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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to identify the perceptions of general and special education teachers currently participating in collaborative co-teaching team models regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. The literature review findings indicated the importance of administrative leadership and support being essential for the implementation of co-teaching. Therefore, the two research questions for this qualitative study focused on administrative practices that support co-teaching. The two research questions for this qualitative research study were a) What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by general education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools? and b) What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by special education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

This research study utilized a qualitative phenomenological research approach which was an interview protocol used to collect data from high school general and special education teachers participating in the study. The criteria for participation included: a) high school general and special education teachers currently participating or had participated in a collaborative co-teaching team model servicing students with disabilities, and b) high school general and special education teachers participating or had previously participated in a collaborative co-teaching team model servicing students with disabilities in core-content areas. The findings for school divisions and high school principals are common vision, expectations for co-teaching, ongoing,
job-embedded professional development, and amenities that support co-teaching. The findings in this study resulted in five implications for school divisions and high school principals. Implications for practice were provided at the conclusion of the study and focused on identifying the practices of principal leadership, as perceived by general and special education teachers, in support of co-teaching in high schools. Also, suggestions for future research were addressed in this study.
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GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

The purpose of this basic qualitative study was to identify perceptions of high school general and special education teachers regarding principal leadership practices in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. During this basic qualitative study, the researcher investigated the perceptions of eight high school general and special education teachers by conducting one-on-one interviews to collect data on the participants’ perceptions of principal leadership practices in support of co-teaching in high schools. This basic qualitative study resulted in five findings. The high school general and special education teachers indicated a) principals conveyed a common vision for co-teaching with all staff members, b) professional development was provided by the principal to support implementing a co-teaching model, c) principal collaboration and communication with co-teaching teams was provided for the co-teaching model, d) co-teaching expectations were communicated by the principal to all staff members to foster a collaborative environment, and e) administrative support is fundamental for effective co-teaching.

The five findings resulted in five implications for high school general and special education teachers perceptions of principal leadership practices in support of co-teaching a) school divisions should provide school leaders with support to develop and articulate a common vision for co-teaching based on research and best practices, b) the school division can allocate funds to provide job embedded co-teaching (for both the general and special educator) professional development, training, and conferences for full co-teaching implementation, c)
principals should provide scheduled collaborative opportunities with general and special education teachers working in co-teaching teams, d) principals should convey co-teaching expectations with all staff members in an effort to strengthen collaborative environments, and e) principals should provide general and special education teachers continuous support in co-teaching collaborations.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Since Public law 94-142, Education of All Handicapped Children’s Act, passed in 1975, “public schools have been striving to successfully include all students with disabilities into general education classrooms” (Nierengarten, 2013, p. 73). The Public Law 94-142, “which was updated to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 (IDEA) incorporated two fundamental principles: a) free appropriate public education to eligible children with disabilities throughout the nation, and b) ensures special education and related services to those children” (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 1990). As a result of laws such as the No Child Left Behind Act (No Child Left Behind (NCLB), 2001) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA, 2004), the necessity for more collaboration and co-teaching evolved in public schools (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 “contain specific mandates and policies that include requirements like serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive setting where their needs can be met, granting access to the general curriculum, and hiring highly qualified teachers that created the conditions for which co-teaching made perfect sense” (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017, p. 285).

Compliance in co-teaching is centered around two key pieces of legislation: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) 2001, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act “which included mandates that all children, including those with disabilities, have access to the general curriculum, be taught by highly competent teachers, and be included in professionals’ accountability for achievement outcomes was a crucial element in contributing to the interest in the co-teaching movement” (Friend, M, et al., 2010, p. 10). Another important aspect is the
revived and increased emphasis on educating students in the least restrictive environment, which is expressed in the most recent reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (Friend, M, et al., 2010, p. 10). This mandate was a catalyst for more students with disabilities being served in the general education setting, naming the general education classroom as the first consideration of placement and the least restrictive environment (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017).

Co-teaching is a means of meeting legislative standards while also providing students with disabilities the specifically designed instruction and other supports and resources to which they are entitled (Friend, M, et al., 2010). In the 1960’s, the co-teaching movement originated as a standard practice to integrate special education students and students facing other conditions and circumstances so that as many children as possible would have full access to a regular education program and would not be segregated from their peers (Peery, 2017). “Co-teaching may be defined as the partnering of a general education teacher and a special education teacher or another specialist for the purpose of jointly delivering instruction to a diverse group of students, including those with disabilities or other special needs, in a general education setting and in a way that flexibly and deliberately meets their learning needs” (Friend, M, et al., 2010, p. 11).

Co-teaching is not an intervention. Instead, it provides a framework for delivering customized services to students with disabilities in the context of general education (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017). Students with disabilities could receive services mostly, if not entirely, in the general education classroom, where they would have full access to the general curriculum and highly skilled content-area teachers, while simultaneously receiving supports tailored to their specific educational needs from a special education teacher (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017). The
key to effective co-teaching is identifying ideal roles that best address the needs of students with disabilities in the setting of a co-taught classroom. (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017). Co-teaching teams are becoming increasingly prevalent in our public-school classrooms as inclusive education becomes more prevalent (Kamens, et al., 2013).

**Statement of the Problem**

The intent of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act is to “provide the opportunity for students with disabilities to be integrated with general education peers to receive rigorous instruction in core content areas. The least restrictive placement for the majority of students was an inclusion classroom setting” (IDEIA, 2004). So, it is essential to understand how school leaders can best support the provision of special education services in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) of the general classroom for students with disabilities. Therefore, the specific leadership practices of high school principals related to co-teaching as a service delivery model needs to be investigated as students with a variety of needs are educated in general education settings, high school classrooms are becoming more diverse, and co-teaching is becoming more common in secondary schools as a means of providing instructional support to students with disabilities. This qualitative research study will focus on the perceptions of general and special education teachers regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

According to the United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2019), in 2015, 62.5% of students with learning disabilities were served in a regular school in the general education classroom for 80% or more of the school day. Also, “today with the many changes occurring in the education system, such as common core standards, teaching our students with special education needs changes using an increasingly popular approach of
implementing a co-teaching model rather than a pull-out model” (Rose, 2018, p. 5). So, it is important to investigate the specific leadership practices of high school principals related to supporting this collaborative model of service delivery (Howser, 2015, p. 10).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this basic qualitative research study was to identify the perceptions of high school general and special education teachers participating in collaborative co-teaching team models regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. “Strong and effective leadership is critical to the success of co-teaching as a service delivery model for inclusive practice” (Kamens, et al., 2013, p. 169). Therefore, administrators must demonstrate their belief in the value of this service delivery approach to all stakeholders by “creating a context in which practice can be successful, and by expressing the benefits of co-teaching for teachers, students without disabilities, and students with disabilities” (Kamens, et al., 2013). Today’s principals are expected to play an important role in developing inclusive schools for students with disabilities, with the vast majority of students with disabilities receiving instruction in general education settings for at least part of the school day (U. S. Department of Education, 2015). Furthermore, the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching in high schools needs to be studied to ensure students with disabilities are integrated with general education peers in the least restrictive environment in the inclusive classroom setting.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions developed to guide this research study were:

1. What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by general education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?
2. What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by special education
teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

Overview of the Study

“Traditionally, students with disabilities receive services in a setting with a teacher
licensed in special education, but not necessarily licensed in a specific secondary content area”
(McDonald, 2013, pp. 3-4). Accountability mandates, responses to changes in legislation, trends
in providing the least restrictive environment, and general education curriculum access for
students with disabilities have led schools to promote co-teaching to effectively meet these
demands (Cook & Friend, 1995). In recent years, “co-teaching has developed as a common
instructional delivery model that meets the needs of all students, including those with disabilities
in K-12 public schools around the country, designed as a service delivery system for students
with mild and moderate disabilities” (Simpson, Thurston, & James, 2014, pp. 100-101). Co-
teaching is a logical approach to educating students with special needs in the general education
setting with two highly qualified teachers. The general education teacher provided quality
content instruction while the special education teacher supported the special educational needs of
students with disabilities (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 2017, p. 285).

This qualitative research study was developed from the analysis of the literature and the
research that will seek to identify the leadership practices of high school principals perceived by
general and special education teachers in support of co-teaching in high schools. The high school
general and special education teachers chosen for this study were selected using a snowball
sampling technique. This sampling is a form of purposeful sampling that involves locating a few
key participants who easily meet the criteria established for participants in the study. Then as key
participants are interviewed, other participants are referred to the researcher (Merriam & Tisdell,
The criteria for participation included: a) high school general and special education teachers currently participating or had participated in a collaborative co-teaching team model servicing students with disabilities, and b) high school general and special education teachers participating or had previously participated in a collaborative co-teaching team model servicing students with disabilities in core-content areas.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework guiding this basic qualitative research study was developed from an analysis of the literature review and the assertion that “principals are charged with leading schools so that all students, including those with disabilities, achieve college and career readiness curriculum standards” (Billingsley et al., 2017, p. 42). Principals in inclusive schools “seek to ensure that all members of the school community embrace and value students with disabilities, and they encourage everyone in the school, as well as parents and those from other agencies, to collaborate and share their expertise so that students with disabilities have opportunity to achieve better outcomes in school and beyond” (Billingsley et al., 2017). The conceptual framework for this qualitative research study indicated the need for principal leadership practices in support of co-teaching generated from the perceived leadership practices of principals by teachers and principals. These leadership practices of principals, perceived by general and special education teachers, provided support for a co-teaching service delivery model. The data analyzed for this qualitative research study revealed the perceptions of general and special education teachers regarding the leadership practices of principals in support co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

Figure 1 is a diagram illustrating the conceptual framework of the principal leadership practices, perceived by general and special education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a
service delivery model in high schools. The co-teaching service delivery model components noted in the diagram identify at the core communication (Howle, 2020), collaboration (Dove-Cummings, 2020), and support (Sipe, 2019) for co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. Then creating a co-teaching common vision (McDonald, 2013) with co-teaching expectations (Sciullo, 2016) in a co-teaching implementation action plan provides a school culture in which co-teaching is valued. Co-teaching teams’ selection (Willard, 2015), co-teaching incentives (Howser, 2015), and co-teaching teams’ common planning (McClarnon, 2021) demonstrates an administrators support (Sipe, 2019) of instructional staff willing to embark on a co-teaching journey and implementing co-teaching approaches. Professional development (Rose, 2018) for co-teaching supports sustainable and continuous improvement and provides support for instructional staff and administrators to develop and implement co-teaching action plans for a co-teaching service delivery model. Therefore, the implementation of a co-teaching service delivery model in high schools supports the intent of IDEIA to provide the opportunity for students with disabilities to be incorporated in the least restrictive environment in the inclusion classroom setting.
Definitions of Terms

1. **Collaboration** is an effective strategy that allows general educators, special educators, learning specialists, administrators, and other stakeholders to work together to meet the needs of students. The primary purposes of collaboration include identifying and sharing effective academic, behavior, and social-emotional instructional practices, ensuring that practices are consistent across all providers,
and ensuring that the students benefit from those practices (National Center for Learning Disabilities, 2021).

2. **Common Practice** refers to quality instruction that must feature some basic routines, including the rudimentary practices of situating learning in the essential concepts of the curriculum, reminding students about what they have experienced so far, what the current and long-term goals are, and how the current activities will prepare them for subsequent learning and performance (McCann, Jones, & Aronoff, 2012).

3. **Co-teaching** involves two or more certified professionals who contract to share instructional responsibility for a single group of students primarily in a single classroom or workspace for specific content or objectives with mutual ownership, pooled resources, and joint accountability (Friend & Cook, Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals, 2016).

4. **General Education** refers to K-12 instruction that meets the commonwealth’s Standards of Learning and prepares children for elementary, secondary, and postsecondary success (Virginia Department of Education, 2022).

5. **High Schools** are eighth through twelfth grade but may not include all grades or have all grades represented (Virginia Department of Education, 2022).

6. **Inclusion** refers to a broad belief system or philosophy embracing the notion that all students should be welcomed members of a learning community, that all students are part of their classrooms even if their abilities differ (Friend & Cook, 2004).
7. **Inclusive Principal Leadership** refers to principals creating strong school cultures and distributing leadership across staff to serve all learners well and ensure all students feel safe, supported, and valued in school. Inclusive principals respond effectively to the potential and needs of each student to ensure high expectations and appropriate supports so that each student cross race, gender, ethnicity, language, disability, sexual orientation, family background, and/or family income can excel in school (CCSSO, 2020).

8. **Professional Development** refers to activities that are an integral part of school and local educational agency strategies for providing educators including teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, and, as applicable, early childhood educators with the knowledge and skills necessary to enable students to succeed in a well-rounded education and to meet the challenging State academic standards; and are sustained intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused (Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association, 2022).

9. **Service Delivery Model** refers to Friend and Cook identifying "co-teaching as a specific service delivery option that is based on collaboration." As a service delivery option, co-teaching is designed to meet the educational needs of students with diverse learning options (Friend & Cook, Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals, 2016).

10. **Special Education** means specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability, including instruction
conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions, and in other settings, and instruction in physical education (IDEA, 2022).

11. **Student with a Disability** means a person who: (I) is determined by an individualized education program team (IEPT), or a hearing officer to have one (1) or more of the impairments that necessitates special education or related services, or both; (II) who is not more than 25 years of age as of September 1 of the school year of enrollment; (III) who has not completed a normal course of study; and (IV) who has not graduated from high school. A student who reaches the age of 26 years after September 1 is a “student with a disability” and entitled to continue a special education program or service until the end of that school year (IDEA, 2022).

12. **Team Teaching** refers to both teachers delivering the same instruction at the same time. Some teachers refer to this as having one brain in two bodies. Others call it tag team teaching. Most co-teachers consider this approach the most complex but satisfying way to co-teach, but the approach that is most dependent on teachers' styles (Friend & Cook, Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals, 2016).

**Limitations of the Study**

This qualitative research study investigated the perceptions of high school general and special education teachers regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching in high schools. The following limitations are those conditions of the study in which the researcher had no control. The generalizations of the study was limited in scope to all Virginia education programs as well as limited by the sample size. The limited sample of participants represents the perceptions of the high school general and special education teachers who
willingly participated in the study. Also, the researcher assumed that the participants in this study shared authentic responses to the interview questions. In addition, the survey participants may not be assigned as a general or special education teacher in the division or the school during the interview timeframe. Subsequently, the school division might consider the interview request outside the scope of division objectives.

Delimitations of the Study

This qualitative research study consisted of some conditions for which the researcher had control when determining the boundaries of the study. This qualitative research study was limited to the perceptions of high school general and special education teachers who participated in collaborative co-teaching team models as a service delivery model in high schools. This study was limited to only high school general and special education teachers; therefore, school counselors, special education teacher assistants, parents, and students were not included. Also, the study did not ask for the leadership practices of anyone involved in the inclusion instructional setting known as co-teaching. This qualitative research study was limited to the study participants being high school general and special education teachers who were participating in collaborative co-teaching team models as a service delivery model in high schools.

Organization of the Study

This qualitative research study is organized into five chapters along with references and appendixes. Chapter One introduces co-teaching, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, overview of the study, conceptual framework, definition of terms, limitations, delimitations, and organization of the study. Chapter Two provides a review of current literature with background information related to co-teaching, search procedures, historical background of co-teaching, co-teaching in secondary schools, professional development for co-teaching,
leadership practices for co-teaching, administrative support for co-teaching, and research studies that support principal and teacher perceptions of principal leadership practices to support co-teaching. Chapter Three details the methodology proposed for this study. This chapter includes a description of the research design methodology/justification, data collection, site/sample selection, data collection/gathering procedures, instrument design, validity, and reliability, data treatment, management, and analysis and time line. Chapter Four presents and analyzes the results related to this study. Chapter Five provides a discussion of the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2

A Review of Literature

Background

This chapter presents a review of research related to identifying the leadership practices of principals for co-teaching as a service delivery model for students with disabilities in high schools. The literature review for this study was extracted from research studies in education, special education, and educational leadership through recent peer-reviewed published work within the field related to co-teaching, co-teaching in secondary schools particularly high schools, and the leadership practices to support co-teaching. Several research studies were utilized as a basis for investigating the need for principal leadership practices in co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. Although the focus of this dissertation was on principal leadership practices for co-teaching in high schools, the research for this literature review was cited from co-teaching literature across grade levels to provide a broad representation of co-teaching. Also, a plethora of legislation and litigation was introduced to describe the progression of educating special education students in this country.

This literature review was intended to provide a comprehensive overview of co-teaching with specific emphasis on general and special education teachers’ perceptions of principal leadership practices for co-teaching. Chapter Two was structured into several areas: co-teaching in secondary schools, professional development for co-teaching, leadership for co-teaching, and administrative support for co-teaching. In this chapter, a deeper explanation into the leadership practices of principals for co-teaching was shared in the research studies themes and findings. Specifically, a review of the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders that supports the work of principals as it relates to inclusive practices for students with disabilities.
Search Process

The literature reviewed, during the search process, was accessed using both electronic databases, books, eBooks, scholarly journals, peer reviewed research journal articles, and dissertations. The literature reviewed was retrieved via online databases that included the Virginia Tech Library, Google, Google Scholar, Academia, ResearchGate, Semantic Scholar, and the Wallace Foundation. The research studies were acquired via online databases to include ProQuest, ERIC-EBSCOhost, universities Institutional Repository Libraries, Scholar Works, and Digital Commons to find relevant studies of researchers within ten years that included both qualitative and quantitative research studies. The following key terms were used in the search: co-teaching, collaboration, inclusion, special education, and team teaching. Also, the research literature key phrases co-teaching and secondary schools, co-teaching and common practice, co-teaching and teacher benefits, co-teaching and student outcomes, co-teaching and administrative leadership, and co-teaching and barriers. The time frame of the research was 10 years, 2013-present, unless it was necessary for a historical context to search prior to 2013. A total of 129 pieces of literature were reviewed; 52 pieces of literature include 30 peer-reviewed articles with 22 research studies were used for the purpose of this literature review.

Co-Teaching Legislative Background

Historically, special education addressed the needs of students with disabilities in separate classes, promoting division of instruction, which frequently resulted in disconnects between students’ special education and general education classes (Pratt, et al, 2017, p. 1). As schools worked to meet the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), student proficiency standards and the least restrictive environment requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Act reauthorization in 2004, collaboration between special education and general education
increased, and the model of co-teaching became an accepted approach (Pratt, et al, 2017, p. 1). This movement, which was initially driven by parents, resulted in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004 (IDEA), which updated Public Law 94-142 and included two fundamentals: a free, appropriate education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment and a free, appropriate education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE) (Peery, 2017, p. 1). “An increasingly popular way to provide a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment is inclusion with the use of co-teaching” (Dunn-Gammarano, 2017, p. 22).

Simultaneously, a plethora of legislation and litigation was introduced with the sole intention of attempting to correct educational inequities for students with disabilities (Friend, M, et al., 2010, p. 14). From 1975 until 2001, educational practices for students with disabilities, according to Friend (2018), were almost exclusively guided by federal special education and civil rights laws. In 1990, Congress amended the Education for All Handicapped Act (originally enacted in 1975) and renamed it the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA). The interest in co-teaching, according to (Friend, M, et al., 2010), intensified because of the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The NCLB Act of 2001 which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), included the requirements that all students, including those with disabilities, access the general education curriculum; be taught by highly qualified teachers (HQT); and be included in professionals’ accountability for achievement outcomes (Friend, M, et al., 2010).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act 1965 (ESEA)

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was signed into law in 1965 by President Lyndon Baines Johnson, who believed that full educational opportunity should be our first national goal because from inception, The civil rights law (ESEA, 1965) was historic
legislation that empowered the federal government to equalize educational chances for all children by allocating federal education funds to the most disadvantaged children living in poverty (ESEA, 1965). The ESEA offered new grants to districts serving low-income students, federal grants for textbooks and library books, funding for special education centers, and scholarships for low-income college students (ESEA, 1965). Additionally, the law provided federal grants to state educational agencies to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education (ESEA, 1965). Therefore, ESEA is beneficial to co-teaching by providing students with disabilities equal access to the general education curriculum (ESEA, 1965).

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504

Section 504 is a federal law designed to protect the rights of individuals with disabilities in programs and activities that receive Federal financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education (ED). Section 504 provides: “No otherwise qualified individual with a disability in the United States shall, solely by reason of her or his disability, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (Office of Civil Rights, 2020, p. introduction). Section 504 regulations require a school district to provide a “free appropriate public education” (FAPE) to each qualified student with a disability who is in the school district’s jurisdiction, regardless of the nature or severity of the disability. Under Section 504, FAPE consists of the provision of regular or special education and related aids and services designed to meet the student’s individual educational needs as adequately as the needs of nondisabled students are met (Office of Civil Rights, 2020, p. introduction). Section 504 requires recipients to provide to students with disabilities appropriate educational services designed to meet the individual needs of such students to the same extent as the needs of students without disabilities are met. An appropriate
education for a student with a disability under the Section 504 regulations could consist of education in regular classrooms, education in regular classes with supplementary services, and/or special education and related services (Office of Civil Rights, 2020, p. IDEA Sec 504). Thus, Section 504 supports co-teaching for students with disabilities having access to the general education curriculum that meets the needs of students in the least restrictive setting (Office for Civil Rights, 2022, p. IDEA Sec 504)

**The Education for All-Handicapped Children Act of 1975-1990**

President Gerald Ford signed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Public Law 94-142) into law on November 29, 1975. The EHA guaranteed every disabled child in every state and locality in the country a free, appropriate public education, or FAPE (IDEA, 2004, p. para 1). This law was a response to congressional concern for two groups of children: children with disabilities who had been excluded entirely from the education system and children with disabilities who had only limited access to the education system and were therefore denied an appropriate education (IDEA, 2004, p. para 2). The four purposes of the Education for All-Handicapped Children Act of 1975-1990 were: a) to ensure that all children with disabilities have access to a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services tailored to their specific needs; b) to protect the rights of children with disabilities and their parents; c) to assist States and localities in providing for the education of all children with disabilities; and d) to assess and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate all children with disabilities (IDEA, 2004, pp. PL94-142). Consequently, EHA safeguards students with disabilities in co-teaching settings equal access to the general education curriculum and a free and appropriate education.
The American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities in everyday activities (Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990, p. para. 1) The ADA prohibits discrimination based on disability just as other civil rights laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, age, and religion (Office for Civil Rights, 2022, p. para 1). Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) prohibits discrimination based on disability by public entities, regardless of whether they receive federal financial assistance. Title II states: “[N]o qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity” (Office for Civil Rights, 2022, p. para. 1). The ADA guarantees that people with disabilities have the same opportunities as everyone else to enjoy employment opportunities, purchase goods and services, and participate in state and local government programs (Office for Civil Rights, 2022, p. para. 1). So, the expectation of this civil rights law promotes students with disabilities in a co-teaching setting having full access and participation in the general education setting.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1997 (IDEA)

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, is a piece of legislation that regulated the accessibility of public education for students with disabilities between 1990 and 2004 (IDEA, 2004, p. IDEA History) This landmark law, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, name changed to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, in a 1990 reauthorization (IDEA, 2022, p. IDEA History). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is a law that makes available a free appropriate public education to
eligible children with disabilities throughout the nation and ensures special education and related services to those children (IDEA, 2022, p. IDEA History). IDEA include educating more children in their neighborhood schools, rather than in separate schools and institutions, and contributing to improvements in the rate of high school graduation, post-secondary school enrollment, and post-school employment for youth with disabilities who have benefited from the IDEA (IDEA, 2022, p. About IDEA). To that end, the purpose of this law is to defend students with disabilities receiving an education in the general education setting alongside peers that prepares them for further education, employment, and independent living.

**No Child Left Behind Act 2001 (NCLB)**

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) is a landmark in education reform designed to improve student achievement and change the culture of America’s schools (The No Child Left Behind Act, 2001). The NCLB Act, which reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act 1965, incorporates the principles and strategies proposed by President Bush. These include increased accountability for States, school districts, and schools; greater choice for parents and students, particularly those attending low-performing schools; more flexibility for States and local educational agencies (LEAs) in the use of Federal education dollars; and a stronger emphasis on reading, especially for our youngest children (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The new law represents a sweeping overhaul of federal efforts to support elementary and secondary education in the United States built on four common-sense pillars: accountability for results; an emphasis on doing what works based on scientific research; expanded parental options; and expanded local control and flexibility (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Based on this law, NCLB underpins the co-teaching idea that students with
disabilities be educated and participate with other students with disabilities and with students
who do not have disabilities in general education (No Child Left Behind (NCLB), 2001).

**The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act 2004 (IDEIA)**

In 2004, Congress reauthorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Act but with
some important changes that required states to establish performance goals for students with
disabilities that aligned with the goals of their peers without disabilities (IDEIA, 2004). The
reauthorized legislation differed so significantly from the original legislation that Congress
renamed it the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, or IDEIA
(Renner, 2018). One of the purposes of IDEIA is to ensure that all children with disabilities have
available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and
related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education,
employment, and independent living (GovInfo, 2004). The 2004 reauthorization called for: a)
early intervening services for children not currently identified as needing special education but
who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education
environment; b) greater accountability and improved educational outcomes; and c) raised
standards for instructors who teach special education classes (Individuals with Disabilities
Education Act, 1990). For this reason, IDEIA reinforces children with disabilities in co-teaching
settings having available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special
education and related services designed to meet their unique needs.

**Co-Teaching Historical Background**

The co-teaching movement began in the late 1960s as a common practice to include
special education students so that as many students as possible would have full access to a
regular education program and would not experience segregation from their peers (Peery, 2017).
Educators gradually expanded the ways in which special education services were delivered during this period of litigation and legislation designed to correct these educational inequities (Friend, M, et al., 2010). Therefore, the goal of co-teaching was to enable students with disabilities to access the regular curriculum while also gaining access to the instructional techniques required to support their academic development (Friend, M, et al., 2010). So, Cook and Friend noted that co-teaching includes the professionals planning and delivering instruction using six approaches and variations of them, with selection based on student needs and instructional intent (Friend, M, et al., 2010). The six approaches of co-teaching outlined by Friend Cook are One teach, One observe; One Teach, One assist; Parallel teaching; Alternative teaching; Station teaching; and Team teaching (Cook & Friend, 1995). These models are used to improve instruction that is typically impractical for a single teacher to deliver and include a range of techniques to improve training for various learning styles (Cook & Friend, 1995).

**Figure 2**

*The Six Approaches to Co-Teaching*
Leadership for Co-Teaching

Co-teaching as a service delivery model for inclusive practice needs strong and effective leadership to be successful and administrators must create a school culture in which co-teaching is valued and expectations are clear (Kamens, et al, 2013, p. 169). Strong principal leadership is necessary to ensure that teachers share common values and a commitment to establishing an effective inclusive school (McLeskey & Waldron, 2015, p. 68). Therefore, principals play a critical role in transforming schools which includes demonstrating expertise at building a vision and setting direction, understanding, and developing people, and redesigning the school to support teachers (McLeskey & Waldron, 2015, p. 73).

The research of McDonald (2013) focused on examining urban secondary educational leaders in transitioning to a co-teaching service delivery model in a high school (p. 96). The findings of McDonald’s study support the need for strong and effective leadership in establishing an effective school. The study participants indicated the leader communicating co-teaching expectations and a common vision, collaborating with, and scheduling common planning for co-teachers, providing professional development, and supporting co-teachers in the transitioning to co-teaching as a service delivery model (McDonald, 2013, p. 91). The findings in the McLeskey and Waldron (2015) study focused on strong active principal leadership, and professional development (p. 68). The research studies of Kamens, et al., (2013), McLeskey and Waldron (2015), and McDonald (2013) indicated professional development, and communicating expectations as common themes related to principal leadership for co-teaching.

Co-Teaching in Secondary Schools

High school classrooms are becoming increasingly diverse as students with a range of disabilities are educated in general education classrooms so collaborative practices, such as co-
teaching, have become more common in high schools as a way to deliver instructional support to students with disabilities of whom many are identified with a specific learning disability (Willard, 2019, p. 82). Therefore, “co-teaching has been one of the support strategies used to address the challenges and capitalize on the opportunities for learners with special needs in the general education classroom” (Nierengarten, 2013, p. 73). According to the research by (Willard, 2019), effective co-teaching supports an inclusive philosophy of schooling by creating appropriate learning spaces for diverse learners, allowing learners access to the general education curricula, building a community of learners, establishing collaborative relationships, and using authentic multi-level instruction to provide worthwhile and engaging learning tasks for all students (p. 81).

Co-teaching in high school classrooms offer the potential of equitable access to content-specific pedagogical practices as well as the specialized instruction students with disabilities need to be successful (Willard, 2019, p. 81). In reference to the Willard (2019) study, four key ideas about co-teaching in high school classrooms were noted, “a) conditions in high school settings are conducive to co-teaching; b) co-teaching approaches depend on the learning objectives of the lesson; c) co-teaching is a professional partnership; and d) co-teaching is a strategy for ongoing professional development which offers a basis for understanding co-teaching practices in a high school setting” (p. 84). The research studies of Willard (2019) and Nierengarten (2013) indicated that the conditions and the support provided to staff and students support co-teaching in secondary schools.

**Co-Teaching Research Studies Themes and Findings**

In this co-teaching literature analysis, the research studies reviewed provided perceptions of teachers regarding the principal leadership practices in support of a co-teaching service
delivery model in high schools. The research studies reviewed for this literature review were based on the work of various researchers in which the following themes related to co-teaching were noted: common vision, administrative support, communication, collaboration, teacher expectations, team selection, teacher incentives, and professional development. The findings recognized in the research studies for this literature review focusing on the leadership practices of principals that support co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools were a) centered on the leader communicating co-teaching expectations collaborating with co-teachers, and providing a common vision of co-teaching; b) the administrators support co-teaching with collaborative practices such as professional learning communities; and c) principals promoted professional growth.

**Common Vision for Co-Teaching**

Researchers who have examined educational leadership agree that “effective principals are responsible for establishing a schoolwide vision of commitment with high standards and the success of all students” (The Wallace Foundation, 2013, p. 7). The research of McDonald (2013) examined urban secondary educational leaders’ role in transitioning to a co-teaching service delivery model. In the McDonald (2013) study, “The first research question addressed the necessary considerations a school leader must perform to effectively transition to a co-teaching service delivery model for students with disabilities” (p. 83). In addition, school personnel study participants indicated the principal should establish a common vision for collaborative co-teaching and provide an understanding of the appearance of co-teaching in the school and communicate this to colleagues (McDonald, 2013, p. 83). According to Howle (2020), the administrator’s vision is also important in creating an inclusive environment and expectations because they influence how teachers perceive their instruction for all students (p. 181).
The following themes indicated in the aforementioned studies support a common vision for co-teaching. In the research study of Hedrick (2016), the researcher noted one of the findings from a high school administrator who participated in the study was in order for an administrator to have a shared vision, teachers, both new and experienced, must understand and value co-teaching, and a shared vision will help create the school culture, which affects everything in the school (p. 120). Therefore, the research studies of McDonald (2013), Howle (2020), and Hedrick (2016) all support the idea of the principal establishing a shared common vision for co-teaching.

**Administrative Support for Co-Teaching**

“Principals play a critical role in transforming inclusive schools into successful programs that would not have been developed without strong, active principal support” (McLeskey & Waldron, 2015, p. 73). The following themes indicated in the aforementioned studies support co-teaching in secondary schools focused on administrative support. Stephen (2021) conducted this study with forty educators participating in one-on-one interviews to improve co-teaching strategies at a middle school. Three main themes emerged from the teacher interviews: “a) collaboration; b) selection of co-teachers; and c) training opportunities. The researcher identified two main themes from the focus group with special education teachers: a) collaboration, and b) administrative support” (pp. 84,89-90,94).

Several of the aforementioned studies indicated professional development, common planning, and selection of co-teaching teams essential forms of administrative support for co-teaching. Therefore, the research of McDonald (2013) reinforced administrative support for co-teaching in findings referencing the school leader needs to “a) establishing a timeline in the action plan with phases leading up to full implementation; b) scheduling of co-teaching teachers a common collaborative period for co-teaching partnerships; c) providing high-quality
professional development for co-teaching; d) identifying teacher compatibility and buy-in for co-teaching” (pp. 91-92). Blevins (2019) administered a qualitative study to examine the role of administrative support for inclusive practices by interviewing teachers and principals in a participating district and suggested that scheduling, professional development, schoolwide culture, and relationships are critical to supporting inclusive practices (pp. 3,40-41). The common themes noted in the research of McDonald (2013), Blevins (2019), and Stephen (2021) indicated professional development or training, administrative support, and collaboration provide support for co-teaching.

**Communication and Collaboration for Co-Teaching**

Principals can ensure that co-teachers have frequent and consistent communication that promotes collaboration (Howser, 2015). The purpose of the (Howser, 2015) study was to “examine the types of principal practices perceived by teachers, coaches, administrators, and principals to be most meaningful in the support of a collaborative co-teaching service delivery model in the context of the least restrictive environment” (Howser, 2015, p. 10). According to Howle (2020), “principals set an expectation that co-teachers collaborate and work towards meeting perceived goals of co-teaching, and principals were credited with arranging the time for teacher collaboration in the master schedule (Howle, 2020, p. 176). In the research study of Sciullo (2017) a qualitative study was conducted to evaluate the role of school leadership within the context of teacher collaboration (p. 100).

The following themes indicated in the aforementioned studies support co-teaching in secondary schools focused on communication and collaboration for co-teaching. The themes that resulted from the Sciullo (2016) study were ensure “a) the school leaders’ meaning of collaboration to include many of the characteristics; b) the principal’s experience and training
impact the school; c) the school leader defines collaboration between general and special
education teachers; and d) the school leader acknowledges that collaboration involves each
discipline working together” (pp. 100-105). Howle (2020) conducted a research study with high
school principals and teachers to determine the perceived supports for co-teaching and cited
these findings: “a) principals created a vision of inclusion; b) sharing resources; c) professional
development; and d) structures for collaboration” (p. 81). The common themes noted in the
research of Howser (2015), Howle (2020), and Sciullo (2017) noted collaboration, professional
development, common vision, and expectations as common themes.

Teacher Expectations for Co-Teaching

The school leader must set expectations for co-teaching as a service delivery model for
co-teaching partnerships, for individual co-teachers, and for student learning within co-teaching
classrooms (McDonald, 2013, p. 77). The McDonald (2013) study participants participated in a
phenomenological case study which included school administrators, general education teachers,
special education teachers, and students (p. 47). In the research by Takacs (2015), the goal of this
study investigated teachers’ perceptions of instructional practices for students with disabilities in
the secondary co-taught classrooms with the findings revealing administrators actively supported
co-teachers, provided them with clear co-teaching expectations, co-teachers expected to
participate actively in student learning, and support co-teaching partners (p. 6). The research
study by McCaw (2019) conducted interviews with research study participants from two building
sites utilizing interviews, focus groups, and observations to understand teacher and administrator
perceptions of the co-teaching model for participants in the public school district (pp. 25-26).

The following themes indicated in the aforementioned studies support co-teaching in
secondary schools focused on teacher expectations for co-teaching. The results of the McDonald
(2013) study as it relates to teacher expectations for co-teaching found that the school leader must a) have an expectation that results in teacher ownership; b) the actions initiated by the school leader for expectations flow into actions for ownership; c) the leader must communicate co-teaching expectations; d) collaborate with co-teachers; and e) provide a common vision of co-teaching implementation for the school (pp. 77-78). Also, the findings of the Takacs (2015) study indicated that “administrators actively supported co-teachers, provided them with clear co-teaching expectations, co-teachers expected to participate actively in student learning, and support co-teaching partners” (pp. 6-7). The researcher McCaw (2019) cited findings in his study related to shared responsibility, co-planning, co-teachers’ relationship, varied co-teaching approaches, and administrator expectations of the co-teaching model (pp. 108-109). The common themes noted in the research of Takacs (2015), McDonald (2013), and McCaw (2019) indicated clear expectations, administrative support, and communication support teacher expectations for co-teaching.

**Team Selection for Co-Teaching**

Co-teaching necessitates the administrator’s selection and pairing of teachers based on compatibility, content knowledge, and a desire to embrace the co-teaching model in an inclusive setting (McDonald, 2013, p. 47). McDonald (2013) discovered that the school leader must carefully match teachers in co-teaching partnerships based on content knowledge, diverse teaching techniques, compatibility, and teacher buy-in (p. 92). In the Howser (2015) study, participants emphasized the importance of carefully selecting and pairing co-teaching partners and administrators being able to choose teachers who are willing to embrace inclusion and co-teaching models in their classes. The research study by Willard (2015) found that “administrators should ensure that co-teaching partners can articulate their shared decision-making process when
choosing one model over another for a specific lesson based on contextual factors such as the lesson topic, student needs, and teacher strengths” (p. 194). Hill (2020) noted that administrators are to choose teachers who are willing to embrace inclusion and co-teaching models in their classes, and that teachers want to be in areas where they excel (pp. 101-102).

The following themes indicated in the aforementioned studies support co-teaching in secondary schools focused on teacher team selection for co-teaching. The common themes noted in the research of Willard (2015), McDonald (2013), Hill (2020), and Howser (2015) indicated the team selection criteria for co-teaching should be pairing teachers based on shared decision making, content knowledge, and how well they embrace inclusion.

**Teacher Incentives for Co-Teaching**

Principal should be engaged in motivational and encouraging practices toward team members that include efforts such as verbal compliments and private and public recognition (Howser, 2015, p. 142). The research study by Nierengarten (2013) found that administrators play an important role as the primary advocate and supporter for co-teaching teams by encouraging, recognizing, and publicly rewarding educators who have volunteered or who have been selected to be co-teachers (p. 81). Also, the Garofalo (2019) research study interviewed participants and discussed what motivated them to become a teacher and participate in co-teaching (p. 96).

The following themes indicated in the aforementioned studies support co-teaching in secondary schools focused on teacher incentives for co-teaching. The research by Sipe (2019) shared findings that teachers requested three things in exchange for participating in co-teaching: a) a common planning; b) pre-determined criteria for students; and c) capped class size at, and the administration was respectful of their wishes as an incentive for teachers (pp. 37-40). The
results of the Garofalo (2019) study focused on three main reasons: a) inspirational teachers; b) educators in the family; and c) the desire to teach students; and d) love of the content (p. 96). The results of the Hill (2020) study indicated that “administrators could support co-teachers through training, resources, incentives, and providing time for planning” (p. 10). The common themes noted in the research of Sipe (2019), Nierengarten (2013), Garofalo (2019), and Hill (2020) indicated teacher recognition, training, resources, incentives, love of content, and planning time as teacher incentives for co-teaching participation.

**Professional Development for Co-Teaching**

Professional development for co-teachers is the responsibility of school leaders. Therefore, teachers and staff serving students in a co-teaching service delivery model need ongoing professional development to address the co-teaching model expectations for teachers, improve collaboration skills, and assess progress toward full co-teaching implementation (McDonald, 2013, pp. 88-90). Rose (2018) noted that professional development is a practice that should be considered when instituting any new co-teaching model and is particularly important when developing a co-teaching implementation plan (Rose, 2018, p. 60). Professional development allows the leader to establish expectations for teachers, clarify teacher roles, and develop ownership in the school’s co-teaching initiative.

The research by McDonald (2013) noted that teachers and staff serving students in a co-teaching service delivery model need ongoing professional development to address co-teaching model expectations for teachers, improve collaboration skills, and assess progress toward full co-teaching implementation (pp. 88-90). The research of Rose (2018) suggested professional development recommendations to facilitate in the implementation of the co-teaching model: a) co-teaching model training for administrators; b) provide professional development for staff; c)
communicate areas of expertise; d) provide specialized instruction (pp. 60-61). Also, the research study conducted by Evertson (2020) indicated that professional development that promotes long-term and continuous improvement focuses on the teacher learning process and is embedded in the teaching practice as experiential, reflective, and cognitive learning that occurs as part of professional practice and through peer observation and support (pp. 59-60). The following themes indicated in the aforementioned studies support co-teaching in secondary schools focused on professional development for co-teaching. The common themes noted in the research of McDonald (2013), Rose (2018), and Evertson (2020) indicated professional development and communicating expectations in support of professional development for co-teaching.

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders

The aforesaid qualitative study utilized the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders which are “grounded in current research and the real-life experiences of educational leaders, articulating the leadership that our schools need, and our students deserve” (NPBEA, 2015, p. 1). “Professional standards defined the nature and the quality of work of persons who practice that profession, in this case educational leaders. Professional standards are created for and by the profession to guide professional practice and how practitioners are prepared, hired, developed, supervised, and evaluated” (p. 2). “The Standards are foundational to all levels of educational leadership, but apply to principals and assistant principals, and to district leaders as they engage in similar domains of work as school leaders. However, the specific leadership activities that follow each Standard are cast more toward school-level leadership than district-level leadership” (p. 2). The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders are “student-centric, outlining foundational principles of leadership to guide the practice of educational leaders for student learning and to achieve more equitable outcomes. The aforementioned standards are
designed to ensure that educational leaders are ready to effectively meet the challenges and opportunities of the job today and in the future as education, schools and society continue to transform” (NPBEA, 2015, p. 1).

The purpose of this section of the literature review described the set of the national standards currently used as a professional guide for any school leader. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) authored the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) in 2015. These standards provided guideposts that are student centric, outlining the foundational principles of leadership to guide the practice of educational leaders (NPBEA, 2015, p. 7). The Standards have been rewritten with a greater, clearer emphasis on “students and student learning, emphasizing fundamental leadership concepts to help ensure that every student is adequately taught and prepared for the 21st century” (NPBEA, 2015, p. 2). The Standards acknowledged the critical role that interpersonal interactions play in all aspects of leadership work, teaching, and student learning (NPBEA, 2015, p. 2). Also, the standards emphasized the value of academic pressure and rigor as well as the care and support needed for students to succeed (NPBEA, 2015, p. 3). According to the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015), Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, the following standards are being noted for the purpose of this study:

“STANDARD 5: COMMUNITY OF CARE AND SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS:
Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student.

(c) Provide coherent systems of academic and social supports, services, extracurricular activities, and accommodations to meet the range of learning needs of each student.
(e) Cultivate and reinforce student engagement in school and positive student conduct” (p. 13).

“STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL:
Effective educational leaders develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

(c) Develop teachers’ and staff members’ professional knowledge, skills, and practice through differentiated opportunities for learning and growth, guided by understanding of professional and adult learning and development.

(d) Foster continuous improvement of individual and collective instructional capacity to achieve outcomes envisioned for each student” (p. 14).

“STANDARD 7: PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY FOR TEACHERS AND STAFF:
Effective educational leaders foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

(b) Empower and entrust teachers and staff with collective responsibility for meeting the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of each student, pursuant to the mission, vision, and core values of the school.

(c) Establish and sustain a professional culture of engagement and commitment to shared vision, goals, and objectives pertaining to the education of the whole child; high expectations for professional work; ethical and equitable practice; trust and open communication; collaboration, collective efficacy, and continuous individual and organizational learning and improvement.

(d) Promote mutual accountability among teachers and other professional staff for each student’s success and the effectiveness of the school as a whole.
(e) Develop and support open, productive, caring, and trusting working relationships among leaders, faculty, and staff to promote professional capacity and the improvement of practice.

(h) Encourage faculty-initiated improvement of programs and practices” (p. 15).

Summary Of Research

“Co-teaching has become an increasingly more common method of service delivery to students in special education; it provides support for students to receive instruction in the least restrictive environment” (Solberg, 2017, p. 68). The findings of the aforementioned studies were “somewhat consistent in both examining what are the important components of implementing a co-teaching model at a secondary building/administrative level and what are the important components of implementing a co-teaching model at an interpersonal level” (Solberg, 2017, p. 69). “To provide the best outcomes to students with disabilities who are instructed in co-taught classrooms at the secondary level, teachers must be provided time, support, and professional development. Teachers who are in co-teaching partnerships must develop strategies for communication, conflict resolution, and develop a shared vision with their co-teaching partners to be successful. When teachers are successful, students can be successful” (Solberg, 2017, p. 69).

“Successful co-teaching in high school classrooms centers on four key understandings: (a) conditions in high schools are conducive to co-teaching, (b) the use of various co-teaching approaches depends on the learning objectives of the lesson, (c) co-teaching is a professional partnership, and (d) co-teaching is a tool for ongoing professional development” (Willard, 2019, p. 98). “Co-teaching offers the potential of giving students with disabilities the support they need when and where they need it, increasing access to the general education curriculum, and
providing opportunities for achieving general education learning outcomes for all learners.

Students and teachers in co-taught classrooms can create jointly a classroom community wherein all learners have the support and conditions for authentic learning” (Willard, 2019, p. 98).

In addition, the results of the aforementioned studies have potential to significantly impact practice for principals. Howser (2015) indicated by “providing guidance for principals desiring to strengthen specific leadership practices in support of their own co-teaching programs, principals could study patterns and themes from this research to identify intersections with their own leadership practices (pp. 181-182). The three themes identified in this examination point to the leadership practices perceived as supportive of co-teaching. “A secondary school leader transitioning to co-teaching as a service delivery model for students with disabilities should begin by gathering sufficient data on the available resources within the school. These resources would include available special education teachers, general education teachers, time, and funds to commit to the initiative. The school leader would also need to have a clear understanding of the student needs of both disabled and non-disabled populations in all courses to determine if current staff numbers are adequate to meets demands” (McDonald, 2013, p. 95). “The school leader should locate a presenter outside the school system to conduct professional development for co-teachers, and the co-teaching model must be shared with parents and students during meetings as part of reports to the public. This gives validity and credibility to co-teaching as an instructional model for all students and lets the public know this model of classroom instruction is a part of the school’s classrooms efforts to provide best practices and achieve high levels of learning” (McDonald, 2013, pp. 95-96). Implications for professional practice at the school district level are “related to establishing a standards-based curriculum and providing teachers adequate professional development opportunities. School districts should provide targeted
professional development to teachers who are engaged in team teaching on characteristics of effective collaboration and methods of co-teaching, planning for instruction, teacher accountability, and individual knowledge” (Sciullo, 2016, p. 110).

Further research conducted to address and to investigate support for principal leadership in co-teaching in secondary schools as a common practice to ensure students with disabilities have equal access to educational opportunities and the general education curriculum, and to support and prepare teachers for teaching in inclusive settings. Researchers might choose to examine staff development for co-teaching, review of the professional development plans of school districts and how special education fits into the plan, and case studies of individual schools may be able to explain more specifically how the co-teaching relationship is developed (Howser, 2015, p. 182). “Future research exploring the impact of school administration turnover on the process of transitioning to co-teaching as a service delivery model for students with disabilities, sustaining co-teaching as an instructional model, and research regarding compatibility between co-teachers” is recommended (McDonald, 2013, p. 96). “Research conducted on how teaching teams select which method of co-teaching they will implement, the impact that professional development activities have on the implementation of effective co-teaching practices, student scores on federal accountability measures on general education teachers of co-teaching, and the paring of a new teacher with a veteran teacher would inform the field about any benefit received from teachers sharing knowledge with each other through team teaching” (Sciullo, 2016, pp. 112-113).

Most importantly, the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, with the focus being student centered, has outlined foundational principles of leadership to guide the practice of educational leaders for student learning and to achieve more equitable outcomes (NPBEA, 2015,
Therefore, for the purpose of this research study aligned with the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders were noted to identify practices of principals’ leadership in support of co-teaching. The aforementioned standards guided the practices of principals in cultivating an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student. The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders promotes the practices of principals in the professional capacity and practice of school personnel, and the professional community of teachers and other professional staff to support each student’s academic success and wellbeing (NPBEA, 2015, pp. 13-14).
Chapter 3
Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents the basic qualitative methodology and procedures that were utilized to conduct this study. Chapter Three outlines the setting and design of the study, including the methodology and justification, data collection procedures, sample selection, instrument design validity, and reliability, treatment and management of the data, and the data analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to identify the perceptions of high school general and special education teachers participating in collaborative co-teaching team models regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. Specifically, this study identified the leadership practices of high school principals, as perceived by general and special education teachers, regarding leadership practices that are supportive of a co-teaching model in high schools.

Results from this qualitative research study may be used to inform school divisions and educational leadership programs on the leadership practices of high school principals perceived by general and special education teachers in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

Research Questions

The research questions that follow served as a guide in creating the interview questions which were designed to identify the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding the
leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

1. What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by general education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?
2. What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by special education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

Research Design and Justification

The premise behind qualitative research is that knowledge is continuously generated by individuals as they engage with and make sense of an activity, event, or phenomena (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The most typical type of qualitative research seeks to learn how people interpret their experiences. In order to answer the research questions posed, data was collected through interviews, observations, and documents are then inductively examined (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Researchers interpret the participants’ feelings, perceptions, and beliefs to clarify the essence of the phenomenon under investigation. Elements of phenomenological design were incorporated into this basic qualitative study. In a phenomenological study, the meaning of lived experiences of a concept or phenomenon is described (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Phenomenological research design requires the researcher to bracket whatever a priori assumption they have about the experience or phenomenon (Delve & Limpaecher, 2022).

This study used a basic qualitative research design to gain an in-depth understanding of the principal leadership practices perceived by general and special education teachers in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. In the study, the researcher engaged high school general and special education teachers in individual interviews to seek detailed descriptions of the reported leadership practices of principals that might be in support of co-
teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. The participants were selected using snowball, chain, or network sampling, the most common form of purposeful sampling, that involves locating a few key participants who easily meet the criteria established for participants in the study. Then as interviews were conducted, key participants were asked to refer other participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 98). The use of an interview protocol instrument was used to explore and gather information from the viewpoint of the high school general and special education teachers in identifying the perceived leadership practices of high school principals in support of co-teaching. The data gained from the interviews provided rich descriptions from high school general and special education teachers about the perceived leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

**Data Collection**

In qualitative research, interviews are frequently the primary source of qualitative data required to comprehend the phenomenon under consideration (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Qualitative researchers usually collect information at the location where participants experience the issue being studied (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In this study, the high school general and special education teachers who currently participate or previously participated in collaborative co-teaching team models were selected using snowball, chain, or network sampling, a common form of purposeful sampling, that involves locating a key participant who easily meet the criteria established for participants in the study. Then, as the researcher, key participants referred other participants to the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 98). Most of the qualitative research employ semi-structured interviews; however, some incorporate a structured component to collect uniform demographic information from all study participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). With
the major source of data for this study being interviews, all high school general and special education teacher study participants were interviewed via Zoom.

Qualitative researchers collect data through examining documents, observing behavior, or interviewing people (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Documents can also be utilized to supplement interviews or observations as a data source; however, consider the documents to be analyzed (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The semi-structured interview for this study consisted of six general information questions that gave background information on the research study participants; and 10 interview questions that provided answers to the two research questions. Each study participant was interviewed individually for 30-35 minutes. The semi-structured interviews allowed research study participants to reveal perceived leadership practices of high school principals perceived by general and special education teachers in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

**Research and Interview Questions**

Table one shows the research interview protocol. The research questions for this study were utilized as a foundation for the development of the interview questions. The interview questions were derived from the conceptual framework which guided this qualitative research study. The conceptual framework was developed from an analysis of the literature review. From that analysis, themes were extracted, and interview questions were constructed. There are 10 interview questions in the table that corresponded to both research questions. The interview questions were utilized during the interviews of both general and special education teachers participating in this study.
### Table 1

*Interview Protocol*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>General Information Questions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many years of high school experience as a teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is your current school setting? Urban, Rural, or Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many years of co-teaching experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many years of co-teaching training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the courses you have co-taught or currently co-teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How many co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences have you been scheduled to attend?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interview Questions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If yes, in what ways does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If no, what components of a common vision do you think would be important to share with all instructional staff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If yes, how does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If no, what do you think would foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If yes, in what ways does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If no, what ways do you think co-teaching expectations should be communicated to all instructional staff in the school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If yes, how does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If no, what do you think would facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1 (cont.)

5. Does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning?
   a. If yes, how does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning?
   b. If no, how do you think co-teaching teams could be ensured common planning?

6. Does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school?
   a. If yes, how does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school?
   b. If no, what do you think collaboration between the principal, co-teachers, and co-teaching teams could be in the school?

7. Does the principal provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school?
   a. If yes, what professional development opportunities does the principal provide to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school?
   b. If no, what professional development opportunities do you think would provide support to instructional staff and co-teaching teams in the school?

8. Does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?
   a. If yes, in what ways does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?
   b. If no, what people or instructional resources do you think could be provided to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?

9. Does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?
   a. If yes, what meaningful incentives does the principal offer instructional staff to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?
   b. If no, what meaningful incentives do you think offered to instructional staff would encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?

10. Does the principal provide additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school?
    a. If yes, what additional support does the principal provide for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school?
    b. If no, what additional support do you think provided for the instructional staff could enable co-teaching to work in the school?

Is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?
Site and Sample Selection

Voluntary participation of high school general and special education teachers was utilized by the researcher for this study. The site and sample selection for this basic qualitative research study endured challenges with recruitment of research study participants which disrupted the timetable for the research study. The first attempt to recruit research study participants following the IRB approval January 31, 2023, included high school principals, general and special education teacher study participants. The second attempt to recruit research study participants following the IRB approval May 26, 2023, included high school general and special education teachers. Following the school division approval on June 23, 2023, snowball sampling was used to locate key participants who easily met the criteria established for this study. Snowball, chain, or network sampling, a common form of purposeful sampling, was used in locating a few key participants who easily met the criteria established for participants in the study. Then, the researcher interviewed these key participants, and asked each one to refer other participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 98). The criteria selection included: a) high school general and special education teachers currently participating or had participated in a collaborative co-teaching team model servicing students with disabilities, and b) high school general and special education teachers participating or had previously participated in a collaborative co-teaching team model servicing students with disabilities in core-content areas.

Purposeful sampling is predicated on the idea that the researcher wants to learn, comprehend, and acquire insight, hence they must choose a sample from which the most may be inferred (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In purposeful sampling, the size of the sample was determined by informational considerations (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Snowball, chain, or network sampling, the most common form of purposeful sampling, involves locating a few key
participants who easily met the criteria you have established for participants in the study. Then as you interview these key participants, you ask each one to refer you to other participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 98). This study included participants selected from general and special education high schools participating in collaborative co-teaching team models servicing students with disabilities in the core-content areas.

This basic qualitative research study included high school general and special education teachers who are participating or previously participated in collaborative co-teaching team models servicing students with disabilities in the core-content areas. Also, this study focused particularly on the individual leadership practices of principals, perceived by general and special education teachers, in support of co-teaching in high schools. The intent was not to generalize to a particular population, but to thoroughly explore the leadership practices, as perceived by general and special education teachers representing multi-regions in Virginia of principals that support co-teaching in high schools. Participants for this study were selected from the high schools participating in collaborative co-teaching team models servicing students with disabilities in core-content areas. Therefore, interviews were conducted with eight general and special education teacher study participants.

**Data Collection Procedures**

This qualitative research study involved semi-structured interviews with high school general and special education teachers via Zoom. As referenced by Merriam and Tidell (2016), semi-structured interviews are the most common form of data collection for qualitative research. Research interviews are based on three basic types: highly structured, semi-structured and unstructured. The semi-structured interview is a combination of more and less structured questions are asked, or all questions are more open-ended (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). For this
study, high school general and special education teachers in the study participated in semi-structured, recorded interviews via Zoom that included a mix of more or less 10 structured interview questions. Following each interview, the researcher reviewed the recorded interview video and verbatim transcription of recorded interview which provides the best database for analysis. Also, the general and special education teachers participating in this study were asked to review the interview transcript and provide feedback to rule out the possibility of any member checking misrepresentation (see Appendix I).

Qualitative data consist of direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings, and knowledge obtained through interviews; detailed descriptions of people’s activities, behaviors, actions recorded in observations; and excerpts, quotations, or entire passages extracted from various types of documents (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Sources of data for this study included participant interviews via Zoom with high school general and special education teachers participating or previously participated in collaborative co-teaching team models regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. During the interviews, each high school general and special education teacher participant was asked six general information questions related to years of experience in high school, years of experience in co-teaching, high school setting, the different co-teaching collaborations, and 10 interview questions related to perceived leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching in high schools. After the completion of eight interviews involving general and special education teachers, the researcher analyzed the verbatim transcripts for answers to the research questions to form categories, themes, or findings.
Data Gathering Procedures

The researcher participated in training for the Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) (see Appendix A). After receiving Virginia Tech’s IRB approval letter (see Appendix B), request to conduct the study letter (see Appendix C) was sent to the school division for permission to conduct the study. The researcher endured challenges in securing research study participants due to the first attempt study participants being a vetted cohort for which the researcher had no familiarity with the school leaders. However, the second attempt was secured due to the researcher utilizing a school division and snowball sampling to acquire research study participants. The permission to conduct the study letter included a summary of the researcher’s dissertation topic, the confidentiality of the schools and the administrators to be included in the study ensured, and a timeline for completion of the data collection will be provided. Once permission was granted from the school division (see Appendix D) to conduct the study, building general and special education teachers were contacted individually by letter/email for an interview via Zoom (see Appendix E). In addition, the researcher provided the study participants with a consent to participate in research document (see Appendix F). Then, the researcher emailed an interview confirmation reminder letter to the research study participants (see Appendix G) as a follow-up to the agreed upon timeframe to conduct the interview via Zoom. Then, a copy of the interview protocol (see Appendix H) was shared with building general and special education teachers before the actual interview. Following the interview via Zoom, study participants were asked to review the interview transcripts for any corrections and or additions member check (see Appendix I).

For this proposed research study, the participants and the interviews were used to explore the perceptions of general and special education teachers’ perceptions of the leadership practices
of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools noted by the researcher in the problem and the research questions. According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), the most common way to record interview data is through audio recording. Written consent was obtained from participants granting permission to record the interview. After recording the interview, the data was transcribed. As referenced by Merriam and Tisdell (2016), transcribing the data familiarizes the researcher with the data to help improve questioning techniques to help with transcribing. Data was stored on a password-protected computer and any hard copies of data were stored in a locked file cabinet. Only the researcher had access to the participant data, to analyze the results.

**Instrument Design**

This qualitative research study identified the leadership practices of high school principals, perceived by general and special education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. The interview protocol (see Appendix H) was designed by the researcher and used in this qualitative research study. The interview questions focused on the how and what of the principal leadership practices, as perceived by general and special education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. The interview protocol (see Appendix H) was used with each general and special education teacher who participated in the study for an interview via Zoom. The interview protocol, which consist of an interview introduction, six teacher general information questions related to years of experience in high school, years of experience in co-teaching, high school setting, the different co-teaching collaborations, and 10 interview questions related to the perceived leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching were used during the interview via Zoom with eight general and special education teachers.
Instrument Validity

This qualitative study was employed to identify the leadership practices of principals perceived by teachers and self-reported by principals to support co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), research designs are based on different assumptions about what is being investigated, and they seek to answer different questions. In the case of qualitative research, understanding is the primary rationale for the investigation, the criteria for trusting the study are going to be different than if discovery of a law or testing a hypothesis is the study’s objective (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). For that reason, an interview protocol instrument was designed by the researcher from the conceptual framework that consists of themes that were extracted from the analysis of the literature review to develop the interview questions. Consequently, the interview protocol instrument was comprised of open-ended questions which reflect the themes identified in the literature review. Engaging an expert panel to review and comment on the interview questions and conducting a pilot test of a few people that meet the same criteria as the anticipated participants adds credibility to the study (Roberts & Hyatt, 2019). Therefore, to establish validity of the instrument, the researcher field tested the interview questions with administrators and school division leaders currently enrolled in a doctoral education leadership program. Also, the general and special education teachers participating in this study were asked to review the interview transcript and provide feedback to eliminate any misrepresentation (see Appendix I).

Instrument Reliability

Reliability refers to the extent to which research findings can be replicated. Reliability in a research design assumes that there is a single reality and that studying it repeatedly will yield the same results (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). However, for the purpose of this research study,
reliability refers to the consistency of repeatability of an instrument which is the degree to which sets of items on an instrument behave the same way (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Qualitative researchers seek to describe and explain the world as those in the world have experienced (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The more important question for qualitative research is whether the results are consistent with the data collected (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016 pp. 251). In addition, the interview protocol instrument was field tested with administrators and school division leaders currently enrolled in a doctoral education leadership program. Therefore, a detailed account of how the study was conducted and how that data was analyzed was provided (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The more important question for qualitative research is whether the results are consistent with the data collected (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Data Treatment and Management

The researcher informed the study participants on how the data were used and maintained to protect the confidentiality of study participants. Pseudonyms were used to identify interviewees and to protect the identity of study participants. The researcher used coding and themes to relate the responses of the interviewees to the research questions. As cited by Merriam and Tisdell (2016), coding could be single words, letters, numbers, phrases, colors, or combinations of these. The participants’ responses were entered into a spreadsheet format so that the data was easily collected and manipulated.

According to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), researchers are expected to maintain raw data for a minimum of five years after publication (Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.), 2020). Research data was stored on a password-protected computer and any hard copies of data was stored in a locked file cabinet. Only the researcher had access to the participant data, to analyze the results. Once
study participants approved transcriptions for accuracy (see Appendix I), the Zoom recordings were deleted to maintain confidentiality. In addition, following the dissertation defense, all data was destroyed.

**Data Analysis**

Consistent with qualitative research, data collection and analysis were conducted simultaneously. Reading interview transcripts, making notes, coding, and assigning codes to data points were part of the data analysis process. Patterns were established, and themes derived from the list of patterns was examined (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The researcher, as the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, utilized an inductive process of the grounded theory to derive meaning from the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, pp. 17, 31). This study utilized the grounded theory in which the data came from interviews. Data collection was guided by the researcher collecting, coding, and analyzing the data by comparing one segment of the data with another to determine similarities. Then the data was grouped together based on similarities, given a name, and placed in a category. Patterns were identified in the data and the relationships of the patterns to one another to develop a grounded theory (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 32). The researcher received written permission from a local school division to conduct the study. The researcher used snowball, chain, or network sampling, the most common form of purposeful sampling, that involves locating a few key participants who easily meet the criteria you have established for participants in the study. Then, the researcher interviewed these key participants and ask each one to refer other participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 98). General and special education teacher participants participated in semi-structured interviews via Zoom.

The researcher used recorded audio Zoom and Otter Voice Meeting Notes interviews and interview transcripts to transcribe interviews by creating a Microsoft Word spreadsheet to record
and document study participants’ responses to interview questions. In addition, the researcher sorted and arranged the data into different categories depending on the sources of information to enhance data analysis and interpretation. Then the researcher read and reviewed all the data, recorded general notations of the information, and reflected on the overall meaning. In addition, the researcher created codes for the data by arranging and bracketing sections of text and adding a word representing each category in the margins. Next the researcher produced a description and topics for analysis using the coding process. These are the primary findings in qualitative investigations and are frequently used as headings in Chapter Five, which displays diverse views from study participants. Finally, the researcher described the themes in the qualitative narrative.

The most common method is to utilize a narrative piece to convey the analyses' findings.

Data collected from general interview questions were used to develop into APA formatted tables created in word to share the educational background, the co-teaching experiences, and the general information regarding the study participants and the respective schools. Interviews were held individually with the research study participants via Zoom. The interviews were recorded and transcribed. Copies of the interview transcripts were shared with the research study participants to avoid any misrepresentations (see Appendix I). The findings of the research were presented in Chapter Five using tables and narratives for how the data was coded and analyzed.

Methodology Summary

This research study utilized a qualitative phenomenological design to identify the practices of principals, as perceived by general and special education teachers, regarding the leadership in support of co-teaching in high schools. Snowball sampling, a type of purposeful sampling, was used involves locating a few key participants who easily meet the criteria you
have established for participants in the study. Then as you interview these key participants, you ask each one to refer you to other participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 98). For this proposed research study, the general and special education teacher participants and the semi-structured interviews were purposefully sampled to help the researcher to best understand the problem, the purpose, and the research questions for this study.

Consistent with basic qualitative research, data collection and analysis were conducted simultaneously. The interview protocol instrument was field tested with administrators and school division leaders currently enrolled in a doctoral education leadership program. Data was gathered from high school general and special education teachers’ interviews. The data was collected, transcribed, and checked by study participants for accuracy. The researcher analyzed the responses to uncover common themes. Chapter Four presents the results of this research.
Chapter 4

Analysis of Data

This chapter provides the data collected for this research study and the subsequent analysis of data. The purpose of this qualitative study was to identify the perceptions of high school general and special education teachers participating in collaborative co-teaching team models regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. The researcher investigated how the leadership practices of principals, perceived by high school general and special education teachers participating in collaborative co-teaching model, is in support of co-teaching as a service-delivery model in high schools. The results of this study may be used to inform school districts and educational leadership programs on the leadership practices of high school principals perceived by general and special education teachers in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model.

Chapter Four shares the perspectives of high school general and special education teachers in response to this study’s two research questions. The research questions that grounded this study were:

1. What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by general education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

2. What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by special education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

The interview instrument was divided into two categories, general information questions, and interview questions. The general information questions included questions regarding the general and special education teachers’ years of high school and co-teaching experience, current school setting, co-teaching training, and professional development opportunities. The second
section of the interview asked questions pertaining to the perceptions of general and special education teachers regarding principal leadership practices in support of co-teaching in high schools.

**Study Participants**

The data for Table 2 indicates the study participants. Out of the eight participants, three (37.5%) were special education teachers and five (62.5%) were general education teachers.

**Table 2**

*Study Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>General Education Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

General and special education teachers who have co-taught or are currently co-teaching in a high school were identified as prospective participants for this study. The researcher used snowball sampling to obtain a diverse pool of participants. The criteria for inclusion in this study were a) high school general and special education teachers currently participating or had participated in a collaborative co-teaching team model servicing students with disabilities, and b) high school general and special education teachers participating or had previously participated in a collaborative co-teaching team model servicing students with disabilities in core-content areas.
The first six interview questions asked of participants were included to provide general information about the study’s participants. Then, the data collected from the remaining 10 interview questions are reported by the research questions.

**Participant General Information**

**Interview Question One**

**How many years of high school experience as a teacher?**

In response to General Information Interview Question One, the interviewees indicated their years of experience. Table 3 details the pseudonyms for each participant and the years of experience as a high school teacher.

**Table 3**

*Years of High School Teaching Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>0-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11-15 Years</th>
<th>16-20 Years</th>
<th>21-25 Years</th>
<th>26-30 Years</th>
<th>31-35 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

The general and special education teachers who participated in this study were asked to share how many years of high school experience they have as a teacher. Of the eight participants, two special education teacher participants and one general education teacher participant (37.5%) have six to 10 years of high school experience as a teacher. One general education teacher
participant and one special education teacher participant (25%) have 11-15 years of high school experience as a teacher. One general education teacher participant (12.5%) has zero to five years of high school experience as a teacher, one general education teacher participant (12.5%) has 21-25 years of high school experience as a teacher, and one general education teacher participant (12.5%) has 31-35 years of high school experience as a teacher. Table 3 details the pseudonyms for each participant and the years of experience as a high school teacher.

*Interview Question Two*

**What is your current school setting? Urban, Rural, or Suburban**

In response to General Information Interview Question Two, the interviewees indicated their current school setting. Table 4 details the pseudonyms for each participant and the current school setting.

**Table 4**

*Current School Setting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Suburban/Urban</th>
<th>Suburban/Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*

The general and special education teachers who participated in this study were asked to identify the current school setting. Of the eight participants, three general education teacher
participants and one special education teacher participant (50%) are in an urban setting. One
general education teacher participant and one special education teacher participant (25%) are in a
suburban setting. One special education teacher participant (12.5%) is in a suburban/urban
setting, and one general education teacher participant (12.5%) is in a suburban/rural setting.

**Interview Question Three**

**How many years of co-teaching experience?**

In response to General Information Interview Question Three, the interviewees indicated
their years of experience. Table 5 details the pseudonyms for each participant and the years of
coteaching experience.

**Table 5**

*Years of Co-teaching Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>0-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11-15 Years</th>
<th>16-20 Years</th>
<th>21-25 Years</th>
<th>26-30 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

The general and special education teachers who participated in this study were asked to
share how many years of co-teaching experience. Of the eight participants, two special education
teacher participants and one general education teacher participant (37.5%) have 11-15 years of
coteaching experience. Two general education teacher participants (25%) have zero to five
years of co-teaching experience. One special education teacher participant (12.5%) has six to 10 years of co-teaching experience, one general education teacher participant (12.5%) has 16-20 years of co-teaching experience, and one general education teacher participant (12.5%) has 26-30 years of co-teaching experience.

**Interview Question Four**

**How many years of co-teaching training?**

In response to General Information Interview Question Four, the interviewees indicated their years of co-teaching training. The data for Table 6 indicates the study participants’ years of co-teaching training.

**Table 6**

*Years of Co-teaching Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>0-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11-15 Years</th>
<th>16-20 Years</th>
<th>21-25 Years</th>
<th>26-30 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*

The general and special education teachers who participated in this study were asked to share how many years of co-teaching training. Of the eight participants, three general education teacher participants and two special education teacher participants (62.5%) have zero to five years of co-teaching training, one special education teacher participant (12.5%) has six to 10
years of co-teaching training, one general education teacher participant has (12.5%) 11-15 years of co-teaching training, and one general education teacher participant (12.5%) has 26-30 years of co-teaching training.

**Interview Question Five**

**What are the courses you have co-taught or currently co-teach?**

In response to General Information Interview Question Five, the interviewees indicated the courses co-taught or currently co-teach. Table 7 details the pseudonyms for each participant and the courses co-taught or currently co-teach.

**Table 7**

_Courses Co-taught or Currently Co-teach_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>English/Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

The general and special education teachers who participated in this study were asked to identify the courses co-taught or currently co-teach. Of the eight participants, two general education teacher participants and one special education teacher participant (37.5%) co-taught or currently co-teach History courses. One special education teacher participant (12.5%) co-taught or currently co-teach English/Language Arts and History, and one special education teacher...
participant (12.5%) co-taught or currently co-teach English/Language Arts and Science. One general education teacher participant (12.5%) co-taught or currently co-teach English/Language Arts courses. One general education teacher participant (12.5%) co-taught or currently co-teach Science courses. One general education teacher participant (12.5%) co-taught or currently co-teach Math courses.

*Interview Question Six*

**How many co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences have you been scheduled to attend?**

In response to General Information Interview Question Six, the interviewees indicated how many co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences attended. Table 8 details the pseudonyms for each participant and the years of co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences attended in increments of five.

*Table 8*

*Co-teaching Professional Developments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>0-5 Professional Developments</th>
<th>6-10 Professional Developments</th>
<th>11-15 Professional Developments</th>
<th>16-20 Professional Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*
The general and special education teachers who participated in this study were asked to share how many scheduled co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences attended. Of the eight participants, three general education teacher participants and two special education teacher participants (62.5%) have zero to five years of scheduled co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences attended. One special education teacher participant (12.5%) has six to 10 years of scheduled co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences attended. One general education teacher participant (12.5%) has 11-15 years of scheduled co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences attended. One general education teacher participant (12.5%) has 16-20 years of scheduled co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences attended.

**Research Question One**

What are the leadership practices of principals, perceived by general education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

**Research Question Two**

What are the leadership practices of principals, perceived by special education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

**Interview Question One**

Does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school?

a. If yes, in what ways does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school?
b. If no, what components of a common vision do you think would be important to share with all instructional staff?

In response to Interview Question One, the data from Table 9 indicated the overall responses to interview question one, does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school.

**Table 9**

*Interview Question 1 Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, six out of eight (75%) answered yes in response to interview question one, does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school. Two out of eight general education teacher participants (25%) answered no in response to interview question one, does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school. Three out of five (60%) general education teacher participants answered yes to interview question one, does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school. Three out of three
(100%) special education teacher participants answered yes to interview question one, does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school.

In response to Interview Question One, the data from Table 10 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated that a co-teaching model conveys the principals’ common vision for co-teaching.

Table 10

Table 10: Interview Question 1 Participant Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3*</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6*</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Strategies/Best Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Relationships/Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

The eight general and special education research study participants were asked does the principal conveys a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school. Three of eight participants (37.5%), including one general education and two special education teachers indicated that the principal conveyed co-teaching expectations to the staff. A special education teacher (P6) stated, “We have a school wide expectations meeting that is held at the beginning of the school year where they get all the teachers together, who co teach. Then they talk about what the expectations are, the different strategies for co-teaching, and how we can work together.”
Two of eight participants (25%), including one general education and one special education teacher mentioned that co-teaching collaboration was part of the principal’s common vision. A general education teacher noted that two or more teachers should be collaborating to ensure that all students are receiving the same opportunities and education, regardless of their abilities or learning styles in the hopes that they will be able to thrive in our school. Four of eight participants (50%), including three general education and one special education teacher shared that various co-teaching models were included in the vision statement by the principal. A general education teacher (P2) stated, “Each class has a minimum of two teachers, a general education teacher, and a special education teacher. Occasionally, a paraprofessional in the classroom because I’ve had students who were visually impaired and hearing impairments, and they will have their own instructional assistant.” Two of eight participants (25%), both special education teachers recalled that co-teaching strategies and best practices were included in the principal’s co-teaching vision. A special education teacher noted that the administrators get the general and special education teachers together, the ones who are paired, and we talk about our best practices. Two of eight participants (25%) including one general education and one special education teacher shared that co-teaching relationships and partnerships were part of the principal’s vision for co-teaching. A general education teacher (P7) stated, “We have a senior teacher for special education, and she leads a meeting during the Back-to-School work week where she talks about co teaching and relationships. The senior teacher provides some different models for co-teaching that work for some different co-teaching partnerships.”

In summary, according to the data, four of eight (50%) of participants mentioned that co-teaching models were part of the principal’s visionary statement, three of eight (38%) recalled co-teaching expectations were stated, and two participants (25%) individually shared that co-
teaching and collaboration, co-teaching strategies and best practices, and co-teaching partnerships and relationships were part of the principal’s vision.

**Interview Question Two:**

Does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?

a. If yes, how does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?

b. If no, what do you think would foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?

In response to Interview Question Two, the data from Table 11 indicated the overall responses to interview question two, does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school.

**Table 11**

*Interview Question 2 Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Yes-A</th>
<th>No-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers
Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, three out of five general education teacher participants (60%) answered yes in response to interview question two, does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. Two out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) answered yes in response to interview question two, does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. Two out of five general education teacher participants (40%) answered no in response to interview question two does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. One out of three special education teacher participants (33.3%) answered no to interview question two, does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school.

In response to Interview Question Two, the data from Table 12 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated the principal fosters collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school.

The eight general and special education research study participants were asked how does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. Four of eight participants (50%) including two general and two special education teachers indicated collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams. A special education teacher noted that the administrators keep collaborative partners together who are compatible, who have requested to be together, and who have been proven through the success of the children. The general education teacher noted that while the co-teachers might have come common planning time, they don’t share the same lesson plans and are often not included with what kind of extra specially designed instruction or lesson plan inclusions that might be useful for even the non-co-teachers. A general education teacher (P1) stated, “So, a good way to
### Table 12

**Interview Question 2 Participant Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3*</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6*</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plans to include Specially Designed Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development and Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching and Non-Co-Teaching Teams Collaboration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/ Accommodations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

improve that collaboration would be to look at how they can include those specially designed instruction components for the non-co-taught classes and still have inclusion students, or for perhaps just a better idea of what the co-teaching team the co-teacher is doing.” Two of eight participants (25%), including two general education teachers identified that common planning fosters collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. A general education teacher noted that co-teachers have the same planning time, and in addition plan with a team that may not consist of a collaborative environment. Three out of eight participants (37.5%), including one general and two special education teachers shared that professional development and training fosters collaboration amongst teams in the school. A general education teacher (P4) stated, “the principal does foster collaboration through our professional developments in our trainings. There is a conversation about co-teaching with everyone.” Three
of eight participants (37.5%) including two general and one special education teacher recalled co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams’ collaboration in the school. A general education teacher noted in the beginning of the year, the special education department gives a briefing to all the teachers on what they can do, especially if not a co-teacher. One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher identified student services and accommodations fosters collaboration amongst teams in the school. A general education teacher (P5) stated, “An elective teacher, like an art teacher, obviously gets those students accommodation. We have a very open school in terms of the art teacher can go to the special education teacher or the case manager and note what the student needs to be doing during the resource hour.”

In summary, according to the data, three of eight (37.5%) participants mentioned that lesson plans to include specially designed instruction fosters collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. Three of eight (37.5%) participants recalled professional development and training to foster collaboration amongst teams, and three of eight Two of eight participants (25%), including two general education teachers identified that common planning fosters collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. Two of eight participants (25%), including one general and one special education teacher individually mentioned student services and accommodations, and compatible partnerships collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. The data from Table 12 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated the principal fosters collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school.
Interview Question Three:

Does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school?

a. If yes, in what ways does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school?

b. If no, what ways do you think co-teaching expectations should be communicated to all instructional staff in the school?

In response to Interview Question Three, the data from Table 13 indicated the overall responses to interview question three, does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school.

Table 13

*Interview Question 3 Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Yes-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, two out of five general education teacher participants (40%) answered yes in response to interview question three, does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school. Two
out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) answered yes in response to interview question three, does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school. Three out of five general education teacher participants (60%) answered no in response to interview question two does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school. One out of three special education teacher participants (33.3%) answered no in response to interview question two, does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school. Generally, in response to this question, four respondents replied yes and four replied no, but the proportions of special education teacher participants and general education teacher participants varied.

In response to Interview Question Three, the data from Table 14 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated mixed reviews on the principal communicating co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school.

**Table 14**

*Interview Question 3 Participant Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations and</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies as Regular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Co-teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teachers and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Co-teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*
The eight general and special education research study participants were asked does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school. Five of eight participants (62.5%), including three general and two special education teachers indicated that the principal communicated expectations and strategies as regular teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school. A general education teacher noted the expectations of what is going on in a co-teaching class not widely shared, and making that more common and vernacular, or even just as part of what is expected of all teachers would probably be helpful.

Also, a general education teacher (P4) stated, “The administrators would best communicate these co-teaching strategies through our meetings, and there is this expectation that the co-teachers are treated the exact same in the classroom and across the board. So regardless of one teacher may be a special education teacher and one may be a general education teacher, the students are to receive them the same, and to experience them essentially the same.” Three of eight participants (37.5%), including two general and one special education teacher mentioned that general and special education co-teaching teams communicate in the school. A special education teacher noted that the administrators discuss, during preschool week, about the content teachers teaching their content, and the special educational resource teacher helping to provide specifically designed instruction and accommodations to the resource students. The administrators also want to make sure that our expectation is making sure that they provide the training that we need, and we provide what the students need to make their learning as successful as possible.

One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher individually shared those observations between co-teachers and non-co-teachers. A general education teacher (P7) stated, “If the principals had teachers who don’t have any co-taught classes, they might benefit from
going in and watching people who are successfully co-teaching classes would be very helpful and might give or eliminate some of the stereotypes of having to teach a co-taught class.”

In summary, according to the data, five of eight (62.5%) of participants mentioned expectations and strategies as regular teaching expectations communicated to all instructional staff in the school. Three of eight participants (37.5%), including two general and one special education teacher mentioned that general and special education co-teaching teams communicate in the school. One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher individually shared those observations between co-teachers and non-co-teachers.

**Interview Question Four:**

**Does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?**

a. If yes, how does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?

b. If no, what do you think would facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?

In response to Interview Question Four, the data from Table 15 indicated the overall responses to interview question four, does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams.

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, one out of five general education teacher participants (20%) answered yes in response to interview question four, does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. Three out of three special education teacher participants (100%) answered yes in response to interview question four, does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. Four out of five general education teacher participants (80%) answered no in response to interview
Table 15

Interview Question 4 Yes/No Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes-A</th>
<th>No-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

question four does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams.

In response to Interview Question Four, the data from Table 16 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated mixed reviews on the principal facilitating the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. The eight general and special education research study participants were asked does the principal facilitates the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher indicated background, knowledge, and interest in the selection of co-teaching teams. A special education teacher (P3) stated, “The administrators try their best to pair teachers who would work well together.” Four of eight participants (50%), including two general and two special education teachers mentioned teaching content knowledge in the selection of co-teaching teams. A special education teacher noted that the administrators ask the teachers what they would be comfortable teaching so that they can pair them up with a content
Table 16

*Interview Question 4 Participants Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3*</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6*</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background, Knowledge, and Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Content Knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Requests, Recommendations, and Student Success</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

teacher they feel comfortable teaching together in that co teaching situation. Three of eight participants (37.5%), including two general and one special education teacher shared interpersonal feedback in the selection of co-teaching teams. A general education teacher (P4) stated, “My co-teacher from last year and I had a good rapport; we worked well together. Our administration team saw that and this year I have the same co-teacher. So, it just kind of helps us to ease into the year, we already kind of know what we have going on, and we just kind of get to keep rolling.” Three of eight participants (37.5%), including one general and two special education teachers recalled teacher requests, recommendations, and student success in the selection of co-teaching teams. A special education teacher noted the principal really does take into consideration our requests and recommendations through classroom observations and through students’ success in their scores. A special education teacher (P8) stated, “The administrators, at the end of the year, will send out a questionnaire and ask how did this year go? Did you work well with the teacher that you were assigned to? Are you comfortable with the
subject matter? Is there another subject that you think you would be more suited to teach? Is there another teacher that you would prefer to work with? Because you think that it would be a good relationship and be compatible? So yes, they do ask for our feedback at the end of the year.”

In summary, according to the data, four of eight (50%) participants mentioned teaching content knowledge, three of eight (37.5%) participants recalled interpersonal feedback, three of eight (37.5%) participants shared teacher requests, recommendations, and student success. One of eight participants (12.5%) including one general and two special education teachers indicated individually that background, knowledge, and interest.

**Interview Question Five:**

**Does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning?**

a. If yes, how does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning?

b. If no, how do you think co-teaching teams could be ensured common planning?

In response to Interview Question Five, the data from Table 17 indicated the overall responses to interview question five, does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning.

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, three out of five general education teacher participants (60%) answered yes in response to interview question five, does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning. Two out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) answered yes in response to interview question five, does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning. Two out of five general education teacher participants (40%) answered no in response to interview question two does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning. One out of three special education teacher participants
Table 17

*Interview Question 5 Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Yes-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Yes-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

(33.3%) answered no in response to interview question two does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning.

In response to Interview Question Five, the data from Table 18 indicated the overall responses to interview question five, does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning.

The eight general and special education research study participants were asked does the principal ensures co-teaching teams common planning. Six of eight participants (75%), including four general and two special education teachers indicated the co-teaching team’s same schedule. A special education teacher (P3) stated, “The administrators make sure that the co teaching teams have the same schedule so that they have the same planning time to collaborate and plan effectively.” A general education teacher noted this year the co-teacher and I have common planning. We have six co-taught classes so our schedule sort of demanded that we would have common planning. Two of eight participants (25%) including two general education teachers...
Table 18

Interview Question 5 Participant Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3*</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6*</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Teams Same Schedule and Same Planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design to Master Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teacher and Case-Manager Duties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

shared design to master schedule. A general education teacher (P2) stated, “The way that the principal ensures common planning is by design to the master schedule; making sure that the common planning times are during the same off period. So, common planning helps to make sure that there is a cohesiveness between the general education teacher and the special education teacher.” One of eight participants (12.5 %) including two general teachers individually recalled department meetings. A general education teacher noted that we do have department meetings so we can communicate with a co-teacher and plan during that time. Two of eight participants (25%), including two general teachers identified co-teacher and case-manager duties. A special education teacher (P8) stated, “It used to be that I would have a teacher duty and a planning block. The special education teacher’s duty was case manager duties. So, that was when I would get my data, pull my students for data collection, and see how they are doing on their goals.”

In summary, according to the data, three of eight (37.5%) participants mentioned co-teaching teams same schedule, and three of eight (37.5%) participants recalled co-teaching teams
same planning. Two out of 8 (25%) participants shared design to master schedule ensures co-teaching teams common planning. Two out of 8 (25%) participants mentioned co-teacher and case manager duties. One of eight participants (12.5%) including two general education teachers individually recalled department meetings ensure co-teaching teams common planning.

**Interview Question Six:**

Does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school?

a. If yes, how does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school?

b. If no, what do you think collaboration between the principal, co-teachers, and co-teaching teams could be in the school?

In response to Interview Question Six, the data from Table 19 indicated the overall responses to interview question six, does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school.

**Table 19**

*Interview Question 6 Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes-A</td>
<td>No-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*
Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, three out of five general education teacher participants (60%) answered yes in response to interview question six, does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. One out of three special education teacher participants (33.3%) answered yes in response to interview question six, does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. Two out of five general education teacher participants (40%) answered no in response to interview question six, does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. Two out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) answered no in response to interview question six, does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school.

In response to Interview Question Six, the data from Table 20 indicated the overall responses to interview question six, does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school.

Table 20

*Interview Question 6 Participant Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Teams</td>
<td>P1   P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Schedule and Scheduling</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Team Meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation and Debrief Session</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*
The eight general and special education research study participants were asked does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. Four of eight participants (50%), including two general and two special education teachers, mentioned observation and debrief session. A special education teacher (P6) stated, “For collaboration between the principal and the co-teachers, maybe the principal could do an observation of the collaborative teams and then do a debrief session afterwards. I think just meeting with the co-teachers after observing them would be the best practice.” A general education teacher noted that if the principal came in and watched pairs that were being successful and gave the pairs opportunities in a workshop where successful partnerships are talking about what is working, so co-teaching partnerships that are newer, or maybe not cohesive, could have an opportunity to ask some questions or see some modeled activities. One of eight participants (12.5%) including a special education teacher indicated co-teaching teams planning supports the principal collaborating with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. A special education teacher (P3) stated, “The principals have scheduled meetings during planning time or after school so they can have time to discuss what is working and what is not working because this makes it more effective in collaborating with the co-teaching teams.” One of eight participants (12.5%) including a general education teacher mentioned master schedule and scheduling supports the principal collaborating with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. A general education teacher noted that better collaboration with the principal and co-teaching teams could be addressed with the master schedule, and scheduling especially the misunderstanding about what co-teaching is and what students are doing in co-taught classes is because of the lack of collaboration. A general education teacher (P1) stated, “So having the principal’s master schedule and other administrators involved with that could improve collaboration.” Two of eight
participants (25%), including two general education teachers shared monthly team meetings supports the principal collaborating with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. A general education teacher (P2) stated, “Our principals join us monthly in our team meetings to ensure that the collaborative team is following the guidelines that have been set forth by the principal, and to ensure that we partner together.” One of eight participants (12.5%), including a general education teacher recalled open communication supports the principal collaborating with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. A general education teacher noted that the assigned assistant principal does collaborate with the co-teaching teams by reviewing lesson plans, coming to our meetings, discussing with us how well we are working together? what's going to be more helpful? what do you need to succeed.

In summary, according to the data, three of eight (37.5%) participants mentioned observation and debrief session, and two of eight participants (25%), including two general education teachers shared monthly team meetings supports the principal collaborating with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school. One of eight (12.5%) participants individually mentioned co-teaching teams planning, and master schedule and scheduling.

Interview Question Seven:

Does the principal provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school?

a. If yes, what professional development opportunities does the principal provide to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school?

b. If no, what professional development opportunities do you think would provide support to instructional staff and co-teaching teams in the school?
In response to Interview Question Seven, the data from Table 21 indicated the overall responses to interview question seven, does the principal provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school.

Table 21

*Interview Question 7 Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, four out of five general education teacher participants (80%) answered yes in response to interview question seven, does the principal provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school. Two out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) answered yes in response to interview question seven, does the principal provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school. One out of five general education teacher participants (20%) answered no in response to interview question seven, does the principal provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school. One out of three special education teacher participants (33.3%) answered no in response to interview question seven,
does the principal provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school.

In response to Interview Question Seven, the data from Table 22 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated the principal provides professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school.

Table 22

*Interview Question 7 Participant Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3*</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6*</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Trainings and Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and Veteran Teachers with Collaborative Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings, Conferences, and Mentoring Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings-General Education Teacher and Subject Matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings-Special Education Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

The eight general and special education research study participants were asked does the principal provides professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school. One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher indicated co-teaching trainings and guidelines provide professional development
opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school. A general education teacher (P1) stated, “Co-teaching types of training or guidelines, which have been very helpful, could be great in building that for the school if we had more time for those types of developments.” One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher mentioned new and veteran teachers with collaborative partners provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school. A general education teacher noted that the principal does provide professional development opportunities, but provides it initially to the new teachers, teachers who are new to the district or new to teaching. So, they will be partnered with their collaborative partner during the mentoring program. A general education teacher (P2) stated “More professional development needs to be strictly geared to the veteran teachers and their collaborative teachers.” Five of eight participants (62.5%), including three general and two special education teachers shared training, conferences, and mentoring programs. A special education teacher noted the administrators have provided, during the planning time, training through different organizations such as T-TAC, or with our special education supervisors, they collaborate with them to provide the co-teaching teams with co-teaching situations using a video via email or in a meeting. A general education teacher (P5) stated, “Before school started, we had a day where we signed up for different sessions. One of the sessions was collaboration in the classroom. We had an expert in the field talk about collaboration. In January, we will have another session. I think it is an ongoing process to communicate and to collaborate, but we do have those professional development opportunities at least twice a year.” Two of eight participants (25%), including one general and one special education teacher recalled training for general education teachers and subject matter. A general education teacher noted that the county does have professional development. The co-teacher and
the special education teacher attend the general education curriculum professional development for the department they are assigned. A general education teacher (P7) stated, “So, I think the best professional development might be to ensure that the co-teacher, and the special education teacher have the content knowledge, and likewise, that the general education teacher gets some basic training in special education.” Two of eight participants (25%), including one general and one special education teacher identified training for special education teachers. The special education teacher (P8) stated, “It would be helpful to have some professional development regarding actual differentiation practices in the subject matter.”

In summary, according to the data, five of eight (62.5%) participants mentioned trainings, conferences, and mentoring programs, two of eight participants (25%), including one general and one special education teacher, mentioned training for general education teachers and subject matter, and two of eight participants (25%), including one general and one special education teacher shared training for special education teachers. One of eight (12.5%) participants individually shared co-teaching training and guidelines, new and veteran teachers with collaborative partner.

Interview Question Eight:

Does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?

a. If yes, in what ways does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?

b. If no, what people or instructional resources do you think could be provided to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?
In response to Interview Question Eight, the data from Table 23 indicated the overall responses to interview question eight, does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school.

**Table 23**

*Interview Question 8 Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes-A</th>
<th>No-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, three out of five general education teacher participants (60%) answered yes in response to interview question eight, does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school. Two out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) answered yes in response to interview question eight, does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school. Two out of five general education teacher participants (40%) answered no in response to interview question eight, does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school. One out of three special education teacher participants (33.3%) answered no in response to interview question eight, does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school.
provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school.

In response to Interview Question Eight, the data from Table 24 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated the principal provides people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school.

Table 24

Interview Question 8 Participant Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3*</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6*</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personnel-Special Education Teachers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Classroom Observations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development-Best Practices/Instructional Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

The eight general and special education research study participants were asked does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school. Three of eight participants (37.5%), including three general education teachers indicated the principal provides additional personnel-special education teachers to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school. A general education teacher (P4) stated, “So, last year I had not only a co-teacher, but we also had an instructional assistant in
the classroom which was wonderful to help us kind of target some of those IEP goals, like small groups, read aloud testing, and things of that nature. The administrators also make sure that we have space to conduct those things.” A general education teacher noted that there were two special education teachers, one works with our autism students, and she pushes into our classrooms. The other special education teacher works with the students who are emotionally disabled and supports positive based behavior with positive behavior interventions. One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher mentioned ongoing professional development. A general education teacher noted that other than our mentoring program, we do not have an ongoing program where the two teachers, general and special education, have an opportunity to learn and grow and develop as a unit. A general education teacher (P2) stated, “That's where they would be enhanced to professional development that they would attend together.” One of eight participants (12.5%), including one special education teacher shared peer classroom observations as the principal providing people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school. A special education teacher (P3) stated, “The administrators have provided training through T-TAC, special education supervisors have given suggestions on training, arrangements for different co-teaching teams to visit each classroom and observe co-teaching experiences, collaborate and talk about what worked and what did not work.” Four of eight participants (50%), including two general and two special education teachers recalled professional development-best practices and instructional resources. A special education teacher noted that monthly department meetings are held for the special education department where we talk about best practices, instructional resources, and how to strengthen ourselves in the classroom with our co-teachers.
In summary, according to the data, four of eight (50%) participants mentioned professional development-best practices and instructional resources, and three of eight participants (37.5%) including three general education teachers indicated the principal provides additional personnel-special education teachers to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school. One of eight (12.5%) participants individually mentioned ongoing professional development, and peer classroom observations.

**Interview Question Nine:**

**Does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?**

a. If yes, what meaningful incentives does the principal offer instructional staff to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?

b. If no, what meaningful incentives do you think offered to instructional staff would encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?

In response to Interview Question Nine, the data from Table 25 indicated the overall responses to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school.

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, five out of five general education teacher participants (100%) answered no in response to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. Two out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) answered no in response to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. Seven out of eight general education teacher participants (87.5%)
Table 25

Interview Question 9 Yes/No Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers

answered no in response to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. One out of eight general and special education teacher participants (12.5%) answered yes in response to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school.

In response to Interview Question Nine, the data from Table 26 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated the principal does not offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school.

The eight general and special education research study participants were asked does the principal offers instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. Four of eight participants (50%) including two general and two special education teachers indicated benefits of collaborative teachers as the principal
offering instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. A general education teacher (P5) stated, “When I look at my class list, and see that half of my class has IEPs, and 504s, I want a resource teacher in there with me. I want a collaborative teacher because it is overwhelming. As a classroom teacher, if I have a class of, you know, 28 kids, and 14 of them have 504s and IEPs, that is a lot for me to keep track, and I rely really heavily on the resource teacher to be able to focus me and be like, Okay, let's make a spreadsheet to make sure that these students all get the accommodations that they need. While I'm trying to teach history, I need that extra layer of support to help me make sure I'm meeting all those students' accommodations. So, for me, it is an incentive just inherently to have that person in my classroom to offer me a layer of support.” A special education teacher noted that when discussing a team that works together, they will at least have two people that can share ideas whereas one may have a different perspective than the other. When teaching the students and doing the different models, they are sharing responsibility so that no one person is always in front of the class teaching the lesson. A special education teacher (P6) stated, “For collaboration between the principal and the co-teachers, maybe the principal could do an observation of the collaborative teams and then do a debrief session afterwards. I think just meeting with the co-
teachers after observing them would be the best practice.” A general education teacher noted that if the principal came in and watched pairs that were being successful and gave the pairs opportunities in a workshop where successful partnerships are talking about what is working, so co-teaching partnerships that are newer, or maybe not cohesive, could have an opportunity to ask some questions or see some modeled activities. One of eight participants (37.5%), including one general education teacher mentioned monetary compensation as the principal offering instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. A general education teacher (P2) stated, “There should be monetary incentives for teachers such as math and special education which have a critical shortage. So, if those two areas are areas that are critical, then there should be some monetary compensation for those critical areas.” One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher recalled extra planning for case manager duties. A general education teacher (P7) stated, “I would see as an incentive, maybe having an extra planning time to accommodate the number of special education meetings that we attend, but it would be nice if I had a planning time set aside for those for those meetings, which are required and to make the parent contacts and to be able to collaborate or contact with case managers who sometimes are really a great resource with our students.”

In summary, according to the data, three of eight (37.5%) participants mentioned benefits of collaborative teachers as the principal offering instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. One of eight (12.5%) participants individually mentioned monetary compensation, common planning with collaborative partner, and extra planning for case manager duties.
Interview Question Ten:

Does the principal provide additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school?

a. If yes, what additional support does the principal provide for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school?

b. If no, what additional support do you think provided for the instructional staff could enable co-teaching to work in the school?

In response to Interview Question Ten, the data from Table 27 indicated the overall responses to interview question ten, does the principal provide additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school.

Table 27

*Interview Question 10 Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Yes-A</th>
<th>No-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, three out of five general education teacher participants (60%) answered yes in response to interview question ten, does the principal provide additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work
in the school. Two out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) answered yes in response to interview question ten, does the principal provide additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school. Two out of five general education teacher participants (40%) answered no in response to interview question ten, does the principal provide additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school. One out of three special education teacher participants (33.3%) answered no in response to interview question ten, does the principal provide additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school.

In response to Interview Question Ten, the data from Table 28 indicated that the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants indicated the principal provides additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school.

Table 28

*Interview Question 10 Participant Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3*</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6*</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time for Common Planning and Monitoring Students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching Instructional Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Time and Physical Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*

The eight general and special education research study participants were asked how the principal provides additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in
the school. One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher indicated time for common planning and monitoring students provides additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school. A general education teacher noted that in addition to being a co-teacher, they have to continue to perform other duties such as being a monitoring teacher for a number of students. Therefore, the loss of common planning to monitor students or complete other responsibilities lessens teaching. One of eight participants (12.5%), including one special education teacher mentioned professional development provides additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school. A special education teacher (P6) stated, “If we request some sort of professional development, the administrators will absolutely make it happen for us. So, that would be supported. It would be more of us finding maybe the professional development, but they would definitely support it.”

Four of eight participants (50%), including three general and one special education teacher shared co-teaching instructional staff. A general education teacher noted that when the teacher makes a recommendation as to what they see, the principal allows the classes to be structured in a way where the students can be best served when an additional instructional assistant is required to make sure that the needs of the students are met. A general education teacher (P5) stated, “I rely on that additional support in the classroom to make sure that I am following all the accommodations and everything that needs to be done for that student. Two of eight participants (25%), including one general and one special education teacher recalled more time and physical space. A general education teacher noted that facilitating the classroom space, facilitating instructional assistants, as well as co-teachers, when and ensuring that we have the materials that we need provide the additional support.
In summary, according to the data, four of eight (50%) participants mentioned co-teaching instructional staff, two of eight participants (25%) recalled more time and physical space, and one of eight (12.5%) participants individually shared time for common planning and monitoring students, and professional development.

**Interview Additional Question:**

Is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

In response to Interview Additional Question, the data from Table 29 indicated the overall responses to interview additional question, is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

**Table 29**

*Interview Additional Question Yes/No Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes-A</th>
<th>No-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*

Of the eight general and special education teacher participants, four out of five general education teacher participants (80%) answered the additional interview question, is there
anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. One out of three special education teacher participants (33.3%) answered the additional interview question, is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. One out of five general education teacher participants (20%) did not answer the additional interview question, is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. Two out of three special education teacher participants (66.6%) did not answer the additional interview question, is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

In response to Interview Additional Question, the data from Table 30 indicated the overall responses from general and special education teacher participants in providing additional information that would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.
Table 30

*Interview Additional Question Participant Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Responses</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3*</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
<th>P6*</th>
<th>P7</th>
<th>P8*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a Clear Expectation of Co-teaching</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Scheduling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Communication for Effective Co-teachers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in Staffing Co-teaching Teams, Assigning Students, and More Special Education Teachers in the Collaborative Environment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Time and Physical Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special Education Teachers*

The eight general and special education research study participants were asked is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. Four of eight participants (50%) including three general education and one special education teacher participants indicated flexibility in staffing co-teaching teams, assigning students, and more special education teachers in the collaborative environment. A special education teacher (P3) stated, “The helpful thing in identifying leadership is the flexibility that you have because constantly there are many changes going in special education information, the staffing, deciding on the co-teaching teams, even the changing of the population of the students.” A general education teacher noted that in a perfect world, you would have a low student to teacher ratio, especially in classes where you have students with disabilities. Also, you will have special education teachers in the classroom, more
than one, maybe two or three special education teachers. A general education teacher (P2) stated, “So, if there were a perfect world, we could have multiple teachers in the room where those students, as the instruction is being given, could get immediate assistance. So, they don't get discouraged, and they can continue to grow and to learn.” One of eight participants (12.5%) including one general education teacher indicated providing a clear expectation for co-teaching as helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. A general education teacher (P1) stated, “I believe the administrators could help to provide a clear expectation of what co-teaching is and what it isn't. There seems to be a lot of confusion.” One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher mentioned better scheduling as helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. A general education teacher noted that better scheduling and communication about how co-teachers can be effective, what co-teachers are doing with students, what students can be in a co-teaching classroom, awareness about the needs of teachers and students in a co-teaching model. One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher, shared better communication for effective co-teachers. A general education teacher noted that in a perfect world, you would have a low student to teacher ratio, especially in classes where you have students with disabilities. Also, you will have special education teachers in the classroom, more than one, maybe two or three special education teachers. “So, if there were a perfect world, we could have multiple teachers in the room where those students, as the instruction is being given, could get immediate assistance. So, they don't get discouraged, and they can continue to grow and to learn.” One of eight participants (12.5%), including one general education teacher identified more time and physical space as helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in
support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. A general education teacher (P7) stated, “I think if the principal made more of an effort to observe what is going on in the classes, to see what students like, what is working and what is not, and then make active changes that aren't punitive, but that is again, time. We all need more time and more space.”

In summary, according to the data, two of eight (25%) participants individually mentioned flexibility in staffing co-teaching teams and assigning students and more special education teachers in the collaborative environment. One of eight participants (12.5%) individually recalled providing a clear expectation for co-teaching, better scheduling, better communication for effective co-teachers, and more time and physical space.

Summary

The research study interviews collected data from the general and special education teachers on their perception of the principal leadership practices in support of co-teaching as a service-delivery model in high schools. Eight general and special education teacher participants responded to the general information and interview questions based on their co-teaching experience. The researcher selected snowball sampling to obtain information from the identified participants.

The general information questions analysis of the data indicated seven of eight (88%) had zero to 15 scheduled co-teaching professional developments. Six of eight (75%) general and special education teacher participants have zero to 15 years of high school teaching experience, co-teaching experience, and co-teaching training. Five of eight (63%) of study participants are general education teachers. Four of eight (50%) general and special education teacher participants are currently in an urban setting. Three out of 8 (38%) co-taught or currently teach History.
The interview questions analysis of the data indicated three of three (100%) special education teachers responded yes to interview questions one does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school. Three of three (100%) special education teachers responded yes to interview question four, does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. Five of five (100%) general education teachers responded no to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. Five of eight (62.5%) general and special education teachers provided additional information to the additional question, is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. Three of eight (37.5%) provided no additional information. The data indicated that the general and special education teacher participants’ responses validate perceived leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service-delivery model in high schools. In Chapter Five, the major findings are discussed. Implications for practitioners and recommendations for future research are also presented.
Chapter 5

Findings, Implications, and Conclusions

The purpose of this qualitative study was to identify the perceptions of high school general and special education teachers in reference to the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. Chapter Five focuses on the findings of this research study, implications of the findings, and suggestions for future research. This chapter concludes with a summary and personal reflections on this research study.

In this study, the high school general and special education teachers who currently participate or previously participated in collaborative co-teaching team models were selected using snowball, chain, or network sampling, the most common form of purposeful sampling, that involves locating a few key participants who easily meet the criteria you have established for participants in the study. Then as you interview these key participants, you ask each one to refer you to other participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 98). The eight high school general and special education teachers who have co-taught or are currently co-teaching were identified as participants in this study. The eight high school participants currently are teaching in urban, suburban, suburban/urban, and suburban/rural school settings. The eight high school participants’ years of co-teaching experience range from zero to five through 26-30 years. The eight high school participants have co-taught or are currently co-teaching History, English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science courses. The research questions that grounded this study were:

1. What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by general education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?
2. What are the leadership practices of principals, as perceived by special education teachers, in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

Discussion of Findings

The researcher interviewed eight high school general and special education teachers to identify the perceived leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching in high schools. The analysis of the data collected during individual interviews identified five findings, which are discussed in the following sections. Several findings were identified within this study, following the review of responses from eight participants and emerging themes from analyzed data.

Finding 1

High school general and special education teachers indicated that principals conveyed a common vision for co-teaching with all staff members. In response to interview question one, the participants in the study were asked does the principal conveys a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school. In Table 9, Six out of eight teacher participants (75%) responded yes to interview question one, does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school. All special education teacher participants, three out of three (100%) answered yes to interview question one, does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school. Two of eight (25%) participants responded no. However, in Table 10, four of eight (50%) participants indicated co-teaching models was how the principal conveyed a common vision for co-teaching with all staff members.

These findings are associated with previous research conducted by McDonald (2013), Hedrick (2016), and Howle (2020). McDonald (2013) study participants indicated the principal should establish a common vision for collaborative co-teaching and provide an understanding of
the appearance of co-teaching in the school and communicate this to colleagues (McDonald, 2013, p. 83). Hedrick (2016) noted one of the findings from a high school administrator who participated in the study was in order for an administrator to have a shared vision, teachers, both new and experienced, must understand and value co-teaching, and a shared vision will help create the school culture, which affects everything in the school (p. 120). According to Howle (2020), the administrator’s vision is also important in creating an inclusive environment and expectations because they influence how teachers perceive their instruction for all students (p. 181).

Finding 2

**High school general and special education teachers indicated that professional development was provided by the principal to support implementing a co-teaching model.**

In response to interview question seven, the participants in the study were asked does the principal provides professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school. In Table 21, Six out of eight participants (75%) responded yes. Two out of eight (25%) participants responded no. However, in Table 22, five of eight (62.5%) participants indicated training, conferences, and mentoring programs were provided as co-teaching professional development.

These findings are associated with previous research conducted by McDonald (2013), Rose (2018), and Evertson (2021). McDonald (2013) noted that teachers and staff serving students in a co-teaching service delivery model need ongoing professional development to address co-teaching model expectations for teachers, improve collaboration skills, and assess progress toward full co-teaching implementation (pp. 88-90). Rose (2018) noted that professional development is a practice that should be considered when instituting any new co-
teaching model and is particularly important when developing a co-teaching implementation plan (Rose, 2018, p. 60). The research of Rose (2018) suggested professional development recommendations to facilitate in the implementation of the co-teaching model: a) co-teaching model training for administrators; b) provide professional development for staff; c) communicate areas of expertise; d) provide specialized instruction (pp. 60-61). Also, the research study conducted by Evertson (2020) indicated that professional development that promotes long-term and continuous improvement focuses on the teacher learning process and is embedded in the teaching practice as experiential, reflective, and cognitive learning that occurs as part of professional practice and through peer observation and support (pp. 59-60).

Finding 3

High school general and special education teachers indicated that principal collaboration and communication with co-teaching teams was provided for the co-teaching model. In response to interview question two, the participants in the study were asked does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. In Table 11, five out of eight participants (62.5%) responded yes. Two out of eight (25%) participants responded no. However, in Table 12, four of eight (50%) participants indicated co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams’ collaboration. In response to interview question six, does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school, in Table 19, four out of 8 participants (50%) responded yes, and four out of 8 participants (50%) responded no. In Table 20, four out of eight participants (50%) indicated teachers viewed observation and debrief sessions as collaboration.

These findings are associated with previous research conducted by Howser (2015), Sciullo (2017), and Howle (2020). Principals can ensure that co-teachers have frequent and
consistent communication that promotes collaboration (Howser, 2015, p. 10). The purpose of the Howser study was to “examine the types of principal practices perceived by teachers, coaches, administrators, and principals to be most meaningful in the support of a collaborative co-teaching service delivery model in the context of the least restrictive environment” (Howser, 2015, p. 10). According to Howle, principals set an expectation that co-teachers collaborate and work towards meeting perceived goals of co-teaching, and principals were credited with arranging the time for teacher collaboration in the master schedule (Howle, 2020, p. 176). Howle (2020) conducted a research study with high school principals and teachers to determine the perceived supports for co-teaching and cited these findings: “a) principals created a vision of inclusion; b) sharing resources; c) professional development; d) structures for collaboration; and e) principals communicate expectations to all staff and set high expectations for the learning of all students” (p. 181). In the research study of Sciullo (2016) a qualitative study was conducted to evaluate the role of school leadership within the context of teacher collaboration. The themes that resulted from the Sciullo study were ensure “a) the school leaders’ meaning of collaboration to include many of the characteristics; b) the principal’s experience and training impact the school; c) the school leader defines collaboration between general and special education teachers; d) the school leader acknowledges that collaboration involves each discipline working together; and e) the school leader employs an open door policy” (pp. 100-105).

**Finding 4**

High school general and special education teachers indicated that co-teaching expectations were communicated by the principal to all staff members to foster a collaborative environment. In response to interview question three, the participants in the study were asked does the principal communicates co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in
the school. In Table 13, four out of eight participants (50%) responded yes, and four out of 8 participants (50%) responded no. In Table 14, five out of eight (62.5%) indicated expectations and strategies as regular teaching expectations.

These findings are associated with previous research conducted by McDonald (2013), Takacs (2015), and McCaw (2019). The McDonald study indicated that the school leader must set expectations for co-teaching as a service delivery model for co-teaching partnerships, for individual co-teachers, and for student learning within co-teaching classrooms (McDonald, 2013, p. 77). The results of the McDonald study as it relates to teacher expectations for co-teaching found that the school leader must a) have an expectation that results in teacher ownership; b) the actions initiated by the school leader for expectations flow into actions for ownership; c) the leader must communicate co-teaching expectations; d) collaborate with co-teachers; and e) provide a common vision of co-teaching implementation for the school (McDonald, 2013, pp. 77-78). In the research by Takacs, the goal of this study investigated teachers’ perceptions of instructional practices for students with disabilities in the secondary co-taught classrooms with the findings revealing administrators actively supported co-teachers, provided them with clear co-teaching expectations, co-teachers expected to participate actively in student learning, and support co-teaching partners (Takacs, 2015, pp. 6-7). Also, the findings of the Takacs study indicated that administrators actively supported co-teachers, “provided them with clear co-teaching expectations, co-teachers expected to participate actively in student learning, support co-teaching partners, and the need for professional development” (Takacs, 2015, pp. 201-204). The research study by McCaw (2019) conducted interviews with research study participants from two building sites utilizing interviews, focus groups, and observations to understand teacher and administrator perceptions of the co-teaching model for participants in the public school
district (pp. 25-26). The researcher McCaw (2019) cited findings in his study related to shared responsibility, co-planning, co-teachers’ relationship, varied co-teaching approaches, and administrator expectations of the co-teaching model (pp. 108-109).

**Finding 5**

**High school general and special education teachers indicated that administrative support is needed for effective co-teaching.** In response to interview question four, the participants in the study were asked does the principal facilitates the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. In Table 15, four out of eight (50%) participants responded yes to interview question four, does the principal facilitates the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. All special education teacher participants, three out of three (100%) indicated yes to interview question four, does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. Four out of eight participants (50%) responded no. In Table 16, four out of eight participants (50%) indicated teaching content knowledge. In response to interview question five, the participants in the study were asked does the principal ensures co-teaching teams common planning.

In Table 17, five out of eight participants (62.5%) responded yes. Three out of eight participants (37.5%) responded no. In Table 18, six out of eight participants (75%) indicated co-teaching teams with the same schedule and planning. In response to interview question eight, the participants in the study were asked does the principal provides people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school. In Table 23, five out of eight participants (62.5%) responded yes. Three out of eight participants (37.5%) responded no. In Table 24, four out of eight participants (50%) indicated professional development-best practices/instructional resources. In response to interview question nine, the participants in the
study were asked does the principal offers instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. In Table 25, two out of eight participants (25%) responded yes to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. Six out of eight participants (75%) responded no to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. All general education teacher participants (100%) answered no in response to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. In Table 26, four out of eight participants (50%) indicated benefits of collaborative teachers. In response to interview question ten, the participants in the study were asked does the principal provides additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school. In Table 27, five out of eight participants (62.5%) responded yes. Three out of eight participants (37.5%) responded no. In Table 28, four out of eight participants (50%) indicated co-teaching instructional staff. In response to the interview additional question, the participants in the study were asked is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. In Table 29, five out of eight participants (62.5%) responded yes. Three out of eight participants (37.5%) responded no. In Table 30, four out of eight participants (50%) indicated flexibility in staffing, assigning students, and more special education teachers in the collaborative environment.

These findings are associated with previous research conducted by McDonald (2013), Stephen (2021), and Blevins (2019). The research of McDonald (2013) reinforced administrative
support for co-teaching in findings referencing the school leader needs to “a) establishing a timeline in the action plan with phases leading up to full implementation; b) scheduling of co-teaching teachers a common collaborative period for co-teaching partnerships; c) providing high-quality professional development for co-teaching; d) identifying teacher compatibility and buy-in for co-teaching” (p. 91-92). Stephen (2021) conducted this study with forty educators participating in one-on-one interviews to improve co-teaching strategies at a middle school. Three main themes emerged from the teacher interviews: “a) collaboration; b) selection of co-teachers; and c) training opportunities. The researcher identified two main themes from the focus group with special education teachers: a) collaboration, and b) administrative support” (pp. 84,89-90,94). Blevins (2019) administered a qualitative study to examine the role of administrative support for inclusive practices by interviewing teachers and principals in a participating district and suggested that scheduling, professional development, schoolwide culture, and relationships are critical to supporting inclusive practices (pp. 3,40-41).

Summary of Findings

The eight general and special education teachers who participated in this study have participated or currently participate in collaborative co-teaching in high school. Four of the eight participants (50%), two general education teachers and three special education teachers have six to 15 years of high school teaching experience. Three general education teachers individually have zero to five years of high school teaching experience, 21-25 years of high school teaching, and 31-35 years of high school teaching experience. After reviewing the participant responses and themes emerging from the analyzed data, five findings were identified in this study.

All special education teacher participants, three out of three (100%) answered yes to interview question one, does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all
instructional staff in the school. Three out of three (100%) indicated yes to interview question four, does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams. In addition, all general education teacher participants (100%) answered no in response to interview question nine, does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school. Findings from this study indicated co-teaching teams with the same schedule and planning were reported by six out of eight participants (75%) general and special education teachers. The findings in this qualitative study suggested that training, conferences, and mentoring programs were reported five out of eight (62.5%). The findings also recommended expectations and strategies as regular teaching expectations were reported by five out of eight (62.5%). The findings further indicated co-teaching models, co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams collaborations, observations, and administrative support were reported four out of eight (50%) by general and special education teacher participants.

**Implications for Practice**

The findings of this study have implications for school divisions and high school principals as these division and school leaders identify the practices of principals’ leadership as perceived by general and special education teachers in support of co-teaching in high schools. School divisions and high school principals can use the findings of this study to inform school divisions and educational leadership programs on the leadership practices of high school principals perceived by general and special education teachers in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model. Based on the five findings of this study, there are five implications for discussion related to the current literature and future principal leadership for co-teaching studies: (a) developing and articulating a common vision for co-teaching, (b) allocating funds for job-
embedded co-teaching professional development, (c) providing scheduled collaborative opportunities with co-teaching teams, (d) conveying co-teaching expectations with all staff members, and (e) providing general and special education teachers continuous support.

**Implication 1**

The school division should provide school leaders with support to develop and articulate a common vision for co-teaching based on research and best practices.

Implication 1 is associated with Finding 1. The participants in this research study discussed how the principal conveyed a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff. The school division should establish a district-wide vision for co-teaching. District and school personnel with expertise and experience in co-teaching should be engaged in establishing the co-teaching district-wide vision to build teacher capacity. The high school principal should engage general and special education teachers in the development of a common vision for co-teaching.

**Implication 2**

The school division can allocate funds to provide job embedded co-teaching (for both the general and special educator) professional development, training, and conferences for full co-teaching implementation. Implication 2 is associated with Finding 2. The participants in this research study discussed how the principal provided professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school. The division and the high school principal can allocate contracted time for professional development to show a commitment to the co-teaching model. The division and the high school principal should locate local, regional, or national presenters to conduct professional development for co-teachers. The high school principal along with other staff members should have ongoing co-teaching professional development and training.
Implication 3

High school principals should provide scheduled collaborative opportunities with general and special education teachers working in co-teaching teams. Implication 3 is associated with Finding 3. The participants in this research study discussed how the principal fostered collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school. The high school principal should have scheduled opportunities to meet with co-teachers during department meetings, team meetings, and observation debrief sessions to discuss and to provide feedback on the co-teaching setting. The high school principal should discuss the components of the co-teaching model in professional learning communities with general and special education teachers. The high school principal, during meetings, can share co-teaching as an instructional model for all students as an effort to provide best practices and achieve high levels of learning.

Implication 4

High school principals should convey co-teaching expectations with all staff members in an effort to strengthen collaborative environments. Implication 4 is associated with Finding 4. The participants in this research study discussed how the principal communicated co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school. School divisions should create policies and procedures focused on co-teaching expectations for teachers involved in collaborative co-teaching. The high school principal should convey co-teaching expectations during faculty meetings, department meetings, team meetings, etc., to present an active role in conveying co-teaching expectations with all staff members.
Implication 5

High school principals should provide general and special education teachers continuous support in co-teaching collaborations. Implication 5 is associated with Finding 5. The participants in this research study discussed how selection of co-teaching teams, common planning, people or instructional resources, meaningful incentives, and additional support, are principal leadership practices that have provided continuous support for co-teaching collaborations. The high school principal should consider utilizing a co-teaching survey along with administrative input in the selection co-teaching teams. The high school principal should work with the school counselors in creating common planning and provide people resources to the co-teaching setting through the design of the master schedule. The high school principal should utilize school funds to purchase instructional resources and materials for the co-teaching settings. The division can allocate school improvement funds to be utilized as supplemental funds for teachers who select to participate in collaborative co-teaching. The high school principal can consider additional instructional staff in the classroom as an incentive for co-teaching.

Summary of Implications

The findings identified from the data collected in this study resulted in five implications for school divisions and high school principals. School divisions and high school principals can collaborate to ensure high school general and special education teachers in co-teaching collaborative settings are provided with a common vision to include expectations for co-teaching, ongoing, job-embedded professional development, and amenities that support co-teaching. Most importantly, the school division and the principal can continuously communicate
with general and special education teachers who provide instructional services to students in co-
teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.

**Suggestions for Future Studies**

The results of this study shared the general and special education teachers’ perceptions regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. The list below reflects suggestions for future studies to support school divisions and high school principals gain a more insightful understanding of the topic.

1. Conduct a study to determine if the impact of co-teaching teams being ensured common planning by the principal benefits the co-teaching model.
2. Conduct a study to identify the meaningful incentives for teachers, principals, and school divisions to implement co-teaching models at the elementary and secondary levels.
3. Increase the sample size of this study to include four to five general and special education teachers and principals in urban and suburban school divisions perceptions of the leadership practices of school leaders in support of co-teaching.
4. Consider a study that includes a case study on a particular school or school division with an effective model of co-teaching at the high school level.
5. Consider a study that includes a professional development model for training co-
teaching teams which include principals, general and special education teachers, and instructional assistants.

**Personal Reflections**

Reflecting on my personal experiences, conducting this qualitative research, and maintaining my sanity throughout this dissertation journey has provided me the opportunity to
ponder on my why. Why after 38 years in public education am I not retired? Why after 19 years out of 38 years (50%) of my professional career as a math facilitator, an elementary assistant principal, an elementary principal, a coordinator, and a high school assistant principal, I continuously look forward to reporting to school daily? Why did I not give up after experiencing some of the most devasting events in my life to include the loss of my grandmother, my niece and nephew, my husband, and my mother, that I did not give up? Why did I continue to move forward in my professional career after being reassigned several times and believing it was without just cause? Why after 19 years out of 38 (50%) of my professional career in the classroom teaching grades 4 and 5 in some of the most challenging schools in my division, did I continue to show up and to give 100% everyday? Why? Because this is my career, my profession, and my life’s work. So, affording me the opportunity to contribute to a body of research that could be utilized in supporting students was worth all my whys.

During this study, as a researcher, I gained a greater respect for researchers and the research process. In addition, I shifted my focus from high school principals to general and special education teachers currently in co-teaching collaborations. As I began to look deeper into the literature review and complete the interviews, it became apparent that general and special education teachers who participated in this study centered their responses on the needs of both teachers and students assigned to a co-teaching collaborative model. Throughout the qualitative interviews was the dedication and the determination of general and special education teachers to work in collaborative co-teaching settings and make a difference in the lives of all students. Study participants viewed co-teaching as collaborating to ensure that all of our students are receiving the same opportunities and education, regardless of their abilities or learning styles in the hopes that they will be able to thrive in our school. They also want to make sure that our
expectation is making sure that we provide the training that we need, and we provide what the students need to make their learning as successful as possible. One study participant noted that working to identify which students have which needs or would benefit best in a co-teaching environment, not just the inclusion students but non-inclusion students who could be successful or contribute to that collaborative learning environment. Also, a study participant shared the administrators allowed her to use project-based learning to ensure ability to reach as many kids as possible with that information. I can best be stated by this study participant, “And so if there were a perfect world, we could have multiple teachers in the room where those students as the instruction is being given. Those students could get immediate assistance so they do not get discouraged, and they can continue to grow and to learn. So that would be the one thing that I would wish for in a perfect collaborative environment.”

I hope this research will support principals, general, and special education teachers in collaborative co-teaching models in high schools by providing a vision for co-teaching with all staff, offering co-teaching professional development opportunities, collaborating, and communicating co-teaching expectations, and ensuring those amenities that contribute to co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.
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Subjects/Participants: High School general and special education teachers participating in collaborative co-teaching team models.

Instrument(s): The interview protocol (see Appendix H) will be designed by the researcher and used in this qualitative research study. The interview questions focus on the how and what of the principal leadership practices, as perceived by general and special education teachers, that support co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools. The interview protocol, which consist of an interview introduction, six general questions related to years of experience in high school, years of experience in co-teaching, high school setting, and the different co-teaching collaborations, and 10 interview questions.
**Length of Study:** The timeframe for participation will be a four-week window.

**Data Analysis:** The researcher will use recorded Zoom interviews and interview transcripts to transcribe interviews by creating a Microsoft Word spreadsheet to record and document study participants’ responses to interview questions. In addition, the researcher will be sorting and arranging the data into different categories depending on the sources of information to enhance data analysis and interpretation. Then the researcher will read and review all the data, record general notations of the information, and reflect on the overall meaning. In addition, the researcher will create codes for all the data by arranging and bracketing sections of text and adding a word representing each category in the margins. Next the researcher will produce a description and topics for analysis using the coding process.

**Proposed Communication of Results:** Following each interview, the researcher will review the recorded interview video and verbatim transcription of recorded interview which provides the best database for analysis. Also, the general and special education teachers participating in this study will be asked to review the interview transcript and provide feedback in order to rule out the possibility of any misrepresentation (see Appendix I). The findings of the research will be presented in Chapter Five using tables and narratives for how the data will be coded and analyzed.

**Benefits:** The study does not have any potential benefits to participants. However, the study findings could be utilized to support a collaborative co-teaching team model in high schools.

**Potential Publication:** Virginia Tech's open access policy follows U.S. copyright law and has been vetted by Virginia Tech's Office of Legal Counsel. Open access refers to scholarship that is freely available online for anyone to read. The policy language states that Virginia Tech authors grant a nonexclusive license to the university to deposit the accepted manuscript of their scholarly article within one month of the publication date in the university repository VTechWorks. Virginia Tech's institutional repository, VTechWorks, provides global access to Virginia Tech’s scholarship. Maximizing the dissemination of research benefits authors, the university, readers around the world, and scholarship generally.

**Confidentiality and Anonymity Statements:** Pseudonyms will be used to identify interviewees and to protect the identity of study participants. The researcher will use coding and themes to relate the responses of the interviewees to the research questions. Research data will be stored on a password-protected computer and any hard copies of data will be stored in a locked file cabinet. Only the researcher will have access to the participant data, to analyze the results. Once study participants have approved their transcriptions for accuracy (see Appendix I), the Zoom recordings will be deleted to maintain confidentiality. In addition, following the dissertation defense, all data will be destroyed.

**Voluntary Participation:** Your participation is entirely voluntary. You can choose not to participate. Should you choose to participate, you can withdraw at any time without penalty.
Questions about the Study: If you have questions or concerns about this study during your participation or after its completion, please contact Virginia Tech HRPP at irb@vt.edu or 540-231-3732

Dissertation Committee Chair:

Dr. Jodie L. Brinkmann
Program Coordinator
Assistant Professor of Practice, Educational Leadership
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
2810 North Parham Road, Henrico, VA 23294
Phone: 804-662-7288
Email: jbrinkmann@vt.edu
Appendix G

Interview Confirmation Reminder Letter

October 2022

Barbara J Shears-Walker, Ed. S.
425 Hideaway Bay Dr. Apt 204
Carrollton, VA 23314

Dear ________________,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study interview focusing on the perceptions of high school general and special education teachers regarding principal leadership practices in support of co-teaching in high schools.

I have scheduled an interview with you via Zoom on _________________ at ____ pm. as we have previously arranged. The Zoom link for the meeting is _________________ and the interview will last approximately 30-35 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded with your permission and transcribed for use in my dissertation. All information will be kept strictly confidential and any identifying information will be coded to protect the identity of the research study participants.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study interview. If you have any questions or need to contact me, I can be reached by email at swjbarbara19@vt.edu.

Sincerely,

Barbara J Shears-Walker, Ed.S.
Doctoral Candidate, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Appendix H

Perceptions of High School General and Special Education Teachers Regarding Principal Leadership Practices in Support of Co-Teaching

Interview Protocol

Principal Investigator: Dr. Jodie L. Brinkmann, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Co-Investigator: Barbara J Shears-Walker, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Discussion Purpose:

Thank you so much for allowing me to interview you. Before we begin, I would like to tell you a little about this study. The purpose of this qualitative study is to identify the leadership practices of principals, perceived by general and special education teachers, in support co-teaching of as a service delivery model in high schools. For our time together, I’d like to discuss how the leadership practices of principals support co-teaching as a service delivery model, support teacher professional development on co-teaching practices, and support instructional staff working in a co-teaching model in high schools.

Discussion Guidelines:

Your participation will require no more than 30 to 35 minutes. When responding to questions that will be asked of you in the interview, please exclude all identifying information, such as your name and names of teachers, administrators, name of the school or other parties. I will interview eight participants, analyze the responses, and look for common themes, similarities, differences, and patterns. I will record this interview audio-only, so we will turn off our cameras. Your information will be identified with a pseudonym. The interview will be transcribed, and
you will receive the transcription. Upon reviewing the transcript, you may make changes in the transcription you believe are necessary. The audio and transcription will be stored on a secured password protected computer and destroyed after the successful completion of the study. Only the principal investigator and I will have access to this data.

**General Instructions:**

There is no compensation for participating, and the risk to you is minimal. Through your participation and those of others, the inclusive education learning community will benefit by having additional information on the leadership practices of high school principals perceived by high school general and special education teachers in support of co-teaching in high school classrooms. If at any point during this interview, you feel uncomfortable or do not wish to answer a specific question, please, let me know. Do you have any questions before we get started? Do you give consent to participate in this study? Do you give consent to be recorded?

**Interview:**

**General Information Questions-Teacher**

7. How many years of high school experience as a teacher?

8. What is your current school setting? Urban, Rural, or Suburban

9. How many years of co-teaching experience?

10. How many years of co-teaching training?

11. What are the courses you have co-taught or currently co-teach?

12. How many co-teaching professional development trainings, workshops, or conferences have you been scheduled to attend?
Interview Questions:

1. Does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school?
   a. If yes, in what ways does the principal convey a common vision for co-teaching to all instructional staff in the school?
   b. If no, what components of a common vision do you think would be important to share with all instructional staff?

2. Does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?
   a. If yes, how does the principal foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?
   b. If no, what do you think would foster collaboration amongst co-teaching and non-co-teaching teams in the school?

3. Does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school?
   a. If yes, in what ways does the principal communicate co-teaching expectations to all instructional staff in the school?
   b. If no, what ways do you think co-teaching expectations should be communicated to all instructional staff in the school?

4. Does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?
   a. If yes, how does the principal facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?
   b. If no, what do you think would facilitate the selection and compatibility of co-teaching teams?

5. Does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning?
   a. If yes, how does the principal ensure co-teaching teams common planning?
   b. If no, how do you think co-teaching teams could be ensured common planning?

6. Does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school?
   a. If yes, how does the principal collaborate with co-teachers and co-teaching teams in the school?
   b. If no, what do you think collaboration between the principal, co-teachers, and co-teaching teams could be in the school?
7. Does the principal provide professional development opportunities to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school?
   a. If yes, what professional development opportunities does the principal provide to the instructional staff to support co-teaching teams in the school?
   b. If no, what professional development opportunities do you think would provide support to instructional staff and co-teaching teams in the school?

8. Does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?
   a. If yes, in what ways does the principal provide people or instructional resources to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?
   b. If no, what people or instructional resources do you think could be provided to strengthen co-teaching as a service delivery model in the school?

9. Does the principal offer instructional staff meaningful incentives to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?
   a. If yes, what meaningful incentives does the principal offer instructional staff to encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?
   b. If no, what meaningful incentives do you think offered to instructional staff would encourage teacher participation and buy-in for co-teaching in the school?

10. Does the principal provide additional support for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school?
    a. If yes, what additional support does the principal provide for the instructional staff to enable co-teaching to work in the school?
    b. If no, what additional support do you think provided for the instructional staff could enable co-teaching to work in the school?

Is there anything else you think would be helpful to identifying the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools?

**Conclusion:**

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to interview you regarding the leadership practices of principals in support of co-teaching as a service delivery model in high schools.
Appendix I

Interview Transcription Consent

Title of Research: Perceptions of High School General and Special Education Teachers Regarding Leadership Practices in Support of Co-Teaching

Date:_____________

Dear ______________,

Attached you will find a copy of the transcription of our interview via Zoom conducted on ____________. Please read the transcript and select one of the statements below. After you have responded below by selecting one of the statements, please return your response via email. If a reply is not received within 5 days of the date noted above, this information will be included in the study. Thank you for your continued participation and support.

☐ I have read the transcription of my interview and agree for the transcript to be used as written.

☐ I have read the transcription of our interview via Zoom and would like the following revised corrections or additions prior to moving forward.

Please make the following corrections:__________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

Please make the following additions:__________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

Respectfully,

Barbara J Shears-Walker, Ed.S.
Doctoral Candidate, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University