

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-8-2000

An evaluation of the major barriers/limitations of collaborative teaching in the middle school inclusive setting

Lisa Barcklow
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barcklow, Lisa, "An evaluation of the major barriers/limitations of collaborative teaching in the middle school inclusive setting" (2000). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1629.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1629>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

**AN EVALUATION OF THE MAJOR BARRIERS/LIMITATIONS
OF COLLABORATIVE TEACHING IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOL
INCLUSIVE SETTING**

by
Lisa Barcklow

A Thesis Project

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree in Learning Disabilities
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
December 1999**

Approved by _____
Dr. Stanley Urban, Ph.D., Professor

Date Approved May 8, 2000

ABSTRACT

Lisa Barcklow

AN EVALUATION OF THE MAJOR BARRIERS/LIMITATIONS OF COLLABORATIVE TEACHING IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOL INCLUSIVE SETTING

1999

Dr. Stanley Urban

Seminar in Learning Disabilities

Graduate Division of Rowan University

The purpose of this study was to identify the major barriers/limitations of collaborative teaching in the middle school inclusive setting and assist teachers and administrators in developing effective strategies to enhance successful collaborative teaching efforts. Professional educators working in a collaborative inclusive middle school setting were selected through the district of Gloucester Township. Regular education teachers and special education teachers were asked to respond to questions addressing the necessary elements needed for effective collaboration

To accomplish the general purpose of this study, questions focused on the following factors: 1) the elements necessary for successful collaborative teaching, 2) areas in collaborative teaching that are successful and areas that are in need of improvement, 3) the concerns/issues related to working teaching relationships. Professional educators working in a collaborative inclusive setting were surveyed. Data was collected and calculated by completing averages and percentages for each question asked. Each section was then analyzed to determine what the barriers/limitations to collaborative teaching.

The following conclusions were drawn from this study. Teachers identified some of the major barriers/limitations to collaborative teaching as followed: insufficient planning time, teacher's attitudes and resistance to co-teaching, difficulty in

determining specific roles and responsibilities, contact with parents, measuring the success of the program, common willingness to participate, and difficulty with problem solving and conflict management.

MINI-ABSTRACT

Lisa Barcklow

AN EVALUATION OF THE MAJOR BARRIERS/LIMITATIONS OF COLLECTIVE TEACHING IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOL INCLUSIVE SETTING

1999

Dr. Stanley Urban

Seminar in Learning Disabilities

Graduate Division of Rowan University

In compliance with providing the least restrictive environment, there is increasing expectations that students with disabilities be educated in classrooms with their nondisabled peers. As a service delivery option in special education, regular education teachers and special education teachers are now merging together to meet the students' needs in the general education settings. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to identify the major barriers/limitations of collaborative teaching in the middle school inclusive setting and assist teachers and administrators in developing effective strategies to enhance successful collaborative efforts.

The findings indicated that the most common concern was the issue of ample planning time. Teacher's attitudes and resistance to co-teaching was another concern reported. In addition, teacher's had difficulty in determining their specific roles and responsibilities, contacting the parents, measuring the success of the program, common willingness to participate, and lastly, difficulty with problem solving and conflict management.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgement.....	iii
Chapter I: Introduction	
Background.....	1
Need for the Study.....	1
Value of the Study.....	2
Purpose of the Study.....	2
Research Questions.....	3
Definition of Terms	3
Chapter II: Review of Literature	
Review of Literature.....	6
Chapter III: Design of Study	
Method of Sample Selection.....	11
Instrumentation.....	11
Pilot Study.....	12
Collection of Data.....	12
Chapter IV: Analysis and Interpretation of Data	
Introduction.....	14
Table 1 Results of Regular Education Teachers.....	14
Discussion.....	16
Table 2 Results of Regular Education Teachers.....	17
Discussion.....	18
Type of Training.....	19
Most Prevalent Inhibitors to Collaborative Teaching.....	19
Discussion.....	19
Table 3 Results of Special Education Teachers.....	20
Discussion.....	21
Table 4 Results of Special Education Teachers.....	22
Discussion.....	23
Type of Training.....	23
Most Prevalent Inhibitors to Collaborative Teaching.....	24
Discussion.....	24

Chapter V: Summary, Findings, and Conclusions	
Summary	25
Findings/Conclusion	25
Discussion	26
Appendixes	
I. Appendix A	28
II. Appendix B	35
III. Appendix C	44
Bibliography	48

Acknowledgement

To my husband, David, whose support and love every night made the difference. Thank you for always being there to comfort and console me through those endless nights of worrying. Your encouragement and confidence brought me through. Your prayers and love will never be forgotten.

But ultimately, I want to thank my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for giving me the ability to accomplish this work. It was only through Him and the confidence He gave me each day that resulted in the completion of this study. To Him I am forever grateful.

Chapter I

Introduction

Background:

In 1975, President Ford signed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) into law. Prior to its passage more than one million children with disabilities were excluded from the public schools. Primary purpose of the IDEA was to provide students with disabilities a “free, appropriate public education”. In addition, it was an effort to end the isolation of students with disabilities by requiring to the maximum extent appropriate that they be educated with students who were not disabled.

In the 1980’s, a new phase of special education referred to as full inclusion began to take form, and is currently one of the most controversial topics in education. Traditionally, school systems focused on establishing self-contained, remedial, and pull-out programs to service students with disabilities. However, emerging recently is a new service delivery model known as the inclusive movement. More and more teachers are participating in an inclusive setting where special and general education teachers work in constructive and coordinated ways. This is an attempt to merge regular and special education so those students with disabilities can be educated in classrooms with their nondisabled peers.

Need for the Study:

With more and more school programs embracing inclusive schooling practices, there is an increased need for collaboration between general and special educators to work together toward commonly defined goals. Having time and energy to jointly plan, engage in problem solving, and monitor student performance can be among the many challenges teachers’ face as they work in collaborative teams. Teachers are confronted with developing new roles and relationships as they work together. As the shift from the single-teacher approach moves towards the collaborative model, certain

barriers tend to arise that inhibit successful development of teaching relationships. In an attempt to shed some light on the major barriers to effective collaboration, this study will assist teachers and administrators in developing effective strategies to enhance the inclusive classroom.

Collaborative teaching encompasses a wide range of educational processes. It includes assessing student areas of strength and weaknesses and determining appropriate educational goals. Educators in the inclusive setting need to design and implement intervention strategies, and most importantly, take time to evaluate students' performance. To be effective, classroom teachers must adjust to additional responsibilities by establishing new roles, developing new competencies, and becoming knowledgeable in the process and method of working in an inclusive setting (Autin, 1999). Most importantly, collaborative teachers must learn to work together laying aside the differences they might have and meet the individual needs of the inclusive classroom.

Value of the Study:

This study will be a valuable source of information to the schools nationwide who are not yet participating in the inclusive movement and to those who are currently involved. By presenting a realistic picture of the difficulties and pitfalls that accompany collaborative efforts in the inclusive setting, it is the hope that teachers and administrators can develop strategies to delineate the possible obstacles that may arise later.

Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of this study is to attempt to explicate the major barriers/limitations of collaborative teaching in the middle school inclusive setting and ultimately conclude with recommendations to improve successful co-teaching efforts. It is important to investigate these difficulties facing collaborative teaching so that changes can be made in the future to ease the facilitation of the inclusive setting.

Research Questions:

To accomplish the general purpose of this study, the data obtained is used to answer the following research questions. The overall general question of this study is as follows:

What are the major barriers/limitations to effective collaboration in the inclusive classroom?

In order to answer this general question, each of the following sub questions will be answered:

- 1. What are the elements necessary for successful collaborative teaching?**
- 2. What are some of the areas in collaborative teaching that are successful and what areas are in need of improvement?**
- 3. What are the concerns/issues of general education teachers and special education teachers when it comes to working collaboratively?**

Definition of Terms:

- **Collaborative teaching**- This is a joint teaching model in which the general and special education teacher share planning, teaching and evaluation within the mainstream setting (Stump & Wilson, 1996).
- **Collaboration**- The style for direct interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal (Stump & Wilson, 1996).
- **Inclusion**- Studies reveal that the term 'inclusion' has been defined in many different ways. Generally, it is considered the practice of providing a student with disabilities an education in the regular classroom. In this paper, the term inclusion refers to students with disabilities being education in an inclusive setting with two teachers working together to provide instruction. It involves bringing the appropriate support services to the child, rather than moving the child to the services. The special and regular education teachers

work as a team to make the necessary accommodations and modifications for each special education student. According IDEA Regulations, if a student's presence in a particular classroom would significantly impair the education of other students (whether disruptive behavior or requiring too much time from the teacher) then inclusion would not be appropriate (York, 1993).

- **Co-teaching or Collaborative Model** – This is where the special educator becomes part of the regular education class. Co-teaching and collaborative model is a widely practiced method for promoting successful inclusion of students with mild learning and behavioral disabilities (Laycock, Gable, & Korinek, 1991).
- **In-Class Support Teacher**- title given to inclusion teachers in the district of Gloucester Township.
- **Team Teaching** – consists of two or more teachers sharing, to some degree, responsibility for a group of students (Wenger, 1999) (team teaching and co-teacher are two words that are used interchangeable).
- **Mainstream** – This term is used to describe students with disabilities being included into the regular education classroom for part of the day or in other specialty areas. However, primary instruction is provided in a special education classroom (Turnbull, 1995).
- **Least Restrictive Environment** – legal principle requiring students with disabilities to be educated as closely as possible with students without disabilities (Gantwerk, 1999).
- **Regular Class** – an educator who follows the general education curriculum and meets the needs of all students who are capable of being mainstreamed with minimal modifications.
- **General/Regular Education Teacher** – A teacher who follows the existing curriculum and content of the general education program (Brockett, 1995.)
- **Special Education Teacher** – A teacher responsible for implementing modifications and accommodations to the existing curriculum and to design

provide effective instruction to meet the educational needs of students with disabilities (Brockett, 1995).

Chapter II

Review of Literature

On June 4, 1997, crowds of people gathered at the White House to witness President Clinton signing the reauthorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The IDEA promotes changing the specific nature and practice of education in general and not just redefining education called “special”. Too often in the past, students with disabilities were provided access to educational settings that were separate special education classes, despite the 1975 law’s “least restrictive environment” (LRE) mandate. This mandate required that “students with disabilities be educated to the maximum extent with children who were not disabled, and that students with disabilities be removed from regular classes only when they could not be educated in a regular setting with supplementary aids and support services” (Lipsky & Gartner, 1997). After more than two decades, the United States Department of Education reports that 71 percent of students with disabilities, having been served through IDEA in the 1995-96 school year, were not fully included in regular classroom (U.S. Department of Education, 1997).

Research findings conclude that by providing a separate system of education, students with disabilities were receiving a disservice by not being included in general education environment and the accepted curriculum and expectations that apply to other students (Yell, 1998). There is no statistical information that proves students with disabilities do significantly or mildly better in pull-out programs as oppose to remaining in the regular classroom. Often students in special education are faced with lower expectations and are socially isolated from their nondisabled peers. As a result, the concept of integration and inclusion are now practiced as the formal educational policy or encouraged in state rules and regulations. This model of education supports several principals:

- Students are more alike than different.

- Result of student outcomes is better when schools educate a wide range of students together and not separate.
- Separation results in limited outcomes for students with disabilities

(Lipsky & Gartner, 1997)

This recent restructuring of education reinforces the view that inclusion is the best way to educate students with disabilities. What exactly is inclusion though? Many educators argue over the definition of inclusion. What does the law really say about including students with disabilities in general education classrooms? Even though the term inclusion does not appear in the law, the concept is very similar to what is known to educators and lawmakers as the “least restrictive environment”.

According to the IDEA, school districts are required to educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. The first part of the LRE principle requires that students with disabilities be educated as closely as possible with their nondisabled peers. The second part states that students may be educated in more restrictive settings if their individual needs can not be properly met in the regular classroom. Furthermore, “if a student’s presence in a particular setting would significantly impair the education of other students, whether disruptive behavior or by requiring an inordinate amount of the teacher’s time, then that specific setting would not be appropriate” (IDEA Regulations, 34 C.F.R. 300.552, comment).

According to the law, the general education classroom is considered the least restrictive environment and is examined as the first option when placing students. A decision to place students in an educational setting such as special classes or private schooling is considered more restrictive than a regular class. “The less an educational setting resembles the general education environment, the more restrictive it is considered under the law” (Gorn, 1997).

When making decisions regarding regular classroom placement, determination must be based upon the student’s Individual Education Program (IEP). The IEP specifies an individualized educational plan that includes the appropriate services and modifications necessary for a particular student. In accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:14-

4.2(a)5, placement must be made based upon these individual needs. Primarily, questions should be tailored to what educational services are required, and then a decision regarding placement should be made (Yell, 1998). If the general education classroom is the appropriate setting, then inclusion is generally required (Gorn, 1997).

In order to integrate students with disabilities into the regular classroom setting, a model of collaboration between general and special educators must be designed and implemented for successful program. This model may be referred to as collaborative teaching, cooperative teaching, team teaching, co-teaching, and inclusion (Stump & Wilson). All of these terms are used to describe the process by which integrated instructional procedures are provided by joint efforts of the general and special education teachers.

In reviewing the literature, there were many studies indicating that certain elements are necessary for effective collaborative to take place. For example, teachers must first have a clear understanding of their respective roles and share similar behavior management techniques. Common planning time is an essential element necessary in preparing for shared teaching responsibilities. The ability to communicate openly is associated with successful collaboration. The need for administrative support is crucial for resolving conflicts or difficulties in developing cooperative working relationships. Furthermore, both general and special education teachers must have a common willingness to participate as team members. These and other considerations need to be addressed prior to collaborative teaching. (Hines, 1994)

For many educators, understanding their specific roles in an inclusive setting has been an ongoing problem. For a long time, professionals have been trained to operate in isolation. For the general education teacher, opening the classroom to another person can be difficult task and may cause much tension. In addition, the special education teachers may feel uncomfortable coming into the regular classroom and identifying with their particular position. A recent study evaluating two teachers' feeling about working collaboratively undoubtedly expressed feelings of uncertainty as they begin to

develop new roles and relationships (Salen, Johansen, Mumper, Chase, Pike & Dorney, 1997).

In nearly all the studies, common planning time for teachers to interact professionally has been emphasized as a critical factor in successful collaboration. By allowing teachers common planning time, preparation for shared teaching responsibilities is established. In addition, teachers can evaluate the inclusive program, collectively access students' performance, and identify potential problems or misunderstanding in advance. Studies indicate that lack of planning and evaluation time has been reported as one of the pitfalls to collaboration teaching (Nowacek, 1992). Educators are faced with questions concerning when and how to find time to plan with co-teachers and how to manage additional responsibilities related to their position.

Research indicates that professional preparation is imperative for successful collaborative efforts (Friend & Cook, 1996). Teachers will need to develop additional communication skills, instructional strategies, and collaborative planning. For the general education teacher, they will need to learn more about modifications and positive behavioral support strategies regarding students with disabilities. On the other hand, the special education teacher will need to gain knowledge in the content area of the general education curriculum. In order to help build and maintain positive working relationships, it is important that professionals prepare prior to implementing inclusion.

Recent literature indicated that some teachers report that planning to work with another teacher is the hardest part of planning for inclusion (Roach1995). Many teachers report that inclusion can be successful in those schools that allow them to be an integral part in the planning process and in making choices of whether or not to work collaboratively. Therefore, in order to develop successful working relationships, administrators should be cautious in making decision regarding who should work collaboratively. Administrators must reflect on the notion that not everyone is able to co-teach. Forcing educators to co-teach becomes a major roadblock in designing programs and services to meet the individual needs of students in the inclusive setting.

Teachers who are successful in working collaboratively require proper inservice training. Teacher training should focus on specific problem-solving strategies, developing effective communication skills, observing or watching a videotape of inclusive classrooms, and developing instructional strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, peer coaching, thematic instruction) and modifications for diverse learners (Roach, 1995). In addition, inservice training enables co-teachers to work together and develop specific behavioral and classroom management techniques. By providing educators with the appropriate training for co-teaching, professionals can then take what they have learned and apply it to the inclusive classroom.

Several studies evaluating teachers' performance and satisfaction finds that administrative support is crucial for teachers' success (Nowacek, 1992). Although there are a myriad of articles discussing this element, the research is less clear on the specific nature of the support teachers seek and what kind of action administrators can take to provide that support (Cook & Friend, 1993). Some literature indicates that administrators need to provide flexible scheduling for co-teachers to have a common planning period, therefore, easing the facilitation of working collaboratively and ultimately develop mutual respect.

Sadly to say, there is no "simple" solution for preparing teachers to work collaboratively. Like any new method of education, successful inclusion takes time and experience. It takes time for educators not only to learn how to meet students' needs but to develop an effective working relationship with another educator. Different teachers may have different comfort levels in presenting content material, managing the classroom, adapting the curriculum, or designing assessments. As a result, there are many challenges facing the inclusive classroom and this need for collaboration and teamwork. Therefore, the ultimate goal of this study is to enable school districts to avoid possible pitfalls teachers' face working collaboratively and attempt to answer questions relating to the effective and efficient implementation of collaboration.

Chapter III

Design of the Study

Method of Sample Selection:

Professional educators working in a collaborative inclusive middle school setting were selected through the district of Gloucester Township. This district contains three middle schools. The total number of In-Class Support teachers located in the three middle schools is twenty. Of that population, approximate one hundred and eighty special education students are obtaining services in an inclusive setting. Each In-Class Support teacher works with four to two regular education teachers depending on their position. Some of the In-Class Support teachers may teach in a resource position for part of the day and the rest of the day co-teaching in the inclusive classroom. Furthermore, the number of inclusion students have increased in the past years because now the resource center students are receiving services in social studies and science. In the past, these students were receiving no help in these subject areas and basically were set up for failure.

Instrumentation:

A review of existing questionnaires and survey documents, which were reported in the literature, was preview (studied, undertaken). Most of the questionnaires dealt with important areas related to collaborative teaching and listings of prerequisite skills considered essential for co-teaching in personal, pedagogical, and discipline-specific domains.

The survey constructed for this study was developed through various researches on areas of importance related to inclusion (see Appendix A). Two forms were developed for regular and special education teachers involving two sections. First, regular and special education teachers are asked how long they have worked with a team member in an inclusive setting. For the special education teachers, not only are they asked to indicate how long they worked in a inclusive setting but also to specify

the subjects they work collaboratively. In addition, the special education teacher's survey is broken down into specific subjects. They are asked to rate each subject according to their experience.

Surveys were designed using a three point rating system. One being very true, two being somewhat true, and three being not at all true. A total of fourteen questions were formulated based on the literature noting specific elements necessary for successful collaboration and input from colleagues. In addition, a listing of items found in research as being critical areas in collaborative teaching was assessed.

For section one, the regular education teachers are responsible for circling their rating response to each question. Special education teachers are asked to rate each question according to their specific subject area. In section two, both teachers have to select three to five areas they feel are successful in collaborative teaching by placing a "+" sign before the number and three to five areas they feel are in need of improvement by placing a "-" sign before the number. The next question pertains to what type of training occurred for inclusion/collaborative teaching. Finally, the last question involves indicating those areas they feel are the most prevalent inhibitors to collaborative teaching in an inclusive setting.

Pilot Study:

Once formulated, the questionnaire was then reviewed by five co-teachers to assess the ease with which it could be completed and the practical value of the information attained. Notes were made on improving the cover letter and survey. Based on the feedback received, a few minor grammatical changes were made and one question in the survey was deleted.

Collection of Data:

Regular education teachers and In-Class Support teachers were surveyed in the district of Gloucester Township. Packets given to the teachers at Charles W. Lewis were

conveniently hand-delivered on Thursday, December 2, 1999. Packets sent to the other middle schools were delivered through inter-office mail on December 3, 1999.

Twenty In-Class Support teachers and forty-six regular education teachers in Gloucester Township received a copy of the cover letter and the actual survey (Appendix A). The packet sent thoroughly explained the purpose of the survey and that all information given was strictly confidential. The returned surveys will be tallied and an average will be calculated for each question asked. Each section will then be analyzed to determine some of the barriers/limitations to collaborative teaching.

Chapter IV

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Introduction:

A survey was sent to the regular education teachers and the In-Class Support teachers working in a collaborative inclusive middle school setting through the district of Gloucester Township. The questionnaire for this study was divided into two sections addressing the specific elements necessary for successful collaboration. A total of twenty In-Class Support teachers and forty-six regular education teachers received a copy of the survey. Of the twenty surveys sent to In-Class Support teachers, nine were returned yielding a 45% return rate. Of the forty-six surveys sent to regular education teachers, seventeen were returned yielding a 37% return rate.

Table 1 Results of Regular Education Teachers (see Appendix B):

The response of the regular education teachers is located in **Table 1**. In order to answer the specific research questions pertaining to this study, the data obtained in **Table 1** was evaluated by listing the number of responses in each category, calculating percentages, and averages. The following is an overall summary of the results obtained from the data according to the specific questions researched:

A. What are the elements necessary for successful collaborative teaching?

1. *Do you and your collaborative teacher provide one another with feedback on instructional styles utilized?* Two (12%) teachers report that they provide each other with feedback on instructional styles used in the classroom. Twelve (70%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while three (18%) report this not to be true according to their experience.
2. *Are there frequent discussions during planning time regarding instructional methods and techniques that the two of you would/should use during class?* Five (29%) report that they have frequent discussions regarding instructional methods and

techniques used in the classroom. Nine (53%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while three (18%) report this not to be true.

3. *Do you and your collaborative teacher work together to master new instructional methods or strategies?* Six (35%) teachers report that they work together to master new instructional methods/strategies. Eight (47%) teachers report this to be not at all true while three (18%) report this to be somewhat true.

4. *Do you and your collaborative teacher plan together?* Four (25%) teachers report that they collaboratively plan together. Seven (41%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while six (35%) report that they do not collaboratively plan together.

5. *Do you and your collaborative teacher share resources with one another?* Six (35%) teachers report that they share resources with one another. Four (24%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while seven (41%) report that they do not share resources with one another.

6. *Do you and your collaborative teacher learn from one another?* Four (24%) teachers report that they learn from one another. Five (29%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while eight (47%) report that they learn from one another.

7. *When the two of you meet with your core, is their time given to discuss pros/cons of inclusion?* Nine (53%) teachers report that they discuss the pros/cons of inclusion. Three (18%) teachers report that this is somewhat true while five (29%) report that this is not true at all.

8. *Are the two of you able to discuss inclusion and/or collaborative teaching with other inclusive teachers?* Eight (47%) teachers report that they do discuss inclusion with other inclusive teachers. Five (29%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while four (24%) report this to be not true at all.

9. *Is time/support specifically provided by administration for resolution of any conflicts?* Ten (59%) teachers report that there is time/support provided by administration for resolution of conflicts. Five (29%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while two (12%) report this not to be true at all.

10. *Do you and your collaborative teacher have a clear understanding of your respective roles?* Three (18%) teachers report that they have a clear understanding of their respective roles. Eight (47%) teacher report this to be somewhat true while six (35%) report this to be not true at all.

11. *Do you and your collaborative teacher share similar behavior management strategies?* Six (35%) teachers report that they share similar behavior management strategies. Five (29%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while six (35%) report this to be not true at all.

12. *Do you and your collaborative teacher share a common willingness to participate?* Four (24%) teachers report that they do share a common willingness to participate. Three (18%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while ten (59%) report this to be not true at all.

13. *Is there ongoing training and support systems in place for you and your collaborative teacher to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers?* Thirteen (76%) teachers report that there is ongoing training and support in place for them to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers. Two (12%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while two (12%) report this to be not true at all.

14. *Before team teaching, did you and your team member discuss various accommodations, modifications, management plans, instructional strategies, and differentiated curricula that could be used with particular content material?* Two (12%) teachers report they discussed various accommodations, modifications, management plans, instructional strategies, and differentiated curricula that they could use with content material. Twelve (71%) teachers report this to be somewhat true while three (18%) report that this is not true at all.

Discussion:

The regular education teachers answered fourteen questions relating to the necessary elements needed for effective collaboration to take place. Overall, results

indicated that most regular education teachers consider the important elements to be somewhat true based upon their experience. According to some of the responses indicated, there are some of elements that need to be improved. One important element emphasized is the common planning time. Only four teachers indicated that they planned together. This element is crucial to the success of co-teaching in order to prepare for shared teaching responsibilities. There could be several reasons why this doesn't happen. One being that a common planning period is not provided because of different schedules. Another could be the result of other teaching responsibilities throughout the day. When regular education teachers were asked whether they share a common willingness to participate, ten (59%) responded that they did not, which indicates that some teachers may be reluctant to have another teacher participate in their classroom, and therefore, not allow for shared teaching responsibilities. Finally, eight (47%) teachers responded that they do not learn from one another. The data clearly revealed that there are areas in need of improvement, especially with the majority of responses being somewhat true.

Table 2 Results of Regular Education Teachers (see Appendix B):

B. What are some of the areas in collaborative teaching that are successful and what areas are in need of improvement?

1. *Curriculum—organization and pacing:* Five (50%) teachers report the pacing and organization of the curriculum to be positive and five (50%) report this to be negative.
2. *Instructional methods, techniques, strategies:* Eleven (92%) teachers report instructional methods, techniques, and strategies to be positive while one (8%) reports this to be negative.
3. *Ample planning time:* Four (33%) teachers' report ample planning time to be positive while eight (67%) report this to be negative.

4. *Evaluation and grading methods:* Eight (62%) teachers report evaluation and grading methods to be positive while five (38%) report this to be negative.
5. *Class rules, procedures, behavior management:* Sixteen (94%) teachers report class rules, procedures, and behavior management to be positive while one (6%) reports this to be negative.
6. *Meeting student needs, appropriateness of placement:* Six (55%) teachers report meeting the student needs and placement is appropriate while five (45%) report this to be negative.
7. *Roles and responsibilities:* Six (55%) teachers report that their specific roles and responsibilities are positive while five (45%) report this to be negative.
8. *Contact with parents:* Seven (50%) teachers report contact with parents to be positive and seven (50%) report this to be negative
9. *Teaching styles and philosophy:* Eight (73%) teachers report teaching styles and philosophy to be positive while three (27%) report this to be negative.
10. *Mechanisms for problem solving and conflict management:* Two (50%) teachers report mechanisms for problem solving and conflict management to be positive and two (50%) report this to be negative.
11. *Measuring the success of the program:* One (9%) teacher reports measuring the success of the program to be positive while ten (91%) report this to be negative.

Discussion:

The regular education teachers were given a list of important items necessary for successful collaborative teaching. They were asked to select three to five areas they felt that were successful and three to five areas they felt were in need of improvement. The highest positive items selected for successful collaborative teaching based upon the results were: class rules, procedures, behavior management (16 out of 17 responded positive); instructional methods, techniques, strategies (11 out of 12 responded positive); teaching styles and philosophy (8 out of 11 responded positive). The highest

items indicating a need of improvement were: measuring the success of the program (10 out of 11 responded negative); ample planning time (8 out of 12 responded negative); contact with parents (7 out of 14) responded negative). The rest of the item indicated a balance between the two.

Type of Training:

The regular education teachers were asked to indicate what type of training they received for inclusion/collaborative teaching.

1. Five responded to having college course work on inclusion/collaborative teaching.
2. Seven responded to having professional conferences/meetings.
3. Fourteen responded to having an inservice at local school.
4. Two responded to having no training at all.

Most Prevalent Inhibitors to Collaborative Teaching:

C. What are the concerns/issues of general education teachers when it comes to working collaboratively?

1. Ten (59%) teachers report that lack of planning time was a major barrier of collaborative teaching.
2. Six (35%) teachers report that administrative support was an inhibitor to collaborative teaching
3. Seven (41%) report that teacher attitudes/resistance was a barrier.
4. Five (29%) report that making modifications was an inhibitor (see **Appendix C**).
5. Five (29%) responded to other section (see **Appendix C**).

Discussion:

The regular education teachers were given a list of major barriers to collaborative teaching. They were asked to indicate what they felt was the most prevalent inhibitors

to collaborative teaching in an inclusive setting. According to the results, the two that received the highest number of responses was not having sufficient planning time and teacher's attitudes/resistance to collaborative teaching. Administrative support was another concern indicated. Lastly, only five indicated that making modifications was an issue.

Table 3 Results of Special Education Teachers (see Appendix B):

The response of the special education teachers is located in **Table 3**. Special education teachers were asked to rate each question according to their specific subject area. Of the responses returned, three special education teachers taught Reading/Language Arts, four taught Math, nine taught Science, and seven taught Social Studies. In order to answer the specific research questions pertaining to this study, the data obtained in **Table 3** was evaluated by listing the number of responses in each category, according to specific subject area, and averages were calculated. Below is a highlight of some of the questions asked that indicate a barrier/limitation to collaborative teacher:

A. What are the elements necessary for successful collaborative teaching?

4. *Do you and your collaborative teacher plan together?* In Science, six out of nine teachers report that they do not plan together as well as those in Social Studies (five out of seven). Reading/Language Arts and Math teachers indicated this to be somewhat true.

7. *When the two of you meet with your core, is their time given to discuss pros/cons of inclusion?* In Reading/Language Arts, two out of three report that they do not discuss the pros/cons of inclusion when they meet as a core. In Math, teachers report this to be somewhat true. In Science, six out of nine indicated this to be not true at all along with teachers in Social Studies (four out of seven).

8. *Are the two of you able to discuss inclusion and/or collaborative teaching with other*

inclusive teachers? In Reading/Language Arts, two out of three teachers report that they do not discuss inclusion with other inclusive teacher as well as those who teach Math (two out of four). In Science, five out of nine teachers indicated this to be not true. In Social Studies, teachers report this to be somewhat true.

13. *Is there ongoing training and support systems in place for you and your collaborative teacher to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers?* In all subjects, overall results indicated that there is no ongoing training and support systems in place for collaborative teachers to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers. Not one teacher indicated this to be true.

14. *Before team teaching, did you and your team member discuss various accommodations, modifications, management plans, instructional strategies, and differentiated curricula that could be used with particular content material?* In Reading/Language Arts and Math, teachers report this to be somewhat true. In Science (six out of nine report that they do not discuss various accommodations, modifications, and instructional strategies to use with particular content material.

Discussion:

The regular education teachers answered fourteen questions relating to the necessary elements needed for effective collaboration to take place. Listed above were some of the elements that seem to be a barrier to co-teaching. Results showed that planning together was an issue for special education teachers, as well as, discussing the pros/cons of inclusion, and discussing inclusion with other inclusive teachers. In addition, special education teachers find collaborative teaching to be difficult because there is no ongoing training and support systems in their schools in order to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers. Finally, special education teachers report that discussing various accommodations, modifications, and instructional strategies with particular content material doesn't happen. Some report this to be somewhat true.

As far as the remaining questions asked in the survey, overall results indicate that most special education teachers consider the important elements for successful collaborative teaching to be somewhat true based upon their experience. Obviously, there were no set elements that all teachers chose to be very true on their part. Therefore, there is a need for improvement

Table 4 Results of Special Education Teachers (see Appendix B):

B. What are some of the areas in collaborative teaching that are successful and what areas are in need of improvement?

1. *Curriculum—organization and pacing:* Five (83%) teachers report the pacing and organization of the curriculum to be positive while one (17%) reports this to be negative.
2. *Instructional methods, techniques, strategies:* Five (83%) teachers report instructional methods, techniques, and strategies to be positive while one (17%) reports this to be negative.
3. *Ample planning time:* One (11%) teacher report ample planning time to be positive while eight (89%) report this to be negative.
4. *Evaluation and grading methods:* Six (100%) teachers report evaluation and grading methods to be positive.
5. *Class rules, procedures, behavior management:* Seven (88%) teachers report class rules, procedures, and behavior management to be positive while one (13%) reports this to be negative.
6. *Meeting student needs, appropriateness of placement:* Four (80%) teachers report meeting the student needs and placement is appropriate while one (20%) report this to be negative.
7. *Roles and responsibilities:* Six (100%) teachers report that their specific roles and responsibilities to be negative.
8. *Contact with parents:* One (33%) teacher reports contact with parents to be positive while two (67%) report this to be negative

9. *Teaching styles and philosophy:* Three (75%) teachers' report teaching styles and philosophy to be positive while one (25%) reports this to be negative.
10. *Mechanisms for problem solving and conflict management:* One (20%) teacher reports mechanisms for problem solving and conflict management to be positive while four (80%) report this to be negative.
11. *Measuring the success of the program:* One (17%) teacher reports measuring the success of the program to be positive while five (83%) report this to be negative.

Discussion:

The special education teachers were given a list of important items necessary for successful collaborative teaching. They were asked to select three to five areas they felt that were successful and three to five areas they felt were in need of improvement. The highest positive items selected for successful collaborative teaching based upon the results were: class rules, procedures, behavior management (7 out of 8 responded positive); evaluation and grading methods (6 out of 6 responded positive); instructional methods, techniques, strategies (5 out of 6 responded positive); curriculum-organization and pacing (5 out of 6 responded positive); meeting student needs, appropriateness of placement (4 out of 5 responded positive); teaching styles and philosophy (3 out of 4 responded positive). The highest items indicating a need for improvement were: ample planning time (8 out of 9 responded negative); roles and responsibilities (6 out of 6 responded negative); measuring the success of the program (5 out of 6 responded negative); mechanisms for problem solving and conflict management (4 out of 5 responded negative); contact with parents (2 out of 3 responded negative).

Type of Training:

The special education teachers were asked to indicate what type of training they received for inclusion/collaborative teaching.

1. Two responded to having college course work on inclusion/collaborative teaching.
2. Three responded to having professional conferences/meetings.
3. Six responded to having an inservice at local school.
4. One responded to having no training at all.

Most Prevalent Inhibitors to Collaborative Teaching:

D. What are the concerns/issues of special education teachers when it comes to working collaboratively?

1. Seven (78%) teachers report that lack of planning time was a major barrier of collaborative teaching.
2. Three (33%) teachers report that administrative support was an inhibitor to collaborative teaching
3. Six (67%) report that teacher attitudes/resistance was a barrier.(see Comments
4. Two (22%) report that making modifications was an inhibitor
5. Four (44%) responded to other section (see Appendix C).

Discussion:

The special education teachers were given a list of major barriers to collaborative teaching. They were asked to indicate what they felt was the most prevalent inhibitors to collaborative teaching in an inclusive setting. According to the results, the two that received the highest number of responses by teachers was not having sufficient planning time and teacher's attitudes/resistance to collaborative teaching. Administrative support was another concern but was only selected by three teachers. Lastly, only two indicated that making modifications was an issue.

Chapter V

Summary, Findings, and Conclusions

Summary:

The purpose of this study was to identify the major barriers/limitations of collaborative teaching in the middle school inclusive setting and assist teachers and administrators in developing effective strategies to enhance successful collaborative teaching efforts. Professional educators working in a collaborative inclusive middle school setting were selected through the district of Gloucester Township. Regular education teachers and special education teachers were asked to respond to questions addressing the necessary elements needed for effective collaboration

To accomplish the general purpose of this study, questions focused on the following factors: 1) the elements necessary for successful collaborative teaching, 2) areas in collaborative teaching that are successful and areas that are in need of improvement, 3) the concerns/issues related to working teaching relationships. Professional educators working in a collaborative inclusive setting were surveyed. Data was collected and calculated by completing averages and percentages for each question asked. Each section was then analyzed to determine what the barriers/limitations to collaborative teaching.

The following conclusions were drawn from this study. Teachers identified some of the major barriers/limitations to collaborative teaching as followed: insufficient planning time, teacher's attitudes and resistance to co-teaching, difficulty in determining specific roles and responsibilities, contact with parents, measuring the success of the program, common willingness to participate, and difficulty with problem solving and conflict management.

Findings/Conclusion:

What are the major barriers/limitations to effective collaboration in the inclusive classroom? Since there was a lack of response on the part of regular education and

special education teachers, more research is needed and more comments about why such necessary elements to successful collaborative teacher are not working. It is difficult to determine the extent of limitations to collaborative teaching, however, research indicated that the most prevalent ones were as followed: lack of planning and evaluation time, need for administrative support for collaborative arrangements between general and special educators, the resistance by professionals to work collaboratively, and lack of understanding of specific roles and responsibilities. This is exactly what the findings indicated.

In addition, results reported that regular and special education teachers identified that it is difficult to consider each other as “equal” partners (see Appendix C). Many expressed that it is difficult for an In-Class Support teacher to prepare for five subjects especially at the middle school level. Teachers noted that having one planning period a week is not enough time to efficiently plan lessons and collaboratively decide who will do what. Regular education teachers by far have the advantage because all they have to focus on is one subject, and therefore, they become quite knowledgeable of their content area. In-Class Support teachers expressed that they are consumed with “other matters”, such as, seeing what students need extra help, creating study guides, redirecting the students who are not on task, and so forth. One teacher suggested that if In-Class Support teachers had the opportunity to focus on just two subjects, they would feel much more effective in what they do and their work performance would improved.

Discussion:

There are areas of concern that commonly arise and require consideration in advance when it comes to working collaboratively. One is the need to schedule times and joint planning in preparation for co-teaching. Pugach and Johnson (1988) suggested that schoolwide schedules could be reorganized so that the time of various content-area specialists (e.g. music, art, physical education) would allow the teachers to meet regularly. This doesn't always happen though, especially in a middle school, where you have various grade-levels teachers. Another suggestion from Pugach and

Johnson (1988) involves changing some faculty meetings for consultation purposes. By allowing planning time for co-teaching, a lot of possible obstacles to collaborative teaching could be diminished. For one, the doors will open for effective monitoring and evaluation of students' needs and problems could be resolved in teaching working relationships. Specific roles and responsibilities could be established, for example, teachers could collaboratively decide who will do what in providing lesson instruction. Furthermore, teachers could effectively and efficiently measure the success of the program if ample planning time is provided. Nonetheless, it is an administrative responsibility of every school to provide scheduling services and planning time that will be an important issue during program development and implementation.

One important concern to collaborative teaching in schools is to decide on the "right people". Research suggests that collaborative teaching should be a decision between special and general education teachers. Administrators and teachers should select together those who might be willing to collaborate. By making this a joint decision, it enables schools to provide healthy and strong working relationships. There must be a common willingness to participate. If administrators decide to pick a teacher who is against having another teacher in their classroom, then failure is doomed to happen.

This study was not to suggest that all collaboration is doomed to failure but, instead, it was to presenting a realistic picture of the difficulties that may come with collaborative efforts. An overwhelming amount of research proves that collaboration can work as a means to serve special needs of students in a general education classroom. Yes, much is require in preparation and implementation, but in the end the results and accomplishments are well worth it.

**Appendix A
Cover Letter
Survey**

December 2, 1999

Dear Colleague,

My name is Lisa Barcklow. I am an In-Class Support teacher at Charles W. Lewis Middle School. I am in the process of completing my Masters at Rowan University and would appreciate your help in finishing my thesis project.

With more and more schools embracing inclusive schooling practices, there is an increased need for collaboration between general and special educators to work together toward commonly defined goals. Having time and energy to jointly plan, engage in problem solving, and monitor student performance can be among the many challenges teachers' face as they work in collaborative teams. Teachers are confronted with developing new roles and relationships as they work together. As the shift from single-teacher approach moves towards the collaborative model, certain barriers tend to arise that inhibit successful development of teaching relationships. This thesis is an attempt to present a realistic picture of the difficulties and pitfalls that accompany collaborative efforts in the inclusive setting. By completing this, it is my hope that teachers and administrators can develop strategies to delineate the possible obstacles that may arise later.

Enclosed you will find a 'Survey on Collaborative Teaching'. Simply use the rating scale for each question. In addition, if you have any comments or suggestions on ways to improve collaborative teaching in an inclusion setting, please feel free to write them directly on the survey sheets or on a separate piece of paper. All information is kept **confidential** and no names will be used. The ultimate purpose is to complete my thesis project. It is imperative that everyone be completely honest so that an effective evaluation can be made.

Please return this 'Survey On Collaborative Teaching' by Wednesday, December 15th, via interoffice mail to Lisa Barcklow at Charles W. Lewis. I appreciate you taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. I know that your time is very valuable and I can't thank you enough for your support.

Sincerely,

Lisa Barcklow
C.W. Lewis School

Survey on Collaborative Teaching: Section I

How long have you worked with a team member in an inclusive setting? _____

According to research, various studies indicate that certain elements are necessary for effective collaboration to take place. In order to make a proper assessment of successful collaborative teaching at your school, please complete the following survey. This survey will indicate areas that may be in need of improvement.

The following questions relate to important elements of collaborative teaching. Please read all question and then rate them on a scale of 1-3. Circle the score you would give based on your experiences. Please use the following ranking system.

- 1 VERY TRUE
- 2 SOMEWHAT TRUE
- 3 NOT AT ALL TRUE

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| 1. Do you and you collaborative teacher provide one another with feedback on instructional styles utilized? | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Are there frequent discussions during planning time regarding instructional methods and techniques that the two of you would/should use during class? | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Do you and your collaborative teacher work together to master new instructional methods or strategies? | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Do you and your collaborative teacher plan together? | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Do you and your collaborative teacher share resources with one another? | 3 | 2 | 1 |

(form for regular education teacher)

6. Do you and your collaborative teacher learn from one another?	3	2	1
7. When the two of you meet with your core, is there time given to discuss pros/cons of inclusion?	3	2	1
8. Are the two of you able to discuss inclusion and/or collaborative teaching with other inclusive teachers?	3	2	1
9. Is time/support specifically provided by administration for resolution of any conflicts?	3	2	1
10. Do you and your collaborative teacher have a clear understanding of your respective roles?	3	2	1
11. Do you and your collaborative teacher share similar behavior management strategies?	3	2	1
12. Do you and your collaborative teacher share a common willingness to participate?	3	2	1
13. Is there ongoing training and support systems in place for you and your collaborative teacher to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers?	3	2	1
14. Before team teaching, did you and your team member discuss various accommodations, modifications, management plans, instructional strategies, and differentiated curricula that could be used with particular content material?	3	2	1

(form for regular education teacher)

Survey on Collaborative Teaching: Section I

How long have you worked with a team member in an inclusive setting? _____

Check the following subjects you teach as an In-Class Support teacher.

_____ **Reading/Language Arts Literacy**

_____ **Math**

_____ **Social Studies**

_____ **Science**

According to research, various studies indicate that certain elements are necessary for effective collaboration to take place. In order to make a proper assessment of successful collaborative teaching at your school, please complete the following survey. This survey will indicate areas that may be in need of improvement.

The following questions relate to important elements of collaborative teaching. Please read all question and then rate them for each subject. Please write 1,2 or 3 on the line below each subject.

- 1 VERY TRUE
- 2 SOMEWHAT TRUE
- 3 NOT AT ALL TRUE

- | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| 1. Do you and you collaborative teacher provide one another with feedback on instructional styles utilized? | <u>R/L</u> | <u>Math</u> | <u>Sci</u> | <u>S.S.</u> |
| | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Are there frequent discussions during planning time regarding instructional methods and techniques that the two of you would/should use during class? | <u>R/L</u> | <u>Math</u> | <u>Sci</u> | <u>S.S</u> |
| | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Do you and your collaborative teacher work together to master new instructional methods or strategies? | <u>R/L</u> | <u>Math</u> | <u>Sci</u> | <u>S.S</u> |
| | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

(form for special education teacher)

	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
4. Do you and your collaborative teacher plan together?	—	—	—	—
5. Do you and your collaborative teacher share resources with one another?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
6. Do you and your collaborative teacher learn from one another?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
7. When the two of you meet with your core, is there time given to discuss pros/cons of inclusion?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
8. Are the two of you able to discuss inclusion and/or collaborative teaching with other inclusive teachers?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
9. Is time/support specifically provided by administration for resolution of any conflicts?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
10. Do you and your collaborative teacher have a clear understanding of your respective roles?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
11. Do you and your collaborative teacher share similar behavior management strategies?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
12. Do you and your collaborative teacher share a common willingness to participate?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
13. Is there ongoing training and support systems in place for you and your collaborative teacher to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—
14. Before team teaching, did you and your team member discuss various accommodations, modifications, management plans, instructional strategies, and differentiated curricula that could be used with particular content material?	R/L	Math	Sci	S.S.
	—	—	—	—

(form for special education teacher)

Section II

Below is a list of important items necessary for successful collaborative teaching. Please indicate 3-5 areas that you feel are successful by placing a "+" sign before the number and 3-5 areas that you feel are in need of improvement by placing a "-" sign before the number. Please make any additional comments to emphasize why you feel this way.

1. Curriculum—organization and pacing
2. Instructional methods, techniques, strategies
3. Ample planning time
4. Evaluation and grading methods
5. Class rules, procedures, behavior management
6. Meeting student needs, appropriateness of placement
7. Roles and responsibilities (preparation, grading, maintenance, supplies, etc.)
8. Contact with parents
9. Teaching styles and philosophy
10. Mechanisms for problem solving and conflict management
11. Measuring the success of the program

Indicate the source(s) from which you have received training on inclusion/collaborative teaching. Please indicate next to the item marked what year you received that training, if possible.

- college course work
- professional conferences/meetings
- inservice workshop(s) at local school
- other, (specify) _____
- no training

In both regular and special education, a limited number of studies have begun to shed some light on several major barriers of collaborative teaching. Below is a list of these factors. Please check the ones you feel are the most prevalent inhibitors to collaborative teaching in an inclusive setting?

- Lack of planning time or time to consult
- Administrative support
- Teacher Attitudes/Resistance
- Making Modifications
- other (specify) _____

Appendix B

Results

Table 1

Survey on Collaborative Teaching: Section I Form For The REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER

- 3 VERY TRUE
- 4 SOMEWHAT TRUE
- 5 NOT AT ALL TRUE

Total Number of Teachers Who Responded: 17

	<u>Number of Responses in Each Category</u>		
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
1. Do you and your collaborative teacher provide one another with feedback on instructional styles utilized?	2 12%	12 70%	3 18%
	Average: 2.06		
2. Are there frequent discussions during planning time regarding instructional methods and techniques that the two of you would/should use during class?	5 29%	9 53%	3 18%
	Average: 1.88		
3. Do you and your collaborative teacher work together to master new instructional methods or strategies?	6 35%	8 47%	3 18%
	Average: 1.82		
4. Do you and your collaborative teacher plan together?	4 25%	7 41%	6 35%
	Average: 2.18		
5. Do you and your collaborative teacher share resources with one another?	6 35%	4 24%	7 41%
	Average: 2.06		
6. Do you and your collaborative teacher learn from one another?	4 24%	5 29%	8 47%
	Average: 2.25		

7. When the two of you meet with your core, is their time given to discuss pros/cons of inclusion?	9 53%	3 18%	5 29%	Average: 1.76
8. Are the two of you able to discuss inclusion and/or collaborative teaching with other inclusive teachers?	8 47%	5 29%	4 24%	Average: 1.76
9. Is time/support specifically provided by administration for resolution of any conflicts?	10 59%	5 29%	2 12%	Average: 1.53
10. Do you and your collaborative teacher have a clear understanding of your respective roles?	3 18%	8 47%	6 35%	Average: 2.18
11. Do you and your collaborative teacher share similar behavior management strategies?	6 35%	5 29%	6 35%	Average: 2
12. Do you and your collaborative teacher share a common willingness to participate?	4 24%	3 18%	10 59%	Average: 2.35
13. Is there ongoing training and support systems in place for you and your collaborative teacher to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers?	13 76%	2 12%	2 12%	Average: 1.35
14. Before team teaching, did you and your team member discuss various accommodations, modifications, management plans, instructional strategies, and differentiated curricula that could be used with particular content material?	2 12%	12 71%	3 18%	Average: 2.05

Table 2

Section II: Form For Regular Education Teacher

	<u>Number of Responses in each item</u>	
	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>
1. Curriculum—organization and pacing	5	5
2. Instructional methods, techniques, strategies	11	1
3. Ample planning time	4	8
4. Evaluation and grading methods	8	5
5. Class rules, procedures, behavior management	16	1
6. Meeting student needs, appropriateness of placement	6	5
7. Roles and responsibilities	6	5
8. Contact with parents	7	7
9. Teaching styles and philosophy	8	3
10. Mechanisms for problem solving and conflict management	2	2
11. Measuring the success of the program	1	10

What type of training?	Number of Responses in each item
College course work	5
Professional conferences/meetings	7
Inservice workshop(s) at local school	14
Other, (specify)	0
No training	2

Most prevalent inhibitors to collaborative teaching?	Number of Responses in each item
Lack of planning time or time to consult	10
Administrative support	6
Teacher Attitudes/Resistance	7
Making Modifications	5 (see Comments)
Other (specify)	5 (see Comments)

Table 3

Survey on Collaborative Teaching: Section I Form For The SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER

- 6 VERY TRUE
- 7 SOMEWHAT TRUE
- 3 NOT AT ALL TRUE

Number of Teachers in Each Subject Who Responded:

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S</u>
3	4	9	7

Number of Responses in Each Category

1. Do you and your collaborative teacher provide one another with feedback on instructional styles utilized?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>
1 2 0	2 1 1	2 4 3	1 3 3
Average: 1.67	Average: 1.75	Average: 2.11	Average: 2.29

2. Are there frequent discussions during planning time regarding instructional methods and techniques that the two of you would/should use during class?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>
1 0 2	2 0 2	1 3 5	1 2 4
Average: 2.33	Average: 2	Average: 2.45	Average: 2.29

3. Do you and your collaborative teacher work together to master new instructional methods or strategies?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>	<u>1</u> <u>2</u> <u>3</u>
0 2 1	1 1 2	1 4 4	0 2 5
Average.: 2.33	Average: 2.25	Average: 2.33	Average: 2.71

4. Do you and your collaborative teacher plan together?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>
1 1 1	2 0 2	1 2 6	1 1 5
Average: 2	Average: 2	Average: 2.56	Average: 2.58

5. Do you and your collaborative teacher share resources with one another?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>
1 2 0	2 1 1	4 3 2	3 3 1
Average: 1.67	Average: 1.75	Average: 1.78	Average: 1.71

6. Do you and your collaborative teacher learn from one another?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>
1 0 2	2 1 1	5 2 2	3 2 2
Average: 2.33	Average: 1.75	Average: 1.67	Average: 1.86

7. When the two of you meet with your core, is their time given to discuss pros/cons of inclusion?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>
0 1 2	1 1 2	2 1 6	2 1 4
Average: 2.67	Average: 2.25	Average: 2.45	Average: 2.29

8. Are the two of you able to discuss inclusion and/or collaborative teaching with other inclusive teachers?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>
0 1 2	0 2 2	1 3 5	1 3 3
Average.: 2.67	Average: 2.50	Average: 2.45	Average: 2.29

9. Is time/support specifically provided by administration for resolution of any conflicts?

<u>R/L</u>			<u>Math</u>			<u>Sci</u>			<u>S.S.</u>		
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
2	0	1	2	0	2	3	1	5	3	0	4
Average: 1.67			Average: 2			Average: 2.22			Average: 2.14		

10. Do you and your collaborative teacher have a clear understanding of your respective roles?

<u>R/L</u>			<u>Math</u>			<u>Sci</u>			<u>S.S.</u>		
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1	1	1	2	0	2	3	4	2	3	2	2
Average: 2			Average: 2			Average: 1.89			Average: 1.86		

11. Do you and your collaborative teacher share similar behavior management strategies?

<u>R/L</u>			<u>Math</u>			<u>Sci</u>			<u>S.S.</u>		
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1	1	1	3	1	0	5	2	2	3	3	1
Average: 2			Average: 1.25			Average: 1.67			Average: 1.71		

12. Do you and your collaborative teacher share a common willingness to participate?

<u>R/L</u>			<u>Math</u>			<u>Sci</u>			<u>S.S.</u>		
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
1	1	1	2	2	0	5	4	0	4	2	1
Average: 2			Average: 2			Average: 1.78			Average: 1.57		

13. Is there ongoing training and support systems in place for you and your collaborative teacher to monitor the progress and needs of the students and teachers?

<u>R/L</u>			<u>Math</u>			<u>Sci</u>			<u>S.S.</u>		
1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
0	0	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	0	1	6
Average: 3			Average: 2.75			Average: 3.11			Average: 2.86		

14. Before team teaching, did you and your team member discuss various accommodations, modifications, management plans, instructional strategies, and differentiated curricula that could be used with particular content material?

<u>R/L</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Sci</u>	<u>S.S.</u>
<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>	<u>1 2 3</u>
0 2 1	1 2 1	0 3 6	1 2 4
Avg.: 2.33	Average: 1.75	Average: 2.78	Average: 2.43

Table 4

Section II: Form For Special Education Teacher

	<u>Number of Responses in each item</u>	
	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Negative</u>
1. Curriculum—organization and pacing	5	1
2. Instructional methods, techniques, strategies	5	1
3. Ample planning time	1	8
4. Evaluation and grading methods	6	0
5. Class rules, procedures, behavior management	7	1
6. Meeting student needs, appropriateness of placement	4	1
7. Roles and responsibilities	0	6
8. Contact with parents	1	2
9. Teaching styles and philosophy	3	1
10. Mechanisms for problem solving and conflict management	1	4
11. Measuring the success of the program	1	5

What type of training?	Number of Responses in each item
College course work	2
Professional conferences/meetings	3
Inservice workshop(s) at local school	6
Other, (specify)	1
No training	1

Most prevalent inhibitors to collaborative teaching?	Number of Responses in each item
Lack of planning time or time to consult	7
Administrative support	3
Teacher Attitudes/Resistance	6
Making Modifications	2 (see Comments)
Other (specify)	4 (see Comments)

Appendix C

Survey Comments

Comments From Regular Education Teachers

____other (specify) – “degree of knowledge of subject area. (My partner this year has never really taught my subject.”

____other (specify) – “student placement”

____other (specify) – “In-Class Support teachers are reassigned each year to different grades/subjects and teachers. This makes the situation difficult, especially in content areas.”

____other (specify) – “pairing up individuals”

____**Making Modifications** – “sometimes with a large number of modifications in one class it is hard to know what to do.

Do you and your collaborative teacher share a common willingness to participate?

“It is unfair to expect an inclusion teacher to have sufficient mastery of five subjects to the point they can be an equal partner in the instruction of all five classes on a daily basis. The “regular education” teacher by necessity and because of much more exposure to subject matter provides the majority of instruction. I see no feasible way around this. Inclusion teacher participates in read-alouds, journal writing, group discussions that do not require a thorough knowledge of subject content. Also, In-Class Support teacher has insights into special education child that regular education teacher may miss. This insight improves instruction and provides motivation for special education and regular education students that one teacher alone cannot.”

Do you and your collaborative teacher share a common willingness to participate?

“We didn’t know we would be working together until the first day of school.”

Do you and your collaborative teacher work together to master new instructional methods or strategies?

“No time!”

Do you and your collaborative teacher share resources with one another?

“No time!”

Class rules, procedures, behavior management—“this depends greatly on the personalities of the two staff involved.”

Comments From Special Education Teachers

____ **other (specify)** – “It is difficult to be knowledgeable about content when you are an In-Class Support teacher in five different subjects. My role in Social Studies and Science is more to keep kids on task, help with organization, etc. I personally don’t see the point of learning content when the Social Studies teacher has taught the lesson four classes before me. I take a more active role in Reading/Language Arts and Math.”

____ **other (specify)** - “In-Class Support in all four major subject areas- Reading/Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Science at a middle school level is too much information to be able to teach. Also, only spending one period a day with the “general education” teacher makes it very difficult to “get used to” teaching together. One planning period a week is set aside for each subject teacher and In-Class Support. But, it is more of a hassle than a productive planning period. I am worrying about getting extra reviews, pulling students for extra help, making sure the students are staying organized, and preparing for upcoming study sessions for tests. If I were responsible for two subjects instead of four, I think In-Class Support would be much more successful. It would provide more planning time and more “work time” with the “general education” teacher and In-Class Support teacher.”

Do you and your collaborative teacher have a clear understanding of your respective roles?

“I work with three different teachers in two different grades.”

Do you and your collaborative teacher share a common willingness to participate?

“I do not have a say on who I am working with from year to year.”

Are there frequent discussions during planning time regarding instructional methods and techniques that the two of you would/should use during class?

“No common planning time—usually during class.”

“None provided for this!”

When the two of you meet with the your core, is there time given to discuss pros/cons of inclusion?

“We are not given common planning time, teach multiple grade levels, and usually don’t teach in the same core.”

“There is but never discussed.”

Roles and responsibilities---“are not actually clear in a job description form. Each teacher expects something different.”

Bibliography

1. Autin, Diana MTK. (1999). Inclusion and the new IDEA. *Exceptional Parent*, 29(5), 66-70.
2. Brockett (1995). Cooperative Teaching – The Key to Full Inclusion. *School Leader*. 31-49.
3. Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1990). Pragmatic issues in the development of special education consultation programs. *Preventing School Failure*, 35(1), 43-46.
4. Gantwerk, Barbara (1999). Placement in the Least Restrictive Environment. New Jersey Department of Education: Special Education Documents.
<http://www.state.nj.us/njded/specialed/lre/ler2.htm>
5. Gorn, S. (1997). *What do I do when.....: The answer on special education law* (2nd ed.). Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.
6. Hines, Rebecca. *(1994). "The best of Both Worlds?" *Schools in the Middle*, 3, 3-6.
7. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Regulations, 34 C.F.R. 300 et seq.
Walsh, J. M. (1992). Student, teacher, and parent preference for less restrictive special education models—Cooperative teaching. *Case In Point*, 6(2), 1-12.
8. Laycock, V.K., Gable, R. A., & Korinek, L. (1991). Alternate structures for collaboration in the delivery of special services. *Preventing School Failure*, 35(4), 15-18.
9. Lipskiy, D., & Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

10. Nowacek, J. E. (1992). Professionals talk about teaching together: Interviews with five collaborating teachers. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 27, 262-276.
12. Pugach, M.C., & Johnson, L. J. (1988). Rethinking the relationship between consultation and collaborative problem-solving. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 21,1-8.
13. Roach, V. (1995). Supporting Inclusion: Beyond the Rhetoric. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(4), 295-302.
14. Salend, S. J., Johansen, M., Mumper, J., Chase, A. S., Pike, K. M., & Dorney, J. A. (1997). Collaborative problem-solving to promote the inclusion of young children with significant disabilities in the primary grades. *Exceptional Children*, 63 (2), 195-210.
15. Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1990). *Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
16. Stump and Wilson (1996). Collaboration: Making It Happen. *Interventions in School and Clinic*. 31, 310-312.
17. Turnbull, A. P., Turnbull, H. R., Shank, M., & Leal, D. (1995). *Exceptional lives: Special education in today's schools*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
18. Wenger, Mike S., (1999). Team teaching for higher level learning: A framework of professional collaboration. *Journal of Management Education*, 23(3), 311-327.
19. Yell, M.L. (1998). *The law and special education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

20. York, Jennifer, et.al., *Creating Inclusive School Communities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1993.