 18% have English certification, and 9% have social studies certification. These statistics reflect the fact that some teachers have dual areas of certification. All teachers worked with students in grades nine through twelve.

Surveys were also administered to students in the six co-taught classes. One hundred-twenty surveys were distributed to students, and one hundred-seven were returned for a turn-in rate of 89%. Within each class, one of every three surveys was randomly selected to be included in the study for a total of thirty-four student surveys. Of the student surveys selected, ten were from Geometry (29%), eight were from Algebra I
(24%), six were from a combined Physics course (18%), six were from English 10 (18%), and four were from World History (12%).

When teachers were asked how much planning time was available to collaborate within co-teaching teams, only 18% said they shared a common planning time. The other 82% did not have common planning scheduled. They were then asked to elaborate on how much of a hindrance lack of common planning is this to communication and instructional practices.

**Co-teaching would be more effective with common planning time.**

*Cannot communicate regularly with daily practices and objectives. Left to briefly catch up at the beginning and end of each class.*

*This is an enormous hindrance if effective co-teaching is to take place.*

*Since no planning time is available intervention specialist has to pick up on my class lectures first, then assists.*

*Not having any planning time is a big hindrance. I find that I am spending a large percentage of my time in the classroom learning to do the material before I can help the students.*

*The hindrance is significant because we do not cooperatively decide on the path to be taken.*

*No common planning is a huge hindrance. Co-teachers need to communicate formative assessment results as well as differentiated instructional ideas to be effective.*

When the teachers were asked about the amount of pres-service training they received prior to co-teaching 27% received some training in college, 45% attended a one-day workshop, and 27% received no training. They were then asked to identify how helpful pre-service training would be for effective co-teaching.
Pre-service training in co-teaching would help to model implementation of practices.

Very helpful to know the roles of each teacher and common models used. It would help to identify expectations of the experience.

Pre-service training is very important if neither teacher has had any pre-service training, etc. I found that the training enhanced the co-teaching experience.

It may make the start-up process easier.

I would imagine pre-service would allow for more equitable modification assignments, more shared vocabulary to use in collaboration.

I think both teachers attending training helps start the communication and dispels some myths about co-teaching.

Teachers were also asked to identify whether it seemed that the regular educator or the special educator did most of the instruction. All respondents explained that the regular education teacher did most of the instruction.

The regular education teacher is the primary instructor in the co-teaching experience.

In this situation, the regular education teacher did 98% of the instruction.

Regular teacher since no collaboration takes place.

We have slipped into roles of regular ed as presenter, special ed as modifier.

The regular education because she was familiar with content. It has taken me a full year to review the content.

Similarly, the students were asked to identify what they perceived to be the job of each teacher.
The regular teacher taught and the second teacher was there to assist in the co-taught classroom.

The main teacher was there to teach and the other teacher was there to help if the kids didn’t understand.

One to teach one to watch.

Teacher #1 is to teach math number 2 is to help us.

Teacher 1 she was to teach us geometry, teacher 2 to help us and teacher 1.

One teacher would show you and teach you how to do something and the other teacher goes around the class and help you to further understand it.

One taught and the other helped us and gave helpful input.

One teacher taught the whole class while the other teacher helped with the LD students.

Teachers were asked to identify their degree of understanding of the goals/purpose of our co-teaching experience. Of those teachers, 45% said they strongly understood, 45% said they understood, and 9% were neutral.

Students were also asked to explain why they believed there were two teachers in the classroom. Some students, 47% recognized that the co-teachers were there to provide extra help, and 26% believed the co-teacher was there to help low or struggling students.

Co-teaching is a strategy that provides extra help to students.

To help the students learn new things quicker.

Two teachers were in my classroom to help all students alike but to also help the more challenged students.

If someone needed help when the other teacher is helping someone else the second teacher is there to help.

Because slower learning kids were added to our class, so their teacher came with them.
Teachers were asked to complete a scale stating their agreement with a series of statements about student learning. When asked to supply their level of agreement to “students learn better in the co-taught classes than they did previously,” 9% strongly agreed, 55% agreed, 27% were neutral, and 9% disagreed. For “co-teaching is benefiting students with special needs,” 27% strongly agreed, 36% agreed, 36% were neutral, and 9% disagreed. For “co-teaching is benefiting students at risk for school failure,” 18% strongly agreed, 18% agreed, 55% were neutral, and 9% disagreed. Then, for “co-teaching is benefiting average students,” 9% strongly agreed, 55% agreed, and 36% were neutral. Finally, for the statement of “co-teaching is benefiting gifted/talented students,” 27% strongly agreed, 18% agreed, 45% neutral, and 9% disagreed. Therefore, Co-teaching benefits students at all levels.

However, when the students were asked to identify if schoolwork had improved in the co-taught classroom, 74% said their work was the same, 26% said their work was better and no students said their work was worse.

Both groups of teachers and students were asked about student behavior. For the teachers, the statement “student behavior is better in the co-taught classes than other classes,” received the following results: 9% strongly agreed, 36% agreed, 45% were neutral, and 9% disagreed. Of the students, 88% believed their behavior was the same as in other classes, 6% thought it was better, and 6% thought it was worse. Therefore, Co-teaching doesn’t greatly affect student behavior.

When students were asked to identify how the co-taught class compared to other classes, 59% said it was about the same, 29% said it was better, and 12% said it was worse. When students were asked whether they would like to have future co-taught
classes, 62% said that they would like it, 26% said they would not like it, and 12% said that they didn’t care either way.

**Co-teaching makes understanding easier because there is more help.**

Yes, I found it very helpful and easier to understand and I would like to do it again.

Yes because there is more help for us to understand more.

Yes because the extra help is a positive way to make sure every student knows what they need to know at a quicker pace.

Yes, if both teachers taught and contributed equally to all students.

Yes, makes the class easier when I stumble on something and can’t figure it out.

Yes because you learn better. It is easier to understand. I stay out of trouble. I get all of my work finished.

When each teacher was asked to state his/her level of agreement with the statement of overall satisfaction with the co-teaching experience, 9% strongly agreed, 45% agreed, 27% felt neutral, and 18% disagree.

**Co-teaching is a good idea, but it takes time and effort for it to work effectively.**

I believe in the philosophy behind this strategy; however, I never had the full experience of “co-teaching.”

I like the idea, but that's all it is for us right now. I would like to try some actual co-teaching, but it needs to start early in the year, so I don't have to wait until next year. I see the benefit that could come from it, but I also see a lot of work for me to "teach" the co-teacher the material.

I know I am not doing co-teaching the way it was meant to be. Starting halfway through the year with limited time to prepare has not helped the situation. At times I feel that I am not utilizing my co-teacher at all because I am still unsure how to work together in the same classroom. Overall, I wish I were more confident in the co-teaching atmosphere.
Students were asked to elaborate on how they felt about having two teachers in the classroom. Of those surveyed, 65% felt positively about the experience, 18% felt neutral, and 15% felt negatively.

**I like that help is given faster when one teacher is busy.**

_It didn't really bother me much that it was nice to have extra help when needed._

_When (one teacher) was busy with another student, the other teacher was here to help._

_That there was more help in the room._

_It was better and helpful because if one teacher is busy the other is there to help._

_It was helpful because we got done faster with more people to help._

_It was different you could have two teachers helping you at the same time._

_I thought it was good because you could learn from more than one person._

_They both helped me. I feel that it gets more accomplished. Also to help better understand._

When asked if they disliked anything about the co-teaching experience, 47% did not have any complaints, but 36% expressed a level of confusion relating to the experience.

**The co-teaching experience was confusing at times.**

_The part I didn't like is the fact I had to listen to two teachers that had different ideas._

_Tell you different ways to do a problem._

_The part I didn't like about having two teachers in class is the different ways of teaching._

_They would have different methods of teaching and sometimes made it harder to understand._
The parts I didn’t like was it was hard to focus on just one.

It was a bit distracting. I didn’t know which to ask for help.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Summary

Special education classes are gradually being phased out in order to serve students in an inclusionary setting dramatically increasing class sizes and teacher responsibilities of meeting the needs of a varied group of students. Co-teaching is emerging as one possible solution to meeting the needs of all students within a regular education classroom. This study was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of a co-teaching program during the first year of implementation at the high school level. To accomplish this, student and staff perceptions of the experience were examined.

Overall perceptions of the experience were positive. Teachers felt that the co-teaching strategy can be effective in the future under proper circumstances. Many students also expressed an interest to be included in more co-taught classes in the future.

The biggest complaint from teachers was the lack of common planning that hindered effective communication that would ultimately benefit the students. Teachers also expressed dissatisfaction in preparedness for beginning the co-teaching experience. The majority of teachers did not receive any training until after the experience had begun.

Both the lack of common planning and training caused one teacher to take a leadership role. Teachers and students alike noticed that both teachers did not share the responsibility of instruction equally. Some teachers expressed an interest in sharing more
responsibility. The students recognized that the second teacher was there to provide extra assistance, and many students seemed to appreciate this. However, because of limited collaboration between the teachers some students felt confused by the other teacher. This confusion reflects upon the lack of coordination of the two teachers.

An interesting difference between the staff and student perceptions involved co-teaching’s benefit academically. Most teachers expressed that they agreed or strongly agreed that students at all levels performed better academically. However, the majority of students did not notice a change in their schoolwork or grades. This discrepancy may be, in part, due to the extrinsic motivation of grades for students. Whereas a teacher may be able to see greater depth of understanding that a student might not otherwise recognize unless their grades were improved.

Both teachers and students agreed that co-teaching does not greatly affect student behavior. A few students mentioned that they were more cautious of their actions because there was an extra set of eyes in the room.

Overall, student and staff perceptions indicate an interest in further co-teaching placements. Teachers can see co-teaching becoming more effective in the future with some modifications to the current program.

**Future Implications**

After evaluating the responses to staff and student surveys about the co-teaching experience, the researcher sees that there are some essential practices necessary for successfully implementing a co-teaching program.
Staff must receive training prior to entering into a co-teaching situation. This will make clear the purpose and expectations of co-teaching. The best scenario for training would include training with the co-teaching partner. After training, both teachers should be given time to develop a common curriculum prior to the start of the school year. Additional common planning should be provided during the school-day on a weekly or daily basis. This time together can be used to reflect on practices, modify and coordinate lessons, and evaluate student work. Communication would help to include the special educator more in planning and teaching lessons that would lead to shared responsibility.

With these modifications to the program, the same surveys should be implemented to the staff and students involved in co-teaching during the second year of the program. The researcher would anticipate more positive experiences.
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A. Who will have access to confidential information?
   Researcher only. No other staff or students will have access to completed surveys.
   Aliases will be used in reporting data.
B. How will confidential information be stored and protected?
   Completed surveys and informed consent forms will be returned to a manila envelope. All materials will be kept in a locked filing cabinet.
C. What will happen to confidential information after the study?
   All confidential information will be shredded and disposed.

11. For each of the following general requirements of Human Subjects research, place a check mark in the column for “YES,” “NO,” or, if the description is not applicable to your project, “N/A.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subjects will participate voluntarily.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subjects will have the freedom to withdraw from the study at any time,</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and without consequence.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The data collected will not be used for any non-approved purpose.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subjects will be guaranteed confidentiality.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Subjects will be informed about the nature of their participation in the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study before they begin the study.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. All reasonable attempts will be made to minimize physical and/or</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychological harm to subjects.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Individual performances will not be disclosed to anyone other than the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigator(s).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Subjects are given the opportunity to ask questions, and all questions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be answered to the satisfaction of the subjects.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. All subjects will provide consent with their signature on a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic relationship.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Appropriate debriefing procedures will explain the purpose(s) of the study following the subject’s participation in the research.

- Explain any ‘NO’ answers below:

12. Describe the extent of your training on ethical guidelines for treating human subjects within this field or discipline. Cite, in APA, MLA, or AMA style, at least two sources you have consulted for research ethics guidelines in your field.

Through my pursuit of a Masters in Education, I have taken two research-based courses that have trained me in the proper guidelines for conducting research with human subjects. Those courses were *Tests and Measurements* and *Research Methods*. Two sources I have consulted for research ethics guidelines include:


13. Additional comments:

14. The following documents are appended to the end of this form (if applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed consent form</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting ads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of permission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Subjects Training certificate(s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests/surveys/questionnaires</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional items (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If this proposal is a “Renewal” or “Re-Evaluation” (see cover sheet), please specify the changes from the original submitted proposal. If not, leave this section blank.
APPENDIX B

Co-Teaching Teacher Survey

1. What ages and grades do you work with in your co-teaching classroom(s)?

2. What is your current teaching assignment? (Special or Regular Educator)

3. How much planning do you have with your co-teaching partner?

4. 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?

5. What, if any, pre-service training did you receive prior to co-teaching?

6. How helpful would pre-service training be for effective co-teaching?

7. Was your teaming a voluntary one, or were you assigned by an administrator? Does that affect your perceptions of the co-teaching experience?

8. In your co-teaching experience, does it seem that the regular educator or the special educator does most of the instruction?

9. What changes could/should be made to increase the efficacy of the collaboration?

10. What changes could/should be made to increase the effectiveness of the co-teaching experience?

Place a checkmark in the column corresponding to your level of agreement to each statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the purpose/goals of our co-teaching experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students learn better in the co-taught classes than they did previously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behavior is better in the co-taught classes than other classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching is benefiting students with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching is benefiting students at-risk for school failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching is benefiting average students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching is benefiting gifted/talented students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the co-teaching experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
APPENDIX C

Co-Teaching Student Survey

1. This year in your classroom there were sometimes two teachers. What did you think of this?

2. If you think about your classroom with two teachers, what kinds of activities did you do that you did not do when there was only one teacher? What did you think of these activities?

3. What was the best part of having two teachers in the classroom? Explain.

4. What parts didn’t you like about having two teachers? Why?

5. Why do you think that two teachers were in your classroom?

6. What seemed to be the job of each teacher?

7. How did your class with two teachers compare to when you’ve only had one teacher (in another class or last year)?
   _____ Worse  _____ About the Same  _____ Better
   If you answered worse or better, explain what made this class different.

8. How did you do with schoolwork this year in the classes with two teachers?
   _____ Worse  _____ About the Same  _____ Better
   How do you know?
9. How do you think you behaved this year in the class with two teachers?
   _____Worse  _____About the Same  _____Better

   How do you know?

10. Would you like to be in a class with two teachers again? Why or why not?
The students and teaching staff at Morgan High School is being invited to participate in a study entitled Perceptions of the Co-Teaching Experience that is being conducted by Cary Harper. 

Cary Harper is a Masters of Education student at Marietta College in Marietta, Ohio.

**Purpose and Objectives**
The purpose of this study is to investigate teaching staff and student perceptions of the co-teaching environment in a rural secondary school setting during the first year of the implementation of the program.

Research of this type is important because it will help the teachers and administration at Morgan High School adjust future co-teaching strategies and initiatives.

**What is Involved?**
The teachers and students currently involved in a co-taught experience are being asked to participate in this study. They will be asked to complete a written survey.

**Risks**
There are no known or anticipated risks to students or staff participating in this research.

**Participation**
Your honesty is important to the success of this study. All responses will be anonymous and confidential. Personal, identifying information will never be disclosed to anyone besides the researcher. All materials will be stored in a locked cabinet and will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Your participation is voluntary, and refusal to participate will involve no penalty. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Cary Harper, Researcher, 740-962-2944, mc-welchc@seovec.org. Questions or concerns about your rights as a subject should be directed to: Dr. Jennifer McCabe, Marietta College Human Subjects Committee Chair, 740-373-7894, Jennifer.McCabe@marietta.edu

**Procedures**
1. If you agree to participate in this study, please complete this section using a pencil:

   Name (Please Print)          Name (Please Sign)
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