

University of the Fraser Valley

Co-Teaching

A Report of an Interdisciplinary Experiment

By Christina Neigel

May 2, 2016

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).



“Pedagogy is not something that is merely transmitted, it’s something that is struggled over.”
-- H. Giroux, *Disturbing Pleasures*, 1994, p. 156.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction	3
<i>Situating the Project</i>	3
<i>Co-Teaching</i>	5
<i>Challenges</i>	6
Structural Realities.....	7
<i>Workload/Recognition</i>	7
<i>Timetabling</i>	8
<i>Document Management</i>	8
<i>Authority</i>	9
Pedagogy.....	10
<i>Class Preparations</i>	10
<i>Assessment</i>	10
<i>Classroom Dynamics</i>	11
Forging Ahead	13
Appendix A.....	15
<i>Recommendations for UFV</i>	15
<i>Recommendations for Instructors Contemplating Co-Teaching</i>	16
Appendix B	17
<i>Course Pairing With Institutional Learning Outcomes for LIBT 399C/BUS 390L</i>	17
References	19

Executive Summary

Having engaged in a semester-long co-teaching experience in a special topics course that was dual-listed as Business 390L and Library and Information Technology 399C (Place Making and Community Engagement), I was prompted to draft a report, summarizing some of the benefits and challenges of such an interdisciplinary undertaking. This report summarizes current educational literature that focuses on co-teaching as a legitimate form of teaching practice. Further, this document examines the very specific circumstances that shape a co-taught classroom, outlining structural realities and important pedagogical considerations. It is my hope that the experiences and research documented in this report offer inspiration, and ideas about the ways our expertise as professors can be integrated in innovative, creative, and critical ways.

Although there are numerous ways to co-teach, this report is focused on synchronized co-teaching where both professors participate in the teaching and assessment fully for the duration of the course. It assumes that such work enhances the learning community within the classroom in powerful ways. Within this context, this report considers issues relating to authority, timetabling, workloads, and classroom dynamics, providing a general assessment of the challenges and benefits of co-teaching practice. The report concludes with recommendations for the institution and for faculty considering co-teaching.

Introduction

The term “interdisciplinary” appears widely in education literature and applies to both approaches and content in teaching practice. It is assumed that interdisciplinarity assists students in grappling with complex questions and problems that benefit from more comprehensive standpoints (Newell, 2010). As Newell (2010) argues, understanding complex problems actually requires integrative and interdisciplinary approaches. Such methods enrich “the possibility of divergent thinking and dialogue in learning spaces” (Cobb & Sharma, 2015, p. 43). Further, education focusing on integrated and interdisciplinary teaching and learning is necessary to meet changing expectations and needs for undergraduate education (Bryant, Niewolny, Clark, & Watson, 2014).

While it is possible to infer the importance of interdisciplinarity within UFV’s Institutional Learning Outcomes (University, 2012), it is not explicitly expressed within them. Although University of the Fraser Valley’s (UFV) strategic goals, *Changing Lives, Building Community* (University, 2010), emphasize the importance of community and innovation, interdisciplinarity is not expressed as a discrete goal. An examination of the UFV website indicates that “interdisciplinary” is focused on programming, featuring information on select programs that incorporate courses and content from different disciplines (e.g. Global Development Studies, General Studies and Religious Studies). Co-teaching or “team teaching” as an aspect of interdisciplinarity is not expressed on the UFV website, with the exception of scattered reports where it is mentioned as part of faculty activities. One such example is a president’s report to the Board of Governors (President, 2012) in which Arts faculty were described as having been involved in an Arts 100 pilot course. An examination of public documents through the UFV website reveals a notable absence of any institution-wide discourse on interdisciplinarity and its various aspects, including “co” or “team” teaching. This report is situated as a starting point for further study. It analyzes how interdisciplinarity at UFV is currently conceived in relation to the practice of co-teaching.

Situating the Project

I have been teaching at UFV for thirteen years and have been recently immersed in a doctoral program in education in post-secondary contexts. Interested in the practice

of critical pedagogy, I was keenly interested in seeking out a team teaching experience as a way of exploring the practice of coalition building and the politics of difference.

Treating the endeavor as a kind of “experiment”, a fellow faculty member from the School of Business, Don Miskiman, and I developed a plan to co-teach a third-year special topics course that centered place making and community engagement. Interested in issues of 'place' and the built environment, my colleague and I had often informally discussed issues around innovation and co-creation in relation to private and public spheres. We discussed the importance of community involvement and citizenship as educational goals within the context of our own academic frames. We became interested in how business and library and information technology perspectives could be integrated into the 'lived space' of the classroom. It was our hope that students would be exposed to the generative tensions that emerge from our different backgrounds, perhaps finding new ways to think about what it means to be engaged in a community. We felt that this would build deeper connections between disciplines, offering students new ways of thinking about community that de-emphasize discipline-specific thinking to illustrate the interconnectedness of business, public services, social responsibility, problem solving, and, even, information literacy.

The course took place during the winter 2016 semester. The course ran as a three credit on-campus course that met for two hours and fifty minutes once a week for thirteen weeks. Both faculty understood that this class was serving as a kind of “sandbox” to understand the dynamics of co-teaching. The course content was completely new and co-developed by the instructors. We agreed to share equal responsibility and accountability for course planning and evaluation. Unlike some examples of co-teaching, both instructors possess substantial teaching experience (i.e. this was not an example of a master teacher and teacher candidate).

I maintained a reflective journal during the course, making entries most weeks after class. This journal was intended to document my own feelings about the experience as well as note any issues with process. Both instructors participated in discussion before and after classes to reflect on experiences and share observations. After the completion of the course, we also had extensive discussions around what the experience meant to each of us.

Co-Teaching

Described as, “two or more teachers who agree to share responsibility to deliver instruction to a single group of learners” (Kariuki, 2013, p. 184), co-teaching assumes a shared responsibility and accountability between teachers. (Gillespie & Isreaetel, 2008). However, there is a significant variability in actual practice. Much of the published research centres on co-teaching among general and special education teachers as well as work focusing on pre-service teachers (e.g. Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2010; Carter, Prater, Jackson & Marchant, 2009; Conderman, 2011; Conderman, Johnston-Rodriguez & Hartman, 2009).

Much of the co-teaching literature for higher education appears within the context of social justice (e.g. Cobb & Sharma, 2015; Garran, Aymer, Gelman, & Miller, 2015; Ouellett & Fraser, 2011; Shapiro & Dempsey, 2008). Garran, Aymer, Gelman and Miller (2015) assert that “team-teaching, especially with colleagues who are diverse along the axes of social class, gender, race, age, culture, tenure, rank, and academic status, offers a rich opportunity to model a social justice, anti-oppressive approach to teaching and learning” (p. 800). While the results of such endeavors are not easily quantified, other work in this area suggests improvements can be measured and identified. Combining the expertise of engineering and communications faculty, Beck’s (2006) co-teaching experience resulted in a “marked improvement in grades” (p. 63). Further, “the quality of students’ written work markedly improved over the course of the semester, as did the quality of their group presentations and the efficacy of their conflict resolution processes” (p. 66).

The literature suggests that co-teaching in higher education takes on various forms and tends to be experimental in its application. Faculty may teach one course by dividing courses into modules, taught by different faculty in different weeks or courses may involve “parachuting” faculty in for specific lessons. This report is based on co-teaching using a *Synchronous Teaming* approach that requires faculty to teach side-by-side with the entire class (Cobb & Sharma, 2009; Cook & Friend, 1995) over the duration of the course. In this way, “multiple objectives, content, materials, and faculty are integrated into a unified setting” (Beck, 2006, p. 59).

Challenges

An exploration of power is an important aspect of teaching and learning, finding ways in which teacher and student “become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow” (Friere, 1968, p. 67). However, co-teaching requires faculty to open up their classroom spaces in ways that can disrupt power dynamics and notions of authority and autonomy. “There is a tendency to feel that all coteaching partnerships should be ‘smooth’, yet deep learning about our own conceptions of teaching can only effectively occur when these are challenged” (Murphy, Carlisle & Beggs, 2009, p. 462). This speaks to struggles that are inherent when two faculty, accustomed to autonomy in the classroom, are confronted with a disruption of both their independence and power by sharing teaching roles.

Existing studies identify a range of natural challenges of co-teaching including “parity in classroom roles” (Pratt, 2014, p. 2), interpersonal communication and style, and differences in general teaching styles (Conderman, 2011; Conderman, Johnston-Rodriguez, & Hartman, 2009; Mastropieri, Scruggs & Graetz, 2005). Other research also points to structural issues including inadequate time for planning and preparation and insufficient administrative support (Carter, Prater, Jackson, & Marchant, 2009).

Faculty require a trusting relationship that assists them in establishing course parameters and a willingness to look out for one another. This necessitates sufficient time to allow for careful planning, dialoguing, and reflection (Cobb & Sharma, 2015). After their own experience in co-teaching, Shapiro and Dempsey (2008) acknowledge that the process creates a form of interdependency that must be carefully managed by faculty participants. The delicate space created in these collaborations must also be carefully respected by administration.

The perceived costs of placing two faculty in one classroom presents another constraint. For example, assigning two faculty to one class can easily be seen as “doubling” the cost of a course. The mechanisms used to calculate costs, however, should be carefully measured against possible benefits. For instance, the enhancement in educational quality may elevate a program or an institution’s appeal to the broader marketplace. Interestingly, there is very little literature that explores such administrative issues. However, two provosts, McDaniel and Colarulli (1997), suggest that:

Institutions which have focused on long-term productivity, on how much learning is accomplished for the typical student in a program or college, will be increasingly attractive to students and parents. Faculty productivity will be measured by the extent of student learning. All this will favorably influence the transformation of the classroom again for the purpose of maximizing learning, not merely generating credits. We believe that collaborative models of teaching and learning will be increasingly adopted because they have the potential to improve learning outcomes.” (p. 30)

Arguing that higher education needs to be responsive to consumer demands, McDaniel and Colarulli (1997), suggest that co-teaching in the form of “dispersed teams” offers a way for institutions to build in co-teaching practices that are not cost prohibitive. Further, Henderson, Beach & Famiano (2006) contend that co-teaching is a cost-effective way of enabling faculty to engage in professional development through the creation of opportunities to observe and engage in alternate forms of instruction.

Structural Realities

Stepping away from the traditional format of one teacher to one class not only pushes against systems crafted for particular processes and procedures, but it also provides tremendous opportunities for developing teaching practice, exploring power/authority, and generating new ways of considering difference in the form of divergent thinking. Nevertheless, it is important to consider the structural systems that shape or inhibit co-teaching possibilities.

Workload/Recognition

In order for two faculty to teach a course *together*, assuming all of the duties of course preparation, assessment, and facilitation, we had to be willing to accept only one-half of an assigned course load. This was based on an assumption in administration that such an arrangement signified half of the amount of work. At one point, we discussed the possibility of faculty opting to accept twice the number of

students, teaching in one combined class as another strategy to ensure workloads are respected. However, such solutions do not support the highly interactive nature of co-teaching. In fact, we felt it was *more* work than teaching alone.

The lack of recognition for such work is discouraging. We agreed that there is little incentive for faculty to experiment and be innovative in their teaching practice if it means taking on more work with no compensation. There appeared to be no framework or understanding of how else to manage. In our particular case, we felt that pushing the issue of workload would have resulted in the course not going forward. The problems of workload are noted in the literature, as well. Bryant, Niewolny, Clark and Watson (2014) observe in their study of co-teachers that, “many of the participants who actively engaged in collaborative teaching felt that they had (...) to frame a collaborative course in such a way that it made “fiscal sense” for the department “(p. 94). “Fiscal sense” often presents a very narrow approach to practice, especially when productivity and outcomes are measured by short-term results.

Timetabling

Because students from different departments (predominately Business and Library and Information Technology), registered for the course under either BUS 390L or LIBT 399C, there was some set up work necessary by program assistants and the registrar’s office. While, our very knowledgeable staff were able to resolve any logistical issues quickly, the process does require special consideration when planning such endeavors. Indeed, I remarked in my journal that in the forty years of this institution’s existence, it seemed surprising that our questions seemed so disruptive. Certainly, the splendid work of our respective department assistants was integral to making sure this project could be set up properly. There was no manual or procedures that guided us through the administrative process.

Document Management

A decision on where files will be stored is necessary when there are two faculty from different departments teaching the same course. To manage version control of items like grade sheets and assignments, files must be stored in a secure location that both faculty are able to access. In our example, we had to choose which of our

department drives would be used and then one of us had to contact the Information Technology department to give the other instructor access to this space. Not operating from a procedures manual, we only discovered this issue when we began developing files in preparation of the course. Because this occurred over the Christmas break, there was some “lag-time” before both instructors had joint and secure access to files.

Issues relating to logistics including registration set up, timetabling and other forms of documentation are reflected in a recent study by Bryant, Niewolny, Clark and Watson’s (2014). When surveyed, co-teaching faculty discussed their struggles with administrative systems, emphasizing “that they perceived the problem to be both how the software systems were designed, and the policies and procedures that had been put in place to regulate their use across the institution” (p. 95).

Unexpectedly, even printing was something neither of us had worked out. It became a necessary routine to check-in with one another about who was going to print handouts, bring a laptop, and other support materials. Fortunately, we communicated frequently and were able to negotiate tasks fairly easily. Because our classroom was in the same building as our offices, it was fairly easy to run upstairs and print materials while the other instructor remained with the class.

Authority

Separate from authority in the classroom, some questions around “departmental” authority emerged throughout the term. For example, students could register under the LIBT or BUS course title and only the instructor with jurisdiction in the respective department could add or drop students, despite us being equal partners in all other aspects of teaching. While this did not emerge for this experience, we also mused how grade appeals or disputes might be handled in co-taught courses. This remains unclear.

Other issues of authority are likely to emerge if trust and respect are not present. I attribute our own smooth experience to the pre-existing relationship I had with the other instructor. Even so, the process requires a vigilant attentiveness to one another and a regular practice of “checking-in” to ensure that problems are addressed. The problems of authority, control and accountability in shared teaching strongly suggest that any co-teaching work must involve parties who are already collegial and committed

to one another. Further, each teaching situation may vary in its arrangement, allowing faculty to address and manage their unique partnerships as they see fit.

Pedagogy

Class Preparations

Although we had established the general skeleton of the course and weekly topics in advance of its start date, we had not designed elaborate details for each class. This was, in large part, due to the limited time available. Since neither of us received any special resources to prepare for this course, the work emerged “as we went along” in a more spontaneous manner. We had a general framework, collective experience, a passion for the topic, and sufficient resources through our professional networks to build the course. We are of the opinion that this was the only way we were going to have an opportunity to try co-teaching within the timeframes of our annual workloads.

When content was developed, it was discussed and sometimes renegotiated in response to weekly discussions held before and after class. Because of the intense group work in this course, there was a significant need to respond to activities in class, making detailed weekly plans sometimes unnecessary. There remained, however, an underlying expectation that weekly content could be modified or completely shifted, with little advance warning. This required us to be flexible and possess a willingness to take risks in the classroom by suddenly shifting content or allowing student needs and interests to drive activities.

Assessment

Before the course began, we had established that we would co-develop both content and assessments. This generally involved a preliminary discussion of what each assignment would entail. One faculty member would create a draft to send to the other for comment and revision. We had the added advantage of being in the same office hallway, allowing for quick clarifying conversations, as well. Criteria was developed and included in assignments. We did not develop elaborate rubrics for most activities with the exception of presentations. In this case, we both had rubrics that we had used in other courses. We decided to use both rubrics in our assessment of presentations.

We marked assignments independently, providing a score/grade in pencil. We would then exchange assignments. After we had both examined all of the assignments, we would meet and discuss their findings and negotiate grades together for each assignment. We both used criteria provided to students as our guide for marking. While we were remarkably close in our initial marking, there were occasions when our grading was different. We would meet and discuss all of the assignments and, in those cases where marks were different, we would discuss, at length, our rationales. Although we were able to agree on the grading of all assignments, negotiating a kind of “settlement” is an issue that should likely be explored at the beginning of any co-teaching enterprise. Assessment presents an interesting area where control and authority may be struggled over.

It is important to note that students received *significant* amounts of feedback as a result of this co-teaching experience. This would not be possible under a single teacher model. Students received slightly different kinds of feedback from each instructor that is the result of our different styles. While we thought that this was positive, informal feedback from students suggests that they did not know how to “take in” this feedback. Some commented in ways that suggested that it was viewed negatively. I hypothesize that this may be due to a lack of communication and understanding about the nature of feedback. While we, as instructors, view feedback as constructive and formative, it may be that some students viewed it as simply negative.

At the end of term, students also commented that they struggled with understanding teacher expectations. While we were careful to provide consistent messages (assignments had purpose, expectations, instructions, and marking criteria explicitly stated), having two instructors was unfamiliar. This circles back to the ways in which students regard their instructors as stewards of content and grading that is imbued with notions of power. We made efforts to minimize concerns about negotiating the expectations of two instructors but it may be necessary to spend more time discussing power/knowledge dynamics with students.

Classroom Dynamics

Neither of us had observed the other teaching in the classroom. However, having been colleagues for a number of years, there was a certain, unspoken trust between us.

We had discussed co-teaching for nearly a year and I felt comfortable with our relationship as co-teachers. More than once, I had commented in my journal and to my colleague that this experience was “eye-opening”. I was better able to see my own teaching style when it was contrasted against another teacher in the classroom. For example, I am someone who is very methodical in how I organize content for a class. This was somewhat impossible, given that there was never enough time for us to plot out such specificity in our class preparations. In addition, it was too difficult to anticipate how we would respond to one another and to the class. My partner’s approach to classroom teaching was more relaxed than my own, leaving more space for spontaneous student group collaborations.

From a practical standpoint, co-teaching enabled us to lead in activities that would be difficult, if not impossible to do alone. For example, we were able to distribute a competitive in-class activity that one instructor marked while the other turned to presenting the class with new content. The activities were marked and returned to students within the class, providing them with very immediate feedback.

I became very sensitive to our classroom interactions and was aware of the need to “let go” and allow my colleague the space to interact with students. Sometimes, while I was sharing a point with the class, my colleague would record key points on the whiteboard and use these as summative statements following my instruction. I found this to be one of the interesting benefits of having two instructors. In my week four reflection I comment:

Working with Don has introduced me to thinking about classroom teaching in different ways and it has been refreshing to talk about shared teaching issues/questions together. We can both examine the same conundrums and ponder approaches.

There were occasions when our points of view would diverge. I view this as one of the benefits of co-teaching. Despite fears that these differences of opinion might “unseat” our position as expert, these moments have the potential to show students that such difference is actually constructive. Lester and Evans (2009) summarize this well, “when we are willing to engage in reflective practice with those around us, listen to the

thoughts and perspectives of others, even when there is inherent risk of conflict and disagreement, the opportunity to build greater understanding emerges” (p. 380).

When we began this course, we explained our roles as co-teachers in the context of an “experiment”. We were very candid that we did not know precisely what to expect as the course unfolded and indicated that this teaching experiment embodied the kind of openness and playfulness appropriate for a course on place making and community engagement. As I now reflect on this process, I lament that we did not delve into this further with the class. It is clear to me, having come through this process, that the power of co-teaching lies in our ability to, “construct knowledge together, to challenge one another (...) to build something bigger (Lester & Evans, 2009, p. 95).

Forging Ahead

This report suggests numerous benefits to the practice of co-teaching. Not only does co-teaching offer a way for faculty to learn from one another, it offers students unique and often quite profound opportunities to see their classroom experiences as part of intimate communities of learning. Having more than one instructor provides students with additional forms of support and feedback and allows instructors more flexibility with activities. Students are exposed to divergent forms of thinking by observing the ways in which their instructors interact with one another and negotiate authority.

Despite studies that suggest that co-teaching is more work than individual teaching, scholarly and professional literature indicates that it can be an effective method in reducing faculty isolation and professional exhaustion. Further, my own experience suggests that co-teaching assists in reflexive practice, creating opportunities for self-reflection and discovery which is both empowering and revitalizing.

There is no denying that co-teaching, particularly in a synchronous form, is a break from “normal” teaching practice and, as such, presents numerous challenges. Workload allocation, authority, student expectations, and, even, general document management are only some of the areas where faculty might struggle. On the other hand, the experience, for me, was invigorating, illuminating and productive. Such an undertaking requires willingness to experiment and confidence that there is space for

failure. Faculty must be confident that the process is respected and supported so that they are able to embrace the kinds of innovative thinking that they hope to inspire in their own students.

Appendix A

Recommendations for UFV

1. *Develop A Cross-Institutional Discourse of Interdisciplinarity*

- Create a working definition of *interdisciplinary* within the context of teaching, scholarship and service
- Identify and contextualize existing UFV areas engaged in interdisciplinary work (this will assist collaboration and support among those interested in developing projects and programs).
- Consider ways interdisciplinarity can be more fully and explicitly incorporated into future institutional strategic/visioning projects.
- Co-teaching, as an aspect of interdisciplinarity, should be recognized as a legitimate professional activity that incorporates the lived experiences of instructors in ways that enrich classroom experiences. Further it can reduce feelings of isolation and burnout.
- Provide opportunities for institution-wide discussions and professional development focused on interdisciplinarity (a broad discussion of its challenges and benefits will assist those interested in finding ways to adopt more integrative teaching practices.
- Recognize “variation in purpose for collaborative teaching” (Bryant, Niewolny, Clark, & Watson, 2014, p. 96). Encourage the use of different teaching models according to specific contexts as there is more than one form of collaborative/interdisciplinary teaching and there is not a single “best practice” method.

2. *Administrative Support*

- Avoid a default position of fiscal efficiency to establish a willingness to emphasize quality of teaching (acknowledging that bureaucratic and administrative conditions have a critical bearing on faculty efforts to collaborate).
- Create incentives to encourage faculty to innovate in collaborative practice (create space and opportunity for faculty).
- When developing/reviewing policies and processes, consider the role of interdisciplinarity (by foregrounding the concept, there is a greater possibility of encouraging faculty to experiment/explore interdisciplinary projects).
- Find avenues to track and share information about interdisciplinary efforts (in this way, others will not feel as though they are “re-inventing the wheel”).

- Acknowledge the role of the registrar's office as key in the establishment of interdisciplinary teaching.
- Establish and maintain records of procedures used in the establishment of collaborative teaching.

Recommendations for Instructors Contemplating Co-Teaching

1. Establish Core Learning Outcomes for a Co-taught Classroom

- Understand *why* interdisciplinary integration is desirable
- Determine how multiple subject areas will be integrated.
- Determine what students need most and what kinds of integration offer the ideal solutions.
- Identify learning outcomes that integrate the experiences of the classroom as an extension of course content. For example, consider how the integration of two teaching styles opens space for learning about social interaction.

2. Define Faculty Co-Teaching Roles

- Establish trust and a system for information sharing (these are essential components for effective collaborative teaching).
- Discuss the roles of power and authority in classroom spaces to ensure trust and openness between collaborators.
- Be respectful and view collaborators as equals not subordinates.

3. Prepare for Constant Renegotiation

- Educate administration and colleagues (they will likely be unfamiliar and curious about collaborative teaching).
- Time is necessary to plan. Time is also needed to revise content and focus as new discoveries are made
- Be prepared to delve deeper into personal assumptions about teaching practice
- Expect some student resistance (collaborative teaching will not likely be familiar to students and they will require explanation and guidance).
- With no easy formula, collaborative teaching will be a different experience for each collaboration, requiring the application of different techniques and approaches.

Appendix B

Course Pairing With Institutional Learning Outcomes for LIBT 399C/BUS 390L

ILO	COURSE OUTCOMES
1. Demonstrate information competency	Students must support their projects with primary and secondary sources. Examples of sources include statistics Canada and municipal documents
2. Analyze critically and imaginatively	- Students must link a problem of place in their community to problems with community engagement (or lack of) - Students must develop a solution to their noted “problem” that is supported by evidence from a variety of information sources
3. Use knowledge and skills proficiently	- Students must write and present projects, convincing others of their merit. - Students support their claims with evidence using data and library resources
4. Initiate inquiries and develop solutions to problems	- Students are required to investigate spaces within their communities and identify those which warrant place making - Students develop a plan to reimagine selected spaces for reshaping - Students must identify a community engagement problem and support this with evidence
5. Communicate effectively	- Students must “pitch” their projects to group members, selecting the ideal one to develop - Presentations that clearly articulate a “problem” and a relevant and supported solution. - Written report adhering to upper-level writing skill expectations - Self-analysis through a reflective assignment and identifying key learning outcomes
6. Pursue self-motivated and self-reflective learning	- Students complete a participation reflection assignment that includes addressing questions like: What was your initial reaction to this course and the assignments? - What resonated with you? - What were you thinking about? - What did not resonate with you? - What needed to be changed in order for the course and its topics to resonate with you? - Did anything change for you as the course progressed? What did you DO in this course? (think carefully about what it means to contribute. There are many ways this is done. Identify these and be prepared to provide specific examples) - What were your contributions to spontaneous group tasks in classroom activities? - What were your contributions to your group term project? - Are there other ways you contributed in this course? - Rarely are our contributions even. Explain how your contributions changed during the course? What factors (inside / outside the course) shaped the ways you contributed. 3) How has this course affected you?

	a) How could you improve your own life with the knowledge you have gained from this course or specific assignments/activities? b) What are some specific examples of how you can incorporate things you have learned in this course into your own life?
7. Engage in collaborative leadership	• The course is designed around term-long group activities of varying scope. Students are given great freedom to organize workloads and tasks in relation to their highly unique and specific projects. • Students come together as a class to develop a class project/presentation that is pitched to University Executive Director of Campus Planning & Resource Development in order to improve/inform the UDistrict plan • Students support one another in their varied group projects
8. Engage in respectful and professional practices	• By working in instructor-assigned groups for the entire term, students perform detailed peer evaluations, self-evaluations and must report, as a group in their presentations, on questions like: ○ A discussion of how you functioned as a group. This can include problems you encountered and whether you were able to overcome them (and how). ○ What did you learn? What were at least two important group take-aways from this project? (these can be about the project itself or the process) • The class prepared a presentation and a series of questions about place making for a UFV administrative representative
9. Contribute regionally and globally	• By adopting an 'ethnographic' lens, students enter their community, observe areas, people, and their interactions in order to identify problems with the use of public spaces and develop solutions that redefine such spaces.

References

- Bacharach, N., Heck, T. W., & Dahlberg, K. (2010). Changing the face of Student teaching through Co-teaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32(1), 3-14. Retrieved from: <http://www.ebscohost.com>
- Beck, A. (2006). Adventures in team teaching: Integrating communications into an engineering curriculum. *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, 34(1), 59-70. Retrieved from: literature.proquest.com
- Bryant, L. I., Niewolny, K., Clark, S., & Watson, C. E. (2014). Complicated spaces: Negotiating collaborative teaching and interdisciplinarity in higher education. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 14(1), 83-101.
- Carter, N., Prater, M. A., Jackson, A., & Marchant, M. (2009). Educators' perceptions of collaborative planning processes for students with disabilities. *Preventing School Failure*, 54(1), 60-70. Doi:10.3200/PSFL.54.1.60-70
- Cobb, C., & Sharma, M. (2015). I've got you covered: Adventures in social justice-informed co-teaching. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 15(4), 41-57. Doi:10.14434/josotl.v15i4.13339
- Conderman, G. (2011). Methods for addressing conflict in co-taught classrooms. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 46, 221-229.
- Conderman, G., Johnston-Rodriguez, S., & Hartman, P. (2009). Communicating and collaborating in co-taught classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*, 5(5), 2-17
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 28(3), 1-16.
- Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- Garran, A. M., Aymer, S., Gelman, C. R., & Miller, J. L. (2015). Team-teaching anti-oppression with diverse faculty: Challenges and opportunities. *Social Work Education*, 34(7), 799-814. Doi:10.1080/02615479.2015.1062086

- Gillespie, D., & Isreaetel, A. (August, 2008). *Benefits of co-teaching in relation to student learning*. Paper presented at the 116th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts. Retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED502754.pdf>
- Henderson, C., Beach, A., & Famiano, M. (2006). Diffusion of Educational Innovations via Co-Teaching. *Proceedings of the 2006 Physics Education Research Conference*. Retrieved from: <http://homepages.wmich.edu/~chenders/Publications/PERC2006Henderson.pdf>
- Kariuki, M. (2013). Co-teaching in graduate programs. *Review of Higher Education & Self-Learning*, 6(18), 184-189.
- Lester, J. N., & Evans, K. R. (2009). Instructors' experiences of collaboratively teaching: Building something bigger. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3), 373–382.
- Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., & Graetz, J. (2005). Case Studies in co-teaching in the content areas: Successes, failures, and challenges. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 40(5), 260-270. Doi:10.1177/10534512050400050201
- McDaniel, E. A., & Colarulli, G. C. (1997). Collaborative teaching in the face of productivity concerns: The dispersed team model. *Innovative Higher Education*, 22(1), 19-36.
- Murphy, C., Carlisle, K., & Beggs, J. (2009). Can they go it alone? Addressing criticisms of coteaching. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 4(2), 461-475. Doi:10.1007/s11422-008-9150-9
- Newell, W.H. (2010). Educating for a complex world: Integrative learning and interdisciplinary studies. *Liberal Education*, 96(4), 6-11.
- Ouellett, M. L., & Fraser, E. (2011). Interracial team teaching in social work. In K. M. Plank (Ed.), *Team teaching: Across the disciplines, across the academy*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Pratt, S. (2014). Achieving symbiosis: Working through challenges found in co-teaching to achieve effective co-teaching relationships. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 41, 1-12. Doi:10.1016/j.tate.2014.02.006
- President. (October 2012). *President's report to the Board of Governors*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ufv.ca/media/assets/presidents-office/Presidents+Report+Oct+2012.pdf>

Shapiro, E. J., & Dempsey, C. J. (2008). Conflict resolution in team teaching: A case study in interdisciplinary teaching. *College Teaching*, 56(3), 157-162.
Doi:10.3200/CTCH.56.3.157-162

University of the Fraser Valley. (August 2012). UFV's ILOs: University of the Fraser Valley's institutional learning outcomes. Retrieved from:
<http://www.ufv.ca/media/assets/teaching--learning-centre/images/UFV-institutional-learning-outcomes.pdf>

University of the Fraser Valley. (April 8, 2010). *Changing lives, building community*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ufv.ca/media/assets/presidents-office/Final+strategic+plan+2010.pdf>