

## **Leadership Faculty Members Reflect on their Own Co-Team Teaching Experiences in the Practicum and Internship Course**

Ann Hilliard<sup>1</sup>, Barbara T. Jackson<sup>2</sup>, J. Winona Taylor<sup>3</sup>, Edward Newsome, Jr<sup>4</sup>,  
Barbara Smith<sup>5</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, Bowie State University, U.S.A.

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Bowie State University, U.S.A.

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Bowie State University, U.S.A.

<sup>4</sup>., Adjunct Professor, Bowie State University, U.S.A.

<sup>5</sup>Professor, Bowie State University, U.S.A.

Corresponding Author: \* Deepika. T

---

**Abstract:** This study focused on the self-reflections that five co-team teaching faculty members used to improve the instructional delivery process for an internship and practicum course for over a period of five years. Co-team teaching is defined for this study as five faculty members coming together in a positive collaborative relationship to share instruction, experiences and educational leadership practices that enhanced the quality of services to students who were seeking career positions in educational school leadership. By offering students teaching experiences from five different faculty members who have actually served as school leaders at the building and district level gave students a broader perspective as to how effective leadership should look like and how competent leadership practices should prevail in an educational environment. The co-team teaching model illustrated the need for collaboration and teamwork in order to improve instruction in the educational setting and to offer students choices as they selected their own group participation team, topics for discussion and demonstrating how to link their coursework learning activities to real-world application as future school leaders. Major emphases in this study included methods and elements plus values and benefits of co-team teaching, views of faculty and students, experiences of faculty, reflective processes used by faculty, characteristics of students in the study and the impact of co-team teaching in higher education.

**Keywords:** *Co-team Teaching, Reflective Faculty, Teamwork, Collaboration*

---

Date of Submission: 31-07-2017

Date of acceptance: 19-08-2017

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

When faculty members co-team teach they share responsibility for planning, organizing, implementing and evaluating instructional activities (Friend, 2005). Five experienced faculty members in teaching and leadership co-team taught the Internship and Practicum course for School Administration and Supervision for five years at a small university in the mid-Atlantic region on the east coast of the United States. The co-team teaching experience involved a group of faculty members working purposefully, regularly, and cooperatively to help groups of students to gain the needed skills, knowledge and have a professional disposition to be effective in public school leadership practices at the building and/or district level (Roth & Tobin, 2005). Faculty members worked together to set goals for the Internship and Practicum course by designing a syllabus for the course, preparing individual lesson plans, implementing instructional services, evaluating the results and conducting field site visits. Faculty members shared their views, argued with one another in a helpful manner and perhaps even challenged students to decide which approach is best for their learning style using the co-team teaching model and methods (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2008). Major emphases in this study were focused on co-team teaching methods, benefits and challenges when co-team teaching, and the importance of being reflective during and after the delivery of instructional services.

#### **Value of Co-Team Teaching**

The co-team teaching model was the major method of teaching by participating faculty members based on a survey used in this study. Faculty members who participated in this experience expressed that co-team teaching offers faculty a broader way of thinking how instruction could be more flexible and diverse based on their own experiences and how to best meet the needs of each student. This method of teaching during this study also created and maintained a community of learners with a focus on using current research practices to improve

teaching and learning for emerging school leaders. Faculty members gained a lot from being involved in collaborate co-team teaching, learning and leading such as new methods of teaching by using technology, engaging in interdisciplinary research, valuing the expertise of others, building stronger trust in their collegial relationships locally, nationally and internationally and staying current in their own discipline. Based on research by (Benjamin, 2000), co-team teaching helps to expand students' analytical abilities, connect students and faculty in learning new skills and knowledge together. Co-team teaching also created a strong sense of a collaborative academic and social community plus improved student and faculty relationships academically, socially and culturally (Wassell, 2005). There was clearly support to students and faculty during challenging moments when using the co-team teaching model, but the benefits out-weight the disadvantages. Because of the co-team teaching faculty experiences and modeling effective school leadership practices being shared with students, it was the belief that the learning outcomes were greater for students, academically, socially and culturally. In essence, the co-team teaching faculty themselves have served in extensive leadership positions in public school systems and the university environment and these faculty members were all willing to share their experiences with students when applicable (Kloo, & Zigmond, 2008).

### **Methods of Co-Team Teaching**

When it comes to team teaching, there are many faces, practices or methods of team teaching (Eisen, (2000). Faculty members in this study used a variety of co-team teaching methods such as interactive team teaching where the five faculty presented in the class simultaneously. Second, faculty members utilized the rotational format every fifteen to twenty minutes where faculty members would insert additional information about the topic area. Third, faculty members would observe while the one faculty member was presenting. In this style of teaching there was one teacher at a time implementing the instructional delivery process. This method of teaching was especially helpful at the beginning of a new topic being presented in the internship and practicum course. The observing faculty members would review more and make notes on how to best accommodate students based on what was presented and what students needed to be presented further in front of the class simultaneously. Four, faculty members would be reflective and continue to plan appropriately how they would each team coordinate activities to ensure that the required curriculum was integrated to execute, maximize learning and make connectivity in applying skills and knowledge to real-world application for students in the internship and practicum course (Roth & Tobin, 2005).

The co-team-teaching approach allowed for more interaction between faculty members and students (Murata, 2002). Faculty evaluated students on their achievement of the learning goals. Students evaluated faculty members based on their teaching proficiency at the end of the class during each semester. Emphases were placed on student and faculty growth and development, balancing initiative, sharing responsibility and collaboration, specializing and broadening experiences for all participants in the internship and practicum course. The clear and interesting presentation of content and student development, faculty members lecturing with encouraging discussions among students, using pertinent videos, participation and common expectations, and behavioral learning outcomes based on standards were all part of the execution of activities in class during this five year study.

Working as a team, faculty members modeled respect for differences, interdependence, and problem solving skills in the internship and practicum course. As a team, faculty members would set goals and contents of the course, select common materials related to educational leadership and best practices for all students which helped the team approach to work more proficiently (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2010). Faculty set the sequence of topics and supplemental materials based on research articles and topics to enhance student learning of effective leadership skills and practices. Faculty members also used various youtube videos related to effective educational leadership and have students to participate in role playing activities. Emphases were placed on school policies and requirements. A review of pertinent law cases were also discussed during the course. The law cases discussed were aligned with the appropriate U.S. Constitution Amendments pertaining to teachers and students' rights and responsibilities.

### **Benefits of Co-team Teaching and Students' Views**

The acquisition of skills and knowledge gained by students would differ. Therefore, the timeliness of assignments within the classroom needed to be extended for some students and those opportunities were given. With the co-team teaching approach, students would have the opportunity to receive input from different faculty members who participated in the co-team teaching experience. From observations and data input from students showed that the skill mastery may be more effective when students can see or hear a different perspective of assigned activities by more than one faculty member. With the expertise of five different faculty members was an asset to most students, because these faculty members brought different academic and teaching skills, knowledge, professional disposition and leadership experiences from PreK to 22 to the table in a collaborative manner (Friend, 2009). Each faculty member had an active role to play in supporting students' academic and

practical skill development for educational leadership positions (Wenzlaff, Berak, Weisman, Monroe-Baillargeon, Bacharach, Bradfield-kreider, 2002).

However, faculty members understood that co-team teaching does not solve all problems in the teaching environment, but some students may be able to solve-problems quicker because of the added human resources and innovative ideas being shared within the classroom. In the co-team teaching environment, faculty members may become more open-minded about helping students try new ways of teaching and learning a skill and faculty members may also become more creative as they plan, organize and implement more meaningful instructional activities to students that have real-world application (Dugan & Letterman, 2008). The co-team teaching concept can have an added advantage by incorporating more usage of technology in the classroom and during the field site observations.

### **Theoretical Framework Collaboration**

The history of co-team teaching dates back to 1960s era of progressive education. Working with a more diverse student populations, co-team teaching has made its way into the classroom in a more prominent manner (Bacharach, Heck, Dank, 2003). Therefore, it is essential that the co-team teaching faculty members ensure that their instructional activities are meaningful and relevant for the times so that students are highly prepared for the workforce economy in the area of school educational leadership. It is essential to create and maintain a high quality educational leadership program experience for each student (Eich, 2008). By the co-team teaching faculty working together in planning for student success collaboratively, students benefit from the many different experiences and faces of the faculty and their areas of expertise (Villa & Nevin, 2005).

Co-team teaching creates a collaborative environment which is a plus for many students who are challenged or need accommodations or non-accommodations too, and offers a professional development opportunity for faculty members to grow more proficiently in their area of expertise. Co-team teaching is great for most classroom environments and faculty development. Labs or clinical related classes are examples of how co-team teaching could work best for students in a collaborative setting. Co-team teaching based on theory and research makes it more possible for students to benefit from this form of teaching. Based on a grounded theory, high quality leadership programs must continue to have high quality instructional services to all students. For example, in the work environment, educational leaders must interact with a variety of personalities and leaders at the building and district level plus the community at-large and the co-team teaching and interactions help to prepare students as future leaders to feel more comfortable with their own leadership responsibility when they are working or interacting with a variety of faculty, staff, students, administrators and diverse groups of people at the building or district level and again the community (Wadkins, Miller & Wozniak, 2006).

### **Statement of the Problem**

There are several implied proposing problems in this type of study. A number of students come to graduate programs in higher education with the need to participate in a variety of experiences when receiving instructional delivery services in preparation for real-world application. Students need to be exposed to teaching from faculty members in educational leadership, especially, those faculty members who have practical experiences and having appropriate credentials in their profession and if this is not a yes then this becomes a problem from the beginning for students experiences in the classroom. In essence, faculty members should be highly qualified and effective as teachers of the subject matter in educational leadership and are able to meet the needs of each student. However, the major problem can exist when too many faculty members as individuals and as a group do not reflect formally on their own teaching practices in order to improve services to students who are seeking a profession in educational school leadership. Second, the question is, are faculty members as co-team teachers co-teaching in a manner consistent with research related to successful co-teaching elements?

### **Purpose of the Study**

The major purpose of this study was to examine the reflective thoughts of co-team teaching experiences of five faculty members teaching the graduate internship and practicum course for five years. Emphases were placed on planning, organizing, implementing instructional teaching methods, monitoring and evaluating their experiences as co-team faculty members reflectively. Second, the purpose of the study was to see how students viewed the co-teaching experience as an evaluative focus group.

### **Assumptions of the Study**

It was hoped that the participants (faculty and students) in this study answered all of the questions honestly. The responses received from the participating faculty members accurately reflected their own thoughts and professional opinion. The sample is representative of five faculty members who co-team taught at the university in the departments of educational leadership, teaching and learning and professional development

who were all highly qualified, competent and effective based on the needs of students. It was assumed that students were honest too, as focus groups, when they expressed their views.

### **Co-team Teaching Faculty Characteristics in this Study**

Among the five faculty members who participated in this study four were full-time tenured faculty and one faculty member served as an adjunct professor. However, all of the faculty participants in this study had taught at the university level from nine to twenty-two years. Four of the faculty members were in the department of educational studies and leadership and one faculty member was in the department of teaching, learning and professional development. Therefore, the interdisciplinary approach was value-added to students' experiences in this study (Creamer & Lattuca, 2005). Four of the faculty members have served as school leaders collectively at the building and district level in three different public school systems for over twenty years with terminal degrees in their field of expertise and one faculty member served as a leader in one school district. The five co-team teaching faculty members have also served as leaders in these areas: department chairpersons, business manager, coordinator for state partnership programs, assistant principals, principals, academic achievement specialist, grant writers, program directors, director of school performance, vice-superintendent and superintendent.

### **Limitations**

This study was limited to one university, five-seasoned faculty members, one course discipline (internship & practicum) and a five-year overview. Participating students enrolled in the course were from four different school districts. A total of N=124 students were enrolled in the internship & practicum course during the five year period. Students taking this course were seeking Certification One status from the State to qualify for an assistant principal's position in a public school environment.

### **Research Questions**

*The three major questions below led this research during the study.*

1. How do faculty members perceive the effectiveness of their co-team teaching experiences with their peers.
2. How do co-team teaching faculty members perceive ways to improve the instructional delivery process for students?
3. How did students perceive their experiences with five co-team teaching faculty members in the internship and practicum course?

### **Positioning Questions to Students**

These were the questions given to students as follows: 1). Did participating faculty members in this study show planning and preparation plus knowledge of the course? 2). Did faculty members communicate expectations of the course clearly? 3). Did faculty members use a variety of technology while teaching the course? 4). Did faculty members show enthusiasm while teaching the course? 5). Did faculty members give feedback in a timely manner?

## **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **Introduction**

Working together in a collaborative manner for the benefit of effective student learning may incorporate the elements of a co-team teaching model. Participating in co-team teaching experience offered students a variety of ways to see how instructional services were delivered in a classroom environment emphasizing school leadership.

For nearly fifty years, co-team teaching has had its presence over the educational landscape. There are advantages and disadvantages to co-team teaching. Starting with the advantages, it is important to show how students can increase their academic and social skills from two or more teaching techniques by faculty members. Second, students are able to receive more help in a co-team teaching classroom especially in smaller groups. Third, students, again, are able to gain more insight from instructional delivery services from the experiences of different faculty members. Fourth, faculty member through additional lenses can observe new ways of delivering curriculum using current standards when team teaching. Fifth, faculty members become more comfortable with working in a collaborative setting and participate in learning communities through professional growth and development (Dahlberg & Bacharach, 2009). Identifying and Addressing the Professional Development Needs of Educators through a School/University Partnership, could also enhance the knowledge of faculty plus added resources could be available to faculty. Sixth, faculty members may feel more comfortable with trying new techniques in teaching especially using technology application that is evidence-

based research with the support of their team members when working with sometimes challenged or advanced performing students (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2004).

Some repeated disadvantages for co-team teaching are having time for planning and citing some confusing thoughts about who will lead the start of the instructional delivery process for the course being taught. Second, some faculty may wish to participate in co-team teaching experiences if they had more time to work together in the same building. Third, faculty may feel that planning with others may take too much time in preparation for class. Fourth, faculty members may feel that their personal authority is being taken away from them as individuals. Fifth, faculty may feel that by presenting expectations and instruction from one or more teachers, students may become confused about the expectations and requirements of the class (Lipsky & Gartner, 1997).

Some classes may not reap student success using the co-team teaching model. Some faculty members' disposition may not fit well in the co-team teaching environment. In order to work collaboratively as a team, faculty members must think and implement the practices of a team where there is an equal partnership not one single individual. In essence, faculty members must "think as a team and act as a team." Some faculty may believe that co-team teaching is too time consuming for planning and executing the current applied curriculum (Helms, Alvis & Willis, 2005). There are many other reasons why some faculty members do not wish to co-team teach because of personality differences, too much work, not feeling comfort with one's own discipline and not being an effective planner. Some faculty members believe that students may become confused, again, with several different faculty members teaching in the same classroom at the same time (Laufgraben & Tompkins, 2004). Preplanning takes a considerable amount of time; therefore, each faculty member participating in a declared level of shared responsibility for the success of the co-team teaching experience must work together effectively to ensure success of all students by their actions as teachers.

Balancing the act of science and art in the teaching profession, there are many benefits to co-team teaching. However, there are some known challenges to this style of teaching for faculty based on research (Friend, 2000). When faculty members are team teaching they may encounter the first lost of personal autonomy and status as to who does what and when, roles overlapping, group relationships could be challenged, inadequate resources such as technology for effective collaboration issues. Again, sufficient time for planning lessons and segmentation of evaluation of each faculty member individually facilitating the instructional delivery process for the class are all a high level of consideration. Also, co-team teaching can be more expensive than solo teaching, because it may involve faculty taking more time to teach fewer total credit hours in some educational settings at the university (Letterman & Dugan, 2004).

In reference to students, inconsistencies for instructional direction and expectations during co-team teaching could pose a problem to students regarding lack of clarity to class work, expectations and standards, not addressing students' needs by all the participating faculty members teaching the course and how will the evaluation or assessment of students' work will be executed could, again, be prevailing problems. However, with proper planning, organizing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating all student learning activities with clarity by the co-team group could possibly ease some problems that may occur while executing the instructional delivery process in co-team teaching (Helms, Alvis & Willis, 2005). Faculty members participating in co-team teaching could be more reflective of their own practices as they plan student activities while working with a number of students who were seeking preparation and eventually job placement opportunities (Dugan & Letterman, 2008)

### **Key Elements of Practice in Co-Teaching**

There are four major types of team teaching models. Bacharach and her colleagues (2008) discussed seven strategies or models of co-teaching. For the purpose of this study, the authors looked at the four approaches to their co-teaching experiences based on the supportive, parallel, complementary, and team co-teaching. For the interest of definitions the supportive co-teaching is defined as one teacher taking a lead instructional role while the second or more teachers support instruction by rotating, providing one-to-one tutorial assistance or assessing as the other co-teacher directs the lesson with the support of a peer (Birrell & Bullough, 2005). Parallel co-teaching involved both co-teaching partners working with different groups of students in different sections of the room. In this model, each co-teacher eventually worked with each student in the class, through rotation or shifting groups over time. In a complementary co-teaching experience, one co-teacher enhanced the instructional services provided by the other co-teachers (i.e. one teacher paraphrasing what the other co-teacher's statements were regarding course activities or modeling note taking skills during the other co-teacher's instruction). The team co-teaching approach involved simultaneous instruction of both co-teachers where each co-teacher demonstrated being comfortable with taking the lead and supporting activities throughout the lesson based on their particular strengths and knowledge. In each case, the co-team faculty members were aware when it was time for their smooth transmission or input of information during the instructional process (Benjamin, 2000). In team co-teaching, it is essential too, that all co-teachers are viewed as equally

knowledgeable and credible (California State University Long Beach Multiple Subject Credential Program, 2012).

At various times during the five years teaching the internship and practicum course, the five co-team teaching faculty in this study used a combination of the four models. However, it was common that the faculty members used more of the parallel co-team teaching model for instruction with groups of four to five students based on topics for problem solving activities and discussions germane to educational leadership for public school leaders. What was key or most important to the co-team teaching faculty was when it was all said and done, it was essential that the instructional delivery process was working for each student (Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001).

### **Best Practices for Co- Team Teaching Faculty Based on Research**

In order to be successful as members of the co-team teaching group, it works best when there is evidence of effective planning, organizing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating student activities. It is important for faculty to identify needed resources for the classroom and students' experiences as soon as possible. Working in a collaborative manner, it is important for faculty members to become acquainted with the teaching style of each participating co-team faculty member. Modeling expectations and rendering support to team members is needed in order to develop and maintain a strong co-team teaching group. Team teaching works well when faculty respects the role and responsibilities of their co-team members. At the end of each teaching session, faculty members of the co-team group should reflect on their effectiveness and seek ways to improve services to students (Greg, Bresnahan & Pedersen, 2009).

Research also shows that successful co-taught courses by faculty members when they use a variety of cognitive strategies and resources as lessons are planned as the norm which could further impact student learning from different backgrounds and learning levels (Dieker, 2006). Actively involving students and incorporating strategic learning into the classroom are necessary components to help all students find learning a more rewarding experience and student will thrive more in the classroom. Looking at the success of the co-teaching partnerships with other faculty members, may also help co-team teaching faculty to improve their teaching skills based on research (Tobin & Roth, 2006)

### **Participating Students in the Internship and Practicum Class**

After learning more about the background of each participating student in the Internship and Practicum class, the five faculty members planned lessons appropriately in preparation for students to join their school building supervisor(s) in gaining first hand experiences in satisfying the internship and practicum course requirements. Using a collaborative approach for delivering instruction to an average class size of 13 to 18 students, per year, on an average during the five years, most members of the co-team teaching group felt the need to be more reflective of their own experiences for improving the instructional delivery process for all students. The total number of students participating in the Internship and Practicum course for the five-year period was N=124. From various experiences in the co-team teaching model, offered faculty a unique challenge to ensure that contents of the course were current and relevant based on Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. Secondly, based on the marketplace for those students who were seeking certification for school administration, students could benefit from the skills and knowledge of experienced faculty members with leadership practical application who were teaching the course. The five faculty members spent two semesters from (September to the following May) with each group of students in the program. For the very first meeting, faculty members would review and share expectations of the program based on the syllabus, standards and rubrics in the handbook for School Administration and Supervision. The two major signature assessment assignments were the portfolio and research theses paper using APA style and format for input into the Taskstream data system for evaluation at the end of the second semester. The class was held on Thursday evenings meeting face-to-face during the first three years. The last two years, the class was taught face-to-face the months of September and October, during the remaining months in the year, students would meet once a month and Blackboard would be used to post various assignments for single or group projects, interactions and discussions for the rest of each month. The ultimate goal of co-team teaching was to improve student achievement academically, socially and culturally and to prepare students to serve as effective school leaders in the workforce economy (Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001).

Students in the practicum and internship program had several books to read related to educational leadership and leading in general during the academic year. Some of the books were: Discover your True North, Bill George and Leadership 2050: Critical Challenge Key Contexts and Emerging Trends author Matthew Sowcik; Planning and Implementing a Sustainable Strategic Plan authors John M. Bryson, Sharon Roe Anderson and Farnum K. Alston; Grassroots Leadership and the Arts for Social Change authors Susan J. Erenrich and Jon F. Wergin and Building Leadership Bridges - Creative Social Change: Leadership for a Healthy World author Kathryn Goldman Schuyler. After reading the selected books, students had to write a

brief book report and present their work in class including the title of the book, introduction, body, analysis and evaluation, conclusion and state why the selected book has real-world application for educational leaders in a school environment or central office administration. All book reports could not exceed five typed pages with appropriate references attached.

The five co-team teaching faculty members as college supervisors for the Internship and Practicum course also shared the responsibility on Fridays and Mondays to visit different school sites to observe students interning in their perspective school during the two semesters annually. During each site visit, students were expected to be participating in actual leadership related activities by demonstrating their leadership ability related to one or more of the twelve itemized topic areas related to ***practical exposure to school leadership***. Faculty members would visit each student two or more times per semester to observe each student's progress during the internship. The five faculty members would compose in written form their observations and would collaborate and compare notes based on their observations during their planning period. Feedback would be given to students based on observations and recommendations for improvement within a week after the site visit. Students participating in the internship and practicum program were represented from four different county school systems.

The co-team teaching structure overall included a combination of parallel teaching, alternative teaching and teaming. Using parallel teaching, the five faculty members divided students into four groups and lead the same instructional activities with all four groups. Second, faculty members would use alternative teaching by managing the large group while the four other teachers would give a specific instructional purpose. Third, faculty members would co-team teach by fully engaging in the delivery of the core instructional delivery services by sharing and leading instruction in front of the class (Walsh, 2012).

During the past five years, the co-team teaching faculty used a variety of structures to implement instructional delivery services as follows: lecture style engagement with discussion, demonstrator or coach style, facilitator or activity style and some hybrid styles when equipment was working. By using a variety of styles of teaching, the five faculty members gave students options many times to select the faculty member and group members with whom they wished to work with regarding a specific planned lesson or activity (Dieker, 2006). What was common among the five faculty members was to give students options in as many situations as possible, but still being able to reach the intended positive outcomes for the course. In each situation while teaching, the five faculty members wanted a case method by providing an opportunity for students to apply what they had learned in the classroom to real-life experiences for school leadership (Harris & Harvey, 2000). The case method further engaged students in active classroom discussions about trends, issues and problems related to school leadership based on well documented research. When topics were relatable to the workplace economy, students were more motivated seemingly to learn and apply information to various assignments (Villa, Thousand & Nevin, 2004).

The five co-team teaching faculty for this study used a combination of models for team teaching. Again, the five faculty members frequently participated in the parallel co-team teaching experience where 18 to 20 students who were divided among five faculty members for instruction and support of various activities in the classroom related to effective school leadership (Wheelan, 2005) The topics for discussion during students' time in the internship and practicum course addressed the twelve items below during the internship experience. These were priorities for developing students' skills, knowledge and professional disposition that would enhance their learning during and after the internship and practicum experiences in a school environment.

Some of the typical topic areas pertaining to relevant leadership in public school settings for discussion and presentations in the classroom, gave students additional knowledge as to what they should know as a school leader. From these experiences for two semesters of each year, faculty members expected students to gain ***practical exposure to school leadership*** by participating in the twelve areas of activities in each category stated as follows:

- 1.Participating in the school Improvement Initiatives (rationale for contents of school improvement plan)
- 2.Looking at relevant curriculum and knowing how to construct (master schedules, testing programs, demonstration lessons, and implementing common core standards).
- 3.Knowing the types of student Support Services within the school district (academic, social and culturally related programs and resources) and activities/services for challenged students and international students. The interns need to know policies pertaining to facilitating effective special education program services to students in a timely manner and completing IEPs online.
- 4.Knowing how to effectively assistant with Human Resources (teacher planning, observations and evaluations informally and formally).
- 5.Having knowledge of General Administration and Supervision (policies, school law, school procedures and expectations for students, faculty and staff).
6. Demonstrating knowledge in how to manage the School Budget/Finance, Grant matters (expenditures for personnel, supplies/materials and equipment).

7. Finding effective ways to include more Parent Involvement in schools (specific role and tasks for parents).
8. Communicating effectively on Community Relations and Partnerships (communication and relationship building).
9. Demonstrating knowledge of Facilities and Management (maintenance, inspections, building, playground safety and knowing about the advantages of having a green school).
10. Facilitating Professional Development Facilitation (correlation toward improving instructional services by meeting the needs of each student).
11. Identifying technology materials and resources within the school district that would be useful for student use to improve student literacy skills across disciplines.
12. Citing innovative tasks demonstrated in the school or district level environment for school improvement (incorporating the use of more appropriate technology for instruction and management).

After the five co-team teaching faculty members reviewed students' assessment data contained in portfolios, research theses, required readings, demonstrated knowledge of Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015, faculty members could clearly see if students were progressing at the expectable level. Faculty members also, expected students to demonstrate their best leadership behavior by having excellent interpersonal skills while observing standards being met. At the end of the second semester, students submitted their two signature assignments for (portfolios and research theses) to Taskstream data system for final evaluation by faculty members finding the average performance level. This type of evaluation and feedback gave the co-team teaching faculty members additional ways to reflect on the quality of services rendered to students as being effectively executed during their course work, internship and practicum experience based on the sum total of students' evaluations by faculty.

### **Some Common Questions to Ask for Co-Team Teaching**

When using the self-reflective journal book or trying to secure feedback from students and peers, perhaps the most difficult part is actually composing suitable questions for improving the co-team teaching process by faculty. A few re-occurring questions were asked and used by faculty members (for self and reflective evaluation) as follows as faculty reflected on their own individual perception of the co-team teaching experience. The reflective questions below were asked among the participating faculty to one another for honest feedback.

#### *Lesson Planning Objectives*

1. Was the lesson relevant to real-world application in educational leadership and what improvements would you make regarding some or any of the lessons presented?
2. Did the students gain mastery of the skills and knowledge presented by the lesson objectives?
3. If the lessons were repeated, what should be added to improve those lessons i.e. are more case studies or problem-solving activities needed?
4. Did the lessons include more meaningful reading materials related to instructional educational leadership?

#### *Resources and Materials (co-team teaching faculty must be specific)!*

1. Do you think that the materials and resources motivated and engaged the students during the lesson presentation?
2. What resources and materials did we use that enhanced the lesson plan?
3. What resources and materials did we use that could have been improved upon regarding specific lessons especially research expectations and related activities for students?
4. Are there more current resources or techniques that could have been used that are more meaningful to the learning experiences of our students currently?
5. Were all students given a copy and an explanation of the rubric for the course?
6. Were students encouraged to go online to review relevant videos with direction of use of the videos to enhance learning for educational leadership?

#### *Overall Behavior of Students*

1. Were students generally on task during each class?
2. With what parts of the lesson plan did the students seem motivated and most engaged?
3. With what portion of the lesson did students seem least engaged such as lecture with fewer discussions?
4. Were students more engaged when they had problem-solving exercises to perform?
5. Were students informed of the various standards for educational leadership practices in the educational environment based on Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 which is now housed at The National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA. 2015) ?



#### *Classroom Management*

1. Were the instructional processes and services clearly presented by all co-team teaching faculty?
2. Was the lesson taught at a reasonable pace within the allotted time?
3. Did all students participate in the lesson plan activities in a motivational manner?
4. Would the use of appropriate and available technology have engaged students more in their own learning?

#### *Co-team Teaching Faculty Reflection*

1. How effective was overall lesson planning executed?
2. How can the co-team teaching faculty members do it better next time that the course is taught?
3. Did the co-team teaching faculty meet all of the course objectives?
4. How did the co-team teaching faculty members deal with problems that came up during instruction?
5. Was co-team teaching faculty perceptive and sensitive to each student's needs?
6. How was the co-team teaching faculty members overall attitude and the delivery process throughout the class?

#### **The Reflection Processes**

Looking at self-reflection during the co-team teaching experience was a process. So the questions stated above gave faculty members the opportunity to truly think about their experiences, quality of services and student reactions. However, the five faculty members discussed what specifics did they wish to reflect on mainly during the reflection process, but the questions gave faculty members some structure and sequence of valuable information to think about during their reflective moments. Members of the co-team teaching group decided to focus on their lessons and the delivery of the lessons, what did students think about the services that they received based on goals, objectives and learning outcomes. The co-team teaching faculty each maintained a self-reflective electronic journal based their reaction of student learning and did an exchange of their own reflections with members of the co-team teaching group. The team members each would also look at lesson objectives, materials, classroom management, and student engagement during the course. Second, looking at student observations of faculty's teaching by having students to complete a survey or questionnaire after each lesson. In this way, faculty can be consistent with how they measure their assessments time after the conclusion of each lesson. Third, peer observations with expertise are invaluable to the co-team teaching faculty, because a school leader can observe and give an honest perspective of the instructional delivery process which is relevant and how it applies to the school environment currently (Badiali & Titus, 2009).

The ultimate goal of self-reflection is to improve the way an individual may teach. Self-reflection affords co-team teaching faculty members to be honest about their performance. During the next teaching experience regarding the internship and practicum class, the co-team teaching faculty will be able to cite ways of how to be more effective when teaching the same course again as a team as they reflect on all the feedback that was given by students during the measurable use of evaluative tools.

#### **Tips for Enhancing the Success of Co-team Teaching**

Faculty members participating in co-team teaching instructional delivery services may benefit from the following practices: 1.) schedule a standard time for co-planning for the course, 2.) communicate clearly illustrative levels of sharing information and documents for enhancing the delivery of instruction using technology, 3.) decide early at the beginning of the semester what major topics will be taught in the class and why, plus who will be the visiting professionals to further articulate aspects of the course for real-world application such as a school leader or principal, 4.) clearly communicate what activities that students are expected to cover as a group and as individuals, 5.) remind students, again, what to expect when site visits take place, 6.) being reflective as to how the course was delivered at the end of the class, 7.) ask for input from students to ensure that they feel that students needs are being met and their views are being valued, and 8.) let students know that the five faculty members are working together on their behalf. The listed successes of co-team teaching have been communicated in items 1 thru 8 as indicators of what makes co-team teaching work (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2008).

#### **How is Success Measured Reflectively in Co-Team Teaching?**

Being reflective as a co-team teaching group for the Internship and Practicum course, the four faculty members agreed that these were ways to measure student success as follows: valuing the full student experiences and build upwardly on those experiences, reviewing collected data and making decisions that would improve instruction and management, planning strategically for co-team teaching to improve student retention and progression, and articulating relevant goals and objectives of the course. Communicating course success to the campus and larger communities through media use is very important and a high priority. The importance of infusing information and illustrating effective practices related to educational leadership in planning, organizing,

implementing, monitoring and evaluating is a major key to leadership at its best. The major objective, however, is by ensuring that students are able to apply professional and technical skills using Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 as they advance to the next level of job growth in the workforce economy. At the end of the course, faculty members informed students how to secure the Administration and Supervision Certification One Certificate from the State Board of Education. The ultimate outcome is essential that students have gained official knowledge and skills so that they were able to obtain meaningful employment in the field in which the students were trained in educational leadership. Again, it is important to find ways to always improve student performance (Friend, 2010). In order to continue to improve aspects of the course, the co-team teaching faculty would ask graduates of the course for feedback as to their own reflections about their educational learning experiences at the university being linked to relevancy to the workforce economy (Villa, Thousand, & Nevin, 2008).

There is always room for improving services to students through the instructional delivery process. Additional ways to be reflective of their work, faculty members used a series of questions being asked of each other as follows:

1. What worked in the lessons delivered in the Practicum and Internship course? How do we know it worked?
2. What would we do the same or differently if we could re-teach the same lessons in the course? Why?
3. What root cause might be prompting or perpetuating student learning in the course?
4. What do we think as a team about how students learn? How does this belief drive our instructional delivery process?
5. What data do we need to improve decision-making for the Internship and Practicum course for the future?
6. What were the most effective ways in accomplishing new and improved services for the Internship and Practicum course?
7. What are other universities doing to improve their Internship and Practicum course as they connect with local school districts and employers in the workforce economy?
8. How did student participants feel about their experiences in the course as they reflected on classroom work, internship sites and the site supervisor's guidance?

### **III. METHODOLOGY**

This was a qualitative study at a mid-Atlantic University where five co-team teaching faculty members expressed their perception of the co-team teaching experience while teaching the internship and practicum course for a period of five years. Faculty members looked at the pros and cons about the co-team teaching model and how effectively they thought their performances were and being reflective on how to find more ways to improve their teaching in the future during the co-team teaching experience. During the five years teaching the internship and practicum course, the number of participating students were N= 124. During this study, faculty members completed a survey about their perception and experiences in the co-team teaching environment. A summary of the results are displayed in Figure 1.

Further information in this research study was qualitative data items that were collected by the authors from articles, scholarly journals, official statistics, reference books, library search engines, government reports and acknowledgements of the thoughts of the co-team teaching faculty members' experiences based on their own perception.

#### **Research Design**

This study employed research methodology extensively to evaluate the perception of faculty members who participated in this study and to receive input from students based on their experiences in the course. Further, this study incorporated the qualitative research method of study that focused on discovering and understanding the experiences, perspectives, and thoughts/perceptions of participants of five professors who were co-teaching in the internship and practicum course for five years. Data were collected from questions on a likert scale from 1 thru 5 with five being the highest number as illustrated in figure 1. The participating professors who were involved in the co-team teaching experience responded to the fourteen survey questions. The survey questions involved were emailed and collected from a sample of five professors by asking them the same questions and securing responses from them within a week spring of 2017. Plus a few questions were specific for students to answer within several focus groups.

#### **Statement of the Problem**

A number of students come to graduate programs in higher education with the need to participate in a variety of instructional delivery services and experiences in preparation for real-world application for educational leadership. The problem is that too many students do not receive instructional services and activities in teaching, learning and leadership from faculty members who have actually served as effective

school administrators at various levels in educational leadership, again, with practical experiences and having appropriate degrees in their profession. In essence, faculty members should be highly qualified and effective as teachers of the subject matter in educational leadership in order to meet the needs of each student. Second, another problem can exist when too many faculty members as individuals and as a group do not reflect formally and informally on their own teaching practices in order to improve services to students who are seeking a profession in educational school leadership. Third, are faculty members as co-team teachers participating in co-teaching in a manner consistent with research knowledge based on successful co-teaching elements for higher student achievement (Slavin, 2001)? It is always a priority to improve student achievement at the highest level possibly with highly qualified and effective teaching faculty members.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The major purpose of this study was to examine the reflective thoughts of co-team teaching experiences of five faculty members teaching the graduate internship and practicum course for a period of five years. Emphases were placed on planning, organizing, implementing instructional teaching methods, monitoring and evaluating their experiences as co-team teaching faculty members reflectively. Second, the purpose of the study was to see how students viewed the co-teaching experience as evaluative focus groups.

### **Assumptions of the Study**

The participants in this study answered all of the survey questions honestly. The responses received from the participating faculty members accurately reflected their own thoughts and professional opinion. The sample in this study was representative of five faculty members who co-team taught at the university in the departments of educational leadership, teaching and learning and professional development.

### **Co-team Teaching Faculty Leadership Experiences and Student Characteristics in this Study**

The five faculty members who participated in this study were full-time, tenured faculty who had taught at the university level from nine to twenty-two years. Four of the faculty members were in the department of educational studies and leadership and one faculty member was in the department of teaching, learning and professional development. Therefore, the interdisciplinary approach of five different faculty members was value-added to students' learning experiences (Creamer & Lattuca, 2005). Four of the faculty members in this study had served as school leaders collectively and effectively at the building and district level in three different public school systems for over twenty years with terminal degrees in educational leadership in their field of expertise. The co-team teaching faculty members have served in leadership positions in these areas: department chairpersons, assistant principals, principals, academic achievement specialist, grant writers, international consultant, peer reviewer for international leadership refereed journals, program directors, vice-superintendent and superintendent.

### **Limitations**

This study was limited to one university, five-seasoned faculty members, one course discipline (internship & practicum) and a five year overview of the course taught. Participating students enrolled in the course were from five different school districts. A total of N=124 students were enrolled in the internship & practicum course for over a five year period. Students taking this class were seeking Certification One Certificate status from the State to qualify for an assistant principal's position in a public school environment.

### **Sample of Student Participants and Demographic Information**

Students participating in the program represented five different school districts. The University has had over a twenty-two year history of preparing individuals for leadership positions at the building and district level for nearby public school systems. The university has continually worked in partnership agreement with local school systems in preparing individuals for leadership positions. The effectiveness of the program was determined based the goals and objectives being completed successfully plus a follow-up to learn about the number of graduates who are serving currently in leadership positions in various public school systems (Braun, Gable & kite, 2008).

Some demographic information about the participating students was as follows: the average age of the participants in the program 28 to 38 at 40%; 39 to 48 at 33% and 50 to 58 at 27%. In terms of race, there were 71 % Black; 23 % White; 4% others; and 2% Latino. The gender distribution was 92 % female and 8% male.

### **Research Questions**

*The three questions below led this research during the study.*

1. How do faculty members perceive the effectiveness of their co-team teaching instructional experiences with their peers.

2. How do co-team teaching faculty members perceive ways to improve the instructional delivery process for students?
3. How do co-team teaching faculty members perceive students' thoughts about their experiences with five co-team teaching faculty members in the internship and practicum course?

**Survey and Data Results**

By addressing the Research Questions (RQ), the survey results used in this study were completed by the five co-team teaching faculty members who were officially participants in this study. The outcome results from the survey were given as follows in Figure 1 on a Likert Scale 1 thru 5 with 5 being the highest as illustrated below:

**SURVEY Data Collected Fall 2012 thru Spring 2017** **Faculty Members Average Input**

<b>Figure 1: Perceptions and Reflections from Five Faculty Members based on the three (3) Research Questions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
01. I understood the purpose, goals, objectives that are commonly practiced using the co-team teaching instructional model for the Internship and Practicum course for school leadership. RQ1					5
02. I believe that students learn best in a co-team teaching class. RQ3				1	4
03. I believe that students engage more in classroom activities in a co-team teaching instructional environment. RQ3				1	4
04. I believe that co-team teaching instruction is beneficial to students with different learning styles, diverse background and English as a second language because of appropriate resources and teaching style among the four faculty members. RQ1				1	4
05. I believe that co-team teaching instruction is beneficial to all students who are at-risks of low performance in basic literacy skills in research and writing skills during the internship and practicum course. RQ1					5
06. I believe that co-team teaching instruction is beneficial to all students performing at all different levels academically. RQ1				2	3
07. I think that university committee meetings should not be scheduled during the time of co-team teaching and planning period. RQ2					5
08. I believe that classroom management and instructional delivery services are shared equally among the co-team teaching faculty. RQ1					5
09. I believe that grading students' performance should be equally shared among members of the co-team teaching faculty. RQ2					5
10. I think that accommodations should be made by each co-team teaching faculty member based on the needs of each student. RQ1					5
11. I think that professional development activities have been undertaken at the university to foster collaboration, inclusive practices and co-team teaching. RQ2				1	4
12. I think that administrators need to support more co-team teaching endeavors at the university by ensuring that there is available operable technology in each classroom. RQ2					5
13. I think that administrators set the registration number and need to support the number of students in the co-team teaching classroom. RQ2					5
14. I am overall satisfied with the current co-team teaching model at the university. RQ1				1	4

**Analyses**

Data were gathered from the five participating co-team teaching faculty members. The resulting data gave a snapshot of perceptions of how five faculty members felt about their co-team teaching experiences at the university as illustrated in Figure 1. The survey had fourteen perception and reflection statements from the five co-team teaching faculty to complete as cited above in this study.

**Findings Overall**

The suggested findings gave an overall view about the *five co-team* teaching faculty members' perception regarding their own co-team teaching experiences as follows:

1. Works best when co-team faculty members can agree on the instructional delivery process per lesson.

2. Works best when one person does not view the other faculty members as a threat.
3. Is very beneficial to both students and faculty members because of the different experiences of faculty and the varied learning styles of students plus the extra support in the classroom that allows individualized attention to students.
4. Needs more support from the university administrative team i.e. dean, provost and president regarding classroom resources.
5. Needs quality and quantity working technology (computers, printers in the classroom).
6. Needs access to an appropriate classroom in advance before the first meeting date of the class.
7. Should offer more co-team teaching faculty with up-to-date training and professional development using the co-team teaching model.
8. Could help students with improving their writing skills when students are working on research projects such as writing articles and writing theses.
9. Should be encouraged in at least one selected course in each department to participate in co-team teaching because of increasing diverse enrolled students and to address students specific learning styles and individual needs.
10. Encourages the co-team faculty members to work beyond teaching the internship and practicum course in the department of educational studies and leadership, because four of the five faculty members have engaged more in working on research-based projects together.

### **Analyze and Implement Effective Techniques**

The collected and analyzed information is very important. The analyzed findings in Figure 1 helped the four co-team teaching faculty to see recurring patterns in number agreement and numbers with less agreeing views. Did the observers or evaluators find any repeated areas action during lesson engagement that needed improvement? The first thing one should look for is any recurring patterns by participants. The number ones that were given by the participant in the study who *is not* from the educational studies and leadership department was recurring. By improving a teaching technique by the co-team teaching faculty could make a difference in students' practical learning experiences with the support of school supervisors as partners during the internship and practicum course (Badiali & Titus, 2009).

The five faculty members see themselves as lifelong learners and they continue to be futuristic visionaries, being active learners in teaching, learning and leading. The co-team teaching faculty members see the co-teaching model as having high workability for the improvement of student learning (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2007).

### **What did the Four Student Focus Groups Say about Co-Team Teaching?**

The co-team teaching faculty members of four were not in the room during the student focus group activity. The use of positioning statements were led by a student leader and a student recorder. Hence students in the four focus groups with four to five students were asked to agree or disagree about a number of statements. It was important that each student participating in the focus group activity was able to identify with one or more of the statements as being important to them as individuals and as a total group for the final statement. In essence, the perspective from students was key in order to learn what their thinking and thoughts were about their experiences in the internship and practicum course. The recorder would articulate the average given statement during the activity which took place the last week of the course. Positioning statements were a variation of the verbal rating scale and was often known as agree/disagree scales or Likert scales after the researcher who popularized the scales historically (Likert, 1932). Typically a statement was read out and the respondents were presented with five choices such as: 1). **Agree strongly**, 2). **Agree**, 3). **Agree slightly** **Neither Agree nor Disagree**, 4). **Disagree Slightly**, 5). **Disagree Strongly** were the overall rating. This activity was facilitated, again, by student leaders in the Internship and Practicum class which took one hour and a half to complete the focus group activity.

### **Analyses and Findings from Perception of Student Focus Group Participants**

Students viewed the five faculty members as equals based on informal questions to students such as: 1). Q. Did the five faculty members (as a group) show planning and preparation plus knowledge of the course? A. Agree 2). Q. Did faculty members communicate expectations of the course clearly? A. Agree 3). Q. Did faculty members use a variety of technology while teaching the course? A. Agree Slightly 4). Q. Did faculty members show enthusiasm while teaching the course? A. Agree Strongly 5). Q. Did faculty members give feedback in a timely manner? A. Agree Slightly. Students stated in written comments that the classroom should have better working technology.

### **A Major Concern of Students**

The co-team teaching faculty members looked at students' feedback statements. When students independently stated similar information for improvement of the course that was an area that needed attention. Is there anything that students kept talking about in the written narratives during the course was questioned by faculty? Yes, the major concern that students expressed, in this study, repeatedly the need for up-to-date working technology in the classroom. Today, technology tools are invaluable assets to the classroom environment in order to help to facilitate classroom activities. According to Janelle Cox, "around 75 percent of educators think that technology has a positive impact in the education process. Educators also recognize the importance of developing these technological skills in students so they will be prepared to enter the workforce once they complete their schooling" (Cox, 2017, p.1).

### **Seeking Ways to Improve Co-team Teaching**

When addressing the needs of students, the co-team teaching faculty members would listen carefully using data reviews and would make every attempt to plan accordingly with the students in mind. Members of the co-team teaching faculty would discuss the concerns based on feedback from students and ask colleagues for suggestions for instructional improvement (Wiggins, 2012). The co-team teaching faculty would look (for example) at effective team-teaching techniques and list those techniques in their lesson plans for the next class delivery. Some co-team teaching faculty would make inquires with faculty teaching the internship and practicum course from other institutions within the state about their success using the co-team teaching model.

### **Impact of Co-team Teaching Model for the Internship and Practicum Course**

It was the benefit of the five faculty members that the effectiveness of the co-team teaching faculty model provided an increase in academic engaged time for students, improved evidence-based instructional practices, created a supportive encouraging environments and offered continuous feedback to their students on an ongoing basis. Again, this paper was written by reflecting upon the experiences of five faculty members and university supervisors by making recommendations that could support future faculty teaching using the co-team teaching approach in the Internship and Practicum course. The co-team teaching faculty embraced the need to always strive for continuous development and improvement for instructional delivery services to each student or groups of students who are participating in an internship and practicum experience in higher education (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2007).

The major aim in this paper was to highlight the experiences and perception of five co-team teaching faculty who engaged in teaching in the Internship and Practicum course for five years. During the first semester program-wide, the co-teaching implementation was carefully organized and executed to promote improved student learning in preparation for the internship and practicum experience. Co-team teaching faculty participated themselves in consciously listening a lot to students' thoughts, one another and reflecting on their own thoughts and perception about their co-team teaching experiences as illustrated in figure 1.

### **Recommendations for Future Practice of Co-Team Teaching**

University faculty and supervisors could perhaps benefit in having more knowledge, experience and engagement in new practices based on research in co-teaching and to know more about the complex nature of this construct. The co-team teaching experience could direct faculty to be more innovative in interdisciplinary teaching in different classes in different departments (Haynes, 2002)

Co-team teaching by faculty members offer a true form of diversity for rendering instructional delivery services to a number of students using a variety of media and expertise of human resources to enhance leadership training for students. The role of each department or unit at the university participating in co-team teaching could for example:

1. Seek the reflections and perceptions of a larger population of teachers who are willing to engage in co-team teaching in higher education.
2. Create better infrastructures by the university leadership to support faculty and to ensure that there is working updated technology that would enhance the instructional delivery process and encourage more co-team teaching in various departments through professional growth development training and activities.
3. Communicate clearly expectations for the co-team teaching approach using Professional Standards for Educational Leaders.
4. Work closely with a larger sample of students who are seeking leadership positions in education early.
5. Perhaps have half of the internship experience for students mid-course work instead of near the end of all course work.
4. Use Blackboard more to support the instructional delivery process for more special signature assignments for student projects on Ethical, Transformational , Political and Authentic Leadership.

5. Seek grant funding and provide the opportunity for students to attend and participate in at least one national leadership professional conference during the academic year during the practicum experience.
6. Offer two student development workshops locally on "effective leadership strategies" during the academic year.
7. Show examples of successful co-team teaching models, learning and leading communities.
8. Prepare an electronic toolkit for effective co-team teaching for educational leaders for the department or unit.
9. Create an appropriate location for faculty co-teams in order to plan effectively for meaningful exercises and activities.
10. Work with student teachers, as co-team faculty members in the future in the Department of Teaching and Learning who may wish to become effective future teacher leaders and eventually as school leader toward advancing one's own career (Heck & Bacharach, 2010). Faculty members in a collaborative manner need to work closely with student teachers to ensure their success as they participate in student teaching practicum experiences Platt, Walker-Knight, Lee & Hewitt, 2001).
11. Continue to mentor instructional school leaders as they progress in their careers at the building or central administration office in the school system, by creating learning professional communities to support these individuals. Professional development should be an ongoing practice (Fox, 2010).
11. Encourage more team teaching in foreign languages, specific needs, science projects or literacy focused curriculum by developing a strategic plan for the Internship and Practicum/clinical courses in different disciplines.
12. Use more case studies, legal cases, videos and discussions during co-team teaching sessions with permission of all faculty members and students in order to see a broader view of the behavior of both students and co-team teaching faculty members. There are needs to be met by working together to use self-reflection more for effective instructional delivery for course improvement (Roth & Tobin, 2002).

### **III. CONCLUSION**

Co-teaching can be an enjoyable and productive experience when there is respect for the expertise of each faculty team member, effective planning to ensure student success, rendering instructional delivery services that are relevant, meaningful and purposeful regarding the discipline area. It is crucial to have excellent interpersonal skills with all faculty, students and the university leadership administrative support team. In order to be effective for co-team teaching faculty, it is essential to learn quickly the teaching styles of the co-team teaching group members and to examine the learning styles of students from diverse backgrounds and know more about students current and prior experiences in order to be able to plan instructional activities more appropriately based on the needs of each student. Being a co-team teaching faculty member, it is a must to be honest in articulating the strengths and weaknesses of team members in order to obtain the best performance from each faculty member. Based on the needs of each student when known, the co-team teaching faculty can prepare a personalized educational action plan for effective leadership training for each student during the internship and practicum experience. All planning and the execution of planning must be done with the students in mind (Villa & Nevin, 2005).

It is important too, to ensure that there is a true organizational structure for the co-team teaching faculty experience. It is a priority for the first class meeting with students is to have an agenda schedule of activities for the years, expectations and requirements, class assignments and due dates, tests, projects, grading system, current leadership standards, rubrics and means of communicating or contacting faculty members and student leaders within the class. The number of illustrative examples will also help students to see clearly about what and how to do their assignments that could become models for others to emulate (Cramer, Nevin, Thousand & Liston 2006). Co-teaching in urban school districts to meet the needs of all teachers and learners was the overreaching goal in this study. In order to render effective instructional delivery services to students, the co-team teaching faculty members in this study believe that it is important to listen to one another and to students in order to improve the quality of services to students. Faculty members must also articulate their individual perspectives about co-teaching principles and began to think more deeply about their enactment in the classroom. In essence, it is the belief that the co-team teaching faculty must find out the needs of students early and meet the needs of students with exceptional needs who may benefit from different teaching modalities. All students including exceptional or challenged students exiting educational programs must be well prepared for the workforce economy at the level in which they qualify (Gately & Gately, 2001).

Successful co-team teaching requires the active institutional and faculty commitment of time, resources, and careful planning and the execution of relevant activities for student learning. By doing so, co-team teaching can enhance the teaching and learning experiences of students and faculty plus fulfill the purpose of university education by helping students to integrate discipline information in meaningful perspectives of more skills and knowledge gained from across the curriculum (Harris & Harvey, 2000). When teaching is all about students, co-team teaching can increase instructional options for all students. The improvement of course

intensity and continuity, reduces stigma for students with different levels of skills and increase support for faculty members. Students could have more options if more operable technology is available for use in the classroom too, because students could work at their own pace, connect with other students for discussions locally, nationally and internationally, and perhaps improve student retention during the course of study. Students using technology could master more skills and knowledge in an interdisciplinary manner (Cox, 2017).

Based on research, the effectiveness of quality co-teaching depends on faculty competence, experience in the discipline area, common planning time, which can lead to more consistent and thoughtful implementation of the co-teaching model. Co-team teaching faculty would be willing and able to use innovative ideas and information to improve teaching, leading and learning for school leadership activities. The co-team teaching experiences may expand the many roles that faculty members may practice during the teaching of skills in leadership. The co-team teaching faculty could also expand the opportunity for use of more scholarly research to enhance the internship and practicum course for students who seek to become school leaders in a public school environment (Arreola, Theall & Aleamoni, 2003).

### **Bio of Key Author**

**Dr. Ann Toler Hilliard** is the key leading author for this article and is an associate professor who teaches in the Department of Educational Studies and Leadership at Bowie State University, U.S.A. The author teaches courses in educational leadership: policy studies for school leaders, school law, strategic planning and evaluation, management of human resources and dissertation one/two. The author's research interests are international studies, professional development, instructional and responsive leadership, learning in global communities, and blended learning. She has published over twenty-eight research articles in peer-reviewed refereed international journals. Dr. Hilliard's research publications and awards have been recognized by (AERA) American Educational Research Association, 2014/2015/2017. Beyond teaching, the author has experience as a college and school leader in administration. The author currently coordinates activities that provide professional experiences for graduate candidates who are seeking the opportunity to serve as school administrators at the building and district level. She also serves as reviewer and editor on several international peer reviewed refereed journals. Education includes: Ed.D. degree, George Washington University; M.S. degree, The Johns Hopkins University; M.A.T. degree, Trinity University-Washington; B.S. degree, Elizabeth City State University, and Certificate for Consulting from Harvard University. Emails: [ahilliard@bowiestate.edu](mailto:ahilliard@bowiestate.edu) or [draph1@juno.com](mailto:draph1@juno.com)

### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Arreola, R. A., Theall, M., & Aleamoni, L. M. (2003) "Beyond Scholarship: Recognizing the Multiple Roles of the Professoriate." Paper presented at the 83rd Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago: April 22. Available at: [www.cednet.com/meta/Beyond%20Scholarship.pdf](http://www.cednet.com/meta/Beyond%20Scholarship.pdf).
- [2] Bacharach, N., Heck, T. W. & Dank, M. (2003). Co-Teaching: A partnership in the classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Education. Jacksonville, FL.
- [3] Bacharach, N., Heck, T. & Dahlberg, K. (2007). Collaboratively researching the impact of a co-teaching model of student teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL
- [4] Bacharach, N, Heck, T., & Dahlberg, K. (2007). Co-teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 4, 19-26.
- [5] Bacharach, N., Heck, T. W., & Dahlberg, K. (2008). Co-teaching in higher education. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 5(3), 9–16.
- [6] Bacharach, N, Heck, T., & Dahlberg, K. (2008). What Makes Co-Teaching Work? Identifying the Essential Elements. *The College Teaching Methods and Styles and Journal*, 4, 43-48.
- [7] Bacharach, N., Heck, T., & Dahlberg, K. (2010). Researching the use of co-teaching in the student teaching experience. In Colette Murphy & Kathryn Scantlebury (Eds). *Moving Forward and Broadening Perspectives: Co-teaching in International contexts*. New York, New York: Springer Publishing.
- [8] Badiali, B., & Titus, N. E. (2009). Co-Teaching: Enhancing Student Learning Through Mentor-Intern Partnerships. *School-University Partnerships*, 4(2), 74-80.
- [9] Benjamin, J. (2000). The scholarship of teaching in teams: What does it look like in practice? *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19, 191–204.
- [10] Birrell, J. R., & Bullough, R. V., Jr. (2005). Teaching with a peer: A follow-up study of the first year of teaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, 27(1), 72–81.
- [11] Braun, D., Gable, R.K., Kite, S.L. (2008). *Relationship among essential leadership preparation practices and leader, school, and student outcomes in k-8 schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association, Rocky Hill, CT.



- [12] California State University Long Beach Multiple Subject Credential Program, 2012.
- [13] Check, J., & Schutt, R. (2011). *Research methods in education*. SAGE Publications.
- [14] Cox, J. (2017). Benefits of Technology in the Classroom. State University of New York College at Buffalo. *Teach Hub Magazine*.
- [15] Cramer, E., Nevin, A., Thousand, J., & Liston A. (2006, January). Co-teaching in urban school districts to meet the needs of all teachers and learners: Implications for teacher education reform.
- [16] Creamer, E. G. and Lattuca, L. R., eds., 2005. *Advancing Faculty Learning Through Interdisciplinary Collaboration*
- [17] Dahlberg, K., & Bacharach, N. (2009). Identifying and Addressing the Professional Development Needs of Educators through a School/University Partnership. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Dallas, TX
- [18] Dieker, L. (2006). *The co-teaching lesson plan book* (3rd ed.). Whitefish Bay, WI: Knowledge by Design.
- [19] Dugan, K., & Letterman, M. (2008). Student appraisals of collaborative teaching. *College Teaching*, 56(1), 11–15. Greene, M. S., & Isaacs, M. L.
- [20] Eich, D. (2008). A grounded theory of high-quality leadership programs: Perspectives from student leadership development programs in higher education. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 176-187. doi:10.1177/1548051808324099
- [21] Eisen, M.-J. (2000). The many faces of team teaching and learning: An overview. In M.-J. Eisen & E. J. Tisdell (Eds.), *Team teaching and learning in adult education* (Vol. 87, pp. 5-14). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [22] Friend, M. (2005). *The power of 2*, 2nd ed. [DVD]. Available from <http://www.nprinc.com>. A comprehensive look at co-teaching, along with definitions, beliefs, and classroom practices. Includes input from educators with extensive experience and a section on the role of administrators.
- [23] Friend, M. (2000). *Complexities of collaboration* [DVD]. Available from <http://www.nprinc.com>. Teachers demonstrate five dilemmas of collaborative practices.
- [24] Friend, M. (2009). *More power! Instruction in co-taught classrooms* [DVD]. Available from <http://www.nprinc.com>. Learn how to improve outcomes for all students by getting more power from co-teaching.
- [25] Friend, M. (2010). *Instructional power! Co-teachers share instructional techniques* [DVD]. Available from <http://www.nprinc.com>. A collection of strategies to improve student performance.
- [26] Gallo-Fox, J. (2010). Risk-taking as practice in a co-teaching professional learning community. In C. Murphy & K. Scantlebury (Eds.), *Co teaching in international contexts: Moving forward and broadening perspectives* (pp. 105-124).
- [27] Gately, S. & Gately, J. (2001). Understanding co-teaching components. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, (3) 44, p40-47
- [28] Greg C, Bresnahan, V & Pedersen, T. (2009). *Purposeful Co-Teaching: Real Cases and Effective Strategies*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press
- [29] Harris, C., & Harvey, A. N. C. (2000). Team teaching in adult higher education classrooms: Toward collaborative knowledge construction. In M.-J. Eisen and E. J. Tisdell (Eds.), *Team teaching and learning in adult education* (pp. 25-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- [30] Haynes, C., ed. (2002). *Innovations in Interdisciplinary Teaching*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education/The Oryx Press.
- [31] Heck, T., Bacharach, N. (2010). *Mentoring Teacher Candidates Through Co-Teaching: Collaboration That Makes A Difference*. St. Cloud, MN: St. Cloud State University
- [32] Helms, M. M., J. M. Alvis, and M. Willis, 2005. "Planning and Implementing Shared Teaching: An MBA Team-Teaching Case Study." *Journal of Education for Business* 81(1), 29-34.
- [33] Kloo, A., & Zigmond, N. (2008). Coteaching revisited: Redrawing the blueprint. *Preventing School Failure*, 52(2), 12–20
- [34] Laufgraben, J. L., and D. Tompkins, 2004. "Pedagogy that Builds Community." In *Sustaining and Improving Learning Communities*, eds. J. L. Laufgraben and N. S. Shapiro. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- [35] Letterman, M. R., Dugan, K.B. (2004). *Team Teaching a Cross-Disciplinary Honors Course*. *College Teaching*, Taylor & Francis, Ltd. Vol. 52, No. 2 pp. 76-79. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27559183> Accessed: 14-12-2015 18:38 UTC
- [36] Likert, Rensis (1932). "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes". *Archives of Psychology*. **140**: 1–55
- [37] Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore: Brookes.

- [38] Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). Classroom instruction that works: Research based strategies for increasing student achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- [39] Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T.E. (2004, July). Conducting evidence based research in educational settings. Paper presented at the annual U.S. Department of Education Project Director's Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- [40] Murata, R. (2002). What does team teaching mean? A case study of interdisciplinary teaming. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(2), 67-77.
- [41] Platt, J., Walker-Knight, D., Lee, T. & Hewitt, R. (2001). Shaping future teacher education practices through collaboration and co-teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.
- [42] Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. The National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA).
- [43] Roth, W.M., & Tobin, K. (2002). At the elbow of another: Learning to teach by coteaching, Vol. 204. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publisher.
- [44] Roth, W., Tobin, K. (2005). Teaching Together, Learning Together. New York: Peter Lang Publisher.
- [45] Slavin, R.E. (2001). Big change questions: Does rigorous research knowledge provide a better base for improving student achievement than teachers' craft knowledge? *Journal of Educational Change*, 2 (4), 347-348.
- [46] The National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA) 2015.
- [47] Tobin, K., & Roth, W. M. (2006). Teaching to learn: A view from the field. Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publisher.
- [48] Villa, R., Thousand, S., & Nevin, A. (2004). A Guide to Co-Teaching: Practical Tips for Facilitating Student Learning. Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press.
- [49] Villa, R. A., & Nevin, A. I. (2005). The many faces of collaborative planning and teaching. *Theory into Practice*, 45(3), 239-248.
- [50] Villa, R. Thousand, J., & Nevin, A. (2008). A Guide to Co-Teaching: Practical Tips for Facilitating Student Learning (2nd. Ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- [51] Wadkins, T., R. L. Miller, and W. Wozniak, 2006. "Team Teaching: Student Satisfaction and Performance." *Teaching of Psychology* 22(2), 118-20.
- [52] Walsh, J. M. 2012. Co-teaching as a school system strategy for continuous improvement. *Preventing School Failure*, 56, 29-36.
- [53] Wassell, B. A., (2005). Co teaching as a site for collaborative research. In Roth, W. M., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). *Teaching together, learning together* (pp. 121-139). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publisher.
- [54] Wenzlaff, T., Berak, I., Weiseman, K., Monroe-Baillargeon, A., Bacharack, N., & Bradfield- kreider, (2002). *Walking our Talk as Educators: Teaching and Best Practice*. In E. Guyton & J. Ranier (Eds). *Research on Meeting and Using Standards in the Preparation of Teachers*. (pp. 11- 24). Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hurt Publisher.
- [55] Wheelan, S. A. (2005). *Faculty Groups: From Frustration to Collaboration*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press
- [56] Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven Keys to Effective Feedback. *Educational Leadership* (p.11).

Ann Hilliard. "Leadership Faculty Members Reflect on their Own Co-Team Teaching Experiences in the Practicum and Internship Course ." *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* , vol. 22, no. 8, 2017, pp. 20-37.