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Why SCSU chose Co-Teaching

• Student Teaching hasn’t changed much in 80 years!
• Re-examination of student teaching
• Growing resistance from teachers to take teacher candidates with high emphasis on NCLB testing
• Pressures from NCATE and other accreditation agencies
St. Cloud TQE Initiative

- 5 year, $5 million federally funded program, awarded in October 2003
- Carry over year through end of summer 2009
- Written in collaboration with St. Cloud School District
- Three major project initiatives
  - Mentoring and Induction
  - Professional Development
  - Co-Teaching
Co-Teaching

Co-Teaching is defined as two teachers working together with groups of students and sharing the planning, organization, delivery and assessment of instruction as well as the physical space.

Both teachers are actively involved and engaged in all aspects of instruction.
Co-Teaching Strategies

☑ One teach, one observe
☑ One teach, one assist
☑ Station teaching
☑ Parallel teaching
☑ Supplemental teaching
☑ Alternative (differentiated) teaching
☑ Team teaching
Co-Teaching is an Attitude

An attitude of sharing the classroom and students

Co-Teachers must always be thinking...

WE’RE BOTH TEACHING!
Co-Teaching

Findings
DATA COLLECTION

P-12 Learners
- Academic Achievement
- 7-12 Survey
- Focus Groups

Teacher Candidates
- Summative Assessment
- End of Experience Survey
- Focus Groups

Cooperating Teachers
- End of Experience Surveys
- Focus Groups
Co-Teaching in P-12 classrooms

826 Pairs to date

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>179 Pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>203 Pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>231 Pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>243 Pair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-teaching has impacted over 25,000 P-12 students in Central Minnesota

- 34 Pre K classrooms
- 601 Elementary (K-6) classrooms
- 120 Secondary (7-12) classrooms
- 71 Special Education classrooms
## Measuring Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA)</th>
<th>Woodcock Johnson III – Research Edition (WJIII)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Math – Grades 3 - 7</td>
<td>Reading/Math – Grades K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Administered</td>
<td>Individually Administered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compares cohorts</td>
<td>Can use as pre/post intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results reported as scale score, index points and proficiency</td>
<td>Results include raw score and standard score, but can also compute gain scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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K-6 Reading Gains

- **Woodcock Johnson III - Research Edition**
- Individually administered
- Pre/Post test
- Statistically significant gains in all four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodcock Johnson III Research Edition W Score Gains</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>Not Co-Taught</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>15.7 (N=221)</td>
<td>9.9 (N=99)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>24.4 (N=225)</td>
<td>18.7 (N=124)</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>14.8 (N=322)</td>
<td>11.8 (N=172)</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>19.6 (N=245)</td>
<td>14.8 (N=182)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**K-6 Reading Proficiency**

- *Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment*
- *NCLB proficiency test for Minnesota*
- *Statistically significant findings in all four years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Reading Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>Not Co-Taught</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>82.1% (N=318)</td>
<td>74.7% (N=1035)</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>78.7% (N=484)</td>
<td>72.7% (N=1757)</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>75.5% (N=371)</td>
<td>64.1% (N=1964)</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>80.8% (N=261)</td>
<td>61.4% (N=2246)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K-6 Math Gains

- Woodcock Johnson III – Research Edition
- Individually administered
- Pre/Post test
- Statistically significant gains in two of four years; positive trend in each year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodcock Johnson III Research Edition W Score Gains</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>Not Co-Taught</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>17.2 (N=221)</td>
<td>13.9 (N=99)</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>20.3 (N=206)</td>
<td>17.4 (N=143)</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>14.3 (N=313)</td>
<td>12.1 (N=182)</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>17.9 (N=250)</td>
<td>16.0 (N=177)</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K-6 Math Proficiency

- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment
- NCLB Approved proficiency test for Minnesota
- Statistically significant findings in all four years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCA Math Proficiency</th>
<th>Co-Taught</th>
<th>Not Co-Taught</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>82.3% (N=317)</td>
<td>75.3% (N=1032)</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>68.9% (N=524)</td>
<td>64.1% (N=1831)</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>69.0% (N=364)</td>
<td>61.5% (N=1984)</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>74.5% (N=314)</td>
<td>59.9% (N=2217)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading Proficiency
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment

MCA Reading Proficiency 2004-2005

\[ \chi^2 (2 \text{ df}, N=1353) = 12.79, p = .002 \]

MCA Reading Proficiency 2005-2006

\[ \chi^2 (2 \text{ df}, N=2241) = 12.54, p = .002 \]
Reading Proficiency
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment

MCA Reading Proficiency
2006-2007 (K-6)

Insufficient Data to Analyze

MCA Reading Proficiency
2007-2008

Percent of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Teaching Candidate (N=261)</th>
<th>One Teacher (N=1977)</th>
<th>Traditional Student Teacher (N=269)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 (2 \text{ df, } N=2507) = 38.01, p < .001$
Math Proficiency
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment

MCA Math Proficiency 2004-2005

- Co-Teaching Candidate (N=317): 82.3%
- One Teacher (N=927): 75.8%
- Traditional Student Teacher (N=105): 70.5%

MCA Math Proficiency 2005-2006

- Co-Teaching Candidate (N=524): 68.9%
- One Teacher (N=1660): 64.7%
- Traditional Student Teacher (N=171): 57.9%

χ² (2 df, N=1349) = 8.31, p=.016
χ² (2 df, N=2355) = 7.35, p=.025
Math Proficiency
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment

MCA Math Proficiency 2006-2007 (K-6)

Insufficient Data to Analyze

MCA Math Proficiency 2007-2008

χ² (2 df, N=1939) = 26.04, p < .001
7-12 Student Data

Cumulative Data 2004-2008
N=1,686

More help with questions
68.9%
Different styles of teaching
66.9%
More indiv attention
66.4%
Get 2 perspectives
65.8%
Teachers build off each other
60.3%
More creative lessons
51.2%
Assignments graded & returned faster
50.9%
More energy between teachers
46.1%
Better discussions
45%
More in-depth knowledge
43.1%
No Benefits
4%
7-12 Survey
Drawbacks of Co-Teaching

Cumulative Data 2004-2008
N=1,686

- Confusing with 2 explanations: 18.8%
- Confusing who to go to: 13.5%
- Grading Issues: 13.0%
- Contradicting information: 11.6%
- Teachers interrupt each other: 8.8%
- Candidate too dependent: 8.3%
- Less material covered: 7.1%

Percent of Responses
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Benefits to P-12 Students
Focus Groups (N=546)

✧ Increased student engaged time
  ✧ Able to work in smaller groups
  ✧ Receive more individual attention
  ✧ Get questions answered faster
  ✧ Get papers and grades back faster
  ✧ Students behave better
  ✧ Fewer class disruptions (for passing out papers, having projects checked, other housekeeping tasks)
# Teacher Candidate Evaluations

## 2005-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Co-Teaching Mean (N=408)</th>
<th>Not Co-Teaching Mean (N=728)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Learners</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Instruction</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Develop.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dispositions*</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant*
Benefits To Teacher Candidates
End of Experience Survey (N=157)

Teacher Candidates indicated that Co-Teaching led to:

♦ Improved classroom management skills (95.5%)
♦ Increased collaboration skills (94.9%)
♦ More teaching time (94.6%)
♦ Increased confidence (89.9%)
♦ Deeper understanding of the curriculum through co-planning (89.1%)
♦ More opportunities to ask questions and reflect (88.6%)
Benefits to Teacher Candidates
Focus Groups (N=136)

Additional benefits of co-teaching:

♦ Being seen as a “real” teacher
♦ Equal partnership
♦ Sharing resources
♦ Mutual support and learning
Benefits to Cooperating Teachers
End of Experience Survey (N=279)

Cooperating Teachers indicate that co-teaching led to:

♦ Ability to reach more students, particularly those with high needs (93.5%)

♦ Better relationship with their teacher candidate (91%)

♦ Experienced professional growth (89.2%)

♦ Enhanced energy for teaching (87.8%)

♦ Hosting a candidate without giving up my classroom (87.1%)

♦ Teacher candidate had a better experience than they would have through with a traditional model (81.7%)
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Benefits to Cooperating Teachers
Focus Groups (N=92)

Additional benefits of Co-Teaching:

- Ability to do projects more successfully
- Class time is more productive
- Modeling and participating in teamwork
- Candidates become competent more quickly
At the Heart of Co-Teaching...

- Building Better Relationships
- Communication/Collaboration
- Co-Teaching/Co-Planning
- Active vs. Passive
- Use Expertise of Cooperating Teacher
- Attitude
- Best Way to Meet Student Needs
Things We Kept

- Solo teaching time
- Placement procedures
- One teacher candidate per classroom
- Total time in classroom
- Evaluation forms
- Individual lesson planning
Things We Added

♦ Support and Training
♦ Co-Planning
♦ Permission for Cooperating Teacher to Stay
♦ Enhanced Collaboration and Communication
♦ Focus on Differentiation
♦ Increased Opportunities for Teacher Candidate to Bring Ideas
♦ Engaged in Professional Development
Key Elements

- Co-teaching workshop for cooperating teachers
- Co-teaching instruction incorporated in teacher preparation curriculum
- Workshop for matched pairs
- One teacher candidate per classroom
- Clearly defined expectations, including solo teaching time for candidates
- Designated planning time for co-teaching each week
Next Steps

• Train the Trainer
Recognitions

- 2008 AACTE Best Practice Award for Research in Teacher Education
- 2007 AASCU Christa McAuliffe Award for Excellence in Teacher Preparation
- 2006 MnSCU Innovative Partnering and Collaboration Award
For more information, please contact:

Nancy Bacharach, Director
nlbacharach@stcloudstate.edu
320-308-4885

Teresa Washut Heck, Co-Teaching Coordinator
twheck@stcloudstate.edu
320-308-1742

(320) 308-4874
www.stcloudstate.edu/coe/tqe