

Hamline University DigitalCommons@Hamline

School of Education Student Capstone Projects

School of Education

Summer 2017

Making The Transition: Moving From A Pull-Out Model For EL Instruction To A Co-Teaching Models

Alyssa Kae Anderson
Hamline University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_cp

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Alyssa Kae, "Making The Transition: Moving From A Pull-Out Model For EL Instruction To A Co-Teaching Models" (2017). *School of Education Student Capstone Projects*. 21.
https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_cp/21

This Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at DigitalCommons@Hamline. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Education Student Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Hamline. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@hamline.edu, lterveer01@hamline.edu.

Running Head: MAKING THE TRANSITION

MAKING THE TRANSITION:
MOVING FROM A PULL-OUT MODEL FOR EL INSTRUCTION
TO A CO-TEACHING MODEL

by

Alyssa Kae Anderson

A capstone project submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Literacy Education.

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

August 2017

Capstone Project Facilitator: Jennifer Carlson

Content Reviewer: Kimberly Olson

Peer Reviewer: Erin Hollister

Abstract

Many schools are transitioning from the pull-out model for English Learner (EL) instruction to the co-teaching model, and many factors are likely to impact the smoothness of this transition. As a result, the author's research questions were: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model? If so, how can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?* An examination of the existing literature demonstrates that very little research has been conducted comparing the effectiveness of the pull-out and co-teaching models. However, research does provide a number of components that must be in place for an effective transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model. A website was created to synthesize the research on these components, along with a checklist that EL teachers may use to guide them in making an effective transition.

To my family and friends for your encouragement and support throughout the capstone process.

Acknowledgments

Special thanks to my content and peer reviewers. Your feedback was invaluable throughout this capstone process.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Definitions.....	1
Rationale and Context.....	3
Implications for Stakeholders.....	6
Summary of Chapter.....	8
Overview of Chapters.....	8
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	10
History.....	11
Reasons for the Transition.....	16
Challenges.....	21
Effectiveness.....	29
Summary.....	34
Chapter Three: Project Description.....	37
Research Paradigm.....	37
Audience.....	39
Setting.....	41
Project Description.....	41
Choice of Format.....	43
Timeline.....	44
Summary.....	44
Chapter Four: Conclusions.....	46

Learnings.....46

Revisiting the Literature Review.....48

Limitations.....49

Implications.....50

Project Sharing.....51

Personal Use.....52

Summary.....53

References.....55

Appendix A: Making the Transition Checklist65

Chapter One

Introduction

“The marriage between the English Learner teacher and the general education teacher in a co-teaching relationship is like _____” (adapted from A. M. Beninghof, district training, June 20-21, 2013). When I was presented with this analogy sentence frame at a co-teaching training several years ago, I initially completed the frame with the phrase “two people riding a bicycle built for two.” Since that time, I have deepened my understanding of what an effective co-teaching partnership looks, feels, and sounds like due to my own experiences co-teaching as an English Learner (EL) teacher with various general education teachers. However, my understanding of an effective co-teaching partnership continues to grow and evolve with each new co-teacher.

Another factor that has impacted my understanding of this partnership is my district’s current transition from primarily using a pull-out model for EL services to using a co-teaching model. As a result of this transition, my research questions arose: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model? If so, how can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?* This chapter will begin with a definition of key terms. Then I will explain the rationale and context for my topic selection and provide background information about my purpose, assumptions, and point of view in conducting my research. Finally, implications of this research for various stakeholders will be discussed.

Definitions

According to Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy (2008), “The term *English language learners* (ELLs)...refers to those students who are not yet proficient in English and who require

instructional support in order to fully access academic content in their classes” (p. 2). As a point of clarification, English Learners are sometimes referred to by other acronyms such as English Language Learners (ELLs), Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, or English as a Second Language (ESL) students.

Schools provide this “instructional support” for ELs in various ways. The traditional model of EL instruction, the pull-out model, was defined by Honigsfeld & Dove (2010) as “...self-standing ESL instruction. The ESL specialist either follows a specially designed ESL curriculum that is based on the participating students’ individual language and academic needs, or he or she might develop a curriculum closely aligned with the general-education curriculum” (p. 11). In this model, the EL teacher (sometimes referred to as an English as a Second Language or ESL teacher) pulls the EL students out of the general education classroom into a separate space or classroom for the purpose of targeted, small-group language instruction. In contrast, according to Beninghof (2012), “Co-teaching (or collaborative teaching) is a coordinated instructional practice in which two or more educators simultaneously work with a heterogeneous group of students in a general education classroom” (p. 7). These two educators may include a general education teacher plus an EL teacher, a special education teacher, an interventionist, or a paraprofessional. Beninghof (2015) explained that effective co-teachers are not clones; rather, both educators bring their unique areas of expertise to the classroom setting to provide effective instruction and support for all students (p. 12). For the purpose of this research, a focus on the particular co-teaching relationship of a general education teacher and an EL teacher will be conducted.

Rationale and Context

My first exposure to co-teaching occurred during a student-teaching placement at an inner-city school in St. Paul, Minnesota. Due to having a high population of ELs, the school was fortunate enough to have one EL teacher per grade level. The English Language Arts (ELA) blocks within each grade level were staggered so that the EL teacher was able to co-teach in each of the classrooms. I student-taught with the EL teacher assigned to 3rd grade. Since I pursued dual-certification in EL Education and Elementary Education, I also student-taught with one of the 3rd grade classroom teachers and was able to see co-teaching from the classroom teacher's perspective as well. This was my one and only experience with co-teaching for a few years.

During my first three years of teaching, I worked in schools that solely used the pull-out model for providing EL services. Then, due to fluctuating numbers of ELs throughout the district, I was transferred to a different elementary school. My new principal wanted the other two EL teachers and me to only use the co-teaching model the following year. Thankfully, the summer before I started at my new school, my district offered a two-day co-teaching training with a renowned expert in the field of co-teaching, A. M. Beninghof (district training, June 20-21, 2013). She defined co-teaching, described the various models of co-teaching, shared co-teaching forms, and demonstrated a number of engagement strategies. Unfortunately, I was only allowed to bring one co-teaching partner (a classroom teacher) with me to the co-teaching training out of the nine co-teaching partners I had over the course of that year.

Some co-teaching partnerships that year were more successful than others. The partnerships that were the most successful were those for which we had a weekly, dedicated co-planning time before or after school. The least successful partnerships were those in which we were not able to have a dedicated co-planning time (for various reasons such as scheduling

conflicts or a lack of classroom teacher buy-in to the co-teaching model). My most successful partnership was with a second-grade classroom teacher who had attended the co-teaching training with me the previous summer. We had a dedicated planning time each week for our co-taught writing class and had equal roles in the planning and teaching process. That spring, she and I were able to once again attend a half-day co-teaching training with Beninghof (district training, April 28, 2014) that was sponsored by the district. This training reviewed and built on the information from the previous training.

Since Beninghof (district training, June 20-21, 2013) had recommended teaching with a maximum of three to four co-teaching partners and since my EL colleagues and I had been trying to co-teach with many more than that, the following year we decided to scale back and do a combination of co-teaching and pull-out services. This was in large part due to the fact that co-teaching with so many partners had been overwhelming and had not gone very smoothly the year before. By using a combination of the two models, we felt that we were able to form stronger co-teaching partnerships since we were working with fewer co-teachers and that we were better able to hone in on meeting the specific language needs of our ELs.

The following year brought a number of changes. Once again, I was transferred to a new school in the district due to fluctuating numbers of ELs. The new district administration, hired toward the middle to end of the previous year, also shared a new EL program vision that all ELs who have an English Language Proficiency (ELP) level of 3-5 will be served in co-taught classrooms by the 2017-2018 school year. ELs with ELP levels of 1-2 will be served in co-taught classrooms but will also receive additional pull-out instruction since they are newcomers or beginners. Since it is very difficult to co-teach with classroom teachers with whom you have no established relationship, I primarily did pull-out instruction that year as I was getting to know

classroom teachers but began to take baby steps with co-teaching in three different classrooms. Unfortunately, once again none of my co-teaching partners had been given the opportunity to receive co-teaching training and so had difficulty buying into the idea of co-teaching.

Most recently, in an effort to align more closely with the district's program vision, I attempted to co-teach in five different classrooms. Two additional groups were still pull-out. Similarly to the previous year, I found co-teaching to be challenging and did not have a dedicated planning time with any of my co-teachers (for reasons such as scheduling conflicts or a lack of classroom teacher buy-in to the co-teaching model). Frequently, I did not feel like an equal co-teaching partner in many of the classrooms and missed the very successful co-teaching partnership I had two years ago when I co-taught second grade writing. Thankfully, my district offered some co-teaching trainings again this past year, but only one EL teacher from each building (some buildings have six or more) was able to attend two half-day trainings with one co-teaching partner (most EL teachers had several).

My desire is to learn more, in general, about the effectiveness of the co-teaching model versus the pull-out model for providing EL instruction. I frequently hear people express something similar to "research shows that co-teaching instruction is more beneficial than pull-out instruction" for ELs but they fail to present the research that they are using to support their claims. I have also heard disgruntled EL teachers say that they have seen research showing that co-teaching instruction is not effective, so I would like to take an honest look at the research to see what it really shows.

Since my school district's vision is to move toward a co-teaching model, I would like to learn more about how this transition can be made effectively, so schools can set themselves up for success in this transition process in the future. While schools operate under the umbrella of a

district, EL teachers are responsible for their own spheres of influence and how to practically make this transition happen within their particular schools. My experience with transitioning to the co-teaching model has been in the elementary grades (K-6), so my research and project will be targeted toward EL teachers in those grades.

Therefore, the purpose of this capstone project will be two-fold. First, I will conduct a literature review to analyze what research shows regarding the effectiveness of co-teaching versus pull-out services. Then I will use this research to create a website, which will be aimed at EL teachers who are considering this transition at the school level so that they may be more informed about how to most effectively make this transition.

Implications for Stakeholders

This research topic is significant to the profession, to me, and to my students for a variety of reasons. First of all, the results of my research will have many implications for my profession. The current trend seems to be moving away from a pull-out model and to a co-teaching model for EL instruction. One of the main reasons for this is to keep ELs in general education classrooms with peers as much as possible so that they do not miss vital class instruction time and so that they do not feel segregated from their peers by being removed from the classroom. If the research shows that co-teaching truly is more effective, it will support the current trend, but if the research shows that co-teaching is not as effective or only minimally more effective, district administrations might need to reevaluate the direction of their EL programs. Research showing that co-teaching *is* the more effective model would guide me in the website I anticipate creating to inform other teachers about how to set themselves and their schools up for success in making the transition to the co-teaching model.

In addition to having significance for the profession, this research will have significance for my work as an EL teacher, as I anticipate that the research will show that the co-teaching model is more effective than the pull-out model. If this is the case, I will have more confidence that what I am doing is what is best for students and have the research to back it up. This research on co-teaching may provide me with ideas of how to make my existing co-teaching partnerships even more effective and of how to make new partnerships as successful as possible. Lastly, this research will support me if I am ever in a place of district leadership to help the schools within the district make the transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model as effectively as possible.

Already, this research is having implications as my school forms the master schedule for next school year. The principal has formed a committee to design this schedule and has chosen me to be EL teacher representative. As a member of the committee, the research for this capstone will help me to make recommendations that will optimize co-teaching partnerships and incorporate regular times for co-planning.

Not only will my research have implications for my profession and me, but it will also have implications for my students. If the research shows that the co-teaching model is more effective than the pull-out model, students will spend more time in their general education classrooms, ensuring that they will not miss vital classroom instruction due to being pulled out. Similarly, ELs will not feel segregated from their peers, as they sometimes do in a pull-out model, because they will remain in the general education classroom. Some may argue that ELs like being pulled out because they feel like the pull-out classroom is the only place they can be themselves and feel free to make mistakes without fear of criticism. Therefore, if a school selects a co-teaching model, it will need to find alternate ways to build community and help ELs feel

comfortable to take risks. Another benefit of the co-teaching model is that students will have two teachers, rather than one, in the classroom working together to differentiate instruction to meet students' individual needs. While co-teaching has many benefits, EL teachers in a co-teaching situation might not be able to provide newcomers or beginners with as intense language instruction as they would in a pull-out setting. Many schools, therefore, opt to use a combination of the co-teaching and pull-out models. Clearly, EL teachers will need to weigh the evidence for both models of instruction, implement any district guidelines, and consider the needs of individual students when deciding whether to use one model, the other, or a combination of models.

Summary of Chapter

Chapter one provided an introduction to the topic of co-teaching and to the research questions: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model? If so, how can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?* Definitions of key terms that are essential to understand the topic of co-teaching on a deeper level were provided. After that, I shared the journey of how I decided on my topic and my reasons for selecting it. Finally, the significance of the research for the profession, myself, and students was discussed.

Overview of Chapters

Chapter two will provide a review of the literature, beginning with a detailed history of the co-teaching model. Then it will move into a discussion of the reasons that have caused districts or schools to make the transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model and any challenges associated with the co-teaching model. Concluding chapter two will be an examination of what the research shows in regard to the effectiveness of the pull-out model for

EL instruction versus the co-teaching model. In chapter three, a detailed description will be provided of the project that is the result of the research: a website for EL teachers. This website will provide EL teachers with practical suggestions and examples related to effectively making the transition to the co-teaching model. In the final chapter, chapter four, conclusions resulting from the research will be presented and their alignment with the existing research that was shared in the literature review. Lastly, implications of the project, any limitations related to the research, and ideas for investigating the topic of co-teaching further will be shared.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

According to Sparks (2016), “Nearly 3 in 4 American classrooms now includes at least one English-language learner, and these students make up roughly 1 in 10 public school students” (p. 1). As of the 2014-2015 school year, there were 4,808,758 ELs nationally, and there were 70,527 ELs in Minnesota (“EDFacts,” 2016). According to a report from the Minnesota Department of Education (2016), this number increased to 71,481 during the 2015-2016 school year, which was equivalent to 8.4 percent of Minnesota’s students. Clearly, schools in the United States need to become more responsive to the growing numbers of ELs. What is not as clear is *how* they should respond or what EL instructional models should be used. This leads to the research questions: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model? If so, how can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?*

In answer to the first research question, this chapter provides background information about co-teaching and will examine what the existing research shows about the effectiveness of this model. At the outset, the history of the co-teaching model will be delineated, including the beginnings of co-teaching as a form of inclusion for special education students up through the present day utilization of the co-teaching model as a way to meet the needs of a diverse group of learners within a mainstream classroom setting. As a part of this history, pertinent legislation throughout history that led to the move toward inclusion and co-teaching will be discussed because a school must examine the historical and legislative support for this model before deciding to make the transition. Next, the existing literature will be analyzed to determine reasons *why* schools are making the transition to the co-teaching model since schools need to be able to defend whatever decision they make. Though many schools are currently making the

transition to the co-teaching model for EL services, the co-teaching model is not without its challenges, however, so these challenges will be examined. Schools that are considering making the transition to the co-teaching model need to weigh these challenges and contemplate if and how they might overcome them. Finally, delving further into the first research question, an analysis of what the existing research shows about the effectiveness of the pull-out model for EL services versus the co-teaching model will be conducted. Regardless of educational trends, schools will want to make sure that they are choosing instructional models that are research based and effective.

History

Many may wonder how the co-teaching model originated. Before transitioning to a co-teaching model, a school will want to understand these origins, namely the historical and legislative support for the model. This section will detail various laws and court cases that paved the way for inclusion and, in turn, co-teaching. The influence of the team-teaching model that arose in the 1950s and 1960s will be reviewed, and the beginnings of co-teaching as a way to mainstream special education students will be investigated.

Legislation and court cases.

1950s-1960s. Over the past sixty years, a number of laws and court cases have demonstrated the need for instructional programming that meets the needs of English Learners. As a result of the *Brown v. Board of Education* Supreme Court case in 1954, laws that required racial segregation of schools were deemed unconstitutional (de Jong, 2011; Platt, Harper, & Beatriz Mendoza, 2003). Stewner-Manzanares (1988) clarified:

Although it did not specifically mention Hispanics or other ethnic minorities, the ruling stated that it applied also to others similarly situated. While this ruling did not affect the

education of non-English speaking minorities directly, it introduced a new era in American civil rights and led the way to subsequent legislation that would create programs for the disadvantaged. (p. 2)

Less than a decade later, the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s was aimed at taking steps to ensure equal rights for all people (Platt et al., 2003). During this time, the federal government passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which banned discrimination against any individuals in a federally funded program based on race or country of origin. (Lhamon & Gupta, 2015; Platt et al., 2003; Sparks, 2016). Since schools are federally funded, this means that they cannot discriminate against students for these very same reasons. The Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1964 mandated that all public schools and state educational agencies (SEAs), including both those receiving and not receiving state or federal funds, had to take action by creating instructional programs for English Learners so that language barriers did not inhibit students from receiving equitable educational opportunities (Lhamon & Gupta, 2015; Platt et al., 2003). Four years later, when the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was passed, it was the first time that the federal government acknowledged the need for federal funding to support programs that met the unique needs of English Learners (de Jong, 2011; Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). As a result of this legislation, states could apply for and receive federal grants for programs aimed at meeting these students' needs (de Jong, 2011; Platt et al., 2003; Stewner-Manzanares, 1988).

1970s-1980s. Another United States Supreme Court case affecting the education of English Learners was the 1974 case *Lau v. Nichols* (Platt et al., 2003). The case was filed because the San Francisco school system in California had not been providing Chinese-American students with English Language instruction. As a result, these students were denied equitable educational opportunities. According to Stewner-Manzanares (1988), the Supreme Court

“[argued] that the same facilities, textbooks, teachers and curricula [did] not constitute equal education” (p. 3). The Supreme Court deemed the San Francisco school system’s actions to be in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1964 (Lhamon & Gupta, 2015; Platt et al., 2003; Sparks, 2016).

From the beginning, early programs for English Learners emphasized cultural assimilation and speaking proficiency in English (Platt et al., 2003). However, Platt et al. (2003) stated:

The effectiveness of typical ESL programs of the 1970s and 1980s was called into question. Cummins (1989) labeled such programs *subtractive*, supportive of neither academic achievement nor retention of the home language or culture. Further, Krashen (1984) argued for ESL programs that provide a range of support and that gradually move English language learners into the mainstream. (p. 110)

Later programs would come to emphasize providing English Learners with the support to achieve language and academic proficiency similar to their native English-speaking peers.

Twenty-first century. The advent of the twenty-first century brought increased legislation and accountability for schools. In 2001 the No Child Left Behind Act was passed, mandating that all students have access to the general education curriculum, receive instruction from highly qualified teachers, and participate in assessments for accountability purposes (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010). Schools were required to provide instruction for English learners that helped them to develop academic proficiency in English and prepared them to meet the academic standards (de Jong, 2011).

Team teaching.

Beginnings. Co-teaching has its roots in team teaching. Trump (as cited in Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend & Reising, 1993) developed the team-teaching model in the 1950s and 1960s as a way to reorganize secondary schools in the United States and England. Teams of teachers would plan interdisciplinary units, and the teacher with the most expertise on a given topic would teach the lesson to a large group of students. Then they would break the students into small discussion groups (12-15 students) for differentiated instruction and assessments (Friend et al., 2010; Friend & Reising, 1993).

Adaptations. Other researchers developed adaptations of Trump's (as cited in Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend & Reising, 1993) team-teaching model. In Warwick's (as cited in Friend & Reising, 1993) 1960s adaptation, students would break into regular classroom groups, as opposed to small discussion groups, after the large group component of the lesson. Geen (as cited in Friend & Reising, 1993) developed another adaptation of the team-teaching model. In this adaptation teams of teachers planned the interdisciplinary units together but then taught the units separately (Friend & Reising, 1993). Both elementary and secondary teachers in the 1970s, particularly those teaching in open-concept schools, began to use the team teaching model worldwide in a variety of different subject areas (Friend et al., 2010; Friend & Reising, 1993; Wertheimer & Honigsfeld, 2000). Some open schools at the elementary level would use a variation of team teaching in which a group of four teachers would share the instruction for a large group of students (around 100) in a single space, often called a "house" (Friend et al., 2010). Many "houses" or "communities" can still be found in schools today.

Current practice. According to Friend et al. (2010), team teaching now takes different forms at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels. Some elementary teachers who

team teach share a large classroom with a moveable partition so flexible groups can be formed (Friend et al., 2010). Teams of four to five teachers at the middle school level will sometimes plan lessons together for a group of 100 to 125 students that they share in common but then actually teach independently of one another (Friend et al., 2010). At the high school level two teachers from different subject areas will sometimes co-teach interdisciplinary classes with large numbers of students (Friend et al., 2010).

Special education.

In the 1980s, special education teachers and classroom teachers began applying this team-teaching model as a way to mainstream special education students (Friend & Reising, 1993; Wertheimer & Honigfeld, 2000). Therefore, co-teaching first began as a way to include special education students in general education classrooms while still meeting their individual needs (Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend, 2015). Additionally, co-teaching became an answer to the legislative mandate of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) in 1975, which later became known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1990, to educate students in the least restrictive environment (Cobb Morocco & Mata Aguilar, 2002; Friend et al., 2010; Friend & Reising, 1993; Platt et al., 2003). This mandate was echoed in the reauthorization of IDEA in 2004 (Friend et al., 2010; Platt et al., 2003).

Clearly, historical court cases and legislation support the need for inclusion of diverse learners within mainstream classrooms and the need for instructional programs to meet the unique needs of ELs. Co-teaching as a model for providing EL instruction has its roots in team teaching and the mainstreaming of special education students, yet these are not the sole reasons why districts choose to make the transition to the co-teaching model for EL services.

Reasons for the Transition

An examination of the literature materialized numerous reasons for why schools make the transition to the co-teaching model. Increased inclusion is one of the primary reasons.

Alternately, teachers may choose to co-teach because they are able to draw on the expertise of one another, have each other for support, and receive on-the-job professional development. Not only does co-teaching benefit teachers, but it benefits students as well because co-teachers are better able to differentiate to support students in meeting the increasingly rigorous standards and provide greater consistency in instruction for ELs. Another factor that may prompt schools to make the transition is a lack of pull-out instructional space.

Inclusion. There are numerous benefits to developing a co-taught educational environment for EL students:

1. ELs are no longer separated from their peers for instructional purposes and all students feel that they are part of the learning community, making it easier for students to focus on learning (Bahamonde, 1999; Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008; Cobb Morocco & Mata Aguilar, 2002; Friend, 2015; Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Murdock, Finneran, & Theve, 2015; Platt et al., 2003; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007).
2. ELs do not face the isolation and social stigma that can sometimes come with being pulled out for EL services (Bahamonde, 1999; Cook & Friend, 1995; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; York-Barr et al., 2007).
3. Students within an inclusive setting are exposed to diversity, and diversity is viewed as an asset rather than a deficit (Bahamonde, 1999).

4. When ELs stay in the general education classroom rather than being pulled out, they are surrounded by good language models (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Platt et al., 2003; York-Barr et al., 2007).

Clearly, when ELs are included within the general education classrooms, all students benefit.

Expertise. Students in co-taught classrooms benefit from having access to two teachers (Beninghof, 2015; Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend & Reising, 1993; Wertheimer & Honigsfeld, 2000; York-Barr et al., 2007). Beninghof (2015) explained that effective co-teachers are not clones; rather, both educators bring their unique areas of expertise and years of experience to the classroom setting to provide effective instruction and support for all students. Friend (2015) reiterated this idea in a different way when she stated:

Co-teachers are redefining the professional relationship: It's less like a marriage and more like a business partnership. Each teacher brings important knowledge and skills to the classroom, and they learn from each other without trying to be interchangeable. They strive for true parity, being equally valued for their individual contributions, rather than being identical. (p. 21)

For example, the EL teacher is able to model for the general education teacher how to scaffold lesson activities for ELs so that the general education teacher will be able to implement these scaffolds even when the EL teacher is not in the classroom (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Maxwell, 2014).

Support. Teachers who engage in a co-teaching partnership are able to support one another (Bahamonde, 1999; Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend & Reising, 1993). If one teacher has a bad day, the other can step in, or if one teacher has to step out or is absent, the other teacher can step in to fill his or her place (Cook & Friend, 1995; Lieberman, 2015; Murdock et al., 2015).

From a financial standpoint, this could decrease substitute teacher costs. If one teacher is perplexed about how to meet the needs of a student who is struggling behaviorally or academically, the other teacher might have some ideas (Lieberman, 2015; Mandel & Eiserman 2015). Teachers might even take turns analyzing and observing student behavior. If one teacher unintentionally forgets a lesson component, the other teacher is there to remind him or her (Lieberman, 2015). Lastly, they can work together to figure out how best to teach difficult concepts (Mandel & Eiserman, 2015; Murdock et al., 2015). Teachers are less likely to burnout when they feel supported through a co-teaching partnership.

Professional development. Since co-teachers are able to learn from one another and grow in their teaching practices, co-teaching is an effective form of on-the-job professional development (Mandel & Eiserman, 2015; York-Barr et al., 2007). In schools where co-teaching becomes the norm, perhaps the number of formal professional development days could even be reduced. Co-teachers can give each other feedback, offer suggestions, or share ideas (Mandel & Eiserman, 2015). In addition, co-teachers are more likely to take risks and try out new teaching strategies (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008; Mandel & Eiserman, 2015).

Standards. As schools implement the Common Core State Standards, schools may have co-teachers work together to support all students in meeting the challenges of these standards by differentiating to meet each student's needs (Bahamonde, 1999; Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend & Reising, 1993; Haring & Kelner, 2015; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b; Maxwell, 2014). Co-teachers can differentiate by forming flexible groups of students and by providing students with academic supports such as sentence frames or graphic organizers. Similarly, having two teachers in the classroom provides students with extra help when they need it and exposes them to various teaching styles and perspectives (Friend et al., 2010; York-Barr et al., 2007). Finally, with two

teachers in a classroom, the student-teacher ratio is reduced, leading to higher levels of student engagement (Cook & Friend, 1995). The hope is that with this increased support for students, schools will be more likely to make adequate yearly progress and narrow the achievement gap (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010).

Consistency. Districts and schools make the transition to the co-teaching model to provide greater consistency for ELs. In co-taught classrooms ELs do not have separate curricula from their peers; rather, they are provided with the necessary supports to access the same curricula (Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015). Likewise, EL teachers are not forced to create their own curricula (Wertheimer & Honigsfeld, 2000). This can significantly cut back on the amount of time EL teachers need to spend searching for or creating materials.

Instruction across the school day is more consistent for students because they do not miss classroom content or discussions due to being pulled out for EL services (Bahamonde, 1999; Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016; Cook & Friend, 1995; Eyolfson, 2016; Fu, Houser, & Huang, 2007; Wertheimer & Honigsfeld, 2000). As a result, EL students will be less likely to fall further and further behind their peers. Whereas they might receive instruction in a pull-out classroom that is disconnected from the instruction in their general education classrooms, this is not the case in a co-taught classroom (Eyolfson, 2016; Fu et al., 2007; Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015; York-Barr et al., 2007). As a result, students will not have the difficulty of trying to transfer what they learned in a pull-out EL class to the general education setting (Bahamonde, 1999; Cook & Friend, 1995).

Greater consistency due to the use of the co-teaching model has other benefits. One benefit is that instructional time is not lost as students transition to and from pull-out services because students remain in the general education classroom (Bahamonde, 1999; Cook & Friend,

1995; Wertheimer & Honigsfeld, 2000). General education teachers have more time to build community in their classrooms and rapport with their students because students are not getting pulled out (Bahamonde, 1999). For instance, teachers who follow a Responsive Classroom approach can conduct Morning Meetings for which all of their students are present. Additionally, parents do not become frustrated that their children are missing out on valuable instruction in the general education classrooms (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008; Platt et al., 2003).

Space concerns. Transitioning to the co-teaching model may be necessary due to classroom space concerns, as some schools are running out of space for pull-out EL classes (Honigsfeld, 2009; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). In fact, some schools may have such a high population of ELs that it would not make sense or be practical to pull out all of these students (Wertheimer & Honigsfeld, 2000). Therefore, co-teaching may be beneficial because separate meeting spaces for EL instruction are not necessary; instruction takes place within the general education classrooms.

Schools may choose to make the transition to promote inclusion, better draw on teachers' areas of expertise, offer teachers a stronger support network, and capitalize on opportunities for job-embedded professional development. Other reasons may include the opportunity to better differentiate to meet students' needs in an effort to help them meet the standards. When schools use a co-teaching model, ELs do not miss classroom instruction by being pulled out for EL services, and additional instructional space for pull-out instruction is not necessary. Though schools may have many reasons for making the transition to the co-teaching model for EL services, the model is not without its challenges.

Challenges

The existing literature on co-teaching describes a number of challenges associated with this model; some of these challenges are easier to overcome than others. Just a few of the challenges include determining how to cluster students, providing sufficient training for staff, creating the optimal schedule for co-teaching, and pairing up co-teaching partners. Other challenges arise when specific co-teaching models are used too heavily rather than a balance of models, often resulting in a sense of inequity or an imbalance of power, and when co-teachers struggle to communicate effectively.

Clustering. To reduce the number of classrooms in which EL teachers will need to co-teach, schools will sometimes “cluster” the EL students within certain classrooms, which involves strategically placing groups of ELs in one or more classrooms within a grade level. However, co-teachers can run into challenges when an EL cluster in a classroom makes up thirty percent or more of that classroom (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; A. M. Beninghof, district training, June 20-21, 2013). The high needs of a large cluster of EL students can be draining on a general education teacher, particularly during the times of the day when the EL teacher is not in the classroom to co-teach (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). Additionally, classroom teachers may be reticent to have an EL cluster of students within their classrooms if they receive merit pay based upon how their students perform on high-stakes tests (Friend et al., 2010).

Co-teaching partnerships. Besides determining how to cluster students, figuring out how best to pair up co-teaching partners can be a challenge as well. Administrators should refrain from requiring specific teachers to co-teach together because not all personalities, teaching styles, cultural backgrounds, etc. will mesh well (Baptiste, 2015; Friend et al., 2010; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). They should start by

pairing teachers who already work well together or who volunteer to give co-teaching a try (Cook & Friend, 1995; Mandel & Eiserman, 2015; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). Alternately, they may want to have teachers complete personality or communication style inventories to provide further information to use when matching up co-teaching partners. These practices will help to reduce teachers' sense of powerlessness due to having to implement mandates passed down from above (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). Additionally, in order to limit burn-out and promote successful co-teaching partnerships, administrators should limit the number of general education teachers with whom a particular EL teacher will need to co-teach and the number of content areas and grade levels (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; York-Barr et al., 2007). When EL teachers have too many co-teaching partners, it can be difficult for them to find time for co-planning, learn the grade-level curriculum, and develop rapport with the classroom teachers and students (York-Barr et al., 2007).

Training. Too often, teachers receive little training prior to beginning co-teaching, but teachers need to be provided with this training in order for co-teaching to be successful (Friend et al., 2010; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). Murawski & Bernhardt (2015) emphasized this need when they shared:

Co-teaching requires more than just learning to 'play nicely' together. It requires a paradigm shift – from teaching in silos to teaching in tandem, from owning the front of the room to sharing space, from sending students with special needs out of the classroom to thoughtfully differentiating for diverse learners. (p. 31)

The training should start by emphasizing the importance of inclusion and reasons for it and should involve the development of a common definition of co-teaching (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). Without a common definition, the chance for the co-teaching model at a particular school

to be successful will be much less likely. The trainers must explain the various co-teaching models that teachers can utilize and provide examples of effective co-teaching partnerships (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; Friend, 2015). Teachers need to be given time to discuss which models they could see themselves using and when. An additional helpful practice during this training could be to have the members of each co-teaching partnership articulate their areas of expertise to one another (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). Finally, co-teaching partners must begin delineating who should be responsible for what in the classroom based upon the areas of expertise that they shared earlier (Benighof, 2015; Wilson, 2015).

Scheduling. Scheduling can pose a problem when an EL teacher co-teaches with multiple classroom teachers (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). When creating a master schedule, Murawski and Bernhardt (2015) recommend that administrators schedule special services (co-taught classes, special education services, etc.) first to promote inclusion. The co-taught classes must be staggered across and within grade levels so the EL teacher does not need to be in two places or more at one time (Friend & Reising, 1993; York-Barr et al., 2007). Another consideration is that newcomers often need additional EL instruction beyond what is provided through co-taught instruction, so this needs to be considered as well when creating a master schedule (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). Blocks of time will need to be set aside for pull-out for newcomers, and EL teachers may need to adjust their schedules if newcomers arrive later in the school year. One word of caution is that some classroom teachers may not care to be given a fixed schedule because they prefer to have more flexibility and spontaneity in their teaching (York-Barr et al., 2007). However, having fixed blocks of time is essential if a school has a limited number of EL teachers who need to co-teach in multiple classrooms. Lastly, sometimes co-teachers may struggle with how to find time to incorporate scaffolds and strategies that

support the needs of ELs within an already packed curricular or pacing guide (Friend, 2015). Therefore, they will need to be intentional in how to optimize every minute of instructional time.

When creating a master schedule, administrators need to build in common planning time for the EL teachers and classroom teachers (Friend et al., 2010; Murawski and Bernhardt, 2015; York-Barr et al., 2007). This common planning time could occur before students arrive, after students leave, during shared prep times, etc. Wilson (2015) emphasized, “Ask anyone involved in co-teaching if there can be effective co-teaching without co-planning, and the answer will be a resounding *no*” (p. 50). The existing literature emphasizes that co-teaching requires regular co-planning, co-teaching, and co-assessing in order to be successful (Flom, 2015; Friend & Reising, 1993; Mandel & Eiserman, 2015; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; York-Barr et al., 2007).

Common planning time helps teachers to have a common vision, clear objectives and end goals, an unambiguous delineation of responsibilities, and built-in differentiation plans. Honigsfeld & Dove (2015b) reiterated the importance of this common planning time when they stated:

Without such careful planning, coordination of instructional delivery, and intentional use of assessment measures and tools that inform collaborative instruction, co-teaching will most likely fail. One teacher will have the responsibility for planning, instruction, and assessment, while the other will be relegated to assistant status. (p. 59)

Another aspect of this co-planning time should involve the co-teachers deciding which of the various co-teaching models they will use and when they will use them (Wilson, 2015).

Over-reliance on particular models. Under the co-teaching model umbrella, there are various co-teaching approaches, often referred to as “models.” These are as follows (Friend, 2015):

- Station Teaching

- Parallel Teaching
- Alternative Teaching
- Teaming
- One Teach, One Assist
- One Teach, One Observe

Ideally, co-teachers should purposefully vary which models they use so that they do not end up relying too heavily on any one model. Otherwise, problems may arise.

As mentioned previously, in partnerships in which it is difficult to find the time to co-plan, the classroom teacher may often end up taking the lead, and the EL teacher may assume more of an assistant or paraprofessional role (Friend et al., 2010; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b; Wilson, 2015). The co-teaching model that involves one teacher taking the lead and the other offering support is sometimes called the “One Teach, One Assist” (or “One Teach/One Support”) model (Friend, 2015; Wilson, 2015).

When the “One Teach, One Assist” model is used on a regular basis rather than periodically, students are not able to truly benefit from the expertise of both teachers (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Wilson, 2015). In other words, one teacher’s expertise is not capitalized upon. For example, EL students may not receive the specialized language instruction that they need (Friend, 2015). The EL teacher may feel restricted in her ability to conduct activities with students to build background knowledge, preview vocabulary, or practice using academic language. In addition, feelings of animosity or frustration may develop between the classroom teacher and the EL teacher because the classroom teacher may feel that he or she has to do the bulk of the work, that the classroom has been invaded, or that he or she is losing autonomy (Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015; Wilson, 2015; York-Barr et al., 2007). He or she

may not want to give up control of the classroom to another adult (Friend & Reising, 1993). The EL teacher may feel underutilized, resent that she is not an equal teaching partner, and feel more like a paraprofessional (Beninghof & Leensvaart; Friend & Reising, 1993; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Powell, 2015; Wilson, 2015). Typically, he or she may not find out what is being taught until he or she gets to the classroom. Alternately, the classroom teacher may swing too far the other direction, relinquishing full control upon the EL teacher's arrival, and sit down to check email, lesson plan, or grade papers rather than actively co-teach (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). Another problem with the overuse of this co-teaching model is that administrators may begin to perceive that co-teaching is not the most fiscally responsible option because two licensed teachers are being paid to teach one regular-sized group of students, and one of the teachers is functioning more like a paraprofessional (Friend & Reising, 1993; Wilson, 2015).

Another co-teaching model that can be problematic when overused is called the "Alternative" co-teaching model (Friend, 2015; Wilson, 2015). In this model the EL teacher will sometimes "push-in" to the classroom and work with the EL students at a table or station in the back of the room. As with the "One Teach/One Support" co-teaching model, the problem arises when the "Alternative" model is used all of the time rather than periodically (Wilson, 2015). The result can ultimately be a form of a pull-out class within a general education classroom (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b; Wilson, 2015). If the same students are pulled to this table or station on a regular basis, they may face social stigmatization or marginalization (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Wilson, 2015).

Inequity. If either of the two co-teaching models described in the previous subsection are used too frequently, a sense of inequity may develop between the teachers (McClure &

Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Wilson, 2015). According to Davison (as cited in McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010), EL teachers may sense “an imbalance of authority, responsibility, and opportunities for input” (p. 108). They may feel unwelcome or that their expertise is not capitalized upon. Likewise, students may begin to perceive the EL teacher to have lesser status and may refer to him or her as a “helper” (Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015). Students may begin to question the knowledgeability of the EL teacher and be less likely to respond to redirection. Since students seek out teachers who they perceive to have high status, this may cause additional frustrations for the EL teacher (Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015).

Inequity may also arise when greater value is attached to the content and work of the classroom teacher versus the EL teacher, as has historically been the case (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). McClure and Cahnmann-Taylor (2010) elaborate:

Whereas grade-level teachers are connected to legitimate, socially sanctioned knowledge of the content area curriculum, ESOL [English for Speakers of Other Languages] teachers are frequently seen as delivering generic support and facilitation for the cultural, linguistic, and ethnic minorities they serve. In this sense, ESOL work is often seen within schools as strategy driven and generic, with no subject-specific knowledge of its own.

This positioning has a significant impact on the potential of co-teaching relationships. (p. 110)

When their content and work is continually undervalued, EL teachers may begin to “lose a sense of [their] professional identity...” (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010, p. 118). The perceived low status of an EL teacher can even have ramifications school-wide for how people perceive the EL program as a whole (Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015). If a school’s EL program is not seen as valuable or necessary, classroom teachers may not want to co-teach, ELs may not get the

instruction that they deserve, schedules may not allow for or maximize co-teaching time, and EL students or teachers may be mistreated. One way to combat the perceived low status of an EL teacher is to ensure that the classroom teacher and EL teacher share approximately an equal number of responsibilities within the classroom that are of comparable value (Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015).

Communication. An all too common challenge for co-teachers is learning how to communicate effectively. Communication challenges may be particularly pronounced when there is a generation gap. As Beninghof (2015) explained, “New teachers may hesitate to claim expertise, even though they have just graduated from a top-notch program with the most current research-based strategies. Veteran teachers may be worried that talking about their strengths sounds like one-upmanship” (p. 14). Another common communication challenge is what Beninghof (2015) called “assumicide” (p. 14). She explained:

A partner who assumes her colleague is responsible for something without actually talking about it is engaging in *assumicide*, as defined by the Urban Dictionary (www.urbandictionary.com): ‘when your assumptions lead to dire consequences that could lead to your potential demise.’ Too many co-teaching relationships fail simply because teachers never talk explicitly about how to share responsibilities or because they burn out by attempting to be clones of each other. (p. 14)

Co-teachers can work to overcome these communication challenges. One way they can do this is by sitting down, discussing each person’s expertise, and dividing up responsibilities (Beninghof, 2015). It is important that they clearly delineate who is responsible for what. Similarly, they should also be open about their likes and dislikes (Baptiste, 2015). Finally, they should discuss

routine classroom activities and how they could best use each of their expertise to maximize the effectiveness of these activities (Wilson, 2015).

When deciding to make the transition to the co-teaching model, schools need to weigh the reasons for co-teaching against the challenges associated with this model. Considering how to cluster students, form co-teaching partnerships, train teachers, create an optimal master schedule, balance the use of co-teaching models, promote equity between co-teaching partners, and ensure effective communication should be talking points for schools that are considering making the transition. Perhaps even more important, however, will be for schools to investigate what research shows about the effectiveness of the co-teaching model.

Effectiveness

Until recently, not much verifiable research has been conducted on the effectiveness of co-teaching (Friend & Reising, 1993; Fu et al., 2007; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Sparks, 2016). In fact, the majority of research on co-teaching up until 2010 had focused on stories of co-teaching, observations of co-teaching implementation, or teachers' perceptions of co-teaching (Friend et al., 2010; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). Friend et al. (2010) cautioned that while studies analyzing perceptions of co-teaching could be helpful,

...perceptions do not establish an evidence base. What are needed are outcome data, including academic achievement on high-stakes tests as well as curriculum-based measures, discipline referrals and other behavior indicators, suspensions, retention and dropout information, attendance information, and other outcome data. A few studies have suggested that well-implemented co-teaching does benefit students (e.g., Rice & Zigmond, 2000; Walther-Thomas, 1997), but these glimmers of positive outcomes must be fortified in order to assert without equivocation whether or not co-teaching positively

affects student outcomes. The sustainability of this instructional model is dependent on better quality and more research. (p. 22)

As the trend toward co-teaching has grown in recent years, researchers have begun to research the effectiveness of this model. However, it continues to inherently be difficult to quantitatively study due to the number of factors and variables involved.

Challenges. Various researchers have noted the lack of research on the effectiveness of co-teaching. York-Barr et al. (2007) emphasized, “To date, however, little research has been generated that provides evidence of the impact of collaborative instructional models on student learning and achievement” (p. 302). Here co-teaching would fall under the category of “collaborative instructional models.” Similarly, Friend et al. (2010) concluded, “To date, co-teaching inquiry generally has barely begun to provide a meaningful evidence base on which to construct efficacious practices” (p. 21). McClure and Cahnmann-Taylor (2010) acknowledged that there is a trend toward the co-teaching model “despite the lack of empirical research on coteaching in ESOL” (p. 102). To summarize, researchers seem to agree that there is not yet enough evidence related to the effects of co-teaching on students’ learning.

The lack of research on co-teaching has to do with the many challenges of studying the effectiveness of co-teaching as an instructional model (Friend et al., 2010). One challenge is differing definitions of co-teaching; the effectiveness of co-teaching can be hard to compare across schools and districts when they do not share common definitions of this term (Friend et al., 2010). Another challenge is that co-teaching is implemented with varying levels of fidelity and consistency across schools and districts; this also makes it hard to analyze its effectiveness (Friend et al., 2010). To truly understand the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of co-teaching,

researchers would need to conduct multiple studies across various grade levels, within different subject areas, and with various groups of diverse learners (Friend et al., 2010).

An additional challenge with studying co-teaching is that it is difficult to conduct rigorous studies of co-teaching because so many variables come into play: consistency of implementation, quality of implementation, minutes of co-taught instruction, student demographics, student mobility, and different levels of preparation and experience among teachers (Friend et al., 2010; Platt et al., 2003).

Research specific to special education students. Some of the existing research on co-teaching is specific to co-teaching in a classroom with a cluster of special education students rather than EL students. Magiera, Smith, Zigmond, & Gebaner (as cited in Friend et al., 2010) conducted a study on the benefits of having two co-teachers in a classroom versus the typical one teacher in a classroom. The study focused on co-taught middle school classrooms that included students with disabilities (Friend et al., 2010). They found that co-teachers received little training, that the classroom teacher spent much less time with the students with disabilities when the co-teacher (a special education teacher) was in the classroom, and that most activities in the co-taught classes were whole group (Friend et al., 2010). As a result, the researchers felt that the students with disabilities were not benefiting from the co-taught classes (Friend et al., 2010). Though this study focused on co-teaching with students with disabilities, similar challenges might arise in a co-taught class with EL students, and the results might be similar.

Another study conducted by Scruggs, Mastropieri, and McDuffie (as cited in Friend et al., 2010) involved the analysis and synthesis of many studies on co-teaching that utilized the qualitative research approach. They found that co-teachers tended to perceive co-teaching as being effective (Friend et al., 2010). Another finding was that co-teachers typically

recommended that co-teaching partnerships should be voluntary (Friend et al., 2010). Co-teachers felt that effective co-teaching teams were collaborative and utilized each person's expertise, whereas ineffective teams did not spend much time collaborating and had conflicting teaching styles (Friend et al., 2010). Lastly, they found a lack of parity in co-teaching roles in some classrooms because special education co-teachers often ended up taking on more of a role of a paraprofessional (Friend et al., 2010). Similarly, a lack of parity might arise in a classroom in which an EL teacher, rather than a special education teacher, is co-teaching with the classroom teacher.

Studies that have examined the relationship of co-teaching to improved high-stakes test results for students with disabilities have shown co-teaching to have very little effect (Idol, as cited in Friend et al., 2010; Murawski, as cited in Friend et al., 2010; Rea, McLaughlin, and Walther-Thomas, as cited in Friend et al., 2010). Special education students scored similarly in pull-out, co-taught, or single-teacher classes. However, they did score higher on report cards and have better attendance in co-taught classrooms (Rea, McLaughlin, and Walther-Thomas, as cited in Friend et al., 2010).

Research specific to ELs. In contrast, more recent studies specific to co-teaching in classrooms with clusters of ELs have demonstrated that co-teaching *can* have positive effects. In Cherry Creek School District in Aurora, Colorado, 5th grade ELs' scores increased 25% on the state assessments over the course of five years after the implementation of co-teaching (Eyolfson, 2015). Similarly, fluent ELs who were designated as achieving fluency in English achieved a 29% increase in their assessment scores (Eyolfson, 2015). The district was also able to eliminate the achievement gap between ELs who were designated as achieving fluency in English and native English-speaking students (Eyolfson, 2015).

Similarly, Littleton Public Schools in Littleton, Colorado, has seen co-teaching prove to be effective. At one particular elementary school, Field Elementary School, the “median student growth percentile moved from a rating of ‘Approaching’ to ‘Exceeds,’ the highest rating possible in Colorado” one year after co-teaching began (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016, p. 73). The district even received the English Language Proficiency Act Excellence Award from the state in 2014 to signify that it had one of the top ten EL programs in the state (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016).

Another district that has seen success with co-teaching is St. Paul Public Schools (SPPS) in St. Paul, Minnesota. The Council of the Great City Schools recognized SPPS in its 2006 report entitled “Beating the Odds VI” as “making among the best gains of the organization’s 67 urban school districts in closing the achievement gap between English language learners and non-ELL students” (Silva, 2011, p. 20-21). From 2002-2005, the number of third grade ELs who achieved proficiency on the state reading assessment grew from 30% to 52% (Silva, 2011).

A word of caution. Though some recent research has begun to demonstrate the effectiveness of the co-teaching model, some researchers caution that co-teaching is not a one-size-fits-all model. Classroom teachers may not have the time or knowledge of EL strategies to meet ELs’ needs (Platt et al., 2003). Therefore, particularly during the times of the day when the EL co-teacher is not present, ELs may not get the level of support that they need (Platt et al., 2003). This is particularly true for newcomers, students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE students), and refugee students with posttraumatic stress disorder (Platt et al., 2003). As a result, some argue that EL teachers are better able to provide students with small group instruction that is specialized to their unique needs within a pull-out setting (Honigsfeld, 2009; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Platt et al., 2003). Additionally, pull-out classrooms

are sometimes the only places in a school where ELs feel safe to be themselves and take risks (Platt et al., 2003).

While current research is beginning to demonstrate the benefits of co-teaching, schools considering making the transition from the pull-out model for EL instruction to the co-teaching model may need to consider that co-teaching may not make the most sense for all students in all circumstances. Honigsfeld (2009) emphasized:

Which is the best possible program model for our English Language Learners? If we believe that one size does *not* fit all, there cannot be *one* right answer to this question....What Zigler and Weiss (1985, 199) noted in 1985 still holds true: research on program effectiveness must “go beyond the question of whether or not a program ‘works’ to ask what works, for whom, how, when, and why.” (p. 171)

Schools may need to consider a combination of models, depending on the needs of the students. Clearly, there is room for much more research to be conducted on the effectiveness of the co-teaching model.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a review of the existing literature on co-teaching in an attempt to begin to answer the research questions: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model? If so, how can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?* A detailed history of the co-teaching model and how it came about as a result of various court cases and legislation was presented followed by an analysis of the roots of co-teaching in team-teaching and in mainstreaming special education students.

Not only was the history of co-teaching outlined, but also many reasons why schools make the transition to the co-teaching model for EL instruction were shared. One of the primary reasons is inclusion. Other reasons include making the most of teacher expertise, enabling teachers to better support one another, providing on-the-job professional development, maximizing resources aimed at helping students meet the standards, helping to ensure greater consistency for students, and utilizing space most efficiently.

Though many schools make the transition to the co-teaching model, the existing literature explains that co-teaching is not without its challenges. Some of these challenges include figuring out how to best cluster EL students, determining how to partner co-teachers, providing sufficient training, and creating a schedule that works for everyone. Other challenges include preventing over-reliance on particular models, averting inequity, and determining how to be proactive in communication.

Lastly, the existing evidence for the effectiveness of the co-teaching model for EL instruction as opposed to the pull-out model was scrutinized. Unfortunately, research comparing the effectiveness of both models was unavailable. Some research has been conducted on the co-teaching model, in particular, yet this research is still very limited. While some recent research is beginning to show that co-teaching can be beneficial, much more research remains to be done in this area. When selecting an instructional model for EL services, schools need to consider that one model may not be effective for all students; therefore, they may need to use a combination of models.

EL teachers must be prepared to help their schools make this transition as effectively as possible, the focus of the second research question, which is why a website could prove

beneficial to EL teachers in aiding them in this transition. The next chapter will further elaborate upon what this website could entail and how it might be used.

Chapter Three

Project Description

This project has been designed to examine the process within a school for implementing a co-teaching model for EL instruction. Specifically, the following questions have guided the research and decision making: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model? If so, how can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?* The focus of this chapter is on the website and checklist that were created to help guide EL teachers in making this transition.

This chapter will describe the worldviews and values that informed the research and website creation. This will help readers to understand the perspective from which the research was conducted and any possible biases that might have influenced the research.

Following this, the chapter will describe the audiences and setting for the website. This information will help explain who might receive the most benefit from the results of the website and in which situations those individuals or groups might receive the most benefit.

The next section of the chapter will provide a more detailed project description, listing the pages of the website and explaining how the information on the website will benefit the EL field. This section will serve to help readers better envision and understand the layout of the website.

After providing a more detailed project description, the chapter will conclude with an explanation of the format chosen for the website and a description of the timeline during which the website was created. This will help readers better understand the project's logistics.

Research Paradigm

A component of the project's logistics is the research foundation from which it was developed. The website is based on elements of the pragmatic worldview and the transformative

worldview (Creswell, 2014). One worldview that informed the website creation is the pragmatic worldview, so what has or has not worked well in the past in regard to transitioning from a pull-out model to a co-teaching model will be considered (Creswell, 2014).

Another lens that informed the research is the transformative worldview (Creswell, 2014, p. 8-11). Oftentimes, ELs come from populations that may be considered oppressed or marginalized. Some might argue that pull-out services seek to marginalize ELs even further because they are separated from their peers based on their limited English. Co-teaching, in contrast, seeks to keep ELs in the classroom with their mainstream peers. Therefore, having effective co-teaching partnerships in schools, the focus of the website, may reduce marginalization of this student population. Also relating to the transformative worldview is the observation made by McClure and Cahnmann-Taylor (2010) in their research that co-teaching partnerships can result in “inequitable power relations” between classroom teachers and EL teachers and further the “historical marginalization of ESOL students, their teachers, and ESOL instructional goals...” (p. 102, 115). Therefore, the website provides teachers with the information they need to be proactive in forming healthy co-teaching partnerships that utilize each teacher’s expertise in an equitable manner and that do not further marginalization.

Some educational values related to co-teaching have informed the research and website, such as the belief that co-teaching can be effective if there is teacher buy-in, administrative support, and sufficient collaboration time. Without these crucial elements, co-teaching will not be as successful as it could be, and the EL teacher may feel more like an Educational Assistant (EA). An additional value is the importance of additional pull-out instruction for newcomers or beginners that is targeted to their specific needs in addition to the co-taught instruction. Within

the general education classroom, beginners or newcomers are not able to get as individualized attention from the EL teacher.

This section described the worldviews and values that guided the research and website creation. This is important in understanding the perspective from which the research was conducted and any possible biases. The next section will describe the audiences for the website and how the website might serve useful to those audiences.

Audiences

The primary audience for the website is EL teachers at elementary schools that are making the transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model for EL services. Rather than directing the website to EL teachers at all grades, the focus was narrowed to teachers at the elementary grades due to my own experience as an EL teacher for seven years in these grades. Therefore, I was able to draw from my own experience as well as the literature in creating the website. Of the various educational professionals, EL teachers will likely benefit the most from the website because they tend to be advocates for the needs of EL students. As such, they have great potential to be agents for change when backed by a website with research-based information. Similarly, many administrators often rely on the EL teachers in their buildings to guide the direction of the EL programs within their schools, so EL teachers need to be equipped to be able to provide recommendations so that this transition can happen as effectively as possible.

Both EL teachers and general education teachers may find the linked document on the homepage of the website about the co-teaching models as well as the “Collaborative Planning” page to be very useful. This document and page will help EL teachers co-plan instruction,

ensuring that they use a variety of different co-teaching models and not rely too heavily on any one model.

Though the website will primarily be aimed at EL teachers, it may be beneficial to other individuals as well, such as administrators. They will likely want to know what they can do to support their EL teachers and classroom teachers in making the transition as effectively as possible. The “Administrative Support” page of the website and corresponding section of the checklist will likely be particularly useful to them.

Coaches might benefit from the “Professional Development” page of the website and the corresponding section of the checklist. This page will help them to plan ongoing professional development for co-teachers. They might glean ideas for topics or discover talking points for professional development sessions. Alternately, they might learn more about how to support co-teachers through observing and modeling lessons in co-taught classrooms.

Administrators, EL teachers, general education teachers, and coaches might like to refer to the linked documents on the homepage of the website. These documents share the key points from chapter two of this paper about the history of co-teaching, the reasons for co-teaching, the challenges associated with co-teaching, and the effectiveness of co-teaching. As a result of reading these documents, the professionals listed above will have a more well-rounded understanding of co-teaching in order to implement it as effectively as possible.

This section elaborated upon the possible audiences for the project. The primary audience will be EL teachers. Other possible audiences will be administrators, classroom teachers, and coaches. In the next section, the setting for the project will be described. I will share how I narrowed the focus to making the transition to the co-teaching model at the school level rather than the district level and in elementary schools rather than secondary schools.

Setting

Since change at the school level is much more within an EL teacher's sphere of influence, I decided to focus on how EL teachers can guide the transition process at the school level, rather than the district level. While EL teachers can provide recommendations to district level administration about effective models for EL instruction based upon the research, they may be able to provide more immediate change themselves within their own schools.

While the website contains information that is beneficial for EL teachers at all grade levels, aspects of it may be more geared toward EL teachers in elementary schools. Much of the research that informed the literature review in chapter two and the links on the homepage of the website was conducted in elementary schools.

This section elaborated upon how I chose to focus on making the transition to the co-taught model for EL instruction within schools at the elementary level. This choice was related to an EL teacher's sphere of influence and to the existing literature. The next section will include a more detailed project description. I will describe the various pages of the website and the reasons why a website was chosen to fill in the gaps within the existing literature in the EL field.

Project Description

The project that is the culmination of this research includes a website and a checklist to assist schools in effectively making the transition from the pull-out model for EL instruction to the co-teaching model. Both can be viewed at the following link:

<https://sites.google.com/hamline.edu/makingthetransition>. After conducting research, five components of an effective transition surfaced, which then became the pages of the website.

These pages are as follows:

1. Committee Formation

2. Voluntary Partnerships
3. Professional Development
4. Collaborative Planning
5. Administrative Support

The other pages of the website include a homepage (provides links to background information, defines important terms, and shares information about the author), the checklist, and the references. The links to background information on the homepage take readers to Google Docs, which include the research from the literature review in an abbreviated format and information on the various co-teaching models.

While creating the website, I realized that administrators and EL teachers may benefit from having a checklist to use to help them determine what steps they need to take to effectively make the transition to the co-teaching model for EL services. Therefore, I created a checklist and added it to the website for this purpose. The sections of the checklist are based upon the website pages, and many of the checklist items were directly taken from or slightly adapted from these pages. Educators will be able to celebrate the components of the checklist that they designate as “fully implemented.” By looking at the components that they designate “not implemented yet” or “partially implemented,” they will be able to create an action plan to guide them as they continue to make the transition to an effective implementation of the co-teaching model. An implementation could be deemed as “effective” once the majority of the components on the checklist have been designated as “fully implemented.”

The focus of the website and checklist are on effectively making the transition to the co-teaching model for EL instruction because there is a need for more information on this topic in the EL field. Most of the existing co-teaching research and literature centers on the various co-

teaching models, the benefits of co-teaching, and the challenges associated with co-teaching. However, during my school's transition to the co-teaching model, I realized that very little literature exists on how to make this transition as effectively as possible, so I chose to create a website and checklist to fill in this gap in the literature.

This section focused on the layout of the website, including its various pages, and the corresponding checklist. Besides describing the pages, I elaborated upon my choice of topic for the website and checklist to help further contribute to the EL field. This ties in with the next section on why I chose the particular format for the project.

Choice of Format

A website with multiple pages was selected as the format for the project because a website made more sense than curriculum design, discourse analysis, or a presentation due to the nature of the topic. Other reasons a website was selected, as opposed to other formats, is that a website is easily accessible across the globe and allows for live hyperlinks to online resources. Prior to this project, I had never created a website. However, after attending a district literacy training, I discovered how simple it is to create and add to a website using Google Sites. By creating a website, I was able to challenge myself to try something new and to develop my technological skills in the process. As an educator, I continue to try to incorporate new technologies into my teaching and to provide opportunities for my students to use these technologies so that they will be real-world ready.

Since the website is broken down into pages based upon the components of an effective transition, it will benefit those who view the website because they will be able to get an overview of the transition process as a whole by viewing all of the pages, or they may choose to only view the pages that are specific to their job roles. For instance, administrators may want to view all of

the website to get a well-rounded overview of the transition process but then spend more time investigating the “Administrative Support” page since it more specifically relates to them.

This portion of the chapter described the many reasons why a website was chosen as the best format for the project. The benefits of the breakdown of the website into pages were shared. In the following section, the timeline for project completion will be detailed.

Timeline

According to Hamline University’s guidelines, a capstone project must be completed in full by the end of the GED 8490: Capstone Project course. I elected to take GED 8490 during the summer 2017 term. Therefore, I began my website at the start of the course on June 5th. A draft of the website was ready for my committee to review by July 10th. Committee members provided me with feedback by July 24th, and then I made all final revisions by July 31st. This section of the chapter explained my timeline for project completion. In the next and final section of the chapter, a summary of the chapter will be provided.

Summary

To conclude, this chapter delineated how I created a website and checklist to answer my research questions: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model? If so, how can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?* At the start of the chapter, an explanation of the research paradigm, including worldviews and values, was presented. Following this, the next sections explained the audiences for the website and the settings in which it will likely be the most beneficial. The chapter described the website and its pages in more detail, expressed my reasons for selecting a website for the format of my project, and provided an overview of the project timeline. Chapter four will describe learnings from the capstone process and revisit the literature review from

chapter two. Additionally, the chapter will delve into implications of the project, limitations of it, and recommendations for future research. To close, the chapter will explain how the website will be shared and how I will use the checklist myself.

Chapter Four

Conclusions

Conducting the research for this capstone and creating the website and accompanying checklist have demonstrated the importance of being a lifelong learner and of being reflective. The questions that have anchored me and focused my work throughout the capstone process are as follows: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model? If so, how can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?* Reflecting back upon these questions and upon the capstone process, I am able to draw a number of conclusions, which are the focus of this chapter.

At the outset of this chapter, I will be sharing some of my learnings during this capstone process as I continue my own journey as a lifelong learner. The literature review will be revisited, and I will share which portions of the literature and which sources were most helpful in creating the project. Limitations will be shared so that others considering a similar study might be aware of some of the challenges involved and begin to consider how to overcome these challenges. Implications of this capstone paper and the corresponding website for future research and for schools will be delineated, and some possible topics for future research will be provided. Concluding this chapter, I will describe how I plan to share the results of the project and how I will utilize the website and checklist at my own school.

Learnings

As a continuation of my journey as a lifelong learner throughout this capstone process, one of my key learnings was that the capstone process is one of continual revision – revising one’s writing, research questions, and project to get just the right cumulative effect. As a part of the process, I engaged a content reviewer and peer reviewer to give feedback on my writing.

Considering their feedback, as well as the instructor's feedback, really helped me to delve more deeply into the topic of co-teaching from multiple angles. I was challenged to present information in a format that would be clear, visually appealing (i.e. the website), and understandable to readers who may not be as familiar with the topic. I came to understand that writing can always be improved and so sought to make revisions, such as searching for just the right word or combining sentences to improve fluency.

The research questions which are the foundation of this paper and the website were revised many times. As I conducted research, I was able to narrow my research questions to provide more specificity and more accurately encompass what I was hoping to achieve with my project. For instance, I chose to narrow my research questions to focus on schools at the elementary grade levels because my co-teaching experience is predominately within those grade levels.

My project went through several revisions as well. Initially, I had planned to create a handbook in Google Docs to guide teachers in making the transition from the pull-out model for EL instruction to the co-teaching model. However, I attended a literacy training earlier this spring during which I was introduced to Google Sites. The thought of creating a website previously would have overwhelmed me, but Google Sites provides templates that make the website creation process fairly simple, particularly for someone like myself who had never created a website before. I chose to create a website because I would be able to reach a wider audience with it than I would have if I had created a handbook. Additionally, as a teacher I am continually seeking to develop my technological skills to better incorporate technology into the classroom. Having created a website fairly easily for this capstone project will make it much

more likely in the future for me to create a classroom website or teacher blog. Alternately, I might guide students in creating websites to share their learning.

As can be seen from this section of the chapter, revision is an essential component of the capstone process. The capstone paper, research questions, and capstone project all need to be considered when revising. Earlier in this capstone paper, a review of the existing literature was conducted in chapter two. Now that the website is complete, this literature review will be revisited in the next section to show how it informed the capstone process.

Revisiting the Literature Review

Two sections of the literature review proved to be most important in the capstone process. The section of the literature review on the effectiveness of the co-teaching model proved to be important in answering the first research question: *Is the co-teaching model for EL instruction truly more effective than the pull-out model?* While no research could be found comparing the effectiveness of both models, I was able to find some limited research on the effectiveness of the co-teaching model in general, which was shared in the literature review.

Likewise, the research for the section on challenges of the co-teaching model helped to inform much of the information on the website, which, in turn, answered the second research question: *How can elementary schools effectively transition from the pull-out model to the co-teaching model?* Knowing the challenges helped me to provide tips for EL teachers so that they might make the transition to the co-teaching model as smoothly as possible. For example, one challenge, co-teachers receiving little to no training prior to being asked to co-teach, helped to inform the page of the website on “Professional Development.”

Two articles cited in the literature review were particularly helpful in the website creation process. These were Cook and Friend’s (1995) article entitled “Co-Teaching: Guidelines for

creating effective practices” and Murawski and Bernhardt’s (2015) article called “An administrator’s guide to co-teaching.” The articles helped me to understand essential components of the transition process from the perspectives of EL teachers, general education teachers, coaches, and administrators and to include these perspectives on the website.

As can be seen, the sections of the literature review on the effectiveness of the co-teaching model and the challenges of the model guided the capstone process. The two articles mentioned above were particularly helpful. Though the literature was helpful overall, it was not without its limitations.

Limitations

After examining the existing literature, I was surprised by what I did not find. For example, I was surprised to learn how little research has been conducted on the effectiveness of co-teaching in general, yet the trend is to move toward this model. It seems that the primary reason for this trend is the move toward inclusion. Therefore, rather than saying, “Research shows that co-teaching is what is best for students,” as some educators or administrators say, perhaps they could say, “Creating a classroom environment that includes and supports the needs of a diverse group of learners is our goal.” Also surprising was that no research could be found comparing the effectiveness of the pull-out model for EL instruction with the co-teaching model. It *is* possible to find research on one model or the other but not research comparing the effectiveness of both models.

In creating the website, I came across many helpful, pre-made co-teaching checklists and evaluation tools (about different aspects of the process of making the transition – not about the entire process like my checklist). Unfortunately, since these materials were copyrighted, I was not able to share these valuable resources on the website. If there had been more time to

complete the project, I may have been able to acquire some of the necessary permissions from the authors or publishers, but this was not possible due to the limited timeline for project completion.

Since the capstone was completed during the summer 2017 semester, there was not an opportunity to try out the checklist in various schools. Hopefully, an opportunity will arise in the future. Being able to try it out in schools would provide feedback about its format, components, and usefulness. Once it has been tried out in schools, any aspects of it that might need revision will become clearer.

Unfortunately, the capstone process has its limitations. Some limitations described in this section were the limitations of the existing literature and of the timeline for project completion. Due to the relatively short timeline, acquiring permissions for copyrighted material and piloting the checklist in schools was not possible. The focus of the next section of this chapter will be on the implications of the capstone process for future research.

Implications

Since little research is available on the effectiveness of co-teaching, an implication is that this would be an area for future research. Likewise, researchers should conduct studies investigating the effectiveness of the pull-out model for EL instruction when compared with the co-teaching model. A challenge for them will be controlling for the many variables such as differing definitions of co-teaching, various levels of fidelity of implementation, and dissimilar levels of preparation and experience among teachers (Friend et al., 2010; Platt et al., 2003). Other variables might include inconsistent grade levels, subject areas, minutes of co-taught instruction, student demographics, and student mobility (Friend et al., 2010; Platt et al., 2003).

Despite these variables, co-teaching is an important area for future research since many schools want to ensure that they are utilizing teaching models and practices that are research based.

Besides conducting more research into the effectiveness of the pull-out model for EL instruction versus the co-teaching model, other individuals who are considering researching co-teaching would have many possibilities. One option would be to evaluate the effectiveness of the various co-teaching models in relation to one another: Station Teaching; Parallel Teaching; Alternative Teaching; Teaming; One Teach, One Assist; and One Teach, One Observe (Friend, 2015). Alternately, researchers could investigate the most effective forms of professional development for teachers who are engaging in co-teaching. They might want to consider trainings led by experts, visits to observe experienced co-teachers in action, or ongoing collaboration with a coach. Effectively evaluating co-teachers could be another area for future research. Researchers might want to consider who should conduct the observations, how the observations should be conducted, and what criteria should be used.

Clearly, many aspects of co-teaching could be researched further. Some of these aspects will be easier to research than others. However, the results of this current capstone still need to be shared, which is why the next section will describe action steps that will be taken to do this.

Project Sharing

One of the reasons I chose to create a website rather than my original idea of a handbook is to make it more easily accessible to a broader audience. Individuals will be able to access the website if the link is shared with them or if they conduct a Google search. The accompanying checklist will be accessible to anyone who clicks on the hyperlink for it on the website. The website will be “live” after August 2017, and I will continue to add updated information to the website as more research becomes available.

To help make people aware of the website, some actions steps are necessary. First, I will email out a link for the website to acquaintances who are EL teachers. After receiving permission from my district's EL Coordinator, I anticipate sharing my website at an EL department meeting. Finally, I may consider submitting a proposal to share my research and project at the annual Minnesota English Learner Education Conference (MELEd) hosted by MinneTESOL, a professional association for EL teachers, in the fall.

This section described how the website and checklist will likely be shared. Potential action steps related to this were articulated. Not only will the website and checklist likely be beneficial other EL teachers, but they will be beneficial to me as well. The next section will describe how I will use the results of my research.

Personal Use

Despite the fact that little research was available on the effectiveness of the co-teaching model in general and no research was available comparing the two models (pull-out versus co-teaching), I am aware that my district is making the transition to the co-teaching model with the goal of full implementation by the 2017-2018 school year. I plan to share my findings with the EL Coordinator for my district, but realize that it is sensible to move forward with the district plan based on the benefits of inclusion in the general education classroom for EL students, though not much quantifiable information on the effectiveness of the co-teaching model is available yet.

The website and checklist will be helpful to me in my work as an EL teacher. I plan to share the checklist with the one other EL teacher at the same building. Together, we will complete the checklist and consider which components are “not implemented yet” or “fully implemented.” Then we will create an action plan for our school's ongoing transition to the co-

teaching model for EL instruction and share the plan with our school principal and Building Leadership Team (BLT). After getting their approval, we will move forward in implementing the steps of our action plan.

Many of the checklist components must be implemented at the school level, but I can begin to implement the “Collaborative Planning” component myself during workshop week in the fall. Before students return, I will set up regular, protected co-planning times with my co-teachers. Since co-planning will be new to some of my co-teachers, I will share the information from the “Collaborative Planning” page of my website with them so that they are better able to understand what our collaborative planning times might involve. Ideally, my co-teachers and I will be able to meet to co-plan at least once during workshop week so that we are ready when students arrive.

This research, website, and checklist will be beneficial to me in my role as an EL teacher. I look forward to utilizing them starting this fall as my district and school continue to transition to the co-teaching model for EL instruction. To conclude this chapter, a summary will be provided in the next section.

Summary

This chapter detailed learnings resulting from the capstone process. To start with, learnings about the importance of revision, in particular, were shared. Following this, the chapter elaborated upon the website and checklist resulting from the research. Revisiting the literature review, the next section of the chapter described which portions of the literature review were most helpful in the capstone process. Limitations and implications of the research and project were discussed in order to assist others who are considering researching the topic of co-teaching. Ideas for additional aspects of co-teaching to research were given. Since research is not of much

use unless it is shared with others, action steps for sharing the website and checklist were outlined. Finally, I articulated how I will use my research results and checklist within my own school setting.

Even with the additional knowledge gained as a result of the capstone process, I still agree with how I completed the analogy shared at the beginning of this paper:

“The marriage between the English Learner teacher and the general education teacher in a co-teaching relationship is like two people riding a bicycle built for two” (adapted from A. M. Beninghof, district training, June 20-21, 2013). As two people riding a bicycle built for two are working together towards a common goal, so do co-teaching partners in working together toward common goals and objectives for their shared students. Likewise, two people riding a bicycle built for two retain their individuality, which can be seen in how co-teachers retain their unique areas of expertise and levels of experience. When two people riding a bicycle built for two follow a roadmap because a route is unknown, they are much more likely to get to their final destination. Similarly, when two novice co-teachers utilize the website and checklist created as a part of this capstone process, they will be much more likely reach their final destination: an effective transition to the co-teaching model.

References

- American Federation of Teachers. (2002). *Teaching English-language learners: What does the research say? ATF educational issues research brief number 14*. American Federation of Teachers.
- American Youth Policy Forum. (2009). *Moving English language learners to college-and career-readiness. issue brief* American Youth Policy Forum.
- Bahamonde, C., & Friend, M. (1999). Teaching English language learners: A proposal for effective service delivery through collaboration and co-teaching. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation, 10*(1), 1.
- Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, D. C.: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from <http://www.ncele.us>
- Baptiste, K. (2015). We were complete opposites, until.... *Educational Leadership, 73*(4), 40.
- Bell, A. B., & Baecher, L. (2012). Points on a continuum: ESL teachers reporting on collaboration. *TESOL Journal, 3*(3), 488-515.
- Beninghof, A. M. (2012). *Co-teaching that works: Structures and strategies for maximizing student learning* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Beninghof, A. M. (2014). Lesson planning questions. Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hWV0R_Zkr77gS2wLsxpvlQ4efB4jMTdsc3AMbdtaSdo/edit
- Beninghof, A. M. (2015). To clone or not to clone? *Educational Leadership, 73*(4), 10.

Beninghof, A. M. (n.d.). Collaborative solutions worksheet. Retrieved from

http://www.ideasforeducators.com/uploads/1/0/7/5/10755773/collaborative_solutions_worksheet.pdf

Beninghof, A. M. (n.d.). Co-teaching observation and reflection. Retrieved from

<http://www.ideasforeducators.com/downloadables.html>

Beninghof, A. M. (n.d.). Co-teaching roles and responsibilities. Retrieved from

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fDB_CG6jkIC6SL30fkYj5T2T6pWo4nnied16lGQxNs/edit

Beninghof, A. M. (n.d.). Indicators of successful inclusive schools. Retrieved from

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1p4VNSRmSFQyVrzn9t7N0EyZZEgHaBo-KCqJU5DMwVyE/edit>

Beninghof, A. M. (n.d.). Reflective questions for co-teaching teams. Retrieved from

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1quJaD1nZ9pb_UFtKp6o2k4uCtXE9nApOUo2pyxRkdQE/edit

Beninghof, A. M. (n.d.) Strategies for the co-taught classroom. Retrieved from

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1d3kEdIsX6dGCLPATWt5Vkor34ESEHIDG3eOYgV6G9Sc/edit>

Beninghof, A. M. (n.d.) Teacher a, teacher b. Retrieved from

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1d3kEdIsX6dGCLPATWt5Vkor34ESEHIDG3eOYgV6G9Sc/edit>

Beninghof, A., & Leensvaart, M. (2016). Co-teaching to support ELLs. *Educational Leadership*, 73(5), 70-73.

- Blackwell, Daniel. (2012, November 14). *Principal for a Day program* [Photograph]. Retrieved from <http://www.shaw.af.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/212899/principal-for-a-day-program/>
- Calderon, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. *Future of Children, 21*(1), 103-127.
- Causton-Theoharis, J., & Theoharis, G. (2008). Creating inclusive schools FOR ALL STUDENTS. *School Administrator, 65*(8), 24-31.
- Cobb Morocco, C., & Mata Aguilar, C. (2002). Coteaching for content understanding: A schoolwide model. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 13*(4), 315-347. doi:10.1207/S1532768XJEPC1304_04
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. (cover story). *Focus on Exceptional Children, 28*(3), 1.
- Co-teaching for English language learners in NYC [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/D7IfQ8oYPBA>
- Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms, grades K-6, part I: Whole group structures and strategies [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/ek951kXTBzo>
- Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms, part II: Effective small group structures and strategies [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/DkY2D-f3JNo>
- Co-teaching is a marriage [Video file]. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/_pnxst7dkLk
- Davison, C. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(4), 454-475. doi:10.2167/beb339.0

- de Jong, E. (2011). *Return to bilingual education*. Caslon. Retrieved from <http://www.colorincolorado.org>
- DeFrance Schmidt, S. (2008). *The power of co-teaching: Predictors of attitudes on elementary ESL/general education coteaching*.
- Dove, M., & Honigsfeld, A. (2010). ESL coteaching and collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL Journal*, 1(1), 3-22.
- EDFacts/consolidated state performance report, 2014-15. (2016). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov>
- ESL co-teaching models [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/NRcDNuZ8e0o>
- Eyolfson, J. (2016). English learners need high-quality grade-level experiences. *Journal of Staff Development*, 37(5), 63.
- Fearon, K. (2008). *A team teaching approach to ESL: An evaluative case study* (M.A.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: Social Sciences. (304819061).
- Flom, J. (2015). Sometimes you need couples' therapy. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 32.
- Friend, M. (2015). Welcome to co-teaching 2.0. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 16.
- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20(1), 9-27.
doi:10.1080/10474410903535380.
- Friend, M., & Reising, M. (1993). Co-teaching: An overview of the past, a glimpse at the present, and considerations for the future. *Preventing School Failure*, 37(4), 6.

- Fu, D., Houser, w. R., & Huang, A. (2007). A collaboration between ESL and regular classroom teachers for ELL students' literacy development. *Changing English, 14*(3), 325-342.
doi:10.1080/13586840701712014
- Gandara, P., & Orfield, G. (2012). Segregating Arizona's English learners: A return to the "Mexican room"? *Teachers College Record, 114*(9).
- Haring, D., & Kelner, T. (2015). Why we got serious about interdisciplinary teaching. *Educational Leadership, 73*(4), 68.
- Hasvold, K. (2013). *Co-teaching and pull-out: A comparative case study and analysis*.
- Haworth, P., McGee, A., & MacIntyre, L. K. (2015). Building a whole school approach and teacher efficacy with English language learners. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 21*(2), 164-177.
- Hillberry, M. M. (2008). *An examination of the effectiveness of english language learner programs at the elementary level* (Ph.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304416849).
- Ho, M. J. *Examining the relationship between instructional models and elementary English language learners' proficiency in English*. Available from Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA). (85628722; 200614240).
- Honigsfeld, A. (2009). ELL programs: Not one size fits all. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 45*(4), 166-171.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2008). Co-teaching in the ESL classroom. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 74*(2), 8-14.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2010). *Collaboration and co-teaching: Strategies for English learners* (1st ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif; London: Corwin.

- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2012). Collaborative practices to support all students. *Principal Leadership, 12*(6), 40-44.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2015a). *Collaboration and co-teaching for English learners: A leader's guide*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2015b). Co-teaching ELLs: Riding a tandem bike. *Educational Leadership, 73*(4), 56-60.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2015c, December 1). How do you know whether or not you are co-teaching ELLs effectively? [Web log]. Retrieved from <http://coteachingforells.weebly.com/co-teaching-blog-q--a/how-do-you-know-whether-or-not-you-are-co-teaching-ells-effectively>
- Hopes, D. L. (2014). *A comparative study of six north Texas school districts and their effects on English language learners' acquisition of English language proficiency and academic achievement* (Ed.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1540839107).
- Inclusive Schools Network. (2015). Finding time for collaboration and using it well. Retrieved from <http://www.inclusiveschools.org/finding-time-for-collaboration-and-using-it-well/>
- Kusuma-Powell, O., & Powell, W. (2015). Lifting the status of learning support teachers. *Educational Leadership, 73*(4), 62.
- Lhamon, C. E., & Gupta, V. (2015). *Dear colleague letter*. U. S. Department of Justice & U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov>
- Lieberman, D. (2015). Sometimes you need to have a state of the union conversation. *Educational Leadership, 73*(4), 13.
- Lodato Wilson, G. (2015). Revisiting classroom routines. *Educational Leadership, 73*(4), 50.

- Mamantov, T. J. (2013). *An investigation of English as a second language models (pullout, co-teaching, and inclusion) on the Texas English language proficiency assessment system* (Ed.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1372812071).
- Mandel, K., & Eiserman, T. (2015). Team teaching in high school. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 74.
- Marietta, G., Brookover, E., & Foundation for, C. D. (2011). *Effectively educating PreK-3rd English language learners (ELLs) in Montgomery County Public Schools. A FCD case study*. Foundation for Child Development.
- Martinsen Holt, N. (2004). *Pull-out to collaboration: Becoming an effective ESL co-teacher*.
- Maxwell, L. A. (2014). ESL and classroom teachers team up to teach common core. *Education Digest*, 79(5), 4-9.
- McClure, G., & Cahnmann-Taylor, M. (2010). Pushing back against Push-In: ESOL teacher resistance and the complexities of coteaching. *TESOL Journal*, 1(1), 101-129.
- Minnesota Department of Education. *English learner education in Minnesota*. (2016). Retrieved from <http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/dse/el/>
- Monika. (2016, February 16). [Photograph]. <https://pixabay.com/en/notebook-pen-pencil-education-1198156/>
- Murawski, W. W., & Bernhardt, P. (2015). An administrator's guide to co-teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 30.
- Murdock, L., Finneran, D., & Theve, K. (2015). Co-teaching to reach every learner. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 42-47.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction, Educational Programs, & Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and

- Academic Achievement for Limited English, Proficient Students. (2015). *English learner toolkit for state and local education agencies (SEAs and LEAs)* National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs.
- Norton, J. C. (2013). *Elementary ESL and general education co-teachers' perceptions of their co-teaching roles: A mixed methods study* (Ed.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1346228583).
- Noyes, K. A. (2016). *Factors that influence ESL directors' and educators' choice of program model or instructional approach: A mixed methods study of Pennsylvania public schools* (Ed.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1854864978).
- Padron, Y. N., & Waxman, H. C. (2016). Investigating principals' knowledge and perceptions of second language programs for English language learners. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 4(2), 127-146.
- Peercy, M. M., & Martin-Beltran, M. (2012). Envisioning collaboration: Including ESOL students and teachers in the mainstream classroom. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(7), 657-673.
- Penke, H. T. (2011). *The effect of the English language learner pull out program on primary students' language achievement* (Ed.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (911044597).
- Platt, E., Harper, C., & Mendoza, M. B. (2003). Dueling philosophies: Inclusion or separation for Florida's English language learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(1), 105-133.
doi:10.2307/3588467
- Potemski, A. (2009). *Teaching English language learners: A complex system. policy-to-practice brief*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

- Ramirez, A. (2016). Co-teaching that works: Structures and strategies for maximizing student learning. *Tesl-Ej*, 19(4), 1.
- Ramirez, J. (2016). [Image]. Retrieved from <https://pixabay.com/en/volunteer-help-service-volunteering-1550328/>
- Rolland, K. A. (2013). *Evaluation of a school district's English as a second language program* (Ed.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1287983075).
- Silva, V. (2011). A co-teaching model raises English learner proficiency. *School Administrator*, 68(5), 20-21.
- Sparks, S. D. (2016). Teaching English-learners: What does the research tell us? *Education Week*, 35(30), 3-6.
- Stewner-Manzanares. (1988). *The bilingual education act: Twenty years later*. The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Sustainable Sanitation Alliance. (2008, August 23). *SuSanA food security working group meeting* [Photograph]. Retrieved from [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:SuSanA_food_security_working_group_meeting_\(Stockholm\)_3171724197.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:SuSanA_food_security_working_group_meeting_(Stockholm)_3171724197.jpg)
- Tacke, O. (2014, January 30). *Checklist* [Image]. Retrieved from <https://www.flickr.com/photos/otacke/12221292503>
- Thumprchgo. (2015, October 13). [Photograph]. Retrieved from <https://pixabay.com/en/faculty-workshop-979902/>
- Villa, R. A., 1952, & Thousand, J. S., 1950. (2013). *A guide to co-teaching: New lessons and strategies to facilitate student learning* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.

- Washut Heck, T., & Bacharach, N. (2015). A better model for student teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 24.
- Wertheimer, C., & Honigsfeld, A. (2000). Preparing ESL students to meet the new standards. *TESOL Journal*, 9(1), 23-28.
- Wicks, A. (2016). *Perceptions of co-teaching*.
- York-Barr, J., Ghere, G., & Sommerness, J. (2007). Collaborative teaching to increase ELL student learning: A three-year urban elementary case study. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 12(3), 301-335. doi:10.1080/10824660701601290
- Young, K. A. W. (2007). *Moving towards ESL co-teaching: A case study*.

Appendix A

Making the Transition Checklist

Directions: Use this checklist to guide your school’s transition from the pull-out model for EL services to the co-teaching model. Put an *x* under “not implemented yet,” “partially implemented,” or “fully implemented” to designate where your school is at in implementing each checklist item. Celebrate the components of the checklist that you designate as “fully implemented.” Examine in more detail the components that you designate as “not implemented yet” or “partially implemented” and then create an action plan to guide you as you continue to make the transition to an effective implementation of the co-teaching model. An implementation can be deemed as “effective” once the majority of the components on the checklist have been designated as “fully implemented.”

Committee Formation	Not Implemented Yet	Partially Implemented	Fully Implemented
Form a co-teaching committee within a school (or begin with one co-teaching partnership) (Cook & Friend, 1995) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite stakeholders (administrators, EL teachers, classroom teachers, parents, etc.) to join (Cook & Friend, 1995) 			
Create a mission and vision statement that promote inclusion (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b)			
Develop a common definition of co-teaching (Cook & Friend, 1995; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015)			
Determine goals, objectives, and outcomes for co-teaching (Cook & Friend, 1995)			
Establish success criteria or "look fors" of effective co-teaching			
Foster the promotion of literacy across all subject areas (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b)			
Specify common language across the curriculum (Haring & Kelner, 2016)			
Ensure alignment between what ELs and their peers are learning (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b)			
Consider which students might benefit from participation in co-taught classrooms (Cook & Friend, 1995)			
Inform staff members about the transition to the co-teaching model (Cook & Friend, 1995) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide staff members with information on how their roles and responsibilities might change (Cook & Friend, 1995) 			
Be prepared to answer questions (Cook & Friend, 1995) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions may be related to... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the impact of co-teaching on students who are not ELs ○ whether or not rigor will be lowered as a result of co-teaching ○ the purpose of co-teaching 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ role changes ○ inclusion ○ amount of service time for ELs ○ staffing ○ scheduling ○ finding planning time (Cobb Morocco & Mata Aguilar, 2002; Cook & Friend, 1995) 			
<p>Inform parents or guardians about the transition to the co-teaching model (Cook & Friend, 1995)</p>			
<p>Consider how to formatively and summatively assess the co-teaching program within the school (Cook & Friend, 1995)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjust goals and objectives when needed (Cook & Friend, 1995) • Create a plan for monitoring progress (Cook & Friend, 1995) 			
<p>Collect Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have parents, students, teachers, administrators, and community members share their input (Murdock, Finneran, & Theve, 2016) 			
<h2>Voluntary Partnerships</h2>	<p>Not Implemented Yet</p>	<p>Partially Implemented</p>	<p>Fully Implemented</p>
<p>Promote buy-in for inclusion and collaboration (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; Silva, 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have teachers who have had successful co-teaching experiences in the past serve as co-teaching ambassadors to encourage others to try out co-teaching (Washut Heck & Bacharach, 2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See if they will allow other interested teachers to informally observe them • Bring in outside experts and facilitators, if needed (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) 			
<p>Have teachers find their own partners or volunteer (Cook & Friend, 1995; Mandel & Eiserman, 2015; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider having teachers complete surveys (personality inventories, communication style inventories, etc.) to determine which co-teachers might work well together (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) • Refrain from requiring specific teachers to co-teach together because not all personalities, teaching styles, cultural backgrounds, etc. will mesh well (Baptiste, 2015; Friend et al., 2010; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). 			
<p>Limit the number of co-teachers with whom any particular teacher will need to co-teach (York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommers, 2007).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general educator should only co-teach with one special educator (EL teacher, special education teacher, interventionist) (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) • EL teachers should have a limited number of co-teaching partners as well (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to Murawski & Bernhardt 			

<p>(2015)"Special educators [or EL teachers, in this case] can collaborate with multiple colleagues; but to truly co-teach, which entails co-planning, co-instructing, and co-assessing, they need to start with one or two partners. It's also important to limit the number of content areas and grade levels in which the special educator co-teaches" (p. 32).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The EL teacher should co-teach with no more than three to four teachers (A. M. Beninghof, district training, June 20-21, 2013). 			
<h2>Professional Development</h2>	<p>Not Implemented Yet</p>	<p>Partially Implemented</p>	<p>Fully Implemented</p>
<p>Provide professional development (PD) for all staff members involved (Cobb Morocco & Mata Aguilar, 2002; Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend et al., 2010; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015).</p>			
<p>Determine who will lead the PD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experienced co-teachers • Members of the co-teaching committee • Outside experts • Coaches 			
<p>Invite key stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrators and/or coaches (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Aids them in better understanding co-teaching in order to support it and to be more informed when conducting observations • All co-teaching partners (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008; Cobb Morocco & Mata Aguilar, 2002; Friend et al., 2010; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensures teachers have a common foundation of knowledge (York-Barr et al., 2007) 			
<p>Arrange for PD sessions on an ongoing basis over multiple years (Eyolfson, 2016; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Silva, 2011; Washut Heck & Bacharach, 2015)</p>			
<p>Give co-teaching partnerships opportunities to receive feedback and support from coaches or Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) with experience in co-teaching (Eyolfson, 2016; Friend et al., 2010; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b; Silva, 2011)</p>			
<p>Consider using an “<i>I do, we do you do, or gradual release, framework</i>” for PD (Beninghof and Leensvaart, 2015, p. 71-73)</p>			
<p><i>I Do</i></p>			
<p>Have co-teaching experts facilitate the PD (Beninghof and Leensvaart, 2015)</p>			
<p>Provide training on the various co-teaching models and strategies (Friend, 2015; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015)</p>			
<p>Model effective co-teaching (Beninghof and Leensvaart, 2015; Friend, 2015; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015)</p>			

<p>Show video clips for teacher analysis (Beninghof and Leensvaart, 2015; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify what is and what is not co-teaching (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) 			
<p>Cover other essential topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being proactive about inclusion (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Defining it ○ Discussing the legal support for it ○ Expressing the benefits of it ○ Describing how co-teaching supports inclusion • Engaging in perspective shifts regarding traditional roles (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The general educator cannot solely be in charge of deciding the curriculum (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008) ○ The EL teacher needs to realize that EL students will be able to survive it even if he or she is not always present (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008) • Presenting both adults as teachers within the general education classroom (Cook & Friend, 1995; York-Barr et al., 2007) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sending communication (report cards, newsletters, etc.) home with both teachers' names (Cook & Friend, 1995) ○ Having two teachers' desks (Cook & Friend, 1995) ○ Posting both names on the door (Cook & Friend, 1995) ○ Sharing work tables or areas (Cook & Friend, 1995) ○ Dividing up grading responsibilities (Cook & Friend, 1995) ○ Alternating who is leading instruction (Cook & Friend, 1995) • Resolving conflict <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Communicating regularly ○ Presuming positive intentions ○ Being solution-driven • Collaborating and communicating effectively (Cook & Friend, 1995; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; York-Barr et al., 2007) • Supporting students and differentiating in inclusive settings (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008; Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend et al., 2010) 			
<p>Ensure discussion time for co-teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing the results of personality inventories and/or communication style inventories • Reflecting on one's own preparedness for collaboration and co-teaching (Cook & Friend, 1995) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Abilities to cooperate, compromise, be flexible, give up power, and differentiate • Articulating each person's area(s) of expertise • Agreeing upon goals and expectations (McClure & 			

<p>Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussing instructional beliefs, confidentiality, noise tolerance, classroom signals and routines, preferences and pet-peeves, and discipline (Cook & Friend, 1995) • Delineating roles and responsibilities with the co-taught classroom (Beninhof, 2015; Cook & Friend, 1995; Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015; Wilson, 2015) • Setting a regular time and format for collaborative planning (Beninhof and Leensvaart, 2015) • Considering which co-teaching models to use and when (Beninhof and Leensvaart, 2015) 			
<i>We Do (over the course of approx. two years)</i>			
<p>Provide co-teachers with extensive coaching (Beninhof and Leensvaart, 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coach and co-teachers engage in “side-by-side teaching,” which is when the coach steps in during an observation to model something (Beninhof and Leensvaart, 2015) 			
<i>You Do</i>			
<p>Ensure co-teachers have time for...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflecting • Examining their teaching practices • Communicating about areas for growth • Visiting other co-teaching partners’ classrooms and providing feedback (Beninhof and Leensvaart, 2015) 			
Collaborative Planning	Not Implemented Yet	Partially Implemented	Fully Implemented
<p>Determine regular, protected times for collaborative planning (Cobb Morocco & Mata Aguilar, 2002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By scheduling common planning periods when possible (Cook & Friend, 1995; Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008; Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Utilizing prep times, before or after school times, professional learning community (PLC) times, or Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) times (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; A. M. Beninhof, district training, June 20-21, 2013) ○ Hiring substitute teachers so co-teachers can plan (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; A. M. Beninhof, district training, June 20-21, 2013) ○ Replacing lunch or recess duties (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) ○ By considering digital options (email, Google Docs, Google Hangouts, Skype, lesson planning software such as www.planbook.com, etc.), if finding a time to meet face-to-face proves to be challenging ○ See this article for more ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finding Time for Collaboration and Using It Well 			
<p>Incorporate time for reflection after the lesson or unit</p>			

<p>(McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-teachers should reflect together rather than individually (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). • This reflection time results in teachers being able to take immediate action (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010). • During this reflection time, teachers may also co-assess student work and problem-solve. 			
<p>Split co-planning into three phases: 1) pre-planning, 2) collaborative planning, and 3) post-planning (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) .</p>			
<p><i>Pre-planning</i> (completed separately via email, Google Docs, lesson planning software such as www.planbook.com, etc.)</p>			
<p>Both teachers individually review the upcoming units or lessons (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b).</p>			
<p>They consider what background knowledge students will need to be successful (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b).</p>			
<p>The general education teacher begins to formulate a content objective and identifies vocabulary (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b).</p>			
<p>The EL teacher requests important information from the general education teacher such as essential questions, content objectives, and vocabulary (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b).</p>			
<p>The EL teacher determines the language objective and considers the academic language needed for the lesson (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He or she may identify additional vocabulary (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b). 			
<p>The co-teachers individually begin to think about lesson activities and resources that might be needed (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EL teacher creates and gathers supplemental materials, including any bilingual materials (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b). 			
<p><i>Collaborative planning</i> (completed together in person or via the phone, Skype, Google Hangouts, etc.)</p>			
<p>The co-teachers agree on content and language objectives and decide how each will be assessed (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b).</p>			
<p>They discuss ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ways to differentiate (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) • Possible supports for students (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) • Lesson activities (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) • Teaching strategies (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) • Co-teaching models (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plan to use a variety of co-teaching models rather than relying too heavily on any one model (Cook & Friend, 1995; Eyolfson, 2016; Wilson, 2015) • Instructional groupings (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Determine how to share students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The EL teacher should not solely 			

<p>work with ELs or always work with students in the same space (Murdock, Finneran, & Theve, 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) • Preparation of materials (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b) 			
Post-planning (completed separately)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each teacher prepares the materials he or she agreed to prepare during the collaborative planning phase (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b). • Teachers complete their individual plans (may share them via email, Google Docs, lesson planning software, etc.) (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015b). 			
Administrative Support	Not Implemented Yet	Partially Implemented	Fully Implemented
Secure sufficient funding (Silva, 2011)			
Be committed to inclusive education (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008)			
Secure additional staff members who are highly qualified and who have experience in co-teaching, when possible (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010; Kusuma-Powell & Powell, 2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must have good communication skills, be credible and trustworthy, be familiar with recent research, be open to sharing ideas 			
Acquire necessary resources (Cook & Friend, 1995; McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010)			
Become knowledgeable about co-teaching and co-teaching strategies (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015)			
Be supportive of co-teaching and promote buy-in from staff (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; Silva, 2011)			
Engage with co-teachers in any training (Cook & Friend, 1995)			
Partner up co-teachers (see "Voluntary Partnerships" portion of checklist) (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010)			
Communicate with parents and community members about co-teaching (Friend et al., 2010; Murdock, Finneran, & Theve, 2016)			
Model and promote collaborative skills (Cook & Friend, 1995)			
Be ready to assist when challenges or conflict occur (Friend et al., 2010; Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008)			
Try to keep effective co-teachers together (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015)			
Schedule co-taught times (Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend et al., 2010) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule co-taught times first when creating a master schedule (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) • Stagger co-teaching times within and across grade levels (Friend & Reising, 1993; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommers, 2007) • Include common planning time when possible (Cook & 			

<p>Friend, 1995; Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008; Friend et al., 2010; Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015; Silva, 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep in mind that 45 minute blocks of time are the minimum for effective co-teaching (A. M. Beninghof, district training, June 20-21, 2013) • Consider that newcomers often need additional EL instruction beyond what is provided through co-taught instruction (McClure & Cahnmann-Taylor, 2010) 			
<p>Cluster EL students in co-taught classrooms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Murawski & Bernhardt (2015) provided the following recommendation: "Try to avoid having more than 30 percent of a general education class designated as having special needs" (p. 32; A. M. Beninghof, district training, June 20-21, 2013) 			
<p>Conduct observations in co-taught classrooms (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observe co-teaching partners more often since they will be using different co-teaching models (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) • Look for indicators of co-planning, co-teaching, and co-assessing (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) • Evaluate both teachers concurrently rather than at separate times so that one teacher does not feel the need to lead the lesson during the observation while the other steps back (Murawski & Bernhardt, 2015) 			