Journal of Teacher Education

Do as We Say and as We Do: Teaching and Modeling Collaborative Practice in the University Classroom

Paula Kluth and Diana Straut

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:
$SAGE Publications

http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:

AACTE

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Teacher Education* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jte.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jte.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DO AS WE SAY *AND* AS WE DO
TEACHING AND MODELING COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE IN THE UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM

Paula Kluth
Diana Straut
Syracuse University

Researchers contend that to be effective in collaborative work, teachers need opportunities to practice and learn about shared decision making, communication, and planning. For this reason and countless others, teacher-preparation programs have recently been called on to include models of collaboration in their programs. This article provides a description of one collaborative partnership between a special education professor and a general education professor. Our program description specifically highlights the integration of two college courses: Academic Curricular Adaptations and Elementary Social Studies Methods and Curriculum. In this article, we have included details about our coteaching model as well as information related to our integrated curriculum and assessments. We also offer recommendations for those considering the implementation of coteaching partnerships and collaborative models in higher education institutions.

Keywords: university coteaching; teaming; collaboration; inclusive schooling

The first barrier to effective collaboration in schools is higher education's categorical approach to teacher preparation and the lack of attention to collaborative skills and ethics in the curriculum.

Villa, Thousand, Nevin, and Malgeri, 1996

In the past decade, considerable attention has been given to the benefits of collaboration among K-12 classroom teachers. In particular, general education and special education teachers have been exploring ways to work together with other service providers and families to create inclusive classrooms for students with a wide range of abilities (Lipsky & Gartner, 1996; O'Brien & O'Brien, 1996; Snell & Janney, 2000). Given the tremendous diversity in U.S. classrooms, in ability, ethnicity, and culture, for example, teachers are finding that it is difficult to deliver effective instruction in isolation. Educators are finding that one of the most powerful ways to cultivate and nurture this diversity is to combine efforts and expertise with colleagues. Effective instruction, particularly in inclusive classrooms, requires cooperation, teaming, and shifts in roles and responsibilities for many school personnel (Cook & Friend, 1995; Jorgensen, 1998; Pugach & Johnson, 1995; Snell & Janney, 2000; Villa & Thousand, 2000).

Recent studies have applauded collaborative efforts, and particularly the use of coteaching, between special education and general education professionals in preschool through high school settings (Meyers, Gelzheiser, & Yelich, 1991; Pugach & Wesson, 1995; Walter-Thomas, 1997). In a study by Meyers et al. (1991), for instance, general education teachers reported that they preferred in-class support models to pull-out models because the more collaborative model seemed to inspire a greater focus on

instructional issues for students with unique learning needs and resulted in more frequent team meetings with colleagues. In another related study, educators in cotaught classrooms described themselves as confident about meeting the needs of all students in the classroom (Pugach & Wesson, 1995). In addition, Walter-Thomas (1997) evaluated 23 coteaching teams and found that both special and general education teachers reported that professional growth and enhanced teaching motivation were results of their collaboration. In this same study, students claimed they received more teacher time and attention in their cotaught classrooms.

Perhaps due to these documented benefits of coteaching and collaboration, teacher educators are seeking new ways of working in college and university classrooms. Recent literature has suggested that teachers in the field cannot be taught collaboration (Garmston, 1997). For this reason, teacher-preparation programs have been called on to model collaboration in their programs (Cook & Friend, 1995; Duchardt, Marlow, & Inman, 1999; Villa et al., 1996; Villa, Thousand, & Chapple, 2000). In many colleges and universities, faculty in preservice teacher education programs have responded to this call and have begun to explore a range of interdepartmental teaching collaborations (Bakken, Clark, & Thompson, 1998; Duchardt, Marlow, & Inman, 1999; Keefe, Rossi, de Valenzuela, & Howarth, 2000; Melnick, Capella-Santana, & Sentell, 2000; Quinlan, 1998; Stallworth, 1998; Villa et al., 2000).

In this article, we will outline the components of one such collaborative model that has been implemented for four consecutive university semesters. We are two assistant professors in a preservice, inclusive teacher education program in upstate New York. One of us specializes in the area of significant disabilities and the other has expertise in general education curriculum and instruction.

This model was developed and implemented in two core courses we collaboratively planned and taught. One, a special education course, Academic Curricular Adaptations, is designed to provide students with the skills and competencies necessary for adapting teaching strate-

gies, classroom management procedures, educational environments, materials, and skill sequences for diverse learners, including those with significant disabilities. The other, a general education course, Elementary Social Studies Methods and Curriculum, focuses on the development and mastery of skills necessary for teaching meaningful and challenging social studies content to elementary-aged students.

INITIATING COLLABORATIVE PRACTICES

Our collaboration began in the fall of 1998 when we were both new faculty members. As we compared ideas for our respective teacher education courses, we noticed that there were many similarities between the ways we were conceptualizing and organizing our classes. There were also many similarities between the two of us as teacher educators; both of us had previously taught in inclusive schools, had worked in coteaching situations in public school settings, and had a social justice orientation to teaching and learning. Because we were assigned to teach the same group of students (a preservice cohort), our classes were assigned to the same classroom and were scheduled to meet in back-to-back time slots, we thought it might be interesting to coteach during one or two course periods. After these initial sessions were planned, we decided to compare our syllabi and identify other areas where the content overlapped and could be strengthened by integrating our disciplines.

During that first semester, we cotaught sessions on assessment, technology, teaching strategies, and classroom materials. In subsequent semesters, we have combined nearly every class period and have spanned topics from "Adapting, Choosing, and Using Textbooks and Children's Literature in the Social Studies" to "Culturally-Relevant Teaching and the Inclusive School."

Both of us were committed to teaching about and constantly stressing the importance of collaboration as we entered our respective positions in the School of Education at Syracuse University. More important, however, as researchers we were both well aware of the important role collaboration plays in effective inclusive

schools (Villa et al., 1996), and we hoped that by providing a collaborative model for students, they would be better prepared to function in progressive and diverse classrooms on their graduation from our program.

We were especially intrigued with the idea of offering general education and special education perspectives to students as they developed understandings of teaching and learning in our university methods courses. According to Winn and Blanton (1997), university collaboration—especially across special and general education disciplines—often parallels the roles of teachers in elementary and secondary schools. We hoped that, through our coteaching efforts, we would "model and at the same time come to understand the realities, benefits, and challenges of the kinds of collaboration for which [we were] preparing teachers" (p. 14).

Throughout the development of our collaborative courses, the administrators and colleagues in our shared department were supportive of our arrangement. Colleagues agreed to protect our back-to-back classroom times in subsequent semesters, encouraged us to further develop shared curriculum, and inspired us to write about our experiences. It is not surprising that our colleagues took such an interest in our ideas, however. A spirit and tradition of collaboration existed in the School of Education and in our department long before we designed our coteaching model (Meyer, Mager, Yarger-Kane, Sarno, & Hext-Contreras, 1997).

In 1990, the undergraduate elementary teacher education program at Syracuse University began requiring students to participate in an Inclusive Education Program. Students completing this program are recommended for certification in both elementary education and special education. Throughout the program, students are introduced to an inclusive ideology and are prepared to teach learners with and without disabilities in diverse educational environments. The promotional materials (Syracuse University School of Education, 1996) describing the program stress its timeliness and importance in today's educational climate:

> Today teachers work in classrooms that serve an increasingly diverse student population. Students come from different ethnic and cultural back-

grounds, and some have special needs that must be addressed. The innovative Inclusive Elementary and Special Education Program at Syracuse University's School of Education prepares you to meet this challenge. Your courses in liberal arts and professional education focus on knowledge and skills you need to teach in today's culturally pluralistic schools and classrooms, in addition to teaching both "typical" and "special" children. (pp. 2-4)

Due to this focus on inclusive schooling and progressive practice, our colleagues are committed to working in partnership with one another (Meyer et al., 1997). Professors often coteach individual classes with community members, parents of students with and without disabilities, other local education professionals, and with one another. In addition, our colleagues often plan in teams, engage in cross-discipline discussions about student needs and concerns, and collectively participate in crafting and recrafting the scope and sequence of individual classes and department programs.

DOING AND SAYING: TEACHING AND MODELING COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE IN OUR COURSES

During the past year, we have challenged one another to improve the curriculum and instruction in both our courses. We have spent hours coplanning our shared classes and developing activities and materials for our students. Although there are clearly many interesting and enjoyable elements of our collaborative partnership, teaching about and modeling coteaching and an interdisciplinary curriculum are the primary reasons we continue to team and work together.

We acknowledge that our situation is unique. That is, we have few barriers to our collaboration; we teach in a program that stresses practices and values of inclusive education; and we have administrative support for our work. We understand that many of our colleagues in our own university and in other institutions of higher education nationwide are interested in coteaching but struggle to do so because of social, logistical, or ideological difficulties. We realize that it may not be possible or even appropriate to replicate the collaborative model outlined in this article. It is our hope, however, that

in sharing this model, we can prompt a dialogue about collaborative models in universities and colleges. Instructors interested in collaborative models may replicate a few pieces of this model, begin sharing curriculum if not teaching responsibilities, move toward program and structural changes that would accommodate collaborative teaching models, or create different and unique coteaching models that might be shared with the field.

Teaching and Modeling Coteaching

To ensure that our students get the most from the Inclusive Elementary and Special Education Program, we make every attempt to teach about diverse classrooms and present teaching strategies and models that can be replicated in the elementary education environments in which our students will eventually teach. Throughout the course of the semester, we conduct approximately 10 shared classes. During these classes, we frequently engage in "duet" presentations (Greene & Isaacs, 1999) on course topics. In this model, we both assume primary teaching roles in the class and take turns leading class discussion, answering student questions, and facilitating the lectures and activities. A first-day-of-class icebreaker/simulation demonstrates this model to our students.

As students enter, they are greeted by a big sign that reads "Welcome to 1960." Before the students have learned our names (or we have learned theirs), we explain that for the next few hours we will be engaging in a simulation that takes place in 1960 at Fisk University in Tennessee (see Douglas, 1997). Students then take on various roles as they progress through a sequence of events (freshman seminar, a History 101 class, a meeting of concerned students) that lead up to a lunch counter sit-in at the local all-White diner. The simulation ends with a series of so-called freeze-frames, with students positioning themselves to reenact various stages of the sit-in, from the first hour to the point at which the police confront them. As the instructors, we too take on various roles, portraying a White history professor at the Historically Black College, or becoming Diane

Nash, the Fisk University student activist who leads the students to the lunch counter. Following the freeze-frames, students are asked to write a letter to a friend or family member telling about their experience as a participant in the sit-ins. We then cofacilitate a discussion about the emotions and insights that students experienced through the simulation. In doing so, we combine our content—students share what they learned about the civil rights movement and talk about feelings of rage or fear related to activism and exclusion. At the same time, we introduce learners to the power of simulation as a teaching tool. Students are asked to reflect on how children with diverse needs would respond to and learn from the use of simulation in the classroom. We also model duet teaching, as each of us shares equally in the preparation, acting, and de-briefing of the simulation.

In addition to using the duet teaching model, we often implement various teaming structures that optimize our expertise, increase interactions with students, and offer them concrete models to observe and assess as they develop their own teaching styles. The coteaching structures we most often use are based on the work of Cook and Friend (1995) and include parallel teaching, station teaching, and one teach/one assist teaching.

Parallel teaching. At least twice during the semester, we model a parallel teaching structure for the cohort. Parallel teaching involves splitting the class into equal sections and providing each group with the same lesson or activity. This structure lowers the student-teacher ratio and, therefore, is useful when students need opportunities to respond aloud, to engage in hands-on activities, or to interact with one another (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 7). Parallel teaching can also be used when teachers want to introduce smaller groups to two different activities, concepts, or ideas; the two instructors teach different content for some part of the class and then switch groups and repeat the lesson with the other half of the class. We use this structure, in particular, when we work on experiential projects so that we can more carefully observe and assess student performance. For this reason, we used parallel teaching when we taught students

how to integrate and adapt technology to challenge, interest, and support a wide range of learners. For half of the class period, students either explored educational Internet sites or investigated different types of assistive technology (i.e., equipment or item used to support functional capabilities of learners with disabilities). Students working with assistive technology got a lecture from a guest speaker, participated in a demonstration of several pieces of equipment, and experimented with technologies ranging from voice-activated software to environmental-control units to talking dictionaries. The group working on the computers was charged with finding Web sites suitable for the elementary classroom. They were asked to evaluate the sites based on age-appropriateness, relevance to a social studies curriculum, reliability of the source, and accuracy of the information provided. Students were also asked to assess how accessible the sites were. For example, students considered whether the print was large enough for a person with low vision to read and whether the animation and background were too stimulating and flashy for an individual with autism (or others with visual sensitivity) to use comfortably. Halfway through the class, students switched activities and worked with the other instructor for the remainder of the day's lesson. Due to the parallel structure, students had more opportunities to operate and experiment with both the computers and adaptive devices.

Because we typically have 25 to 30 students in our methods courses, we try to highlight how parallel teaching benefits both the students and the teacher in a larger class. We ask students to process how beneficial the lower ratio seems to be—do they feel they are getting more direct instruction? More teacher attention? Increased opportunities to receive feedback on their performance of skills (using the computers, programming the devices)? We then share how we, as instructors, profit from the parallel model, stressing primarily the importance of getting more individual time with learners.

Station teaching. In station teaching, teachers divide instructional content into two, three, or more segments and present the content at separate locations within the classroom (Cook & Friend, p. 6). When we teach using this structure, we both support and provide instruction for students at all stations. By using this model, we are able to offer activities that integrate social studies and adaptations content, while freeing ourselves to pause at different stations to listen and assess learning, provide more information about a topic, prompt a more complex discussion, ask a question (e.g., What type of learner would benefit from the adaptations you are creating?), or reinforce information from lecture or readings. During this time, we might also check in with any student who seems to be struggling with content.

Recently, we designed and implemented a station teaching lesson that integrated both of our disciplines and kept students engaged and challenged. During this lesson, students worked on activities at seven different stations. Each station included information and activities related to different areas of social studies and, in some cases, science, math, and language arts curriculum, as well. Students had 20 minutes to complete the activities at each station and then to design adaptations for these activities; each station offered activities appropriate for the elementary school classroom. At one station, students were prompted to assemble sentence strips into the appropriate sequence necessary for a bill to become a law. They discussed how students with fine motor difficulties might approach the task and how nonreaders could be a part of the activity. Another station required students to compare and contrast traditional social studies textbook representations of Helen Keller with contemporary biographical information. Students collaborated on the activity, then suggested ways to make it accessible and relevant for a wider range of learners in inclusive elementary school classrooms. One group generated the following adaptations: use picture books and chapter books about Helen Keller to supplement text book information; allow students to use books on tape to learn about Helen Keller; compare and contrast video representations of Helen Keller with textbook accounts of her life; have students draw graphic

organizers as they compare and contrast information; and let students work in pairs with one reading from the text books and one recording the findings. We further used the Helen Keller materials to discuss Ann Sullivan's role in Keller's life. This discussion prompted a mini-lecture on supports for individuals who are deaf-blind.

One teach/one assist. During some of our classes, one instructor acts as lead teacher whereas the other floats throughout the classroom providing individual assistance and facilitating small-group activities. For example, in one of our joint classes, one instructor provided instruction on creating authentic assessments, whereas the other instructor walked from table to table offering suggestions on how to appropriately adapt the assessments for students with disabilities. Students worked in groups to create appropriate assessments for model lessons. One professor stood in the front of the classroom and showed students different types of assessment approaches (e.g., interviews, portfolios, learning logs/journals, and exhibitions) via a PowerPoint presentation; students were verbally walked through the steps of assessment design (e.g., designing criteria, communicating criteria to students). After the professor gave cues for a step of the process, she provided students with 10 minutes to discuss the step. During this time, the other professor gave individual groups information about how these assessments might be used with students with a range of disabilities. For instance, she worked with one group of students to adapt the interview process for a student without speech. She worked with another group to think about ways to include a student with learning disabilities and writing struggles in a journal-writing assessment.

We use one teach/one assist, in some form, almost every week. One teach/one assist is easy to implement and, importantly, can be arranged on the spot. For this reason, we often naturally shift into one teach/one assist when one of us drifts into the classroom for an unplanned visit or stays in the classroom past a planned co-taught lesson.

Teaching About and Modeling the Integration of Course Content

Unlike the coteaching component of our model, the course content integration is difficult to make explicit. We need to constantly talk to students about how and why we are connecting the courses in so many ways. We feel it is important to have class discussions about how we have planned course sessions, how we negotiate roles in our collaboration, how the courses were designed, and why we think our decisions are important for making our classroom more motivating, stimulating, and suitable for college students with a range of needs and strengths.

At times, the content integration in our courses is informal and unplanned. For example, as we conduct shared classes, either one of us may provide impromptu comments that link concepts from the two courses. For the most part, however, the integration of course material is carefully planned and designed. Specifically, we have integrated content through an interdisciplinary curriculum, related objectives, and shared assessments.

Interdisciplinary curriculum. The interdisciplinary curriculum we have created is as important as our coteaching model. It allows us to demonstrate collaboration to students throughout the semester, from the first day to the last and helps us implicitly teach about collaboration even when we are not physically providing instruction together.

Syllabi from both of our courses include the following explanation of the course structure: "Our goal is to demonstrate effective models of collaboration that you might use as either a special education or a general education teacher. Many times, the $2\frac{1}{2}$-hour classes will be combined into a 5-hour block, with breaks taken as needed." At times, both of us teach for the entire 5-hour block, but this is rare due to the various demands on both of our schedules. Instead, we have crafted a flexible model that allows us to share curriculum without coteaching 100% of the time. We felt it was important to design a model that would not necessarily add to our

teaching load and would change and flex with our schedules from semester to semester.

At this point in our history, we have designed interdisciplinary content on the following topics: The Social Studies Standards: What Do They Mean for ALL Students?; The Multiple Intelligences Theory (see Gardner, 1983) as an Adaptation and a Planning Tool; Writing Units and Lesson Plans for Diverse Learners; Adapting, Using, and Assessing Materials for the Classroom; Lesson Formats that Engage and Challenge Every Student; Using and Adapting Assessments; Community-Based Instruction for the Whole Class; Using Technology to Teach Whole-Class Lessons and Support Individual Learners; Adapting, Choosing, and Using Textbooks and Children's Literature in the Social Studies; and Culturally Relevant Teaching and the Inclusive School.

Not all of the aforementioned sessions are cotaught, but we often integrate the curricula even on the days when we teach our classes separately. Even when we plan to teach separately, however, we often visit each other's classes for a few moments and offer quick commentary on the day's lecture and activities, thereby providing an impromptu synthesis of material from both courses. Other times, we simply plan together and blend expertise to prepare both of us to teach content that is shared.

One day, for example, the Elementary Social Studies Methods class was learning about how to use historical documents such as diaries, census records, and immigration papers in the classroom. Although only one instructor was teaching, we had coplanned the lecture. Students, therefore, also received some instruction in how to adapt lessons involving historical documents by enlarging the text, letting students use highlighter pens and magnifying glasses, and preteaching information related to the documents. In addition, the class was introduced to and asked to analyze historical photographs of children with significant disabilities living in residential institutions. Although the students had previously learned about institutionalization and segregation, the photos seemed to impact them deeply and prompt new

questions about the history of special education and disability.

During another lesson in Elementary Social Studies Methods on "using the media responsibly in the social studies," students worked in teams to draw political cartoons of current events. Several students drew cartoons about their recent experiences canvassing the campus for businesses that did not have handicap accessible entrances—an experience that was part of a lesson in Academic Curricular Adaptations. One cartoon showed a student with a wheelchair sitting at the bottom of a flight of stairs. At the top of the stairs the students drew the university's Legal Services Office, which, ironically, is not accessible for people in wheelchairs. This was an indication to us that students could and did make connections between course issues and curriculum even when they were not prompted to do so.

Overlapping objectives. Although we are considering combining our syllabi and objectives in the future, presently, we both have some objectives for our courses that are distinctly and specifically related to our individual content areas. Most of our objectives are closely aligned and related, however. For example, both of us emphasize the importance of constructivist teaching, working with families, thinking politically about education, and using a wide range of materials, methods, and strategies to reach diverse learners.

An example of how our separate objectives often overlap comes from a class session related to textbooks. In one session, students learned about the textbook adoption process and considered how that process influences what gets included or excluded in textbooks (K. Colleary, personal communication, October 1, 1999). They considered the economic and political dilemmas of textbook creation, then did visual surveys of elementary social studies texts to find how the adoption process is manifested in pictures and text. In a separate but related class session, students learned strategies for making traditional textbooks more accessible to a wide range of learners. For example, students designed semantic webs that highlighted

important content and vocabulary from a social studies textbook chapter and revised the traditional end-of-chapter pencil and paper tests to create hands-on assessments more appropriate for active, kinesthetic learners. During this exercise, the Elementary Social Studies Methods and Curriculum targeted course objectives where (a) students will examine the political dilemmas that accompany the teaching of social studies and (b) students will critique instructional resources (e.g., texts, Web sites, literature) in consideration of multicultural, ability, and gender issues. The Academic Curricular Adaptations objective related to this lesson was as follows: Students will implement strategies (e.g., creating adapted materials, using technology) useful in teaching reading, social studies, mathematics, and other content to students with unique learning characteristics in typical classroom settings. Students were able to work on a meaningful project while addressing separate, but overlapping, objectives from our classes.

Shared assessments. Although each course has its own collection of assessments, we do share two assessments. One assessment offered across the two classes is a cooperative exam (A. Udvari-Solner, personal communication, September 5, 1998; Meyers & Jones, 1993). Students are required to work in a cooperative group to complete a written test containing traditional test items such as fill-in-the-blank, matching, and short-answer responses (A. Udvari-Solner, personal communication, September 5, 1998). The test contains content from both Academic Curricular Adaptations and Elementary Social Studies Methods and Curriculum courses. Some items are designed to assess content from just one of the two courses, whereas other items ask students to apply information from both courses. For example, one item on a recent exam prompted students to design a lesson comparing and contrasting the lives of Malcolm X and Dr. Martin Luther King. Within the lesson, they had to include adaptations for a student with significant physical disabilities who uses sign language to communicate. There are two purposes for this assessment—it allows us to assess their content knowledge while observing and

cultivating their collaborative behaviors and skills.

A second assessment that has been implemented across our classes is a curriculum portfolio. Students are required to collect artifacts from both of our classes throughout the semester and showcase them to peers and instructors midway through the class and on the final class day. Students are instructed to collect artifacts that demonstrate growth as a teacher, relate to course objectives in both classes, and reflect how the coteaching model and shared content have affected their learning about inclusive education. This authentic assessment allows us to model the type of evaluation preservice educators might use in their classrooms one day. Because the portfolio is both student centered and easy to adapt for individual learners, it is ideal for kindergarten through college classrooms.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED? RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FIELD

From course evaluations and our personal experiences, we have learned a lot about relationships, teaching and learning, and change. From this learning, we have crafted recommendations for those considering the development of new collaborative models at the university level. These recommendations reflect our own learning thus far about how university faculty in preservice programs can maximize the benefits of collaboration for students. Based on these learnings drawn from course evaluations and our experiences, we recommend that teacher educators engaged in collaborative partnerships purposefully model a variety of collaborations; make collaborations transparent; model the good, the bad, and the ugly of their work; think "out of the collaborative box," seek institutional support, and study their experiences.

Purposefully Model a Variety of Collaborations

We realized, based on feedback from our first group of students, that students needed to see different ways that adults could interact to

deliver instruction. In our first semester, we did some parallel teaching and used the one teach/ one assist structure, but students were asking for more integrated teaching (We want to see you teach together). Students need to see faculty taking on many different roles—sometimes as the primary instructor for the lesson, other times just floating in for a mini-lecture on a particular topic or participating as a support person for the primary instructor. We found that students were most likely to use the collaboration models that they saw and experienced in the university classroom in their own practice. Therefore, the students need to be exposed to a wide range of collaborative interactions.

Make Collaborations Transparent

Students in our courses are implicitly and explicitly provided with information about how and why the two courses are connected. This includes direct conversations about coteaching, collaboration, and the importance of interdisciplinary instruction. Students can also learn about our collaborations by studying the syllabus and other course materials.

There are many aspects of collaboration that are invisible, however. Effective coteachers spend time planning, debriefing, and assessing their lessons. Students rarely get to see these essential components of coteaching, so we try to share with students how we negotiate to create a productive experience in the classroom. The civil rights sit-ins simulation described in a previous section reads as though it came off without a hitch. The truth is that when one of us proposed the idea to the other, it was met with hesitation. One member of the teaching team worried that it was "too risky" as a first-day activity, and expressed some doubts about her own ability to "pull it off" sensitively without knowing the students. As we discussed our own desires and fears related to the idea, we made adjustments to the presentation that accommodated each of our interests. Perhaps most importantly, we shared this experience with students. As students reflected on their experience after the simulation, calling the simulation positive and powerful, we shared with

them the conversations that occurred as we planned the activity. In doing so, we hoped to share a practical component of coteaching and to help students see that taking risks is easier when shared with a supportive colleague. It is important to make collaborative actions transparent, to reinforce the language of coteaching, and to help students see the many, varied roles that adults may take in delivering instruction.

We find it valuable to discuss with students the various roles that they see us play in the classroom. We have explicit discussions about how we structured our time without doubling our load, how we set up systems that support communication about student progress, and how we cope with the stress of shared responsibilities. These are all essential elements of collaboration that we hope will help preservice teachers become effective coteachers when they leave our program.

Model and Share the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly

Although we did not always realize it, our students reported that they appreciated the different lenses and perspectives that we, as a special educator and a general educator, brought to classroom discussions. They seemed to appreciate the humor created through our teacher dialogue and the open and informal climate cultivated by a collaborative model.

They also appeared to appreciate it when we gave one another critical feedback and engaged in constructive debates related to political and social issues in education. For example, during one class, we discussed with students an ongoing conversation that we had been having about the appropriateness of statewide learning standards. In the earliest days of our collaboration, we held conflicting views about which students are served or disserved by a set of statewide learning standards. For months we challenged each other, thinking about the issues related to statewide standards. Eventually, we brought the discussion into our classroom, taking class time to share our differing viewpoints with the preservice students. As students watched us discuss the advantages and disadvantages of

statewide learning standards and inclusion, they not only came to understand the content, but they witnessed respectful and critical dialogue between two professionals. Eventually, we drafted a manuscript in which we outlined the various benefits, dangers, and myths that impact how students with disabilities are served by standards. The manuscript is now included in our course reader. By bringing the discussion and resultant manuscript to our course, we hoped that our students would be encouraged to experience and participate in productive disagreement, critical discussion, reflective practice, and scholarly growth. We believe that these are all necessary, and all too often untaught, habits of successful collaborators.

Think "Out of the Collaborative Box"

We realize that many of our colleagues in this institution and others are not able to implement a full coteaching model in their current programs. Coteaching and other types of collaboration may not be practical when time is tight and resources limited. In other instances, institutional structures may prevent inventive models from being implemented in the most desirable ways.

Instructors in these situations might need to think "out of the collaborative box" in considering possibilities. Instructors teaching in the same certifying programs, for example, can plan together to improve student learning in all classes. Two or more instructors in such a program could work together to align assessments, plan activities that emphasize content across courses, and design common, longitudinal objectives that follow students from class to class.

Instructors who want to collaborate, but do not share a program, can also consider creative ways to team. Instructors may work to trade course sessions with one another where one instructor shares an area of expertise with a colleague's students during one or two course sessions each semester. The other instructor does the same. The instructors can decide whether the sessions are cotaught or taught solely by the

visiting professor. In a model described by Melnick et al. (2000), three faculty members combined their expertise to coteach the practicum component of a field-based preservice program. In consideration of course overload and geographic limitations, the authors created a model in which coteaching occurred intermittently, but responsibility for grading student papers was picked up by only one faculty member.

In all instances, instructors who use any type of collaborative model should be sure to find creative ways to discuss it and teach it to students. Surely, one of the most important lessons preservice teachers can learn is that no model is perfect or sacred and changes in school schedules and structures are inevitable. Certainly there are as many ways to implement good collaborative practices as there are instructors in the university. Opportunities will flourish if we are inventive and flexible when designing and implementing collaborative models and if we are willing to craft new models when existing ones do not work for us.

Seek Institutional Support

Our collaboration would not be possible without support from our program administrators and colleagues. Ironically, the structural requirements of our teaming are seemingly simple, contiguous blocks of time and a classroom that is available for the entire time period, yet accommodating such time and space issues within a busy university is often tantamount to performing a miracle. Nonetheless, we encourage faculty considering coteaching and other types of collaboration to persevere.

Nothing in our collaborative arrangement requires additional resources. Because it does require creative thinking about the use of time and space, however, we encourage those interested in collaboration to look to university administrators and colleagues for help in constructing new ways of doing business. Challenge traditional time slots. Propose new ways of thinking about instructor teaching load. Question assumptions about curricular integration that may inhibit opportunities for collabo-

ration. In our situation, input from a few imaginative and flexible individuals helped us to develop our existing collaborative partnership and has also inspired us to continue our collaborative arrangement for a fourth consecutive semester.

Study Your Experience

Although collaborative teaching and planning is not a new phenomenon in higher education, it has not been extensively studied, and although we are pleased with some of the outcomes of our collaborative relationship, we cannot claim that it is a success until we know it benefits students. For this reason, we are currently in our fourth semester of collection data on the question: How does collaborative teaching in our higher education courses impact the students in our preservice courses? Specifically, we are interested in exploring how students understand collaboration as a result of our classes, how they implement collaborative models and engage in collaborative behaviors as they enter the field, and if and how those collaborative models and behaviors were shaped or inspired by the collaboration they experienced in our courses. We have been collecting survey data throughout our coteaching experiences and will be conducting individual interviews with current and former students to elicit qualitative information about the impact of our partnership. Eventually, we will survey our students who have taken teaching positions to understand how they are utilizing what they know about collaboration.

Studies in this area are nearly nonexistent, and research is needed to uncover why and how we should continue developing collaborative models in college and university teacher-preparation programs. Primarily, we need to study the collaborative experiences themselves. Among other questions, we need to explore how student learning is affected when college instructors coteach and engage in other types of collaboration; how coteaching and collaboration in the college classroom affects student behaviors, actions, and decisions in the field; and what aspects of instructor collaboration

(e.g., coteaching, coplanning, integrated curriculum, shared assessment) have the biggest affect on student behaviors and decisions related to coteaching.

We must also explore the role of colleges and universities in cultivating collaborative models. We need to better understand how to develop curriculum, instruction, and assessment approaches that will serve as models for students as they enter the teaching profession. We must also get creative in tackling administrative and institutional barriers. We should examine how instructor load can be managed differently to allow for collaborative models, for example.

Studying your own collaborative experience does not have to be as extensive as launching a formal study, however. Instructors may decide to engage in data collection that is more informal and formative. Collaborative teams might choose to examine their practices through monthly focus groups with students, for instance. Instructors can also pose questions about their collaborative models on mid-semester and end-of-semester course evaluations as we did. This anecdotal data was invaluable as we planned daily and weekly lessons and made decisions to adapt our evolving collaborative model.

CONCLUSIONS

Although we understand that collaboration is not a hallmark of every inclusive schooling model and that teachers collaborate outside the parameters of inclusive schooling, we feel strongly that in progressive models of education these two ideas—collaboration and inclusion—are inextricably linked. For this reason and countless others, current literature has issued a strong plea for preservice (and in-service) programs to address the essential skills and dispositions necessary for successful collaboration. Researchers contend that to be effective in collaborative work, teachers need opportunities to practice and learn about shared decision making, communication, and planning (Cook & Friend, 1995; Villa et al., 1996). Beyond seeing these skills modeled at the university, the most intensive professional development for coteaching will occur when teachers and other

specialists are in service and have opportunities to implement what they learn (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 12).

Friend (2000) indicated that one of the most glaring misconceptions related to collaboration is that it "comes naturally" (p. 132). Collaborative skills, she insisted, need attention; they must be honed and cultivated. How better to encourage the development of these skills than to invite students to observe and participate in a collaborative environment during their teacher preparation sequence? How better to prepare students for inclusive classrooms than to demonstrate and model inclusive practice? The university or college classroom can become a laboratory for developing coteaching and coplanning skills that will undoubtedly be needed in the diverse, inclusive classrooms students are entering. Even those preservice teachers who do not have future opportunities to coteach, will most likely be expected to work in concert with therapists, families, administrators, and community members at some point in their career. True inclusive schooling models require collaboration (Villa & Thousand, 2000). Therefore, teacher-preparation programs must support preservice teachers in learning collaborative skills.

Although many universities and colleges will struggle to design models that support coteaching partnerships, this reality parallels the logistical difficulties in K-12 schools. Teacher preparation programs can incorporate discussions of these difficulties into the preservice education curriculum. How do teachers manage the needs of diverse learners when they cannot engage in full-time coteaching? Instructors in higher education might show students how models of collaboration and coteaching are incredibly varied and changeable. Although two instructors might be able to coteach for a few sessions one semester, they might only be able to share written communications and do some collaborative planning the following semester. This type of shifting and renegotiating happens in K-12 schools all the time. In practice, models of collaboration must be fluid and flexible. Even when institu-tions of higher education cannot offer students coteaching options such as the one described in this article, they may be able to offer them creative and realistic alternatives to such a model. In doing so, they will be modeling practical ways of working with colleagues despite struggles related to time, space, and scheduling.

Although we hope that students do see coteaching and collaboration in the field and that they do have opportunities to practice these skills and approaches, we cannot guarantee that they will. We also cannot guarantee that they will experience progressive models or that they will have the competencies necessary to engage in collaboration when they do encounter favorable collaborative opportunities. We as teacher educators, therefore, have a responsibility to lay the foundation for the new teacher so that he or she approaches new collaborative situations and relationships with creativity, confidence, and competence.

Both of us have formerly taught in inclusive public school classrooms and have reaped professional and social benefits through the implementation of different collaborative models in that arena. Having both learned so much and enjoyed so immensely these experiences, we were, in part, driven to coteach at the university by our own personal desires for collegiality and personal growth. We were also prompted to pursue this model for a more critical reason: because we felt it was better for learners. Students, it seems, will be better prepared to coteach, and, therefore function as effective teachers in inclusive education settings, if we teach about and model progressive practices. In other words, we believe teacher educators must both say and do when educating students about inclusive schooling, coteaching, and other types of collaboration.

REFERENCES

Bakken, L., Clark, F., & Thompson, J. (1998). Collaborative teaching: Many joys, some surprises, and a few worms. *College Teaching*, *46*, 154-157.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *28*, 1-15.

Douglas, R. (1997). Democracy and empowerment: The Nashville student sit-ins of the 1960s. In A. Manley & C. O'Neill (Eds.), *Dreamseekers: Creative approaches to the African American heritage* (p. 84). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Duchardt, B., Marlow, L., & Inman, D. (1999). Collaboration and co-teaching: General and special education faculty. *The Clearing House*, *72*, 186-190.

Friend, M. (2000). Myths and misunderstandings about professional collaboration. *Remedial and Special Education*, *21*, 130-132.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Garmston, R. (1997). Can collaboration be taught? *Journal of Staff Development*, *18*, 44-46.

Greene, M., & Isaacs, M. (1999). The responsibility of modeling collaboration in the university education classroom. *Action in Teacher Education*, *20*, 98-106.

Jorgensen, C. (1998). *Restructuring high schools for all students*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Keefe, E. B., Rossi, P. J., de Valenzuela, J. S., & Howarth, S. (2000). Reconceptualizing teacher preparation for inclusive classrooms: A description of the dual license program at University of New Mexico. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, *25*, 72-82.

Lipsky, D., & Gartner, A. (1996). Inclusion, school restructuring, and the remaking of American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, *66*, 762-796.

Melnick, C., Capella-Santana, N., & Sentell, C. (2000, April). *Co-teaching in a pre-service program: Collaboration between special and elementary education professors*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Meyer, L., Mager, G., Yarger-Kane, G., Sarno, M., & Hext-Contreras, G. (1997). Syracuse university's inclusive elementary and special education program. In L. Blanton, C. Griffin, J. Winn, & M. Pugach (Eds.), *Teacher education in transition* (pp. 18-38). Denver, CO: Love Publishing.

Meyers, C., & Jones, T. B. (1993). *Promoting active learning: Strategies for the college classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyers, J., Gelzheiser, L. M., & Yelich, G. (1991). Do pull-in programs foster teacher collaboration? *Remedial and Special Education*, *12*, 7-15.

O'Brien, J., & O'Brien, C. (1996). Inclusion as a force for school renewal. In S. Stainback & W. Stainback (Eds.), *Inclusion: A guide for educators* (pp. 29-48). Baltimore: Brookes.

Pugach, M. C., & Johnson, L. J. (1995). *Collaborative practitioners, collaborative schools*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing.

Pugach, M. C., & Wesson, C. (1995). Teachers' and students' views of team teaching of general education and learning-disabled students in two fifth-grade classes. *Elementary School Journal*, *95*, 279-295.

Quinlan, K. (1998). Promoting faculty learning about collaborative teaching. *College Teaching*, *46*, 43-47.

Snell, M. E., & Janney, R. (2000). *Collaborative teaming*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Stallworth, B. J. (1998). Practicing what we teach. *Educational Leadership*, *55*, 77-79.

Syracuse University School of Education. (1996). *Inclusive elementary and special education program* [Brochure]. Syracuse, NY: Author.

Villa, R., & Thousand, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Restructuring for caring and effective schools: Piecing the puzzle together*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Villa, R., Thousand, J., & Chapple, J. W. (2000). Preparing teachers to implement inclusive practices. In R. Villa & J. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective schools: Piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 531-557). Baltimore: Brookes.

Villa, R., Thousand, J., Nevin, A., & Malgeri, C. (1996). Instilling collaboration to inclusive schooling as a way of doing business in public schools. *Remedial and Special Education*, *17*, 169-181.

Walter-Thomas, C. S. (1997). Co-teaching experiences: The benefits and problems that teachers and principals report over time. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *30*, 395-407.

Winn, J., & Blanton, L. (1997). The call for collaboration in teacher education. In L. Blanton, C. Griffin, J. Winn, & M. Pugach (Eds.), *Teacher education in transition* (pp. 1-17). Denver, CO: Love Publishing.

Paula Kluth, *Ph.D., Syracuse University, studies inclusive education and differentiating instruction.*

Diana Straut, *Ph.D., Syracuse University, is currently exploring issues in social studies education and school reform.*