

2015

Improving Instruction for English Language Learners through the Development of Coteaching

Anna Parrish
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), and the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Anna Parrish

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Susan Adragna, Committee Chairperson, Education Faculty

Dr. Rick Grimes, Committee Member, Education Faculty

Dr. Donald Yarosz, University Reviewer, Education Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2015

Abstract

Improving Instruction for English Language Learners through the Development of
Coteaching

by

Anna Barbara Parrish

MEd, Southern Wesleyan University, 2011

BS, Taylor University, 2003

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Walden University

December 2015

Abstract

Researchers have described how a missing element in instructional services for English language learners is effective collaboration between general education and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) teachers. This collaboration is vital to the success of English language learners. This multisite case study was designed to gain insight into current practices and how to improve collaboration between educators in a way that improves instructional services for English language learners. Knowles' theory of andragogy, the transfer of learning theory, and constructivism were used as a basis for analyzing educators' perspectives and instructional practices. Two sites were selected for the study—one that implemented pull-out services for ESOL students and one that implemented coteaching. Data included individual interviews with 24 educators and 17 observations of lessons within the classroom. Data were open coded and thematically analyzed. Results from the interviews indicated that coteaching was perceived by teachers as beneficial in improving instructional practices for English language learners when educators participate in structured planning with face-to-face communication. Observation findings included similarities between the content, delivery, and format of instruction between schools, which indicated the potential success of implementing coteaching in the school that initially implemented pull-out services. This study may be beneficial to schools and districts seeking to transition from the format of pull-out instructional services to more inclusive models.

Improving Instruction for English Language Learners through the Development of

Coteaching

by

Anna Barbara Parrish

MEd, Southern Wesleyan University, 2011

BS, Taylor University, 2003

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Walden University

December 2015

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Section 1: The Problem.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Definition of the Problem	2
Rationale	6
Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level.....	6
Evidence of the Problem from the Professional Literature.....	9
Definitions.....	12
Significance.....	13
Guiding/Research Question	14
Review of the Literature	14
Implications.....	27
Summary.....	28
Section 2: The Methodology.....	29
Introduction.....	29
Conclusion	43
Section 3: The Project.....	61
Introduction.....	61
Description and Goals.....	61
Rationale	66
Review of the Literature	67
Implementation	72

Potential Resources and Existing Supports.....	73
Potential Barriers	73
Proposal for Implementation and Timetable.....	74
Roles and Responsibilities of Student and Others	75
Project Evaluation.....	75
Implications Including Social Change	76
Local Community	76
Far-Reaching.....	76
Conclusion	77
Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions.....	78
Introduction.....	78
Project Strengths	78
Recommendations for Remediation of Limitations	80
Scholarship.....	82
Project Development and Evaluation.....	82
Leadership and Change.....	83
Analysis of Self as Scholar	83
Analysis of Self as Practitioner.....	84
Analysis of Self as Project Developer	84
The Project’s Potential Impact on Social Change.....	85
Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research	86
Conclusion	87
References.....	88

Appendix A: Columbia, SC Class Observation	97
Appendix B: Mount Olive, NC Class Observation.....	98
Appendix C: Semi-structured Interview Questions for Sunshine Elementary	99
Appendix D: Semi-structured Interview Questions for Fairview Elementary.....	100
Appendix E: Document Analysis Protocol.....	101
Appendix F: Codes Developed from Sunshine Elementary Interviews	102
Appendix G: Codes Developed from Fairview Elementary Interviews	104
Appendix H: Codes Developed from Sunshine Elementary Observations	106
Appendix I: Codes of Sunshines Elementary Photographs	107
Appendix J: Codes of Fairview Elementary Photographs	109
Appendix K: Modules and Timeline of Implementation.....	110
Appendix L: Module One Structured Discussion Questions.....	111
Appendix M: Module One Lesson Planning Guide.....	112
Appendix N: Individual and Group Reflection Question and Discussion Prompts.....	113
Appendix O: Evaluation Survey Questions	114

List of Tables

Table 1. Codes Developed From Observations at Sunshine Elementary49

Section 1: The Problem

Introduction

The purpose of this doctoral project study was to investigate how to improve the services that English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) students receive, as specifically related to teacher collaboration and the implementation of instructional services. Bell and Walker (2012) described how a missing element in instructional services for English language learners is effective collaboration between general education and ESOL teachers, which is vital to the success of English language learners. Specifically, English language learners who do not experience success may have a tendency to drop out of school, resulting in lower graduation rates for the English language learner population. Hispanic students have had high dropout rates in contrast to other groups of students (Winsler et al., 2012). Outcomes from this study will be used to modify current ESOL instructional practices and understand how to help classroom teachers implement instructional practices designed specifically to help English language learners within the classroom.

The number of English language learners in U.S. classrooms is increasing, presenting needs that the educational system must meet. Barry (2012) indicated that by the year 2050, it is projected that 50% of U.S. students will be English language learners, which will significantly impact public schools. It is vital that schools are prepared for increasing numbers of English language learners and have the best instructional models in place to support learning.

Definition of the Problem

Influx of English Language Learners

Between 1992 and 2012, over 40 million nonimmigrants entered the United States (Office of Immigration Statistics, 2013). Nonimmigrant individuals include aliens in transit, foreign exchange students, visitors, and temporary workers (Office of Immigration Statistics, 2013). Permanent citizenship was also established for 1,031,631 in the year 2012 (Office of Immigration Statistics, 2013).

This rapid influx of English language learners has resulted in a need to maximize the impact of instructional services for this population. The influx has affected education within the United States as schools have strived to provide an equitable education for English language learners. The outcome of the *Lau v. Nichols* case (1974) resulted in all students being given the right to receive an education without discrimination. In this ruling, educators were required to teach using instructional practices appropriate for English language learners (Legal Information Institute, 2013).

Success of English Language Learners

A challenge for educators of English language learners is determining how to ensure these students' success and provide appropriate services to them. Of great importance in relation to this effort are dropout and graduation rates. Hispanic students have demonstrated a dropout rate of 27% since 2008 (McClure, 2012). Within Richland District 2, a major concern is the graduation rate. According to the South Carolina Department of Education (2013), the overall graduation rate of students in Richland District 2 is 74.1%. Whereas other student groups have shown improvement in

graduation rates, students designated as having limited English proficiency have not demonstrated such an increase in their graduation rate (South Carolina Department of Education, 2013).

The problem of interest in this study was disconnection between classroom teachers and ESOL educators, which may contribute to students' lack of success. English language learners do not always achieve at expected levels within content areas, and educators are challenged to provide services that meet the needs of all students. Within the target school in this study, concerns about student achievement are evidenced in the submission of Intervention Assistance Team (IAT) referrals. As of the school year 2013-2014, nine different students had been referred by teachers or parents. Teachers and parents expressed concern over students' academic performance and lack of progress in one or more academic areas. When students are initially referred by a teacher, the teacher must provide documentation and evidence of students' lack of achievement. Within this documentation, there must also be evidence that the work has been modified in order for the case to move through IAT. Examples of modified work include alternative assignments and reduced numbers of questions and answer choices. In one of the IAT cases, the referral came to a standstill and could not move forward because the classroom teacher had not implemented adequate modifications to warrant the referral. This referral, with lack of modifications, represented a case where there were not enough modifications to warrant the continuation of the referral.

Three elements contribute to a classroom teacher-ESOL teacher disconnect. First, separation of classes and lack of common planning periods for content area teachers

and ESOL faculty often limit the amount of communication and collaboration that can occur between these groups. Classroom teachers instruct students in the mainstream classroom in the content areas of English language arts, science, social studies, and math. Using a pull-out instructional model, ESOL teachers pull students out for blocks of 30 to 40 minutes each. Instruction often involves the integration of science and social studies content, along with English language development standards and Common Core standards. Misconceptions about the roles of ESOL teachers can cause classroom teachers to question the practices of ESOL educators, including what is done during pull-out time and what objectives are in place. Classroom teachers may view instructional goals as incongruent. Second, an additional component that contributes to the problem is limited scheduling for services. The English Language Development Plan (ELDP) specifies the services that limited English proficiency students receive. The ELDP is a legally binding document that complies with the provision of equal education in the Equal Education Opportunity Act (1974) and the *Lau v. Nichols* case (1974). Within the ELDP, students who are designated as having limited English proficiency are expected to receive services between 1 and 5 days a week. Students in Grades 1 through 5 are expected to receive formal services. Kindergarten students have been placed in ESOL services, but due to high numbers of ESOL students in the upper grades, service for kindergarten students is almost exclusively provided by the ESOL teaching assistant. A third part of the problem entails either inadequate modifications or lack of modifications in the classroom for ESOL students, in spite of professional development that has been in

place. Results from this study could be used to improve instructional practices for English language learners.

Setting

In order to protect confidentiality, the targeted school is referred to in this study with the pseudonym *Sunshine Elementary*. Sunshine Elementary is a suburban elementary school located in Columbia, South Carolina, within a public school district. At the time that this study was conducted, a total of 800 students attended the school, and 157 of these students were English language learners. Within the ESOL program, there were two Chinese students, one Iranian student, one African student, and 153 Hispanic students. All students with a first language other than English had been screened upon enrollment into the school. The screening instruments used were the Woodcock and Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) assessments or the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA). New students to the district were screened using the Woodcock and BICS, whereas transfers within the district maintained their current placements, which had been made using ELDA scores and previous performance. Three ESOL educators and one ESOL teaching assistant provided services for these students, serving and monitoring a total of approximately 52 students each. A pull-out program was a primary model of instruction. Using the *pull-out model*, the ESOL teacher took students out of mainstream classes for 30 to 40 minutes and taught them in small groups. Students then returned to the mainstream classroom for the remainder of the instructional time. Students were generally pulled out of English language arts, and it was district policy to not remove students from the classroom during math instruction. Another

model of instruction is the *push-in model*, in which the ESOL teacher goes into the classrooms of mainstream teachers and instructs ESOL students within the context of the mainstream classroom. Although the push-in model was an option at the study site, classroom teachers and ESOL teachers had not been trained in this model and it was rarely used in the district, except in cases where there were no other options.

Rationale

Evidence of the Problem at the Local Level

Between the years 1998 and 2008, South Carolina experienced rapid growth in the population of English language learners (McClure, 2012). The state had the largest percentage of growth in this population when compared with other states: 800% (McClure, 2012). Growth in the Hispanic population was especially high between the years of 2000 and 2010. This growth was among the highest growth of all states which included a 148% growth of the population of Hispanic individuals (Pew Hispanic Center, 2013). A problem within schools is how to educate English language learners most effectively when there are limited numbers of ESOL educators, limited collaboration between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers, and differences in the modifications that students receive in the classroom. The local problem in this study was an influx of English language learners occurring at a time when there were limited numbers of educators available to provide instruction and meet the diverse needs of these students. Although students in grades 1 through 5 received the required services, kindergarten students were underserved. A total of 12 students were identified as requiring 5 days of

services. Due to limited staffing and needs across multiple grade levels, these students received only 1 or 2 days of services.

Setting. Within Sunshine Elementary, the increase in English language learners and the limited number of ESOL instructors had resulted in a need to focus efforts on the grade-level requirements of serving first through fifth grade students. This had resulted in limited services at the kindergarten level. Students with limited English proficiency were pulled out of mainstream classrooms and into small-group ESOL classes between 1 and 5 days a week. Designated levels of proficiency were labeled A1, A2, B1, and B2. The lowest levels of proficiency were the A1, A2, and B1 levels. Students at the A1 level were prefunctional and typically had extremely limited literacy. In many cases, A1 students were newcomers. Students at the A2 level were considered beginners and might either have limited English proficiency in all areas or lack foundational reading skills. Students at the B1 level were at the intermediate stage of English language development. These students typically could converse orally but had not fully developed their reading or writing. Many of the B1 students were still significantly below grade level but were able to converse and perform some literacy tasks. B2 students were considered advanced and were just below the level of being considered English proficient. These students were more advanced than B1 students but might also have difficulties with reading and writing. Usually, these students were nearly proficient in reading and writing but needed additional help in refining their literacy skills. It was a requirement that these students were served on a daily basis, due to the limitations of their English proficiency. Students who were placed at the B2 level based on their English proficiency were served between

1 and 5 days a week. These students performed just below proficiency level in reading, writing, listening to, and speaking in English. According to data from Sunshine District 2, these students had performed at a level lower than 5 on the English Language Developmental Assessment (ELDA). Performance at such a level indicates the need to remain in the program and continue to either receive services or be monitored by ESOL teachers. Students who receive a score of a 5 on the ELDA no longer take the ELDA assessment and are gradually released from services and monitoring. As of the 2013–2014 school year, only one student out of 156 students had scored high enough on the ELDA test to be exempt from the test and placed at the next level.

In the 2013–2014 school year, the majority of the ESOL students in Grades 1 through 5 at Sunshine Elementary received instructional ESOL services in small groups using the pull-out model. Generally, a small group consisted of three to six students, and students were pulled out of the classroom for a period of approximately 30 to 40 minutes per day. Due to high student numbers, instruction was often limited to 30 minutes. If a group of students only received 30 minutes of instruction each day, this resulted in a loss of instruction of 50 minutes per week.

When students return to the mainstream classroom after being pulled out for ESOL services, they receive modifications and accommodations to the traditional instruction. Changes to the curriculum such as alternate assignments or spelling lists are examples of modifications. Accommodations students receive are written into their English Language Development Plan (ELDP) and generally include oral administration of classwork, extended time, repeating directions, and providing instruction in small

groups within the classroom (Richland District 2, 2012). The ELDP was established to provide an equal education as required in the Equal Opportunity Education Act of 1974 (Richland District 2, 2012).

When there are not enough modifications in place within the classroom, students may not meet expectations for levels of academic growth. At times, teachers at the study site expressed concern over their ability to implement modifications for ESOL students in the context of the larger population of students. Lack of modifications was also evident in work submitted by teachers who had indicated concerns over students' performance.

Evidence of the Problem From the Professional Literature

Smith (2010) emphasized that ESL teacher shortages due to limited budgets and budget cuts can cause problems in meeting students' needs. According to Pawan and Craig (2011), a challenge since 1995 has been the 5.1 million English language learners who have entered schools in the United States. Although numbers of English language learners have been increasing, many teachers have not had training in teaching English language learners (Pawan & Craig, 2011). Pawan and Craig (2011) reported that 12.5% of teachers had received 8 hours or less of training that prepared them to teach English language learners.

Three facets of the problem—(a) communication and collaboration, (b) scheduling, and (c) the implementation of modifications and accommodations—could contribute to ESOL students' lack of success in the classroom. Lack of collaboration can be an issue, with ESOL teachers sometimes being perceived by mainstream teachers as inferior (Flores, 2012). Flores (2012) emphasized that the “challenges of developing true

collaboration indicate the need for more professional development” (p. 192). Martin-Beltran, Percy, and Selvi (2012) argued that instruction could be improved and enhanced through effective collaboration between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers.

Inadequate communication and collaboration. A very important factor in student achievement is the presence of ongoing and effective communication among all stakeholders (George, 2009). Examples of stakeholders include educators, administrators, district personnel, and members of the community. According to Dodor, Sira, and Hausafus (2010), a significant concern in education is professional isolation and alienation from colleagues, whereby educators work in their classrooms alone and without the support of fellow educators. George (2009) indicated that distances between classroom teachers and specialists can cause a breakdown of communication. Frustration can arise between individuals when misunderstandings occur alongside inadequate or ineffective professional development (George, 2009). Additionally, marginalization can occur when content teachers view ESOL teachers as being inferior or not having the same skills that traditional classroom teachers have (Creese, 2010). This can occur when content teachers place the content over the instructional methods (Creese, 2010). Instead of mutual goals fostered by collaboration, isolation of teachers may develop.

Services for students. Recent influxes of immigrants have caused many changes to the population of the United States over the last 10 years (Garcia, Jensen, & Scribner, 2009). Garcia et al. (2009) indicated that a major challenge schools face is filling ESL teacher positions with qualified personnel. English language learners are at risk when

there are limits placed upon the instructional time and number of educators, resulting in achievement gaps (Garcia et al., 2009). Part of the problem is determining how to serve a large number of students with limited time and human resources.

Implementation of modifications and accommodations within the classroom.

An issue surrounding the provision of services for students is the implementation of instructional strategies for students within the content-area classroom. DeCapua and Marshall (2010) described many schools in the United States as being culturally unresponsive to the needs of students, with a lack of adaptation of instruction to facilitate student learning. Such practices result in cultural dissonance that leads to negative outcomes for students such as isolation, confusion, disengagement, and feelings of inadequacy when compared to native learners (Decapua & Marshall, 2010). DeCapua and Marshall (2010) stated, “What they need is not provided and what is demanded of them is new” (p. 37). DeCapua and Marshall emphasized the problem of a rapidly growing immigrant population within an educational system that slowly changes its practices and thus does not meet the needs of English language learners. Lewis, Maertan-Rivera, Adamson, and Lee (2011) conducted a study in which they analyzed teacher practices to support English language learners. Lewis et al. claimed that many teachers across the nation are not prepared to instruct students from diverse cultures. In their study, Lewis et al. found that there was a weak to nonexistent relationship between the implementation of teaching practices to support English language learners and teachers’ report of using strategies to reach English language learners.

Foley and Kaiser (2013) suggested that barriers to change in instructional practices were related to a lack of transfer. Specifically, Foley and Kaiser stated that there could be problems with foundational knowledge, confidence, or feeling supported. Richards and Skolits (2009) indicated that teachers were hesitant to change their practices because they did not feel that they had the tools to make changes effectively.

A major issue related to the implementation of modifications and accommodations for students is the corresponding academic achievement. Sheng, Sheng, and Anderson (2011) noted that poor academic achievement can lead to dropout. Students' low English proficiency can lead to poor academic achievement, which can subsequently lead to dropping out of school (Sheng et al., 2011). In order for students to experience academic achievement, they need to receive instruction with pedagogy that is culturally relevant (Sheng et al., 2011). When teachers do not craft instruction in culturally relevant ways, rates of poor academic achievement and dropping out of school increase (Sheng et al., 2011).

Definitions

Basic intercommunication skills (BICS): BICS include the conversational skills needed for language fluency, as demonstrated through conversational language in everyday activities (Stewart, 2012).

English for speakers of other languages (ESOL): ESOL refers to specific roles of teachers who educate students who first learned a language other than English (Martin-Beltran & Percy, 2012).

Pull-out model: In this model, students are removed from the mainstream classroom in order to receive instruction from an ESOL teacher (McClure & Cahmann-Taylor, 2010). During this time, students miss content instruction by the mainstream teacher and receive tailored instruction from the ESOL teacher (McClure & Cahmann-Taylor, 2010).

Push-in model: In the push-in or *coteaching* model, the ESOL teacher enters the mainstream classroom to help instruct students within the mainstream classroom (McClure & Cahmann-Taylor, 2010). Rather than pulling students out, the ESOL teacher teaches with the general education teacher (McClure & Cahmann-Taylor, 2010).

Significance

Studying this problem is significant because it could result in improving services for students in the local school and district setting, and possibly in schools around the state. The pull-out model is the primary option for ESOL educators in the district and state, with no formal structure designed to foster and improve collaboration between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers. The result of primarily using the pull-out model is isolation of classroom teachers and ESOL teachers, even though they are educating shared students. Because planning times often do not correlate, there may be limitations to what the classroom teachers and ESOL teachers are able to share with each other. This can result in an inability to fully meet the needs of ESOL students. This study addresses what else can be done to improve services that are not currently being implemented.

Guiding/Research Question

The guiding research question was the following: What practices can improve collaboration and communication between classroom and ESOL educators to support instructional services for ESOL students? The topic addresses issues related to specific instructional models for educating students, how ESOL teachers can support classroom teachers, and what forms of professional development are most beneficial for classroom teachers. Currently, the pull-out model is the primary vehicle for instructional services at the study site. The local problem is a disconnection between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers in regard to collaboration and communication on student instruction. This has occurred as a result of time constraints and scheduling needs, which could be the cause of a lack of student achievement. Research indicates that coteaching could be implemented to help close gaps that occur as a result of the isolation of educators and could be beneficial to some members of the ESOL population. Dove and Honigsfeld (2010) indicated that the use of collaborative experiences involving ESOL and general education teachers could lead to improvement in student learning. Additionally, Dove and Honigsfeld (2010) emphasized that collaboration between educators is necessary in order for students to be successful.

Review of the Literature

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework addressing the problem includes a combination of adult learning theory, constructivist theory, and transfer of learning theory. Principal contributors to the development of adult learning theory include Knowles, Illeris, and

Jarvis. Various parts of their theories and frameworks were combined to form the overall framework for this study. The rationale for using these theories involves their relationship to adult learning. Within this study, the aim was to identify methods to help adults in the implementation of modifications and instructional practices for ESOL students. In order to effect change in the instructional practices used with students, changes must begin with the adult educators and their implementation of instructional practices with students.

Adult learning theory. Knowles, a founder of the theory of andragogy, framed andragogy on six assumptions related to the individual learners' self-concept, experience, readiness, orientation, motivation, and rationale for learning (Taylor & Kroth, 2009). Knowles (1975) described the importance of considering the needs of adults when creating learning opportunities. Core concepts and considerations included a need for self-direction, the use of and analysis of experiences, and the overall orientation of learning (Knowles, 1975). When considering the needs of adults, Knowles (1975) emphasized making learning experiences convenient for adults and structured in a way that allows easy access. Knowles found that using a pedagogical framework with adults can lead to resistance to change, but with the use of principles of adult learning theory, communication and collaboration improve (Chan, 2010).

Because this project study was primarily intended to relate to adult learning and transfer of learning, adult learning theory was most relevant. A key premise of adult learning theory is that the method of instruction is focused on the learner rather than centered on the instructor (Taylor & Kroth, 2009). Knowles (1975) originally proposed

the importance of the leader becoming a facilitator in adult learning experiences. Instead of promoting a hierarchal relationship, the facilitator must put his or her individual goals at the same level as those of the adult learners (Knowles, 1952). Individual goals are replaced with common group goals (Knowles, 1952). The experience of the adult learner is one of the focal points of Knowles's theory of andragogy (Jarvis, 2009). Rather than being a transmitter of information, the instructor becomes a facilitator, with participants taking greater control over and responsibility for their learning (Taylor & Kroth, 2009).

The experience of the learners is extremely significant (Taylor & Kroth, 2009). Knowles (1979) stated that adult education is inclusive of all experiences of adult individuals, including areas such as understanding, skills, and attitudes. The experiences of individuals are valuable in the process of adult learning and should not be left out (Knowles, 1979). Jarvis (2011) emphasized that age is directly related to experience. Because learning arises from individuals' experiences and adult learners have had more experiences than young learners, it is important to take individuals' perspectives into account (Jarvis, 2011). Chan (2010) contrasted andragogical theory with pedagogical theory and indicated that using andragogy in adult instruction is important.

Westover (2009) suggested that there are multiple factors in why adults learn differently, including motivations, interests, attitudes, values, and each adult's individual history of learning. In relationship to these factors, Westover named the importance of various characteristics of adult learning, including the need for active involvement, connecting new learning to what is already known, keeping new learning realistic and relevant, and adopting a nonjudgmental approach. Westover (2009) also cautioned that

participants must see a need for the training, or the training itself will be fruitless.

Knowing the adult learners and framing professional development around their personal experiences can help to improve the motivation and ultimately transference of the learners (Westover, 2009).

Within the structure of learning experiences, it is important to foster self-directed inquiry (Knowles, 1975). Adult learners are generally self-directed and have the innate desire to learn and grow (Jackson, 2009). Jackson (2009) also indicated that learning results in a reorganization of the experiences of learners. This framework relates to the problem in recognizing that adult educators already have established experiences that relate to what and how they learn. Individuals may have previously developed beliefs or fears related to their prior experiences, which may be contradictory to learning the content that is presented (McGinty, Radin, & Kaminski, 2013). McGinty et al. (2013) also emphasized that a learning experience is problematic when the participants are able to perform rote recall but are not able to apply the content in complex forms. McGinty et al. suggested that facilitators of adult learning experiences should strive for creating an environment that fosters “relaxed alertness,” in which there is a high degree of challenge but participants simultaneously experience low threat. Knowles (1979) suggested that professional organizations could be transformed into communities where adult learners recognize their own needs, create objectives, and use identified resources. Knowles (1952) described the use of methods in adult education as being like a mosaic in which there are different individual aims that comprise the overall organization. Through the

use of an interactive group experience using interactive relationships, individuals within an organization can grow (Knowles, 1952).

Ultimately, the goal of adult education is change, which involves shifts in perspective and deep, transformative learning (Young, 2013). Such change involves reorientation of individuals' beliefs, attitudes, and values, which directly influence individuals' behaviors and professional practices (Young, 2013). Consideration and integration of the individual adult learners' life experiences into new learning experiences can result in change (Jarvis, 2009).

Transfer of learning theory. Transfer of learning theory is directly linked to the concept of transformative learning. Transformative learning occurs when individuals have experiences that cause an adjustment in their thinking or beliefs, including changes to individual perceptions (Pugh, 2011). McDonald (2009) emphasized that it is crucial to maintain transfer of learning as a foundation of professional development, with the ultimate objective of professional development being transformative change. Effective professional development is a series of "systematic processes that bring about teacher change in attitudes, beliefs, and practices to impact the learning outcomes of students" (McDonald, 2009, p. 624). Transfer and transformative change directly correspond and relate to one another. Transfer involves the application of newly acquired beliefs that have been a result of an expansion of the individual's former perceptions (Pugh, 2011). This is also related to the value that individuals place upon the content, as well as the motivation for using content independent of required circumstances (Pugh, 2011). Kaminski, Foley, and Kaiser (2013) outlined three types of transfer: near transfer, not-so-

near transfer, and farther transfer. Kaminski et al. indicated that the lowest level of transfer is *near transfer*, where individuals merely replicate content from a previous learning session and apply it to their work environment. Hung (2013) also indicated that near transfer has a high similarity to original training and requires little change to the original format. Additional transfer is more complex and requires that individuals apply concepts in great complexity so that they are actually generating something new using the principles from the learning session (Kaminski et al., 2013).

Sibthorp, Furman, Paisley, Gookin, and Schumann (2011) found various mechanisms that could impact the transfer of learning. Specifically, Sibthorp et al. and MacRae and Skinner (2011) noted that there are variables that can influence the outcomes of transfer, which include the characteristics of the learner and the design and delivery of instruction. MacRae and Skinner also suggested that the work environment can be an influence affecting the degree of transfer. Hung (2013) found several obstacles that could result in the failure of learning transfer. These included a problem with the learning focus in which individuals are expected to simply memorize without application (Hung, 2013). An additional obstacle could be differences in learning environments, in which individuals learn within one form of professional development but are expected to apply learning in an entirely different context (Hung, 2013). This relates to concerns with professional development in which modifications are taught. Educators learn in one format without immediately applying the information in the authentic classroom environment. Finally, an obstacle to transfer could be the actual structure of the problems and activities that are included in the learning experiences (Hung, 2013). McDonald

(2009) emphasized that teacher rejection of professional development occurs because facilitators do not use approaches related to the adult learning theory, address the diversity of the learners, or design training to build upon the experiences of the adult learners.

In order to improve transfer, Hung (2013) suggested several guidelines for designing instruction. Cowan, Holdman, and Hook (2010) described such instruction as a transfer of training, wherein professionals develop certain skills and knowledge in a professional-learning context and apply them in another task. Hung indicated the importance of offering authentic problems within the context of the culture and specific elements of the profession. In addition, the instructional design should include a range of immediate applications for professionals that gradually extend outward. Self-directed learning and reflective activities can also contribute toward improved transfer (Hung, 2013). Finally, Hung suggested that effective questioning could also be beneficial in improving learning transfer.

MacRae and Skinner (2011) described characteristics associated with learning transfer as well as factors related to the design of learning activities and the environment that could be used to enhance and improve learning transfer. Characteristics of individuals that may impact learning transfer include motivations, perceptions of training, self-efficacy, and commitment to the organization (MacRae & Skinner, 2011). Aspects of the design of instruction that could relate to improved transfer include providing relevant training, offering opportunities for practice, and presenting error-based examples (MacRae and Skinner, 2011). Specifically, MacRae and Skinner noted that a fault of

many workplace trainings is the use of examples that are too easy, rather than giving the participants the opportunity to critically think about situations that are more difficult. Learning transfer could also be improved and influenced when the learning environment has an atmosphere which that is supportive, with both supervisory and peer support as well as opportunities for trial and error (MacRae & Skinner, 2011). When individuals experience transfer of learning, the result is a change in practices, attitudes, and beliefs (Young, 2013).

Constructivism. In both adult learning theory and the transfer of learning framework, the experiences of the learners constitute a significant and very important consideration for the facilitator of training or professional development. Likewise, constructivism contributes a piece to the overarching framework of this study. Holb's work was used in the framework of this study. Trin and Kolb (2011) described four states of experiential learning theory, which is a component of constructivism. The four stages are experiencing, reflecting, thinking, and acting (Trin & Kolb, 2011). The assumption of experiential learning theory is that learning is a process (Trin & Kolb, 2011). In addition, reflection is vital and necessary for subsequent progress (Trin & Kolb, 2011).

Constructivists assume that an environment with active engagement and collaborative problem solving is ideal for learning (Ruey, 2010). In addition, the success of learning outcomes is directly related and dependent on the experiences of the learners (Ruey, 2010). Constructivism asserts that the curriculum should be designed with extensive consideration of the needs and experiences of the learners (Ruey, 2010).

Another core constructivist belief is that learning is process-oriented in which students need to become “constructors of knowledge,” in which they participate in examining, constructing, and re-constructing their learning (Mohammed, 2010). The learners become active participants in planning for their learning, reflecting, and applying new learning (Mohammed, 2010).

The rationale for utilizing this set of theories as the theoretical framework is because this study first relates to addressing the problem of a disconnection between adult learners. Within this study, the adult learners are defined as the educators. If change is to occur in the classroom, it must begin with the adults in the classrooms who are responsible for facilitating change in instructional practices. As a result, it is important to consider how to reach adult learners in facilitating these changes in order to improve professional transfer of professional development and change in instructional practices.

Review of Literature Related to the Problem

Collaboration and communication. A disconnection between classroom teachers is evident through the missing element of collaboration. Fazarro (2012) noted the problem of isolation among teachers today. An effect of this isolation is inadequate collaboration and communication. One missing element within the instruction of English language learners is effective communication between content area teachers and ESOL teachers, which is vital to the success of the students (Bell & Walker, 2012). Bell and Walker (2012) indicated that multiple barriers can lead to ineffective collaboration between ESOL and general education teachers. These include a lack of effort, power

struggles, and even negative attitudes about the students who are taught (Bell & Walker, 2012).

English (2009) conducted a study of a program implemented for English language learners within a school and found a lack of time for collaboration between general education educators, ESOL specialists, and paraprofessionals, due to the nature of the pull-out instructional model which was implemented. A result of a lack of communication and collaboration is that the ESOL teacher experiences isolation and is also uncertain as to how to most effectively help general education teachers (Brown & Stairs, 2012). Creating a climate of collaboration has been a challenge for many schools (Brown & Stairs, 2012).

Instructional services for students. English (2009) analyzed the project of one school's project which was specifically designed to improve the educational experiences of English language learners. English (2009) found the need to provide professional development for general education teachers which both helps improve pedagogy, while simultaneously challenging the underlying ideological assumptions of the educators. Specifically, English (2009) suggested the need to help teachers critically reflect on their own practices and to adjust their practices to provide adequate instruction for English language learners. In addition, English (2009) found the existence of various perceptions of the teachers of ESL students. Some teachers viewed instruction as a top-down model, in which the classroom teacher is primarily responsible for instruction, with the ESOL educator in a subservient and supportive role (English, 2009). Other classroom teachers maintained a perspective of labeling, viewing the ESOL teachers as having the primary

responsibility for the students' education, with the classroom teachers focusing on the mainstream students (English, 2009). Finally, some classroom teachers viewed instruction as a bottom-up model, in which the student was primarily responsible for his or her learning, with the teachers being responsible for creating activities and maintaining a sense of community (English, 2009).

Denton et al. (2011) also conducted an experimental study, specifically investigating the effects of utilizing a small group reading intervention program and considered the use of various forms of instructional services for students. This intervention was used for first graders at risk and focused on decoding, spelling, fluency, and comprehension (Denton et al., 2011). The amount of time students received varied and at the end of the study, various groups who received the intervention were compared (Denton et al., 2011). Denton et al. (2011) indicated that the results of this studied showed no significant difference between students who received lengthier and more intensive interventions. Denton et al. (2011) suggested the importance of considering the instructional design when implementing interventions.

Yin and Hare (2009) conducted a study which specifically investigated the use of a pull-out versus push-in model of instruction. This longitudinal study was a causal-comparative study and contrasted the two models of instruction (Yin & Hare, 2009). Within this study, Yin and Hare (2009) found that students who had received the format of a push-in model of instruction scored two levels higher at the culmination of the study. Walsh (2012) also noted that students who learn in a co-taught classroom perform higher

than those students who receive more restrictive services, such as being pulled out of the classroom for separate small group instruction.

Transfer of professional development to practice. Directly related to the actual instructional services which students receive is the concept of utilizing professional development to impact instructional practices within the classroom. As related to the instructional practices of educators, English (2009) found the need to support classroom teachers through various forms of professional development. Although negative attitudes and inadequate practices may be evident in the mainstream classrooms it is important to not simply blame teachers, but to provide resources that enable change to occur (English, 2009).

Illeris (2009) noted that a major issue is the application of new learning. It can be very challenging for educators to learn content and instructional methods in one context and later apply these methods in another context (Illeris, 2009). The use of knowledge can occur in different forms, resulting in cumulative, assimilative, accommodative, and transformative learning (Illeris, 2009). In application to the school context, it can prove to be difficult for teachers to receive examples of modifications and accommodations, yet return to the classroom and be able to create their own modifications with the specific content that they teach.

Richards and Skolits (2009) conducted a study that both evaluated teachers' perceptions related to new instructional methods and analyzed the effects of the professional development on the future instructional practices of the educators. Richards and Skolits (2009) found that an issue in many forms of professional development is a

discrepancy between the learning experience of the adult learners and the implementation, as evidenced in practical application. As a result, the outcomes of the professional development experiences do not lead to change (Richards & Skolits, 2009).

Additionally, Richards and Skolits (2009) noted that certain barriers can actually prevent instructional change. A key concern is how to effect long term, sustainable change in which teachers both internalize and utilize new instructional strategies (Richards & Skolits, 2009). This was defined as a gap in research to practice in which educators do not directly use new information to inform future instruction (Richards & Skolits, 2009). Other barriers to instructional change include the formation of habits, avoidance, and fear of implementing new instructional methods (Richards & Skolits, 2009). Richards and Skolits (2009) emphasized that various barriers must be overcome in order for individuals to internalize and adopt new instructional strategies. Additionally, educators need to gain tools and experiences from professional development which empower them to modify current instructional practices (Richards & Skolits, 2009).

The application of instructional practices to implementation in the classroom directly relates to the importance of learning transfer. Foley and Kaiser (2013) stressed the importance of designing professional development, specifically with consideration for learning transfer. McDonald (2009) noted that the transfer of learning ultimately results in the transformative change within educators' practices in the classroom.

Implications

Findings from this study were used to construct a model that could improve collaboration between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers in a manner that modifies or changes current instructional practices as related to English language learners. This included the specific development and application of the coteaching model and specific vehicles for implementation. Specifically, these vehicles for implementation include a framework and tools that foster collaboration between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers. Since the purpose of this study is to improve collaboration and thereby improve instructional services for students, the outcomes should provide a positive impact on both levels.

Findings were used to determine what classroom teachers need in order to effectively implement coteaching between ESOL and classroom teachers. Results from the interview questions helped determine areas of need in which more professional development can be constructed. This included the development of a curriculum and set of guiding questions and activities which teachers could use to promote discussion and proceed with the implementation of a coteaching framework. Data from the use of documents such as pictures were used to determine how to support classroom teachers in designing future work. The overarching goal was to utilize the data to construct a professional development piece which is effective in a transition from the pull-out model to coteaching.

Summary

An increase in the population of English language learners being enrolled in schools in the United States has caused a need to reconsider instructional practices which are used with English language learners. Both the instructional models used with English language learners and the degree of collaboration between mainstream and ESOL teachers can impact the education which English language learners receive. In order to provide better services for English language learners, it is imperative that there is adequate collaboration between educators and the most effective instructional models for the students. By investigating the perceptions of mainstream educators and corresponding documents that indicate current classroom practices, data provided a bridge to understanding how instructional practices can be improved for the students. This could lead to better instruction for the students, increased teacher collaboration, higher student engagement, and eventually, fewer students who drop out of school. In order to understand these perceptions of classroom teachers including their various needs, a qualitative multisite study was beneficial. Using a site that implements pull-outs versus a site that implements coteaching helped give a broad perspective. It also helped gauge teacher perspectives and what is needed in order to construct an effective coteaching model and professional development which can be used in place of the pull-out programs.

Section 2: The Methodology

Introduction

Merriam (2009) described qualitative research as attempting to understand and interpret individuals' experiences and the meaning that is derived from these experiences. The purpose of this study was to identify educators' perspectives, experiences, and practices and to use these data to find ways or methods to improve communication and collaboration between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers. In addition, these data were intended to be used to simultaneously improve services for ESOL students. The perspectives gathered from classroom teachers were specifically related to the individuals' experiences in both instructing English language learners and collaborating with ESOL teachers. Results from this study can be used to improve methods of collaboration between educators as well as modify current instructional practices. The methodology used in this study stemmed from the guiding research question: What practices can improve collaboration and communication between classroom and ESOL educators to support instructional services for ESOL students?

Because schools across the district and state are diverse in their hired personnel and school philosophies, the data that can be procured from each individual school are unique. This is particularly true in the ESOL program. Although a certain protocol is followed across the district regarding student placement, testing, and minimum times of service, each school has a distinct climate and instructional leadership. The aim of this study was to improve services and collaboration in one particular school, using qualitative data from individuals within this particular school to determine teacher needs

related to a possible transition from a pull-out model to a coteaching model. Although the study addressed general and specific questions related to collaboration and communication, concepts related to coteaching were included as part of the study. Currently, the general model for instructional services within this school is the pull-out model. Most schools within the school district operate using the pull-out model. In North Carolina, a school district has fully implemented coteaching and has found success with this model. Insights from the success of this school were joined with data from the home school to determine what shifts need to take place in a possible transition toward implementation of coteaching. As a result, a multisite case study was used to gain a deep understanding of specific needs and teacher perspectives within one school and to use outside data from a coteaching school to identify specific areas of need that might arise if coteaching were implemented within the home school.

Research Design

Because the purpose of this study was to investigate very specific environments and problems, a multisite case study was the best design. One characteristic of a case study is the inclusion of a bounded system (Merriam, 2009). Within a bounded system, there is a limitation to the entity being studied and a focus on a contained area of data (Merriam, 2009). This is in contrast to broader studies, which may be inclusive of a greater range of data. The bounded system in this case study was the home school in Columbia, South Carolina, which primarily implemented pull-out services, and an additional school in Mount Olive, North Carolina, which fully implemented coteaching.

Within the school in Columbia, South Carolina, there were specific perspectives and practices that may or may not have been similar to those of other schools within the same district and the state of South Carolina. For example, this school is an arts-integrated magnet school. It is also a Green Steps school, which means that the students participate in an extensive recycling program. Other programs such as “A+ Girls” are exclusive to the school and are not implemented in the same way within other schools around the district. Because this school contains a unique culture, a case study was the best research design. A critical characteristic was a high population of ESOL students within the school.

A link between the school in Columbia, South Carolina, and the school in Mount Olive, North Carolina, was a large population of ESOL students. By using both schools in a multisite case study, I sought to understand how to transition from a pull-out program to a coteaching framework like the one implemented at the school in Mount Olive, North Carolina. A key difference between the schools was the contrasting implementations of instructional services for students, as the South Carolina school primarily used the pull-out model whereas the North Carolina school used a coteaching model.

The rationale for choosing a qualitative research design rather than a quantitative design was related to the nature of the problem. A qualitative design was chosen over a quantitative or mixed-methods design because the problem related to an understanding of teacher perspectives. Merriam (2009) indicated that a unique characteristic of case studies is that they are not focused on testing a hypothesis. The purpose of this study was not to form and test a hypothesis, but to more deeply understand perspectives and

instructional practices so as to effect change. One specific type of case study is an instrumental case study. The purpose of an instrumental study is to gain insight into a broader issue (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2010). Because this study was intended to investigate issues related to teacher collaboration and instructional models for ESOL students, this study was classified as an instrumental design.

Other qualitative research designs that could have been considered for this study include narrative inquiry, phenomenology, and ethnography. Lodico et al. (2010) described narrative inquiry as a research design in which the researcher tells a narrative story. Because the problem of this study was not related to one specific sequence of events, a narrative inquiry design would not have been appropriate. Phenomenological studies primarily rely on the experiences of the participants (Lodico et al., 2010). The problem in this study had multiple facets, not only the individual experiences of the teachers. As a result, a phenomenological study would not have been ideal.

Participants

Participants included teachers and teaching assistants who worked within Sunshine Elementary and Fairview Elementary. Fairview Elementary is a pseudonym for a public school in North Carolina that currently implements coteaching. Sunshine Elementary is a pseudonym for a public school in South Carolina that only implements pull-out instructional services for ESOL students with the exception of a few cases. Triangulation of data involved using various sources for the purpose of comparison (Lodico et al., 2010). Triangulation occurred in the types of participants as well as the data collected. In an attempt to get multiple perspectives, this study included specialists,

such as teachers of the arts, special education teachers, and teaching assistants. My relationships with the participants did not include any supervisory roles in which I had any supervisory authority over any of the participants.

Criteria for selecting participants. A unique characteristic of qualitative research is that participants are often selectively chosen, with specific attention given to those who have information that is directly related to the purpose of the study (Lodico et al., 2010). Purposeful sampling was used to select content area educators, teaching assistants, and specialists. For the selection of both participants from Sunshine Elementary and Fairview Elementary, purposeful sampling was used.

Selection of participants at Sunshine Elementary began with contact by me. An initial email was drafted that provided an overview of the intentions prior to offering participation. Individuals had the option to respond via email or in person. Further description, including a consent form, was given to participants in the form of a hard copy, which was distributed to individual teachers. For teachers at Sunshine Elementary, this occurred in person. For teachers at Fairview Elementary, copies of the consent form were sent via the postal service. Individuals had the option to respond electronically or to mail the hard copy of the consent form back.

Contact of potential participants from Fairview Elementary occurred through purposeful sampling with the specific use of network or snowball sampling. Lodico et al. (2010) described *network* or *snowball sampling* as a type of purposeful sampling in which key informants give referrals to the researcher regarding potential participants. In such a case, the researcher is reliant upon the key informants for referrals to specific

individuals who have information that is relevant to the study (Lodico et al., 2010).

Because I did not know all of the individuals within Fairview Elementary, I contacted the lead ESOL teacher to seek advice on whom to contact for interviews or observations.

Number of participants. The number of participants was limited to fewer than 15 educators per school. Merriam (2009) indicated that it is most effective to use smaller numbers of individuals in case studies rather than large samples. The rationale for having a lower number of participants was to provide for a greater depth of analysis of individual responses and a greater amount of time interviewing individuals. A total of 10 general education educators would represent 25% of the total population of general education educators. There was a smaller number of specialists in the school, including arts, speech, and resource teachers. In order to gain a well-rounded perspective, I aimed for at least one or two of these educators to participate in the study. Three ESOL faculty and staff members served as participants. One ESOL faculty member from Sunshine Elementary participated in the study, and two ESOL faculty members from Fairview Elementary participated in the study.

Procedures for gaining access to participants. Procedures for gaining access to participants at Sunshine Elementary included applying within the district for approval of the project. This occurred through a form on the district website. Once the district committee approved the project and the IRB approved the recruitment of participants, I proceeded with further recruitment of participants. Prior to distributing any information to prospective participants, I submitted all information that was to be distributed and requested the principal's approval, which I received. The project was approved by both

the district and my principal during April 2014, but due to a later IRB approval, actual data collection began in the fall of 2014. Participation in the project was entirely voluntary.

For gaining access to individuals from Fairview Elementary, the lead ESOL teacher was contacted. The district had previously granted permission to use the research site of Fairview Elementary in April 2014, but recruitment did not take place until the fall of 2014, as the IRB did not give approval until July. Because Fairview Elementary is located in North Carolina, correspondence occurred through email, but no data were collected through email in order to protect confidentiality.

Methods of establishing a researcher-participant working relationship. Prior to the implementation of the research project, I had worked with the individuals at Sunshine Elementary in an educational setting and had met the ESOL teacher at Fairview Elementary at a Carolina TESOL conference. At no point had I been in a supervisory role in relation to any of the participating individuals, nor was I in a supervisory role over any of the prospective participants. Establishing the purpose of the research study was vital in my communication with the individuals. I intended to communicate to the individuals the purpose of the project and to clarify my separate role as a researcher. The protection of the individuals regarding their responses and contributions of data was also necessary.

Ethical protection. All responses and disclosures of data were collected in person and in hard copies. Prior to collecting data from participants, I gave potential participants a complete description of the project, which was included in an initial email and an

informed consent form. In order to protect participants, no names were used when the data were reported. Additionally, identification of participants was banded by grade levels, including early childhood, elementary, and specialists. This was necessary for the identification of any themes that might emerge that were specific to various levels. After the study, any information that could identify individuals will be kept in a secure, locked location for 5 years. After that point, any identifiable data will be destroyed.

Data Collection

Description of data to be collected. In order to provide triangulation of data, multiple data sources were used. These included different individuals who contributed in the form of interviews, as well as a variety of different sources. Creswell (2012) cited multiple categories of qualitative data, including observations, interviews and questionnaires, documents, and audiovisual materials. The forms of data which were used in this study will include interviews, photographs, and observations. Interviews were one of the primary sources of data, which were used to gather insights into the perspectives of multiple teachers of ESOL students. Potential participants included general education teachers, specialists, and ESOL staff. One form of data which was collected was photographs of various examples of student work. This was primarily in the form of student work that is displayed on bulletin boards and on the walls around the school. Data to be collected included multiple sources of qualitative data, which was combined to create an inclusive perspective, which provided deep insights into the research question. These types of data were specifically useful in a case study because

they provided information that helped identify deep insights into the topics of collaboration and models of instruction for ESOL students.

Justification of data to be collected. The rationale for using interviews was to gain insights into the perspectives of teachers of ESOL students. These perspectives helped answer the research question involving the improvement of collaboration and services provided to ESOL students. Interviews of ESOL staff provided additional perspectives of ESOL specialists. Other specialists within the school also collaborate with general education teachers on an ongoing basis. These individuals had unique insights from their own experiences in collaborating with classroom teachers. A few of these specialists have even participated in a push-in model at one time in the past, so they could contribute very specific perspectives related to how to improve communication between specialists and general education teachers. Each of these individuals could contribute very specific information related to the collaboration of educators and the overall services for students.

The rationale for using observations as a data source was because the observation of classroom practices can be used to identify points where ESOL instruction can be fostered even more and how modifications can be more fully developed. It served as a valuable source in triangulating data with interviews that occurred. Observational data provided information that could be used to inform future practices, including collaboration and involvement of the ESOL teacher and general education teachers.

The rationale for using photographs as a part of the data collection was to provide insights into how the ESOL teacher can work with general education teachers in the

future to merge goals. Photographs provided information about how the ESOL teacher can help classroom teachers modify work for students and what areas teachers may need additional help in modifying work. These work samples also provided insight into particular types of work in which students may struggle.

Plan for intended number of interviews. The plan for the intended number of interviews was between three and ten individuals. At least one general education teacher, one specialist, and one staff member were planned for an interviewed, to provide a balanced perspective. The intended number of interviews was six interviews from each school. The rationale for having a smaller number of interviews was to spend more time with individuals and to locate commonalities in the data, particularly as the data was coded.

How and when the data will be collected and recorded. Most observations occurred first in the process of data collection. In a few instances, the schedules and needs of the teacher resulted in a need to conduct the observation first and the interview following. Observations occurred during the school day, but not be during my own school working time. During the month of October, I took a personal day of leave so that I was not completing research during my district allotted work time. Since all teachers who were observed agreed to an interview, the interview deepened the understanding of how the ESOL teacher can better support the general education teachers. Data from the observation was recorded using a two-column chart which specifies specific observations in one column and notes that describe possible insights in the second column. Photographs were collected before, during, and following observations, as it was not

essential that this preceded the interviews. Interviews were conducted and recorded, if the participant agreed upon recording. Transcriptions were completed after data was collected from both school sites. Further analysis that took place included multiple re-readings and coding of the data.

Process for generating, gathering, and recording data. After consent forms were signed by the participants data collection began. Observations were conducted first at Sunshine Elementary and interviews followed these observations on a later date. Observation protocol forms were used when conducting observations (see Appendices A & B). The process for generating data from interviews occurred in multiple steps. Before participants participated in the study, an initial email was sent out. This email was approved by both the principal as well as the IRB. Individuals who expressed interest then received a consent form, which they signed prior to the interview and any other data collection. A semi-structured interview was conducted, with additional probes that were used, as needed. A specific list of questions was available for use during the interview (see Appendices C and D). A request to audio record the interview was made to each interviewee that participated in the study. All interviewees consented to having an interview that was recorded. Interviews did not last more than thirty minutes, with most interviews being completed in fifteen minutes or less. Photographs were used to analyze student work. These photographs included student work only, without the students themselves in the picture. Analysis of student work occurred using a document analysis protocol and coding of data (see Appendix D). The process for collecting data, including the use of instruments and specific instruments was shared with both potential

districts. Both districts gave permission to use the sites in the study and also approved the procedures and methodology for collecting the data, including the specific instruments.

Systems for keeping track of data. Charts were used to track all sources of data, including interviews, observations, and documents and were also later used in data analysis. Following data collection, the type of data was labeled, assigned a specific and confidential indicator, and placed in the chart under the specific type of data. Using these charts provided a broad overview of the data, while keeping the data organized. A notebook with hard copies of the data was also used to keep the data organized.

Gaining access to participants. Participants were not recruited until permission was granted for the study at both the district and school levels. Sunshine Elementary and Fairview Elementary gave approval in April of 2014. The IRB approval was not obtained until July of 2014 and therefore, no recruitment of participants started until the fall of 2014. The initial notification was in the form of an email. The purpose of this initial contact was to simply notify the participants of the reason for the study and not necessarily request participants to sign consent. If the potential participants had any questions about the study, those were discussed in person. Potential participants expressed interest both in person and in the form of an email. The participants had no obligation to participate in the study and participation was entirely voluntary.

Access to the participants at Fairview Elementary occurred in a slightly different format, due to the location of the school. Initial contact was made through the principal and lead ESOL teacher at that school through email, but no data was collected through

email. All consent forms were emailed to potential participants so that they could be aware of the study. Some individuals chose to express consent via email, while other individuals chose to mail the consent forms back. Following this initial contact and following district and IRB approval, I traveled to the school site to collect all data.

Role of the researcher. As the researcher, I did not assume the role of a participant in this study. A specified location for the observation was pre-arranged with the teachers so that entrance would not be a distraction. The teacher also had the opportunity to notify the students ahead of time that a visitor would be in the classroom so that the students were not easily distracted with the entrance. I strived to be objective when conducting the interviews and phrased questions in a manner that gives teachers the chance to express their ideas in both general and specific terms, based on past and present experiences.

Data Analysis

How and when the data were analyzed. Data from specific sites was analyzed in a systematic manner in order to prevent confusion. The rationale for using the separate sites was to determine what instructional practices can improve collaboration and communication between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers. Two different sites were chosen, due to the variation in the structure of the instructional services which were provided for the ESOL students. At Sunshine Elementary, pull-out instruction was solely utilized by ESOL teachers. At Fairview Elementary, coteaching was used by the ESOL teachers. Utilizing comparisons and contrasts of the data helped to determine what instructional practices could positively impact instruction for students at the local school,

where coteaching is not utilized. Similarities in the data and in perspectives of the teachers could then lend insight into whether or not a coteaching model or a blended version of a coteaching model could aid in improving communication and collaboration between ESOL educators and classroom educators. Merriam (2009) indicated that when conducting multisite studies it is helpful to collect the set of data from one site before moving to the next site. In order to accomplish this, the data collection occurred at differing time periods. Data collection at both Sunshine Elementary and Fairview Elementary occurred in the fall of 2014, between September and December 13th.

Data from the interviews was analyzed in a systematic manner and in sequential order. If two interviews were scheduled on the same day, it could be difficult to distinguish them and therefore, audio recording and codes were used to identify the interviews. Audio recording and transcriptions aided in ensuring that data from the interviews was not contaminated by being intermixed. Once transcriptions and notes have been completed, the notes were reread during multiple occasions to look for insights.

A similar process was used for the data collection utilizing observations and photographs. Notes from the observation were used to locate trends and themes and to assign codes. A similar procedure was used for photographs, in which a chart was used to write down any notes and code the data. Comparisons and contrasts between observations in the photographs also provided data. A triangulation of the data was used to determine themes that emerged, using a hand coding process. Hand coding was

preferable to using computer software because the researcher was very familiar with the specificity of terms, particularly related to the instruction of English language learners.

Evidence of quality and procedures to assure the best possible accuracy and credibility of the findings. In order to ensure accuracy, triangulation and member checks were used in the study. Triangulation of sources occurred in both differences in individual contributions and differences in sources. Multiple perspectives were used by interviewing individuals who have different roles in the school. In this manner, it helped ensure that the information was not one-sided. Additionally, multiple sources of data gave insight and provided balance. Member checks were used following the interviews to ensure that positions and statements accurately reflected what the individuals desired to communicate through the interviews.

Procedures for dealing with discrepant cases. Limitations of this study included the use of schools in two different states, with very specific demographics. As a result, broad generalizations could not be made outside of the limitations of the schools and other schools with very similar demographics. Trends in the developed themes and codes were identified within this study and correlations were made. Identification of outliers and additional, isolated themes were also acknowledged, including the fact that certain responses were in isolation. All developed codes and themes are included either in-text or within the appendices.

Conclusion

The guiding question of the study was: What practices can improve collaboration and communication between classroom and ESOL educators to support instructional

services for ESOL students? Two school sites were used, one of which fully implemented a pull-out model of instruction, while the other implemented a coteaching model. Students at Sunshine Elementary received solely pull-out instruction, while students at Fairview Elementary received instruction through the coteaching model. Within this framework, ESOL teachers entered content area classrooms to teach joint lessons with content area teachers.

Participants

Sunshine Elementary. A total of five teachers consented to having me enter their classrooms for a brief observation and for me to take photographs of student work. All five of these teachers also consented to participation in recorded interviews, which occurred outside the bounds of instructional time, occurring either before or after school. Three additional teachers consented to participation in recorded interviews, but did not participate in the observational component. No teaching assistants expressed interest in participating in this study.

Of the individuals who participated in the study, diversity was evident in grade level bands, gender, and ethnicity. In order to protect confidentiality, teachers were grouped into one of two grade level bands in data collection and analysis. These two bands were identified as a kindergarten through second grade (K-2) and a third through fifth grade (3-5) band. Three teachers represented the K-2 band, three teachers represented the 3-5 band, one teacher represented the related arts specialists, and the other teacher represented ESOL. Of the eight teachers, five teachers were Caucasian and

three teachers were African American. One of the teachers was male and the other seven teachers were females.

Fairview Elementary. Sixteen total participants from Fairview Elementary participated in the study. Fairview Elementary was selected, due to the school's implementation of a unique coteaching model. This model was in contrast to Sunshine Elementary, where pull-out instruction was the primary model. Within South Carolina, models of coteaching are more limited than schools such as Fairview Elementary in North Carolina. Through use of comparisons, themes could be developed to determine whether a form of coteaching could be effectively implemented in South Carolina and provide better instructional services for the students. Of the individuals who participated from Fairview Elementary, eight participants were K-2 grade teachers, five participants were 3-5 grade teachers, two participants were ESOL teachers, and one participant was an assistant. All individuals were female. One individual was an African American, while the remaining participants were Caucasian. A total of 12 teachers from Fairview Elementary consented to an observation. Eight teachers from Fairview Elementary consented to having photographs of student work taken. Ten teachers consented to participation in a recorded interview.

Themes Developed From the Interviews at Sunshine Elementary

Improving communication. Two modes of communication were referenced by most teachers (see Appendix F). The majority of the teachers attributed face-to-face communication as a positive factor in improving communication. Five out of the eight teachers at Sunshine Elementary mentioned the importance of face-to-face

communication, including brief check-ins as well as conversations. Seven out of the eight participants mentioned the use of e-mail as a mode of communication, but four of those participants emphasized that email needed to be used with caution. One of the participants mentioned specifically that the tones of email can be misconstrued, while another participant suggested a greater disconnection with the use of email. Face-to-face communication was the preferable mode of communication for the majority of the participants.

Additional suggestions for improving communication included recommendations for communication between ESOL teachers and other teachers about pedagogy, strategies, and standards. Two classroom teachers suggested a need for greater sharing of ESOL standards. In regards to factors that could improve communication, teachers cited coordination, collaboration, free and open communication, and confidentiality.

Coordinating instruction effectively. The themes of planning and professional development emerged when participants were asked about how to coordinate instruction effectively. Five out of eight of the participants communicated the importance of the ESOL teacher and classroom teacher sharing plans and correlating content. Specific ideas related to planning included sending lesson plans ahead of time, utilizing a shared school-wide planning board, and customizing plans for individual students rather than generic plans designed for entire grade level. The theme of customized, intentional plans emerged. Participants from this study also suggested the importance of professional development that is structured, in-person, and includes examples and work samples.

As related to the development of modifications, participants who gave suggestions preferred hands-on, relevant work sessions. A theme developed from the responses was specificity of the work samples and sessions in which teachers are able to create materials that can be taken with them and immediately used in the classroom. Several participants also mentioned that the content for these sessions should stem from current curriculum from the teachers' classrooms.

Recommendations for coteaching. Six of the eight participants named recommendations for coteaching. Shared goals and collaboration emerged as a theme from the responses of five of those participants. Shared-decision making and shared leadership was also cited by two of the six participants. In addition, structure, expectations, and ground rules were cited by two of the six participants. The theme of flexibility also emerged in interviews with two of the participants. One participant, who had previously had intensive experience with coteaching indicated a need for buy-in from the faculty and training prior to the implementation of coteaching.

Vision for set-up of coteaching. Themes related to visions of set-up for coteaching included small group instruction, flexible or heterogeneous grouping, and lesson planning. Five out of the eight participants mentioned small group or one-on-one instruction as an ideal model. Three out of the eight participants mentioned the use of flexible or heterogeneous group in planning instruction. Four of the eight participants mentioned planning, including the need for structure and the development of routines.

What makes coteaching work. When asked what they thought made coteaching work, five out of the participants noted that planning is an important part in the success of

the coteaching model. Additionally, two participants mentioned the importance of structure and guidelines, including having a system in place. Three out of the eight participants also mentioned the importance of enthusiasm, buy-in, and a willingness to participate in coteaching with another educator. The coordination of teaching styles and approaches was also cited as a factor in successful implementation of coteaching.

Effective staff development. Themes related to staff development included the use of specific, hands-on professional development that targets specific strategies and specific grouping. Six out of eight participants expressed a preference for hands-on professional development. Two of those six participants suggested the possible use of video footage as an alternative. Topics for effective staff development included differentiated instruction, specific strategies to use with students, language skills, and ideas for small group instruction. Two participants also suggested that examples could be effectively used within a professional development session. If the North Carolina school agreed, videos from that school could potentially be used to train individuals who have not implemented coteaching.

Themes Developed From the Observations at Sunshine Elementary

An observational protocol was developed in order to provide clear linking between themes developed from the photographs and interviews. Additionally, the protocol streamlined the process of observation, making it easier to determine patterns and trends that were evidenced in a variety of classrooms. Utilizing a two-column chart for notes and observational protocol, data was coded and combined into four different categories of codes: content during instruction, delivery of instruction, the format of

instruction, and miscellaneous codes that did not pertain to any of the above categories. Five observations were conducted that included observations of five classroom teachers. Of these five teachers, three teachers taught at the K-2 grade level band and two teachers taught at the 3-5 grade level band.

Table 1

Codes Developed From Observations at Sunshine Elementary

Teacher	Content (Green)	Delivery (Yellow)	Format of instruction (Pink)	Misc. codes (Orange)
<u>CT1</u> K-2	ELA Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read aloud • Choral read 	Small groups Learning clubs (2) Independent Whole group	Technology Interactive games D.I. (2)	Structure Procedures (2) Flexibility
<u>CT2</u> 3-5	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing • Read aloud Social studies	Whole group Independent Learning club Small groups	Technology (2) Illustrative/Arts Note-taking Graphic organizers D.I.	Resources Word banks Procedures (2) Structure
<u>CT3</u> K-2	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocab (2) • Spelling • Reading • Writing 	Learning teams Whole group Small group	Multisensory D.I. Strategy instruct.	Procedures (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class man. • Vocab Modeling
<u>CT-4</u> 3-5	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary Social studies	Learning clubs Small groups One-on-one Heterogeneous Whole group	Column notes Visual support Graphic organizer	Procedure Student ownership Flexibility
<u>CT-5</u> K-2	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading 	Whole group One-on-one (2) Independent Heterogeneous Learning clubs Small group	Whiteboard	Procedure (2)

Content. In all classrooms, the content observed was English language arts instruction. Within two of the five classrooms, social studies was integrated into English language arts. A read-aloud was utilized as part of the instruction in two of the five classrooms. An emphasis on vocabulary instruction was also evident in two of the classrooms. Reading was a primary emphasis in four of the five classrooms.

Delivery of instruction. Within every classroom observed, small groups were an integral component of instruction. Every classroom observed included group arrangements, in which students' assigned seating was in groups rather than isolated, individual seating. Another common aspect of delivery was the use of whole group instruction at some time during the lessons. Whole group instruction and small group instruction were utilized interchangeably and blended, resulting in lessons that integrated both forms of delivery. Four out of five of the classrooms also included some form of independent work or one-on-one instruction between the teacher and students. Heterogeneous grouping of students was also apparent in two of the five classrooms.

Format of instruction. Themes developed from observation of the format of instruction included the use of differentiated instruction, technology, and visual supports such as graphic organizers and the use of column notes. The use of differentiated instruction to target the needs of learners was evident in three of the five classrooms. Two of the five classrooms integrated technology into lessons. In addition, two of the five classrooms also implemented the use of graphic organizers and visual support. Other themes that emerged from individual classrooms included the use of interactive games, arts integration, and strategy instruction.

Additional themes. Additional themes which emerged from the observations included structure within the classroom, flexibility, resources for students, and student ownership. Structure and procedures were evident in all five of the classrooms. In two of the classrooms, classroom practices reflecting flexibility were evident. In single classrooms, other themes which emerged included student ownership, modeling of instruction, and supplemental resources for students, such as the use of word banks.

Themes Developed From the Photographs at Sunshine Elementary

Content. The content codes developed from photographs of student work was exclusively work in the content area of English language arts. Reading and writing were a primary content area among all of the photographs. Within eleven photographs, the content area of social studies was evident. Seven of the photographs included work that included science content.

Delivery of instruction. A common theme of the work completed was the characteristic of small group work and evidence that the work was completed in small groups. Photographs also showed evidence of work that was both individual and whole group, indicating a balance of instructional delivery between different modes. In one particular photo, it was evident that the group work was completed in a heterogeneous group.

Format of instruction. As evidenced in the photographs taken of student work, there were multiple themes which emerged. In four of the photos, interactive learning games were evidenced in the student work. Paper and pencil, rather than electronic work, was the primary mode of work production. Evidence of technology did occur in some

photos, which was primarily apparent through electronic writing and word processing. Other themes which emerged were arts integration, the use of graphic organizers, and various tasks which required reading skills.

Themes Developed from the Interviews at Fairview Elementary

In order to align codes and themes, categories from data coded at Sunshine Elementary was aligned to codes and themes generated at Fairview Elementary. These categories included improving communication, coordinating instruction effectively, recommendations for coteaching, what makes coteaching work, and effective staff development.

Improving communication. Of the ten teachers who participated in the interviews, nine out of ten participants indicated that face-to-face communication is best. Of those nine participants, four participants indicated that conversations are beneficial in improving communication between classroom and ESOL teachers. Regarding the use of email, participants primarily referenced it as less effective than face-to-face communication. Reasons cited included a delay in email, email not being sufficient, email not being consistent, and concerns that email can be misunderstood at times. An additional theme that emerged related to lesson planning. Three of the ten teachers attributed shared lesson plans as a way to improve communication. Six of the nine teachers mentioned the benefits of a shared planning time or a time to collaborate. Additional themes that emerged from the interviews with the participants included the importance of shared decision-making, having similar goals, respect for time and feelings, giving specific feedback, and maintaining confidentiality.

Coordinating instruction effectively. Regarding the coordination of instruction, multiple participants again referenced the importance of planning. Three of the participants referenced team planning meetings as a way to coordinate instruction. Participants also indicated the importance of professional behaviors such as collaborating to find resources, brainstorming, sharing ideas, and sharing resources. When asked how to most effectively modify work, participants had a broad range of suggestions for ways that ESOL teachers could support teachers in modifying work. Three participants indicated the need for help in modifying vocabulary instruction. Three participants also indicated a need for help in modifying work for small groups. Two of the participants indicated the importance of having resources available. Methods of helping teachers modify work included having the resources available, modeling strategies, and giving gentle reminders. Due to the diverse responses in regards to modifications, it could be inferred that the process of modification is highly specific to the individual needs of teachers and ESOL teachers can best help classroom teachers on an individual basis.

Recommendations for coteaching. Two main themes emerged from the participants' responses regarding recommendations for coteaching: clear, open communication and planning. Six of the ten teachers referenced the importance of clear communication and openness between educators, as well as an openness to new ideas. Five of the ten participants referenced the importance of planning. Three participants suggested utilizing small groups within coteaching. Two participants suggested a slow start and another two participants suggested sharing resources. Other recommendations included having professional development, clear expectations, questioning between

teachers, consistency, and flexibility. The broad range of responses also indicated that teachers have very individualized and specific concepts of coteaching and what is recommended for implementation.

What makes coteaching work? Themes which emerged from responses included the importance of respect, planning, buy-in, communication, cooperation, and sharing ideas. Five participants cited planning as a factor in what makes coteaching work. Four participants indicated that communication was a factor in what makes coteaching work. Three participants indicated that respect is important. Three participants also indicated the importance of buy-in. Three participants also indicated the importance of sharing ideas and having shared leadership in the classroom. Other themes which emerged from various participants included the importance of rapport, similar teaching styles, flexible grouping, and having frequent conversations.

Effective staff development. Themes which emerged regarding staff development included both content and format of professional development. Regarding the content, three teachers suggested professional development on differentiated instruction and two teachers suggested strategy instruction. Regarding the format, four participants indicated that observation and modeling is useful in professional development activities. Three of the participants specified that in-person professional development is preferable to online professional development. Two participants suggested that ideal professional development is hands-on.

Themes Developed From the Observations at Fairview Elementary

Content. Content in the majority of the classrooms was English language arts instruction. Utilizing the structure of coteaching, 6 of the 10 teachers were conducting read-alouds within the classroom. Six out of the 10 teachers were also teaching reading. Of the 10 classrooms where coteaching was implemented, 8 of the classrooms had a clear focus on vocabulary instruction. Three of the classrooms included writing instruction within the lesson observed. Additional content areas, which were observed included math and science, were seen in one classroom each.

Delivery of instruction. Delivery of instruction in the classroom included small group work, partner work, teacher use of learning clubs, whole group instruction, and independent or one-on-one instruction. Eleven out of 12 classrooms included use of small group instruction. Seven out of the 11 classrooms also had set-ups that facilitated learning clubs or strategic placement of assigned seats into small groups. Within five of the classrooms it was apparent that students were placed into groups heterogeneously. Within seven of the classrooms, students worked independently or received one-on-one assistance from a teacher. Partner or whole-group instruction was used less, but occurred within multiple classrooms. Partner instruction was used in four of the classrooms, while whole group instruction was used in three of the classrooms.

Format of instruction. Prevalent formats of instruction included the use of technology and tasks that involved using a paper and pencil. Seven out of the 12 classrooms incorporated technology into lessons. Five out of the 12 classrooms involved paper and pencil assignments. Graphic organizers were also prevalent in instruction,

occurring in 4 out of 12 of the classrooms. Evidence of differentiated instruction and strategy instruction were apparent in three classrooms. Modeling was also used in two of the classrooms. Additional formats of instruction included questioning, think-aloud instruction, interactive games, arts integration, and multi-sensory lessons. Based on these formats it could be inferred that coteaching could be used in a variety of ways and could be inclusive of multiple types of lessons.

Additional themes. Additional themes which emerged from the observations included the alternate roles of teachers, flexibility, established procedures, circulating around the room, questioning, and the availability of resources. Within 7 of the 12 classrooms, the ESOL teacher and classroom teacher alternated roles throughout the course of the lesson. Within 7 of the 12 classrooms, there was evidence of flexible instruction, in which the teachers modified or changed instruction within the course of the lesson. Structured and specific procedures were evident in 8 of the 12 classrooms. Within four of the classrooms there was a frequent circulation of educators around the classroom.

Themes Developed From the Photographs at Fairview Elementary

Content. Photographs were taken from the classrooms of eight teachers and included evidence of the content areas of reading, writing, and math. Six of the eight teachers' photographed work included reading instruction. Four out of eight groups of pictures indicated writing instruction. Two groups included math instruction.

Delivery. Delivery of instruction was classified into four different themes of delivery: Whole group instruction, small group instruction, individual instruction, and the

use of learning clubs. Four of the eight teachers' photographed work included evidence of whole group instruction. Four of the eight teachers' photographed, student work included evidence of small group instruction. Individual work was evident in three groups of photographs. Evidence of learning clubs was included in one group of photographs.

Format of instruction. Themes developed from the groups of photographs included the use of graphic organizers, technology, paper and pencil assignments, the use of interactive games, and strategy use. Three of the eight groups of photographs included photographs of graphic organizers. Four groups of photographs showed evidence of paper and pencil work. Three groups of photographs revealed the use of technology. Two groups of photographs showed the use of interactive games. Color-coding and strategy use was also evident in two separate groups of photographs.

Summary of Findings

Interview correlations. Correlations of interview themes from teachers at Sunshine Elementary versus teachers at Fairview Elementary revealed common themes. Participants at both schools indicated that face-to-face communication is ideal, while there are concerns with using email, including its limitations. Participants at both schools also voiced the importance of collaboration and planning time. The issue of confidentiality also emerged among participants at both schools. In regards to coordinating instruction, participants at both schools indicated the importance of utilizing plans.

Relating to coteaching, participants at both schools indicated the important of establishing expectations, flexibility, buy-in, and similar teaching styles. Structure and professional development were also named by participants in both schools. Participants at Sunshine Elementary primarily emphasized the importance of structure and guidelines and a system, while teachers at Fairview Elementary primarily emphasized the importance of shared ideas and shared leadership. Within both schools, selected participants emphasized the concept of sharing goals, ideas, or leadership.

Participants from both schools indicated the need for professional development that is hand-on and provides strategy instruction. Giving examples and modeling strategies was named to be effective in providing professional development. Specifically, individuals in both schools described the need for differentiated instruction professional development and the potential use of observation or video footage as exemplars of coteaching frameworks.

Observation correlations. Correlations of observational data included a broad range of topics in the content, delivery, and formats of instruction. Read alouds, vocabulary instruction, and the content area of reading were used by teachers in both schools. The delivery of instruction in both schools included a combination of whole group, small group, and independent instruction. Within both schools there was evidence of heterogeneous grouping of students. The format of instruction was also very similar in both schools. Differentiated instruction was used in classrooms at both schools. Technology was also used consistently in both schools, as were graphic organizers also

used as an integral part of instruction. Other areas of correlation included the use of interactive games and arts-integrated instruction.

Photograph correlations. Correlations were also evident between the two schools in terms of the content, delivery, and format. Within both schools there was evidence of reading and writing student work. Sunshine Elementary displayed additional social studies and science work, while Fairview Elementary displayed additional math work. Within both schools there was evidence of blended formats of learning, including the use of whole group instruction, small group instruction, and independent work. The format of work shown in photographs also closely correlated between the schools. In both schools teachers used a combination of technology and paper and pencil assignments for student work. Graphic organizers were also an integral part of instruction, as were interactive learning games also used within both schools.

Limitations of Study

Limitations of the study included the representation of many educators, but limited representation of teaching assistants within the study. No teaching assistants at either school chose to participate in the study. A future study could investigate the perspectives of teaching assistants, as related to coteaching.

An additional limitation of the study relates to the demographics of participants. A balanced number of Caucasian and African American teachers participated in the study, which correlated closely to the actual percentage of educators. A limited number of males participated in the study. One male from Sunshine Elementary participated in the study, while no males from Fairview Elementary participated in the study. Four male

teachers currently teach at Sunshine Elementary, while two males teach at Fairview elementary. A future study could further investigate the perspectives of male educators, as pertains to coteaching.

Section 3: The Project

Introduction

Devlin-Scherer and Sardone (2013) suggested that coteaching can be a form of professional development for educators. Devline-Scherer and Sardone also indicated that coteaching could be a base for improving communication. Collaboration and communication with other teachers can develop as a teacher is concurrently participating in the development of coteaching, which simultaneously helps the educator grow professionally (Devlin-Scherer & Sardone, 2013). Jarvis (2011) indicated a need to consider adult learners' perspectives when planning professional development. Gningue, Schroder, and Peach (2014) suggested that a cyclical design of reflective inquiry can be beneficial in professional development for teachers. A cyclical design could aid teachers in continually returning to re-evaluate which practices are most and least effective, which could provide educators with a greater amount of independence with consideration for their personal. Using three different modules in the context of a goals-based evaluation, teachers can actively participate in their own professional development. As coteaching is implemented, teachers will more adequately meet students' specific needs (Fenty & McDuffie-Landrum, 2011). The community may also benefit as students demonstrate greater achievement and are more prepared to enter the workforce.

Description and Goals

The genre of the project is a professional development evaluation, which includes a training plan that is concurrent with the implementation of coteaching. This project provides an inclusive framework of stages for the development of coteaching practices

intended to provide a bridge between instructional practices in which there is pull-out instruction to the gradual implementation of coteaching. This will be developed in the target school, where there has been a disconnection between content-area classroom teachers and ESOL teachers. The purpose of the partial or full development of coteaching is to increase communication and collaboration among educators through the process of coteaching development. The intention of this project is to provide groundwork for the implementation of coteaching on a small scale, as recommended by participants who were already involved in coteaching.

As indicated in Section 1, there is currently a gap between educators who teach in content-area classrooms and ESOL teachers who teach in a traditional pull-out program. This gap could contribute to students' lack of success in the classroom. The problem is evident in the dropout rate and the number of referrals for assistance involving ESOL students who are not experiencing success in their academic work. By providing opportunities for joint planning and instruction, this project addresses gaps that can occur between educators. In addition, as the ESOL teacher will work more closely with the classroom teacher, there will be more opportunities for the ESOL teacher to offer suggestions for modifications and accommodations. This project addresses gaps between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers that may contribute to a lack of student success. The intention is to provide a framework for the development of increased positive collaboration between content-area teachers and ESOL teachers. The goals of the project include the development of productive coplanning between classroom teachers and content teachers, increased communication and collaboration between classroom teachers

and ESOL teachers, and the gradual, effective implementation of coteaching at Sunshine Elementary. Following segments of coteaching, a reflection guide serves to aid teachers in working through challenges.

This professional development evaluation project consists of three phases of implementation that correspond to three separate modules during the initial stages of the development of potential coteaching practices (see Appendix K). This project includes a training plan with three corresponding modules: preparation before coteaching, implementation of coteaching, and intentional reflection after coteaching. The purpose of module one is to facilitate preparation for coteaching. This is directly connected to data from the study suggesting the importance of systems, planning time, and preparation prior to coteaching. Module 2 is designed to be used within the implementation phase, in which teachers will make decisions and implement coteaching. Module 3 involves structured reflection upon teaching practices and evaluation for any further implementation.

Module 1

Within Module 1, teachers will prepare for coteaching by participating in structured discussions that are designed to proactively address potential needs and concerns, and teachers will plan a lesson (see Appendix L). This will occur over the course of 6 weeks in three different sessions. These discussions will occur in the context of professional learning communities (PLCs) that will meet once every 2 weeks. Module 1 will last approximately 6 weeks, allowing for one small group meeting (involving multiple pairs of coteachers), 1 day of individual meetings between pairs of coteachers,

and a planning session for an individual lesson (see Appendix M). Two types of structured discussions will be suggested to the teachers prior to the planning section of the module. One series of questions will be targeted for multiple pairs of coteachers in a small group discussion. This small group discussion will occur during the first meeting. Another series of questions will be suggested for individual pairs of teachers to assist them in working out the more specific details of their coteaching implementation and structure. This partner discussion will occur during the second meeting. During either the first or second meeting, the teachers will also view footage of coteaching, which could prompt further discussion and prepare teachers to begin coteaching.

The planning guide (see Appendix M) is designed to facilitate discussion for the teachers as they plan to implement a lesson and will occur during the third meeting. First, the educators will identify separate standards that can be joined and met in a single lesson or series of lessons. Following this, they will work together to develop joint objectives that will meet both sets of standards. The next step is for the educators to plan the general structure of the lesson, including a warm-up or introduction, the core components of the lesson, and closure or wrap-up of the lesson. As the educators determine which instructional methods to use for instruction, they will also pinpoint how they will implement the lesson. This will include a description of their individual roles. After planning the instructional sequence, they will be guided to determine what preparation each teacher will contribute to the lesson.

Module 2

During the implementation part of the project, an ESOL teacher and a classroom teacher will partner to coteach a lesson, as previously planned. This implementation could occur at any time within the 2 weeks following the planning phase. Immediately following the implementation, individual teachers will reflect upon the lesson and determine what went well and what could be improved (see Appendix N).

Module 3

During the reflection part of the project, teachers will discuss the effectiveness of coteaching and will work out any issues that either teacher encountered during the course of the lesson. The project is designed to be a cycle, where future cotaught lessons are modified based on reflections on previous lessons. It is assumed that lessons will not always go as planned and that previous coteaching opportunities can be used to improve future coteaching experiences. Module 1 through Module 3 could be used to inform and modify the structure of the future lessons.

Components of this project include a suggested calendar of implementation (see Appendix K) and materials that can be used in a gradual development model of the implementation of coteaching. These materials include a timeline of implementation, discussion questions and activities for teachers to complete prior to implementation, a planning guide for teachers to begin constructing coteaching plans, and a guide for reflection. This combination of materials can aid teachers in working through different perspectives and proactively anticipating and planning for instruction as well as reflecting upon teaching practices once coteaching is implemented in the classroom.

Rationale

The rationale for choosing this project stems from the need for quality communication between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers. The project is intended to facilitate targeted communication between teachers, specifically in regard to the logistics of working together, specific planning for instruction, and intentional reflection following the implementation of lessons. This will serve as the foundation for the development and effective implementation of the coteaching model within a school that does not yet use coteaching between ESOL and content-area teachers.

Research Findings

Improving communication. Themes that emerged from the study included suggestions to have face-to-face interactions that included conversations, free and open communication, and planning. As a result, this project contains a framework including a potential planning protocol that teachers can use to discuss their ideas and plan for future lessons. The planning tool is designed to help coteachers proactively address issues and work through potential differences such as teaching styles, classroom management, and perspectives.

Coteaching. In regard to the effectiveness of coteaching, participants indicated the importance of establishing expectations, correlations of teaching styles, and a structured guideline or system. The teaching inventory, discussion questions, and activities are integral to establishing expectations, setting up a structure, and providing opportunities for teachers to merge their teaching styles. As indicated by teachers at Fairview Elementary, coteaching can serve to increase communication and collaboration

between teachers; therefore, the implementation of coteaching is an important part of this project.

Professional development. This project is intended to include ongoing professional development that is embedded within the implementation of a coteaching framework. An integral element of this professional development is the use of reflective questioning and questions following the implementation of coteaching. Coteaching therefore serves as a professional development that is embedded in the cycle of preparation, teaching, and reflection. This project is designed with the intention that individuals will broaden their perspectives and adjust their teaching styles while learning from other educators.

Review of the Literature

Learning Transfer

Learner perceptions. Closson (2013) indicated that the adult learner's perception of the learning transaction is different from that of a child. Specific influences that affect transfer of learning include the trainee's characteristics, the design of the training, and the work environment (Closson, 2013). Training needs to be relevant to the culture, perspectives, and expectations of the participants (Closson, 2013). Using this research, a connection can be made to the findings from this study. Data collection included gathering data on individuals' perceptions in order to construct a framework for professional development on coteaching.

Implementation. Macrae and Skinner (2011) indicated that four specific phases are important in maximizing learning transfer. Within the first stage, facilitators prepare

the participants for change (Macrae & Skinner, 2011). Within the second stage, training occurs, in which new concepts are introduced (Macrae & Skinner, 2011). Following this stage, transfer and maintenance occur when individuals are given the opportunity to practice what they have just learned (Macrae & Skinner, 2011). Finally, participants conduct an evaluation of the change (Macrae & Skinner, 2011).

Transfer of content. Cowan, Goldman, and Hook (2010) indicated that action planning results in increased transfer. This transfer was defined as a “process through which skills or knowledge learned in one task help problem solving or performance in another task” (Cowman, Goldman, & Hook, 2010). The development of an action plan template will aid in facilitating this learning transfer within the early preparation stages of this project.

Application to Coteaching

Establishing partnerships. Partnerships are a solution to the isolation that can occur between teachers. Dodor, Sira, and Hausafus (2010) referenced a need for shared teaching practices between educators. In addition, Dodor et al. (2010) indicated that a solution to the disconnection between educators could include the use of computers to develop networks which, in turn, break down isolation. The end result is both a partnership and a greater deal of collaboration and communication between educators.

In the initial phases of implementing coteaching, “strengthening compatibility will support the collaborative coteaching relationship and minimize pre-planned teacher conflict” (Petrick, 2014). Petrick (2014) indicated that compatibility fosters harmony and a greater deal of success within a coteaching relationship. Petrick (2014) suggested four

steps in building greater compatibility. First, an evaluation of the relationship is necessary in which the educators establish the expectation and direction of the work (Petrick, 2014). Second, educators seek to understand one another's needs, and make direction statements that describe what individuals need to do, using "I" statements (Petrick, 2014). Following this, the educators work together to develop "We" statements, targeting how they can support one another (Petrick, 2014).

Coplanning. Cowan, Goldman, and Hook (2010) suggested that the positive benefits of co-planning include an increased motivation and a system for organizational change. A response of several participants in this study included the need for a system or a framework. A benefit of coplaning is that it encourages two educators to "build on each of their expertise in order to design lessons that make it more likely that all students learn the curriculum the first time it is taught" (Vostal et al., 2014, p. 18). Vostal et al. (2014) suggested the need for structured planning. As evidenced in the data from this study, participants saw a need for coplaning, communication, and time spent coplaning together. Vostal et al. (2014) also indicated the need for educators to talk to each other, maintain an agenda and routine, and document planning time. Fenty and McDuffie (2011) emphasized the importance of common planning times of at least one hour per week, with the inclusion of a planning sheet. An integral part of this project is a framework for coplaning, which includes the development of coplaning charts which can be used by the educators who are co-planning together. This will include the development of sample routines and agendas which could be used by educators to facilitate the co-planning process.

Coteaching instructional approaches. Vostal et al. (2014) suggested that coteaching can be used in order to restructure classrooms. Specifically, when coteaching is used, transformation occurs in the three areas of planning, instruction, and assessment (Vostal et al., 2014). Vostal et al. named five different models of coteaching. Within the first model, one educator teaches and another educator supports (Vostal et al., 2014). In the second model of team teaching, educators take turns within the instruction, including interactions and role playing, which can be conducted during a whole group lesson (Vostal et al., 2014). Parallel teaching could occur in two different formats (Vostal et al., 2014). Once the class is divided into halves and each educator takes a half of the class, the groups could either be taught the same content or similar content in different ways (Vostal et al., 2014). Another form of coteaching is station teaching, in which students rotate through various stations in the classroom (Vostal et al., 2014). Finally, alternative teaching could include one teacher who teaches the majority of the students, while the other teacher provides enrichment (Vostal et al., 2014). Vostal et al. recommended that in the case of alternative teaching, educators should alternate lead roles in order to promote parity.

Coassessment. Coassessment is the third leg of coplanning and coteaching. Vostal et al. (2014) suggested using learning targets, in which students are first given clear statements about what they should know and be able to do by the end of the lesson. A primary benefit of coassessment is that immediate feedback can be given and the data can be utilized for future coplanning (Vostal et al., 2014).

System and tools. Martin-Beltran, Peercy, and Selvi (2012) noted that shared tools can be used to overcome challenges of coteaching. Specifically, Martin-Beltran et al. (2012) indicated a need to establish norms between educators. Such norms promote parity and prevent misunderstandings among educators. Martin-Beltran et al. (2012) also recommended the use of shared tools as a way to confront challenges. Based on the results from this study, part of the project includes the development of tools that can be used by coteachers.

Staff Development While Teaching

Walker and Edstam (2013) suggested that staff development can occur while staff members collaborate on the instruction of English learners. Walker and Edstam (2013) also indicated that a personal professional action plan is useful in mapping a course for professional development. Themes for professional development that can occur alongside teaching can be concepts of instruction, assessment, or strategies to reach English learners (Walker & Edstam, 2013). Honigsfeld and Dove (2015) suggested that there are multiple effective team practices that can improve collaboration. Examples of professional development include the use of collegial circles, collaborative coaching, collaborative inquiry, lesson study, and professional learning communities (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015).

Honigsfeld and Dove (2015) also described multiple options for the organization of staff development. Smaller groups of teachers are ideal for practices such as collaborative inquiry, collegial circles, lesson study groups, or professional learning

communities (Hongisfeld & Dove, 2015). Honigfeld and Dove indicated that partners or individual teachers are the ideal configuration for collaborative coaching.

Implementation

Implementation of the project will begin with the approval of the principal where I am currently teaching. Once I have her approval, I will then begin gauging interest by inquiring whether teachers would like to continue with the pull-out model or a coteaching model. If additional ESOL teachers also desire to participate, they will also be included in the project. Using that interest, I will begin implementation of the project, which will include the phases of preparation, implementation, and intentional reflection. During the preparation stage, I will introduce the questionnaires and planning organizers to the teachers for use during planning. Utilizing questionnaires and similar activities, I will focus on developing a foundation which considers teaching styles, perspectives, and concerns. This will serve to proactively address any concerns before they arise and will help the teachers merge their instruction effectively. I will work with the teachers to develop lessons for coteaching implementation which are purposeful in design, considering the particular coteaching configurations for each lesson and the merging of content between the ESOL teacher and classroom teacher.

After completing the project, I will follow up with staff members, using an open-ended survey (See Appendix O), designed to determine the effectiveness of the project. Specifically, the survey will pertain to how to refine the implementation of coteaching to improve it. Staff members will be asked to rate their opinions regarding the coteaching process and how it can be improved. The reflection component of this project will also

help determine the next step. This will likely involve joint decision-making between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers, such as revisions to planning guides. In addition, it may include planning for broadening the implementation of additional coteaching, which may include peer staff development.

Potential Resources and Existing Supports

Potential resources and existing supports include the preliminary structure and district ESOL department which encourages the development of a coteaching model. Currently, the district primarily uses a pull-out model but the district has sent teachers to workshops to receive training on coteaching. The current ESOL director supports a more inclusive, collaborative model, so there is support at the district level.

Two classroom teachers in the school recently attended a coteaching workshop and have been trained in the basics of coteaching. These two teachers could assist in the leadership and future facilitation of broader professional developments on coteaching. Both teachers are willing and open to the concept of coteaching, so these teachers could be a part of the first phase of planning, implementation, and reflection prior to implementing coteaching on a broader scale.

Potential Barriers

Potential barriers could include teacher resistance to the coteaching model or lack of interest of buy-in. Since the teaching profession is often isolating and teachers are acclimated to having the sole control in their classrooms, this could be a potential barrier to implementation. Additionally, if there is not enough planning and intentional communication between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers there could be the

potential for differences that could impeded instruction. With enough support and preparation prior to the implementation of coteaching, hopefully these issues could be prevented or overcome.

Proposal for Implementation and Timetable

The proposal for implementation includes a gradual transition from the previously established pull-out model to an implementation of the coteaching model on a small scale. Since multiple participants indicated the importance of starting small, this project will be started on a small scale. This could include implementation with one or two teachers before proceeding to include multiple teachers.

The timetable for implementation includes allowance for the three components: preparation, implementation, and intentional reflection. Rather than immediately beginning with coteaching there will be a period of preparation, including enough time for the teachers to get to know each other's teaching styles and establish expectations for the coteaching framework. The initial onset of this process will occur between one ESOL teacher and one classroom teacher. Several meetings will occur over the course of two to three weeks. Following the initial set-up of expectations and discussion of the logistics, the teachers will plan for instruction. Since significant time for this may be needed, there may be a gradual transition from pull-out to coteaching. The teachers will begin by teaching one lesson together, followed by reflection before planning for the next lesson. The reflection will again occur in the format of an informal meeting. The teachers will gradually increase the number of coteaching days. Coteaching will occur

until the ESOL standardized testing begins in February. At that time, the teachers will do a comprehensive reflection of what worked and what could be improved.

The process will occur in a cycle in which the ESOL teacher gradually begins working with one or more teachers who are also interested in coteaching. Over time, additional teachers may also partner to coteach. These teachers will emerge as leaders who continually refine the process and serve as examples to other teachers. This gradual implementation will encourage other teachers within the school to also participate in coteaching.

Roles and Responsibilities of Student and Others

The roles and responsibilities of the doctoral student include facilitation of the three stages of the project. This will begin as the student reaches out to other teachers and establishes partnerships. The partnerships with other teachers will serve as the base of the project. The primary roles and responsibilities of those participating in the project include ongoing collaboration and participation in the coteaching model. Those who choose to be a part of this project should realize that time will be invested and a significant amount of planning and communication will be needed in order to effectively implement coteaching.

Project Evaluation

The type of evaluation that will be used is goals-based. The rationale for using a goals-based evaluation is to determine the effectiveness of the coteaching implementation, based on very specific goals. This type of evaluation can be completed through the use of a survey and reflective conversations with staff members that

participated. The overall goal of this project is to increase communication and collaboration between ESOL and classroom teachers, which serves to improve instruction for the students. Goals will be met when teachers display favorable opinions of the various parts of the coteaching process, including implementation. This will include mutual perspectives and not only the perspective of one teacher. Additional evidence of meeting these goals includes student performance and higher student performance on content areas that are co-taught by a classroom teacher and ESOL teacher. Key stakeholders in this project include the district ESOL administration, school administrators, ESOL teachers, and classroom teachers.

Implications Including Social Change

Local Community

This project addresses the needs of the learners in the local community because it aims to find better modes of instruction for English learners. When learning experiences are merged and students are not isolated by single pull-out programs, students become more involved and less likely to drop out of school. Increasing student engagement in learning experiences helps to prevent drop-outs and encourages students to become more productive citizens. As students become more productive, they are more equipped to get jobs.

Far-Reaching

Within the larger context, this study could help other similar schools transition from a pull-out model to a coteaching model. This could be particularly important for schools that have received no training in coteaching. The transition from pull-out to

coteaching is a critical component of the overall process of coteaching and the effectiveness of two teachers who are coteaching is interconnected with the success of coteaching. Likewise, this affects the collaboration and communication between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers. Overall, this project could be used to help improve communication and collaboration between teachers who have diverse specialties and could be applied to other specialists.

Conclusion

Intentional design of the transition of coteaching through professional development can have a positive impact upon students and teachers. As classroom teachers observe how the coteaching model effectively works, greater buy-in will be promoted and more teachers will see the benefits of coteaching. Instead of merely sitting in seminars, teachers will experience professional development in the context of coplanning and coteaching. At the same time, teachers will have materials that help them work through potential issues and proactively collaborate with one another so that students can more fully benefit from the instruction that they receive.

Section 4: Reflections and Conclusions

Introduction

Through the process of developing coteaching, educators can improve instructional services for students while simultaneously improving their own instructional practices. Educators can be empowered to coteach with partner teachers in a way that facilitates professional development. Ultimately, the outcome is not a one-time achievement, but an ongoing process of continual change. This change can impact and improve student services so that less isolation occurs. Teachers can become less isolated from one another, and students can also become less isolated in the instruction that they receive.

Project Strengths

This project specifically targets collaboration between classroom teachers and ESOL teachers in the context of the transition from pull-out services to more inclusive, coteaching practices. Specific strengths include the empowerment of teachers, ongoing professional development, fostering of greater collaboration and communication, the availability of supporting resources, and the groundwork to expand the initial development of the coteaching model.

Empowerment of Educators

This project is specifically designed for the adult learner, with the recognition that adult educators need independence, autonomy, and responsibility in the process of learning. This project is designed with consideration for adult learners' needs for self-direction and active involvement. The coplanning, coteaching, and intentional reflection

phases of this project encourage that self-direction and active involvement, rather than reflecting a prescribed, top-down model of professional development. In addition, this project is centered on the adult learner and the experiences of the learner, indicating recognition of the value of the adult experience and perspective.

Professional Development in the Context of Coteaching

With professional development intertwined with the context of implementation, the development of coteaching is intended to be joined with ongoing professional development. Instead of separating professional development from implementation, educators will enter the project with the understanding that the process of developing effective coteaching is an ongoing process, rather than a stagnant, final destination. This project incorporates professional development in the context of coteaching in a way that is intentional, integrated, and cyclical. The ongoing nature of the development of this project will foster growth beyond single experiences, with the assumption that change will happen over time rather than through one single experience.

Fostering Collaboration and Communication

This project has been intentionally designed so that classroom educators and ESOL educators will be involved in greater communication and collaboration. This will be achieved through targeted communication that is designed to occur during the preparation, planning, teaching, and reflection components of the project. The discussion questions, activities, and guided questions will help to facilitate that ongoing communication in a way that prevents isolation of the educators. Additionally, the reflection piece is built into the project in order to increase the amount of communication

and to provide an avenue for teachers to recognize that improvement in instruction is not a one-time event.

Groundwork for Transition of Instructional Model

In addition to fostering greater collaboration, this project provides opportunities for the transition from a pull-out model to a coteaching model. Designed to be implemented on a small scale, this project opens opportunities for teachers to become leaders and to begin implementation of a larger scale instructional model of coteaching. This project is designed with the realization that there is potential to build, expand, and change current models of instruction.

Resources

Rather than leaving teachers on their own to work their way through the instructional practice, this project is intended to provide resources that support the educators through the process. The supports include a timeline that will facilitate implementation and assist teachers in developing goals. The discussion questions and teaching inventories will support educators as they work through potential issues or areas of need, as well as clarify any misunderstandings before they arise. The planning guide will also help educators work together to plan for lessons, which will replace lesson planning in isolation. Finally, the reflection guide steers educators through the process of reflection, including how change can be made in the coteaching implementation.

Recommendations for Remediation of Limitations

Limitations in addressing the problem might include reaching teachers who are resistant to coteaching or resistant to working with other teachers. Some teachers may

have chosen not to participate in the study because they are not interested in greater communication and collaboration with the ESOL teacher. Teachers who have been in education for many years may have solidified routines that result in resistance to changes in methods and instructional practices. Because this project relies on the voluntary participation of teachers, reaching the classrooms of uninterested teachers may be a concern.

Remediation of this problem could involve the participation and positive perspectives of teachers who do participate in the transitional coteaching project. Their involvement with teachers who do not participate could be more effective than traditional forms of professional development, as they share common perspectives with classroom teachers, thus increasing buy-in. The communication of these teachers with other teachers during grade-level meetings or staff development could help other teachers gain positive perspectives on coteaching and might subsequently increase their willingness and openness to participate in future models of coteaching.

Other alternatives could include finding ways to reach teachers who are resistant to changes in instructional practices. These could include the development of stronger interpersonal relationships with teachers and locating common ground between the classroom teacher and ESOL teacher. As the ESOL teacher strives to understand the classroom teacher's perspective, effective solutions could be suggested and potentially implemented. As rapport is built, the ESOL teacher may be able to more effectively suggest alternative methods, and likewise, the classroom teacher may develop a greater willingness to try alternative methods.

Scholarship

Throughout this project, I was able to gain a greater understanding of what is effective and what is not effective in coteaching. This occurred through a combination of sources that explored multiple facets of the issues, challenges, and successes of coteaching. Reading through multiple articles and sources helped me to gain perspectives from those who had experienced success in coteaching, as well as those who had experienced frustration or forms of failure in coteaching. I was challenged to look for multiple perspectives to get a well-rounded view of those perspectives. The work of theorists, combined with current research on the topic, contributed to my understanding. Overall, I learned the importance of thoroughly exploring a topic or issue, considering a foundational theory that could aid in addressing the issue, and keeping a broad perspective when looking for solutions.

Project Development and Evaluation

In the development of the project, I learned the importance of merging research with data collected in a study. By studying the participants' responses and other data that were collected during the study, I was brought to a greater awareness of the need to find common areas among the work of the theorists, the current literature, and the data collected during the study. To develop a project without consideration for the theoretical framework or the current literature would result in a project that might be applicable now but has no foundation in any prior work. In contrast, developing a project without enough consideration of the current data could result in a project that is not relevant to the audience for which it was designed. Overall, marriage of sources, including the work of

theorists, the current literature, and data from the project, provides a needed balance that can aid in making a project both timeless and relevant to the current audience.

Leadership and Change

The greatest thing I learned about leadership and change is that leadership can take the form of facilitation rather than reflecting a “top-down” model. One of the most important lessons of my study was that adults have a different way of learning than children and that it is imperative that my approach toward adults adjusts to these learners’ needs in determining forms of professional development. Consideration for self-direction and the value of adults’ experiences is crucial when developing a project, and the inclusion of these pieces may determine whether or not a project will be a success. My studies also altered my overall view of leadership and what it entails, even apart from the development of the coteaching projects. I learned that leadership may not be embodied only by a person standing in the front of a room, but may also be represented by a person who is at the side, having a quiet conversation with another person. That individual conversation could help facilitate a type of change.

Analysis of Self as Scholar

One of the things that I learned about myself as a scholar is that I am continually in the process of learning. This was particularly apparent as I saw research literature change over time. Just as individuals are continually finding new solutions to old or new problems, I can continually find new ways to improve my instructional practices through newly published literature. Throughout this process of research, I was encouraged to

think beyond my initial perspective and to broaden my understanding of how I can find updated literature and use it in combination with data to elicit change.

Analysis of Self as Practitioner

Prior to this project, the majority of the staff development I conducted was more leader centered than learner centered. Although I am currently in a dual role of both educating students and reaching out to teachers to provide professional development, I have learned that I need to be mindful of how I am approaching various learning experiences. My approach toward students will be a lot different from my approaches in reaching out to teachers who are jointly teaching our ESOL students. I have learned through this project that the design of professional development for teachers is just as important as the implementation of the professional development. Prior to this research study, I was more focused on the presentation of the professional development. Now that I have completed the data collection, analysis, and project development phases of this study, I realize the importance of focusing on the facilitation of professional development. It is the difference between giving information versus empowering teachers to formulate their own professional development. I see my role as empowering teachers rather than just conveying specific information to them.

Analysis of Self as Project Developer

Throughout this research process, I learned the importance of being open to changes in a project. These changes may come as a result of new literature, previous project experiences, or the needs of the learner. As I look toward developing future projects, the emphasis needs to be not my vision of how the project could be effective,

but also what data indicate that the project will be effective. Input from the individuals around me, including those whom the project will impact, will be vital to the success of the project. Having an open mind is critical to success as a project developer.

The Project's Potential Impact on Social Change

The project's impact on social change at the local level includes a transition between the format of instructional services and an improved quality of services provided for the students. With the implementation of structured coteaching, classroom teachers and ESOL teachers can work more closely to streamline lessons and target areas of student need. In this way, the lessons provided to the students will be less isolating and students will be provided with more opportunities to learn alongside peers who are non-ESOL students rather than in isolation. In doing so, students will have more opportunities to interact with non-ESOL peers and learn life skills which are vital to success in a working world.

Beyond the local level of the school and district, this project has the potential to provide assistance to other schools that may be transitioning from a pull-out model to a coteaching model. This project could provide resources to these schools and districts in order to make the transition smooth. Since this project was designed with the understanding that professional development is ongoing, the cyclical nature of this project could be used by other schools and districts to implement coteaching at any level, from initial implementation to widespread implementation.

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

Implications

Implications for future research include consideration for how to provide effective transitions between models of instruction. The current transition which is the focus of this project includes the transition from pull-out instruction to coteaching, with the use of a gradual transition model. Future research could include a focus on partial implementation of coteaching to a greater implementation of coteaching, to include an all-inclusive coteaching model. Since this research utilizes teacher interest, it will be important to study how to reach and include teachers who may be resistant to change or whose years of experience and previously established routines preclude those changes. Additionally, gauging the perspectives of teaching assistants and males within the teaching profession will be important.

Applications

Applications to the educational field can include the process of implementing coteaching rather than simply focusing on the framework of coteaching itself. Prior research has been completed on the forms of coteaching that have been successful, but more limited research has been completed on the transitional component of moving from non-coteaching models to greater implementation of coteaching. The resources included in this project can be applied to varying degrees of implementation. This can include schools that transition from utilizing no coteaching to the initial onset of coteaching or it can include schools that have a partial model of coteaching already developed. In addition, the planning resources can be applied to other teachers who may also participate

in coteaching. Examples of other educators who could co-teach include special education teachers, speech therapists, and teachers who educate students in the context of related arts.

Directions

In addition to future studies of the development of coteaching, the directions for future research can include studies of teachers who co-teach in the context of mixed genders and ethnic groups. Examples include studies of non-minority educators who teach with minority educators or studies of men coteaching with women. Future studies can also include research on established partnerships between educators and paraprofessionals, such as teaching assistants.

Conclusion

Within the context of an educational system that has many types of instructional practices, coteaching between ESOL teachers and classroom teachers can be a means to improve communication between teachers and simultaneously improve services for students. As this is accomplished, the effect is a decrease in isolation between teachers and between students. Ongoing research of a variety of coteaching relationships can provide even greater insights into how coteaching can be most effectively and successfully implemented within today's classrooms.

References

- Barry, P. S. (2012). In our school, we all teach ESL. In A. Honigsfeld & M. Dove (Eds.), *Coteaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom: Rationale, research, reflections, and recommendations* (pp. 207–216). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Bell, A. B., & Walker, A. B. (2012). Mainstream and ELL teacher partnerships: A model of collaboration. In A. Honigsfeld & M. Dove (Eds.), *Coteaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom: Rationale, research, reflections, and recommendations* (pp. 207 – 216). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Brown, C. L., & Stairs, A. L. (2012). Inclusion or intrusion? Reculturing schools for collaborative ESL instruction. In A. Honigsfeld & M. Dove (Eds.), *Coteaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom: Rationale, research, reflections, and recommendations* (pp. 207 – 216). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Chan, S. (2010). Applications of andragogy in multi-disciplined teaching and learning. *MPAEA Journal of Education*, 39(2), 25–35.
- Closson, R. (2013). Racial and cultural factors and learning transfer. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 137, 61–69.
- Cowan, C., Goldman, E. F., & Hook, M. (2010). Flexible and inexpensive: Improving

learning transfer and program evaluation through participant action plans.

Performance Improvement, 49(5), 18–25. doi:10.1002/pfi.20147

Creese, A. (2010). Content-focused classrooms and learning English: How teachers collaborate. *Theory Into Practice*, 49(2), 99–105.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

DeCapua, A., & Marshall, H. W. (2010). Reaching ELLs at risk: Instruction for students with limited or interrupted formal education. *Preventing School Failure*, 55(1), 35-41.

Denton, C. A., Cirino, P. T., Barth, A. E., Romain, M., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., & Fletcher, J. M. (2011). An experimental study of scheduling and duration of “tier 2” first grade reading intervention. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 4(3), 208–230.

Devlin-Scherer, R., & Sardone, N. B. (2013). Collaboration as a form of professional development: Improving learning for faculty and students. *College Teaching*, 61(1), 30-37. doi:10.1080/87567555.2012.714815

Dodor, B. A., Sira, N., & Hausafus, C. O. (2010). Breaking down the walls of teacher isolation. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences Education*, 28(1), 1–12.

Dove, M., & Honigsfeld, A. (2010). ESL coteaching and collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL Journal*, 1(1), 3–22.

English, B. (2009). Who is responsible for educating English language learners?

Discursive construction of roles and responsibilities in an inquiry community.

Language and Education, 23(6), 487–507.

Equal Education Opportunity Act, 20 USC Sec. 1703 (1974).

Fazarro, C. J. (2012). Reforming 21st century American public education: A case for changing school structures. *Journal of Philosophy & History of Education*, 62(1), 161-169.

Fenty, N., & McDuffie-Landrum, K. (2011). Collaboration through coteaching. *Kentucky English Bulletin*, 60(2), 21–26.

Flores, N. (2012). Pseudo-collaboration between ESL and mainstream teachers. In A. Honigsfeld & M. Dove (Eds.), *Coteaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom: Rationale, research, reflections, and recommendations* (pp. 207–216). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Foley, J. M., & Kaiser, L. R. (2013). Learning transfer and its intentionality in adult and continuing education. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education*, 137, 5-15.

Garcia, E. E., Jensen, B. T., & Scribner, K. P. (2009). The demographic imperative. *Educational Leadership*, 66(7), 8–13.

George, C. (2009). Marginalization or collaboration: First year ESL teachers and the middle school context. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 4(1), 25–52.

Gningue, S. M., Schroder, B., & Peach, R. (2014). Reshaping the "glass slipper": The development of reflective practice by mathematics teachers through action research. *American Secondary Education*, 42(3), 18-29.

- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2015). *Collaboration and Coteaching for English Learners: A Leader's Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hung, W. (2013). Problem-based learning: A learning environment for enhancing learning transfer. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education, (137)*, 27 - 36.
- Illeris, K. (2009): Transfer of learning in the learning society: How can the barriers between different learning spaces be surmounted, and how can the gap between learning inside and outside schools be bridged? *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 28(2)*, 137 – 148.
- Jackson, L. D. (2009). Revisiting adult learning theory through the lens of an adult learner. *Adult Learning, 20(3/4)*, 20 – 22.
- Jarvis, P. (2009). Developments in learning theory. *International Journal of Continuing Education & Lifelong Learning, 2(1)*, 1 – 14.
- Jarvis, P. (2011). Teaching, learning, & the human quest: Wisdom. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education, (13)*, 85 – 93. doi:10.1002/ace.424
- Kaminski, K., Foley, J., & Kaiser, L. (2013). Applying transfer in practice. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education, (137)*, 83 – 89.
- Knowles, M. S. (1975). Adult education: New dimensions. *Educational Leadership, 33(2)*, 85 – 88.
- Knowles, M. S. (1952). Group methods in adult education. *Journal of Social Issues, 8(2)*, 11 – 22.
- Knowles, M. S. (1979). The professional organization as a learning community. *Training*

and Development Journal, 33(5), 36 – 40.

Lau vs. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563. (9th Circuit, 1974).

Legal Information Institute. (2013). Retrieved from

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/cases/name.htm>.

Lewis, S., Maerten-Rivera, J., Adamson, K., & Lee, O. (2011). Urban third grade teachers' practices and perceptions in science instruction with English language learners.

School Science & Mathematics, 111(4), 156 – 163. doi:10.1111.j.1949-

8594.2011.00073.x

Lodico, M., Spaulding, D., & Voegtle, K. (2010). *Methods in educational research:*

From theory to practice (Laureate Education, Inc., custom ed.). San Francisco,

CA: John Wiley & Sons.

MacRae, R., & Skinner, K. (2011). Learning for the twenty-first century: Maximising

learning transfer from learning and development activity. *Social Work Education*,

30(8), 981 – 994. doi: 10.1080/02615479.2010.520118

Martin-Beltran, M., & Peercy, M. M. (2012). How can ESOL teachers and mainstream

teachers make the best of a standards-based curriculum in order to collaborate?

TESOL Journal, 3(3), 425 – 444.

Martin-Beltran, M., Peercy, M.M., & Selvi, A.F. (2012). Collaboration to teach

elementary English language learners. In A. Honigsfeld & M. Dove (Eds).

Coteaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom (p.111 –

119). Charlotte: IAP.

McClure, G. (2012). Pulling away from pull-out. In A. Honigsfeld and M. Dove (Eds),

Coteaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom: Rationale, research, reflections, and recommendations (pp. 207 – 216). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

- McClure, G., & Cahmann-Taylor, M. (2010). Pushing back against push-in: ESOL teacher resistance and the complexities of coteaching. *TESOL Journal*, 1(1), 101 – 129.
- McDonald, L. (2009). Teacher change: A dynamic interactive approach. *International Journal of Learning*, 16(10), 623 -636.
- McGinty, J., Radin, J., & Kaminski, K. (2013). Brain-friendly teaching supports learning transfer. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, (137), 49 – 59.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mohammed, M. R. (2010). Don't give me a fish; teach me how to fish: A case study of an international adult learner. *Adult Learning*, 21(1/2), 15 – 18.
- Office of Immigration Statistics (2013). *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.dhs.gov/yearbook-immigration-statistics>.
- Pawan, F., & Craig, D.A. (2011). ESL and content area teacher responses to discussions on English language learner instruction. *TESOL Journal*, 2(3), 293 – 311.
- Petrick, D. (2014). Strengthening compatibility in the coteaching relationship: A four step process. *Global Education Journal*, 2014(1), 15 – 35.
- Pew Hispanic Center (2013). *Census 2010: 50 Million Latinos*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/140.pdf>

- Pugh, K. J. (2011). Transformative experience: An integrative construct in the spirit of Deweyan pragmatism. *Educational Psychologist, 46*(2), 107 – 121. doi: 10.1080/00461520.2011.558817
- Richland District Two. (2012). *The ESOL Handbook for Richland District Two*. Retrieved from <https://docs.google.com/a/richland2.org/file/d/0B5y6KRhY3G4IN2dMaUhRd1ZGVEk/edit>
- Richards, J., & Skolits, G. (2009). Sustaining instructional change: The impact of professional development on teacher adoption of a new instructional strategy. *Research in the Schools, 16*(2), 41 – 58.
- Ruey, S. (2010). A case study of constructivist instructional strategies for adult online learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 41*(5), 706 – 720. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00965.x
- Sheng, Z., Sheng, Y., & Anderson, C. J. (2011). Dropping out of school among ELL students: Implications to schools and teacher education. *The Clearing House, 84*, 98 – 103.
- Sibthorp, J., Furman, N., Paisley, K., Gookin, J., & Schumann, S. (2011). Mechanisms of learning transfer in adventure education: Qualitative results from the NOLS transfer survey. *Journal of Experiential Education, 34*(2), 109 – 126. doi:10.5193/JEE34.2.109
- Smith, G. (2010). S.C. schools adjust to rising Hispanic population. *The State*. Retrieved from www.latinamericanstudies.org/immigration/SC-Hispanic-population.htm
- South Carolina Department of Education (2013). Retrieved from

<http://ed.sc.gov/data/esea/2013/school.cfm?SID=4002073>

- Stewart, M. (2010). Walking in my students' shoes: An ESL teacher brings theory to life in order to transform her classroom. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 12(1), 1 – 6.
- Taylor, B., & Kroth, M. (2009). Andragogy's transition into the future: Meta-analysis of andragogy and its search for a measurable instrument. *MPAEA Journal of Adult Education*, 38(1), 1 – 11.
- Trin, M.P., & Kolb, D.A. (2011). Eastern experiential learning: Eastern principles for learning wholeness. *Career Planning & Adult Development Journal*, 27(4), 29 - 43.
- Vostal, B., Bostic, J., Fidler, D., Stewart, A., & Watterson, A. (2014). Coteaching: Evolving English language arts instruction in the elementary classroom. *Ohio Journal of English Language Arts*, 54(1), 17 – 25.
- Walker, C., & Edstam, T.S. (2013). Staff development while you teach: Collaborating to serve English learners. *TESOL Journal*, 4(2), 345 – 359.
- Walsh, J. M. (2012). Coteaching as a school system strategy for continuous improvement. *Preventing School Failure*, 56(1), 29 - 36.
- Westover, J. (2009). Lifelong learning: Effective adult learning strategies and implementation for working professionals. *International Journal of Learning*, 16(1), 435 – 443.
- Winsler, A., Hutchison, L. A., De Feyter, J. J., Bleiker, C., Manfra, L., Hartman, S. C., &

Levitt, J. (2012). Child, family, and childcare predictors of delayed school entry and kindergarten retention among linguistically, and ethnically diverse children.

Developmental Psychology, 48(5), 1299 – 1314. doi:10.1037/a0026985

Yin, L., & Hare, D. (2009). Pullout or inclusion: A longitudinal study of reading

achievement of English language learners in grades 1 and 2. *Journal of School*

Connections, 2(1), 75 – 91.

Young, J. (2013). Understanding transfer as personal change: Concerns, intentions, and

resistance. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education*, (137), 71 -82.

Appendix A: Columbia, SC Class Observation

IRB Approval Number: Approval Number: 07-14-14-0318437

Observation Protocol (Classroom without Coteaching)**Observe Set-Up of Classroom (Diagram)**

Purpose: Determine how the ESOL teacher could seamlessly enter and exit classroom when servicing multiple classes

Diagram of Classroom	How ESOL Teacher Could Integrate Into the Physical Set-Up of Classroom	
	<u>Class Feature</u>	<u>Possible Entrance</u>

Observe Teaching Style of Educator

Purpose: Determine how teaching styles and instructional practices of classroom teacher and ESOL teacher could be joined to accomplish common goals.

In what areas can the ESOL educator merge or coordinate with the classroom teacher?	How could this positively impact instruction?

Observe Use of Modifications (or Lack of Modifications)

Purpose: Determine what additional modifications are necessary and how the ESOL teacher can support the classroom educator in creating additional modifications for students who are struggling.

Identifiable Modification	Identifiable Lack of Modifications

Observe Student Progress

Purpose: Determine points where students are experiencing success or failure and the work associated with the tasks.

Student Behavior (Struggle or Success)	Work Associated with Task

Appendix B: Mount Olive, NC Class Observation

Observation Protocol (Classroom with Coteaching)**Observe Set-Up of Classroom (Diagram)**

Purpose: Determine how the ESOL teacher enters and exits classroom when servicing multiple classes

Diagram of Classroom	How ESOL Teacher Integrates Into the Physical Set-Up of Classroom	
	<u>Class Feature</u>	<u>Entrance</u>

Observe Teaching Style of Educator

Purpose: Determine how teaching styles and instructional practices of classroom teacher and ESOL teacher could be joined to accomplish common goals.

How do the classroom teacher and ESOL teacher merge to deliver instruction?	How does this positively impact instruction?

Observe Use of Modifications

Purpose: Determine what modifications are evident in the classroom and corresponding student responses.

Identifiable Modification	Student Responses/Behavior

Observe Student Progress

Purpose: Determine points where students are experiencing success.

Points of Success	Work Associated with Task

Appendix C: Semi-Structured Interview Question Samples for Sunshine Elementary

Interview Questions for Classroom Teachers:

1. What can ESOL teachers do to improve communication with classroom teachers?
2. What should ESOL teachers *not* do in communicating with classroom teachers?
3. How can ESOL teachers most effectively collaborate with classroom teachers in coordinating instruction and instructional goals?
4. If you could choose any form of ESOL professional development, what would it look like?
5. How can ESOL teachers most effectively support classroom teachers in modifying work?
6. Have you ever co-taught with another educator? If so, what recommendations would you give for future coteaching, based on your experience?
7. If you could co-teach with an ESOL teacher what would the classroom look like?
8. What would you need in order for coteaching to work in your classroom?

Interview Questions for Specialists (Encore, SPED, ESOL, etc.)

1. What can improve communication between classroom teachers and specialists?
2. What are some challenges in communication between classroom teachers and specialists?
3. What have you found to be effective strategies for collaborating with classroom teachers?
4. If you could choose any form of professional development, what would it look like?
5. If you could co-teach with a classroom teacher what would you need in order for coteaching to work?
6. Have you ever co-taught with another educator? If so, what recommendations would you give for future coteaching, based on your experience?

Appendix D: Semistructured Interview Question Samples for Fairview Elementary

Interview Questions for Classroom Teachers:

1. What can ESOL teachers do to improve communication with classroom teachers?
2. What should ESOL teachers *not* do in communicating with classroom teachers?
3. How can ESOL teachers most effectively collaborate with classroom teachers in coordinating instruction and instructional goals?
4. If you could choose any form of ESOL professional development, what would it look like?
5. How can ESOL teachers most effectively support classroom teachers in modifying work?
6. What recommendations would you give for teachers who are starting to implement coteaching, based on your experience?
7. What makes coteaching work in your classroom?
8. What would you need in order for coteaching to work in your classroom?

Interview Questions for Specialists (Encore, SPED, ESOL, etc.)

1. What can improve communication between classroom teachers and specialists?
2. What are some challenges in communication between classroom teachers and specialists?
3. What have you found to be effective strategies for collaborating with classroom teachers?
4. If you could choose any form of professional development, what would it look like?
5. When you co-teach with a classroom teacher what do you need in order for coteaching to work?
6. What recommendations would you give for teachers who are starting to implement coteaching, based on your experience?
7. What makes coteaching work in your classroom?

What is most effective in helping classroom teachers modify work for students?

Appendix E: Document Analysis Protocol

Document Analysis

Purpose: Identify points at which student work samples (through photographs) or plans can be further modified to scaffold for student levels.

Document Type	Indication of Modification	Points at which further Modifications May Be Made/ How Modifications May Be Increased

Appendix F: Codes Developed From Sunshine Elementary Interviews

	Improving Communication	Coordinating Instruction Effectively	Recommendations for Coteaching	Vision for Set-up of Coteaching	What Makes Coteaching Work	Effective Staff Development/PD
CT1	Collaboration Communicating pedagogy Shared strategies Confidentiality Allow processing time <u>Mode:</u> notes, portfolios	Awareness Expectations Communication of goals Strategies	Ground Rules Expectations Respect Space for each Individual Awareness	Small Group Instruction Flexible Grouping Similar Expectations Consistency Routines Strategies	Willingness Administrative Support System in Place Structure Collaborative planning Shared Expectations	Specificity -- ESOL strategies Small group instruction Support <u>Content:</u> Grading, Leveling, Differentiating, Sharing Assessments/ Observations
CT2	Conversations Dual Specificity Meetings, Check In Conferences <u>Content:</u> ESOL standards Language Used Curriculum <u>Mode:</u> Check-ins, Examples, Work Sample Folder Email: with caution	In Person PD Conversations Examples Work Samples Work Modifications: Specific Modifications Conferences Make and Take Work Sessions	Planning Preparation Awareness Congruent Expectations Shared Decision-Making Debriefing	Small Group (2) Technology Space (2) Resources Merging	Shared Vision Enthusiasm Planning (2) Flexibility Resources	<u>Form:</u> In-person Classes Make-and-Take <u>Content:</u> Specific Strategies Specificity Resources Small Group Ideas
CT3	Conversations Piggy Back Coordination Presence Suggest, not Mandate Freedom <u>Modes:</u> Conversation, Face-to-Face, Email	Sharing Plans Mutual Observations	Structure Expectations Consistent Collaboration Communication Flexibility	Mini-Lessons Workshop Model (Small Groups)	Training Practice Buy-in	Observe a Lesson Hands-on Video Footage Visual Examples
CT4	ESOL Standards <u>Modes:</u> Conversations, Email, Meetings	Meetings Conversations Planning <u>Work</u> <u>Modifications:</u> Hands-on Relevance Current Work	Heterogenous grouping Flexible Curriculum PD (Workshop) Training Buy-in Collaboration Brainstorming Shared Responsibility Shared Leadership	Mixed Grouping Blended Learning Club Heterogeneous Differentiated Instruction Evaluation Teacher Growth	Time Planning Coordination of Teaching Styles/ Approaches Debriefing	<u>Content:</u> Language Skills, Templates, Examples Openness Lines of Communication Hands-on

	Improving Communication	Coordinating Instruction Effectively	Recommendations for Coteaching	Vision for Set-up of Coteaching	What Makes Coteaching Work	Effective Staff Development/PD
CT5	Model Lesson Observation Confidentiality <u>Modes:</u> Conversation, Face to Face Email: cautious (inundated sometimes)	Planning Together Sharing Plans Sending Lesson Plans Customized Lesson Plans (not generic) <u>Mutual Work Modifications:</u> Teachers Provide Curriculum Make and Take	Share Observations Come into the classroom	Mixed Blended Lesson Planning Together Shared	Time Planning Resources	Video Collaboration Training Model Lessons Mini Lessons Make and Take Specificity
CT6 *S *non ESOL	Email Conversations Content: Levels of English Proficiency	Graphic Organizer Shared Board Integration Planning Snapshots	N/A	Time to Plan Patience		Relevant PD
CT7 ESOL	Email Common Planning Face-to-Face Discussions Professional Development <u>Challenges:</u> Scheduling Email Disconnection Giving Suggestions	Discussions Suggestions Structured PD	N/A	Time Lesson Planning Administrative Support Openness		Lesson Planning Correlation of Content
CT8	Openness Free Communication Mutual Communication Follow-up <u>Modes:</u> Face-to-face Conversation Email faster, Oral Preferable	Observe Correlate content <u>Work Modifications</u> Specificity on assignments	Collaboration Shared Goals	Structure Small Group One-on-One Self- Improvement Professional Growth Feedback	Guidelines Responsibility Structure	Differentiated Instruction Strategies Model Lessons

Appendix G: Codes Developed From Fairview Elementary Interviews

	Improving Communication	Coordinating Instruction Effectively	Recommendations for Coteaching	What Makes Coteaching Work	Effective Staff Development/PD
NT 11 801_042	Email lesson plans Face-to-face Presence <u>Modes:</u> Conversation, Face-to-Face, Email	Correlating Lesson Content <u>Modifying Work:</u> Vocabulary Content	Openness to New Ideas	Small Group One-on-One Planning Know Lesson Preparation	Uncertain
NT 6 801_043 ESOL	Immediate Communication Specific Feedback Connect to Curriculum Shared Decisions/Control Respect Modes: Face-to-Face better, Conversations, Delay with Email	Presence in Classroom Awareness Planning <u>Modifying Work:</u> Case-by-Case Resources Available	Pre-plan strategies Don't get offended by differences Negotiations Problem-solving	Flexibility Energy Heterogeneous Grouping Flexible Grouping	Content: Differentiated Instruction Individual Student Needs Feedback – Give and Receive
NT 2 801_044 *ESOL	Time to Plan, PLCs Planning time Quick debrief Challenges: Understanding Roles (Classroom teacher understanding ESOL role)	Collaboration Finding Resources Brainstorming <u>Modifying Work:</u> Modeling Gentle Reminders	Slow start Small group	Mutual Respect Buy-in Glean Ideas Conversations Enjoy Questioning	Observation Modeling
NC 1 801_045 *ESOL	Administrative support Sending lesson plans Weekly planning Common Planning Time	Weekly Meetings Email Lesson Plans Open Communication PLC <u>Modifying Work:</u> Analyzing Data Using Data	Open Communication Gathering Resources Small Groups Heterogeneous Grouping	Positive Rapport Respect Open Communication In-depth Planning Willingness Buy-in "Our" class	PD on Coteaching See it in action Modeling

	Improving Communication	Coordinating Instruction Effectively	Recommendations for Coteaching	What Makes Coteaching Work	Effective Staff Development/PD
NT 5 801_046	Planning time Conversations Meetings Respect time and feelings Not use too much jargon <u>Modes:</u> Face-to-face, Orally, Email not sufficient	Contribute Share ideas Share the work load <u>Modifying Work:</u> Vocabulary Resources Pre-teach w/picture cards Small groups	Willingness to share Willingness to try new things Consistency Supplementing	Contribution Honest communication Sharing Cooperation Working Together Receptivity	Strategy Development Hands-on Modeling Learner activated
NT 3 801_047 801_048	Planning Time ESOL specific <u>Modes:</u> In-person, Face-to-face	Planning in Person Jotting Notes <u>Modifying Work:</u> Small groups	Time to plan Ask questions Clarify Clear expectations Clear communication Advanced notice Preparation	Planning Time Technology	Specific ways to scaffold Differentiated instruction Small group Face-to-face Not online Observation Video
NT 4 801_049	Lesson plans Correlating Curriculum Corresponding Similar Goals <u>Modes:</u> Face-to-face, Verbal	Sharing Feedback Mutual <u>Modifying Work:</u> Interaction Heterogeneous groups	Communication Professional Development Equality	Communication Correlating Preparation Planning Good rapport	Visual Face-to-face
NT 8 801_050	Open line of communication Time to collaborate Close proximity Face-to-face	Plan ahead Preparation <u>Modifying Work:</u> Repetition Strategies Vocabulary	Openness Willingness Open Door Policy Good communication Flexibility	Communication Same teaching styles Clear Expectations Good communication Team Planning	Workshop Face-to-face Student-specific Utilizing data Data Analysis
NT 13 801_051	Planning Time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team • Individual Not Discuss Irrelevant Students (Non-ESOL) Confidentiality <u>Modes:</u> Face-to-face (clarifies), Email misunderstood sometimes	Team Planning Looking at Misconceptions Looking at Vocabulary Preparation Front-loading <u>Modifying Work:</u> Provide resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visuals • experiences 	Planning Time Patience Start small Small groups at first	Getting along Camaraderie Cooperation Brainstorming Personalities No conflict	See or Do Workshop Practice Watch Seeing strategies modeled Mock lesson Model lesson
NT 14 801_052	Give feedback Ideas Data <u>Modes:</u> Face-to-face, Email is inconsistent (checking)	Sit in on meetings Grade level meetings <u>Modifying Work:</u> Suggestions for Specific students Tailored Modifications	Open-minded Good to collaborate Get ideas	Respect Understanding	Hands-on Experience

Appendix H: Codes Developed From Sunshine Elementary Observations

Observations – NC Teachers

Teacher	Content (Green)	Delivery (Yellow)	Format of Instruction (Pink)	Misc. Codes (Orange)
<u>NT3</u> K-2	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Aloud • Reading 	Small Group Partner Work	Technology Graphic Organizer Questioning	Alternate Roles Flexibility
<u>NT4</u> 3-5	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Aloud • Vocabulary • Writing 	Learning Clubs Partners Group Work Whole Group One-on-One Small Group Cooperative Heterogeneous	Modeling Graphic Organizer Paper/Pencil	Flexibility Procedure (3) Circulation around room
<u>NT5</u> 3-5	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Adjectives • Vocabulary 	Small Groups Group Work Learning Club Heterogeneous	Technology Modeling Paper/Pencil	Alternate Roles (2) Congruent Tasks Transition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set-up Procedure Flexibility
<u>NT-6</u> K-2	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary Math	Whole Group Small Group	Technology	Alternate Roles (2) Procedures Questioning Respect
<u>NT-7</u> K-2	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Writing 	Small Group Heterogeneous Independent	D.I. Technology Strategy Instruction Paper/Pencil	
<u>NT-9</u> K-2	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Aloud • Writing • Vocabulary 	Learning Clubs Small Group Whole Group Independent	Technology Think Aloud Paper/Pencil	Alternate Roles Think Aloud Word Bank
<u>NT-10</u> K-2	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Aloud • Vocabulary 	Small Groups Learning Clubs	Graphic Organizer Technology	CT-Questioning Procedure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turn/Talk Alternate Roles Questioning S Insertion (ES) Flexibility
<u>NT-11</u> 3-5	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading 	Learning Clubs Small Groups Individual Partner	Strategy Use Instr.	Resources Flexibility Procedures
<u>NT-12</u> 3-5	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary • Read Aloud 	Partner Learning Clubs	Graphic Organizer	Alternate Roles Resources Circulation around Room Rotation
<u>NT-13</u> 3-5	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary • Reading 	Heterogeneous Small Groups Individual	D.I. Technology Strategy Instruct.	Procedures Flexibility
<u>NT-14</u> K-2	Math	Small Group Individual	D.I. Interactive Games Technology	Alternate Roles Procedures (2) Rotation Circulation (ET/CT)
<u>NT-15</u> K-2	ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Read Aloud • Vocabulary Science	Small Group Technology Heterogeneous	Arts Integration Multi-sensory	Resources Flexibility Questioning S Alternate Roles Circulation Procedures (2)

Appendix I: Codes of Sunshine Elementary Photographs

CT 1

Photo Code	Content (Green)	Delivery (Yellow)	Format of Instruction (Pink)
CP1	ELA Writing	N/A	Paper /Pencil
CP2 CP3	ELA Writing	N/A	Paper/Pencil
CP4 CP5 CP6 CP7	ELA Reading	Workshop Small Groups	Interactive Games Listening Independent Reading
CP8 CP9 CP12 CP14 CP15 CP16	ELA Reading	Small Groups	Interactive Games
CP10	ELA Reading	Small Groups	Interactive Games
CP11	ELA	Small Groups Individual	Interactive Games
CP13	ELA Reading	Individual	Independent Reading
CP17	ELA Reading	Individual	Independent Reading
CP18	ELA Reading Writing	Small Group Individual	Interactive Games Paper/Pencil
CP19	ELA Reading Writing	Small Group Teacher led	Manipulatives Paper/Pencil

CT 2

Photo Code	Content (Green)	Delivery (Yellow)	Format of Instruction (Pink)
CP20	ELA – Writing, Reading Social Studies	Whole Group	Graphic Organizer Technology
CP21	ELA Social Studies	Individual Whole Group	Fill-in Notes Cloze Reading
CP22	ELA Social Studies	Individual Whole Group	Graphic Organizer
CP23 CP24 CP25 CP30	ELA Social Studies	Individual Whole Group	Arts Integration Graphic Organizer
CP26 CP27	ELA	Individual	Paper/Pencil
CP28	ELA – Reading, Writing	Individual	Graphic Organizer Paper/Pencil

CT 3

Photo Code	Content (Green)	Delivery (Yellow)	Format of Instruction (Pink)
CP31 CP32	ELA – Reading, Writing	Whole Group	Dry Erase Whiteboards

CT 4

Photo Code	Content (Green)	Delivery (Yellow)	Format of Instruction (Pink)
CP33 CP34 CP35 CP36	N/A	Small Group Heterogeneous	Graphic Organizer Paper Pencil
CP37 CP38 CP39 CP40	ELA Writing	N/A	Arts Integration Paper/pencil
CP41 CP42 CP45 CP46 CP47	ELA -- Reading Social Studies	Small Group Individual	Graphic Organizer Paper/pencil
CP43 CP44	ELA -- Writing Social Studies	Small Group Individual	Paper/pencil

CT 5

Photo Code	Content (Green)	Delivery (Yellow)	Format of Instruction (Pink)
CP48 CP49 CP50 CP51 CP52 CP53 CP54 CP55 CP56 CP57	ELA Writing Science	N/A	Technology Visual Arts Integration

Appendix J: Codes of Fairview Elementary Photographs

NT4

<u>Photo Code</u>	<u>Content (Green)</u>	<u>Delivery (Yellow)</u>	<u>Format of Instruction (Pink)</u>
NP1 NP2 NP3	ELA Reading Writing	Whole Group	Interactive Chart Graphic Organizer Paper/pencil
NP4 NP5 NP6 NP7	ELA Reading Writing	Small Groups	Paper/pencil

NT5

<u>Photo Code</u>	<u>Content (Green)</u>	<u>Delivery (Yellow)</u>	<u>Format of Instruction (Pink)</u>
NP8 NP9 NP10	ELA Reading Writing	Whole Group	Interactive Chart Graphic Organizer Paper/pencil

NT3

<u>Photo Code</u>	<u>Content (Green)</u>	<u>Delivery (Yellow)</u>	<u>Format of Instruction (Pink)</u>
NP11 NP12 NP16	ELA Reading	Whole Group	Technology Graphic Organizer
NP13 NP14 NP15	ELA Reading	Small Group	Interactive Games

NT6

<u>Photo Code</u>	<u>Content (Green)</u>	<u>Delivery (Yellow)</u>	<u>Format of Instruction (Pink)</u>
NP17 NP18 NP19	Math ELA	Whole Group	Technology

NT9

<u>Photo Code</u>	<u>Content (Green)</u>	<u>Delivery (Yellow)</u>	<u>Format of Instruction (Pink)</u>
NP20 NP21 NP22 NP23	ELA Writing Reading	Individual Learning Clubs	Paper/pencil

NT10

<u>Photo Code</u>	<u>Content (Green)</u>	<u>Delivery (Yellow)</u>	<u>Format of Instruction (Pink)</u>
NP24 NP25 NP26 NP27	ELA Writing	Individual	Paper/pencil

NT11

<u>Photo Code</u>	<u>Content (Green)</u>	<u>Delivery (Yellow)</u>	<u>Format of Instruction (Pink)</u>
NP29 *ESOL	Reading	Small Group	Color coding Strategy Use
NP30	Reading	Small Group	Color coding Strategy Use

NT14

<u>Photo Code</u>	<u>Content (Green)</u>	<u>Delivery (Yellow)</u>	<u>Format of Instruction (Pink)</u>
NP31	Math	Small Group Individual	Technology
NP32	Math	Small Group Individual	Interactive Learning Games

Appendix K: Modules and Timeline of Implementation

	Week	Activity	Individuals Involved
Module One: Preparation	1	Small Group Discussion on Coteaching Practices	Multiple Pairs of Coteaching Partners Formed in a Small Group (no more than 10 teachers)
	3	Paired Discussions	Independent Pairs of Coteaching Partners (Groups of 2)
	5	Guided Lesson Planning	Independent Pairs of Coteaching Partners (Groups of 2)
Module Two: Implementation	7 (One lesson)	Implementation of Lesson	Independent Pairs of Coteaching Partners (Groups of 2)
Module Three: Reflection	9	Individual/ Partner Reflection	Independent Pairs of Coteaching Partners (Groups of 2)
	11	Small Group Reflection	Multiple Pairs of Coteaching Partners Formed in a Small Group (no more than 10 teachers)

Appendix L: Module 1 Structured Discussion Questions

Small Group Questions

1. What are our “ground rules” and expectations when we co-teach with one another?
2. How will we work out disagreements?
3. How will we ensure that there is equal participation and parity between co-teachers? How can we prevent one teacher from dominating and another teacher from functioning as an “assistant?”
4. With what school staff will we discuss our successes and challenges in coteaching? How can we do so in a safe, non-judgmental environment that considers the dignity of the teachers?

Paired Co-teachers

1. In what format will we plan our lessons? How will we communicate our planning?
2. How will we manage the classroom? What rules or expectations will we use for the students? What will be the consequences?
3. What students’ behavior will I choose to ignore and what will I address?
4. How will I contribute to planning and implementing the lessons?
5. What coteaching structures will we use?
6. What will I do if I have concerns about the way a lesson has been implemented?

Appendix M: Module 1 Lesson Planning Guide

Lesson Title:		
Content Area Standards:	ESOL Standards:	
Objectives:		
Lesson Procedures		
Overview of Lesson Component	Content Area Teacher Role and Responsibilities	ESOL Teacher Role and Responsibilities:
Warm-up:		
Core Lesson:		
Closure/Wrap-up:		
Lesson Preparations Needed		

Appendix N: Individual and Group Reflection Question and Discussion Prompts

Individual Questions and Prompts

1. What went well during the lesson?
2. What parts of the lesson could be improved?
3. What was the most effective part of the lesson?

Paired Questions and Prompts

1. Were there any parts of the lesson that could be improved?
2. How could we build greater teamwork if we teach a similar lesson again?
3. Overall, how did the lesson go? Why?
4. Did we encounter any problems or challenges? How can we address these in the future?

Appendix O: Evaluation Survey Questions

1. What components could be added to the trainings to assist you in successful coteaching experiences?
2. Were the number of meeting times adequate for the coteaching preparation? Did you feel like more or less meeting times were needed?
3. Did you need more or fewer small group or paired meetings were needed? Would you benefit from more time with small groups?
4. Overall, how effective were your co-taught lessons? What evidence did you find of this effectiveness or lack of effectiveness?
5. What recommendations would you give for other educators who are providing professional development on coteaching?
6. Do you have any additional needs that could help you be more successful at coteaching?
7. What recommendations would you give for future co-teachers?