USING A FRAMEWORK FOR COLLABORATIVE TEACHING: HOW THE

CONSTRUCTS OF THE FRAMEWORK IMPACT ADMINISTRATORS'

ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES REGARDING INCLUSION

by

Melinda Stone, M.Ed.

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The University of Houston-Clear Lake

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE

DECEMBER, 2016

USING A FRAMEWORK FOR COLLABORATIVE TEACHING: HOW THE

CONSTRUCTS OF THE FRAMEWORK IMPACT ADMINISTRATORS'

ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES REGARDING INCLUSION

by

Melinda Stone

APPROVED BY

_____
Sandra Browning, PhD, Chair

_____
Denise McDonald, EdD, Committee Member

_____
Elizabeth Beavers, PhD, Committee Member

_____
Elaine Hendrix, EdD, Committee Member

RECEIVED BY THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION:

_____
Joan Pedro, PhD, Associate Dean

_____
Mark D. Shermis, PhD, Dean

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful for so many people and the support they have given me during this journey. This is one of the most challenging things that I have ever accomplished and I was only able to persevere because of them. I wish to first acknowledge the support and guidance of my dissertation committee. As my dissertation chair, Dr. Sandra Browning has believed in me and my work. She has been encouraging, kind and patient. Dr. Browning was always willing to listen and provide counsel and direction, and I am very grateful. I know I am a better educator because of her expertise and support.

Dr. Denise McDonald, my methodologist, graciously agreed to take me under her wing and is amazing at what she does. Her feedback and guidance has been invaluable not only as my methodologist, but also as my professor in curriculum and instruction. I have learned so much from her beyond my research. She sat down with me, even on weekends, to help keep me stay on track. I am forever grateful and appreciate her belief in me.

Dr. Beavers and Dr. Hendrix provided me with feedback and advice to improve my study. I appreciate Dr. Beavers sitting with me to work through the structure of my review of the literature, and I also am thankful that Dr. Hendrix agreed to step in and assist with my committee.

I would also like to acknowledge two of my mentors, Dr. Tory Hill and O.D. Tompkins for encouraging me to push forward and become a continuous learner. They provided leadership opportunities for me and both have helped me progress in my career. I cannot thank them enough for all of their guidance, belief and encouragement over the years. Thank you to the administration teams at Tompkins High School and Mayde Creek Junior High for their support. Many times they covered duties and tasks for me when I had class.

To the members of my cohort – I treasure your friendships and encouragement as we have taken this journey together. At times, it felt as if we would never get to the end of the road but we lifted each other up and pushed through together. I am especially grateful for Emily, Will and Sanee. Our late nights studying and writing are some of the best times that I have ever had. You are truly three of the best people that I know.

Finally, my family has been tremendous. My husband, James, has spent many evenings making sure that our three children are at their various activities while I was in class or writing. He has made sure that homework was done and dinner was made for them. Thank you for your support as I pursue my goals. To Jason, Ava and Hayden – you three are the reason that I pursue greater things. I look forward to being completely present at all of your activities as you pursue your own goals and dreams. I love all of you more than you know.

ABSTRACT

USING A FRAMEWORK FOR COLLABORATIVE TEACHING: HOW THE

CONSTRUCTS OF THE FRAMEWORK IMPACT ADMINISTRATORS'

ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES REGARDING INCLUSION

Melinda Stone
University of Houston-Clear Lake

Dissertation Chair: Sandra Browning, PhD

The purpose of this qualitative study was to look at how administrators perceive their role in supporting collaborative practices and their effectiveness while incorporating the framework of the Collaborative Teaching Project (CTP). The CTP was created by a suburban district to provide structure to collaborative teaching in order to address the needs of special education students. In this study looked, six different administrators were interviewed using an interview protocol in order to gain insight in to how they perceive their role as they implement collaborative teaching on their campuses.

This study used a descriptive case study design and moved to an exploratory case study design in order to initially describe the Collaborative Teaching program created by

a district and then explore its undetermined impact and outcomes as it relates to administrators' attitudes and practices towards inclusive teaching.

Results of this study indicated that the administrators that participated perceived their roles as relational and responsive. All of the themes and subthemes that emerged are directly related to how the teaming and training of the collaborative teaching project helped to provide support in the facilitation of co-teaching. The data also provide information on whether the project changed administrator perceptions of collaborative teaching and how administrators can support collaborative teaching on their campuses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Schools are dealing with the pressure to succeed on standardized tests and comply with state and federal standards that align with the passing of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Historically, the implications for schools not meeting state standards are significant (Scott & Center on Education, 2008). For example, Title I funding could have been taken away and this action would have resulted in schools, under this category, to initiate a restructuring phase under the No Child Left Behind Act. This often resulted in a process where schools could be completely taken over by district administrators, and teachers could possibly have lost their jobs (Scott & Center on Education, 2008). There are several factors that contribute to schools not meeting federal and state standards, such as inadequate teachers, lack of attendance by students and low standardized test scores in reading and math; the sub-population of special education students who consistently scores low on standardized tests compared to non-disabled students impact this factor (Eckes & Swando, 2009). Students with disabilities are expected to maintain the same levels of proficiency in various subjects as their non-disabled peers, yet they are falling short causing countless schools to not meet federal and state standards (Blanton & Perez, 2011).

How can schools address the needs of students who receive special education services and still capture the rigor and relevance in the curriculum? Providing appropriate support and scaffolding is a crucial part of helping students learn at more rigorous levels

(Blackburn & Witzel, 2013). The National Center for Restructuring and Inclusion (1995)

describes co-teaching as the most common model for teaching students with disabilities

in the general education classroom. This is in response to the increasing numbers of

students with disabilities included in the regular education classroom. Special education

teachers are providing services for the students that need them and these services are

most effective when teaching the curriculum within an inclusion setting (Obiakor, Harris,

Mutua, Rotatori, & Algozzine, 2012). Schools are adopting co-teaching models as a way

of increasing inclusive practices, reducing special education segregation and addressing

the lack of qualified special education teachers at the secondary level (Isherwood &

Barger-Anderson, 2007). However, Special education teachers often do not feel they are a

valuable part of an inclusion classroom due to feelings of marginalization and lack of

support (Pazey & Cole, 2013). Administrators can play a pivotal role in developing a

cohesive team culture between themselves, the general education teacher and the special

education teacher by providing time for co-teach teams to truly collaborate (Madigan &

Schroth-Cavataio, 2011). Co-teaching occurs when a general education teacher and a

special education teacher both actively participate in the delivery of instruction and are

both responsible for student learning (Cook & Friend, 1995). This model of co-teaching

can be effective if utilized properly, but there are often barriers to successfully

implementing the co-teach model (Friend, 2008). A major barrier to co-teaching is not

defining the classroom roles and responsibilities for and between the two teachers.

Studies have found that the general education teacher generally takes the role of lead

teacher while the special education teacher is relegated to a helper in the class (Scruggs,

Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007). Even though the co-teach model is consistently viewed

as the best practice for a least restrictive environment, the model is not always implemented with fidelity resulting in the special education teacher assuming the role of what could be described as a paraprofessional (Conderman & Hedin, 2014). Administrative support is crucial in assisting these teachers in developing positive self-efficacy which has a direct impact on student achievement and helping with the fidelity of implementation of the co-teach model (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). However, many building administrators are insufficiently trained and lack the knowledge necessary to address inclusion classrooms (Pazey & Cole, 2012).

This study examined administrators participating in the Collaborative Teaching Project (CTP) that was created to garner support for co-teaching in the classroom by all stakeholders (general education teacher, special education teacher, administrator, instructional coach and ESL teacher) within a co-teach classroom. The framework provides structure for schools to help collaborative teaching flourish in schools. Specifically, the study analyzed how campus administrators perceive their role in the implementation of the framework of the Collaborative Teaching Project (CTP) and how administrators perceived their effectiveness in supporting a collaborative teaching model.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to examine administrators' perceptions while operating within the framework of the Collaborative Teaching Project (CTP) that one suburban school district implemented in order to facilitate co-teaching and gain the most benefit from the collaborative teaching model. The study also examined the administrator's perceptions of practice and perceptions of the model itself on their campus once they had been trained and once their action plan was implemented. The

goals of the project were to facilitate a common language and common practices that all stakeholders could use when examining current practices in co-taught classrooms and provide the support that schools need in order to sustain a successful co-teach program. Finally, a description of the model will be presented in addition to administrative insights related to the effectiveness of the project specifically as it relates to the administrator's role in the special education co-teach model at each of their schools.

Statement of the Problem

While students with disabilities must take state assessments, the law emphasizes, as a requirement, that students with disabilities are entitled to be educated in a least restrictive environment which emphasizes access to the general curriculum. Students with learning disabilities must take the same version of state assessments that their non-disabled peers must take. While an inclusive co-teach model helps all students have access to the general curriculum, there are far greater reaching effects to the inclusion model in that students with disabilities demonstrate improved academic achievement and social benefits overall when they have access to the general education curriculum in a co-teach setting (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger 2010; McLesky & Waldron, 2002; Walsh, 2011).

Providing an inclusive environment in schools takes time and support from administrators. Research shows that co-teach models are most effective when they have the support of their administrators and the inclusion model is considered to be best practice (Friend, et al, 2010; Scruggs et al., 2007; Thousand, Villa, & Nevin, 2006; Weiner & Murawski, 2005). An evidence-informed model provides a necessary structure in order for schools to help students meet the rigor of the curriculum and aligned state

assessments. In the school district in which the study was conducted, the co-teach model was considered a research-based practice, but implementation of the model lacked fidelity. According to Scruggs, Mastropieri & McDuffie (2007) co-teachers feel that administration is the key to them having a successful co-teach program for several reasons: (a) administrators can control the teams by having teachers volunteer to co-teach, (b) administrators can provide the time for the co-teach teams to plan together, and (c) they need to be trained properly. The special education department in this suburban district recognized the need for a guiding framework for all stakeholders involved in the co-teach model on campuses throughout their district. They saw a need for a common language regarding the co-taught classroom in order to meet the needs of students with special learning needs or those that English is their second language.

Research Questions

The study explored the following questions:

1.   How does participation in the collaborative teaching project help the administrator provide support for the collaborative teaching model in the special education classroom?

2.   How do administrators perceive their role in supporting collaborative practices and their effectiveness while incorporating the collaborative teaching project framework?

Definitions

Collaborative teaching – A way to provide students with diverse needs the specially designed instruction they are entitled to while ensuring access to the general education curriculum. This is provided by having two teachers in one classroom with one being a special education teacher and the other a general education teacher (Cantrell, 2014).

Collaborative teaching approaches – This district and program will use the six approaches as described by Marilyn Friend: one teach, one assist; one teach, one record; station teaching; parallel teaching; alternative teaching; and team teaching (Friend, 2007)

Co-teaching – Two teachers, one special education and one general education, using one of the six approaches in the classroom that maximizes the situation of having two teachers (Friend, 2007)

Collaborative teaming – using several staff members who serve in different roles in order to make decisions based on special education. For the purpose of this study, it would be comprised of an administrator, an instructional coach, a general education teacher, a special education teacher and an ESL teacher (Cantrell, 2014)

Inclusion model – "students with special education needs are attending the general school program, enrolled in age-appropriate classes 100% of the school day" (Idol, 1997, p. 4)

Instructional coach (IC) - ICs partner with teachers to help them incorporate research-based instructional practices into their teaching. They are skilled communicators, or relationship builders, with a repertoire of excellent communication skills that enable them to empathize, listen, and build trusting relationships (Knight, 2007).

Inclusive practices - Schools that provide the least restrictive environment for students that have disabilities or are learning English as a Second Language (Scruggs et al., 2007).

Limitations of the Study

The project piloted one feeder pattern of schools – one elementary, two junior high schools and one high school. Feeder patterns in a public school system are comprised of the same stream of students that attend the elementary, junior high and then high school. Secondly, the results of this study may not apply to rural schools or other districts with

differing contexts and may not be generalizable to other districts. Since this framework was created to meet the needs of the district in this study, it may not be generalizable. Efforts were made to eliminate any bias, the researcher is employed by the focus district which could possibly account for unrealized biases after the data was collected and analyzed. The researcher remained unbiased by bracketing out potential biases during data analysis and having other district leaders look at the data and conclusions serving as peer debriefers. Finally, there could have been limitations in administrators' willingness to express their true thoughts and feelings when interviewed since responses may infer negative judgment on program practices, which is the case with any qualitative study. Even with the possibility of bias, the study has the potential to add to the body of knowledge for special education inclusion classrooms, specifically with respect to how administrators might change their practices in order to facilitate greater success.

Basic Assumptions

The primary assumption of this study was that the co-teach model, when implemented with fidelity and supported administratively, would raise student achievement and help students become successful learners. This systematic approach provided a framework for stakeholders to implement the co-teach model with success. According to Friend (2007), when a co-teach model is implemented it will, in general, raise student achievement as well as have teachers and administrators feel more efficacious in their positions. This study sought to provide insight into these assumptions and demonstrate how providing a framework for stakeholders to have a common language and goal will impact student achievement and provide ideas for other districts to systematically approach their

inclusion models with a specific focus on administrator's role in supporting fidelity of the

co-teach program.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of the literature describing administrators' roles and impact on inclusive practices as well as the role(s) of inclusive practices in schools. Educators have looked for a way to use highly-qualified teachers to enhance special education instruction in the general education classroom while adhering to the guidelines of providing it in the least restrictive environment (Friend et al., 2010). Administrator support and coaching is the backbone of successful inclusive practices in schools (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). Even though the basic premise for inclusive education is to provide an education for all students regardless of their gender, race, culture, ability or economic stability, inclusive education tends to focus more on students with disabilities and special needs (Artiles & Kozleski, 2007). This goal has its challenges in providing students access to the scope and content of the general curriculum (Cochran-Smith & Dudley-Marling, 2012). These challenges can include teacher attitudes towards inclusive practices and a lack of knowledge when it comes to implementing inclusion as a practice on a campus (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2009; Ceylan & Aral, 2016). Another challenge associated with inclusive education is the preparation of teachers and appropriate staff development for them (Florian, 2008).

Role of Inclusive Practices

Defining inclusive practices is somewhat difficult due to the broad use of the term 'inclusion' in education (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011). Florian (2008) says that

inclusion involves "the use of support, the ways in which teachers respond to individual differences during whole-class teaching, the choices they make about group work and how they utilize specialist knowledge" in schools (p. 205) . Inclusion, as a practice, is the basis to current education reform when it comes to students receiving special education services and provides all students, including those with disabilities, placement within the school's general population (Algozzine & Ysseldyke, 2006; Artiles & Kozleski, 2007; Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2009). Effective inclusive practices are guided by state and federal legislation, directed by codes of ethical and professional conduct, and defined by the effectiveness of the instruction that occurs in the classroom (Obiakor et al., 2012). Within inclusive classrooms, special education is designed to specifically provide individualized instruction so that students are able to perform at their highest potential while simultaneously providing access to a meaningful and rigorous general education curriculum (Algozzine & Ysseldyke, 2006; Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2009; Ford, Davern, & Schnorr, 2001; Hockenbury, Kauffman, & Hallahan, 2000).

The practice of inclusion is sometimes difficult to provide in educational settings so that all students have access to the general curriculum provided by schools (Cochran-Smith & Dudley-Marling, 2012). This is due both to philosophical differences among educators and because educators and administrators are not sure how to merge both students receiving special education services and general education students in to the same classrooms in an efficient manner. Some educators feel that inclusion addresses social justice and equity and it provides common practices so that students are not marginalized or excluded because of their disability (Dieker & Murawski, 2003; Obiakor et al., 2012). Another concern is that poor, ethnic and English as a Second Language

Students (ESL) are overrepresented in special education (Artiles & Kozleski, 2007). Co-teachers can demonstrate culturally-responsive teaching by facilitating situations in which students are able to share their own cultures or experiences (Dieker & Murawski, 2003). In addition to minorities being overrepresented in special education, cultural practices and processes can be ignored when providing inclusion services. Inclusive education as a practice typically only addresses students' disabilities with no consideration for the different backgrounds and cultures where the students come from (Artiles & Kozleski, 2007).

Despite continuing debates about the practicality of full inclusion, it has many positive outcomes (Algozzine & Ysseldyke, 2006; Artiles & Kozleski, 2007; Obiakor et al., 2012; Sailor & Roger, 2005). Frattura and Capper (2007) state that schools adequately providing inclusive practices for students receiving special education services in the general education environment is an issue of equity and social justice. They argue that the school's community, administrators and teachers must reflect on their inclusive practices and how they relate to social justice for their students with disabilities so that they might provide the best service possible. As diversity in classrooms increases, teachers must consider how they will work together to address the different languages and cultural backgrounds their students bring to the classroom (Dieker & Murawski, 2003). While inclusion is designed to benefit students with disabilities, successful inclusion benefits both students with and without disabilities (Sailor & Roger, 2005).

Content knowledge vs. Pedagogical knowledge

Dieker and Murawski (2003) believe that expecting general and special educators to possess the same content knowledge is not practical. They also support the idea that

teachers need to be taught how to recognize one another's areas of expertise and to collaboratively build upon those strengths. General education teachers can provide content-specific knowledge for special education and special education teachers can share differentiated strategies and structures that the general education teachers may not have otherwise known (Dieker & Rodriguez, 2013). Additionally, teacher preparation programs focused on content mastery tends to be at a much higher level than special education preparation programs; therefore many special education teachers have limited course credit hours in core curricular areas (Dieker & Murawski, 2003). A meta-synthesis study on co-teaching conducted by Scruggs et al. (2007) found four common themes that related to inclusion schools: (a) both administration and teachers see co-teaching as beneficial, (b) time is provided for teachers to plan together in order for the co-teach model to be successful, (c) one-teach, one assist is the most commonly used co-teach strategy used with the special education teacher taking on a subordinate role and (d) there is mostly teacher-led instruction in a co-teach classroom especially in math classrooms with the special education teacher serving as an aide. The final two themes of this study, highlight discrepancies in pedagogical and content knowledge. Co-teaching allows ongoing professional learning for teachers by being able to share experiences with each other as well as content expertise.

The lack of content knowledge is a major issue in secondary teacher preparation programs since many states only require special education teachers to earn a K-12 special education certification (Dieker & Murawski, 2003; Dieker & Rodriguez, 2013; Mastropieri et al., 2005; Scruggs et al., 2007). Dieker & Murawski (2003) say that despite special education teachers holding a K-12 certification, many of the strategies and

techniques taught in programs are designed mostly for the elementary level which leaves secondary teachers needing more specialized content knowledge. They call for teacher educator programs to better prepare teachers who are going to secondary level inclusion classrooms.

It is ironic that many of the students served by special educators have not been exposed to, and may not be capable of, the same level of content mastery as their nondisabled peers, yet the special education teacher does not possess the mastery of content knowledge themselves to be able to teach it (Dieker & Murawski, 2003). While special education teachers should continue to build their content knowledge, general education teachers must focus on more than content in order to truly meet the needs of students with disabilities in co-taught settings (Mastropieri et al., 2005). For special education teachers, solid knowledge of science and mathematics content is imperative if students with disabilities are going to have access to advanced careers (Dieker & Murawski, 2003).

Rice and Zigmond (2000) found that confusion about the roles and responsibilities of special education teachers in the classroom is further compounded when special education co-teachers do not assume roles equal to their general education teacher counterparts. An identification and understanding of roles and responsibilities, as it relates to expertise, must occur for both general and special education teachers to be effective instructional agents in the co-teaching process (Hang & Rabren, 2009; Rice & Zigmond, 2000). A synthesis of research supports that teachers with high levels of self-efficacy believe that they can control or at least strongly influence student achievement, so both teachers in a co-teach classroom should become knowledgeable of each other's

expertise (Lee, Patterson, & Vega, 2011; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998; Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette, & Benson, 2010). For example, a study conducted by Lee, Patterson & Vega (2011), focused on perils to special education intern teachers' perceived self-efficacy and the quality of support they received in teacher preparation programs. The study supported that teacher's self-efficacy was dependent on the teacher's perceived knowledge of the content. The researchers suggest that university programs need to assess intern teachers' knowledge and instructional experience in order to deliver instruction that closes gaps while broadening and enhancing teaching skills. There is a correlation between research focused on content and pedagogical knowledge and the perceptions teachers embrace regarding their effectiveness in inclusive instructional settings.

Teacher Perceptions of Inclusive Practices

Several studies reported that co-teachers have positive perceptions of co-teaching and inclusion in classrooms (Ajuwon, Lechtenberger, Griffin-Shirley, Sokolosky, Li, & Mullins, 2012; Ali, Mustapha, & Jelas, 2006; Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). Specifically, co-teachers have felt that their students experienced improved self-confidence, academic performance, social skills, and peer relationships when in a co-taught class (Austin, 2001; Cramer & Nevin, 2006; Ritter, Michel, & Irby, 1999; Trent, 1998). Eriks-Brophy and Whittingham (2013) surveyed 63 inclusive classroom special education and general education teachers to determine whether teachers had the same attitudes, knowledge, and teaching skills as a teacher who taught in a general education classroom. Interestingly, they found that teachers had favorable attitudes toward the inclusion of students with hearing loss specifically. Pre-service education programs should provide at least one

course in special education because attitudes towards instructing children with disabilities significantly improve upon taking a single introductory course in special education (Ajuwon et al., 2012). While many teachers find inclusive practices to be beneficial to students, some also feel that the students with more severe disabilities are better served in a more specialized school where the entire school environment is focused on students with disabilities (Thorpe & Shafiul Azam, 2010). Some teachers have the perception that schools should cater to the specific needs of students with severe disabilities where "they could be looked after and helped" (Thorpe & Shafiul Azam,, p. 167). The expectation is that classroom teachers are instructionally effective for every type of student in their classroom regardless of diversity and the number of students receiving special education services (Berry, 2010). Teachers with positive attitudes toward working with students in their classrooms take responsibility to help all students, and in turn help all students learn to take ownership of their learning despite dealing with adversity and having students who are receiving special education services (Berry, 2010; Titone, 2005). In an international study conducted by Loreman, Sharma & Forlin (2003), pre-service teacher reports of teaching self-efficacy for inclusive education was examined. The study focused on the explanatory relationship between a scale designed to measure teaching self-efficacy and key demographic variables within Canada, Australia, Hong Kong, and Indonesia. Their study revealed that those preparing to become primary/elementary teachers reported significantly higher levels of self-efficacy in terms of efficacy in collaboration than did those preparing to become secondary school teachers.

Keefe, Moore and Duff (2004) interviewed high school teachers to study their perceptions of co-teaching in inclusive settings. They found that the teachers identified

three themes that described their practice: the nature of collaboration, the roles and responsibilities of teachers, and the outcomes of students. The teachers believed that co-teachers should have some say on their teaching partner. The researchers also noted that teachers' ability to get along was a critical factor to the success of co-teaching. Findings of the study found that direct conversations about their roles and responsibilities in the classroom would have helped to avoid problems. The teachers in this study indicated that despite the challenges, they felt positively about co-teaching and that it provided less stigma surrounding students with disabilities and that they performed at a higher level. In another study, Weiss and Lloyd (2003) found, through interviews and observations that the roles of special education teachers varied greatly. The researchers found that special educators assume certain roles yet their actual role is different than what they originally reported. The study found that differences between these roles are influenced by personal definitions of co-teaching and perceived pressures from the classroom, administration, and professional community. The study also noted that in some cases they were simply assistants to the teacher of record while others taught the content or sometimes removed a group of students to another location to teach.

<div align="center">**Instructional Coaching**</div>

Instructional coaching is meant to build capacity to change and provide instructional improvement, by providing learning opportunities necessary to facilitate change (Knight, 2007). Instructional coaches are master teachers who offer on-site and ongoing instructional support for teachers (Marsh, J., Sloan McCombs, J., & Martorell, F., 2010). Instructional coaches should be "skilled communicators, or relationship builders, with a repertoire of excellent communication skills that enable them to empathize, listen, and

build trusting relationships" (Knight, 2007, p. 13). Instructional coaches need to be knowledgeable in their content area and they need the pedagogical knowledge to be effective (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). Research supports that an effective instructional coach focuses on several instructional issues and shares a variety of effective practices that could address classroom management, instructional strategies, or formative assessment. Coaching has the potential to support the development of teachers' efficacy as they implement new programs or strategies (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008). It provides support for teachers as they gain mastery experiences with new techniques, and coaching is essential in enabling teachers to take risks and change their practice in significant ways. Effective coaches do not tell teachers what to do; rather, they use data from an observation, or comments made by the teacher, to provide feedback that is precise and non-judgmental. Effective coaches are always open to the teacher's point-of-view (Knight, 2007; Williamson & Education Partnerships, 2012). Research has informed the parameters of the coaching role and offers insight into how individuals learn to be effective coaches and/or are supported to refine their practice over time (Gallucci, Van Lare, Yoon, & Boatright, 2010).

Existing research on the professional development of coaches and how they learn to become coaches is sparse (Gallucci et al., 2010). Data focused on instructional coaching describe learning and ongoing training as important for coaches' success (Galluci & Swanson, 2008; Knight, 2007; Marsh, Mccombs, Lockwood, Martorell, & Gershwin, 2009; Shanklin, 2007). Working one-on-one with teachers and guiding conversations about teachers' instructional practice has been found challenging, especially for new instructional coaches (Neufeld & Roper, 2002). Collaboration is as an

essential element of teaching and coaching teachers, so teacher preparation programs should include collaboration and consultation skills as part of the curriculum (Griffin, Jones, & Kilgore, 2006; Knight, 2007).

Coaches are often left to overcome obstacles on their own and to define their role as they learn (Marsh, McCombs, Lockwood, Martorell, Gershwin, et al., 2009). Challenges in coaching can be minimized with professional development and organizational support (Gallucci et al., 2010). New reports have called for professional development that helps coaches learn how to support adult learners (Marsh, McCombs, Lockwood, Martorell, Gershwin, et al., 2009). The literature surrounding instructional coaching tends to portray coaches as static entities that already possess the content and pedagogical expertise that are needed for the job (Galluci & Swanson, 2008).

Principal support of Instructional Coaching

An essential structure for successful instructional coaching is that coaches need to learn to work with principals (Crow, 2008). Knight (2005) said that schools where the principal and instructional coach work together makes a big impact on the school and instruction. Killion (2007) recognized the importance of principals providing support for coaches by working to help set forth the principal's expectations of the coach's role and being able to meet regularly to discuss instruction. Grant and Davenport (2009) identified four ways principals demonstrate support for math coaches: (a) by collaborating with math coaches to identify and set priorities; (b) by putting support structures in place such as professional development and collaboration time with other coaches; (c) by setting norms for professional development and the expectations for collaboration between the coach and other math teachers; and (d) by learning alongside the teachers and coaches.

In a study focused on the relationship between principal leadership and teachers'
participation in the Content-Focused Coaching literacy coaching initiative, researchers
sought to determine how principals support teachers' participation in coaching activities.
The study also analyzed the relationship between a principal's understanding of the role
of the literacy coach and if the coaches perceived the principals to be supportive of their
work. (Matsumura, Sartoris, Bickel, & Garnier, 2009). The study indicated that principals
demonstrate support for their coaches by, (a) granting them professional autonomy and
treating them as a professional in general; (b) publicly endorsing their literacy coach as
an expert in literacy; (c) providing the coaches direct assistance when necessary; and (d)
by being active participants in the initiative. While securing time for teachers and coaches
to work together is considered a supportive principal behavior (Grant & Davenport, 2009;
Killion, 2007), researchers in the Matsumura et al. study (2009) were surprised to find
that there was not a significant link between teachers' use of the coach and time set aside
by principals for teachers and coaches to meet.

Collaborative Practices

Since the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was amended in 2004,
educators have searched for the best ways to teach students that are serviced by special
education. Because of IDEA's requirements of ensuring access to the general curriculum
in the least restrictive environment, educators are continuously looking for ways to
educate students who receive special education services (Friend et al., 2010). In a
National Survey of Inclusive Practices conducted by the National Center on Educational
Restructuring & Inclusion, co-teaching is, in fact, the most common service delivery

model for students with disabilities receiving instruction in the general education classroom (Education, 1994)

Inclusive education focuses more on students who receive special education services than any other group of students even though inclusive education is meant to provide an education for all students regardless of their gender, race, culture, ability or economic stability (Artiles & Kozleski, 2007). Co-teaching provides a direct means of special education service delivery that does not isolate the student nor does it stigmatize the student (Weiss & Wills, 2002), yet co-teaching requires the utilization of effective collaborative practices.

Characteristics of Effective Co-Teaching

As special education teachers prepare for the 21st century learner, schools must reform how they provide specialized instruction to both teachers and students, and they should make sure that they are inclusive in their approach by training teachers and administrators in effective practices. Effective co-teaching involves providing teachers opportunities to participate in professional development, and administrators encouraging teachers to use different strategies with student groups (Friend, 2007).

Models of co-teaching

According to Friend (2007), the focus of co-teaching is to provide students equal access to the full scope of the curriculum including those who qualify for an alternative assessment. Friend has stated that the most effective co-teaching is highly collaborative and is highly effective when delivering instruction to students receiving special education services in the general education classroom. Friend et al. (2010) indicate that because co-teaching is so different from the traditional classroom, it is unreasonable to expect

educators to implement the co-teach model without specific instruction on how to do so. Cook and Friend (1995) describe six variations of co-teaching and state that no particular variation or mode of co-teaching should be used exclusively by a teaching team. Additionally, they should strive to use those that fit their team the best. There are varying styles of co-teaching that include, (a) one teach/one assist where one teacher teaches and the other teacher circulates helping students stay on task, (b) one teach/one observe where the teacher teaches while the second teacher records data, (c) station teaching where instruction is divided in to three parts and students move through the three stations, (d) alternative teaching where a teacher works with the majority of students while the other teacher works with the smaller group to reteach and remediate, (e) parallel teaching where each teacher teaches half of the class at the same time and (f) team teaching where both teachers lead instruction as they take turns (Conderman & Hedin, 2014; Friend, 2007).

Challenges in secondary settings

Though there is evidence that co-teaching improves student outcomes, there are challenges. Some secondary educators are disenchanted with the co-teaching model, and this disappointment is often said to be caused by a lack of definition in the support that is needed or in predetermining and defining the roles of both teachers (Dieker & Murawski, 2003). Content issues that impact co-teaching at the secondary level include lack of adequate planning time support from administration, and differing teaching styles (Dieker & Rodriguez, 2013).

Planning time. While content knowledge is important, the planning time required for co-teaching is the primary issue for many educators (Dieker & Murawski, 2003;

Dieker & Rodriguez, 2013; Hang & Rabren, 2009; Mastropieri et al., 2005; Obiakor et al., 2012; Scruggs et al., 2007; Weiss & Wills, 2002). According to Obiakor, et al. (2012), general educators tend to use their time to plan broad instruction for their classes; therefore minimal time remains for co-teachers to communicate about specific students' needs and specifically plan for co-teach instruction. Success with the co-teaching model at the secondary level will continue to be difficult if class schedules are not adapted to address these concerns. To be successful with co-teaching, common planning periods are essential for all involved (Dieker & Murawski, 2003; Hang & Rabren, 2009). Santoli, Sachs, Romey & McClurg (2008) conducted a quantitative casual comparative study to determine if 56 middle school teachers, assistants, and administrators' beliefs about inclusion correlated to their experiences with inclusion. The research revealed that the most predominant area of concern for the participants in the study was lack of planning time.. These teachers did not have enough time to collaborate with their colleagues who were also working with their students with disabilities, attend meetings related to their students with disabilities, or fulfill the instructional responsibilities for their students with disabilities. Magiera & Zigmond (2005) conducted a quantitative casual comparative study on co-teach middle school classrooms and reported that teachers lacked sufficient planning time under routine conditions to make co-teaching instructionally beneficial for students with disabilities. They found that general education teachers and special education teachers spent minimal time together to discuss their students.

Support from administration. In addition to lack of time, teachers often report a lack of administrative support when they try to carry out inclusive practices (Carter, Prater, Jackson, & Marchant, 2009; Jang, 2006; Kritikos & Birnbaum, 2003). Jang (2006)

conducted a quasi-experimental study with two secondary mathematics teachers in

Taiwan. The teachers structured their classes to be team-taught during the course of the

study using a modified station teaching model of co-teaching. The participants reported

that administration support was critical to scheduling the common planning time needed

to make their team teaching successful. In addition, teachers often feel pressured with the

demands that are placed upon them to meet student needs. Administrators can either

greatly hinder the success of collaboration or can effectively improve its success by

supporting teachers as they work together (Paulsen, 2008).

Different teaching styles. As classroom diversity increases, teachers will be forced to

reconsider how they will work together to address/accommodate the different languages

and cultural backgrounds their students bring to the classroom (Obiakor et al., 2012). In

addition to providing common planning periods, special education department members

can be divided by areas of expertise which allows these educators to serve all students

with and without disabilities. Researchers have been hesitant to measure the success of

co-teaching because successful teaching relies heavily on the relationship between the

teachers (Dieker & Murawski, 2003).

     Several researchers have reported challenges to collaboration when teachers have

different teaching styles or ways that they teach (Bouck, 2007; Brownell, Adams,

Sindelar, Waldron, & Vanhover (2006); Carter et al., 2009; Kritikos & Birnbaum, 2003;

Paulsen, 2008; Timmons, 2006; Van Garderen & Whittaker, 2007). The educational

training that teachers receive typically only focuses on their content and management in

the classroom but there is little training on how to collaborate with other teachers (Friend

& Cook, 2010). Teachers sometimes become defensive or believe a different perspective

is a criticism of their current practice so forcing teachers to work together, who do not have common goals or shared beliefs in educating students, makes effective collaboration nearly impossible (Friend & Cook, 2010).

Collaboration is more successful when teachers volunteer to work with one another (Leatherman, 2009; Scruggs et al., 2007). Another obstacle in different teaching styles is the historical differences and isolation between special education and general education (Van Garderen et al., 2009; Wasburn-Moses & Frager, 2009). Van Garderen et al. (2009) reviewed research studies conducted in the special education and math education fields for students who were struggling learners in mathematics. They found that there are differences in philosophical perspectives between special education and math education with special education focusing on individual children, while general education focuses on curriculum and differentiated instruction. While some claim philosophical differences can be too wide for co-teachers to cross over to understand each other (Wasburn-Moses & Frager, 2009), others say the differences can be complementary if used positively (Wasburn-Moses & Frager, 2009). Differences in the teaching styles and philosophies of teachers that work together in a co-teach classroom could be a challenge but could also improve the co-teach classroom if the right philosophies are matched properly.

Administrators' Perceptions of their Role in Inclusive Practices

IDEA continues to drive administrators to look at how students with disabilities are being served in schools (Dieker & Murawski, 2003; Laframboise, Epanchin, Colucci, & Hocutt, 2004). For the success of inclusion as a research-based practice, there must be a willingness for schools to change (Crockett, 2002).

Administrator Roles in Inclusion

Crockett (2002) provides five guiding principles that administrators could anchor their decisions in when it comes to special education and inclusion: (a) ethical practice, (b) individual consideration, (c) equity under law, (d) effective programming, and (e) establishing productive partnerships. In order for co-teaching to be successful, these guiding principles should be included in every administrator's preparation program prior to them entering in a leadership position. An alternative might be to consistently include these guiding principles in professional development sessions (Forlin & Chambers, 2011). School leaders must share the vision of inclusive education and secure commitment from teachers and service providers (Carter, Prater, Jackson, & Marchant, 2009; Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2009). Sharing a vision of what inclusion looks like for schools can provide meaning and lasting reform (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2009). School administrators must also support and encourage teachers to take risks with respect to the implementation of progressive instructional practices that showcase inclusion in their schools (Wakeman et al., 2006).

Administrators are responsible for establishing a supportive climate that is conducive to change and (McLeskey & Waldron, 2002). While several studies discuss the implementation of inclusion, little discussion is available concerning the logistics and structure within the school that inclusion requires for it to be successful (Bryant Davis, Dieker, Pearl, & Kirkpatrick, 2012). Bryant Davis et al. (2012) sought to create a specific professional development program for administrators focused on co-teaching. Different professional development programs that were created by the researchers were conducted in three different schools over a three year period. These customized programs

focused on planning for co-teaching, teacher training, and evaluation of co-teaching models. The program featured a professional development component including a 1-day workshop for members of a co-teaching building leadership team (BLT) and a 1-day workshop for co-teaching teams. The BLT team consisted of at least the following members: an assistant principal or principal (to oversee to the co-teaching program), one co- teaching partnership (general education and special education teacher), and one other school support staff (i.e., special education supervisor, curriculum coordinator, mathematics or literacy coach, professional development coordinator, or a school counselor). The creators of the professional development provided ongoing support through webinars, web sites and phone calls for a 3 year span. Then they examined the effectiveness of the professional development by examining the co-teach teams' lesson plans and through observations. In concluding, teachers' implementation of the co-teach model varied with the most predominant co-teach method still one-teach, one assist (Bryant Davis et al., 2012).

Waldron, McLeskey, and Redd (2011) examined the critical features of the principal's role that contributed to the success of a highly effective, inclusive school. They conducted 22 individual interviews with both teachers and administrators who were directly involved in facilitating inclusion on their campuses. They found that inclusive programs are can be developed and successful at any typical resourced school. The success of an inclusive program does not require contributions that are above and beyond what the school's normal resources are. High quality professional development and the efficient use of the resources that they have are required for success of an inclusive program. This study showed the importance of the principal's role in an inclusive school.

It also indicates that student outcomes improved when the principal became involved, a direction was set, working conditions were improved and data were used to drive decision making (Waldron et al., 2011).

Knowledge of special education

While principals are receiving some knowledge of special education practices through administrator training and professional development, they really learn about special education on the job (Wakeman, Browder, Flowers, & Ahlgrim-Delzell, 2006). While some researchers report that many school administrators still have limited knowledge about special education law or knowledge of the educational needs of students with disabilities and inclusion (Eckes & Swando, 2009; Powell & Hyle, 1997), one study revealed that principals self reported that they know fundamental special education issues very well (Wakeman,et al., 2006).

Wakeman, et al. (2006) surveyed school administrators that revealed they were knowledgeable when it came to the fundamental issues surrounding special education and inclusion. They also found that principal practices with regards to special education knowledge had a positive impact on special education programs and inclusion. Not only did this study show that 92% of principals reported that they did not come from a special education background, but they also reported that they had participated in two or less trainings in the last two years of being in an administrator position. Principals in this study overwhelmingly felt that it was their responsibility to ensure the success of special education students, but they also felt that it was the teacher's responsibility for instruction. Wakeman et al. (2006) indicate that a key factor for principals to help to guide and support general education teachers as they become more knowledgeable about

the needs of special education students.

There continues to be a lack of special education preparation for aspiring administrators in their coursework to become principals. In a study conducted by McHatton, Boyer, Shaunessy, Terry, and Farmer (2010), identified that half of the 61 administrators surveyed lacked adequate coursework in their preparation programs. Results also indicated a definite disconnect between the professional development that districts provide to school administrators and the practical activities that happen in special education every day in school.

Administrator decision making

Salisbury and McGregor (2002) examined the administrative climate and context of five successful schools in three states. They gave school climate questionnaires, observations and interviews with principals and found several keys for success that were shared by the schools that were studied. The principals of these schools were risk takers and were clear in their beliefs and firm in their expectations of teachers. These administrators recognized the value of professional relationships and collaboration and the shared decision making with their staff. Finally, the administrators were purposeful in that they worked towards a goal not allowing them to get distracted by challenges.

Principals' beliefs about inclusion are critical to a school's climate and definitely affects decisions regarding instruction (Wakeman et al., 2006). Hanover Researchers (2012) found that, in general, administrators are not always in favor of inclusion in as a model for educating students with disabilities. The report also highlighted that it is imperative that administrators be trained properly in the co-teach model in addition to scheduling time in the school day for both general education and special education

teachers to plan.

      In conclusion, the success of inclusion in the classroom depends on a number of variables. Teachers and administrators hold the key to success by having positive attitudes towards the effectiveness of inclusion. In addition to positive attitudes from both teachers and administrators, administrators need a true understanding of inclusion to effectively support and implement it effectively. They need the knowledge of how beneficial co-teaching is as a means to implement inclusion. A deep understanding of the co-teach model and the varying styles is crucial to know what professional development is needed for teachers, instructional coaches and administrators.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

A qualitative study is appropriate in this case because it allowed the researcher to explore

attitudes, opinions, and beliefs of administrators as well as more closely examine their

personal reactions in the context of the Collaborative Teaching program and how that

affects the inclusion classroom (Brantlinger, 2005). This study used a descriptive case

study design and moved to an exploratory case study design in order to initially describe

the Collaborative Teaching program created by a district and then explore its

undetermined impact and outcomes as it relates to administrators' attitudes and practices

towards inclusive teaching. It also describes the Collaborative Teaching program or

intervention as it occurs in real-life context of the schools in which it is implemented to

get an accurate count of what is being taught to the collaborative teams. Yin (2014) says

that a case study approach should be used when the focus of a study is a contemporary

phenomenon as opposed to a historical one. This study focuses on the head principal and

administrator of three collaborative teams, on three different campuses, one elementary

school, one junior high school and one high school that are working through a

collaborative framework which is provided by their district. The purpose of that

framework is to provide information that helps teams of teachers successfully implement

the co-teach model on their campuses.

Population and Sample

The sample is purposive as the administrators at the schools were chosen because they are participating in the Collaborative Teaching program. Included are two principals from one elementary school, two principals from one junior high and two principals from one high school all within the same feeder pattern in the same school district. In-depth descriptive profiles of all the participating schools as well as the administrators in the participating schools are provided so that a collective, holistic view of the implementation of Collaborative Teaching at multiple sites and different administrators' views were examined. Interviews were conducted with the six selected administrators. The interview questions were created by the researcher (See Appendix A). Human Subjects approval of the study was obtained and a panel of experts was asked to review the interview Protocol for integrity and alignment of the questions in soliciting participant responses that support examining the study's research questions. The questions are semi-structured designed to provide further insight into their attitudes and beliefs about the program and how they view inclusive teaching. With permission of the participants, all interviews will be audio-taped and later transcribed. By recording, the researcher was able to retrace the interview and make sure that nothing is missed. When needed, participants were contacted after interviews to verify responses during the data analysis in a member-checking validity process (Berg, 2009). All participants and their respective schools were given pseudonyms to ensure anonymity of the study.

Background of Study

The researcher for this study was a student support administrator for three years at a junior high campus, and that campus is part of the study. She worked closely with the special education department and co-teachers and saw that there were several issues as it

related to teacher confidence, instructional planning, lack of administrator knowledge in the area of inclusive teaching and a lack of implementation of a co-teach model that was the standard of the district. Many teachers shared through interactions with her that they felt unprepared and marginalized in the classroom due to a lack of proper training for both general education teachers and special education teachers within that co-teach model. The special education teachers appeared discouraged by the own lack of their own participation in the classroom, and reported wanting to be more involved with instruction and not just relegated to a helper or support position. It is the intention of the researcher to explore, within the context of the Collaborative Teaching project, if and how administrators change their practices through active participation within a collaborative team and subsequently, then train their co-teachers how to properly and effectively implement the co-teach model. Once approval is received, specific profiles of each administrator will be given that will include their years of experience and total number of years on their respective campuses.

Participants

Participants in the study are three head principals (one from the elementary, one from the junior high and one from the high school) and three assistant principals from their respective schools. The three head principals agreed to participate in the collaborative teaching project that was provided by the district and the three assistant principals were selected by their principals to be a member of the collaborative teaching team that will help facilitate the collaborative teaching program at their schools. The principal from the high school has been an administrator for over twenty years and is in her sixth year as principal of her high school. The principal from the junior high has been at his school as

the principal for one year but has been an administrator for over ten years. The principal at the elementary has been at her school for four years and has been an administrator for ten years. All of the assistant principals that were selected have all had less than 5 years of administrator experience.

Context of the Study

Davies Elementary School

The demographics at the elementary school (Davies Elementary) are as follows: 50.2% Hispanic, 17.9% White, 8.8% Asian, 20.3% African American, and 52.5% are eligible for free and reduced lunch. Davies Elementary is a Title I school in a large suburban district. They opened their doors in 2004 and have an established bilingual program to service their English Language Learners (ELL) students. Their focus for campus improvement includes providing more training for special education teachers to accommodate increasing numbers in the special education population. This principal has been at this school for five years. Their special education population for the campus is at about 6%. This school has 1300 students and a total of 84 teachers. There are ten Special Education teachers for the campus. The Special Education teachers provide in-class support in various classrooms to provide the support that is lined out for each individual student's education plan. Davies has many opportunities for their students to be successful. They offer Pre-K classes as well as ESOL, bilingual, and challenge classes for those students who meet the criteria. Extended-day academic tutorials are offered in order to provide support for students who are struggling in their classes. They offer Destination Imagination, Student Council and other activities for students. Davies has numerous

volunteers who offer tremendous support to their teachers and students. They feel that having the community involved is extremely important.

Breen Junior High

The demographics of the junior high (Breen Junior High) are: 58.3% Hispanic, 23.8% White, 3.3% Asian, 13.2% African American, and 57.4% are eligible for free and reduced lunch. Breen Junior High opened its doors in 2008. Their principal has only been there for eight months and is "inheriting" the participation in the Collaborative Teaching program. They are a Title I junior high which means that they are provided financial assistance because they have a high percentage of children from low-income families, and their main focus for campus improvement is to use the instructional coaches to help support teachers in the classroom. Their special education population is at 10%. There are about 1,030 students at Breen with 76 teachers. There are twelve special education teachers. Out of the twelve special education teachers there are six teachers who are paired with a general education teacher in a classroom in order to co-teach their content level. Instruction at Breen is enhanced with technology and 21st century learning. Students are allowed to suggest different clubs that pique their interest and are not dictated by the teachers or administration on campus. Some of the opportunities available to students at Breen Junior High are Student Council, National Junior Honor Society, pep squad and Broncos Care which is a service organization dedicated to school and community volunteerism. There are several languages spoken by the families that attend Breen so communication with parents is done through a variety of means and in several languages to insure the community and parents having access to information.

Hull High School

The demographics of the high school (Hull High School) are: 50.6% Hispanic, 25% White, 6% Asian, 16.8% African American, and 55.7% of the students are eligible for free and reduced lunch. They have a 7% special education population. Their main focus for campus improvement deals with improving special education scores on state standardized testing. They opened their doors in 1984. Their principal has been there for six years. The school employs 159 teachers with 21 special education teachers. There are twelve teachers that are paired with general education teachers in order to co-teach their content. Hull High School offers advanced placement classes, dual credit courses, international business, and many career and technology courses. Hull offers an online program for students needing credit recovery or academic improvement. After-school tutorials are offered for students needing academic and STAAR assistance. Some of the extra-curricular activities offered are Student Council, National Honor Society, foreign language clubs, multi-cultural clubs, service clubs, Future Business Leaders of America, Future Farmers of America, and others. Hull is also unique because it is the only high school in the district that offers National Junior ROTC program that services the entire district.

Data Collection

Qualitative methods were used to provide an understanding of administrators' attitudes towards inclusive practices and the collaborative teaching program. One of the methods of data collection was descriptive data about the profile demographics of the participants. The demographics that were collected were age, years of educator experience, years of administrator experience, years at current campus, ethnicity, prior teaching field and prior experience with special education. Additionally, audio-recorded interviews were

transcribed, coded and reviewed by a peer researcher and an experienced qualitative researcher. Audio recordings will be kept with an experienced researcher and the names of the participants were changed to protect their identities. The interviews were conducted at each of the participants' schools in the fall semester of 2015.

Data Analysis

The qualitative data was analyzed using the constant comparative method. All of the data was closely analyzed for constructs, themes and patterns. Open and axial coding was used. Open coding is the initial combing or scanning of data to look for common themes that emerge while axial coding involves making connections within each category along with any sub-categories that emerge (Berg, 2009). This researcher coded and classified main categories that evolve from the data collection after the interviews. All sources of data were triangulated for patterns and was examined for themes that evolved from the data. Coding was separated into categories which was determined once the data had been analyzed for emerging themes. To validate the data, member checking was used after the data had been loosely analyzed and peer debriefers were utilized as well to ensure validity of themes identified.

Limitations

As is true with the majority of research, there are limitations to this study. First, the study takes place in three schools in a suburban district near one of the largest cities in the Southwest section of the United States, therefore, results may not be generalizable to districts with varying demographics. Another consideration is that this researcher has worked in the district for over 15 years and may interview someone with whom she is familiar. This could potentially cause some bias in the collection of data where

participants feel compelled to share what they think the researcher wants to hear, although controls will be in place to minimize the outcome as much as possible. Even with the possibility of bias, the study has the potential to add to the body of knowledge for administrators and districts on how to design and implement an effective framework that enables all stakeholders to better understand how to systematically operate an inclusive classroom program in their school or district.

Ethical Issues

The researcher obtained Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for the study. To protect the confidentiality of the participants in the study, the researcher met individually with each of the selected participants during the explanatory phase to discuss all aspects of the study and to assure them that they will remain anonymous. Pseudonyms are used when discussing each individual response. The participants were allowed to leave the study at any time. Permission was gained through the district so that all parties involved knew about the study. Currently, the researcher is the associate principal at one of the seven high schools located in the district that is being studied.

Narrative Description of Collaborative Teaching Program

A special education instructional officer in a suburban district decided that there needed to be common language and a common approach to collaborative teaching in their special education classrooms after it was discovered that campuses were not consistent in how they were implementing the co-teach model which is what is considered "best practice" for this district. Through discussions with various campuses, their special education departments and administrators, it was evident that none of them was conducting their

inclusion program in a way that would yield the best results through observations by administrators. Based on these outcomes, it was decided that teachers all needed a common language and direction in order for guidance to be successful and also that professional development and creative collaborative teaming would hopefully help the vision of true co-teaching to become realized. The Instructional Officer for Special Education Curriculum & Instructional Programs decided to collaborate between the Special Education Department (SPED) and the English as a Second Language Department (ESL). When it was realized that both SPED and ESL primarily wanted to similar goals by way of collaborative teaching. In the interest of collaborative teaching, the decision was made to utilize a common language across ESL and in-class support for SPED to have a better understanding of what teachers should be doing in the classroom. An Independent Education Management Professional was invited to participate as a consultant, whose responsibility it was to team up with the Instructional Officer for Special Education the program specialists in the SPED and ESL departments. They modeled their training after the concepts and ideas of Marilyn Friend and the Power of Two, as they wanted a common language to hopefully avoid confusion for all involved. Their focus then became, now that the language is being provided, what is the next step? Program specialists then sat down to identify the keys to success since even though this research has been around for a long time, many cannot sustain the ideas presented in the research without a framework within which to work. To accomplish this, it was decided that having administrators on board was essential so the administrative model was devised, beginning with– what specific knowledge was essential for the administrator. The district special education department determined that it was necessary to provide an

overview of every component related to co-teaching in an inclusion classroom, and following that decision, a structure for administrative training was created, as this is what they felt to be the most important for their school district in order to sustain this model. A meeting was then held for interested principals, and after their meeting, the principals who decided that they wanted their campus to participate in the collaborative teaching program were provided with the scope and conditions of the program. The program that was then created was called the Collaborative Teaching project and it was determined that the implementation of this project would be accomplished in stages.

Stage 1 – Guidelines for Administrators

The first step in the Collaborative Teaching Project was to provide guidelines for the administrators in the schools who had volunteered to participate in the project. They were given specific key non-negotiables if they chose to participate in the program, including:

1. Shared classroom space exists for Collaborative Teaching;

2. Structured planning process exists that allows for dedicated planning times

- Initial face to face planning before school starts to map out the first semester

- Periodic face to face planning, once every six weeks, etc.

- Weekly electronic planning

3. All collaborative teaching classroom staff receive training;

4. Use of a variety of identifiable Collaborative Teaching approaches is observed;

5. Priority is given to students with disabilities when creating the master schedule;

6. Campus based support team is in place to facilitate the Collaborative Teaching Project (administrator, instructional coaches, teachers who have experience with collaborative teaching, team leaders/department chairs, ESL representative); and

7. A monitoring process is established for continuing growth.

It is important to have the administrators adhere to a common "picture" of what collaborative teaching truly is, and this provides flexibility to the differences that lie between transitions from the elementary and to the secondary levels (Cantrell, 2014). In this project, administrators must make sure that there is adequate space for collaborative teams to teach. They must also have the time to plan together during the day and both the special education teacher and general education teacher must be trained at the same time. In addition to providing time for the teachers to plan together, administrators must give those special education classes and students priority when creating the master schedule. Many times, special education, sections of special education courses and where they fall during the day (e.g., morning or afternoon) are secondary in thought compared to other mainstream courses. A collaborative team must be created in order to help problem solve and facilitate the inclusion program on campus. Finally, administrators must identify a system through which to monitor the program and facilitation of collaborative teaching on the campus. If the administrators could commit to each of these components then they were allowed to participate in the program.

Stage 2 – Training of Trainers

The collaborative team that was created by the campus principal would attend a training of trainers during which they would become the trainers for their campus and create the plan for implementation that would be unique to their campus while they are using the framework provided by the district. The team would work through three different modules. These modules would help them get a better grasp of what comprises collaborative teaching in order to share that knowledge and train the teams of teachers

that actually carry out these plans in the classroom. The modules are: 1) defining and learning the different collaborative approaches; 2) planning, communicating and establishing procedures; and 3) instruction and lesson delivery. The first module describes what successful collaborative teaching looks like in the classroom. It goes through the six different approaches as described by Marilyn Friend (2011). The module also provides suggestions about the roles that two teachers should take in the classroom. The second module provides ideas on creating the master schedule and also planning of collaborative teaching in the classroom. It provides insight as to how staff can effectively communicate with each other. This module also discusses how to collaboratively work on lesson plans that incorporate one of the collaborative teaching approaches as described above. Module 3 consists of specific instructional design strategies within the structure of one of the six approaches to collaborative teaching. It describes planning a short term calendar as it relates to the curriculum and content that is coming up. This module discusses the difference between modification and accommodations for special education students. In addition, it shows how to increase instructional intensity with both teachers in the classroom and also describes how *depth* and *complexity* are defined and actualized in the curriculum.

Once the collaborative team has been trained in all of these modules, they are responsible for creating an action plan as to how they will train their co-teaching teams and sustain their respective programs.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In the following chapter, the qualitative data discussion that will be presented is comprised of data that were collected through individual interviews with principals and assistant principals from an elementary, a junior high and a high school campus. These interviews were intended to capture the administrator's role and perceptions of collaborative teaching as it pertains to their campus' participation in the Collaborative Teaching Project and addresses the two original research questions:

1.   How does participation in the collaborative teaching project help the administrator provide support for the collaborative teaching model in the special education classroom?

2.   How do administrators perceive their role in supporting collaborative practices and their effectiveness while incorporating the collaborative teaching project framework?

In addition to the interviews, a short profile survey was provided to the participants to gather information about how long they have worked in education and how they describe their leadership style. The qualitative methodology allowed for the data to be analyzed through a grounded theory process. Open and axial coding were used to identify themes that emerged for the data. A peer debriefer was used during the analysis process to reduce researcher bias and provide another viewpoint when analyzing and validating the data. The peer debriefer used for the study was an experienced qualitative researcher and faculty member in the education department at an accredited university.

Based on the quantitative data, six administrators were selected and participated in the individual administrator interviews. Three of the participants were principals of the schools that were participating and three were assistant principals that each worked under one of those principals.

Interviewee biography briefs

For the purpose of this discussion, each administrator who participated in the study will be identified by a pseudonym. Two administrators from all three levels, the principal and an assistant principal, from each of the campuses were interviewed.

"Irma"

Irma is a principal at the high school campus (Hull) used for this study.

Table 1

Demographics for the Hull High School campus

Student statistics

Group	Number	Percent
African American	465	16.93%
Hispanic	1,459	53.13%
White	587	21.38%
Asian	174	6.34%
Native American	11	0.40%
2 or more races	48	1.75%
Economically disadvantaged	1,596	58.12%
Limited English proficiency	140	5.10%
Total Students	2,746	100.00%
Program		
Bilingual	134	4.88%
Gifted & Talented	93	3.39%
Special Education	257	9.36%

Note. 2014-15 Campus Profile Texas Academic Performance Report from District website - reference link is not included to retain anonymity

Her experience in education has been somewhat varied. She has a total of 29 years of experience in education, 11 years of experience in her current district and a total of 9 and a half years at her current campus. She has been in the role of principal for 7 of the 9 and half years she has been there. She began as an assistant principal, and then was moved to the curriculum principal for the campus. She left for a brief stint as the principal at the feeder junior high, then was hired as the principal of her current campus. She began her education career as a high school science teacher then became an assistant principal at a junior high. She has had other principal experience other than the current high school that she is at. Here is how she describes her leadership style: "I use a very collaborative style of leadership. Shared leadership amongst staff helps all of us make the best decisions for our students and our campus."

"Janis"

Janis is the student support assistant principal at the same high school as Irma. She has been chosen by Irma to serve as a team leader in the Collaborative Teaching project on her campus. She has had 27 total years in education and 26 years in her current district. She has been on her current campus for 8 years and has served in her current role for 2 years. Prior to coming to this high school campus, she taught junior high math and also served as an assistant principal at a junior high. Here is how she describes her leadership style: I want to create learning environments that will simultaneously nurture academic achievement and recognition of self-worth. I continue to learn every day and want my campus and staff to be continuous learners as well."

"Heather"

Heather is the principal at the junior high campus used for this study.

Table 2

Demographics for the Breen Junior High School campus

Student statistics

Group	Number	Percent
African American	102	13.49%
Hispanic	247	32.67%
White	351	46.43%
Asian	32	4.23%
Native American	5	0.66%
2 or more races	16	2.12%
Economically disadvantaged	317	41.93%
Limited English proficiency	32	4.23%
Total Students	756	100.00%
Program		
Bilingual	31	4.10%
Gifted & Talented	39	5.16%
Special Education	88	11.64%

Note. 2014-15 Campus Profile Texas Academic Performance Report from District
website - reference link is not included to retain anonymity

Heather has been in education for 17 years and has served all 17 years in the same

district. She has been at her current campus for 3 years and has served as the principal for

all 3 years. She started in the district as a math teacher who co-taught with a special

education teacher in math at a high school that has a high special education population.

She then became an assistant principal at the same high school that she taught at and then

became the associate principal at the school prior to becoming the principal of the junior

high that she is currently at. Here is how she describes her leadership style: "I tend to

want others to experience success. I take ownership and responsibility in our work, but allow for collaboration and teamwork to make things happen. Whatever it takes!"

"Tammy"

Tammy is the student support assistant principal at the junior high used in the study. She was chosen by Heather to serve on the team for the Collaborative Teaching Project for the campus. She has been in education for a total of 23 years. She has been in the current district for 12 years. Prior to coming to the district, she taught in a district in Louisiana. She has had different roles within the current district. She taught 1st, 2nd an 3rd grades and then became a reading intervention specialist for the district. She then became an AP for her current school and she has been there for 3 years. Here is how she describes her leadership style: "I believe it is important for my students, staff and community to trust me. I spend a great deal of time building relationships with my stakeholders. The teachers know and trust that I wouldn't expect them to do something that I wouldn't be willing to do myself. It is important for me to be a support for my teachers."

"Arlene"

Arlene is the principal of the elementary school used in this study.

Table 3

Demographics for the Davies Elementary School campus

Student statistics

Group	Number	Percent
African American	154	20.08%
Hispanic	351	45.76%
White	173	22.56%
Asian	64	8.34%
Native American	3	0.39%
2 or more races	22	2.87%
Economically disadvantaged	476	62.06%
Limited English proficiency	239	31.16%
Total Students	767	100.00%
Program		
Bilingual	237	30.90%
Gifted & Talented	10	1.30%
Special Education	82	10.69%

Note. 2014-15 Campus Profile Texas Academic Performance Report from website-reference link is not included to retain anonymity

Arlene has been in education for 44 years. Her time has not all been spent in public schools. She taught junior high math early in her career then she served as a professor in a teacher preparation program helping to train new teachers to the profession prior to coming to her current school district. She has been in the district for 10 total years, first as an assistant principal and then the last 6 years as the principal of this elementary school. This is how she describes her leadership style: "I want to create learning environments that will simultaneously nurture academic achievement and recognition of self-worth. I continue to learn every day and want my campus and staff to be continuous learners as well."

"Carol"

Carol is the assistant principal at the elementary used in this study. She was chosen by her principal as one of the team members in the Collaborative Teaching Project. She has been in education for 18 years all in the same district and she has been at her current campus for 2 years as assistant principal. Prior to her current assignment, she taught technology applications at a high school in the district and then became an assistant principal at a junior high in the district. Here is how she describes her leadership style: "My style of leadership could be categorized by the expressive style (social recognition specialist), followed closely by the amiable style (relationship specialist)".

Biography summaries

The previous biographies were written to provide context for the themes that will be discussed in detail in the following section. All of the participants in the study are still in the role that they were in at the time of the interviews. All of the schools used are still participating in the Collaborative Teaching project as well. Themes and subthemes attempt to answer the initial research questions.

<div align="center">

Complexities of Study

</div>

The data that were gathered from the participant interviews revealed great complexity and numerous variables that could be considered for this study. The researcher has chosen to focus only on the perceptions of administrators' roles in implementing collaborative teaching within the collaborative teaching project framework. All of the schools that participated in the study hover around a 10% special education population so there are several resources that need to be used to go toward making sure

that they have good instructional practices in place to be able to accommodate special

education students and allow them to thrive in the least restrictive environment.

In addition to the special education populations being a bit large, you also have

the complexities of master scheduling in regards to co-teaching (See Appendices B, C,

D). These are each of the different levels, elementary, junior high and high schools'

schedules. The complexities of the schedule, the stipulations that the district puts on the

schools and complying with federal law makes the task of instructionally sound teaching

a bit difficult. Within the complexity of scheduling, the considerations that an

administrator has to take into account are great. The administrator that is in charge of

creating the master schedule at the secondary level must look and schedule all singleton

classes to where they do not conflict with each other. Singleton classes are classes that

only happen one time in the day. One has to consider placement of all your electives such

as fine arts and athletics so that they are scheduled around the singleton classes. The

district standard for inclusion classes is that you should have enough spots for 12 students

to go in to one inclusion class and the remainder of the sports goes to general education

students. If you only have 12 students, by district standards, they should only go into one

section. Most schedules do not work out where all 12 students that should go into that

section perfectly because there will be at least one or more conflicts with those 12

students in regards to the placement of that particular class. This could happen several

times throughout the day as well. One of the difficulties with staffing is they don't staff

teachers to where each one can teach one sole subject. Most teachers, if you can get them

to teach in one subject, have to teach multiple grade levels of that particular subject.

Specifically at the high school level, content knowledge can sometimes become an issue.

For example, if you are a science co-teacher you could potentially have to do different subjects which are vastly different from each other such as chemistry, physics or biology. All of those courses require a different skill set and content knowledge. In many cases, it is hard to even keep one teacher within the same content area because there's not enough sections for them to teach straight biology all day or straight math or whatever the content or case are. This will also differ between the different levels from elementary to junior high to high school.

The complexities at the high school, in regards to scheduling, are a bit different than they are for the elementary. In high school and junior high there are distinctive periods of time where classes are taught and a special education teacher would be scheduled in each of those different periods. In the elementary school, because most classes are self-contained where each teacher has an entire class of anywhere from 20 to 30 students all day long, special education teachers are scheduled going in and out of those classes to provide services the amount of minutes the students are ARDed. It is much more difficult to manage the times that special education teachers come and go to provide services. The elementary assistant principal in this study said that she is going to try to do a little bit more of a secondary style schedule to alleviate the complexity at the elementary school. The assistant principal that is in charge of scheduling all this at the elementary school has a secondary background and understands how to make it more of a secondary schedule where elementary teachers will teach math at a certain time, science at a certain time, etc. Currently, they are able to be flexible as to what time they teach each subject to their students since they are with the same students all day. Something else that could be added to the complexity of collaborative teaching is that the high

school is considering eliminating resource classes. Currently all three levels, elementary, junior high and high school have resource classes in at least math and English. Arlene, the elementary principal, sums up this complexity:

> You know, there's a significant difference between an elementary school and a secondary school in a number of teachers that you encounter on a daily basis. But generally, and years gone by, it was pretty much that you had a different teacher for this subject area, for this subject area, for this subject area. But I think with the inclusion model, there are several things that come in to make it really powerful. One is the children are just accustomed to having multiple adults in a classroom and multiple adults supporting them…and so I think that one of the things that happens especially since that person who's in there collaborating for inclusion...the SPED child would have to be the priority but that teacher can help any child in that classroom if the need arises and the SPED child doesn't need the individual support at the moment and so I think that a lot of reservations that people have about getting the support the children need, through special ed, I think the inclusion model and collaboration gives a level of student comfort with there's not any stigma to having this person in there. So I think that as children go into secondary classes and if they're also doing an inclusion program that they are accustomed to, there's a greater comfort level for them.

The high school is looking to pilot a program where there is no resource English or math resource. This means that all of the students that would normally be serviced in a resource setting, will now be in a collaborative teaching setting which makes it even more important for the collaborative teaching model to be solid and supported by

administration. Sometimes there are issues with placement of special education students. Students that are in resource classes might have to be moved to a co-teach class; whereas, some students that are in co-teach classes might have to be moved to a resource class. This causes issues with numbers in classes and potential wasted resources when it comes to placement of teachers in classes. It is difficult when we are using teacher for a 45 minute block for only two students and there are twelve students packed in larger classes.

Participants indicated that part of the complexity of implementation was the time of year that all of the schools were trained. Most were trained in the middle of the school year instead of perhaps in the summer or at the very end of the previous school year in order to roll out from day one of a new school year. All three schools used in this study created their own plan on how to implement the co-teaching collaborative teaching project that they believed would work for their campus mid-year. Once they were trained, they all experienced changes to their trainer of trainers team. This made it difficult for any continuity with the implementation and support of collaborative teaching on their campus. They had to retrain people and it slows down the process. Irma had her original trainer of trainers team decimated:

> My core team - three of those people left my school and so I didn't even have the core team that I have [started with], that's another reason why we didn't start in the fall, okay? So then I had to get a core team again, like a new team together, and that's why we had to go to training again because the only main player that stayed the same was Dee, the assistant principal. The other three changed because of that I really need it to you know what I can't start with me and Dee the only two that know anything because they're not going to really know or buy into the

whole thing because we needed to work together as a team and as a group so

that's why….that's...I knew there was another reason - all my people left.

She knows that the continuity, when broken, can cause the plan to take a step back. When

you have good people on your team, they are trained and work well within the team, it is

hard to replace those people. She is frustrated at the prospect of having to retrain staff in

order to have a solid program. They initially tried to get the program to a sustainable pace

but when certain people left it stopped the progress that they were making.

They also all lost teachers for various reasons so teams of co-teachers who were

working well together changed because one of the members of the team needed to be

partnered with someone different the next school year or even mid-year. This can be

detrimental to collaborative teaching since the success of co-teaching has a lot to do with

the relationship between teachers.

Interview and Survey Data Analysis

The following section will review the themes that emerged through the voices of

the participants during face-to-face interviews and data collected by using an interview

protocol (Appendix A). The qualitative data were analyzed utilizing grounded theory. All

of the themes are grounded in the voices of the participants and their answers to the

interview protocol. Four general themes emerged through these data sets. There were

subthemes that emerged within each theme presented. All of the themes and subthemes

that emerged are directly related to how the teaming and training of the collaborative

teaching project helped to provide support in the facilitation of co-teaching. The data also

provide information on whether the project changed administrator perceptions of

collaborative teaching and how administrators can support collaborative teaching on their campuses which includes the following themes and subthemes:

Theme 1: Teacher characteristics

> *Subtheme 1: Willingness*
>
> *Subtheme 2: Relational Assets*
>
> *Subtheme 3: Relational Challenges*

Theme 2: Administrator characteristics

> *Subtheme 1: Relational*
>
> *Subtheme 2: Responsive*
>
> *Subtheme 3: Valuing Teamwork and Collaboration*

Theme 3: Time

> *Subtheme 1: Planning and Collaboration Time for Teachers*
>
> *Subtheme 2: Planning Time for Administrators*

Theme 4: Supporting through fidelity and framework

> *Subtheme 1: Support from Campus Administration*
>
> *Subtheme 2: Support from the District*

In the following sections, each of the themes and subthemes will be described in detail.

Theme 1: Teacher Characteristics

Through the interviews it was revealed that teacher characteristics are factors for administrators and how they approach and perceive collaborative teaching on their campus.

Willingness

All of the participants in the study revealed that much of the success or detriment to co-teaching on their campuses had to do with the receptivity of the teachers. Many felt that their teachers were optimistic about the prospect of co-teaching. They felt that the structure and guidance that was provided helped them to navigate using the co-teaching models to their fullest potential. When Janis was asked how teachers feel about inclusion, she said that "they have been pretty receptive so far to it". She went on to say the following:

> I think they are excited about the prospect of this working and they seem to like
> the structure that we provided for them in which to work. But I think overall, they
> have a positive attitude towards collaborative teaching now that they know that
> there are resources and structures for them to work in.

After explaining a collaborative session that she had with her teachers to talk about collaborative teaching, Irma said, "They are wondering why they cannot be together all day long and I am going, 'wow' we've come full circle [laughter] you know! [There's] a lot of good synergy about that idea". She later went on to explain:

> [Teachers say] Oh my God, I love having another set of eyes, another set of hands
> and another person in the room with me because I feel like I can get to everybody
> the way that you know so I think that's the beauty of it. I think they see…at least
> if they're doing it for the right reasons.

This administrator sees her campus staff as having a positive outlook on collaborative teaching. She can tell from her hard work in implementing collaborative teaching on her campus that her teachers are looking at the framework in a positive manner. They are

even going above and beyond what she had hoped for and expected in that they would like to have a second teacher with the every period of every day.

Administrators think that there is value in teachers' receptivity to co-teaching and that teachers feel there is value to the co-teach model. This happens too when administrators have a positive outlook and holds their staff accountable to the framework such as Irma does.

Relational assets

Many of the administrators felt that co-teaching has a relational aspect as much as it does a pedagogical one. Several of them began to provide the framework for co-teaching on their campus by being purposeful in who they chose to first provide complete, structured co-teaching in their classrooms. Tammy says that they "don't put anyone together that's going to clash." Arlene said that "the biggest barriers that we still are needing to address, I just addressed with people". The key is to stick with research-based structures and pairings that will ultimately work for the co-teaching model. Heather explains:

> Co-teach can be very successful if we do it correctly and you implement it with fidelity. [And] that's the part that hangs up because you've got to have consistency and I look at some of the strongest co-teach pairs that I've ever worked with and there has been consistency where it is like a marriage - you need to finish each other's sentences and it doesn't matter who's absent that there's not going to be a beat that's missed.

Irma felt the same way and was strategic in how she went about choosing her pairs. She wanted teachers that would comply with the ideology of the co-teach model and would share the work based on student needs and collaborative planning:

> I only picked those people that in my mind are going to be successful with it. You know what I am saying, I purposefully chose the ones I chose you know, and so I know that's what their thinking is but at the same time, I am going to do my homework over the course of this next semester to videotape like the teach assist that...and I forgot where it all those different strategies are...but everyone of those strategies, I'm going to film different teachers doing that and co-teachers and paras doing it because that is going to be my impetus and those are going to be my models to show in the fall when we go full fledged with a lot more groups doing it. You know, and we may go back to that thinking of being with one teacher all day long and giving one teacher all of those kids you know, immersed throughout the school day and that kind of thing in there some people in there that they really believe that they want to work that way because they want a partner in the classroom, you know, and having a partner for some is going to make teaching a lot easier for them because they've got somebody to bounce off ideas.

The relational aspect of collaborative teaching is the backbone of success. Being purposeful in who administrators select to be co-teaching partners is essential to the framework's ultimate success. At first, it is difficult to determine which relationships will work because administrators don't truly know how personalities will match up until they put the teachers together. Once they have taught together for a while, it is easier to see if the relationship will work in order to have a successful collaborative teaching classroom.

When changes in staff occur, it sets back the plan for collaborative teaching because you have to determine new relationships from the beginning again. Pedagogically sound instructors are only half of what is needed in order to have a successful co-teach model. Teachers must have the mindset that the co-teach model will work and it is what is best for students and what is best for teachers to be able to reach those students.

Relational challenges

Administrators feel that teachers can face relational challenges when participating in a collaborative teaching model when there are personality differences between a pair of teachers, or there are differences in teaching philosophies. Some general education teachers feel that it will be impossible for students to learn as quickly as their other colleagues' students because their peers do not have special education students in class. These same teachers sometimes feel that their state assessment scores will never measure up to general education classes. This sometimes makes general education teachers not want to teach in a collaborative teaching model because of the perception of having to work harder and not getting as good a result as non-special education classes. The relational aspect between student and teacher can be strained because of this.

Administrators feel that teachers draw a line between general education students and special education students. Teachers do not see fairness sometimes when having to teach special education students. Teachers compare themselves to other teachers who have it "easier" than they do simply because they teach special education students and the other teachers do not. Irma says "a lot of teachers are [starting] feeling like, well how come I get all of them and she doesn't get any and how come her scores are always going to look better than mine." Teachers' attitudes toward teaching special education students

are sometimes negative because of the uncertainty that they feel in having the capacity to handle a co-teach classroom. Carol says that "something about the [special education] label scares them." Teachers' resistance also has to do with the mindset that the classroom is *theirs.* They feel that if they allow another teacher in to their classroom, they will have to relinquish control of their classroom and that is not something that they are willing to do. Tammy says the following about territorialism in the classroom:

> I feel that the majority of my teachers on my campus would rather that we not have inclusion because my general education teachers just want to be able to teach their content to their students and I feel that when inclusion…..that they have to think of differentiation and more accommodations and modifications to the curriculum.

Heather says:

> I think there's a lot of uncertainty though about not knowing how to properly service the students. I think we still fall into the boat of - my kids, your kids with the inclusion model and not understanding the shared responsibility and I think that's because there's been the lack of…...a lack of training and understanding and it's not on one particular special pop or the other, it's a matter of it's gotta be….it's gotta start with everybody of what is the purpose and how do we do this and how do you do it effectively and I think that's been part of our missing piece for a really long time.

Territorialism and resistance are often times personality traits that teachers come with and can hinder teachers' relationships with one another. There are times where teachers are resistant to the idea of change plus they lack the knowledge of how to implement new

ideas as well. It is important for teachers to be flexible in thinking and adaptable to different situations.

While the resistance comes from general education teachers mostly, special education teachers provide resistance as well. Heather explains that "sometimes that's where the resistance comes from. It is not always just the general ed side of things". Administrators say that teachers do not feel that they have the tools to be able to teach in a co-teach setting because they are not sure how to navigate that relationship. The collaborative teaching project provides a framework that is able to help with this. Sometimes teachers either feel inadequate to co-teach or they feel that they do not have the resources or support to be effective. They must be able to be confident in their abilities and they should feel that they have support from administration.

Relational challenges can be found not only between the general education and special education teacher but also between teachers and students and their perceptions of whether all students can learn despite any type of learning disability that they might have. These challenges provide complexity to the collaborative teaching model. It complicates the process and makes it more than just putting two people together and expecting it to work. It has to be the right pair of teachers and both of those teachers have to have the right mindset so that the model works.

Theme 2: Administrator characteristics

Administrators shared three main characteristics in their dedication to implementing collaborative teaching on their campuses. They were a) relational, b) responsive and c) valuing teamwork and collaboration. Administrators want their teams to be synergistic and able to be a team with their support.

Relational

The data from the interviews revealed that all of the administrators in this study were all relational and that they cared to work alongside each of their teachers, administrators and teams. Providing feedback and praise for a job well done is important to some administrators. They feel that it is necessary to build up the confidence of their teachers so that they feel more apt to take on what they perceive as a difficult task. Heather cares about her teachers and how they perceive co-teaching. She wants them to be able to take risks and use other schools as resources:

> [Heather] You know I think it's my job as a campus leader to make sure that it is part of our conversations…make sure that we are able to recognize and praise and listen to the feedback given - positive or negative - and praise those who are part of it and be in the trenches with them and help brainstorm. I'm not going to have all the answers either or but is there somebody I can call that, is there somebody that I can….maybe another campus that's done something really great that we can send people to look at...is there someone that could come over and clarify something for us you know those kinds of things that can happen.

She goes on to say:

> It's got to be part of our vocabulary. We got to be able to have those conversations and recognize and praise no matter how big or small. It is goes such a long way just the fact that you see someone trying something new or having a conversation about it, maybe not having fully implemented, but just being able to have that dialogue and conversation. You have got to be able to recognize because, hey,

you know what? That was good what you did. Let's do it again and being able to

offer the support and the time to allow for them to collaborate.

Arlene thinks that it is more than just going in to classrooms for visits and providing

planning time for the teachers. She says it is "actually watching it and celebrating and

making sure that they know that I appreciate what they're doing and that I appreciate the

effort and work they're putting into it and celebrating those successes especially when we

see it working". These administrators care about making their teachers successful and

providing them support.

Responsive

All of the administrators desire feedback from their teachers and they want to

provide feedback for them as well. They want to know what they can do to help improve

co-teaching on their campus and respond to the needs of their teachers and co-teaching.

They want to follow through with what they say they are going to do and they want to

support their teachers in every way possible. Irma has her collaborative team conduct

learning walks to calibrate and see where they need to improve and to see what is

working well. She feels that teamwork and the collaborative teaching team is the key to

being responsive in this way. She says "I think it's a more rich experience and you get to

see more of the best because they're working as a team". She envisions the team seeing

common threads between them to help improve co-teaching in general. The teachers are

the heart and soul of the campus and the key to creating a environment conducive for co-

teaching to be able to work. Assessing how they are doing to make adjustments is

something that they feel is necessary. There are many different variables to consider.

Janis says this about collaboration and feedback:

> I think that more than anything, more than even the walkthroughs and evaluations, the telling sign will be our collaborative times with those co-teach teams just getting information from them learning from them to see how things are going. What adjustments need to be made, what do they need from us? I think just checking on them and hearing from them is going to be better than any walkthrough….walkthroughs are going to show us how, if they're doing a particular model correctly or does their lesson plan fit that particular model that they're doing but to find out the whole progress of each team is to sit down with them individually to talk about what kind of support they need, what extra things do they need, how do they feel it's going and that a lot of that will come in an internal PLC time and perhaps we even meet one-on-one with each team you know, our….our trainer of trainers team meet with each co-teach team periodically to just talk to them instead of in a group setting.

For administrators, part of being responsive is knowing when to seek help for something that they do not know the answer to. Administrators, especially the head principal, organize how the structure of collaborative teaching will be implemented. They rely on the experts on campus to help carry out their vision. The teachers and special education specialists have knowledge that the principal has an overview of but they are the ones that are directly working within the framework of collaborative teaching. Administrators respond to their needs and take in to consideration their expertise when making adjustments and helping to provide resources for co-teaching. This is what Arlene says about her campus in regards to being responsive to her teachers' needs in making the co-teaching model work:

I have the overview and they have the in-depth knowledge. And so I have to be, you know, respectful of that in-depth knowledge and I have to ask questions and I have to be ready to find the answers if people ask me questions [and I have to be ready to find the answers if people ask me questions] and so I think that just being a support for those people, and also just making sure that I'm not just sitting here expecting that they do all the work. I want to be part of the work in the role that I play.

She goes on to say:

[We need to have] a conversation where there is something that we are doing pretty well and that we need to polish and maintain that, where is that, maybe we really need to focus some attention because we're not where we need to be at this. [We need] to kind of break down what information they have and to customize that information to see the needs of our individual campus.

Arlene also will have a team conducting learning walks and she feels that in addition to helping the teachers, they will be able to continuously improve co-teaching by looking at students in particular. She says "the day to day progress that we see students making with their grades, with their behavior, with their eagerness to learn and also so that's the reason we're here – for the children". Looking at all the stakeholders from students to teachers is important for these administrators.

Valuing teamwork and collaboration

"Meeting together as a PLC every 3 weeks…I think that's where the magic is going to happen."

Administrators consistently said that they collaborated with their teachers to provide support and make sure that they are on target with the goals that they have set in regards to co-teaching. Some of the campuses will meet together on a regular basis to discuss how the program is going and what adjustments should be made. Collaborating and teamwork is a time for reflection and discussion so that they can continuously improve and plan. Having a team of people to collaborate with and generate new and innovative ideas stems from the commitment of administrators to provide not only the time but have the expectation for them to collaborate. Janis, the high school assistant principal says that they are going to "PLC after school to get some feedback and have some discussions and revisit things to continuously improve what we're doing, if we need to make any adjustments. It's more of a time to reflect and again to make adjustments". Irma, the high school principal, is directly involved and confirmed in her commitment to students and teachers and optimizing their learning experience. She values this approach and believes that if she models collaboration and is directly involved teachers will more likely "buy in" to the co-teach model. She says:

> I have instructional collaborative every 6 weeks and so during that time when we're sharing student work and we're sharing different kinds of things that go on in the classroom, technology – whatever the focus is for that six weeks that's naturally going to come up in the discussion because those co-teachers attend those instructional collaborative with them and we'll be talking about that then too.

The model of the collaborative teaching project requires that a participating school has a team for support made up of a SPED representative, an ESL representative, an

instructional coach and an administrator. The training that is provided for schools gives the tools that this team needs in order for them to be able to support their teachers and the model itself. The collaboration that happens within the training helps administrators plan for rollout and helps them get ideas from other schools. Arlene says:

> There's a collaboration factor that we're less to have something fall through the cracks that we didn't address because somebody's going to remember it. And so I like the fact that it's a group model for doing the training and the other thing that I really like is that it has like I said, I'm going to have to change some members to go but, the fact that it is spread across different departments so there is an AP, there is a SPED person, there is an ESL person…the fact that it is diverse in the roles, I believe makes it more effective.

She goes on to say:

> I loved the opportunity to hear what other schools were doing when they were able to share out because some of those things they were doing, we were like ooh…that would really work well at our school and it gave us time to collaborate with the others, the schools, the other campuses. I thought that was huge to hear how they do it differently because there was a lot of differences in that room that day.

Administrators focus on community within their schools. They have communal discussions and learn together. This optimizes the aspects of actual implementation of the program and how they interpret their function. Teamwork and collaboration for administrators is essential for continuous improvement of the collaborative teaching model. They learn from each other when they are able to take the time to collaborate.

There are ideas that stem simply from their discussion about what is working and what is not working at their campus. The administrators in this study all valued collaboration and teamwork not only within their peer group but also with teachers as well. They feel that time spent with others that are going through the same challenges is a valuable asset and they look forward to meeting and talking to other administrators that are trying to facilitate the collaborative teaching project on their campuses. It is comforting for these administrators to know that they have resources other than the people on their campus.

Administrators perceive their role to be relational and responsive when it comes to having a successful model of collaborative teaching on their campuses. They feel that building relationships is important and keeping an open line of communication between themselves and the teachers is crucial. In addition to honesty and open communication, They feel that there is a synergy to the success of collaborative want their teams to be synergistic and able to be a team with their support. They value teamwork and working together and they find that this will lead to a successful implementation of collaborative teaching.

Theme 3: Time

"I think our biggest barrier right now is time."

The data showed that time is a major factor in how administrators perceive their effectiveness in implementing collaborative teaching within the framework of the collaborative teaching project. The participants provided two different ways that time was a factor in regards to successful implementation of the collaborative teaching project: a) time to plan and collaborate for teachers and b) time to plan and collaborate for administrators.

Planning and collaboration time for teachers

Administrators stated that they felt that the biggest barrier to implementing collaborative teaching is time. They feel that it is crucial to provide teachers time to plan so that they may be successful with co-teaching and provide the fidelity that it deserves. On the elementary campus, they schedule in time for teachers to be able to plan. This is what Carol says about the time that is provided to the teachers at her campus:

> It's kind of their time where we put….we take our support teachers, our intervention teachers and put them in the classroom. We take the classroom teachers out and they're given an hour and a half, whatever it is, where they can totally plan everything and they can talk about all those things.

There are complexities in providing time for the teachers to plan. On the same campus as Carol, Arlene also expresses the importance of the time that they provide for their teachers to plan. She also expresses the importance that the teachers utilize the time in a productive manner and speaks to complexity in the utilization of time:

> On adjusting when our lesson plans are due, I just had a conversation with the entire staff on Monday or Tuesday about that - is that the planning facet of it? Are you're going to have effective collaboration? Both people have to have a voice in the planning and have to be aware of what is the plan. And so it can't be that the gen ed teacher is there doing the lesson plan and getting it all done and prepared for the end of the week and then the special ed person [and collaboration] hasn't seen that plan until Friday afternoon or Monday morning. There needs to be some time so that the special ed teacher can be able to address - how am I going to use this core plan that she should have or he should have had a voice in initially? How

are we going to modify that plan or accommodate for individuals, whatever it may

be, to address the needs of the children? So planning, I think, is a major thing that

we continue to work on.

The planning that goes in to collaborative teaching is extensive and includes reviewing

individualized educational plans (IEPs) and accommodations which takes time. Tammy

says that "the number one barrier [to successful implementation of collaborative

teaching] is the planning time for them to get together and to truly look at the IEPs, the

accommodations for these students and to plan these lessons together collaboratively".

Knowing that planning includes more than just the lesson, Tammy's campus felt that it

was important to discuss long-term planning. General education teachers and special

education teachers need time to be able to modify tests and assignments prior to seeing

the students in class. They will pay for their teachers to attend summer professional

development. Long term planning will help get the lesson plans in to their lesson

planning tool called *Forethought* and they can start modifying everything ahead of time.

She says:

> We discussed long-term planning, short term planning and weekly planning and
>
> pit stop planning. So we discussed all of that. We then provided them with funds
>
> so that they can plan [so that they can plan] together like long time during this
>
> summer we're going to pay them when they come together during the summer to
>
> plan for the year. So we're completely through the faculty meetings through staff
>
> development and that's how we're working it out right now.

She goes on to say "even doing that long term planning, thinking about the entire year
ahead of time. Mapping out the six weeks…it's more than just getting that lesson plan in
Forethought, you know, before the week starts its way more than that."

The data show that the master schedule for these campuses is crucial to being able
to create pockets of time so that teachers can plan. It takes dedication from the
administrators to purposefully plan schedules so that off times for both general education
and special education teachers match for them to plan. Janis, her principal and her co-
teach teams met as a group to discuss the components of the collaborative teaching
project and she explained that they "talked about the master schedule and how we can
provide time last week and they had some really good ideas in regards to that so I think
it's going to be really good." Using the master schedule to create times in the day for the
teachers to collaborate and plan is different in high school and junior high than in the
elementary. Carol, the assistant principal at the elementary school feels that she should
take more of a secondary approach to planning time for her teachers. She says:

> One of the things that we are looking at is one of the hindrances is that
> time…..time factor as far as them collaborating with each other to plan. And so
> one of the things that I would like to see and this was after the training that really
> kind of hit home with all of us sitting there was creating a master schedule at the
> elementary level is very different than the secondary level and that was one of the
> big changes I had to make coming here. At the secondary level everything is
> broken down by period so you can plan who has got what period Pre-AP, GT
> what period, in class support one period. You can do those but at the elementary
> level it's not like that so you know at the secondary level when English is being

taught when the have reading - you can plan all those things. At the elementary

level you basically say you have an instruction block from 8:30 in the morning till

10:30 at 10:30 go to recess until 11, at 11 you may have another instructional

block but you're not telling them when to teach math, when to teach reading,

when to teach science. So the planning part of getting that….the in-class support

teachers, ESL teachers in there at the right reading time, English time, math time

it's very tricky and so one of the push is that my principal and I are working on is

next year we may go back to a true secondary-style master schedule where you

are planning when they are going to do that and we're going to have some

pushback from some and we know that but I think once they see the benefit from

all of it that will be able to be okay.

While the administrators interviewed feel that scheduling is important, they must hold

teachers accountable to planning during the time that is allotted for them. After meeting

with her teachers, Tammy felt that administrators needed to take baby steps in order to

help hold teachers accountable:

It's going to have to come from the top from us as administrators and we're going

to have to start requiring that they let us know when that planning is happening,

you know, taking place so we need to know the dates and that was our first baby

step yesterday - that they had to provide us the date that we will be planning. So

we have to supervise to get them going because if we just sweep it under the rug

they'll never find the time.

Teachers need time to plan lessons and collaborate to collaboratively teach.

Administrators felt that providing time was an important factor while participating in the

collaborative teaching project. Their participation in training and the everyday process helped them to realize changes that they need to make when making the master schedule for their teachers. It is essential to prioritize the schedule to where teachers have the same conference periods in order to be able to collaborate. Administrators realized this through the process of their training and from collaborating with each other. They know the importance of the collaboration that has to happen between the teachers so that they can deliver instruction in an effective manner for all students. They feel that they need to provide that time structurally within the day for teachers.

Planning time for administrators

Timing and rollout of the collaborative teaching project was a factor for the participants. The training that participants received was midyear and difficult to implement at that time. Administrators, however, did come up with different plans on how to be purposeful in rolling out collaborative teaching on their campuses. Time of implementation and time of planning for implementation was a challenge for them. Administrators are concerned about the receptivity of what teachers would perceive as "something new" if they were to implement something in the middle of the year. Janis describes the barrier of time as it relates to implementation:

> Part of it is our roll out time getting it midway through the semester and how do you kind of get them jump started and not saying 'hey' this is one more new thing that we're doing. [But] it's to help better the practices that we already have going on but being able to roll it out in a fashion that is digestible and doable and in a way that you're setting them up for success as opposed to it being one more thing on their plate.

Carol felt that the training provided some time for them to collaborate with other schools and come up with a plan to make it easier for rollout.

> To have time for us just to sit down because we don't have time to do just within our own school components of the process and the facilitation of it and we were given enough time to collaborate and plan what are we going to do, how we are going to do it. The time that it have us to collaborate, the time that it have us to work with other schools and see what ideas were working, what ideas were not working, hey we tried this but it flopped and getting those ideas.

Irma felt that they were able to have time to discuss in the training and map out what they felt needed to be done for successful rollout. She says "there was a lot of time for sharing, a lot of time for personal talk with one another". Time is always discussed when it comes to teachers having time to plan, grade, etc. Time for administrators to collaborate is hardly ever discussed. Administrators must have time to be able plan and be strategic when they are hoping to implement a new system or initiative. In addition to helping support teachers with instruction, administrators also have other things that will take their time such as discipline, parent conferences and evaluations to name a few. Rarely do administrators specifically plan time to help support new initiatives. Through this process, the administrators have realized the importance of taking in their own time to talk to each other and collaborate together just as the teachers do. Through the training of this framework, they came to realize this.

Overall, providing time is a challenge to the collaborative teaching project framework. It becomes especially complex when you look at the differences between elementary schools and secondary schools when it comes to planning time.

Administrators realize that they must provide support in this area and make changes to the overall schedule of school so that they may provide pockets of time for both teachers and administrators to be able to purposefully plan. In addition to just having time to plan, timeline is important too when trying a new framework. Starting too soon could be detrimental to the success of collaborative teaching and being able to make adjustments when needed is a skill that the administrators realize that they need to have.

<div style="text-align:center">Theme 4: Supporting through fidelity and framework</div>

Administrators feel the obligation to support their teachers and co-teaching because they believe it is best instructional practice. To support their teachers, they want do so with fidelity.

They want to make sure that they hold teachers and themselves accountable to what they want to accomplish. The training that the administrators received on collaborative teaching helped to frame their thinking and approach to co-teaching on their campus. Each campus had a different but similar approach but all agree that they have to carefully approach how they hold themselves and others accountable for providing quality instruction through collaborative teaching. The training helped to give administrators a different perspective, in some instances, from what they originally thought that they would do. Tammy feels that the framework that was provided for them caused her to be flexible. She said that it "changed my whole way of thinking and how I was going to present it. I basically wanted to go in and say this is what is expected and this is how we are going to do it right now". They want to stay consistent in their practices and in their support by holding the teachers and themselves accountable to their plan. This could mean that they have to change what they had originally planned as far as

training for their teachers to be able to collaboratively teach. Tammy explains how she and her principal will help to hold teachers accountable, "we're going to do it by giving them deadlines and going in and making those visits to the classrooms, checking lesson plans and meeting with them when they are planning". At Hull High School, Janis says "I have to make sure that the teams are meeting, the co-teach teams are meeting with each other and help to maybe troubleshoot anything that might come along or if they have questions about the co-teach models that we asked them to use". Holding the teachers accountable supports the vision and goal of collaborative teaching.

The participants felt that data needed to be used in order to see if their plan is working. They keep their teachers informed of student progress through the use of data. They reflect on whether they are making good progress as a result of inclusion but it goes beyond just looking at student scores to see if the collaborative teaching framework is working at their campus. They must include themselves to take a qualitative approach to make sure that teachers are carrying out the vision of what the administrators want by being directly involved in planning sessions. Tammy explains:

> They have to send us a date that they're going to be meeting and they have to send it to us by progress reports and they're sending it to their supervising administrator. So in hopes that we will see, yes, they are definitely going to meeting on this date but we can also visit that meeting. We can be there not for the whole time just to step in maybe possibly here and then moving forward we have goals we want to give them especially from January to June choose one or two approaches that you want to try and that way they can give us the feedback of how it went. And so we will be given them their expectations like I said little

small baby steps right now. And then we're going to do it by giving them

deadlines and going in and making those visits to the classrooms, checking the

lesson plans and meeting with them when they're planning.

Creating opportunities to build teacher capacity is important to administrators. They do

this through trainings that they create for their co-teach pairs and through professional

development sessions that are offered throughout the year. They want to take advantage

also of the professional development days that the district provides all schools the week

prior to the start of the school year. The important element of building capacity is

providing the time for it to happen. Heather feels certain that providing time for

professional development is essential to having the administrators support the

collaborative teaching project on their campus:

In order for it to be done with fidelity we've got to build in that time so figured

out how to get that time back in our PD opportunities that first week back, you

know, no it's not going to be enough time for everybody to get it all down then

but can we give them 45 minutes, can we give him an hour, do we give them an

hour and a half, do we give them a morning versus, you know, to allow for some

of that collaboration as well as with our new teachers our brand new back to our

campus having that already carved into our not only learning this is what we are

doing at Breen Junior High, this is also another piece of the information that you

need to know because that's how we do things here.

All of these ideas for building capacity were fueled by the trainings that the district gave

to administrators where district specialists in special education explained the benefits of a

true co-teach model and provided resources for them to be able to take back to their

campuses and train teachers why co-teaching is so important for special education students.

Support from the district

The collaborative teaching project began with administrators being trained by a district special education instructional specialist. This training provided them the framework to decide if this was something that they could sustain and implement on their campuses. Once they decided that they wanted to bring true collaborative teaching to their campuses, they, along with the trainer of trainers team of their choosing (an administrator, instructional coach, special education representative and ESL representative) attended another training that provided the modules that were needed in order to train their co-teach teams. Participants felt that the training that they received with their team was sufficient enough to come up with a plan for their campus even though the training came in the middle of the year in January. At the time of this study there were mixed reviews as to the support that the district provided so that the administrators in turn, could support their campuses through collaborative teaching. Tammy said this about the fidelity of support that the district has given them:

> In general, they provided us with all the resources we need to train the teachers by providing all those modules through the Google Docs that has been extremely helpful because you're not looking or create anything. It's all there. That has made training our teachers super easy I think. Providing us that face to face...I know the first one we did it online and that was helpful but meeting face to face for module 2 and module 3 was extremely helpful. I feel like what they've given us so far has been a huge support. I haven't heard anything from them since our

training for feedback on any of this but they haven't asked for any feedback from us unless they have asked from our principal. I'm not sure if they've done that. The indication from one of the participants in this study was that there had not been a lot of feedback from the district in regards to how the campus is facilitating the co-teach model on their campus since they had been trained. Heather, the principal of the junior high said,

> There has not been any other contact about it you know whether it's something just simple, how's it going or I see that you're going to do this at a faculty meeting. How did it go? What was the buy in? There hasn't been that kind of follow-up even if it wasn't necessarily face to face or anything.

Most felt that they could use the district as a resource so in that way, they were supportive with the fidelity of the project. The point of view on whether the district was supportive or not depended on how the participant viewed the question and how they interpreted what support really meant. The high school administrators felt that the district is supportive in that they do not require each school to take the same approach to the collaborative teaching model. They are able to customize it to meet their needs as a campus and the timing of the rollout is their decision as well. Irma explains:

> They want a good solid program that works on your campus that has these elements now. You figure out how you're going to put it all together and they're good with that and they support that and I think that's where the foundation of support is really good that they give you that flexibility to be able to do that because otherwise I don't think people would buy into a cookie cutter it's got to be

this way because none of us...you can't always make it that way kind of thing today.

The elementary thought that the district was supportive because they could call at any time and use them as a resource when they had questions. No matter how the participants viewed how the district carried through with their support, the overall sense was favorable that the district has followed through with helping the campuses sustain collaborative teaching on their campus.

Administrators must support the collaborative teaching project through providing professional development when needed and they should be able to pull from district personnel resources for help too. Since the framework was provided by the district, the district has said that they can provide support for campuses. The support that comes from the district must be individualized by campus since they were given the freedom to plan and implement at their own pace. It is difficult at this point to know what specifically is needed from the district since they are in the beginning stages. Right now campuses need the support of their administrators to help problem solve and be flexible with training and implementation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, implications, and recommendations of the findings of this qualitative case study research. The purpose of this study is to examine the framework of the Collaborative Teaching Project (CTP) that one suburban school district implemented in order to facilitate co-teaching and gain the most benefit from their collaborative teaching model. This study was conducted in the spring semester of 2016 using principals and assistant principals to determine their thoughts on how they support their collaborative teaching models on their campuses. The study also examined the administrator's role in the framework of this project as well as their perceptions of practice and perceptions of the model itself on their campus once they have been trained and their action plan has been put into place. The goal of the project is to have a common language and common practice that all stakeholders can use when examining current practices in the special education co-teach classroom and provide the support that schools need in order to sustain a successful co-teach program.

Statement of the Problem

Currently, the demands for high-stakes testing and special education laws suggest an effective inclusion model to ensure that students are receiving instruction that will help special education students be successful on state assessments. In this study, a modified version of the state assessment is not offered to address special needs learners except for those that are in life skills classes. Very few students will qualify for the

alternative state assessment which meets the needs of the intellectually disabled. The students that qualify for learning disabled must take the version of the examination that their non-disabled peers must take. Many of the students that would qualify to take a modified version of the state assessment are served through a co-teach classroom. While the co-teach model and inclusion is an answer to the stipulations of special education laws and NCLB, there are far greater reaching effects to the inclusion model in that students with disabilities demonstrate improved academic achievement and social benefits overall when they have access to the general education curriculum in a co-teach setting (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger 2010; McLesky & Waldron, 2002; Walsh, 2011).

Support from school administration is vital for a co-teach program yet many school administrators do not have a background in special education and do not have the knowledge in how they should support the co-teach model. Research shows that co-teach models are most effective when they have the support of their administrators and the inclusion model is considered to be best practice (Friend, et al, 2010; Scruggs et al., 2007; Thousand, Villa, & Nevin, 2006; Weiner & Murawski, 2005) and provides a necessary structure in order for schools to help students meet the rigor of the state assessments.

Summary of Findings

This study examined how administrators' participation in the collaborative teaching project helped them provide support for the collaborative teaching model on their campuses. The study further examined how administrators reflectively described

their perceptions of the collaborative teaching project during the implementation of the model.

As identified within the qualitative data reporting, participant data reveal that the training that was provided helped to solidify what administrators already thought about collaborative teaching and how to support it. In addition to this, participation in the project helped to expand administrators' thinking about different possibilities and ways that can help to sustain collaborative teaching on their campus. Participant data also reveal that the relational aspect of how they allow teachers to have input in how collaborative teaching can be successful on their campus is important to them. They also feel that they need to be purposeful in allowing teachers to have time to plan and to give themselves time to plan for the success of the collaborative teaching project. They also indicate that their perceptions of what teachers thought about the project affected the success of the project.

The training that the administrators received from the collaborative teaching project helped administrators to expand their thinking and perhaps think of new and different ways to plan and sustain the collaborative teaching model and implement it with fidelity. The training also helped administrators to understand that they have to make sure that the teachers are held accountable, that teams are meeting, and that the vision and goal of the collaborative teaching project is successful. Administrators know that they must support the project through providing professional development for their teachers, not only in what they feel that they need in order to be successful but also listening to the teachers and what their needs are once they are in the project. They should revisit the needs of their teachers and of the program because those needs could change.

Administrators realized that building the capacity of teachers to work within the collaborative teaching model is essential for the success of collaborative teaching on their campus. Administrators indicated that they had to provide time for planning for not only the teachers in the classroom but also for themselves to be able to plan out how they're going to train teachers and how they will maintain and support the project.

The willingness of a teacher to participate in collaborative teaching was a factor for administrators when asked. They felt that if teachers had a positive attitude towards co-teaching then the model could be much more successful. In addition to teacher willingness, relational assets were a factor for administrators. They felt that putting teachers together that fully complement each other, plan well together and are on the same page in regards to what needs to be taught is a big factor. Administrators felt that teachers sometimes have a somewhat negative attitude towards having special education students because they feel it will contribute to their overall class scores being lower.

The study revealed that time is considered a factor for a successful co-teaching model. Planning and collaboration time for teachers is crucial. Administrators recognize that they need to make adjustments and all of the schools that were studied made adjustments in the way they planned or the way they structured their collaborative time. They all scheduled things a bit differently but it worked for their own school. Not only do the teachers need time for a successful co-teaching model but administrators have to take the time to be purposeful and plan for the collaborative teaching model. It is difficult for them to implement the collaborative teaching model and not revisit the components in order to continuously improve upon it and continuously look to see what needs to be done and adjusted.

In order to keep the fidelity of the framework that is provided by the district, it is crucial to utilize the different modules and to train those teachers that might be new to the campus. One challenge that needs to be overcome is teacher turnover and administration turnover. This makes it hard for the continuity that is needed in order for the model to be a successful model. A plan for professional development for the new team members is necessary to help with the continuity.

Implications

Results from this study have implications beyond the participants in this research; districts and aspiring administrators can use the results to identify whether a framework, such as the one used in this study, can help to provide structure for schools that are looking to provide a useful collaborative teaching model. It could inspire administrators, in particular, to self-examine their perceptions of collaborative teaching and how they can either initially implement a model like this or improve a model that they have already started. School could benefit from a strong collaborative teaching model. It also helps to support the research that says that a key factor for principals to help guide and support general education teachers is to become more knowledgeable about the needs of special education students and inclusive practices (Wakeman et al., 2006).

This study also brings light to the complexities of measuring the success of collaborative teaching on a campus. There are so many variables to consider and they vary greatly between campuses. Each campus has their own needs and in this study, they approached the collaborative teaching project in their own way. The framework allows for them to be able to plan for the collaborative teaching model the way they see fit within the framework that is provided for them. The master schedule of each school is approached differently due to their specific needs. The Collaborative Teaching Project is

not a program, but a framework where all of these variables can work.

Administrators in this study were committed to support the change that was needed to implement the framework. Research says that school administrators must also support and encourage teachers to take risks with respect to the implementation of progressive instructional practices that showcase inclusion in their schools.(Carter, Prater, Jackson, & Marchant, 2009; Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2009).

Recommendations for Future Research

There are several recommendations for future research based on the results of this study. In this particular study there were many complexities and many variables that made it difficult to cover all variables or to narrow it down any one particular variable that made a sole significant difference. This is why the researcher chose to focus on the administrators within the framework of the Collaborative Teaching Project. As the researcher began to look at the different variables, it would be impossible to cover everything that could potentially make a difference within a collaborative teaching model. The impact of the model could be researched from the students' point of view. A longitudinal study would be important to find how successful the collaborative teaching model would be over years of participation. Scores of the students could be looked at over time. Another potential study surrounding this framework would be to study the teachers' perceptions of the model or their perceptions of the support that they receive from administrators.

This study was done at the beginning of the implementation of the Collaborative Teaching Project so answers to the questions presented in the interviews might be answered differently. A study could be done on how administrators' perceptions change

over time within this framework. The characteristics of teachers' personalities within successful co-teach pairings could be studied within this framework as well. Finding out what personality trait combinations make for good pairings could help administrators to pick good pairings for co-teachers. Finally, the perceptions of district personnel could be studied in relation to the framework.

Conclusion

The major purpose of this study is to examine the framework of the Collaborative Teaching Project (CTP) that one suburban school district implemented in order to facilitate co-teaching and gain the most benefit from their collaborative teaching model. This study found common themes in how the administrator can provide support for the collaborative teaching model at three different schools and how they perceive their roles in supporting collaborative practices. There were four main themes that emerged from this study that impacted the implementation of the collaborative teaching project: teacher characteristics, administrator characteristics, time and support through fidelity and framework.

While the co-teach model and inclusion is an answer to the stipulations of special education laws, there are far greater reaching effects to the inclusion model in that students with disabilities demonstrate improved academic achievement and social benefits overall when they have access to the general education curriculum in a co-teach setting (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger 2010; McLesky & Waldron, 2002; Walsh, 2011). Collaborative teaching provides special education students the access that they need to the general education curriculum. This study was designed to look at how administrators can improve their knowledge and practice as it relates to

supporting collaborative teaching. Ultimately, it should be the goal of administrators to make collaborative teaching a more common practice in K-12 education. Because of the growing need for the inclusion of special education students in the general education classroom, administrators could benefit from the framework of the Collaborative Teaching Project.

References

Ajuwon, P., Lechtenberger, D., Griffin-Shirley, N., Sokolosky, S., Li, Z., & Mullins, F. E. (2012). General education pre-service teachers perceptions of including students with disabilities in their classrooms. *International Journal of Special Education, 27*(3), 100-107.

Algozzine, R., & Ysseldyke, J. (2006). *The fundamentals of special education : a practical guide for every teacher*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Ali, M. M., Mustapha, R., & Jelas, Z. M. (2006). An empirical study on teachers' perceptions towards inclusive education in malaysia. *International Journal of Special Education, 21*(3), 36-44.

Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 17*(2), 86-95.

Artiles, A., & Kozleski, E. (2007). Focus on policy: Beyond convictions: Interrogating culture, history, and power in inclusive education. *Language Arts, 84*(4), 357-364.

Berg, B. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Berry, R. (2010). Preservice and early career teachers' attitudes toward inclusion, instructional accommodations, and fairness: Three profiles. *Teacher Educator*, 45, 75–95.

Billingsley, B. M. S. (2011). Supporting new special education teachers. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 43*(5), 20-29.

Backburn, B. R., & Witzel, B. S. (2013). Rigor for students with special needs.

Blanton, L. P., & Perez, Y. (2011). Exploring the Relationship Between Special Education Teachers and Professional Learning Communities. *Journal of Special Education Leadership, 24*(1), 6-16.

Bouck, E. (2007). Co-teaching…not just a textbook term: Implications for practice. *Preventing School Failure*, 51(2), 46-51.

Brantlinger, E. R. J. M. V. (2005). Qualitative Studies in Special Education. *Exceptional Children, 71*(2), 195-207.

Brownell, M.T., Adams, A., Sindelar, P., Waldron, N., & Vanhover, S. (2006). Learning from collaboration: The role of teacher qualities. *Exceptional Children*, 72(2), 169-185.

Bryant Davis, K. E. k. o. e., Dieker, L., Pearl, C., & Kirkpatrick, R. M. (2012). Planning in the middle: Co-planning between general and special education. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation, 22*(3), 208-226. doi: 10.1080/10474412.2012.706561

Cantrell, D. (2014). *Collaborative Teaching*. Katy Independent School District. Katy, TX.

Cantrell, S. C., & Hughes, H. K. (2008). Teacher efficacy and content literacy implementation: An exploration of the effects of extended professional development with coaching. *Journal of Literacy Research, 40*(1), 95-127. doi: 10.1080/10862960802070442

Carter, N., Prater, M., Jackson, A., & Marchant, M. (2009). Educators' perceptions of planning processes for students with disabilities. *Preventing School Failure, 54,* 60-72.

Causton-Theoharis, J., & Theoharis, G. (2009). Creating inclusive schools for all students. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 74*(6), 43-47.

Ceylan, R., & Aral, N. (2016). The opinions of classroom teachers and normally developing children on inclusive practice. *International Online Journal Of Educational Sciences, 8*(2), 12-22. doi:10.15345/iojes.2016.02.002

Cochran-Smith, M., & Dudley-Marling, C. (2012). Diversity in teacher education and special education: The issues that divide. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(4), 237-244. doi: 10.1177/0022487112446512

Cole, C., & McClesky, J. (1997). Secondary inclusion programs for students with mild disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 29*(6), 1-15.

Conderman, G., & Hedin, L. R. (2014). Co-teaching with strategy instruction. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 49*(3), 156-163. doi: 10.1177/1053451213496158

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. (cover story). *Focus on Exceptional Children, 28*(3), 1.

Crockett, J. B. (2002). Special education's role in preparing responsive leaders for inclusive schools. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(3), 157-168. doi: 10.1177/07419325020230030401

Crow, T. (2008). Courage, confidence, clarity mark the pathway to change. *Journal of Staff Development*, 29(4), 55-59.

Dieker, L., & Rodriguez, J. (2013). Enhancing secondary cotaught science and mathematics classrooms through collaboration. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 49*(1), 46-53. doi: 10.1177/1053451213480028

Dieker, L. A., & Murawski, W. W. (2003). Co-teaching at the secondary level: Unique issues, current trends, and suggestions for success. *High School Journal, 86*(4), 1-13. doi: 10.1353/hsj.2003.0007

Eckes, S., & Swando, J. (2009). Special education subgroups under NCLB: issues to consider. *Teachers College Record, 111*(11), 2479-2504.

Education, U. D. o. (1994). National study of inclusive education.

Embury, D., & Kroeger, S. (2012). Let's ask the kids: Consumer constructions of co-teaching. *International Journal of Special Education, 27*(3).

Eriks-Brophy, A., & Whittingham, J. (2013). Teachers' perceptions of the inclusion of children with hearing loss in general education settings. *American Annals of the Deaf, 158*(1), 63-97.

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(5), 813-828. doi: 10.1080/01411926.2010.501096

Ford, A., Davern, L., & Schnorr, R. (2001). Learners with significant exceptionalities. *Remedial & Special Education, 22*, 214-225.

Forlin, C., & Chambers, D. (2011). Teacher preparation for inclusive education: increasing knowledge but raising concerns. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(1), 17-32. doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2010.540850

Frattura, E., & Capper, C. (2007). *Leading for social justice: Transforming schools for all learners.* . Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Friend. (2007). The Coteaching Partnership. *Educational Leadership, 64*(5), 48-52.

Friend. (2008). Co-teaching: A simple solution that isn't so simple after all. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 2*(2), 9-19.

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 & Psychological Consultation, 20*(1), 9-27.

Gallucci, C., Van Lare, M. D., Yoon, I. H., & Boatright, B. (2010). Instructional coaching: Building theory about the role and organizational support for professional learning. *American Educational Research Journal, 47*(4), 919-963. doi: 10.3102/0002831210371497

Galluci, C., & Swanson, J. (2008). Aiming high: Leadership for distict-wide instructional improvement: A partnership between the Center for Educational Leadership and Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District, Interim research report and case summary. Seattle: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Grant, C., & Davenport, L. (2009). Principals in partnership with math coaches. *Principal*, 88(5), 36-41.

Griffin, C. C., Jones, H. A., & Kilgore, K. L. (2006). A qualitative study of student teachers' experiences with collaborative problem solving. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 29*(1), 44-55.

Hang, Q., & Rabren, K. (2009). An examination of co-teaching: Perspectives and efficacy indicators. *Remedial and Special Education, 30*(5), 259-268.

Hockenbury, J. C., Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan, D. P. (2000). What Is Right About Special Education. *Exceptionality, 8*(1), 3-11.

Idol, L. (1997). Key questions related to building collaborative and inclusive schools. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30(4), 384-394.

Idol, L. (2006, March/April). Toward inclusion of special education students in general education: A program evaluation of eight schools. *Remedial and SPecial Education 27,* 77-94.

Isherwood, R.S., & Barger-Anderson, R. (2007). Factors affecting the adoption of co-teaching models in inclusive classrooms: One school's journey from mainstreaming to inclusion. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research, 2,* 121-128.

Jang, S. (2006). Research on the effects of team teaching upon two secondary school teachers. *Educational Research*, 48(2), 177-194.

Keefe, E.B., Moore, V., & Duff, F. (2004). The four "knows" of collaborative teaming. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 36, 36-42.*

Killion, J. (2007). Web of support strengthens effectiveness of school-based coaches. *Journal of Staff Development*, 28(1), 10-12, 14-16, 18.

Knight, J. (2005). A primer on instructional coaches. *Principal Leadership*, 5(9), 16-21.

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional Coaching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kritikos, E.P. & Birnbaum, B. (2003). General education and special education teachers'
beliefs regarding collaboration. *Learning Disabilities*, 12(3), 93-100.

Laframboise, K. L., Epanchin, B., Colucci, K., & Hocutt, A. (2004). Working together:
Emerging roles of special and general education teachers in inclusive settings.
Action in Teacher Education, 26(3), 29-43.

Leatherman, J. (2009). Teachers' voices concerning collaborative teams within an
inclusive elementary school. *Teaching Education*, 20(2), 189-202.

Lee, Y., Patterson, P. P., & Vega, L. A. (2011). Perils to self-efficacy perceptions and
teacher-preparation quality among special education intern teachers. *Teacher
Education Quarterly, 38*(2), 61-76.

Loreman, T., Sharma, U., & Forlin, C. (2013). Do pre-service teachers feel ready to teach
in inclusive classrooms? A four country study of teaching self-efficacy.
Australian Journal Of Teacher Education, 38(1).

Madigan, J. C., & Schroth-Cavataio, G. (2011). Building collaborative partnerships.
Principal Leadership, 12(3), 26-30.

Magiera, K. & Zigmond, N. (2005). Co-teaching in middle-school classrooms under
routine conditions: Does the instructional experience differ for students with 316
disabilities in co-taught and solo-taught classes? *Learning Disabilities Research
& Practice*, 20(2), 79-85.

Marsh, J., Mccombs, J., Lockwood, J., Martorell, F., & Gershwin, D. (2009). "Supporting
literacy across the sunshine state: A study of Florida middle school reading
coaches". *Journal of Staff Development, 30*(1), 75-75.

Marsh, J., McCombs, J., Lockwood, J., Martorell, F., Gershwin, D., & Naftel, S. (2009). Supporting literacy across the sunshine state: A Study of Florida middle school reading coaches. *Journal of Staff Development, 30*(1), 75-75.

Marsh, J., Sloan McCombs, J., & Martorell, F. (2010). How Instructional Coaches Support Data-Driven Decision Making: Policy Implementation and Effects in Florida Middle Schools. *Educational Policy, 24*(6), 872-907. doi:10.1177/0895904809341467

Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., Graetz, J., Norland, J., Gardizi, W., & Mcduffie, K. (2005). Case Studies in Co-Teaching in the Content Areas: Successes, Failures, and Challenges. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 40*(5), 260-270. doi: 10.1177/10534512050400050201

Matsumura, L., Sartoris, M., Bickel, D., & Garnier, H. (2009). Leadership for literacy coaching: The principal's role in launching a new coaching program. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 45(5), 655-693.

McHatton, P. A., Boyer, N. R., Shaunessy, E., Terry, P. M., & Farmer, J. L. (2010). Principals' Perceptions of Preparation and Practice in Gifted and Special Education Content: Are We Doing Enough? *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 5*(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1177/194277511000500101

McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2002). School change and inclusive schools: Lessons learned from practice. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(1), 65.

National Center for Restructuring and Inclusion. (1995). *National study on inclusion: Overview and summary report.* New York: Author.

Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2002). Off to a good Start: Year I of collaborative coaching and learning in the effective practice schools.

Obiakor, F., Harris, M., Mutua, K., Rotatori, A., & Algozzine, B. (2012). Making inclusion work in general education classrooms. *Education & Treatment of Children (West Virginia University Press), 35*(3), 477-490.

Panscofar, N., & Petroff, J. (2013). Professional development experiences in co-teaching: Associations with teacher confidence, interests, and attitudes. *Teacher Education & Special Education, 36*(2), 83-96.

Paulsen, K.J. (2008). School-based collaboration: An introduction to the collaboration column. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 43(5), 313-315.

Pazey, B. L., & Cole, H. A. (2012). The role of special education training in the development of socially just leaders: Building an equity consciousness in educational leadership programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(2), 243-271. doi: 10.1177/0013161X12463934

Pazey, B. L., & Cole, H. A. (2013). The role of special education training in the development of socially just leaders: Building an equity consciousness in educational leadership programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(2), 243-271. doi: 10.1177/0013161x12463934

Powell, D., & Hyle, A. E. (1997). Principals and school reform: Barriers to inclusion in three secondary schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 7*(3), 301.

Researchers, H. (2012). The effectiveness of the co-teaching model: Literature review. Washington D.C.

Rice, D., & Zigmond, N. (2000). Co-teaching in secondary schools: Teachers reports and American classrooms. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 15*, 190-198.

Sailor, W., & Roger, B. (2005). Rethinking inclusion: Schoolwide applications. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(7), 503-509. doi: 10.2307/20441832

Santoli, S.P., Sachs, J., Romey, E.A., & McClurg, S. (2008). A successful formula for middle-school inclusion: collaboration, time, and administrative support. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, 32(2).

Salisbury, C., & McGregor, G. (2002). The administrative climate and context of inclusive elementary schools. *Exceptional Children,* 68, 259-270.

Scott, C., & Center on Education, P. (2008). A call to restructure restructuring: Lessons from the No Child Left Behind Act in five states: Center on Education Policy.

Scruggs, T., Mastropieri, M., & McDuffie, K. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children, 73*(4), 392-416.

Shanklin, N. L. (2007). What Supports Do Literacy Coaches Need from Administrators in Order to Succeed? : Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse.

Thorpe, A., & Shafiul Azam, A. Q. M. (2010). Teachers' Perceptions of Inclusive Education in Mainstream Primary Schools in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 5*(3), 163-172.

Thousand, J. S., Villa, R. A., & Nevin, A. I. (2006). The Many Faces of Collaborative Planning and Teaching. *Theory Into Practice, 45*(3), 239-248. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4503_6

Timmons, V. (2006). Impact of a multipronged approach to inclusion: Having all partners on side. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 10(4-5), 469-480.

Titone, C. (2005). The philosophy of inclusion: Roadblocks and remedies for the teacher and the teacher educator. Journal of Educational Thought, 39(1), 7–32.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202-248. doi: 10.2307/1170754

Van Garderen, E., Scheuermann, A., Jackson, C., & Hampton, D. (2009). Supporting the collaboration of special educators and general educators to teach students who struggle with mathematics: An overview of the research. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(1), 56-77.

Van Garderen, D. & Whittaker, C. (2007). Planning differentiated, multicultural instruction for secondary inclusive classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 38(4), 12-20.

Viel-Ruma, K., Houchins, D., Jolivette, K., & Benson, G. (2010). Efficacy beliefs of special educators: The relationships among collective efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. *Teacher Education & Special Education, 33*(3), 225-233. doi: 10.1177/0888406409360129

Wakeman, S. Y., Browder, D. M., Flowers, C., & Ahlgrim-Delzell, L. (2006). Principals' knowledge of fundamental and current issues in special education. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(2), 153-174. doi: 10.1177/0192636506288858

Waldron, N. L., McLeskey, J., & Redd, L. (2011). Setting the direction: The role of the principal in developing an effective, inclusive school. *Journal of Special Education Leadership, 24*(2), 51-60.

Walsh, J. (2012). Co-Teaching as a school system strategy for continuous improvement. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 6*(1), 29-36.

Wasburn-Moses, L. & Frager, A.M. (2009). Point-counterpoint: Can special education and general education get along? *The Educational Forum*, 73(3), 215-228.

Weiner, I., & Murawski, W. W. (2005). Schools attuned: A model for collaborative intervention. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 40*(5), 284-290. doi: 10.1177/10534512050400050501

Weiss, M.P., & Lloyd, J. (2003). Conditions for co-teaching: Lessons from a case study. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 26, 27-41.*

Weiss, M. P., & Wills, L. J. (2002). Congruence between roles and actions of secondary special educators in co-taught and special education settings. *Journal of Special Education, 36*(2), 58.

Williamson, R., & Education Partnerships, I. (2012). Coaching Teachers: An Important Principal Role. Research into Practice: Education Partnerships, Inc.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.): Sage, Inc.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

APPENDIX A

Interview Protocol for Administrator on Collaborative Team

Prior to your training of collaborative teaching, given by the district, what was your knowledge of facilitating collaborative teaching as an administrator?

What do you think the teachers feel about inclusion? Will that help or become a barrier to your role and/or the successful implementation of this program, and why?

Tell me about the need for inclusion on your campus.

Tell me how you are included in facilitating inclusion on your campus.

How will you go forward with helping to facilitate the co-teach model on your campus?

How will you work with the members of your team to be a support system for your co-teach teams?

How do you feel that the training that you were provided helps or is sufficient for facilitation of collaborative teaching on your campus?

What revelations did you have about collaborative teaching once you were trained?

What is your comfort level of having a team made up of an instructional coach, administrator, ESL representative and SPED representative that will be responsible for training and maintain the co-teach model on your campus?

How will you as the campus principal monitor and facilitate collaborative teaching on your campus?

What is your prior knowledge of collaborative teaching before the district presented you with the program to be done in your school?

Your feeder school(s) will be involved in the same collaborative teaching project, how do you feel this will help your campus?

What do you expect of your collaborative team?

How will you measure the progress in your co-teach teams?

How will you evaluate the program?

What changes would you make to the training and program?

What were the positives of the training?

APPENDIX B

ELEMENTARY SPECIAL EDUCATION MASTER SCHEDULE

APPENDIX B

Elementary Special Education Master Schedule

Time	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3			
8:30-8:45	4th gr Math 5 students	2nd gr ELA 5 students	1st gr ELA 3 students			
8:45-9:00	↓	↓	↓			
9:00 – 9:15	↓	↓	↓			
9:15-9:30	↓	↓	↓			
9:30-9:45	Planning	↓	↓			
9:45-10:00	↓	↓	↓			
10:00-10:15	↓	↓	1st gr ELA 4 students			
10:15-10:30	↓	↓	↓			
10:30-10:45	4th gr ELA 2 students	AE 3 students	1st gr Recess 1 student			
10:45-11:00	↓	↓	↓			
11:00-11:15	↓	↓	Teacher Lunch			
11:15-11:30	5th gr Math 7 students	↓	↓			
11:30-11:45	↓	Teacher Lunch	RESOURCE 3 students			
11:45-12:00	5th gr Science 7 students	↓	↓			
12:00-12:15	↓	Lunch/Recess 2 students	↓			
12:15-12:30	↓	↓	↓			
12:30-12:45	5th gr ELA 7 students	Planning	1st gr Math 3 students			
12:45-1:00	↓	↓	↓			
1:00-1:15	Teacher Lunch	↓	↓			
1:15-1:30	↓	3rd gr Math 2 students	↓			
1:30-1:45	5th gr ELA 7 students	↓	Planning			
1:45-2:00	↓	↓	↓			
2:00:2:15	↓	3rd gr ELA/S.St 6 students	↓			
2:15-2:30	↓	↓	↓			
2:30-3:30	5th Social Studies 7 students	↓	4th Math/Sci. 3 students			

APPENDIX C

JUNIOR HIGH EDUCATION SPECIAL EDUCATION MASTER SCHEDULE

APPENDIX C

Junior High Special Education Master Schedule

Co-Teach	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Teacher 1 A14	Conference	6th Resource English	6th Resource Reading	8th Resource ELA	7th Resource Reading	7th Resource English	Advisory No Students	FND ELA Elective 6th, 7th, 8
Teacher 2 A03	D.C Duty	7th Co-Teach C06	Conference	7th Resource Math	8th Resource Math 7L	6th Resource Math	Advisory No Students	FND Math Elective 6th, 7th, 8th
Teacher 3 A09	6th Science B17	8th Science B15	7th Science B11	7th Math C06	8th Math B06 7L	6th Math Evans A06	Advisory	Conference
Teacher 4 A09	Conference	6th ELA Wright A13	6th ELA Wright A13	7th Science Tristan B11	7th Reading Richie C11	8th S.S Pisciola B26	Advisory	Athletics
Teacher 5 A09	7th S.S C15	Conference	8th S.S B23	8th English B24	6th S.S 7L	7th English C07	Advisory	7th S.S C17
Teacher 6 A01	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	Advisory	PASS

APPENDIX D

HIGH SCHOOL SPECIAL EDUCATION CO-TEACH SCHEDULE

APPENDIX D

High School Special Education Co-teach Schedule

TEACHER									
Teacher 1	GOVERNMENT F216	U S HISTORY F215	U S HISTORY F215	ATHLETICS <---------->	ATHLETICS	LUNCH	ECO F222	CONFERENCE	ATHLETICS
Teacher 2	W GEO S332	W GEO S332	W HISTORY F212	ATHLETICS <---------->	ATHLETICS	W GEOGRAPHY S332	LUNCH	CONFERENCE	ATHLETICS
Teacher 3	ATHLETICS	CONFERENCE	ALGEBRA 1 S400	BIO - S420 <---------->	LUNCH	BIOLOGY S420	BIOLOGY S411	ALGEBRA 1 S400	ATHLETICS
Teacher 4	IPC G210	BIOLOGY S411	CONFERENCE	ATHLETICS <---------->	ATHLETICS	LUNCH	IPC G210	BIOLOGY S424	ATHLETICS
Teacher 5	W HISTORY F212	W HISTORY F212	W HISTORY F211	W.HIST-F211 <---------->	W HISTORY F211	LUNCH	U S HISTORY F215	CONFERENCE	W GEO S314
Teacher 6	U S HISTORY F218	ENGLISH 4 E206	ALGEBRA 1 S414	U.S.HIST-F218 <---------->	LUNCH	U S HISTORY F218	CONFERENCE	ALGEBRA 1 S414	U S HISTORY F218
Teacher 7	ATHLETICS	IPC H207	CONFERENCE	BIO - S415 <---------->	BIOLOGY S415	ATHLETICS	LUNCH	IPC G210	IPC G207
Teacher 8	ENGLISH 3 E217	BIOLOGY S422	CONFERENCE	ATHLETICS <---------->	ATHLETICS	LUNCH	ENGLISH 1 S425	ENGLISH 2 E216	ATHLETICS
Teacher 9	ALGEBRA 1 S404	CONFERENCE	MATH MOD H210	ALG1 - S404 <---------->	LUNCH	ALGEBRA 1 S404	MATH MOD H210	GEIOMETRY F202	MATH MOD H210
Teacher 10	ENGLISH 1 S203	ENGLISH 1 S203	ENGLISH 2 E214	CONFERENCE <---------->	CONFERENCE	LUNCH	ENGLISH 3 E219	ENGLISH 3 E219	ENGLISH 3 E219

APPENDIX E

COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF
HUMAN SUBJECTS FORM

University
of Houston
Clear Lake

COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
Faculty/Sponsor Application for Investigation Involving Human Subjects
2700 Bay Area Blvd.   281.283.3015   FAX 281.283.2143
Houston, TX 77058-1098   uhcl.edu/research

DATE:	**9-17-2015**
TITLE:	Using a Framework for Collaborative Teaching: How the Constructs of the Framework Impact Administrators' Attitudes and Practices Regarding Inclusion
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S):	
STUDENT RESEARCHER(S):	**Melinda Stone**
FACULTY SPONSOR:	**Dr. Sandra Browning**
PROPOSED PROJECT END DATE:	**December 2015**

All applicants are to review and understand the responsibilities for abiding by provisions stated in the UHCL's Federal-wide Assurance (FWA 00004068), approved by the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) on March 9, 2004: (a) The Belmont Report provides ethical principles to follow in human subject research; and (b) Federal regulations 45 CFR 46 and all of its subparts A, B, C, and D are the minimum standards applied to all of UHCL's human subject research.
See http://www.uhcl.edu/research -- **Protection of Human Subjects, Federal-wide Assurance.**

For questions, contact the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) at 281-283-3015 or sponsoredprograms@uhcl.edu

Principal Investigator (PI) / Faculty Sponsor (FS) Responsibilities Regarding Research on Human Subjects:

- PI / FS acknowledges reviewing UHCL's FWA (Federal-wide Assurance) (FWA #00004068) approved by the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP). PI / FS understands the responsibilities for abiding by provisions of the Assurance.
- The PI / FS cannot initiate any contact with human subjects until final approval is given by CPHS.
- Additions, changes or issues relating to the use of human subjects after the project has begun must be submitted for CPHS review as an amendment and approved PRIOR to implementing the change.
- If the study continues for a period longer than one year, a continuing review must be submitted PRIOR to the anniversary date of the studies approval date.
- PI / FS asserts that information contained in this application for human subjects' assessment is complete, true and accurate.

- PI / FS agrees to provide adequate supervision to ensure that the rights and welfare of human subjects are properly maintained.
- Faculty Sponsors are responsible for student research conducted under their supervision. Faculty Sponsors are to retain research data and informed consent forms for three years after project ends.
- PI / FS acknowledges the responsibility to secure the informed consent of the subjects by explaining the procedures, in so far as possible, and by describing the risks and potential benefits of the project.
- PI / FS assures CPHS that all procedures performed in this project will be conducted in accordance with all federal regulations and university policies which govern research with human subjects.

A.   DATA COLLECTION DATES:

1. From:	October 1, 2015
2. To:	December 17, 2015
3. Project End Date:	December 17, 2015

B.   HUMAN SUBJECTS DESCRIPTION:

1. Age range:	30 - 54
2. Approx. number:	6
3. % Male:	60
4. % Female:	40

C.   PROJECT SUMMARY:

Complete application using commonly understood terminology.

1. **Background and Significance**

Provide a **CONCISE** rationale for this project, based on current literature, information, or data. Include references as appropriate.

The major purpose of this study is to examine the framework of the Collaborative Teaching Project (CTP) that one suburban school district implemented in order to facilitate co-teaching and gain the most benefit from their collaborative teaching model. In addition, the study will also specifically examine the administrator's role in the framework of this project as well as their perceptions of practice and perceptions of the model itself on their campus once they have been trained and their action plan has been put into place. Finally, the study will provide a description of the model itself and offer administrative insight to the effectiveness of the project as it relates to the administrator's role in the special education co-teach model at each of their schools. The researcher for this study was a student support administrator for three years at a junior high campus, and that campus is part of the study. Many teachers shared through interactions with her that they felt unprepared and marginalized in the classroom due to a lack of proper training for both general education teachers and special education teachers within that co-teach model. The focus of co-teaching is to provide students equal access to the full scope of the curriculum including those who qualify for an alternative assessment (Friend, 2011). It is the intention of the researcher to explore, within the context of the Collaborative Teaching project, if and how administrators change their practices through active participation within a collaborative team and subsequently, then train their co-teachers how to properly and effectively implement the co-teach model.

2. Specific Aims

Purpose, Hypotheses/Research Questions, Goals of the Project. **BRIEFLY** describe the purpose and goals of the project (include hypotheses or research questions to be addressed and the specific objectives or aims of the project. Describe or define terms or methods as needed for CPHS reviewer's understanding.

The purpose of the study is to examine the administrator's role in the CTP framework of this project as well as their perceptions of practice and perceptions of the model itself on their campus once they have been trained and their action plan has been put into place.

Research Questions:

3. How does active participation in collaborative teaming help the administrator provide support for the collaborative teaching model in the special education classroom?
4. How do administrators perceptions of collaborative teaching change throughout the project?
5. How do administrators perceive their role in supporting collaborative practices and their effectiveness?

3. Research Method, Design and Procedures

(A) Provide an overview of research methodology and design; e.g., how the data are to be collected, analyzed, and interpreted.

(B) Provide step-by-step description of procedures and how they are to be applied. Procedures are to begin from CPHS approval and end when data compiled and results reported. Possible information to include: What are participants asked to do? When and where are they to participate? How long will it take to participate? Describe type of research information gathered from participants, i.e., data being collected.

Note that ethical responsibility of researcher to participant does not end until participant's information has been destroyed. Research documentation cannot be destroyed for up to three years after completion of a study.

> It is a qualitative research study that will use a case study design. Interviews will be conducted and audio recorded. The qualitative data will be analyzed using the constant comparative method. All of the data will be closely analyzed for constructs, themes and patterns. Open and axial coding will be used. This researcher will code and classify main categories that evolve from the data collection after the interviews. All sources of data will be triangulated for patterns and will be examined for themes that evolve from the data. Coding will be separated into categories which will be determined once the data have been analyzed for emerging themes. To validate the data, member checking will be used once the data have been loosely analyzed and peer debriefers will be utilized as well to ensure validity of themes identified.
>
> 1) CPHS Approval will be obtained
> 2) IRB Approval from district will be obtained
> 3) Interviews will be conducted with 6 principals in the district
> 4) Interviews are recorded and analyzed.
> 5) Interviews will be conducted from October to December
> 6) Data will be analyzed and coded from the themes that emerge.

4. Instruments for Research with Human Subject

Indicate instruments to be used.

(A) Submit copies electronically, if possible.

(B) Submit copy of copyrighted questionnaire for CPHS review. Copy kept on file by CPHS.

(C) Examples of instruments are as follows: (1) Educational Tests, (2) Questionnaires/Surveys, (3) Psychological Tests, (4) Educational Materials, i.e., curriculum, books, etc., (5) Interview or Phone Script, or (6) human subjects recruitment advertisements.

> Interview Protocol - *see attached

5. Human Subject Source and Selection Criteria

Describe the procedures for the recruitment of the participants. Indicate when human subject involvement is expected to begin and end in this project. Example information to include:

(A) Characteristics of subject population, such as anticipated number, age, sex, ethnic background,   and state of health.

(B) Where and how participants are drawn for subject selection criteria. Coercion or undue influence needs to be considered and eliminated.

(C) How ensuring equitable subject selection.

(D) If applicable, criteria for inclusion and/or exclusion and provide rationale.

(E) Children are classified as a vulnerable population. See Subpart D, §46.401, of federal   guidelines for additional safeguards aimed to protect the rights and welfare of these subjects.

A) There are 6 participants (principals and assistant principals) all with varying backgrounds when it comes to ethnicity, gender and race. They are all part of the Collaborative Teaching Project for their district.

B) These participants were chosen because they are part of the Collaborative Teaching Project which is what is being studied.

C) All of the participants were also chosen because of the feeder pattern that their schools are in – the elementary school students feed in to the junior high that feeds in to the high school.

D) There are no children involved in this study

---

6. **Informed Consent**

For more details, see "Federal & University Guidelines" document, "Informed Consent" section.

(A) Describe procedure for obtaining informed consent.

(B) Use language that is appropriate for age or understandability of subjects.

(C) Attach informed consent page.

(D) If applicable, attach the following documents for review: (1) Parental permission form for participation of minors (under 18 years of age). (2) Assent form for children between ages 7 and 17: (2a) ages 12-17 must sign assent form; (2b) ages 7-11 must have witness sign attesting to child's positive assent.

(E) **Request CPHS waiver for documentation of informed consent, if appropriate**. Justification is required. See "Federal & University Guidelines."

A project information sheet will be given to the participants along with a consent form *see attached

7. **Confidentiality**

Describe how data will be safeguarded: (a) how confidentiality maintained; use of personal identifiers or coded data; (b) how data collected and recorded; (c) how data stored during project; (d) who has access to data or participant's identifiers; (e) who is to receive data, if applicable; (f) what happens to data after research is completed.

Note that research documentation, including signed informed consent forms, are safeguarded for three years after completion of study for federal audit purposes. Faculty sponsors are responsible for safeguarding research documentation completed by students.

To protect the confidentiality of the participants in the study, the researcher will meet individually with each of the selected participants during the explanatory phase to discuss all aspects of the study and to assure them that they will remain anonymous. Pseudonyms will be used when discussing each individual response. The participants will be allowed to leave the study at any time. Permission will be gained through the district so that all parties involved know about the study. Currently, the researcher is the associate principal at one of the seven high schools located in the district that is being studied. Interviews will be recorded and kept by the researcher and the methodologist. The methodologist will keep data once the research is complete.

8. **Research Benefits**

Describe any anticipated benefits to subjects as well as reasonably expected general results.

The benefit of this research will be to see how this project helps to enhance schools' co-teaching programs. Specifically it could show that administrators need more training when it comes to special education and the co-teach model. It is anticipated that this project will help with administrators' knowledge in regards to the co-teach model and how to support their school in regards to this.

9. **Risks**

Describe any foreseeable risks to the subjects, whether physical injury, psychological injury, loss of confidentiality, social harm, etc., involved in the conduct of the research. Explain precautions taken to minimize these risks. If there are any foreseeable risks, provide contact information of organization(s) for professional treatment.

There are no foreseeable risks to the subjects

10. Other Sites or Agencies Involved in Research Project

Indicate specific site if not UHCL, e.g., school districts or school, clinics.

(A) Obtain written approval from institution. Approval should be signed and on institution's letterhead. Other proof of documentation may be reviewed for acceptance by CPHS.

(B) Institution should include the following information: (B1) institution's knowledge of study being conducted on its site; (B2) statement about what research study involves; (B3) outline specific procedures to be conducted at site; and (B4) identify type of instrument(s) used to collect data and duration needed to complete instruments; (B5) statement that identities of institution and participants will be kept confidential; (B6) institution's permission granting the use of its facilities or resources; and (B7) include copy of Informed Consent document(s) to be used in recruiting volunteers from the institution.

(C) If at all possible, electronic copies of letter or other documentation are to be submitted with CPHS application.

(D) If letters are not available at time of CPHS review, approval will be contingent upon their receipt.

IRB Approval has been submitted to district but I have not received anything back as of yet.

APPENDIX F

PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX F

Project Information Sheet for Participants

Using a Framework for Collaborative Teaching: How the Constructs of the Framework

Impact Administrators' Attitudes and Practices Regarding Inclusion

The major purpose of this study is to examine the framework of the Collaborative

Teaching Project (CTP) that one suburban school district implemented in order to

facilitate co-teaching and gain the most benefit from their collaborative teaching model.

The goal of CPT is to have a common language and a common practice that all

stakeholders can use when examining their current practices in the special education co-

teach classroom. In addition, the study will also specifically examine the administrator's

role in the framework of this project as well as their perceptions of practice and

perceptions of the model itself on their campus once they have been trained and their

action plan has been put into place. The goal of the project is to have a common language

and common practice that all stakeholders can use when examining current practices in

the special education co-teach classroom and provide the support that schools need in

order to sustain a successful co-teach program. Finally, the study will provide a

description of the model itself and offer administrative insight to the effectiveness of the

project as it relates to the administrator's role in the special education co-teach model at

each of their schools.

You and your school are a participant in this project and you are being asked to be

interviewed for this project. Please contact Melinda Stone at ▬▬▬▬▬▬▬ if you have

any further questions about the project. Please sign the attached consent form if you would like to participate in this project. Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX G

CONSENT FORM

APPENDIX G

CONSENT FORM

Project Title:: Using a Framework for Collaborative Teaching: How the Constructs of the Framework

Impact Administrators' Attitudes and Practices Regarding Inclusion

Name of Researcher: Melinda Stone, Associate Principal, Katy High School

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.

3. I agree to take part in the above study.

Please initial box

Yes   No

4. I agree to the interview being audio recorded

5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications

6. I agree that my data gathered in this study may be stored (after it has been anonymised) in a specialist data centre and may be used for future research.

_____   _____   _____

Name of Participant   Date   Signature

_____   _____   _____

Name of Researcher   Date   Signature