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Abstract

Co-teaching was identified over 35 years ago as a way to support in-service teachers in working together to better meet the needs of the students in their classrooms. Since then, teachers have applied the model across grade levels, content areas, and inclusive education. Pre-service teachers, specifically in early childhood settings have had the least representation in the co-teaching literature. This study is an investigation of the co-teaching experiences surrounding the early childhood, pre-service, field placement and student teaching semesters. Using survey data, interview data and programmatic document analysis, this investigation looks at the roles enacted by pre-service teachers and cooperating teachers and how those roles impacted the learning experience of the pre-service teacher. Specifically, this study identifies the learning that is co-constructed through cogenerative dialogue during co-teaching and co-planning experiences. The study supports the current, but limited, body of literature that suggests more inquiry into the lived experience and voice of the pre-service teacher within the co-planning model during the pre-service year. The participants (n=41) in this study identified co-planning as more than a component of co-teaching, calling for more time to be spent on the organization of planning. This study also shed light on the roles both pre-service and cooperating teachers enact during co-planning, these roles are hierarchical and influence the degree to which pre-service teachers shared in the leadership of planning. From the
study of these planning experiences emerged an informed cycle of planning that supported pre-service teachers in co-constructing and revising existing knowledge about planning and instruction.
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Chapter 1

Background

Introduction

“How is what we are doing together substantively different, and better for students, than what one of us would do alone (Murawski, 2012, p.8)?”

Student teaching along with the support of a cooperating teacher (CT) is historically and currently regarded as the most valuable and critical learning experience a pre-service teacher engages in during their teacher preparation program (Ambrosetti, 2010; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2002). However, a closer look at the experiences, roles, and relationships that are enacted among CT, pre-service teacher (PST), and supervisor reveals a much more complicated story than is typically told: “A tale of power negotiation and of positioning and being positioned to influence learning, preserve one’s sense of self, and achieve or maintain a measure of control over one’s situation (Bullough & Draper, 2004, p.418).”

Teacher education programs have traditionally paired or assigned a PST with a CT, often allocating time, money, and resources such as providing supervision and guiding documents that align with program goals in order to support this learning experience (Walkington, 2005; Sayeski & Paulsen, 2012). These pairings are often driven by the understanding that much of what PSTs need to learn cannot be taught
through coursework, but must be learned through practice in the classroom alongside a CT (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Hudson, 2012; Roth & Tobin, 2002; Sykes, Bird, & Kennedy, 2010).

In the traditional model of PST learning, according to Darling-Hammond (2006), the focus is on teaching the PST how to teach through modeling with little time for planning, reflection, or feedback throughout the learning process. Darling-Hammond along with others encourages teacher preparation programs to design more appropriate models that encompass the learning needs of PSTs in addition to the individualized needs of the children in the classroom (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010; Zeichner, 2010). Co-teaching, which according to the literature is inclusive of co-planning is a model that supports collaborative learning and can be applied in cooperation with the traditional field experience models in order to broaden the focus of the PST learning (Bacharach et al., 2010; Cook & Friend, 1995; Roth & Tobin, 2005; Solis, Vaughn, Swanson, & McCulley, 2012). As CTs and pre-service programs reframe their focus to include deeper thinking about PST learning in addition to children’s learning, co-teaching can act as a structural framework (Backarch, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010; Diana, 2014).

PST education programs have, historically supported the practices of co-planning and co-teaching in coordination with CTs and PSTs within the contexts of special education, secondary, and middle education with little representation of the early childhood PST experience (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Diana, 2014; Trump, 1966). More recently, pre-service preparation programs have struggled to secure cooperating teachers willing to take on pre-service teachers due to the state-mandated, No Child Left Behind,
high-stakes tests (Ellis & Bogle, 2008; Diana, 2014). The co-teaching model is one way to support CTs and PSTs in working and learning together as they respond and adjust to challenges such as testing.

This study seeks to more deeply understand the co-planning and co-teaching experiences PSTs have during both the early childhood field experience and student teaching. Embedded within these experiences is a look into the roles CTs and PSTs enact and how prepared PSTs feel they are when it comes to implementing lessons after co-planning. It looks specifically at the reported experiences of the early childhood PSTs, as they are being prepared to take on the role of licensed classroom teacher.

**Statement of the Problem**

PSTs enter into professional partnerships with CTs filled with prior notions and expectations rooted in their own experiences as students over a lifetime. For example, Ambrosetti (2010) surveyed 155 PSTs regarding their perceptions of the relationship they would share with their cooperating teacher, characteristics of their cooperating teacher, the roles both would undertake, and what learning opportunities were expected. PSTs in this study indicated preferences for a CT that was friendly, provided feedback, and treated them as an equal. Regarding feedback, PSTs specifically indicated that it should be in the form of guidance and support and not a grade-based assessment. PSTs have been searching for these qualities in CTs since 1977, when Karmas and Jacko investigated the influences on PSTs by having them rank, after the conclusion of student teaching, the “significant others” that influenced their learning during student teaching.
Not surprisingly, CTs were first on the list. With these findings in mind, pre-service programs need to better understand the PSTs experience and the relationship with the CT.

Missing from these investigations and from the pre-service literature in general are any rich, PST-centered descriptions of co-planning and co-teaching between a PST and a CT in a general education, early childhood classroom. It appears, then, that there may often exist a mismatch between the expectations PSTs have of the roles their cooperating teachers will enact, the roles they may need to enact, and the roles each actually fulfills during the field experience and student teaching semesters. A deeper understanding of the pre-service teachers experiences with co-planning and co-teaching contributes to clarifying these role-based misconceptions. The following research questions serve as guides for this inquiry.

**Research Questions**

1. How do pre-service teachers experience co-teaching during a field experience and subsequent student teaching? What types of co-teaching are represented in their experiences?
2. In what ways are pre-service teachers participating in co-planning during their field experience and student teaching? How do pre-service teachers view their role and the role of their cooperating teacher during co-planning?
3. How well does co-planning support pre-service teachers in feeling prepared to implement lessons and to reflect on student learning?
4. In what ways and when are pre-service teachers engaged in cogenerative dialogues?
Significance of the Study

An investigation of these research questions aims to inform and improve the teaching and learning practices surrounding PST education and the corresponding student teaching experience. Pre-service teachers, and their cooperating teachers, are held to the standards of multiple “institutions filled with competing ideological interests all demanding a place in the teacher education curriculum” (Sykes et al. 2010, p. 473). In order to reduce this disparity between theoretical ideology and practice Sykes et al. and Darling-Hammond (2006) recommend that teacher education programs find ways to establish generative, or productive relationships with cooperating teachers. Such relationships are supported by the collaborative construction of new knowledge that takes place during cogenerative dialogues (Siry, 2011; Roth & Tobin, 2002). Investigating PST roles and experiences is a valid point of entry for this investigation in that learning to teach occurs most influentially between a PST and a CT (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010; Karmos & Jacko, 1977). Doing so provides evidence for guiding and supporting those navigating the ever-changing trajectory of Teacher Education programs.

Terms in the Study

Also undergoing constant change and development are the phrases, words, and terms surrounding teacher preparation. This section provides definitions for and explanations of the terms chosen for this investigation.

Field Experience and Student Teaching

This field experience is often referred to as ‘student teaching,’ which in some literature denotes the entirety of the PST’s time spent in the CTs classroom
(McDonough & Matkins, 2010). Alternatively, there is also reference to ‘student teaching’ as a limited or specific period of time within the field experience, during which the pre-service teacher shifts roles to having greater responsibility or leadership (Zahorik, 1988). These responsibilities include, but are not limited to guiding the lesson planning process, implementing the lessons, and being responsible for classroom assessment and management.

Within this investigation, ‘Student teaching’ is a specific period of time, during the field experience, when pre-service teachers put into practice their culminated knowledge, develop and practice skills and dispositions, and even experiment with enacting roles (Darling-Hammond & Hammerness, 2005; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002). In the case of the participants in this study student teaching is a specific six-week period of time during which PSTs take the lead role in the planning and instruction of their classroom.

**Co-teaching**

The learning surrounding lesson planning and learning to teach is critical and takes place during the field experience and student teaching. In order to support this learning, cooperative teaching, also known as Co-teaching is historically defined and enacted in a variety of ways depending on the roles of the co-teachers (Bauwens, Hourcade, & Friend, 1989). For example, co-teaching that takes place between two practicing in-service teachers is very different from the co-teaching a CT enacts with a PST (Diana, 2014). For the purposes of this study co-teaching is defined within the latter model as “two teachers (a CT and a PST) working together with groups of students;
sharing the planning, organization, delivery, and assessment of instruction, as well as the physical space” (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010, p. 4). In addition to this definition, Bacharach et al. describe seven strategies to better define the co-teaching that takes place during the implementation of a lesson in table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One teach, one observe</td>
<td>One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other gathers specific observational information on students or the (Instructing) teacher. The key to this strategy is to focus the observation on specific behaviors. Both the teacher candidate and the cooperating teacher are able to take on either role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One teach, one assist</td>
<td>One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other assists students with their work, monitors behaviors, or corrects assignments, often lending a voice to students or groups who hesitate to participate or add comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station teaching</td>
<td>Station teaching occurs when the co-teaching pair divides the instructional content into parts. Each teacher instructs one of the groups. The groups then rotate or spend a designated amount of time at each station. Independent stations are often used along with the teacher-led stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel teaching</td>
<td>Parallel teaching occurs when the class is divided, with each teacher instructing half the students. However, both teachers are addressing the same instructional material. Both teachers are using the same instructional strategies and materials. The greatest benefit to this method is the reduction of the student-to-teacher ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental teaching</td>
<td>Supplemental teaching allows one teacher to work with students at their expected grade level while the other teacher works with those students who need the information or materials extended or remediated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative (differentiated) teaching</td>
<td>This teaching strategy provides two approaches to teaching the same information. The learning outcome is the same for all students; however, the avenue for getting there is different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching</td>
<td>Team teaching incorporates an invisible flow of instruction with no prescribed division of authority. Using a team-teaching strategy, both teachers are actively involved in the lesson. From the students' perspective, there is no clearly defined leader—both teachers share the instruction, are free to interject information, and are available to assist students and answer questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bacharach et al., 2010)
These seven strategies guide our thinking about the ways in which co-teaching can be thought about during planning and implemented through instruction. Specifically, in this investigation, these strategies were provided as a reference to participants as they described their experiences with co-teaching. This list is not exhaustive, it was chosen due to its use in an early childhood setting (Bacharach et al., 2010).

Co-planning

Co-planning has its roots in the collaboration between special educators and general educators who sought to better support the children in inclusive classrooms (Cook & Friend, 1995). Co-planning, among these in-service teachers, is noted as being both the most critical and most challenging aspect of successful co-teaching due to the difficulty in organizing both time and place for collaborative planning (Murawski, 2012; Walther-Thomas, Bryant, & Land, 1996). The term often goes undefined aside from the push for finding time to make it happen, although Cook and Friend (1995) suggest that teachers prepare for co-planning by seeking to “sense the direction the class is headed and how they play a role in it (p.11),” and discuss this during their shared planning time. Solis, Vaughn, Swanson, and McCulley (2012) further develop co-planning as a time to “collaborate about instruction” structured within a “formalized process (p. 505).”

Murawski (2012) provides tips for successful co-planning in place of a definition, which are framed by the guiding question “How is what we are doing together substantively different, and better for students, than what one of us would do alone” (p.8). These tips are outlined below as they help to shape and define a productive co-planning experience.
1. Establish a regular time to plan collaboratively
2. Select an appropriate environment without distractions
3. Save rapport building for another time
4. Have an agenda and snacks
5. Determine regular roles and responsibilities
6. Divide and conquer
7. Keep a list of individual student concerns
8. Build in regular time for assessment and feedback
9. Document your planning and save it for future reference
10. Use a what / how / who approach to planning

In addition to these specific tips, Brown, Howarter, & Morgan (2013) stress that the lesson planning during co-planning be “high quality,” meaning it is inclusive of “the co-teaching model or models to be implemented and the responsibility of both teachers (p. 85). Co-planning also implies that content, implementation, and specific student needs will be considered and discussed during planning sessions (Fenty & McDuffie-Landrum, 2011). Overall and for the purposes of this investigation these understandings of co-planning inform and guide the inquiry as I seek to add to these descriptions.

**Cogenerative Dialogue**

As a part of the co-teaching and co-planning literature, cogenerative dialogues, according to Roth and Tobin (2005) are an opportunity for co-teachers to “articulate as fully as possible the different kinds of experiences and to explain them in and through collective interpretation, from which new possibilities for individual and collective
actions emerge (p.66). Often these dialogues take place during co-planning when, “teachers review what has been accomplished in the class, decide upon what is to happen next and the division of labor for the forthcoming lesson (p. 67).” As a result of cogenerative co-planning, co-teachers may also engage in “huddles” or an opportunity to check in during lesson implementation and review the lesson in order to decide where to go next (Roth & Tobin). Equally important are the cogenerative dialogues between supervisors and PSTs, these conversations occur during the post-observation debriefing session, a time in which a more critical analysis of the teaching takes place (Roth & Tobin, 2002). These discussions are critical for pre-service teachers, participating in co-teaching, as they provide time for progress-oriented reflection alongside supervisors and experienced CTs (Siry, 2011). In this investigation, cogenerative dialogues are also understood as resources for PSTs to learn from both in their field placements and in their methods courses (Roth, Tobin, Carambo, & Dalland, 2004; Siry & Lang, 2010).

**Constructivism**

Piaget (1953) brought the process of constructing knowledge to us through his theory of cognitive development. He stated that learners cannot simply be given knowledge and expected to use it, but they need to construct their own understanding of the knowledge and apply it (Piaget, 1953). This process, initially observed in children, constitutes both assimilating and or accommodating for new knowledge through the personal act of cognitive constructivism. It is through this construct that I attempt to make sense of the data, which is based on PSTs construction of knowledge.
In addition to the definition of cognitive constructivism, Vygotsky (1962) explains that teaching and learning are an act of social constructivism that influence the cognitive construction of new knowledge. The addition of the social realm, as a place in which knowledge is constructed, by Vygotsky encompasses the collaboration, social interaction, and critical thinking that takes place between teachers and learners or PSTs and CTs (Powell & Kalina, 2009). Specifically, the learning is situated in the zone of proximal development (ZPD), which is most simply understood as a place for potential learning according to Nyikos and Hashimoto (1997) who specifically studied collaborative learning among teachers. Both cognitive and social constructivism have an impact on the construction of knowledge and both are important as I try to understand more about how PSTs experience learning with and without collaboration.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

The aim of this dissertation is to investigate PSTs’ experiences with co-teaching, explore their roles and the roles of their CTs, understand how cogenerative dialogues can support them in learning and preparing to teach. Ch. 1 illuminates the problem and describes the research questions, purpose, and significance of this investigation. During Ch. 2 relevant literature is reviewed. In order to create a context for this investigation the literature review focuses on the following sections: the development of co-teaching practices, contextualizing the PST field experience, PST field experience models, co-teaching with PSTs, co-planning, and cogenerative dialogues.

During Ch. 3 I discuss the research design with a focus on data collection, data analysis, theoretical framework, and limitations. An in-depth explanation of methods for
each of those areas is explored. Ch. 4 draws specific connections to the ways in which the data did and did not inform the research questions. Triangulation of data-sources guides my interpretation of the codes and schemes that resulted from the methods used in this dissertation. Together with those codes and schemes I hope to influence the practices surrounding PST preparation, which are shared in Ch. 5, the concluding chapter of this investigation.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Chapter two presents co-planning and co-teaching as models or frameworks for pre-service, early childhood, field experiences inclusive of student teaching. Because this model is historically rooted in other contexts of education, the chapter begins with an explanation and examples of those practices. Next, an explanation of the pre-service experience and participant roles are explored. The following section is a review of studies in which multiple iterations of co-planning and co-teaching are presented and evaluated. Overall, this chapter presents background knowledge for better understanding the work that has been done throughout the evolution of co-planning and co-teaching, documents the value of the model, highlights the cogenerative discourse necessary for success, and identifies the call for studies that expand the benefits into the realm of pre-service education.

The Development of Co-teaching Practices

During the 1960’s co-teaching arose as an organizational solution for teachers who were trying to improve instruction for middle school students (Trump, 1966). Its application also became relevant and more well known as students with disabilities
transitioned into inclusive classroom where two teachers, one from general education and one from special education, began working together to meet the needs of this student population (Bauer, 1974; Garver & Papania, 1982). In many of these classrooms, according to Easterby-Smith and Olive (1984), team teaching, or two teachers planning together but instructing separately took place prior to more recent enactments of co-planning and co-teaching. It was later that Bauwens, Hourcade, and Friend (1989) coined the term *cooperative teaching* to represent the work general and special educators did to serve students with disabilities. Cook and Friend (1995) later shortened cooperative teaching to co-teaching as they clarified aspects of the model within special education and secondary contexts. The authors provide an early list of questions co-teachers should discuss when preparing to work collaboratively, these questions are listed in Table 2 and are still relevant today.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Beliefs</td>
<td>• What are our overriding philosophies about the roles of teachers and teaching, and students and learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do our instructional beliefs affect our practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>• When do we have at least 30 minutes of shared planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do we divide our responsibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How much joint planning time do we need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What records can we keep to facilitate our planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity Signals</td>
<td>• How will we convey to others that we are equals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can we ensure a sense of parity during instruction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>• What information about our teaching do we want to share?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Which information should not be shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Which information about students can be shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>• What noise level are we comfortable with in the classroom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Routines</td>
<td>• What are the instructional and organization routines for our classroom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>• What is acceptable and unacceptable student behavior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who is to intervene and at what point?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the rewards and consequences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>• What is the best way to get feedback to each other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How will we ensure that both positive and negative issues are raised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Peeves</td>
<td>• What aspects of teaching and classroom life do each of us feel strongly about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can we identify our pet peeves as to avoid them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although co-teaching quickly gained popularity across grade levels in inclusive classrooms, Murawski and Swanson (2001), who conducted a comprehensive review of the co-teaching literature, warn that not enough experimental data exist to determine if
co-teaching actually increases the learning outcomes of students with disabilities. More recently, Solis, Vaughn, Swanson, and McCulley (2012) reviewed and coded the updated empirical data on co-teaching in inclusive classrooms. The authors included 146 experimental studies in their coded review concluding that the most typical arrangement of co-teaching placed the special educator in a subordinate role, providing planning advice and not affecting instruction in the general education classroom. The existing contexts in which co-teaching and co-planning are defined limit the potential scope of influence such practices have, especially when explored in a pre-service, early childhood model. Although these reviews are generally informative to the practices of co-planning and co-teaching, they also, by omission, display the need for further investigation into the early childhood pre-service experience.

**Contextualizing the Pre-service Field Experience**

In all models of field-based experience in early childhood teacher preparation programs, PSTs who are learning to teach aim to bridge the gap between theory and what is practiced in the classrooms of their CT (Diana, 2014). In order to accomplish this, PSTs, CTs, and university supervisors often enact many roles over the course of a field placement (Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002). In order to further frame the variety of experiences pre-service teachers might encounter, a description of the various roles each member enacts are described. Descriptions of the following individuals will be provided, Supervisor, CT, and PST. Providing both the historical and current context of each role highlights the many opportunities for co-planning and co-teaching that exist during the field placement and student teaching.
Supervisory Roles

Historically, it can be noted that the supervisor was viewed as a teacher in the field who posed questions to link and support the theory to practice gap between the university program and classroom practice (Cohn & Gellman 1988; Rust, 1988). Additionally, Zahorik (1988) looked into the ways in which ten supervisors performed their duties during conversations and as observers of PSTs. Results pointed to the identification of three roles supervisors might play, including “behavior prescription, idea interpretation, and person support” (p.14). These roles also inform the role of the CT in models where the supervisor may have a nonexistent or reduced role (Gimbert & Nolan, 2003; Wilson, 2006). Overall, each supervisor prefers one role over another, leading to the recommendation for multiple supervisors to work with one PST at different points during their field experience in order to best meet the needs of each PST (Zahorik, 1988). This recommendation, although potentially costly, supports PSTs in being prepared to participate as collaborators with their CTs.

More recently, Steadman and Brown (2011) point out that there is great inconsistency across institutions as to how the job of supervisor should be defined according to their data from fourteen supervisors. Often Supervisors engage in the job very differently depending on many factors, such as, type of university, supervisory experience, and program requirements (Steadman, 2009). Alternately, Bates, Drits, and Ramirez (2011) investigated the practices of three supervisors working with twelve pre-service teachers. From their conclusions they suggest that supervisors take on stances, which influence roles. Stance is defined as “a supervisor’s professional knowledge,
perspective, and conceptualization about how student teachers learn to teach in the classroom context” (Bates et al., 2011, p.70). The three supervisors in this case were identified as each utilizing one of the following stances more than others: self-esteem building, professional thinking or relationship building. It is unclear if these stances apply to interactions supervisors have with cooperating teachers or if they would be visible in a case where the supervisor played a less evaluative and a more cooperative role. However, Slick (1997) calls attention to the tensions supervisors may encounter when trying to balance the demands of assessing PSTs for the university program while also guiding the CT-PST dyad in reflection and preparation.

Defining and redefining the roles and expectations of all members of the model may ease the tensions that can arise, thus supporting a more collaborative relationship. As novice supervisors enter into the classrooms of CTs, the relationships that need to be developed can sometimes be neglected, especially when, as Steadman (2009) points out:

Individuals taking up the unfamiliar role of student teacher supervisor may experience confusion when encountering the behaviors and attitudes of those they mentor or a sense of disequilibrium as they struggle to understand their place within, and the mandates of, their college or university’s programs. (p. 10).

It seems then that some supervisors both recently and historically are questioning their role and are unable to provide efficacious guidance and evaluation to PSTs. However, supervisors often believe they are on a satisfactory continuum with no need for further change or development (Zimpher, deVoss, & Nott, 1980; Steadman, 2009). This
finding highlights the need for co-planning and co-teaching, among the members so that supervisors can also develop their own roles and practices.

**Cooperating Teacher Roles**

During the field experience, PSTs typically work most closely with CTs and supervisors towards the following aims, accomplish their licensure and programmatic goals, play the dual role of teacher and learner, and contribute to student learning in the classroom. A ‘cooperating teacher’ is an in-service teacher who becomes part of the teacher education program in the sense that they open their classroom and work with PSTs (Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002).

It has also become common in some of the education literature for the CT to play the role of ‘mentor.’ Using this term can be misleading according to Glenn (2006) who observed, interviewed, and surveyed PSTs regarding the interactions of this dyadic relationship and what aspects they perceived as helpful in their learning to teach. Overall, her findings indicate that not all CTs are able to successfully play the role of mentor. As mentors “collaborate rather than dictate, relinquish an appropriate level of control, allow for personal relationships, share constructive feedback, and accept differences,” (p. 94) according to Glenn (2006). Further, she goes on to describe an effective mentor as being more than just a veteran or model teacher. Thus, many sources suggest that CTs must, at a minimum, have an understanding of these qualities if they are in fact expected to successfully enact the role of mentor (Chu, 2012; Glenn, 2006; Grossman & Davis, 2012; Hawkey, 1997). Under those circumstances, it has been reported that the pressure for CTs to act as fully capable mentors can be reduced when
responsibilities for the PST are further shared through co-teaching (Bacharach et al., 2010; Diana, 2014).

Even when cooperating teachers model the qualities Glenn (2006) describes, there often still exists a tension or mismatch between the content courses taught by the university or program, personal histories, and the practices PSTs face when learning to teach in the classrooms of CTs (Brown & Feger, 2010). Consequently, the relationship between PST, supervisor, and CT may not always be of a productive or cogenerative nature. When pre-service teachers enter into professional relationships with CTs both bring prior knowledge, personal educational understandings, and expectations about the roles that will be enacted during the field experience (Fairbanks, Freedman and Kahn, 2000). Although CTs may desire to be efficacious and productive in their relationships, they may be missing opportunities to fulfill their role in such a way because the model under which they are operating does not match their perceptions of their roles. A closer look at the PST field models further positions CTs and PSTs to better understand and learn from the roles enacted. Additionally, these roles are historically unchanged until they are interpreted through the application of a new model such as co-teaching.

**Pre-service Field Experience Models**

Teacher-education programs use different structural models and student teaching practices thus different experiences and roles evolve based on individual needs. It is thus especially important to explore these models and identify which characteristics contribute to successful preparation of PSTs. Doing this helps to draw out the points of entry in which the co-teaching model connects or overlaps with existing more traditional models.
Triads

When three people are working together to support the learning of a PST they are often referred to as a triad. Many iterations of this model have been practiced and will be explored in more depth in this section. Criticisms of this model often include the need for professional development that guides and supports all members in enacting their roles as co-workers and co-learners, specifically, Smith and Avetisian (2011) support the need for more involvement from universities in defining and preparing pre-service teachers for the relational dynamics of student teaching. Although, after reviewing the models in the following section, it becomes more clear that some models align with aspects of co-planning and co-teaching more ease than others.

**PST, CT, and supervisor.** This model is most commonly described as a situation in which one PST works closely with one CT who models teaching, co-plans, provides feedback, ongoing opportunities for practice, and reflection (Goodnough, Osmond, Dibbon, Glassman, & Stevens, 2009). The third member is the supervisor, often a graduate student, methods course instructor, or even a retired classroom teacher who is affiliated with the institution through which the PST is attending classes. This model involves the supervisor in roles such as observer, provider of feedback, and discussion partner, which have remained relatively stagnant over time (Steadman, 2009; Zimpher, deVoss, & Nott, 1980). Recommendations for improving the role of the supervisor, through professional development, are often made as an implication for further research (Bates & Drits, 2009; Bullough & Draper, 2004; Cuenca, 2010).
Glenn (2006) and others who have studied the CT and PST relationships reinforce the need for more clarity regarding the roles each member enacts, emphasizing that when the PST acts only as observer and imitator of the CT their participation and learning of new knowledge are limited (Bacharach et al., 2010; Roth & Tobin, 2002; Solis, Vaughn, Swanson, & McCulley, 2012). In response, Korth and Baum (2011) indicated specifically that PSTs “need access to and participation in the teacher thinking and reasoning (p. 76). After examining a case study of one CT-supervisor-PST triad over a year, Bullough and Draper (2004) reinforce that professional development for the members of the triad is needed in order to support members in exacting their roles more purposefully. Diana (2014), however, challenges the notion of support through professional development, as it may not be feasible for many logistical and fiscal reasons. Thus pointing to a possible solution in which the members of the models work together frequently as co-planners of lessons and co-teachers who have an ongoing reflective dialog, which also supports them in enacting their roles (Diana, 2014).

Two PSTs, one CT. In this alternative triad model, two K-6 PSTs are partnered with one another and referred to as a ‘peers’ and then paired with one CT for a 13-week field experience. Goodnough, Osmond, Dibbon, Glassman, and Stevens (2009) collected data form these peer pairs via online journals, surveys, and school visits from four alternative triads. Although some peer pairs were speculative about having three teachers in a classroom, findings indicate that co-teaching emerged among members. More specifically, PSTs reported that collaboration with a peer gave them someone to share ideas and feelings with. Five of the eight participants also indicated the value in feedback
from multiple sources, peer partners and CTs. Having feedback from two sources is identified, within this study, as a benefit that only occurs when you either this alternative model, or the traditional triadic model. Both models provide opportunities for feedback from multiple sources including the supervisor, CT, and the various instructors who are a part of teaching methods courses.

**Two CTs, one PST.** A second study of the alternative triad is provided in order to highlight the unique findings regarding the role of the CT. Gardiner and Robinson (2009) collected artifacts and interviewed ten PSTs who participated in this model during an early childhood licensure program. PSTs reported in interviews after their field experience that they valued the peer-to-peer interactions, such as co-planning, providing feedback, and that the collaboration they experienced made them feel as if they could safely take risks during the implementation of their teaching (Gardiner & Robinson). As for the role of the CT, PSTs in this model claimed that conversations with CTs were less than with peers, and that feedback from CTs was not as helpful as was from peers. Attention needs to be drawn to the reduced role of the CT and what implications that may have for PSTs learning. That limitation aside, providing PSTs opportunities to practice working with peers and CTs supports Darling Hammond’s (2006) call to prepare teachers that are ready to collaborate, work, and learn from one another.

In an addition version of this arrangement, Smith & Avetisian (2011) interviewed pre-service teachers who defined the roles of their cooperating teachers as coach or guide. In this case study, one PST worked with two CTs in separate high school classrooms without the involvement of a supervisor. CTs enacted the role differently from one
another, which was framed as a benefit to the PST. Within this model the members roles were described in broader terms, such as reflective coaches or guides which led to co-inquiry and co-learning benefits for each person. Aspects of this model are often visible in early childhood education pre-service programs during co-planning as teachers often plan together in grade level groups.

**Professional Development School**

In response to the ongoing call for professional development for supervisors and CTs, Gimbert and Nolan (2003), engaged CTs and supervisors in a Professional Development School (PDS) model. In this model, the supervisor becomes a Professional Development Associate (PDA) who models, intensively, strategies for problem solving in relationships and instructional content for the CTs and PSTs. In this rare case, the university provided training to guide the supervisor’s interactions with the PSTs. Contrastingly, in most cases, Steadman and Brown (2011) found that one third of the research extensive universities studied lacked any type of induction or ongoing training for their supervisors. Gimbert and Nolan speak to the variance in PDS models and how each one is very unique as they are community-based and take a great deal of time to establish, in this case eight years.

Participants in the Gimbert and Nolan PDS model reported limitations, acknowledging that their will always be a hierarchy among the members so long as one holds an evaluative role but that professional behavior and mutual respect are more readily established in PDS models. This model is inspirational in that it has the potential for collaboration among triad members, yet it is also identified as limiting due to the
acknowledgement that one member remains evaluative. Merging this model with the co-teaching model alters the roles greatly, in that, CTs and PSTs may be more open to co-planning and co-teaching if they are not identifying in the role of someone being evaluated.

**Clinical Master Teacher**

Wilson (2006), in trying to better meet the needs of pre-service elementary education, conducted a qualitative study in which she compared the supervisor, PST, and CT triad model to her Clinical Master Teacher (CMT) model. The participants in this model included 90 pre-service teachers in elementary and secondary programs, 10 CMTs, and five supervisors. The CMTs are chosen when they meet the following six criteria, five years of teaching experience, two years of cooperating teacher experience, recommended by the principal, participation in professional development, reviewed by a panel of school and university members, approved by faculty. Over a three-year period, multiple CMTs worked with four to six PSTs all while collaborating with various university supervisors and faculty. With the participants constantly changing triads and dyads it becomes challenging to identify exactly what this collaborative process entails from day to day and if it is informed by co-planning or co-teaching frameworks.

What is of interest for this review are the perceptions and findings each member reported. Pre-service teachers spoke highly of how the talking and planning that took place with the members of this model made them feel like a collaborative team. This type of cogenerative dialogue during planning exemplifies the co-planning that is a critical part of the co-teaching model (Roth & Tobin, 2002). Supervisors identified
feeling a greater sense of belonging as compared to their experiences with the triad model; however, one supervisor felt that she was unable to have close relationships with CMT’s in this model (Wilson). Nevertheless, CMT’s reported that the sense of community and the credibility they felt as professionals were among the many benefits of collaborating within this model. Overwhelmingly, the members of this model have identified mostly benefits, many of which align with the level of collaboration found in the co-teaching model (Fenty & McDuffie-Landrum, 2011).

When reviewing all of the field models it becomes clear that co-teaching and co-planning can be implemented along with aspects of existing models with some shifting of the specific enactments of the roles. It is also clear that there exists an ongoing call for improved structural models to guide and frame the pre-service teaching experience.

**Field Experience Models and Co-Teaching**

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the co-teaching model both supports the learning of the PST and the professional development of the CT by positioning each as an equal collaborator (Bacharach & Heck, 2012; Diana, 2014). Co-teaching can be applied in cooperation with the traditional field experience models in order to broaden the focus of the PST learning (Bacharach et al., 2010; Cook & Friend, 1995; Roth & Tobin, 2005; Solis, Vaughn, Swanson, & McCulley, 2012).

**Co-teaching with Pre-service Teachers**

Models for co-teaching first started to grow out of special education and reach pre-service elementary education at St. Cloud University in Minnesota, an institution that graduates up to 400, K-6, pre-service teachers each year (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg,
2010). The authors piloted a study with 826 PSTs over the course of four years, evaluating the impact co-teaching between PST and CT had on the children’s academic achievement in the classroom. CTs were identified as prepared to participate in co-teaching following two professional trainings focused on co-teaching. Overall this study resulted in quantitative and qualitative data. Increased student outcomes in co-taught classrooms were reported along with qualitative data in which children self-reported on the benefits they experienced from having two teachers in one classroom.

As a result of this work, there are now more CTs in this district than there are PSTs to place with them, thus presenting a feasible solution to the need for high quality PST placements (Ellis & Bogle, 2008; Diana, 2014). It is also important to note that according to Arndt and Liles (2010) PSTs are increasingly more likely to be asked to participate as co-teachers during their novice teaching years. With that in mind, teacher licensure programs are beginning to explore the many ways in which co-teaching can support PSTs during their field placement and coursework experiences.

Models of Co-teaching

Much like the varying models for pre-service education field experiences, there are many iterations of co-teaching that exist both outside of pre-service education and within the context. To clarify, these differ from the strategies that support co-teaching, which were presented in the previous chapter and focus more on the roles and number of co-teachers working together. Additionally, many models focus on the collaborative nature of working together but are not identified as co-teaching (Smith & Avetisian, 2011; Gardiner & Robinson, 2009). These clarifications are a reminder that the co-
teaching taking place between PSTs and their CTs remains a fairly understudied area with few exceptions (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Bacharach et al., 2010; Bacharach & Heck, 2012). We will now look more closely at the ways in which co-teaching has been enacted in teacher education programs.

**Learning to co-teach on campus.** The literature highlights many well-studied opportunities for pre-service teachers to observe and plan for a potential co-teaching experience (Parker, Allen, McHatton, & Rosa, 2010; Arndt & Liles, 2010). In both of these cases the study participants are pre-service special education majors working along with pre-service general education majors with the purpose of revising lesson plans in order to differentiate instruction for their subgroups of students. Arndt and Liles collected the work samples and asked the 29 participates to write reflections about the process, findings indicate that students were open-minded about co-teaching but have concerns about how it is enacted in practice. Similarly, Parker et al. approached learning to co-teach by modeling the practice for their 56 elementary and special education students in the university classroom in addition to collecting reflective data. The students in the two studies differ greatly as one group was participating in their field placement during their time in the course, which allowed them to make the theory to practice connections their counterparts were unable to achieve.

**Collaboration in the field.** Although the examples presented in this section are of in-service teachers at varying grade levels, many implications are relevant to the pre-service experience. Fently and McDuffie-Landrum (2011) observed and interviewed co-teachers in three classrooms. Specifically, the co-teaching practices between special
education teacher and general education teacher were investigated. Results suggest that co-teaching practices were implemented with most ease during the literacy instruction and least present in most other content areas. Examples of the observed co-teaching practices include one teach/one assist and team teaching however over half of the participating teachers identified the lack of training in co-teaching along with lack of planning time together as areas in which they would like to improve. These indications are well aligned with the needs of PSTs during a field experience, as they are also learners of new knowledge.

Within the publications focused on the field of special education one can find a great deal of discussion, data, and recommendations for successful co-teaching in the field (Brown, Howarter, & Morgan, 2013; Murawski, 2010; Murawski & Swanson, 2001; Walter-Thomas, Bryant, & Land, 1996). These recommendations should not go unnoticed, as many of the findings are generalizable enough to make a contribution to the pre-service learning experience. Recently Brown et al. sum up successful co-teaching for inclusion as being based in “communication, co-planning, shared delivery of instruction and assessment, and conflict resolution (p.85).” In addition to those findings, Bacharach et al. (2010) suggest that more components be considered when evaluating co-teaching that takes place during the pre-service experience as it is contextualized as separate from inclusive models. These components are represented via comparison in table 3 and clearly define what co-teaching is and is not. The most clarifying aspect of the chart is the identification of each component in isolation, which guides the reader in seeing the explicit and sometimes slight differences between co-taught and non-co-taught models.
### Table 3

**Key Components of Co-teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Non-co-taught Models</th>
<th>Co-taught Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>- Little lesson planning preparations among triad members.</td>
<td>- All member of the triad are working together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Little collaboration among university supervisor, pre-service teacher, and</td>
<td>- Descriptive information is provided to inform each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cooperating teacher.</td>
<td>member of his or her role and expectations for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Literature on co-planning and co-teaching approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategies for how to build strong relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>- Pre-service teacher observes upon immersing into the classroom.</td>
<td>- Coopering teacher introduces pre-service teacher as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pre-service teacher has minimal participation in classroom routines</td>
<td>teacher form day one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>until further along in the experience.</td>
<td>- Pre-service teacher is incorporated into routines and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instruction from day one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>- One teacher leads instruction while the other teacher is more passive.</td>
<td>- All teachers are actively involved with instruction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>student questions, and one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>- Prior to working together pre-service teacher and cooperating teacher have</td>
<td>- Pre-service teacher and cooperating teacher come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>little time to build a relationship.</td>
<td>together prior to the field experience to establish a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professional and trusting relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support structures are in place to maintain this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationship throughout the experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>- Pre-service teachers are expected to arrive with and put into practice skills</td>
<td>- Guidance is provided in the areas of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Collaboration</td>
<td>such as communication and collaboration.</td>
<td>and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>- Pre-service teachers plan in isolation.</td>
<td>- Opportunities for purposefully practicing effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lesson are shared with the cooperating teacher just prior to</td>
<td>collaboration strategies are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo versus Lead</td>
<td>- Pre-service teachers observe and take over tasks on their own.</td>
<td>- Cooperating teacher provides mentoring and support in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Eventually, the cooperating teacher exits and leaves the class alone with the</td>
<td>every aspect of classroom instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-service teacher.</td>
<td>- Pre-service and cooperating teacher partner together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling and</td>
<td>- Pre-service teachers are expected to be skilled at instructional strategies,</td>
<td>- During times when the pre-service teacher leads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>lesson planning, and classroom management upon entry into the classroom.</td>
<td>planning and instruction the cooperating teacher remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an active member of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Differential</td>
<td>- Ideas of who has the power in the relationship are left unaddressed or not</td>
<td>- Cooperating teacher provides ongoing modeling and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discussed.</td>
<td>coaching in the areas of lesson planning, classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management, and instructional strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cooperating teacher provides a rationale for decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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These components describe in-depth the ways in which PSTs can navigate preparing to co-teach however, many of these components do not apply in that PSTs are not experiencing co-teaching during the field experience or student teaching. Descriptions of how these components are viewed by PSTs during the field experience, specifically during co-planning inform this study.

**Co-planning**

As a part of co-teaching, co-planning before and during the instruction of a lesson is a valuable learning opportunity for the pre-service teacher, even more important than the implementation of a lesson (Murawski, 2012). According to Norman (2011) CTs must be aware of their assumptions regarding what PSTs will or will not learn about planning just by observing instruction. To investigate the CTs’ role as a teacher of planning, Norman created a study group during which six elementary, CTs met 19 times and examined planning as an area for communication breakdowns and misunderstandings between themselves and their PSTs. More specifically the author points to the need for the CT to explain the thinking behind the planning process with attention to each pedagogical move or shift throughout the lesson. Making thinking visible or giving the PST access to the CTs thinking is a critical aspect of co-teaching that often occurs during co-planning (Brown, Howerter, & Morgan, 2013). Norman’s findings indicate that purposeful discussions or cogenerative dialogues, such as those in the study group, prepare CTs to think differently about co-planning with a pre-service teacher.

Parker, Allen, McHatton, and Rosa (2010) modeled co-teaching for their PSTs at the university level but found many challenges in co-planning. The authors reported that
finding common planning time was critical as they mapped out the course. However, it was during the implementation that they found they needed more co-planning time in order to reflect. Similarly, pre-service teachers are in need of co-teaching partners who can “work together on the planning, organization, delivery, and assessment of instruction” (Diana, 2014, p. 78) before, during, and after lesson implementation. Murawski’s (2012) tips for using co-planning time effectively include recommendations for preparing for co-planning and are inclusive of planning at a regular time, choosing the right location, preparing an agenda, and determining the roles and responsibilities each individual enacts during the planning session.

**Cogenerative Dialogues**

Co-planning and cogenerative dialoguing are closely linked in that co-planning is a time when participants report applying the concepts of cogenerative dialogue to their practice (Roth & Tobin, 2005). Moreover, PSTs and CTs carry these productive conversations into instructional time by meeting for quick fine-tuning sessions called “huddles” throughout the implementation of a lesson (Siry, 2014; Tobin, 2006; Roth & Tobin, 2005). Since the conversations between PST and CT are grounded in a shared classroom experience the dialogues are authentically based in the actual teaching instead of simply talking about teaching in theory, which impacts the learning the PST experiences (Siry, 2014; Tobin, 2006).

Roth & Tobin (2005) ground their understanding of this practice in a more theoretical manner than was presented previously in the section defining terms. The
The practice of cogenerative dialoguing evolved from earlier debriefing sessions in response to the need to articulate as fully as possible the different kinds of experiences and to explain them in and through collective interpretation, from which new possibilities for individual and collective actions emerged (p. 66).

These types of conversations do not emerge without practice and support, to do so, the authors recommend supporting participants by assuring that they share equally in the conversation by asking the following: are critical questions being posed?, is evidence provided?, are ideas and practices being evaluated? These questions are only a starting point and ongoing support and reflection are necessary for cogenerative dialoguing to be deemed successful. These questions further inform the analysis of co-planning that follows in this inquiry.

**Gaps in the Literature**

After a careful examination of the co-teaching literature, evidence suggests that further studies are required in order to better bring forth the PSTs voice and lived experience during co-teaching and co-planning. Firstly, authors in this review have made countless recommendations for the general implementation of co-teaching with little differentiation with regard to the grade level the teachers are instructing. Secondly, co-planning is mentioned as a critical component of co-teaching yet how it is to occur between a pre-service teacher and a cooperating teacher is left undefined. Thirdly, successful co-teaching and co-planning rely on teachers to prepare lessons inclusive of all students and their learning needs, yet for PSTs planning to this depth of understanding may be an area where further scaffolding is needed. Lastly, pre-service teachers thrive
When cycles for feedback are consistently in place throughout the planning for and implementation of a lesson; yet pre-service teachers are often unaware of how to successfully enact the necessary roles for getting their learning needs met.
Chapter 3
Methodology and & Research Design

Introduction
The methodology in this chapter is presented in order to highlight the process of moving towards answers to the guiding research questions. The nature of the questions led me to use a qualitative methods design in which qualitative data was collected in order to determine how student-teacher interns experience co-planning, co-teaching, and cogenerative dialoguing during field placements and student teaching in a pre-service teacher education program. This chapter includes the following sections: research design, data collection, data analysis, theoretical framework, and limitations of the study.

Research Design
In order to more deeply understand the pre-service teachers experience of co-planning and co-teaching, qualitative methods were used in the form of surveys and semi-structured interviews and focused on gathering and interpreting both open-ended data and highly specific data (Galletta, 2013). Seven data sets were gathered and will be more explicitly reviewed in the detailed data collection section. The research questions addressed in this study were:

1. How do pre-service teachers experience co-teaching during a field experience
and subsequent student teaching? What types of co-teaching are represented in their experiences?

2. In what ways are pre-service teachers participating in co-planning during their field experience and student teaching? How do pre-service teachers view their role and the role of their cooperating teacher during co-planning?

3. How well does co-planning support pre-service teachers in feeling prepared to implement lessons and to reflect on student learning?

4. In what ways and when are pre-service teachers engaged in cogenerative dialogues?

Data Collection

Participants

The research site for this study was a large Midwestern University. The participants for the PST portion of the study were all female students enrolled in the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Bachelors Degree Licensure Program or the ECE Masters Degree Licensure Program during the 2014-2015 school year. Table 1 is a breakdown of participants and the data sources in which they were participants. The M. Ed. is an accelerated one-year licensure program while the B.S.Ed. is part of a four-year undergraduate degree. Both programs are aligned and the aim of coursework and field experiences is to prepare students to apply for licensure in this state at upon completion.
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Targeted Participant Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Placement Survey</td>
<td>B.S. Ed. Pre-service Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Placement Survey</td>
<td>M. Ed. Pre-service Teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Survey</td>
<td>B.S. Ed. Pre-service Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Survey</td>
<td>M. Ed. Pre-service Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview</td>
<td>B.S. Ed. Pre-service Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview</td>
<td>M. Ed. Pre-service Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Programmatic Artifacts</td>
<td>B.S. Ed. Pre-service Teachers &amp; M. Ed. Pre-service Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSTs who participated in the survey portion of the data collection were completing courses while also spending two to three days per week in the field during the fall semester and five days per week in the spring semester. Students were placed in schools based on the availability of cooperating teachers. The placements were across four school districts with three being considered urban and one suburban.

Four PSTs participated in semi-structured interviews, three of which were chosen for this study. The three participants had been placed in the same urban elementary school in differing grade levels and were assigned to me as their supervisor. These three participants also attended monthly professional development at the school site that focused on supporting in-service and pre-service teachers in learning about the co-
teaching model. A local university supported and guided this professional development and continues to work in a partnership with the elementary school (Brosnan, Jaede, Brownstein, & Stroot, 2014). Each of the students self-identified their race when seeking admission to the ECE program, while researcher observations were applied regarding the race of the CT. Table 5 displays the partnerships between CT and PST with regard to race. Although one student, Beth, did change her classroom between field placement and student teaching, table 5 still remains accurate.

Table 5
*Interview Participants: PST and CT Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PST</th>
<th>PST Self Identified Race</th>
<th>CT Researcher Observed Race: Field Placement</th>
<th>CT Researcher Observed Race: Student Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Participant’s School Placement.** The urban elementary school in which the three white PSTs completed their field experience and student teaching enrolls 340 students according to the Ohio School Report Card from 2013-2014. To further illustrate the diversity and subgroups of the children in the school Table 3 is provided. In the event that something is “NC” or not calculated that is because there were less than ten students represented in that group. As the table reflects, the PSTs were part of the white minority in this school. With regard to teachers, including CTs, 100% have a Bachelor’s Degree and 71% have a Master’s Degree and 97.6% of these teachers hold certifications for the subject areas in which they are teaching.
Table 6
*Enrollment by Subgroup*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Enrollment Number</th>
<th>Enrollment Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**My Role and Voice.** In addition to being the co-investigator I also participated in this project as I served as a field supervisor within the programs. The 12 PSTs I supervised included five B.S.Ed. students and eight M.Ed. students. My responsibilities included completing no less than five documented, formal observations of each student over the course of their two-semester placement in the field. During the fall field placement I also reviewed four lesson plans from each PST and provided written feedback.

In preparation for the spring student teaching semester my feedback centered on the documents PSTs prepared for their six weeks of lead teaching. These documents
included, an overview of the six weeks, lesson plans for each week, and substitute plans. Among these responsibilities I also met with PSTs and their CTs to complete midterm and summative evaluations that were provided by the university. This degree of involvement with my PST’s assisted me in gaining an understanding of their needs as learners.

**Survey Design and Implementation**

The study used surveys to elicit descriptions of participants’ opinions and experiences during their field placement and subsequent student teaching. Items for the field placement survey and the student teaching survey include short-answer questions and open-ended prompt questions. The two surveys are identical in order to compare experiences over time. The survey responses were then considered when preparing the semi-structured interview questions (see Appendices B-C). These questions were also written and informed by information I gathered from the current body of literature.

The survey consisted of two parts, a chart in which PSTs wrote about the types of co-teaching they experienced and open-ended co-planning questions. The first part involved identifying one or more of the seven types of co-teaching listed and describing the experience inclusive of content area, time of year, and any reflective thinking that resulted. PSTs could describe up to ten co-teaching experiences (Cook & Friend, 1995). The second part involved writing narrative descriptions in response to the nine co-planning questions. In the case of the six open-ended questions PSTs provided longer more detailed responses. When responding to the three more specific questions much shorter responses were written.
Before survey implementation, I contacted the program manager to seek permission to conduct the surveys during course meetings and was given permission. I then used a recruitment script (see Appendix A) to invite all pre-service teachers, within the Early Childhood Licensure Programs to participate in the survey portion during one of their class meetings. Participants were provided with a copy of the informed consent document (see Appendix F) and given time to read it and ask questions. All PSTs were given a copy of the survey and after 35 minutes all surveys and consent forms were collected regardless of participation in order to maintain participant and nonparticipant privacy.

**Interview Design and Implementation**

According to Galletta (2013) a semi-structured interview designed for a qualitative study is informal in the sense that questions vary among participants in order to accommodate the research goals. Participants were identified for interview recruitment if I was their field supervisor, this allowed for triangulation as my observations served as the third data-source in addition to the survey and programmatic documents. Using the interview recruitment script (see Appendix D), 12 participants were invited via email to participate in interviews. The recruitment yielded four interview participants. All four were interviewed; however, three are included in this study due to their field placement at the same school location.

The interview protocol (see Appendix E) was individualized based on the experience of each participant and coupled with five standard questions. Interviews were both open ended and based in participant’s responses to the survey questions in order to
further inform their written and verbal responses. If there was a need for further clarification follow-up questions were asked at the conclusion of the interview.

Programmatic Document Review

In order to triangulate the survey and interview data sources, I used the documents completed by PSTs and myself during the program were used. Two specific types of programmatic documents have been included; supervisor observations of teaching and the PST completed narrative overview of student teaching. I completed two observations for each PST during student teaching, which serves to inform the co-planning and co-teaching practices of the PST. These observations were completed on a form provided by the university program (see Appendix G). In addition to the observations, all PSTs write individualized student teaching overviews as they prepare and plan for their six weeks of lead teaching. The overview required that students define their role and the role of other adults in the classroom. This information aligned with the survey and interview questions and therefore contributes to informing the research questions.

Data Analysis

In this section I will outline each data source, which can be seen more clearly in table 7, addressing how I began making sense of my data through a qualitative lens. Then I describe the ways in which I analyzed the written survey and interview data more than once, or in waves (Galetta, 2013). Lastly I conducted an artifact analysis of the documents collected, employing the constant comparative method, while also coding for emergent categories (Glaser, 1965). During the overall analysis grounded theory, as defined by Charmaz (1990) and Corbin and Strauss (1990) as consisting of the inductive
analytic procedures one employs to develop initial theory, served as the framework along
with constructivism for building further theory (Piaget, 1953).

Table 7
Alignment of Research Questions, Data and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do pre-service teachers experience co-teaching during a field experience and subsequent student teaching? What types of co-teaching are represented in their experiences?</td>
<td>Written Survey</td>
<td>Constant comparative, and thematic coding of emergent categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways are pre-service teachers participating in co-planning during their field experience and student teaching? How do pre-service teachers view their role and the role of their cooperating teacher during co-planning?</td>
<td>Written Survey</td>
<td>Constant comparative and document analysis using thematic coding of emergent categories across data sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does co-planning support pre-service teachers in feeling prepared to implement lessons and to reflect on student learning?</td>
<td>Written Survey</td>
<td>Constant comparative, and with thematic coding of emergent categories across data sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways and when are pre-service teachers engaged in cogenerative dialogues?</td>
<td>Semi-structured Interview</td>
<td>Constant comparative, and with thematic coding of emergent categories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Surveys**

Responses to the open-ended items on the survey were coded with an emergent coding scheme based in constant comparative analysis techniques (Glaser, 1965).

According to Glaser there are many iterations of constant comparative analysis. For the purposes of the written survey I applied a more structured approach to coding and
categorizing. For example, when I read the responses I highlighted words and phrases based in recurrence and or uniqueness and as my codes emerge I sorted them into more specific categories and repeated the process at two time points during data collection in order check my own reliability (Glesne, 2011).

I used this information to draw initial conclusions and to guide me in triangulating, or using multiple data sources to support my research question across the data sets (Glesne, 2011). Additionally, this information guided my inquiry process as I crafted topics and questions for the semi-structured interviews.

**Overview of Survey Response Data.** The survey data collection occurred at two time points: November 2014 and April 2015. During the first time point 52 surveys were distributed to Early Childhood Education students in the B.S.Ed. and M. Ed. Licensure programs, yielding 41 completed surveys. During the second time point 49 surveys were distributed yielding 40 completed surveys. The total number of possible participants was reduced due to the withdrawal of three students from the programs. For this study, eligible surveys were those that were more than 75% complete. No surveys contained that degree of missing information and therefore all completed surveys were eligible for analysis. Table 8 illustrates participants recruited and surveys completed during the two data collections.
Table 8  
*Survey Response Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Group</th>
<th>Recruited</th>
<th>Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S.Ed. November</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.Ed. April</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. November</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. April</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering the whole survey data set there was minimal missing information on individual survey items. In two cases participants did not answer the opened ended question but did remark that a previous written answer should be referenced. Specifically the participants put “see previous question,” or indicated a previous question by drawing an arrow to their response. In these cases the response was duplicated and recoded. Coding of responses occurred in two waves for each time point and multiple codes could be applied to one response. A full overview of resulting codes can be found in Appendix I. Specific questions and their resulting codes are referenced among the three cases in order to triangulate the other data sources.

**Interviews**

My initial analysis began alongside my data collection or during the actual event according to Galetta (2013), as I made notes during the interview and reflected after the experience. Altheide and Johnson (2011) also suggest that interpretive qualitative researchers include many points of view, including the researchers in order to increase validity. Follow-up was needed for clarification of responses or further, more specific
questioning and was done at the conclusion of the interview, during which I reviewed survey responses with participants and asked for any necessary clarification. This is a very common practice during semi-structured interviews according to Galetta, who argues that both researcher and participant should be afforded an opportunity to bring new meaning to questions and responses.

Responses to the semi-structured interview questions were first analyzed through the application of the constant comparative method, which Glaser (1965) describes as not limited to a sequence such as coding, categorizing, and then theorizing. Authentic constant comparative analysis guides the researcher in simultaneously coding, categorizing and writing theory all while cyclically returning to the data more than once. Next, I used the resulting thematic patterns, codes, and theory to review the data once again in what Galetta more clearly describes as waves of interpretation. The purpose of doing this is to look for relationships among the existing codes that can, at this point, be combined into larger categories alongside the theories and hypotheses. It is these categories and theories that I then used to draw comparisons and seek triangulation across data sources (Glesne, 2011; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Programmatic Artifacts

In a similar way to the interview analysis, documents found to be relevant to each case were analyzed both in general and with specific purposes. For example, after the interview supervisor observations and student teaching overviews were included and reviewed in order to support or disconfirm the PST’s recollection of an experience. These documents further guided the development of interview topics. In a more general
way, documents were also analyzed using Glaser’s (1965) constant comparative method to isolate categories and trends in the data set. Such documents also support triangulation and alignment among data sources. A constructivist lens further informed the interpretation of these artifacts and will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

**Theoretical Framework**

Informing this study is the theory or framework of constructivism in combination with grounded theory (Corbin & Stauss, 1990; Charmaz, 1990). This theoretical framework is based on two related components, cognitive constructivism or individual learning and social constructivism or social learning. This section will describe the theoretical framework and draw out the relevance to this research.

**Constructivism**

Constructivism is a theory of learning based in the work of Jean Piaget (1953), which focuses on how individuals construct knowledge. More specifically, Piaget’s theory proposes that information must be constructed by the individual and not simply given to the individual for immediate application. Therefore learners need to have experiences that allow for personal connections to be made to the new knowledge in order to construct meaning and further apply that knowledge (Piaget, 1953, Powell & Kalina, 2009). Baviskar, Hartle, and Whitney (2009) suggest four characteristics of constructivist activities, eliciting prior knowledge, creating cognitive dissonance, applying of knowledge with feedback, and reflection. These characteristics informed the coding of data and influenced the semi-structured interview questions.
Cognitive constructivism. As stated above cognitive constructivism refers to an individual’s personal learning. Adoption or rejection of new knowledge at the individual level occurs during a process of discrimination by the individual. New knowledge enters the mind as a construct made up of facts, experiences, personal values, and relationships and is then carefully compared to the individuals existing understandings. An example of this is a PST who wants to understand more about writing lesson plans. She works with her CT and adopts the strategies that align with her beliefs and rejects those that do not. When new knowledge is determined to be incorrect by comparison, the individual experiences cognitive dissonance, which acts to promote learning according to Baviskar, Hartle, and Whitney (2009).

Social constructivism. Vygotsky (1962) built upon the work of Piaget by adding the social aspect to constructivist theory and also arguing for its ongoing consideration. Although highly related to cognitive constructivism, social constructivism is rooted in the belief that groups construct knowledge through dialogue and collaboration or that the knowledge construction is situated outside of the mind. While, according to Piaget, it remains in the individuals control to base the construction of knowledge on personal experience. Critical to the social learning that takes place is a space in which the learner, according to Vygotsky, must be involved in activities that are at their level with support structures available for times when assistance is needed to increase understandings. This space is an individual’s zone of proximal development (ZPD). More recently, Powell and Kalina (2009) affirm that Vygotsky’s theory “engages students in activities creating relationships that will directly affect what they learn (p.
The application of this lens to my data is well aligned as I look to understand more about how PSTs experience learning during co-teaching.

**Limitations of the Study**

Each method of data collection and analysis presents challenges and limitations, which I attempt to address and remedy, when feasible, knowing that no study or resulting data are perfect. With regard to the analysis of surveys, there existed the reality that responses were based in ideas most salient to the responded at that current moment in time and may not actually be reflective of their experiences according to Zaller and Feldman (1992). In order to address this I relied on triangulation in order to check for evidence of trends and codes among experiences and across data sets.

With regard to the two surveys, I am following Tourangeau, Rips, & Rasinski’s (2000) suggestions for helping participants to avoid difficulties while taking the survey. Recommendations include but are not limited to using uncomplicated language and including ranges where unclear qualifiers are often used. Similarly, I have incorporated the suggestions for preparing a survey described by Bradburn, Sudman, and Wansink (2004), which support drafting questions and revising to reduce the chances of respondents misunderstanding question content.

Similar strategies are employed during the semi-structured interview in order to fully embrace the method’s goal of allowing the participants narrative to be highly represented (Galetta, 2013). Doing this allows participants to share what is important to them about their experience and further guides the semi-structured interview. Attention to the order of questions was given to reduce what Zaller and Feldman (1992) refer to as
response effects or the likelihood that a prior question will have an effect on a subsequent question. Likewise, follow-up was conducted at the conclusion of the interview in order to address the issue of one-sided data interpretation and to involve participants in validating my interpretations of their understandings through commentary and clarification (Bradburn, Sudman, & Wansink, 2004).

Accounting for myself in the data is one of the most challenging and limiting analytic goals I imposed upon this project. Altheide and Johnson (2011) concluded that although the researcher may not always be successful at self-representation there should exist a path that displays the attempts. As a supervisor for the ECE program I was assigned 12 PSTs to directly supervise during their field placements. Of the 12, four participated with me in a semi-structured interview, during which I was able to ask highly specific questions, as I was familiar with their field placements and CTs. Additionally, one of the programmatic documents, the observation, was written by me so it is important to note that my own understandings of PST learning influence what I did and did not document during observations.

Similarly, the participant samples and subsamples in this study represent a very limited sampling of PST, cooperating teacher, and supervisor populations making it challenging to generalize results. However generalizability is not the ultimate goal of this project as I seek to ethically illuminate the stories and understandings of the participants through what Glesne (2012) asserts as proposing hypothesis about data but not making claims.
Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of a qualitative analysis. The goal of this is to support the inquiry into the research questions restated below. This chapter contains the following sections: What were the Co-planning and Co-teaching Experiences of these PSTs, Roles During Co-planning, Co-teaching: An Ongoing Cycle, and Conclusions.

1. How do pre-service teachers experience co-teaching during a field experience and subsequent student teaching? What types of co-teaching are represented in their experiences?

2. In what ways are pre-service teachers participating in co-planning during their field experience and student teaching? How do pre-service teachers view their role and the role of their cooperating teacher during co-planning?

3. How well does co-planning support pre-service teachers in feeling prepared to implement lessons and to reflect on student learning?

4. In what ways and when are pre-service teachers engaged in cogenerative dialogues?
Organization of this Chapter

This chapter seeks to explore the co-planning and co-teaching experiences of early childhood, pre-service teachers (PSTs). Each of the sections focuses on informing the research questions by discussing relevant data, emerging themes, and connections to the existing body of literature. The data sources informing this analysis are survey responses, programmatic documents, and three semi-structured interviews. To begin, I introduce the interview participants in order to contextualize their experiences as they are threaded throughout the chapter.

Three Pre-service Teachers

Getting to Know Beth. Beth (pseudonym) began the school year in a third grade, departmentalized classroom. This meant that each of the teachers focused on one content area when instructing the students. Beth was only assigned to work with one teacher and the other members of the team, although willing, were not responsible for cooperating with her when it came time to complete the requirements of her program. This was a significant worry for Beth and she requested to be moved to another classroom. After only a week, she moved downstairs to a first grade classroom, where she spent the duration of her fall, field placement. During this time the cooperating teacher (CT) had taken on many roles outside of the classroom in support of the school and it become clear to Beth that this CT did not currently have the time to attend team co-planning sessions with the other first grade teachers. Again, Beth requested a move and
was placed down the hall in Kindergarten in order to fulfill her entire student teaching semester.

At last Beth felt that a match had been made and she began to “listen to how other teachers do things. Learning from them but in the same process growing in my own thought process” (Beth, interview, lines 437-438). In order to provide an authentic context, Beth’s story begins in first grade where she spent the entirety of her fall field placement.

**Getting to know Ann.** Ann began her field placement in a first grade classroom and stayed in this room for the duration of student teaching. This classroom was self-contained, meaning that one teacher in one classroom taught all subjects. Ann was a planner and she looked forward to learning how to plan for long periods of time in order to get more organized and prepared to teach. From the start she described her relationship with her CT as a “personality match” (Ann, interview). More than any other case, Ann shared a close relationship with her CT, which led to a “seamless” (Ann, interview) co-teaching experience for Ann. Over time and across data sets the relationship Ann shared with her CT is marked as important and necessary to her ongoing learning. Her comfort in working with this CT allowed her to ask questions about planning and receive feedback, depend on their structured schedule for planning, and engage in a successful co-teaching experience.

**Getting to know Sue.** Much like Ann, Sue began her field placement in a third grade classroom and stayed in that room for the duration of student teaching. Although Sue’s classroom was part of the departmentalized third grade, Sue and her CT felt that
they could work with the other grade level teachers to assure that Sue had the opportunity
to teach all subjects and receive feedback over the course of the year. During the fall
semester it become clear to the team of teachers that the students were not thriving and as
a result, Sue, her CT, and their students become a self-contained classroom for the
remainder of the school year. Previously it was the responsibility of Sue’s CT to teach
Language Arts to all of the third grade students and now she would be instructing all
subjects to her class of students.

**What were the Co-planning and Co-teaching Experiences of these PSTs?**

This section presents survey and interview data in order to examine the
experiences of PST’s during their field placement and student teaching. These responses
are from open-ended survey items, semi-structured interviews, and my own field
supervision observations. This section is framed by the second research question: In
what ways are PSTs participating in co-planning? How do PST’s view their role and the
role of their CT during planning?

**Collaborative Planning: Is There Ever Enough Time to Learn?**

As mentioned in earlier chapters, successful co-planning among in-service
teachers requires time spent in preparation and time spent in collaboration (Murawski,
2012, Tobin & Roth, 2005). For PST’s who are balancing, among other aspects,
participation in planning and learning how to plan, having what feels like “enough time”
to plan is a critical finding of this investigation. Time spent before, during, and after
planning is further divided for PSTs than it is for in-service teachers who are well versed
in the process of planning (Tobin & Roth, 2005). PST’s are learning about planning for
content but also need time to learn the practices and thought processes that productive planning entails, which is greatly different from many models of co-planning in the literature that focus on two in-service teachers co-planning for the inclusive classroom (Solis, Vaughn, Swanson & McCulley, 2012).

**Time spent co-planning.** At a minimum, in-service co-teachers should co-plan for no less than 20 minutes per week (Murawski, 2012) however, 70% of PSTs in this study planned for longer sessions and in greater frequency during their fall field placement. The time spent planning then increased, for 85% of PSTs during student teaching as they planned for longer than 20 minute sessions. For PSTs, the minimum was not enough as described by Sue, who co-planned one on one with her CT for 15-20 minutes in the morning and sometimes during the times when students were at specials (Sue, fall survey). In comparison to peers in the cohort, Sue was meeting to plan with her CT daily, while 65% of PSTs planned only weekly. Although they met each day, the duration of their session was short which was not uncommon among cohort members, as was described previously. The recommendation for the perfect amount of time to co-plan does not exist, but much like this sample of PSTs, teachers who participate in co-planning models often report that there is not sufficient time to plan (Solis, Vaughn, Swanson & McCulley, 2012).

**Post co-planning implications.** This survey asked PSTs how they felt after planning sessions, Sue stated, “I normally wish we had more time to plan” (Sue, fall survey). At the same time, when asked how she felt about implementing, she reported, “More prepared and able to guide students better towards what we wanted them to get out
of the lesson” (Sue, fall survey). It is contradictory that Sue would like more time for planning but also feel ready to implement lessons. Rather than needing more time to plan for content, Sue needed more time to learn about the act of planning itself and how it is structured and enacted. In her overall reflective statements about her learning of planning she concluded that

I think it is easy to make quick decisions and her (CT) stopping and explaining why made me understand that she wasn’t just like “no, I don’t feel like doing that today,” there was a reason behind it. It just gave me ideas for things to do in the future. (Sue, interview, lines 608-611)

In this example Sue shares that when her CT explained her thinking she better understood the reasons that informed the process of planning. Sue noted the quick decision-making skills her CT modeled and could have easily adopted this type of quick planning if her CT had not stopped to explain the thinking behind the decision. Now Sue could see that planning was informed and cyclical, which she plans to carry into her future thinking about planning.

Although Beth’s struggles with time for planning are unique to her planning situation, as she is without the direct support of a CT at this time, she reiterates a need to understand planning as a process. She was unable to spend planning time with her CT due to responsibilities the CT needed to fulfill, which makes her unique. However, she put effort into attending ongoing planning sessions with other grade level teachers.

Every week on Thursday two teachers in the same grade get together to plan but my teacher does tutoring now and does not come to planning sessions anymore, so I sit in with the other teachers sometimes. I have not seen my teacher during a planning session (Beth, Fall Survey).
She describes their planning as being done this way instead, “These sight words, this worksheet, these activities, (Beth, Fall Survey)” without sufficient planning time or collaboration with her CT Beth felt “apprehensive” about her readiness to implement any of the plans (Beth, fall survey). These feelings were also reported by 24% of her peers in the cohort, for example, one PST noted “I usually feel unprepared to implement the lesson because our planning is normally just discussing the topic (for things that I will implement) and then I must plan out how I will teach it later on my own (09BE, fall survey). When PST and CT plan topics or content together that is not enough information for a PST who is still learning about what steps come next in the process of planning, thus leaving the PST to feel unprepared. Comparatively, this situation could be challenged and viewed more productively as a learning experience in which the CT, who feels the PST is ready to complete the task of planning on her own, scaffolds or provides just enough information to guide the learner to the next step. Although that would be an incorrect interpretation of this experience, as we see the PST feels unprepared to take the next step, it is valuable as it illustrates that CTs often think PSTs know more about planning as a process (Norman, 2011).

According to Roth and Tobin (2005), if enough concrete decision-making takes place during a co-planning discussion the PST should be able to leave the session and complete or review the lessons. For Beth, not enough discussion left her feeling unable to complete lessons on her own. A survey respondent describes a similar experience.

Sometimes I feel really sure of where a lesson is going and other times I leave feeling confused. She will not always give specific feedback because she wants me to try and figure it out on my own but in these cases there are times I wish we developed a more concrete idea. (10KI, spring survey)
This PST is struggling with the level of scaffolding she is experiencing during planning, she specifically illustrates what Roth and Tobin are describing when they describe the need for enough concrete discussion during planning. Without enough time to plan there may not be enough time to adequately develop concepts surrounding content or the process of planning, which leaves PSTs feeling confused and disorganized about the planning process. The time spent co-planning is critical, but it cannot be about just duration, what takes place in that time has an impact on PST learning as well.

**The organization of co-planning.** From the beginning of her time in the classroom, Ann, like Sue, experienced planning with her CT as a one on one process, in which they worked together at a “designated time” (Ann, interview) each week. Her understanding of planning time was that “it was definitely a co-planning process, we always did it all 100% together” (Ann, interview, lines 13-14). Numerous studies suggest that meeting at a regular time to co-plan and eliminating isolated planning sessions supports in-service teachers in being prepared to co-teach, which is well reinforced here in a PST and CT model (Cook & Friend, 1995; Murawski, 2012; Walter-Thomas, Bryant, & Land, 1996). If co-teaching is the aim of co-planning, as it was for Sue and many others in the literature, then designating time for this during the PST field experience would best support PSTs in becoming co-teachers.

Being organized about planning and having a regular meeting schedule was important to members of the cohort as a whole, in which 44% of students emphasized aspects of organization in their responses to being asked what they learned during planning. Details such as, “Figuring out how long each lesson should last, thinking about
situations I should be prepared for, and figuring out which content I should cover (05BA, fall survey),” are examples that demonstrate the two aspects of planning CTs need to be prepared to teach to PSTs. Specifically, this data is supported by the literature, which describes the CT in the role of teacher of planning in addition to planning for content, furthermore recommending that CTs are explicit about delineating between teaching the “conceptual and practical knowledge of instructional planning (Norman, 2011, p. 66)” when co-planning. To clarify, PSTs need CTs who collaborate to plan conceptual, content-based lessons while simultaneously sharing the practice-based knowledge of planning as a process.

Well organized co-planning often leads to successful co-teaching. During an observation of Sue and her CT I could see evidence of co-planning as the two co-taught a math lesson.

While working out a word problem students are gathered at the carpet. Sue asks guiding questions to support students in solving the problem in whole group. Sue emphasizes labeling what students are talking about through the use of units. Co-teacher reinforces solving the problem by participating along with Sue and working with students to design a chart that will help students solve the problem. Sue and Co-teacher take turns leading the lesson. Sue reinforces the vocabulary of “combining and separating” for her students. When a student solves a problem Sue encourages students to explain how they did it. (Observation, Jamie).

Sue and her CT take turns leading the lesson or team teaching, according to Bacharach et al. (2010), during which they share instruction. This can be seen when the CT reinforces Sue’s teaching by creating a concrete chart for students to refer to throughout the lesson. Sue and her CT had not prepared or planned to include a visual aide in the lesson but during the co-teaching interaction the CT recognized the need and without disrupting the flow of instruction made the change. Since the two had an organized, co-planned lesson
structure, Sue was able to step back into the shared instruction and adjust the lesson to include this visual aide. Sue also learns from this experience as she sees the benefits of a visual for her students and can add that to her knowledge of tools that assist the learning of students in her classroom.

Disorganization. Sue and her CT provide compelling evidence of the ways in which organized co-planning directly affects the learning of PSTs and children during future co-teaching. In other words, it all starts with organized co-planning. When a PST has a co-planning experience where, “Each week my teacher would throw new ideas or lessons into the plans without warning or support,” then this causes her to “doubt decisions during planning” (05WI, spring survey). This PST is also going to doubt the reliability of decisions during co-teaching instruction since there is not an organized lesson plan for her to call to mind if and when instruction is altered.

This kind of unpredictability in co-planning was experienced by 24% of peers in the cohort, who reported feeling unprepared or apprehensive after planning during the fall semester and 18% who still felt that way in the spring. In order for co-planning to be successful each participant needs to prepare and participate, which also supports co-planners in staying organized (Norman, 2011). For this group of PSTs, the structure of their university program may have played a role in influencing how they experienced co-planning during the fall field experience. PSTs were only in the field one to two days per week and may not have been present for all planning sessions, however in the spring students were in the field five days per week, giving them more opportunity to experience co-planning. The literature suggests that the misalignment between the university
schedule and the PST field schedule is a contributing variable which remained a concern for 18% of PST during student teaching (Smith & Avetisian, 2011).

Along with the 18% of students who felt unprepared after planning in the spring, one of the three case study participants, during her interview, also indicated feeling “unorganized” or “worried (Sue, spring interview).” Although a small subgroup, these data indicate that for some PSTs, co-planning is not successful even when they were present for the full five-day week. Sue illustrates this disorganization when describing frustrations with finding time to plan, “there were weekends when I couldn’t get together with her or mornings when I was just running late, so she would just do what was in her head” (Sue, interview, lines 566-567). Sue cannot be expected to organize materials and instruction when the idea for the lesson is still in her CTs head. Norman (2011) reminds us that often the mental preparations an experienced teacher can plan from are insufficient as they lead to confusion when PSTs cannot see how the CT is getting from one step to another.

Who takes the lead? Roth and Tobin (2005) explain that PSTs should be taking on an increased leadership role in co-planning as they progress in their learning. For the 18% of PSTs who still felt unprepared to implement in the spring a closer look at the role of the CT during planning was undertaken. PSTs described planning situations in which plans were presented to the CT for feedback but collaboration was not a part of the process.

She dictates what a lesson should look like and what material it should cover and gives suggestions on how I could accomplish it (12BA, spring survey).
My CT planned most lessons using prior experiences that were successful. She ran the team planning and told the other three teachers what they could plan if they wanted to follow her plans (12BR, spring survey).

In both of these planning sessions the CT has maintained full control of the planning sessions, which is in misalignment with recommendations for co-planning that suggest that eventually the PST should take the lead in planning in combination with ongoing modeling from the CT (Bacharach at al., 2010). PSTs were limited in their participation, “I basically ask her what she wants done” as co-planning appeared to be framed around what I call a supply and demand relationship rather than opportunities for collaboration. (12BA, spring survey). In a framework of shared leadership, PSTs are given more opportunities to engage in cogenerative dialogues in which they can access the thinking of their CT and further develop their understandings of lesson planning (Bacharach & Heck, 2012).

**Co-planning as a Visible Process**

Norman (2011) argues that experienced teachers can implement lessons based on minimal recorded notes while PSTs cannot as they lack “well developed ways of thinking about teaching, students, and subject matter (p. 59).” In order for PSTs to learn about the planning process and planning for content the teaching must be explicit and visible as it was for this student, “Seeing her (CT) collaborate with other second grade teachers, seeing how she uses old things but modifies them, and seeing how she connects material throughout the day” (10NO, fall survey), were ways in which Ann learned about planning. Ann also focused on how it was “beneficial to see the process of planning lessons, to see how to fit all the necessary content in and keep plans organized” (Ann, fall
survey). Additionally, Sue shared that “being able to hear her thinking and see it play out was helpful (Sue, fall survey).” Although these examples do not highlight a shared dialogue between PST and CT, they do illustrate how, during the fall field experience, PSTs had a preference for seeing and hearing the process of planning before actively participating.

PSTs described a need to observe, see, hear, and reflect on the planning process early in their field experience. This is distinctly different from the recommendations for co-planning among in-service teachers which require all participants to contribute (Murawski, 2012). In general the greater body of co-teaching literature promotes a role of active engagement for PSTs from the moment they enter the classrooms of their field experience (Cook & Friend, 1995; Bacharach & Heck, 2012). However, I would argue that yes, PSTs need to know that participation is welcome and expected but that if they also need time to process or observe that there is room for such experiences within a co-teaching model that is enacted between PSTs and CTs.

To further illustrate the growth and learning of the PST from field placement to student teaching, PST’s were asked again, about the aspects of planning that helped them learn during co-planning in the spring, 30% of participants reported collaboration and discussion. In other words, PSTs do not need to see and hear as much about planning as a process, they are more engaged as active participants who make a contribution to co-planning. Specifically, if we follow survey respondent 10NO, we see the shift in her preference for participation over observation in her description of her role and what she learned during co-planning.
I had a fairly equal role in the planning process. During my 6 weeks I took more of the lead, but when I wasn’t I was more of a sound board for ideas and I contributed if I had anything important or cool to share I learned that using old ideas can be great as long as they are modified and adapted according to the needs of the current class. I also just learned how valuable co-planning could be. I don't know what I'm going to do without my mentor teacher next year. (10NO, spring survey)

Her more equal role and increased level of sharing displays her commitment to the success of the lessons being planned, which is, according to Tobin and Roth (2005), an integral aspect to getting a cogenerative dialogue started.

**Visible Co-planning and Cogenerative Dialogue.** Different from Sue and Ann, Beth, who was now planning with a team of kindergarten teachers, was asked if she would like to share anything additional about her experience student teaching:

> Learning how people think through their planning made me think through mine in more depth. When we had students that were not able to put images in order from beginning, middle, and end that is when I talked to the team about the images. The teachers didn’t think the students could see the images very clearly and that’s when we came together and thought about doing color images and blew up the images larger. That was something that we implemented in the future, we made sure we did that for future assessments because we learned that it made a difference. (Beth, interview, lines 439-445).

As a group, the teachers Beth co-planned with engaged in a cogenerative dialogue surrounding the post-implementation, reflective concerns Beth brought up with the teachers about the images. This dialogue fulfilled the purpose of being cogenerative as it “allowed for collective interpretation, from which new possibilities for individual and collective actions emerged (Tobin & Roth, 2005, p. 66).” In talking as a collective team about Beth’s concerns, the teachers were each able to contribute, resulting in a solution based on the collective interpretations of the group of co-planners.
These rich discussions or cogenerative dialogues in combination with the ongoing planning between Beth and her CT solidified co-planning as a valuable, cyclical practice for her. In response to being asked what specifically she would take into her future planning practices Beth shared that:

It was an experience that I will always hold onto. The communication I found very important and hearing ideas and giving and getting suggestions about what might help in the classroom. Even if we were all trying to be on the same page it is still different teaching styles so to be able to all come together and express ideas and learn from them and ask questions and get advice. That collaboration was very important. (Beth, interview, lines 395-399).

Beth specifically states that her learning occurred in a social space, where ideas were co-constructed through collaborative dialogue (Vygotsky, 1962). Her example also supports the ways in which communication among the teachers during co-planning influenced and prepared Beth to think about implementation and student learning as part of a cycle of informed planning practices. The diversity of ideas and experiences that each teacher brings to the co-planning enriches the learning experience for everyone, but most notably for the PST. This example answers what Murawski (2012) poses as the essential question surrounding co-planning, “How is what we are doing together substantively different and better for students than what one of us would do alone? (p.8).” Beth specifically identifies that she learned from coming together, asking questions, and getting advice from the co-planners about what might make a difference in her classroom and for her students.

Planning for content. Feeling prepared to implement lessons involves both deeply understanding the content and visualizing how it meets the learning and management needs of the students (Arndt & Liles, 2010). According to Norman (2011),
PSTs “lack well-developed ways of thinking about teaching, students, and subject matter (p.59),” which is clearly indicated in this example from the survey data, “I felt mixed emotions. At times, overwhelmed with the amount of content expected to be covered in one session of planning. I also felt relieved, having an idea of what to expect for the coming weeks (12ME, fall survey).” Co-planning for an early childhood classroom is complex and requires the consideration of all content areas in coordination with student needs. Although this PST describes a sense of relief in knowing what to anticipate she also struggles with deeply understanding how to plan for the vast array of content. An interview participant also struggled to align content and standards, “Sometimes I feel the session is rushed to come up with work that relates back to the standards (Beth, fall survey).” Bringing these ideas into alignment is an integral part of the planning process, one that needs to be both visible and discussed. This is important to highlight, as very little literature on co-teaching takes place in early childhood and with PSTs (Bacharach at al., 2012).

*Co-planning, but not for co-teaching.* While Beth described her frustration with drawing content connections during planning sessions another PST struggled with bridging the gap between planning and implementing, “Coordinating two different teaching styles is tiring at times. Sometimes I feel like we come out on the same page and others I think it may have been easier to plan myself (08CO, spring survey).” Although Beth and her peer were co-planning in the sense that teachers were working together to organize the lessons for the week, each of them identifies a breakdown in connecting content and implementation. For this PST co-planning lacked a time during which the
teachers would discuss the implementation of the lesson, which prevented successful co-teaching (Bacharach at al., 2010). Another possible breakdown is that the PST expresses the challenge of coordinating two different teaching styles, which is exactly what the two need to be doing during their co-planning in order to improve their co-teaching (Walter-Thomas, Bryant, & Land, 1996).

**Co-planning for co-teaching.** While Beth was struggling during planning, Ann was thriving and learning how to think about co-planning for co-teaching. She shared that when preparing to implement a lesson, she and her CT would “talk it out together, (Ann, interview, line 32)” which gave her access to her CT’s thinking and a time to ask questions before going home for the weekend and reviewing the lessons to prepare to teach. This process gave Ann confidence in her ability to leave a planning session and implement lessons, a feeling she shared with 56% of her peers who also reported feeling “confident” about lesson implementation post-planning in the fall.

Drawing connections between co-planning and co-teaching need to be explicit for PSTs and highlight the organization of the future implementation as reported here, “When we co-planned I was a lot more confident about the teaching and the days layout (08CO, fall survey).” Additionally, another student indicates, “I felt confident understanding the lesson being taught with a plan on how to implement the lesson prior to (12ME, spring survey).” When PSTs experienced planning that included a time for thinking through the implementation in addition to preparing the content they felt more confident in their ability to co-teach.
When the Relationship Makes all the Difference. Ann started off feeling “hesitant” about her contributions to the content piece of planning. However, Ann had the support of her CT and the added variable of a positive working relationship:

We would go through every subject and especially towards the beginning I was hesitant. She would let me know where we were supposed to be based on their curriculum and I would either find things online or just think of something and be like “do you think this is a good idea?” Because early on I was kind of unsure and so she helped a lot. Later in the process it was a lot more me saying what I was thinking and she would kind of confirm. This really didn’t happen often but if there was something she didn’t see panning out she would say “why don’t we try this first” or “we should switch these two days.” So it all progressed to me bringing the ideas and her validating them or offering suggestions. (Ann, interview, lines 18-27).

Ann grows in her understanding of planning as a process as she and her CT develop and revise their relationship across time. Ann felt her CT helped her to grow in their relationship through what she described as a progression in which they balanced their leadership in co-planning. Initially Ann had access to the well developed thinking of her CT as they reviewed plans for every subject, freeing her up to think more deeply about her content implementation (Norman, 2011). As time passed and with the support of their relationship, Ann took on more of the leadership role by bringing her own ideas to the planning sessions.
Ann and her CT spent time co-planning and had an understanding of their roles and that they grew and changed based on the needs of the relationship. At times, Ann presented her work for feedback and at other points they collaborated together to create lessons. During these experiences Ann was seeing the process of planning with the added benefit of a supportive CT who provided scaffolding that guided Ann in increasing her mastery of planning (Vygotsky, 1962). When Ann suggested or planned something that her CT thought needed revised the CT provided feedback or guided Ann in making changes, which aligns with co-planning practices suggested in the literature. Ann saw this as part of the evolution of their relationship and took suggestions from her CT as constructive feedback.

This balance is not uncommon within the PST and CT relationship, as many other members of the cohort reported engaging in similar dynamics with their CT’s. During the field placement 41 responses were coded as interactive or collaborative planning, which during student teaching was reduced to 28 responses. PSTs were doing more of the planning on their own citing that, “Because I am currently student teaching I am responsible for a bulk of the planning, my teacher approves the ideas and gives me her opinion on how those ideas may happen (08CO, spring survey).” Again, there is an understanding of co-planning by the PSTs that goes against co-planning as PSTs plan in isolation and only collaborate with the CT for approval. For Ann, the collaboration during planning remained steady across the two semesters, giving her increased support and opportunity for learning during co-planning. Contrastingly, the teachers with reduced support had less opportunity to see and learn planning from CTs but more
opportunity to practice applying skills independently. This is where the roles enacted by each participant become relevant, co-planning is defined by collaboration but also allows for shared leadership. PSTs like Ann are learning more than those who plan in isolation, as Ann and her CT spend time in collaboration they are revising their learning and their thinking about student learning. This is accomplished as Ann enacts leadership roles and her CT acts as guide and both revise content and planning practices as they share in the learning that takes place during co-planning.

**Roles During Co-Planning**

In this study survey participants were asked to answer two questions about roles during their field placement and student teaching. First, PSTs were prompted to describe their role in planning. Second they were asked to describe their CT’s role in planning. The three PST’s that participated in interviews were asked these questions once more with the additional request to provide examples of how their roles were enacted. The following section explores how this data informs the second part of research question two: How do PSTs view their role and the role of their CT during co-planning and co-teaching?

**Role of the PST**

Co-planning or collaborative planning has been identified in the literature as an integral part of co-teaching. Often overlooked are the ways in which co-planning is enacted by participants, especially PSTs and their CTs. In the survey participants were asked how they viewed their role during planning sessions with their CT. From their responses categories describing their role and level of participation emerged. PSTs
identified as collaborators, interactive participants, recipients of feedback, presenters, and in some cases having no role. It is important to note that students were assigned more than one code if there description suggested the need for a dual code. For example, “I listened to what my teacher had in mind and then shared my ideas of what I’d been thinking, then we made a plan using both (06BR, fall survey).” This student was coded with presentation and collaboration due to the sharing of ideas (presentation), and the creation of a new idea together (collaboration). Throughout this section I will bring forth more data to support these codes.

**Collaboration.** PSTs who thought of themselves in the role of collaborator described themselves in ways most closely aligned with recommendations from the literature for co-planning that prepared teachers to co-teach. Additionally, these PSTs described having a role in conversations that would qualify as cogenerative dialogues that collaboratively created new ideas. During the fall 29% of students believed they were collaborators in the planning process. In the spring less than 1% of PSTs were identified as such. To explain this we see a breakdown or misalignment of some sort between PST understandings of program requirements and how they enact those requirements in their classroom placements. The lack of collaboration during student teaching has been noted previously in this chapter and is a challenge for the implementation of co-teaching. Without the collaboration, PST learning is again limited, but when cogenerative conversations are part of the co-planning process during student teaching PSTs are learning at much deeper levels.
I was surprised in the co-planning with the ideas I came up with in the moment. I hadn’t thought about them before but something somebody else said triggered something that made me think about something that I thought would work really well. I don’t feel that if I hadn’t had that other experience with other teachers that I might not have come up with these ideas. (Beth, interview, lines 414-418)

The description is compelling evidence that supports the use of co-planning as a strategy to increase the learning of PSTs, which is inclusive of supporting the PST in developing a voice in the partnership (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010). Without the cogenerative dialogue described by Beth she would have left planning as she had many times before, confused and unsure. In this case she grew her ideas through co-construction and refined them for implementation. Over the course of student teaching Beth stated, “I could put my voice into what I thought would work (Beth, interview, lines 367-368).” Feeling heard and coming together with the team of teachers surprised Beth in unique ways and influenced how she thought about her role.

**Interactive.** One level below collaboration on the hierarchy that emerged from these surveys were PSTs who described their role in a way that aligned with recommendations from the literature for co-planning but did not report engaging in discussions that would qualify as cogenerative dialogue or create new ideas. PSTs whose descriptions were coded as interactive appeared to have conversations with their CTs that lacked the degree of depth necessary to impact or alter the learning of the PST. One survey respondent describes such a co-planning experience, “I ask her what she'd like me to help teach for the day and what topics she'd like me to plan my lesson plans on, what
fits with what she plans on teaching that week (12RE, fall survey).” During the fall 71% of PSTs participated in planning in this manner with only 25% reporting this during spring. Of the 71%, again many students were assigned two codes due to their descriptions. An additional survey respondent was coded as interactive and collaborative, “I was free to give ideas or input where I would like. Often they would have subjects in mind for the week and I could help build upon those (06DA).” For both of these survey respondents the first code assigned was interactive, as they each describe contributing ideas or asking questions in order to determine how they should proceed. For the second respondent, the addition of participating as someone who “could help build” ideas qualified her as a collaborator in addition to being interactive. This is an important qualifier according to Roth and Tobin (2002) who clearly state that to be cogenerative all participants must be enacting their roles equitably and with the aim of understanding something more deeply. This respondent is making a contribution to the conversation that alters the outcome; if she were not participating, the resulting new knowledge would be different. The interactive role is important because it provides the PSTs with an opportunity to practice making contributions and builds them up to being more prepared to collaborate.

**Feedback.** PSTs who were coded in this category were identified, as they were the recipients of direction or guidance from their CT during planning but did not actively participate or present ideas during planning. In the fall 22% of PSTs self identified in this role, which increased to 80% during the spring.
Understanding the Program Requirements. With 80% of PSTs coded as recipients of feedback during spring student teaching we cannot move forward without describing an important variable influencing these responses. As described earlier in this chapter, these students were all enrolled in courses on campus while completing their field experience and student teaching. In the spring, PSTs are responsible for completing lesson plans and other programmatic documents in order to prepare for a six-week period of lead teaching.

“I have assumed more of a primary role in the classroom. Our co-planning sessions have consisted of me developing main ideas for the lessons and turning them in to my CT for guidance and resources (07MC, spring survey).”

This PST has taken on the role of both presenter and recipient of feedback. She is now the lead teacher in the room and although she still needs feedback and support during co-planning she has taken on developing most of the ideas on her own. This description of co-planning has not and may not provide a collaborative or cogenerative experience for the PST. One positive is that the PST described a change in her role, which is identified as progression within the co-planning models presented in the literature (Roth & Tobin, 2005).

Presentation. With the exception of having no role at all, students who were coded as presenting information often planned in isolation and brought their lessons to the CT. A student who was assigned only a code of presentation reported, “I would present my ideas for my lessons to her on a daily basis. She did the planning at home (11TA, fall survey).” I must emphasize that a very small subset of students were coded as presenters only, and that in most cases being coded as a presenter was accompanied by
an additional code. Many students who enacted this role were coded with presenter and feedback, as in this case, “I prepare the entire lesson plan (when I am going to be the lead instructional teacher) and bring it to her and she gives suggestions about how differently I could use my instructional sequence (11JV, fall survey).” In these cases PSTs do not participate in cogenerative dialogues, they simply supply a lesson to meet the demand of either university program or CT. Although PSTs learn from the feedback or revisions they are given from their CT, in these cases, they are simply making edits to paper and not altering their own reconstruction of planning knowledge (Piaget, 1953; Powell & Kalina, 2009).

In preparing for student teaching, Beth, an interview participant described her role in the classroom as a part of her assigned paperwork for her seminar class.

My role as a student teacher is to take more responsibility and become more of the lead teacher in the classroom. I am planning daily activities with suggestions from my cooperating teacher and I will plan all reading activities (Beth, overview).

Beth describes an important part of the co-teaching model when she identifies taking on more responsibility however; her role also limits her at this time in her experience, as she appears to be taking on all of the planning on her own. Although it may be true that she is taking on an increased leadership role, when the leadership is enacted in isolation and there are no others to lead, it becomes invalid.

No Role. Only one student reported having no role in planning, and although she is an outlier I feel it important to highlight her case as it displays why she may have identified in this way. In response to being asked to describe her role in the fall she stated, “I do not have a role in planning unless the lesson is mine (as an assignment)
(04LA, fall survey).” In the spring the same PST reported, “I would contribute ideas and suggestions my mentor and I would discuss and come to a conclusion together.” And was then coded as presenting and collaborating. Although this student transitioned from a non-co-planning model to a co-planning model across time, I would also like to further explore her survey responses in order to see if this low level of participation is visible.

Even though this student felt that she did not have a role in planning, except for her own lessons, when she responded to question seven, which asked PSTs how they felt about planning sessions she reported, “Usually overwhelmed after the teaching team planning. I feel more comfortable after one on one planning with my CT” (04LA, fall survey). She further explains, “I attend weekly planning meetings with the 1st grade teaching team, but for my personal lesson planning I present ideas when I have lessons due (04LA, fall survey)” Overall, during the fall, this student reinforces the need for one on one planning time early in a PSTs experience in order to support the PST in having higher level co-planning experiences such as interaction and collaboration.

**Role of the CT**

Similar to the previous section, PSTs were asked to describe the role of their CT during planning sessions. Four similar codes resulted from the responses provided by PSTs including interactive, feedback, presentation, and plans all. It is important to note that these roles are the product of the perception of the PST and not reports from the CT. This was purposeful as the understandings PSTs have of the roles of their CTs is a gap in the co-planning and co-teaching literature. This section aims to explore PST understandings of the roles of their CTs as framed by the resulting codes.
Interactive. During the fall, 71% of PSTs described their CT as being in an interactive role with them during planning. By spring the number reduced to 33%. Specifically, these students described sharing in the leadership role but not engaging in cogenerative dialogues. Ann, an interview participant anticipated the roles each person would enact during student teaching as a part of her student teaching overview, a programmatically required document that she completed for her seminar class.

During my six weeks of student teaching, my role in the classroom will be that of lead teacher. My CT and I have a great dynamic co-teaching our students; however my CT has held the role of the lead teacher during the fall semester. During student teaching I will take more of the lead role while my CT provides support as a co-teacher. My CT and I have already been planning together throughout the fall semester, so we will continue to plan our instruction together after school on Thursdays, which I plan to bring more ideas and input to during my official student teaching. (Ann, overview)

Ann describes how both of them will have shared in taking the lead role during co-planning and in their co-teaching. This shifting of leadership is well documented in the co-teaching literature and illustrates that these two teachers have negotiated any issues surrounding power differential in the relationship, which is a component of the co-teaching model (Bacharach et al., 2010).

When CTs and PSTs do not adequately address the power differential ideas about it are left unattended and the relationship can suffer. Survey respondents who were coded as viewing their CT in an interactive role did not describe experiences in which there was a struggle with power differential. What they did share were experiences with CTs during which “we bounced ideas off of each other (10ME, fall survey)” or “we discussed possible activities and resources (06BO, spring survey)”
Feedback. 49% of PSTs felt that their CT enacted the role of provider of feedback during the fall and in the spring the number rose to 80%, paralleling exactly the role of the PST in spring. To clarify and emphasize, during the spring student teaching 80% of PSTs viewed themselves in the role of recipient of feedback while at the same time seeing their CT as the provider of feedback. This is exemplified in a survey response, “My CT’s role is to provide feedback on my ideas and lesson concepts. She also is there to provide guidance and access to resources that she has (07MC, spring survey).” The PST indicates a leadership role for herself as creator of the plans but also notes her CTs role as provider of feedback. Another important aspect to highlight is the view that the PST has of her CT as a provider of resources and guidance, indicating that the power differential may not have been addressed between this pair.

Presentation. Less than 13% or 3 students saw their CT in the role of presenter of ideas during the fall, which was maintained during the spring. To clarify, CTs who were coded as presenters lead co-planning sessions entirely. One survey respondent planned with a team of teachers in the spring and noted that; “They came with examples of prior plans and activities in the subjects to guide where we would go. They also made sure to make clear the specific assessment expectations established by the TBT and school staff/district” (06BR). Having information presented during co-planning is not outside of what can be defined as co-planning as long as the presenting is a pre-planned part of the process and planners share in discussing the information (Roth & Tobin, 2005). Even so, PSTs in co-planning sessions dominated by presentation are limited in the roles they can enact.
**Plans All.** In the fall 37% of students placed their CT in the role of planning all lessons. In the spring, two students still had CTs who planned all lessons. Sue, an interview participant described the relationship she shared with her CT and how co-planning worked when the CT was always in the lead role.

She normally has the main idea planned, I help focus it, like pick out a book or help write math questions or reading response questions. I will type or make copies as well (Sue, fall survey).

CT gives big ideas for whole group reading and I narrow down things, give input on small things. She will ask my opinion or to read over things she prepared. Sometimes she will ask what I think we should do for topics or big ideas (Sue, spring survey).

Sue’s CT involved her in the planning by challenging her to finalize ideas, which left her feeling that planning sessions “focused on her needs for planning and not mine.” (Sue, spring survey). This left Sue feeling prepared enough to teach but often wondering if she had “missed something (Sue, spring survey)” during planning that she might need to be considering in order to feel ready to implement. Since Sue’s CT enacted the lead role for the duration of their relationship Sue remained stuck in her role as support teacher.

Murawski (2012) suggests that roles need to be determined based on individual strengths that are discussed ahead of co-planning. For in-service teachers this type of role dynamic may be acceptable within the co-teaching model but for PSTs there needs to be a shift in the roles in order to support their learning.

CTs in this study enacted many roles during co-planning, ranging from highly interactive collaborators to owners of all planning. This range is not surprising, as university programs do not often have the luxury of placing PSTs with only highly collaborative CTs. However, these roles are the experiences of this group of PSTs, many
of whom did experience co-planning with a collaborative CT, but for those that did not
the experience was often one of isolated planning that did not carry over into successful
co-teaching. In order to better support PSTs and CTs in negotiating roles during the field
placement and student teaching experiences strategies within the co-teaching model
should be accessed and explicitly discussed as a part of the co-planning experience.

**Co-Teaching: An Ongoing Cycle**

Reflective practice is part of a well-established strategy that supports the learning
and development of persons in a variety of fields who are looking to learn from and
improve their actions (Schon, 1982). In the field of education, the co-planning and co-
teaching model supports and reinforces reflective practice both during planning and
implementation (Murawski, 2012). What we do not know as much about is how
reflective practice, which is informed by student data, impacts PSTs and their learning of
planning as a cycle or process. This section seeks to inform research question three and
four, how well does co-planning support PSTs in feeling prepared to implement lessons
and reflect on student learning and in what ways are pre-service teachers engaged in
cogenerative dialogues. When reviewing the data that informed this question PSTs
frequently reported engaging in co-planning that was organized or structured by a
recurring cycle.

**The Co-plan, Implement, Co-plan Cycle**

Each of the three interview participants described being engaged in a cycle of co-
planning, implementing, and informed co-planning. Correspondingly, survey
respondents also described their process as a cycle.
I like that at the beginning of each session we talk about what we notice (for example, in math students understand all operations, but we noticed they struggled with putting them together in multi-step word problems) and this "noticing" leads our planning (along with considering target standards). Planning sessions are very reflective and targeted toward our specific group of students not 3rd graders in general. (01WA, fall survey)

Figure 1 displays the possible iterations the interview participants enacted during their field placement and student teaching.

Figure 1  
*Co-planning Cycle*
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**Co-planning that leads to independent teaching.** According to Diana (2014), for co-teaching to work between PSTs and CTs both must co-plan for their co-teaching roles during instruction and assessment. Finding common co-planning time is reportedly the greatest challenge facing co-teaching, in-service teachers, not to mention the added difficulty CTs take on when working with a PST (Murawski, 2012).
I co-plan but teach alone. Beth’s experience with the first grade planning team looked like co-planning, but for Beth, who shared “I have not seen my CT during a planning session” (Beth, fall survey), the planning was disconnected from her classroom and CT. Without co-planning that was inclusive of her CT, Beth felt “unsure” and did not participate as fully, or at all, in co-teaching as I observed her during a lesson implementation.

Beth is completing a lesson (Reading out loud). A student turns on the smartboard and Beth sets up the board for the sight word lesson. Beth reviews the sight words by saying them and having students echo them back to her. Beth stops the lesson to redirect a student who is talking with his peer. (A student enters the room, late for school) Sight word review is over and Beth transitions the students into groups for the next activity (Jamie, fall observation).

During this observation we see that Beth takes on all responsibility for implementation, management, timing of transitions, and many other aspects of a lesson. What we do not see are any interactions between CT and PST that would indicate co-teaching was a part of this lesson. Additionally, Beth’s co-teaching survey indicates that at time she thought she was engaging in co-teaching but in actuality she was only preparing materials, “I would help set up for the next activity (Beth, fall survey),” was what she reported as a description of co-teaching. Some authors might challenge this, as co-teaching is not always the best instructional strategy for the implementation of a lesson (Roth and Tobin, 2005). However, Beth’s planning experiences without her CT along with this observation do indicate that co-teaching did not occur due to lack of co-planning (Roth & Tobin, 2005). So it is possible, for a PST to experience co-planning that is not at all linked to co-teaching. This situation is highly unlikely to occur when co-planning takes place among in-service teachers so it is especially important to point out this unique case
as relevant in that it is something PSTs need to be aware of when participating in the PST and CT co-teaching experience.

A co-planning comparison. It was also a common trend in the survey data for PSTs to feel unprepared after planning, like Beth, 41% of her peers reported feeling “overwhelmed” or “confused” after co-planning during the field placement. Upon closer investigation, the 17 students reporting these feelings differed from Beth in that they felt this way even after co-planning with their CT, an experience Beth was not afforded. To clarify, a survey participant who reported feeling overwhelmed highlights the differences between her experience and Beth’s, “I felt mixed emotions. At times, overwhelmed with the amount of content expected to be covered in one session of planning. I also felt relieved, having an idea of what to expect for the coming weeks” (12ME, fall survey). In this example the respondent indicates that although overwhelmed, there is a plan in place for what is expected during instruction. Upon further investigation of her co-teaching survey data, I can conclude that unlike Beth, this student did engage in co-teaching after co-planning.

My CT and I planned and prepared together multiple math lessons for the months of Oct-Nov. We divided the lesson into sections to teach as well as shared assessment roles. My CT and I divided subjects between each other to teach individually. The person not teaching served as a classroom aide (12ME, fall survey).

Although co-planning led these PSTs to feel overwhelmed, they were able to draw connections between the first two phases of the cycle, co-planning and then implementing through co-teaching.

Co-planning that leads to co-teaching. Co-planning on its own does not always lead to meaningful co-teaching; it can sometimes result in independent teaching as we
saw earlier in this chapter. Many have reasoned that relationship building is a critical support structure that links co-planning and co-teaching into a seamless cycle (Parker, Allen, McHatton, & Rosa, 2010; Diana, 2014; Bacharach et al., 2010). For PSTs and CTs developing a relationship is often a challenge as it is seen by the CT as an additional responsibility that takes more time away from the work of planning and teaching and not something that is embedded within those aspects. Co-teaching between a PST and a CT requires the purposeful inclusion of relationship building strategies as a necessary component (Bacharach at al., 2010). When PSTs are working towards a more equal partnership in both planning and implementation, they are sharing roles, workload, and building their relationship in the process (Bacharach & Heck, 2012).

*Relationship.* Co-planning was an opportunity for this PST and CT to develop their relationship and they did so over the course of many planning sessions.

I think just having that personality match. My teacher and I were extremely close and our personalities just clicked really well. That helped me so much with planning and implementation. If I had been with someone I wasn’t comfortable with I know it would have been a lot more difficult for me or I just might not have learned as much. Even with her, initially during planning I was really nervous. Is she going to think this is stupid? She is so experienced and I just have these ideas and I don’t know if she is going to like them. It was nice being so close that eventually I felt comfortable throwing out any idea and knowing she wasn’t going to shoot it down. Even if she thought it was bad that she would be able to offer me something better and I would learn from that. That was a big part of our planning and teaching. (Ann, interview, lines 74-83)

In reflection, Ann views the relationship between herself and her CT as a “personality match,” one that strengthened their co-planning time as she become more comfortable. The strength of the relationship has implications for co-teaching, as one survey respondent describes, “She helped me learn to take risks, that in teaching we can learn
through experience, what works and what does not (12BA, fall survey).” As this PST and her CT learn from their experiences they are also presented with opportunities to build their relationship according to Diana (2014). This is important for PSTs as they enter relationships with CTs filled with prior notions and expectations about what the relationship will be like (Ambrosetti, 2010). The co-teaching that resulted from these relationship building co-planning sessions was referred to by Ann as “seamless.”

Seamless co-teaching. At the mid-point of student teaching I documented the following observation Ann and her CT during a math lesson:

Ann introduces the activity and models cutting out the materials students will need to participate in the matching activity. Students assist in passing out materials and have a sense of what is expected of them. Co-teacher is moving around the room with Ann in order to guide students in organizing materials. Ann counts down from 3-2-1 and asks students to practice the math activity with her. Ann models the addends activity and shares with students that there are often two or more correct answers. Ann uses the document camera to model all steps of the lesson. During this part of the lesson students are using the number sentences and adding words to write an explanation. Reminders are given to students to be sure they are writing in complete sentences as well as including a reason for their explanation. The CT writes an example of a sentence on the board. Students share examples and discuss how others in class may have thought about the addend matching in a different way. Both teachers move around the room checking in with students and asking for explanations regarding student decision-making. (Jamie, observation, 2-10-15)

During the lesson Ann expected that the CT would assist students in preparing and organizing materials. The impacts co-teaching had on this lesson occurred at multiple points. First, the co-teacher supports the PST by circulating the room along with Ann in order to help students organize materials. Second, the CT reinforced Ann’s reminder to write in complete sentences by providing an example for students to see on the board. Third, the CT and Ann resume checking in with students together so they can talk with
them about their understandings. Given these points, both the PST and the students are enhancing their learning.

When a PST and a CT co-teach, the PST learning that would take place reflectively after the lesson is not delayed and takes place during the lesson. For example, in this case, the CT reminds Ann that students may need concrete examples of directions she is only orally presenting when her CT reinforces this by writing on the board. Ann can immediately revise her initial lesson plan to include this practice both now and in future lessons. Simultaneously Ann can revise her own knowledge of implementation as she constructs new meaning around her students needs to have a more concrete example. Ultimately, the children benefit from co-teaching when the lesson is adjusted during implementation in order to meet their learning needs throughout the implementation.

**Huddles.** Adjusting the implementation of a lesson while teaching is a challenge within itself, especially when there are two teachers. According to Tobin (2006) a huddle is an opportunity for a cogenerative dialogue that centers on what has happened, and what needs to happen in this lesson. Sue and her CT enacted huddles by “rotating halfway around the room and touching base. So when we had a moment we were talking to each other (Sue, interview, lines 512-516),” this movement around the room assured that they would check in during lessons. During huddles Ann shared that she and her CT would “real quick, on the fly, change it (Ann, interview, line 91).” Ann describes this in an example during math instruction:

If we were doing math and we thought they would get it really quickly and they weren’t I would look at her and be like, “should we pull out those manipulative
“clocks?” She would be like “Yes that sounds like a good idea.” We would then all move to the carpet and kind of regroup (Ann, interview, lines 93-95).

During this interaction Ann is not alone in her teaching, her CT and the co-planning they had done ahead of time support her. This level of communication is also supported by the relationship the two teachers built throughout their co-planning experiences. Here we see the work of co-planning in action as the teachers re-plan in response to student needs. This occurred when both teachers were being reflective of student learning and actively listening to one another in the midst of implementing the lesson (Tobin, 2006). At the same time student learning is enhanced because the two teachers are engaged in a live dialogue surrounding the implementation of the lesson. It is a powerful learning experience for PSTs when they participate in co-teaching relationships that can productively scaffold their learning of teaching practices while they are being enacted.

**Informed Co-planning.** In the same way that huddles informed the co-teachers of how they should adjust their lesson in action, student data informs co-planners as to how they should proceed. Informed co-planning between PSTs and CTs is a part of the co-teaching cycle and all three interview participants reported having a role in this reflective process.

**Informed Cogenerative Dialogue.** After co-teaching, any assessments that were given were referenced during co-planning in order to inform the next steps in the planning process.

Every Friday all of the Kindergarten teachers would meet and go over the assessments from the previous week, we decided if we were going to continue a topic or if we were ready to move on. If we needed to keep it going, I think we really started co-planning. We all needed to come together and figure out how we were going to do this. We saw in the data that the students weren’t getting it so
we discussed what we could do and that was the co-planning, where everyone could share their ideas. (Beth, interview, lines 329-331 & 405-408)

This team modeled and included Beth in an informed, collaborative, and reflective approach to thoughtful lesson planning. Equally important is the recognition Beth gives to co-planning as she describes it much like a dialogue-based support mechanism that can be accessed when the team needs to share and think through multiple possibilities. Under these co-planning circumstances the PST can draw personal connections to previously constructed knowledge, make new meaning through cogenerative dialogue, and therefore revise and apply new knowledge during lesson implementation.

*Informed co-planning impacts future planning.* During her interview Sue also described a cycle of planning similar to Beth as she co-planned with her CT one morning:

So the morning of we would reflect and kind of be like “well they didn’t finish that so obviously we need to continue it on or some got it and some didn’t” or “oh gosh some of them are writing their fractions really weird so we need to review that” so it would be a lot about reflecting on what we did the day before and then we would go hour by hour and discuss what each subject looked like. (Sue, interview, lines 481-486)

Much like Beth, Sue engaged in a cycle of planning that was informed by the student learning from the previous day. Although brief and informal Sue still managed to revise planning and form understandings about why it was necessary to plan in this way.

*Co-planning informed by reflection.* After co-teaching Ann and her CT were co-planning when they reviewed assessments that showed how many students had not mastered the spelling words from the previous week.

Instead of just bulldozing through all of these and moving ahead we would go back and spend another week using different strategies to help them learn the spelling patterns and then move on from there. So planning was a time when we reflected on “how did this go this week?” Being more reflective of what just
happened in the classroom or how students responded right then is going to impact my planning a lot. (Ann, interview, lines 63-69).

This example is highly similar to the cycle Beth described in her planning process. Both Ann and Beth reflect on the student learning from the previous week in order to inform their future planning. This not only supports informed planning practices, but it simultaneously provides a point of entry into planning giving the PST a place to start contributing.

This reflective cycle of co-plan, implement, informed co-planning is not fully enacted when PSTs plan in isolation; the collaborative interaction that allows for a cogenerative dialogue among the planners provides a unique social interaction that is not present when planning alone. During this time PSTs have access to the thinking of their CT’s through conversation, questioning, and feedback. The co-teaching model supports and is supported by the cogenerative dialogue Ann shares with her CT. Ann’s learning needs as a PST and co-teacher are met when the rationales and decisions are co-constructed through dialogue.

Conclusions

In this chapter I have discussed resulting data from this investigation. PSTs experiences with co-teaching and co-planning were greatly varied among participants and across time from field placement to student teaching. Responses regarding the roles enacted during co-planning by PSTs resulted in the following hierarchical categories: Collaboration, Interaction, Feedback, and Presentation. Additionally, the roles PSTs perceived their CTs to be enacted fell into these categories: Interaction, feedback, presentation, and plans all. Also discussed were the ways in which PSTs and CTs
engaged in cogenerative dialogue, specifically within the cycle of co-planning identified from this data. Throughout this chapter, data have been triangulated in order to bring the data sources together and show the relationships among the various types of data collected. With the intention of further supporting these connections, the existing body of literature surrounding co-planning and co-teaching was referenced when relevant. In the final chapter of this dissertation, the implications of these results will be discussed.
Chapter 5
Discussion

Introduction

The research, learning, and practices surrounding early childhood teacher education are a complex area of research, inclusive of both theoretical and practice-based contexts. Additionally, the research questions and subsequent data collected for this study aim to inform practice and excite further interest in continuing to investigate this area of study. In this chapter, I first discuss the data related to the four research questions in relationship to implications for pre-service teachers, CTs, and teacher educators in early childhood. Then I discuss the limitations of this investigation. Next, I make recommendations for further research in early childhood teacher preparation. Lastly, I conclude this chapter with a summary of the investigation.

Implications of the Study

In this study I set out to qualitatively investigate the experiences early childhood PSTs were having with co-teaching and co-planning during their field experience and student teaching. Simply reporting these results limits their impact regarding how we think about and enact early childhood teacher preparation. As an educational researcher in early childhood teacher education, I want this work to impact PSTs, CTs, and the program-based teachers guiding their practice. For this reason, the results of this study
are displayed in Ch. 4 in three major sections based on the research questions: experiences PSTs had with co-teaching and co-planning, the roles enacted by the participants, and co-planning practices and cogenerative dialogues. The following implications are suggested based on the data collected for this study. The first responds to the explicit call from PSTs for more time and attention to be given to co-planning outside of its role as a part of co-teaching. Second, the data suggest preparing PSTs and CTs for the hierarchical roles at play during co-planning. Thirdly, a cycle of informed co-planning inclusive of rich opportunities for PST learning resulted from the PST experiences during co-planning, which emerged from this data. These three implications will be more specifically explained in the following sections.

**Implications for Early Childhood Pre-service Teachers**

This study is rooted in the call for a deeper understanding of PST learning within the co-planning and co-teaching models that are based in and have the voice of the early childhood PST. It is important that the experiences PSTs have with co-teaching are shared, revised, and improved upon as existing, less informed co-teaching models gain popularity in teacher preparation programs. Responding to the experience of the PST during their field placement and student teaching experience has the potential to greatly influence the learning opportunities they are afforded thus impacting their personal and social learning. PSTs with experience collaborating are entering their novice year of teaching more prepared to continue collaborative practices and engage in ongoing learning opportunities that contribute to their development as professionals in the field of education.
The data from this study suggests that co-planning is more than just a component of the co-teaching model when it is enacted between CT and PST. For PSTs in this study making time for co-planning was critical as it supported PSTs in three areas: co-planning is a point of entry for participation in the construction of new knowledge, it supported PSTs in building relationships with CTs, and it contributed to their feelings of confidence both during the process of planning and the implementation of lesson plans. To a greater degree, PSTs who experienced cogenerative dialogues during co-planning were more prepared to revise their understandings in all of these areas throughout their field experience and student teaching. Participating in co-planning within the co-teaching model does not provide sufficient time for PSTs to learn and process their learning, in order to optimize learning co-planning must be more clearly defined and enacted.

**Co-planning: a point of entry for knowledge construction.** It is clear from the data that PSTs desire more time for co-planning since the dialogues had during co-planning impacted and altered their existing understandings about planning. This new planning knowledge was created as a result of PST participation in cogenerative dialogues and centered on both content being taught to children and the process of planning teachers modeled. These dialogues helped PSTs to co-construct knowledge about planning and teaching with their CT. In addition to preparing and organizing content for co-teaching, PSTs are learning how to organize and understand the complex process of planning. On their own, cogenerative dialogues, the co-construction of knowledge, and viewing planning on multiple levels are not new ideas however, PSTs
experiences with these ideas during such a critical time for their learning does make a contribution towards filling the gaps in the co-teaching literature.

The data simultaneously reinforce the existing literature, which proposes that CTs are both teachers to children and teachers to PSTs (Norman, 2011). CTs who understand this role enacted co-planning in an organized and reliable way, which according to the data supported the PSTs in participating meaningfully by questioning, giving input, and receiving feedback. All of which have the potential to contribute to the cogenerative dialogues that PSTs need to participate in as they construct and reconstruct their understandings of co-planning. Their contributions as collaborators and not observers removes them from the isolation cognitive construction of knowledge is often criticized for and into a social place in which they can enter the conversation through questioning and test their new understandings with others. It is clear that while licensure programs hold PSTs accountable for what they can plan on their own those PSTs who plan alone are at a disadvantage in comparison to their peers who participate in dialogue-based experiences that best support PST learning of planning.

**Co-planning: a time for relationship building.** The study has also revealed that co-planning, in addition to being a time for learning, also provided a time and a place for PSTs and CTs to develop their professional relationship. The data suggest that PSTs often continue to struggle with the power dynamic between themselves and PSTs, especially when they do not experience high quality co-planning. Instead of participating in the relationship as a collaborator, those PSTs were limited in their interactions with CTs. Often those interactions consisted of presenting lessons and listening to feedback.
It is clear that while those interactions may meet minimal learning needs the data suggest that those PSTs wanted to increase their participation in the co-planning relationship. This suggests a need for a more explicit implementation of co-teaching, one that is specific to meeting the needs of the PST-CT relationship during this critical time in PST learning.

**Co-planning: A visible cycle.** The data shows us that in addition to being a component of co-teaching, co-planning, with or without corresponding co-teaching provides PSTs with opportunities to see and hear why planning decisions are made. The co-planning stories shared during this study overlapped at times and from that alignment emerged a cycle of informed co-planning. This cycle shows us the opportunities we have to influence PST learning during co-planning, which is critical knowledge for CTs. The three interview participants each described the lasting benefits of informed co-planning in relationship to their future planning and lesson implementation. Sue and Ann identified the ways in which concrete examples gave them access to their CTs thinking during planning and impacted the subsequent co-teaching. Both PSTs felt that their informed planning practices supported them in co-teaching as both CT and PST had a clear understanding of the lesson implementation, which allowed for adjustments to be made mid-instruction. These interactions supported the PSTs in revising their lessons in action, something commonly left for post-instruction reflection. In contrast, Beth participated in informed co-planning and implemented lessons on her own with no reflection on the lesson until the next planning session. For all three of these PSTs, the cycle of informed co-planning prepared them to implement lessons with confidence despite Beth’s lack of
co-teaching. To prepare PSTs for confidence in implementation effectively, CTs made their thinking visible by participating in dialogue and creating concrete documents that recorded the thinking of the co-planners. PSTs could then review and or further develop their understandings from the planning sessions by referring to the concrete documents created.

**Implications for Early Childhood CTs and Teacher Educators**

It is clear from the data that PST learning is supported and increased by participation in co-planning that is inclusive of a CT who participates in cogenerative dialoging. More Specifically, the data suggests that CTs who openly discussed the roles enacted during co-planning supported their PST in sharing in leadership roles during co-planning and co-teaching. It is still not enough to discuss these roles during the field placement and student teaching. PSTs, CTs, and teacher educators must aim to improve the alignment of field-based assignments and university coursework.

**CT and PST roles that support learning during co-planning.** In this study PSTs enacted four hierarchical roles during co-planning: presenters, recipients of feedback, interactive participants, and collaborators. The data suggest that PSTs enact these roles in response to their co-planning experience. Experiences ranged from planning in isolation to planning one on one with a CT to team planning. For example, Beth planned in isolation and presented her lessons to a team of teachers who gave direct and specific feedback, while Ann and Sue were interactive collaborators as they co-planned with only their CT. PSTs who collaborated during field placement co-planning went on to co-teach while Beth taught independently. CTs who provided opportunities
for PSTs to enact the higher-level roles were also providing increased learning opportunities. Specifically, when PSTs enacted collaboration they grew from observers to equal participants as they co-constructed and revised knowledge of planning during cogenerative dialogues. These PSTs learned more about planning as a process, planning for content, and how to balance their roles so that leadership was shared. Based on those results, it is important for CTs to be informed regarding these ever-changing roles so that they can define how roles shape their relationship with their PST. Furthermore, CTs who have an understanding of the roles can more quickly recognize a PST who needs support in moving from, for example, an observer of co-planning to a collaborator. The CT can then discuss how the responsibilities of a role can be shared in order to scaffold the PST from one role to the next.

**Teacher Educators.** The analysis of these data revealed that programmatic documents such as lesson plans and Student teaching overviews influenced the roles PSTs enacted during field placements and student teaching. There was often a mismatch between how the PST understood the assignment and how it was enacted. Survey respondents clearly reduced their role as co-planning collaborators when they believed assigned lesson plans, specific to coursework, were to be completed independently. This often led to PSTs falling back into the role of recipient of feedback during their student teaching, the most critical time for learning. In order for PSTs to enact roles more effectively, teacher educators must be explicit about how PSTs should go about completing assignments that are field-based. The data also suggest that in some cases reduced collaboration during planning can be overcome or may not be necessary during
student teaching. Ann and her CT understood the shared nature of their roles in co-planning and co-teaching early in the field placement. By the time student teaching began Ann wanted to plan on her own while the two co-taught. In this case, the PST and CT were supported by their existing relationship, which was rich with verbal and nonverbal communication. This relationship scaffolding allowed Ann to take on a planning leadership role during which her CT provided feedback. This was possible because the CT was prepared to negotiate the roles of co-planning. Recruiting CTs who are prepared to enact co-teaching is an ongoing recommendation and challenge for teacher preparation programs.

**Limitations**

Qualitative studies present their own unique limitations. Many potential limitations were addressed before and during the investigation, such as the addition of a more thorough semi-structured interview as to more deeply inform three cases identified after surveys were completed. At the same time, limitations presented themselves during the data collection. The impact such limitations have on the study are discussed.

**Qualitative Research**

The first limitation, the small sample size, does limit the scope, reliability, and generalizability of this investigation. Small sample size does challenge the reliability of this investigation and attempts were made to reduce the effect. I triangulated the survey data along with the semi-structured interviews and programmatic documents for the three interview participants. For non-interview participants I referenced their two surveys and programmatic documents. Having multiple kinds of data sources made it possible for me
to describe experiences as are they are based on the provided perspectives. Additionally, my observations as their supervisor further assisted me in developing the questions for the three interviewees. This added depth to their survey data and would not have been a feasible course of action for all survey participants.

The second limitation is that I designed the survey based on the limited existing body of literature and to align with my specific research questions. Because of this I also considered my anecdotal observations of the field in order to inform the survey and interview protocols. As a supervisor and course instructor I had relationships with all of the PSTs and the observations I made of their experiences, roles, and teaching also impacted the development of my research questions and data collection instruments. In light of the limitations my role may have imposed, my positive relationships with PSTs may have increased their willingness and comfort in sharing their experiences. As a result, I believe the findings reported to be a valid qualitative interpretation of the experiences these PSTs reported.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

How I went about interpreting the data was rooted in my data collection process and analysis. Survey implementation took place at two time points, first at the conclusion of the field experience and second after the completion of student teaching. PSTs however were enrolled in their university program during both of these implementations and for 11 PSTs I was their field supervisor. As their supervisor I am an insider in the classroom, involved in meetings and observations along their CTs. For some PSTs the relationship I share with them may have influenced what they did and did not report
duing surveys and interview. These are circumstances that must be considered, as PSTs are reliant upon me for letters of recommendation and may have been hesitant to report any struggles in their placement. One example of this is Sue; her reported responses on both survey and interview are misaligned with my anecdotal observations of her experiences in the field. I am confident however that my observations are highly limited and only a glimpse of the PST experience and therefore do not jeopardize the findings of this study.

The experiences the PSTs reported in their field placements and student teaching were limited by the constraints of the university-based program. An example being that PSTs receive guidance from instructors and supervisors regarding the aims of their relationships with CTs and that information was not considered during this study. Participation in this study was not a coursework obligation however; the implementation of the surveys took place on campus during a course meeting, which may have reduced participation.

Many limitations also stem from the survey instrument I created. For example, I ask PSTs to describe their experiences during the “planning session,” a term that I did not define. This resulted in two different ways PSTs interpreted the term, some students responded to the questions with only one planning session in mind while others reported a more aggregated story of their experience. A second limitation from the survey implementation is that the exact same survey was given at two time points to allow for comparison however, after the coding of the first survey and the realization of the previous limitations it would have been productive to have improved the survey by
rephrasing and clarifying questions to which PSTs answered by drawing arrows to previous questions. Altering the survey between the two implementations would have reduced comparability and impacted analysis.

There were also analysis-based limitations in this study. According to Glesne (2005) “All the words you gather through your research are not inherently meaningful in themselves. Rather you make them meaningful through your analysis and interpretations (p. 214).” Although I completed a minimum of three waves of coding and categorizing of the survey responses, interviews, and programmatic documents, the lack of a secondary coder to add inter-rater reliability is missing from this study. It would have been beneficial to add this extra layer of triangulation overall.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Based on this investigation, I recommend the following areas for further examination:

1. In order to add to this body of work further investigations into the learning outcomes for PSTs who experience co-planning and those that do not are recommended. Specifically in the form of an experimental study.

2. In this study data were collected at limited time points. Future studies could expand these findings by diversifying the data collection methods to include increased time points during which PSTs report on their experiences. This would result in a richer picture of the ways in which co-planning practices are ongoing, outside of official co-planning sessions.
3. Another area deserving a closer look involves the separation of co-planning from co-teaching. Looking at the ways in which PSTs and Co-plan but do not always co-teach is distinctly different from the existing literature which links the two together.

**Conclusions**

In this study, I have presented my understandings and interpretations of the co-teaching and co-planning experiences of 41 early childhood PSTs. These interpretations have informed the research questions that guided this study and also demonstrated the impact co-planning has on PST learning during a very critical part of their development as teachers. Schools require teachers to be prepared to act as collaborators, yet teacher preparation programs are not explicit with PSTs as to how they can go about developing the skills necessary to enact this role. In order to be collaborative, PSTs need CTs who are willing to engage with them in co-planning that embodies shared leadership through an explicit negotiation of roles. Equally important is the need for CTs to ensure PSTs are learning about planning that leads to the implementation of content and about the cycle of planning as a process. Doing this involves openly sharing the decision making that takes place and documenting an informed cycle of planning so that PSTs have concrete references to support them in reinforcing their learning.

Finally, I believe this investigation positions teacher preparation programs as responsible for preparing and guiding the field-based learning practices of PSTs by providing high quality field-based experiences inclusive of a well-trained CT. Although challenges exist, recruiting CTs who are willing to truly fulfill their role as a
collaborative partner to both PST and university improves and reinforces PST learning overall. PSTs need to be able to rely on, and it is the duty of, the preparation program to thoughtfully consider co-teaching as model to better support PSTs in their field-based learning.
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APPENDIX A:

Pre-service Teacher Recruitment Script

Recruitment Script: Student Interns (Survey Only)

Hello,

My name is Jamie Schiff and I am working on a project, under the supervision of my advisor, Dr. Rhoades, regarding intern’s experiences during a field placement. Participating in my project is voluntary and would consist of completing two questionnaires during your enrollment in the Early Childhood M. Ed. Program. During those times, you would be independently filling out a questionnaire that would take no longer than 20 minutes.

If you have any questions about my project, you may contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Melinda Rhoades at rhoades.89@osu.edu.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Thanks you for your time and consideration,

Melinda Rhoades and Jamie Schiff

Please take time to review the consent form.

If you have chosen to participate please look at the cover page attached to your survey. Carefully follow the instructions to create your unique identifier along with
your name. Next, copy your unique identifier onto the first page of your questionnaire.
APPENDIX B:
Pre-service Teacher Survey (Field Experience)

Please print neatly.

NAME (First and Last):
____________________________________________________________________

Example:

I was born in June and my mother’s maiden name is Smith. My code is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Two-digit Birth Month</th>
<th>First two Letters of Mother’s Maiden Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE FILL IN YOUR CODE BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Two-digit Birth Month</th>
<th>First two Letters of Mother’s Maiden Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
PLEASE FILL IN YOUR CODE BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Two-digit Birth Month</th>
<th>First two Letters of Mother’s Maiden Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Placement Student-Intern Survey Fall 2014
Administered in-person
Seven Types of Co-Teaching taken from *Marilyn Friend and Lynne Cook (1996a).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Co-Teaching</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One teach, one observe</td>
<td>One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other gathers specific observational information on students or the (instructing) teacher. The key to this strategy is to focus the observation on specific behaviors. Both the teacher candidate and the cooperating teacher are able to take on other roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. One teach, one assist</td>
<td>One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other assists students with their work, monitors behaviors, or corrects assignments, often <em>kicking</em> a voice to students or groups who hesitate to participate or add comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parallel teaching</td>
<td>In parallel teaching, the teacher and student teacher plan jointly but split the classroom in half to teach the same information at the same time. For example, both teachers could be explaining the same math problem-solving lesson in two different parts of the room. If the room had two computers, each teacher could use a computer to model the use of the Internet or a new piece of software to half of the class. Each half of the class could be involved in a literature study group during a novel study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alternative teaching</td>
<td>Both teachers are responsible for planning, and they share the instruction of all students. Both teachers, who actively engage in conversation, not lecture, to encourage discussion by students, teach the lessons. Both teachers are actively involved in the management of the lesson and discipline. This approach can be very effective with the classroom teacher and a student teacher or two student teachers working together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplemental teaching</td>
<td>Supplemental teaching allows one teacher to work with students at their expected grade level while the other teacher works with those students who need the information or materials extended or remediated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Station teaching</td>
<td>Both teachers divide the instructional content, and each takes responsibility for planning and teaching part of it. In station teaching, the classroom is divided into various teaching centers. The teacher and student teacher are at particular stations; the other stations are run independently by the students or by a teacher's aide. For example, three or more science stations, each containing a different experiment, could be organized with the teacher and student teacher working with the two stations that need the most supervision. It is also possible to use an aide or parent volunteer to supervise stations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Team Teaching**

Both teachers are responsible for planning, and they share the instruction of all students. Both teachers, who actively engage in conversation, not lecture, to encourage discussion by students, teach the lessons. Both teachers are actively involved in the management of the lesson and discipline. This approach can be very effective with the classroom teacher and a student teacher or two student teachers working together.

During your field placement have you participated in any of the above types of co-teaching? If so, please use the chart below to describe your experiences. An example has been provided. Feel free to use the same type of co-teaching for multiple examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of co-teaching</th>
<th>During what Subject/part of school day</th>
<th>During what month</th>
<th>Description/Outcome/Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Calendar time</td>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td><em>My cooperating teacher (CT) and I planned together to prepare for the calendar lesson. We decided which parts each of us would lead. During the lesson we talked to one another and our students. I forgot a few small parts but my CT picked right up and kept the lesson flowing. I felt confident having my CT with me so that we could answer student questions as a team.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Co-Planning Questions
During your Field Placement, what did planning with your cooperating teacher look like? In your response please discuss the following using as much detail as possible:

1. How often? ________________________________________________________________

2. How long did a planning session last? __________________________________________

3. Where did you plan? _________________________________________________________

4. Describe your role in the planning session.
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________

5. Describe your cooperating teacher’s role in the planning session.
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________

6. What aspects or practices of the planning session helped you learn about lesson planning?
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________________________

7. When your planning sessions ended how did you feel about the session?
   _____________________________________________________________________________
8. When your planning sessions ended how did you feel about implementing the lesson(s)?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

9. How did your planning session help you to think more deeply about your students’ learning?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
APPENDIX C:
Pre-service Teacher Survey (Student Teaching)

PLEASE FILL IN YOUR CODE BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Two-digit Birth Month</th>
<th>First two Letters of Mother's Maiden Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Teaching Student-Intern Survey Spring 2015
Administered in-person
### Seven Types of Co-Teaching taken from *Marilyn Friend and Lynne Cook (1996a).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Co-Teaching</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. One teach, one observe</strong></td>
<td>One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other gathers specific observational information on students or the (instructing) teacher. The key to this strategy is to focus the observation on specific behaviors. Both the teacher candidate and the cooperating teacher are able to take on other roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. One teach, one assist</strong></td>
<td>One teacher has primary instructional responsibility while the other assists students with their work, monitors behaviors, or corrects assignments, often lending a voice to students or groups who hesitate to participate or add comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Parallel teaching</strong></td>
<td>In parallel teaching, the teacher and student teacher plan jointly but split the classroom in half to teach the same information at the same time. For example, both teachers could be explaining the same math problem-solving lesson in two different parts of the room. If the room had two computers, each teacher could use a computer to model the use of the Internet or a new piece of software to half of the class. Each half of the class could be involved in a literature study group during a novel study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Alternative teaching</strong></td>
<td>Both teachers are responsible for planning, and they share the instruction of all students. Both teachers, who actively engage in conversation, not lecture, to encourage discussion by students, teach the lessons. Both teachers are actively involved in the management of the lesson and discipline. This approach can be very effective with the classroom teacher and a student teacher or two student teachers working together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Supplemental teaching</strong></td>
<td>Supplemental teaching allows one teacher to work with students at their expected grade level while the other teacher works with those students who need the information or materials extended or remediated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Station teaching</strong></td>
<td>Both teachers divide the instructional content, and each takes responsibility for planning and teaching part of it. In station teaching, the classroom is divided into various teaching centers. The teacher and student teacher are at particular stations; the other stations are run independently by the students or by a teacher's aide. For example, three or more science stations, each containing a different experiment, could be organized with the teacher and student teacher working with the two stations that need the most supervision. It is also possible to use an aide or parent volunteer to supervise stations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **Team Teaching**

Both teachers are responsible for planning, and they share the instruction of all students. Both teachers, who actively engage in conversation, not lecture, to encourage discussion by students, teach the lessons. Both teachers are actively involved in the management of the lesson and discipline. This approach can be very effective with the classroom teacher and a student teacher or two student teachers working together.

During your Student Teaching have you participated in any of the above types of co-teaching? If so, please use the chart below to describe your experiences. Feel free to use the same type of co-teaching for multiple examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of co-teaching</th>
<th>During what Subject/part of school day</th>
<th>During what month</th>
<th>Description/Outcome/Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Co-Planning Questions
During Student Teaching, what did planning with your cooperating teacher look like? In your response please discuss the following using as much detail as possible:

1. How often? ________________________________________________________________

2. How long did a planning session last? __________________________________________

3. Where did you plan? _______________________________________________________

4. Describe your role in the planning session.
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

5. Describe your cooperating teacher’s role in the planning session.
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

6. What aspects or practices of the planning session helped you learn about lesson planning?
7. When your planning sessions ended how did you feel about the session?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

8. When your planning sessions ended how did you feel about implementing the lesson(s)?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

9. How did your planning session help you to think more deeply about your students’ learning?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
APPENDIX D:

Pre-service Teacher Interview Recruitment Script

Recruitment Script: Student-teacher Interns (Interview Only)
In-person

Dear Early Childhood M. Ed. Interns,

My name is Jamie Schiff and I am working on a project, under the supervision of my advisor, Dr. Melinda Rhoades, regarding Interns’ experiences with co-planning and co-teaching. Participating in my project is voluntary and would mean participating in one in-person, semi-structured interview and between one and two follow-up email communications. During that time, you would be asked questions about your experiences co-planning and co-teaching with a cooperating teacher. The interview would take no longer than 30 minutes with the follow-up emails taking no longer than 15 minutes. If you choose not to participate please reply to this email.

If you have any questions about my project, you may contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Melinda Rhoades at rhoades.89@osu.edu.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Thanks you for your time and consideration,

Melinda Rhoades and Jamie Schiff
APPENDIX E:

Pre-service Teacher Interview Protocol

Standard Interview Questions

1. What would you like to tell me about your planning experiences?

2. Tell me about your role and the role of your cooperating teacher during co-planning.

3. What about your planning experiences helped you to feel ready to implement?

4. How did classroom management play a role in planning?

5. What did you learn that you will carry over to your future planning?
APPENDIX F:

Pre-service Teacher Informed Consent

The Ohio State University Consent to Participate in Research

Study Title: Co-planning and Co-teaching within an Early Childhood Licensure Program
Researcher: Jamie R Schiff
Sponsor: Melinda J Rhoades

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary. Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose: To obtain the opinions and ratings of student teacher interns regarding their personal experiences surrounding co-planning and co-teaching during the field placement and student teaching.

Procedures/Tasks: If you consent to participate, you will be asked to fill out paper-based questionnaires at two regularly scheduled course meetings: one today, and one near the completion of your elementary placement. You may also be asked to participate in a follow-up interview. The questionnaire distributed today has a cover page. On it you would write your name and then create a code that will serve as a unique identifier for use on the second questionnaire. The cover page will be removed and stored separately from the questionnaire responses. In this way, your name will be separated from your responses on both questionnaires, but your responses can be examined for change over time from the first questionnaire to the second.

Duration
You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

**Risks and Benefits:**

The questions may be of a somewhat sensitive nature as they relate to student-interns’ experiences with their cooperating teacher of their student-teaching practicum. The responses, though de-identified, will be identifiable when matched. Participants will receive no direct benefits except the opportunity to reflect on their experiences.

**Confidentiality:**

Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

**Incentives:** None

**Participant Rights:**

You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.
Contacts and Questions:
For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study, or you feel you have been harmed as a result of study participation, you may contact ___________________.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251. Signing the consent form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of subject</th>
<th>Signature of subject</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date and time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person authorized to consent for subject (when applicable)</th>
<th>Signature of person authorized to consent for subject (when applicable)</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date and time

**Investigator/Research Staff**

I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.
APPENDIX G:

Supervisor Observation Form

Intern: ____________________________________________
Mentor teacher: ______________________________________
Date of observation: _________________________________
Lesson focus: ______________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the lesson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the lesson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After the lesson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Things to try</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>