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Iron Sharpens Iron: Co-Teaching in a Teacher Education Program

Abstract
Recently the Education department at Dordt College revamped its program. We were implementing co-teaching during our year-long student teaching experience for seniors, but we felt it would be more effective if students had experience with co-teaching before being one of the main participants. As changes were discussed, we were challenged to look for opportunities to implement co-teaching so students would benefit from it as a student as well as seeing it modeled and explained. As a result of this, Ed Starkenburg and Gwen Marra have been co-teaching an undergraduate Children’s and Adolescent Literature course. They will share their experiences of implementing the various strategies and data they have collected from students who have taken the course. Planning, instruction, and assessment ideas will be shared.
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Co-Teaching in a Teacher Education Program
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The Context

Where have we been?
Where are we now?
Where do we hope to go?
In the beginning...

- Traditional student teaching model
- 15 weeks
- 2 sessions
- Gradual increase of responsibility
- 1-2 weeks full responsibility
- Gradual decrease of responsibility
Professional Development School Model

• Yearlong experience
• Co-teaching model
• Intentional matches
• Training provided prior to and ongoing
Was the PDS with its co-teaching model a better way to prepare preservice teachers?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How effectively you feel you</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>12+years/5+- years of teaching experience</th>
<th>Have/have not worked with student teacher before</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated One Teach, One Observe</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4/6.5</td>
<td>6.3/7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated One Teach, One Assist</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6/6.8</td>
<td>6.6/7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Station Teaching</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1/6.8</td>
<td>6.1/7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Parallel Teaching</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2/5.3</td>
<td>5.9/6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Supplemental Teaching</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2/5.0</td>
<td>5.0/6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Alternative Teaching</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4/6.8</td>
<td>6.4/6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Team Teaching</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8/5.3</td>
<td>6.0/4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed the lead role in co-teaching</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7/6.8</td>
<td>6.6/7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed the support role in co-teaching</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8/5.9</td>
<td>5.3/6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared co-planning roles</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8/6.4</td>
<td>6.1/6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared co-assessing roles</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3/5.3</td>
<td>5.5/6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentor and Intern Reflections on Co-teaching

Mentor: “I definitely saw growth in my students’ learning. Especially when we used parallel teaching or stations, we could address students’ needs more specifically. It really worked!”

Intern: “We worked together to try and figure out what co-teach strategies worked best for us, for our students, and for the teaching structures set up in the class. The way the class was structured, sometimes made it difficult or impractical to try out all of the co-teaching methods. I feel like she engaged in effective co-teaching with me, and was very willing to try things I suggested or asked her to do in regards to co-teaching.”
Site and College Coordinator Reflections on Co-teaching

Site Coordinator: “The best part is that the classroom teacher has grown a lot too.”
“Why would we NOT do this? It’s a win-win (for P-12 schools and for interns)”

College Coordinators: “Made me a better professor – made my teaching fresh”
“When I observed co-teaching, I saw that it was really effective at meeting the needs of students.”
Four Pathways to Student Teach

**PDS/YLST**
- Yearlong placement
- Co-teaching model
- Training in co-teaching initially and ongoing
- Highly desired and highly successful

**Local**
- Within an hour of our setting
- Co-teaching model beginning Spring 2016
- Online training provided

**Non-Local**
- With two “satellite” locations
- Co-teaching model beginning in Spring 2016
- Online training provided

**International**
- Various locations
- Co-teaching model
- Online training provided
So Iron Sharpens Iron in the Student Teaching Context....
Previously this course was

**EDUC 205: Marra**
- For Elementary Education Students
- Covered Fiction / Nonfiction
- 3.0 Credits per semester
- Offered 3 semesters out of 4.
- Averages 20 students/ offering

**EDUC 206: Starkenburg**
- For Secondary and Middle School Students
- Covered Fiction / Nonfiction
- 3.0 Credits per semester
- Offered 1 semester out of 4.
- Averages 15 students per offering
Co-Teaching in EDUC 155 Children & Adolescent Literature

• 3-credit class offered
• All elementary education majors and some secondary education majors
• Early in the program
• Children’s Literature or Adolescent Literature Track
Effective Partnership due to TRUST

- Vulnerability
- Commitment
- Flexibility
- Effort
EDUC 155 with Co-Teaching

• Intentional Weekly Planning
• Incorporating Co-teaching Strategies (Share with Students)
• Shared Responsibility for Assessment
Co-Teaching Strategies

- One Teach, One Observe
- One Teach, One Assist
- Station Teaching
- Parallel Teaching
- Supplemental Teaching
- Alternative / Differentiated Teaching
- Team Teaching
What do students say?

“I learned how co-teaching is not just about two teachers teaching completely different lessons, but about two teachers working together to strengthen the lesson all together.”

“I appreciated how co-teaching emphasized both of the professor’s strengths. They complemented each other well. It is much easier to spot co-teaching strategies now that I have seen them in action.”
What do course evaluations tell us?

### IDEA Diagnostic Report Form  
Spring 2016

#### Your Average Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Raw</th>
<th>Adj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Progress on Relevant Objectives</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Excellent Teacher</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Excellent Course</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Average of B &amp; C</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Evaluation (Average of A &amp; D)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If you are comparing Progress on Relevant Objectives from one instructor to another, use the converted average.

#### Your Converted Average When Compared to All Classes in the IDEA Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Progress on Relevant Objectives</th>
<th>B. Excellent Teacher</th>
<th>C. Excellent Course</th>
<th>D. Average of B &amp; C</th>
<th>Summary Evaluation (Average of A &amp; D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Higher</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>64 (90-100)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>64 (90-100)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>64 (90-100)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Lower</td>
<td>64 (90-100)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Your Converted Average When Compared to Your:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline IDEA Report</th>
<th>Institution IDEA Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59 (mid)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDEA Discipline used for comparison:
Teacher Education, Specific Academic & Vocational Programs
### IDEA form before Co-teaching

#### A. Progress on Relevant Objectives
- **Five objectives were selected as relevant (important or essential – see page 2)**
  - **Your Average (5-point scale)**
    - **Raw**: 3.9
    - **Adj.**: 3.6

#### Overall Ratings
- **B. Excellent Teacher**: 4.1
- **C. Excellent Course**: 3.9
- **D. Average of B & C**: 4.0

#### Summary Evaluation (Average of A & D)
- **4.0**

---

#### Comparison Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Progress on Relevant Objectives</th>
<th>B. Excellent Teacher</th>
<th>C. Excellent Course</th>
<th>D. Average of B &amp; C</th>
<th>Summary Evaluation (Average of A &amp; D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Higher</td>
<td>Raw: 51</td>
<td>Adj. 49</td>
<td>Adj. 50</td>
<td>Adj. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest 10% (63 or higher)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Next 20% (56-62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Middle 40% (45-55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Next 20% (38-44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Lower</td>
<td>Lowest 10% (37 or lower)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. If you are comparing Progress on Relevant Objectives from one instructor to another, use the (Adj.) ratings.
What Next?

Senior Seminar Co-Teaching Training
Survey after Student Teaching
Incorporating Co-Teaching into Other Classes
Questions