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Changing Traditions: Supervision, Co-teaching, and Lessons Learned in a Professional Development School Partnership

David S. Allen, Michael Perl, Lori Goodson, and Twyla Sprouse

Dr. David S. Allen, Associate Professor and Director of Field Experiences, is a former elementary and middle school mathematics teacher and has been with the Department of Curriculum and Instruction for 14 years. Prior to assuming the duties associated with the Office of Field Experiences, Dr. Allen worked closely with the KSU PDS in the role of a faculty liaison through which he provided professional guidance in the area of mathematics.

Dr. Michael Perl, Associate Professor Emeritus and former secondary English teacher and faculty member at Kansas State University, served in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction for 10 years and was Coordinator of Field Experiences and Director of Student Services for 25 years.

Dr. Lori Goodson, former public school teacher at the middle and high school levels, is a National Board Certified Teacher and Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at Kansas State University's College of Education. She has served as a cooperating teacher and is involved in PDS through the Core Teaching Skills course at the university.

Ms. Twyla K. Sprouse, a former public school teacher, is the Assistant Principal at Amanda Arnold Elementary School, one of the original Professional Development Schools in the KSU PDS Partnership. Ms. Sprouse has been an active PDS participant since 2012, serving as a clinical instructor for Amanda Arnold and Ogden Elementary Schools in the Manhattan-Ogden School District.

Considering how long societies have been educating their youth, the history of teacher education is relatively brief. The first efforts to provide systematic education for teachers with some kind of practical experience occurred in Rheims, France, in the late 17th century when Jean Baptiste De La Salle opened the first normal school (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

In the middle of the 19th century when normal schools were first established in the United States, student teaching as well as early field experiences became available for those preparing to be elementary teachers. Secondary teachers generally were not provided the opportunity for practical experience but were given only academic preparation for teaching. For nearly 100 years as normal schools expanded throughout the country, the use of practical experience to prepare teachers expanded.

But when the need for teachers exploded after World War II, it became common practice to assign large numbers of student teachers to public schools. By the late 1960s teacher preparation institutions realized assigning a student teacher to a cooperating teacher in a public school, and having a faculty member observe the student teacher two or three times in a brief student teaching experience, was insufficient preparation.

In the 1970s and 1980s an approach to supervision called the student teaching triad was touted as the way to make the student teaching experience more beneficial. The idea was that the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher would become a team working for the same goal of providing a successful experience for the student teachers. This approach had little effect on the way student teachers were prepared since there was nothing substantially different from the model of the previous 20 years. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, scholars, professional organizations, and regulatory agencies began to emphasize the need for prospective teachers to spend more time in schools with students and teachers. This not only meant extending the length of student teaching; it also meant that prospective teachers should be assigned more field experiences for...
significant lengths of time. This had a profound effect on teacher education programs around the country.

At Kansas State University (KSU) this change caused significant problems. At that time the institution placed over 400 student teachers a year, most of them in the surrounding area which had a relatively limited population. In addition to student teaching now three early field experiences were required for each student. This meant nearly 2,000 field placements each year.

As the pressure increased to assign more and more students to local schools, students, teachers, administrators, and parents began to complain about the amount of time K-12 students were being taught and managed by inexperienced individuals. For the good of their students, district administrators began notifying the director of field experiences that they were limiting the number of student teacher and early field placements in their schools. This posed a serious problem for KSU's College of Education.

From the first teacher education innovation in the 17th century through those of the late 20th century–de la Salle, the American normal school, the flood of student teachers into public schools after World War II, the student teacher triad, the expansion of field experiences–all focused on the student teacher. It became clear that this was no longer a viable way to approach teacher preparation. A new approach was needed.

In the late 1990s KSU faculty, public school administrators, and teachers designed a new approach to teacher preparation. The new KSU program would focus on K-12 students instead of student teachers. As the new program was planned the question that had to be answered to the satisfaction of everyone was, “How can we improve K-12 student learning while preparing future teachers?” Positive answers to this question came in several forms.

Educators knew an extra person in the classroom reduced the student-teacher ratio and thus improved student learning. The decision was made that in KSU student teaching and field experiences, university students would no longer take the place of teachers; rather both teacher and prospective teacher would remain in the classroom to co-teach.

An additional change was hiring a public school teacher (clinical instructor), paid by the university, to oversee the supervision of university students in the schools so that a university presence was always there.

Cooperating teachers were also expected to change and supervise the prospective teachers in more immediate ways, such as providing instructional direction during co-teaching activities, immediately after a lesson, and ongoing throughout the day.

University supervisors were assigned to a specific school or in some cases two schools and were asked to not only observe and critique student teachers, but also to work with school administrators and teachers to provide action research and in-service that would meet the specific needs of the school to improve K-12 learning. From this emphasis on K-12 learning grew the professional development school (PDS) model focused on improving K-12 learning. This unique approach to supervision combined with co-teaching to support K-12 learning is the essence of the KSU PDS model.

The following pages explain in some detail the elements of supervision and co-teaching embedded in the program. The Kansas State University Professional Development Schools (KSU PDS) model involves a network of stakeholders engaged in a simultaneous renewal process whereby teachers, preservice teachers, and supervisors are collaborating to deepen their understanding of teaching and learning. This highlights a progressive approach to supervision and support of the student teacher, including a unique implementation of co-teaching opportunities involving the cooperating teacher and the preservice teacher sharing classroom instructional duties. The KSU PDS model represents a move toward enhancing the experience by having professionals in a more visible and supportive role for the preservice teacher, with the ultimate goal of improving education for K-12 students.

The Traditional Triad Model of Supervision

A traditional triad model of supervision involves a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor, who engage in a semester-long series of formal observations and interactions with the student teacher to ensure he or she demonstrates the knowledge and skills necessary to qualify for the licensure of a teacher (See Figure 1).

These observations are both formative and summative, and decisions regarding the success or failure of the student teacher are made during the traditional midterm and final evaluation. Through this process, addressing observed deficiencies is often a product of communication efforts on the part of the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. However, flaws in this communication as a part of the triad model can lead to less valuable interventions for and assessments of the student teacher. Given the volume of student teachers in large education programs and the number of student teachers assigned to each university supervisor, intervention attempts are not always timely or effective. This delay can have a detrimental effect on the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship and, ultimately, negatively impact learning opportunities for K-12 students.

Research indicates a number of other issues associated with the traditional triad model as well. For example, Bullough and Draper (2004) investigated the problems associated with the inevitably hierarchical nature of the triad characterized by a shifting set of alliances, one with the university supervisor and another with the cooperating teacher.
Nearly five decades ago Yee (1967) identified the problem associated with inadequately trained supervisors who were thrust into the supervision role. This is further accentuated by Rodgers and Keil (2007) who, 40 years after Yee, examined the historically low priority afforded to the supervision of student teachers. The researchers articulated the fact that supervision assignments are generally given to junior faculty, adjunct faculty, or retired teachers, with little regard to the preparation of those who are placed in supervisory roles.

Faculty members often seek promotion or buy-out opportunities, which affords the opportunity to focus significant time on research and writing, rather than supervision. Institutional requirements for publication and creative endeavors encourage faculty to move away from what is often perceived as a mundane and time-consuming "chore" involving supervision, and toward the ultimate reward of tenure and promotion. This institutional perspective leads to a revolving door of inadequately trained new supervisors year after year.

Valencia et al. (2009) examined the complex interactions associated with the student teaching experience. The researchers found that all members of the triad operated in multiple settings and faced competing demands. These demands shaped actions and stances, which led to numerous instances of lost opportunities including little feedback on teaching subject matter, few links to methods course content, and limited opportunities to develop identities as teachers. Historically, the literature identified numerous instances in which cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and student teachers held differing beliefs about the outcome of the student teaching semester (Darling-Hammond, Pacheco, Michelli, Lepage, & Hammerness, 2005; Zeichner & Gore, 1990). Widen et al. (1998) identified “a gap between the change agenda of teacher educators and the survival goal of preservice teacher.” The researchers called for a broader perspective on student teaching research that would focus on contextual factors that influence student teaching.

An extensive line of research was conducted (Bullough & Draper, 2004; Slick, 1997; Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Veal & Rikard, 1998), which examined the relationships within the triad model. Their findings suggest that two different hierarchical triads existed during the student teaching semester, which placed the student teacher in the position of spending more time mediating these triadic relationships rather than honing his or her teaching skills. Bullough and Draper (2004) specifically examined the tension between cooperating teachers and university supervisors with differing views about how algebra should be taught. Borko and Mayfield (1995) concluded that although all members of the triadic relationship were generally satisfied with the outcome of the student teaching experience, the university supervisor and cooperating teacher had little impact on the student teachers’ content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, or dispositions regarding teaching.

Even with the difficulties associated with it, the triad model of supervision still appears to be the prevailing model for supervision during the student teaching semester. Traditional triad models of supervision include the role of cooperating teacher and university supervisor. However, these roles have not been well defined across and within institutions, creating unstructured and non-supportive environments that generate numerous difficult situations, both educational and political, for the student teacher to navigate during the semester.
KSU PDS Model of Supervision

In the KSU PDS model each elementary and secondary student in the College of Education professional education program completes four field experiences. The Early Field Experience is four hours per week for 12 weeks in length and provides the opportunity for both elementary and secondary students to explore the career of teaching.

For elementary education students the next experiences are Blocks B and C. In Block B students spend nine half-days in the schools teaching K-2 literacy and science and begin to explore general skills needed to teach. Block C consists of 15 half-days in the schools teaching literacy, math, and social studies and focuses on more specific teaching skills.

In Block 1 field experiences, secondary education students spend four hours per week for 10 weeks in schools to explore general teaching skills. In the next field experience, Block 2, students spend 10-12 weeks in schools for four hours per week and explore and teach specific methods based on their individual content areas. The final field experience for both elementary and secondary students is 16 weeks of all-day student teaching.

In the traditional PDS model, the cooperating teacher, clinical instructor, and university supervisor are three key components equally vital in assisting the student teacher in his or her on-site classroom training and, ultimately, the future of K-12 education.

Cooperating Teacher: The cooperating teacher, as a mentor, opens the classroom and provides the clinical setting. The initial point person for day-to-day feedback on activities in which the student teacher is engaged, the cooperating teacher is knowledgeable about K-12 students, the classroom management plan, school politics, and general pedagogical practices implemented throughout each school day. The cooperating teacher also provides multiple formal and informal observations.

Clinical Instructor: A clinical instructor is the site-based university point person. He or she provides seminars for teacher work sample completion, professional development, supervision, and on-site trouble shooting, and develops a personal/professional relationship with the student teacher.

University Supervisor: The third component, the university supervisor, serves as the content-specific point person for the university, addressing a specific grade level—such as elementary—or a secondary content—such as math, social studies, English/language arts. This individual generally conducts two to three formal observations and provides content-specific feedback and support for student teachers.

However, as a variation upon the traditional PDS roles in an attempt to address the issues that have arisen from the traditional triad model, the KSU PDS developed and modified two roles that, based upon previous experiences, were designed to assist in the simultaneous renewal efforts of the partnership stakeholders. These provided support for the student teacher, as well as others involved in the student teaching experience.

Faculty Liaison: The first of these roles was that of the faculty liaison, a faculty member who was assigned to a specific school or schools within the partnership model. The faculty liaison’s role was to act as a consulting member of the faculty and staff at the school, assist with meeting the professional development needs associated with current research on teaching and learning, and provide supervision for students enrolled in methods courses and those enrolled in the student teaching semester. The faculty member met such needs as providing current research in content, professional development related to pedagogy, assistance in curricula selection, and at times serving on the School Improvement Team (SIT).

From 2000-2007 numerous KSU PDS faculty worked with teachers and students in the school setting to create a collegial relationship in which ongoing research further informed the process of teaching and learning (Allen, 2006; Larson, et al., 2009; Bay-Williams, et al., 2007). During this period the College of Education reinforced the commitment to the partnership by assigning faculty loads that accounted for the time within the school setting. Faculty members were encouraged to integrate service, teaching, and scholarship within a single context. Many faculty members thrived in this environment, while others did not.

Those faculty members who could not reconcile their career goals with this role left the university to pursue careers at universities with a more traditional academic structure. While this was not representative of a large population of the faculty, when coupled with the financial crisis experienced across the country, these two issues did impact the ability to continue this role as a part of the supervision system, and the process of phasing out the faculty liaison role began. A university-wide hiring freeze affected the replacement of retiring faculty, as well as the retention of junior faculty members who were not invested in the partnership. Unable to replace faculty members from the research community, the partnership supervision model began to rely heavily on the second and, perhaps most important role created through the KSU PDS, that of the clinical instructor.

“The cooperating teachers often speak of how much they learned from their interns as they participated in using our evaluation system, co-teaching, and reflective conferences.”

– Jeanne Christiansen
Clinical Instructor, Blue Valley School District
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Clinical Instructor
In a critical role for the supervision process, the clinical instructor bridges the gap between the university and school settings. While many of the roles within this approach are similar to the traditional model, the addition of the clinical instructor enhances the opportunity for simultaneous renewal and growth on the part of the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, the student teacher, and, most importantly, the K-12 students (See Figure 2).

The role of the clinical instructor, a classroom teacher identified by the school partner for his or her leadership, teaching, and interpersonal skills, is vital to the Professional Development School partnership and viewed as the face of the university within the schools while also a school district employee. As noted in Figure 2, the Clinical Instructor is in constant communication with all members of the team. A clinical instructor also collaborates with district administrators, building administrators, school faculty and staff, students in the teacher education program, and K-12 students. Providing support for a variety of populations is challenging and requires the ability to adapt to those varied audiences.

Clinical instructors are considered “in the trenches” university supervisors who provide on-site mentoring for the cooperating teacher and student teacher. School partners are reimbursed by the university for a portion of the clinical instructor’s salary. Clinical instructors working closely with content faculty at the university provide daily guidance for student teachers and work as a liaison between faculty, student teachers, and cooperating teachers. They serve in an evaluative capacity as well, completing half of the formal evaluations for each student teacher in the school.

Student teachers often enter the building anxious about adjusting to the new environment, meeting the cooperating teacher, managing the workload, and meeting university portfolio requirements for graduation and teacher licensure. In their role, clinical instructors provide support in numerous ways to help student teachers navigate the semester-long experience.

Clinical instructors lead weekly seminars for student teachers to provide guidance on the teacher work sample, build relationships with cooperating teachers, communicate with peers and building staff and support personnel, prepare for the transition from preservice teacher to in-service teacher, and provide a first line of support for the various issues encountered by students during this challenging semester. Topics may include—but are not limited to—a review of the domains of the Danielson Framework (1996, 2007), instructional practices, classroom management strategies, and interviewing. Brown (2012) states, “Novice teachers can only figure out so much on their own. Dedication to the job means forging relationships and creating opportunities to pick colleagues’ brains, figure out what works, and apply it to your class” (p. 27).

Clinical instructors recognize the importance of preparation prior to the first day on the job and provide interactions with district and building-level resources during seminars. Special education resource teachers, math enrichment teachers, school social workers, gifted education facilitators, speech-language pathologists, building principals, and curriculum directors all bring different perspectives to the table.

If student teachers are aware of the human resources available and the benefits of collaboration with them, as a
novice teacher, seeking out such sources will not be perceived as negative. The ultimate goal is to support teachers through collaboration and becoming a part of the professional community within the school (Scherer, 2012).

Clinical instructors also develop a strong working relationship with the cooperating teachers and provide in-service for them to ensure they understand and practice the expectations the university has for student teachers, and that they understand and use appropriate co-teaching procedures to increase the learning opportunities for K-12 students. They are also responsible for identifying and recommending those teachers who have demonstrated the mentoring skills and dispositions essential to successfully working with a student teacher. Likewise, they are responsible for identifying cooperating teachers who are not successful mentors. These decisions are evidenced-based and are communicated with the Office of Field Experiences at the end of each semester.

Additionally, the clinical instructor is responsible for the protection of the cooperating teacher from overuse. A cooperating teacher who repeatedly has to serve in a mentoring role for a student teacher across multiple semesters generally needs time to engage in a renewal process different from that associated with mentoring.

A cooperating teacher is provided the opportunity—some would say the honor—of sharing the joys, struggles, enthusiasm, and passion for teaching and learning firsthand when mentoring a student teacher. Cooperating teachers who are committed and model best practices are critical to the success of student teachers (Chelsey & Jordan, 2012). "Being in the classroom of an effective mentor teacher for a long enough period of time, with graduated responsibilities, has a huge impact. Carefully managed student-teaching placement matters, too" (Scherer, 2012, p. 20).

A clinical instructor provides support for the cooperating teachers through meetings where the models of co-teaching are reviewed and encouraged. Communication and feedback between the cooperating teacher and student teacher is also encouraged. Necessary resources for lesson planning and observations are provided and easily accessible so the paperwork does not overshadow the role of mentor and teacher. Availability of the clinical instructor is important to answer questions and provide suggestions throughout the semester.

Additionally, the clinical instructor’s careful planning can help avoid many issues during the student teaching semester. The use of timelines for portfolio submissions and lesson plans; regular communication in person, via email and/or phone; and provision of meaningful feedback and flexibility—all allow the clinical instructor to set high expectations and meet individual student teacher needs. Often having open dialogue, setting boundaries, and reviewing roles and responsibilities provide the opportunity for reflection and professional growth. To assist the clinical instructors, KSU stays in contact with them through regular meetings as well as a variety of other professional development to provide support for their work in the partnership.

The perceived link between a lesson plan that did not go well and failure of the student teaching semester is common among student teachers. However, clinical instructors, as well as cooperating teachers, can help student teachers understand the value of reflecting on less-than-successful lessons and becoming a better teacher.

In the article “Good Failure,” Hoerr (2013) discusses the importance of classroom students learning to face adversity, to be supported whether they succeed or fail, and to develop “grit.” Student teachers need to do the same. “What matters most is what we do after we fail” (p. 85). Many student teachers will plan a lesson that looks incredible on paper and then flops in the classroom. True reflection on the lesson—from planning and preparation, to implementing in the classroom environment, to reflecting instructional practices—will provide valuable data for future planning and demonstrate growth as a pre-professional.

University Supervisor

Clinical instructors have taken on many tasks previously held by the faculty liaison. However, the role of the university supervisor is still critical to the success of the student teacher. The university supervisors are typically content experts who provide critical feedback related to their individual fields of study. This is especially true at the secondary level. For example, a high school clinical instructor with a background in English may not be able to provide the necessary guidance, both in content and pedagogy, for an algebra or chemistry lesson. In this instance, the secondary content faculty works closely with the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and clinical instructor to provide the necessary content expertise. Because of the large number of students a clinical instructor oversees, it is critical that the university supervisor role remain in place, as even a teacher devoted full time to the task cannot effectively provide the necessary support for such a large number of student teachers.

As identified earlier in this paper, the relationships between and among university supervisor, clinical instructor, and cooperating teacher can become difficult for a student teacher to navigate, especially when a disagreement arises with one of them. In these instances, one of the other team members can act as a mediator and intervene on the part of the student teacher so the student teacher is able to focus on lesson preparation and delivery. These instances of tension are mediated at a level that does not involve the student teacher and, thereby, creates an environment in which the learning on the part of the student teacher and K-12 students is optimized.

Historically, numerous issues have arisen during the student teaching experience. One of the aspects of such an arrangement involves the fiscal commitment of all entities involved—the student teacher, the school, district, and university. All parties are providing significant financial support, as well as time and manpower to address the student teaching experience.

Another area of concern is a shift in roles for each person/component in the system. Often it can be fairly easy for a clinical instructor to take on more duties of the university supervisor, especially with the limited amount of time available for a large number of student teachers, as stated...
The Co-teaching Model

Supervision is a key component of the KSU Professional Development School because it works hand in glove with the co-teaching portion of the model. This gives the cooperating teacher or other professional in the classroom such as the clinical instructor, school principal, or university supervisor, the opportunity to provide guidance to the student teacher while conjointly instructing K-12 students.

The co-teaching model involves a series of approaches that teams may choose to use as part of their repertoire. Perl, et al. (1999) and Friend and Cook (2000) describe six techniques used in co-teaching; others provide a discussion of four (Villa, Thousand, & Nevin, 2004), and yet others, seven (Bacharach & Heck, 2007). All offer fairly similar techniques, but their details about the approaches are based on a slightly different perspective, either combining those presented by Friend and Cook or expanding upon them.

Friend and Cook and Villa, et al., address co-teaching as used by a general education teacher and a special education teacher. These techniques are:

- One Teach, One Observe
- One Teach, One Assist
- Station Teaching
- Parallel Teaching
- Alternative Teaching
- Team Teaching

Each of these strategies manifests differently in classrooms. Brief suggestions for how the cooperating teacher and the student teacher might use each of these strategies can be seen in the sidebar table accompanying this article. The following provides more specific information on those same six approaches and how they might be implemented when a student teacher and a cooperating teacher co-teach.

Co-Teaching Model from Student Teaching Handbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Teach, One Assist</td>
<td>With this approach one person does all of the teaching while the other moves around the classroom helping individuals, monitoring students’ behavior, or observing selected students to monitor for understanding. This approach can be a great asset for increasing student engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Teach, One Observe</td>
<td>Much like the first approach, one person does all of the teaching while the second is responsible for observing one or more students and recording her/his observations. You might collect data on what activities engage a student or a group of students, what distracts them, how often they are actively on task, which students interact with them and why. All of this information and much more can be collected using the one teach, one observe technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Teaching</td>
<td>Here the classroom is split in half and both instructors teach the same information or related information at the same time. This might be done because smaller groups might allow for more student involvement or there might be a particular reason for grouping some students together. It is also possible to have the two instructors teach the same concept using different techniques. For example both teachers could be explaining the same math problem-solving lesson in two different parts of the room. If the room had two computers, each teacher could use a computer to model the use of the Internet or a new piece of software. Or each half of the class could be involved in a literature study group but using two different short stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Teaching</td>
<td>With this approach one person manages the whole group while the other works with a small group inside or outside of the classroom. The small group instruction does not have to relate to the lesson being covered with the large group. For example, one person could take an individual student out to catch her up on a missed assignment. One might work with an individual or a small group for assessment purposes or to teach social skills. One could work with a small group for remedial purposes or extended challenge work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Teaching</td>
<td>Station teaching occurs when the classroom is divided into various teaching stations. The teacher and student teacher work at two stations and the other stations run independently, with a teacher aid or a volunteer. For example, three or more science stations each containing a different experiment could be organized with the teacher and student teacher working at the two stations that need the most supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>Team teaching occurs when two teachers serve as one. Students are generally involved in individualized or small group instruction. Lessons are taught by both teachers who actively engage in conversation, not lecture, to encourage discussion by students. Both teachers are actively involved in the management of the lesson and discipline. This approach can be very effective with the classroom teacher and a student teacher working together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the six techniques require that the two teachers be responsible for a separate group of students on their own. In these cases, either the cooperating teacher or the student teacher can be responsible for either group, essentially the two teachers, in some situations, work together to teach the same students. In these instances, one typically takes the leadership role and the other takes the assisting role. However, it is important that the cooperating teacher and the student teacher take on both roles throughout the semester so the students see each of them as the lead teacher from time to time. If the cooperating teacher is always the lead teacher, the students may regard the student teacher as simply the cooperating teacher’s paraprofessional, which could affect how they perceive the student teacher when he or she does take over a major portion of the lead teaching. Following is a description of each of the six approaches.

**One Teach, One Observe**

The co-teaching technique One Teach, One Observe involves either the cooperating teacher or the student teacher instructing the whole class in a lesson, while the other specifically observes a student, group of students, or the whole class for a specific reason the co-teachers have agreed upon for social, academic, or behavioral reasons. To get the most accurate information, the cooperating teacher and student teacher should choose an approach for data collection and, if possible, an instrument or technique to collect the information. Many such data collection instruments are available in supervision textbooks, as well as other texts such as Good and Brophy’s (2008) *Looking in Classrooms*. For example, the co-teaching team may have recognized that three students are having difficulty understanding what is necessary to create a research paper. The co-teachers have narrowed the problem so they have an idea about what might be causing a lack of understanding for the three students. While the cooperating teacher presents information on preparing notes from various sources, the student teacher observes the three students to specifically see when they are or are not engaged, if they seem to be following the instruction given by the cooperating teacher, or if they misunderstand the procedures for gathering information. After the student teacher collects data on these three students, the co-teachers analyze the situation and determine that two of the students are having trouble attending to the instruction given by the cooperating teacher, while the other needs more help understanding the overall process of constructing a research paper so s/he can better relate the parts to the whole. In another situation, the teaching team may know a specific student is having difficulty attending to the materials being covered in class, so the cooperating teacher keeps a running record of the student’s behavior for several minutes of the class and compares it to what the student teacher is covering to see if there is a connection between the student’s behavior and the lesson topics. In addition, the cooperating teacher pays special attention to the students sitting directly around the troubled student to see if there is any social activity that might be causing the student to be distracted during the instruction.

One Teach, One Observe can be used any time teachers need more information to make an informed decision about the academic or social progress of one or more students.

**One Teach, One Assist**

One Teach, One Assist is a technique much like One Teach, One Observe; however, either the cooperating teacher or student teacher teaches the class while the other moves around the class to assist students the two teachers have agreed are having problems and need extra assistance to learn the material being covered in class. For example, the student teacher may be presenting a lesson on the periodic table and explaining how the table and the columns and lines of the table are divided. The cooperating teacher and student teacher have identified five students they believe will have problems following the presentation because they have difficulty processing new information presented with little time to process. The student teacher will refer to a periodic table in the students’ textbook and will ask them to use it to explain the various elements’ positioning in the table. The cooperating teacher moves around the room observing students but gives specific attention to the five students they identified prior to the lesson. The CT would answer questions students might have and identify individual students’ difficulties. As the student teacher asks the students to explain why lead is in the fifth column of the third row, the cooperating teacher will interact with one or more students to see if they understand the procedure and to provide prompting questions to help them discover the correct answers, thus providing guidance to understand the material the student teacher is presenting. In using this technique, it is important for the teacher assisting to know precisely each step the teacher is covering, including in the specific order and time frame. To some extent, they must attempt to anticipate the kinds of problems the identified students will have and have specific techniques and procedures to guide them to the expected outcome for the entire class. The purpose of this approach is to ensure all students are on the same step at the same time and are not falling behind or getting lost during the student teacher’s presentation. As the cooperating teacher and student teacher use this approach, they must be aware that it does have problems. As the assisting teacher moves around the class to help the students, her movements and conversations with students may be a distraction to other students in the classroom. If either of the teachers notices this is a problem, they must discuss it and determine if it is distracting to the extent that its use should be limited or discontinued because more students are being disadvantaged by the technique. Another problem may be that some students will come to depend too heavily on the assisting teacher and not be an independent learner.

**Station Teaching**

A third technique described by Friend and Cook is Station Teaching, in which the cooperating teacher is responsible for teaching certain information, the student teacher is responsible for teaching other information, and perhaps one station is set up for independent learning. It is also possible
It is exciting to work with the next generation of educators! I am invigorated by their enthusiasm!

— Jean Johnson
Clinical Instructor, Geary County School District
them in their learning. When the students are involved in group work, both teachers oversee the groups, answer questions, provide guidance, and assist in the activities. During whole-class instruction, both teachers are involved in presenting information, monitoring student understanding, and answering questions. One teacher might be explaining a mathematical operation, while the other demonstrates it to the class. One might be pointing out features on a map, while the other shows pictures of the actual terrain the map presents. The two teachers may ask questions of each other, simulate a debate, or give opposing points of view on a topic. To do this, the teachers must feel very comfortable with each other. They also will have to guard against falling into some traps when teachers work together. Their teaching should not become turn teaching, where they take turns presenting material; this technique serves more to reduce the involvement of each of the teachers, rather than to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio. Successful Team Teaching requires a significant amount of planning time because it is important that both parties clearly understand what the other is doing at all times and that each is clear about the objectives to be achieved by the students. This technique is one that will not be used extensively by most cooperating teachers and student teachers; it takes individuals who know each other well to Team Teach, so it will happen more often near the end of a student-teaching experience. However, cooperating teachers and student teachers who work well together from the beginning of the semester will find that they, indeed, may be able to truly team teach.

Complacency and Other Cautions

While the KSU PDS Model provides tremendous learning opportunities for everyone, it is important that those involved remain vigilant in keeping this approach from regressing to the more traditional Triad Model. As with any teacher preparation model, we need to guard against the natural human inclination of complacency. The KSU PDS Model is not easy. If any of the partners fail to perform their tasks as envisioned, the program reverts to a traditional one. Some of the tendencies to guard against are given below.

Student teachers can become too concerned about their own survival, put too much emphasis on their requirements, and forget their responsibility to the K-12 students. While student teachers often enter the experience with enthusiasm, they can become burdened with necessary tasks. Taking time away from student teaching for job-hunting and other duties provides a ripple in consistency that can disrupt the overall experience.

Cooperating Teachers can allow the student teacher to do too much teaching without their supervision and without co-teaching with the student teacher. They can spend too much time working on a curriculum innovation, drinking coffee in the lounge, preparing for national board certification, or studying for their master's or doctorate degrees.

University supervisors might turn over supervision responsibilities to the clinical instructor and spend time at the university writing or attending meetings. They can downgrade the importance of being in the schools with their student teachers supervising and holding seminars for them, working with cooperating teachers, or demonstrating teaching techniques with K-12 students. They can involve themselves only with the supervision of university students and fail to help teachers and administrators with action research and in-service activities. It is important that the University Supervisor be an integral part of the student teacher's experience. However, it can be argued that the university supervisor should take even greater involvement, serving as a resource not only for the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and clinical instructor, but also for the building administrator and other faculty members. Allen (2006) notes the broader role that the university supervisor can have in the relationship, such as providing professional support and advice regarding curricular decisions for departments in the building. Another concern is the potential outsourcing of supervision at the university level. Many university supervisors are not faculty members and may not have the expertise to handle various problems that might arise. It's also important for faculty to be visible in the school setting and have name recognition as university supervisors and resources for the schools, and not let such a role become a lower priority for faculty members.

Clinical instructors can spend too much time in social interaction with teachers, student teachers, and those in early field experiences. They can get caught in the trap of doing too much of the formal observations and supervision when the university supervisor fails to perform his or her portion of the formal supervision. The clinical instructor must be actively engaged in the process, as the university relies on the clinical instructors to determine whether cooperating teachers are providing quality experiences for the student teachers. It is their job to oversee the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship and to share concerns with the university supervisor. It is through that role that the university's College of Education can continue to make quality placements for its students.

Retention high expectations and accountability levels are critical to ensure the success of this model. At each level, individuals must know what is expected of them. In avoiding such issues, it is essential that all members of the student teaching team be on the same page regarding their expectations. While exceptions can occur and require flexibility to those expectations, they must be allowed sparingly; otherwise, such a model can lose its effectiveness and value to the profession.

Conclusion

The KSU PDS Model, through the past 25 years, has transformed the roles of cooperating teacher, clinical instructor, and university supervisor into a solid web of support for the student teacher during his or her semester of student teaching. Through this network, the KSU PDS Model has moved beyond the traditional triad approach and now emphasizes the need for co-teaching, in an effort to strengthen the learning experience for the student teacher. But, more importantly, the end result is a vital collaboration that helps improve education for K-12 students.
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