CO-TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION: COLLABORATIVE ACTIVITIES & INSTRUCTOR MATCHING GUIDELINES

Kylie B. Rogalla-Hafley, Ph.D., LPC, NCC krogalla@iusb.edu
Counseling & Human Services—Indiana University South Bend

"Pay attention to the ways effective professors do business" (Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011, p. 148)

Literature Review

- Faculty are readily willing to collaborate on research, less so in teaching.
- Co-teaching is common in K-12 settings, but rare in higher education outside of mentor/internships.
- Research & teaching don't coexist, but are in competition for faculty devotion (Frank Fox, 1992).
- Faculty engage in a "deceiving game" where they oscillate between external confidence & internal despondence in regard to their work and performance (Bloch, 2002).
- The external peer review process risks shame, anger, & broken social-professional bonds (Bloch, 2002).
- Co-teaching in higher education encourages mutual trust & openness to vulnerability (Lock, 2016).
    - Planning, observing, negotiating, and providing feedback

The Pilot Project

- IUSB Counseling & Human Services department (4 grad programs, 1 undergrad minor, ~100 students)
- Two faculty members (equal rank—tenure track; dossier submission scheduled for Spring, 2021)
- Combined two internship sections; Spring, 2019 (n = 12 graduate students)
- Designed to address patterns in unbalanced section choices; dispositional concerns; triangulation
- Included three-tier assignment structure for variance & student choice/empowerment

Three-Tier Assignments

- 300 total points; 150 attempted by spring break, 150 attempted by finals week
- One assignment from each category required; remaining points free to choose by students
- Faculty graded assignments authored (equal distribution among categories & possible choices)

Category A (25 points)	**Category B (50 points)**	**Category C (75 points)**
Skill Demonstration/Tape Review	Professional Counseling Resume	Individual Differences Project
Positive Psychology Discussion Post	Session Transcript Review	Conference Attendance & Reflection
Professional Development Activity	Case Conceptualization	Pre-Post Assessment Report
Counseling Microskill Quiz	NCE Practice Exam	Community Grant Project
Counseling Theory Quiz		
100% Attendance & Reflection		

Co-Teaching Activities

(Bacharach, Heck, Dahlberg, 2008)

- One teach, one observe
- One teach, one drift
- Station teaching
- Parallel teaching
- Supplemental teaching
- Differentiated teaching
- Team Teaching

Considerations & Guidelines for College Co-Teaching

The Structure

- Multiple sections of same course
- Total student enrollment remains feasible when doubled
- Administrative support for innovation & collaboration (e.g., Dean approval, space, cost, etc.)

The People

- Complementary personality types (Four Temperament Model) (Rohm, 2008)
- Variations in student and faculty intelligences (Multiple Intelligence Theory) (Gardner, 1983)
- Mutual commitment to trust *with* and *from* each other as colleagues (Lock et al., 2016)
- Assess for time availability among matrix of strategies for planning/debriefing (Villa et al., 2013)
    - Borrowed, common, tiered, rescheduled, released, freed-up, purchased, found, new

Benefits

- Highly diverse teaching styles and supervision theories provided students with complementary feedback
- Peer review observations & letters of support for tenure/reappointment
- Parallel teaching/supervision allowed students to give & receive feedback to revolving peer members
- Mutual modeling of new pedagogical strategies & methods of addressing student questions or crises

Challenges

- Students often emailed one, rather than both, instructors regarding questions or notifications of absence
- Maintaining consistent meeting times to check-in on the progress of each student
- Grading distribution for longer written assignments

Student Feedback on Pilot Experience

Informal (paper form, distributed in class, anonymous)

- Structure: 13-question survey; Two open-ended qualitative questions; Responses, n=10 (83%)
- Overall rating of experience across items (4.8/5)
- Recommendation for future students (10/10—yes)

Formal (electronic form, distributed by the university, anonymous)

- Overall ratings (5/5); Responses, n=6 (50%)
    - Instructor well-prepared & readily available
    - Clear explanation of subject matter
    - Environment conducive to learning
    - Assignments helpful in learning
    - Helpful feedback

"I appreciated the list of available options and the freedom to choose which assignments interested me the most."

"This was a really cool way to do internship!"

"I highly recommend this format of combining the two classes. It was such a benefit!"

"I really appreciated having a combined internship experience. The balance between the professor feedback was meaningful and pushed my growth in big ways. I was able to learn from two experts in the subject matter, receive balanced and diverse feedback, and gain insight from a larger peer group. Please consider continuing this format in future sections."

"I LOVED having both professors provide feedback, as well as LOVED having the larger class to hear from all my peers and receive their feedback. It was instrumental to my learning. Thank you."

**For questions, comments, or reference list, please email presenter