

MULLICAN, JEANNE L. Ed.D. Co-Teaching Training and Paired Placements in Physical Education Teacher Education Field Experience. (2021)  
Directed by Dr. Michael Hemphill. 92 pp.

Despite field experiences being especially valuable for physical education teacher education programs, the concerns and issues that are often faced by teacher candidates can make for less-than-ideal experiences. Variability in the quality and satisfaction of field placements have led programs to seek ways to maximize their quality mentors while finding alternative models that may reduce some of the issues seen in the traditional placement model (Baeten & Simons, 2016a). As collaboration in teaching gains prominence, the paired placement with peer mentoring model looks promising in decreasing field experience issues and effectively socializing PE teacher candidates into the profession. Paired placement involves placing two teacher candidates together with one mentor teacher. Many benefits have been found in using this model but there is a recurring theme in challenges. Teacher candidates have a lack of experience in the team teaching/co-teaching processes and find it difficult to schedule a time for collaborative planning (Chang, 2018; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Jenkinson & Benson, 2017; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019; Ratcliff, 2016). In this case study, an educational training was created to strengthen and support the abilities of teacher candidates to be collaborative teachers during field experience. The experience of the paired PE teacher candidates was investigated, and several themes were found concerning the co-teaching training program, future usage, and occupational socialization. The issues found in previous studies with lack of preparation to co-teach was well negated by providing previous experience before student teaching and giving support throughout. All participants in the experience noted positives but also had areas to improve how teacher candidates could better harmonize.

CO-TEACHING AND PAIRED PLACEMENTS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER  
EDUCATION FIELD EXPERIENCE

by

Jeanne L. Mullican

A Dissertation

Submitted to

the Faculty of The Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Greensboro

2021

Approved by

---

Dr. Michael Hemphill  
Committee Chair

## DEDICATION

*I dedicate this work to my husband, David, my children, June and Jack, our family and closest friends. I did not travel this journey alone. From even considering applying to graduation, I have had support beyond what I deserve. There were times where I had to be selfish and each of you provided unselfish encouragement and met my needs to keep us floating. I am blessed to know each of you and have you to walk through this life with. I look forward to days where I can show you my gratefulness for your kindness and love.*

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation written by Jeanne L. Mullican has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Michael Hemphill

Committee Members

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Ben Dyson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Diane Gill

October 21, 2021

Date of Acceptance by Committee

September 27, 2021

Date of Final Oral Examination

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special and heartfelt thank you to the faculty at UNCG who helped me throughout this program. Dr. Hemphill, your guidance, support, and optimism made it easy to communicate with you even through such a vulnerable experience. Dr. Dyson, you were very encouraging and supportive, and your insights were appreciated. Dr. Gill and Dr. Brown, I am thankful for your wisdom and assistance from orientation through graduation. Thank you all for caring about each of us in the cohort and helping us grow personally and professionally.

To the cohort of 2017, better known as “The Squad”. It has been a pleasure and an honor to walk through this with you. I could not have finished without you. Each of us faced mountains and valleys in our personal and professional lives over the last 4 years. You are all amazing individuals and I feel lucky to boast that I know you. I am thankful for the friendships and the support system that we established. I look forward to cheering on your future successes.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: PROJECT OVERVIEW .....	1
Background .....	1
Occupational Socialization .....	2
Field Experience in Physical Education .....	3
Alternative Model of Field Experience .....	4
Purpose and Aims.....	8
Methods .....	8
Peer Mentoring and Co-teaching Program Design.....	9
Case Context.....	9
Measuring Teacher Candidate Experience .....	10
Collecting and Analyzing Teacher Candidates Experiences .....	13
Results and Discussion.....	15
Contrasting Qualities .....	16
Mutual Benefits .....	18
Influential Structure.....	20
Other Themes and Advice .....	22
Field Experience and Professional Socialization .....	23
Limitations and Future Changes .....	25
Conclusion.....	26
CHAPTER II: DISSEMINATION .....	28
Paired Placement Presentation .....	29
Title Slide .....	29
Occupational Socialization Theory .....	29
Field Experiences in Physical Education .....	30
Alternative Model of Field Experience .....	30
Challenges Presented.....	31
Overview of Peer Mentoring and Co-teaching Program Design.....	32
Case Study Details.....	33
Matching Mentors and Peers .....	34
Co-teaching.....	34

Peer Mentoring .....	36
Findings .....	36
Conclusion and Future Directions .....	38
CHAPTER III: ACTION PLAN.....	39
REFERENCES .....	43
APPENDIX A: PROGRAM OUTLINE.....	53
APPENDIX B: CO-PLANNING ACTION PLAN .....	55
APPENDIX C: LESSON CO-TEACHING ACTION PLAN .....	56
APPENDIX D: CO-TEACHING PAIRED PLACEMENT OBSERVATION FORM .....	57
APPENDIX E: CASE CONTEXT .....	61
APPENDIX F: PEER ASSESSMENT RUBRIC .....	64
APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW GUIDE .....	68
APPENDIX H: SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	69
APPENDIX I: CODEBOOK .....	70
APPENDIX J: DISSEMINATION PRESENTATION.....	84

## CHAPTER I: PROJECT OVERVIEW

Beyond university coursework, field experiences in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) have the greatest impact on teacher candidates (TCs). The hours spent in on-the-job training that TCs complete to prepare for their professional career is minimal compared to other apprenticeships (Cabral, 2018). Therefore, it is important to maximize the quality of the experience. At field placements, mentor teachers are often expected to fill numerous roles and TCs can have unrealistic ideas of what the mentor will do (He, 2010). Delivering discipline knowledge and pedagogy skills to the TC can be a challenge but these alone do not equate to quality education and teaching (Vumilia & Semali, 2016). As a TC goes through the socialization process, the mentor influences this through their psychological support (Gunn et al., 2017; Hennissen et al., 2011). The mentor is not always adequate in accomplishing both task assistance and emotional support (Hennissen et al., 2011). Field experiences are crucial steps in teacher preparation programs but there are issues in the traditional placement model that influences quality and impact for TCs which has caused programs to seek alternative models.

### **Background**

PETE programs can help TCs develop their teaching disposition by immersing them in curriculum classes that allow them to practice their instructional proficiencies on peers before going into local schools (Hushman et al., 2013). However, when TCs are learning in university classrooms they are learning theories and practicing in a safe space; in reality, there is no substitute for teaching students in a classroom setting (Cabral, 2018). Field experiences in PETE are important in optimally preparing TCs for their career but there are also other areas that influence a TCs perception of quality teaching.



## **Occupational Socialization**

Lawson (1986) described occupational socialization theory (OST) as a culmination of all experiences that initially guide a person to begin the career path of a physical educator and that later shape their perceptions and actions. More recently, it has been described as a theoretical model used for: comprehending how students are recruited, examining the continual socialization of PE teachers, and a framework for how to design PETE programs (Richards et al., 2018). There are three stages of OST: acculturation (personal PE experience as a student), professional (PETE program), and organizational (career in teaching) (Lawson, 1983).

TCs bring in preconceived notions on how physical education (PE) should look, and it often mirrors society's misguided belief that PE simply provides students time to release energy and play sports (Ferry & McCaughtry, 2013; Placek et al., 1995). School settings are different than many other professions in that students have already spent a significant amount of time experiencing the area before they begin their career (LaVine, 2010; Lawson, 1983; Placek, et al., 1995). A major obstacle that PETE programs face is that they can have a hard time changing the minds of TCs who hold fervently to their own philosophy and ideas about PE (Ferry & McCaughtry, 2013; Placek et al., 1995). Many PE TCs enter with the motive of becoming a coach and are not focused on teaching lifetime physical activity to the general student population (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Placek et al., 1995; Templin & Schempp, 1989). Other TCs are acculturated from programs that used exercise as punishment, assessed based on dressing out and effort, viewed PE as recess, did not follow state or national standards (Castelli & Williams, 2007; Chen, 2006) or the program was solely engrossed in team sport content delivered through non-teaching methods (Ferry & McCaughtry, 2013; Flory, 2016). These ineffective practices contribute to low quality PE, do not help children enjoy physical activity and are what PETE

programs want to remove as they further contribute to the negative reputation and marginalization of PE (Blankenship, 2017; Hushman et al., 2013; Templin et al., 2019). PETE programs aim to introduce TCs to new ways of teaching PE that may differ from their past experience (Lee et al., 2017). Despite advancements in theory, curriculum, experiences, and assessments, many PE teachers will continue with the inappropriate practices they learned in their own school experiences (Richards & Templin, 2019).

When a TC graduates and becomes a teacher, he/she may keep with a school's status quo instead of sticking with the what was learned in the education program (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Geisler (2017) found that those in the organizational phase attribute much of their teaching perspective to field experiences from the professional phase. Field experiences are not successful in growing the field if PETE programs simply duplicate a TC's previous experience instead of challenging their perception (Richards & Templin, 2019). Those who are socialized into schools with ineffective teaching practices either reproduce the practices or have internal conflict; these conflicts can cause teachers to leave the field (Angelle, 2006). TCs are influenced by the mentor's teaching practices at the field placement more than their coursework (Hushman et al., 2013); therefore, it is important for chosen field placements to have the same PE ideology as the education program (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

### **Field Experience in Physical Education**

Effective field experiences ensure that the TC links theory to practice (CAEP, 2013). The experiences provide TCs experiential activities that help them to better understand the concepts they learned in their program (Barnes & Pujol, 2017). In the field, a TC has the opportunity to observe, teach, and reflect on their current understandings in contrast to their prior experiences (Wright et al., 2012). It is important to examine problems in field courses and how these affect

the professional socialization of TCs in order to provide insight for internship improvements (Abas, 2016). Novice teachers who graduate from education programs with quality field mentoring hold to their educational training in the first few years (Risko & Reid, 2019) instead of reverting to their pre-teaching experiences which is known as the washout effect (Blankenship & Coleman, 2009).

The effective experience should be mutually beneficial for the TC and their field placement school (CAEP, 2013), which means that these placements should not be haphazardly assigned. Ideally, the PETE program is involved in positioning their TCs at a field placement fit for them but often the field office arranges all certification placements (Tannehill & Goc Karp, 1992). The sheer numbers of mentors needed to be matched up with individual TCs can frequently overshadow the process of selecting mentors based on mentoring abilities (Tannehill & Goc Karp, 1992) and a good teacher does not always equate to a good mentor. It can be difficult to find enough qualified mentors for all TCs. Mentor teachers should be chosen based on interest, expertise, and training; veteran teachers who have worked with the university before are preferred (Russell & Russell, 2011). Wright and Grenier (2018), suggest PETE programs use alumni mentor teachers who are familiar with the program and then allowing TCs to evaluate mentor effectiveness each semester. Due to the value of field experience and the variability TCs encounter in the traditional model of field experience, it is important to consider alternative models of field experience placement.

### **Alternative Model of Field Experience**

As collaboration gains prominence in schools and education programs look to maximize their quality mentors, there is an increased interest to move to alternative models of field experience (Simons & Baeten, 2016). New models should be structured to foster community,

mentoring, and professional development (Valencia et al., 2009). Peer learning and mentoring are fundamental in moving to student-centered pedagogies that allow students to take responsibility for their learning (Clark & Andrews, 2009). TCs are placed at schools with other peers and mentor teachers but rarely is there a sanctioned assembly for peer mentoring or mentoring by other mentors (Valencia et al., 2009). Alternative models of field experience can capitalize on available resources by creating a community of learners as opposed to isolated triad units. Paired placement with peer mentoring involves simultaneously placing two TCs with one mentor teacher. Peer mentor approaches lean on social constructivism. Social constructivist pedagogies have shown to augment the student's sense of belonging and learning, which leads to retention (Richards & Gaudreault, 2016). Paired placements reduce the number of needed mentors and enables universities to focus on matching TCs with mentor teachers and using those who have worked well with the program previously. Also, by placing pairs of TCs together, opportunities for collaboration occur (Baeten & Simons, 2016a).

Social constructivist strategies help TCs be reflective and it can be a valuable way to encourage TCs to approach their subjective teaching theories and align their thinking with best practices (Richards & Templin, 2019). Peer mentoring has similar goals as other mentor designs, but the horizontal variation of the relationship fosters the sharing of ideas and increases leadership opportunities for both parties (Andersen & Watkins, 2018). Educator programs must prepare TCs to be collaborative as in-service teachers and peer mentoring appropriately begins this process (Le Cornu, 2005).

Mentors who experienced paired TCs reported that having two TCs was not more work and that they observed a decrease in mentoring duties because the peers have more people to consult (Lynam et al., 2015; Simons & Baeten, 2016). The burden to provide constant feedback

and affective support was decreased as the peer mentoring helped the TCs be more accountable in recognizing their own needs (Harvey & Uren, 2019). Baeten and Simons (2016b) looked at how the student learners experienced the paired TCs. They found that because TCs were taking more risks in teaching styles and involved in more individual feedback to students, there was deeper learning, increased support, higher engagement, and more differentiation was presented. Field experiences become more positive as the mentor teacher burdens are decreased and the TC's needs are being met.

TCs skills improve in observation, feedback, and reflection (Lynam et al., 2015). Peer mentors collaborate on lessons, share resources, and benefit from each other's expertise and personal knowledge (Harvey & Uren, 2019; Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). This social practice exemplifies the constructivist learning theory. It shows how TCs learn from each other and how they may acquire further understanding on a matter when they receive multiple perspectives (Andersen & Watkins, 2018). Although paired TCs come from the same program and the mentor teacher may have worked with the program before, everyone involved has different interests, needs, personalities, and background information which provides diverse insight to the team.

There are recurring challenges as universities have studied paired placements. TCs lack experience in collaborative teaching (co-teaching) and find it difficult to schedule a time for collaborative planning (co-planning) (Chang, 2018; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Jenkinson & Benson, 2017; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019; Ratcliff, 2016). Originally, co-teaching was used for special education. Now co-teaching is seen as a model of planning and instruction and with classes expected to be inclusive, more collaboration is required between educators to be able to meet the needs of all students (Akerson & Montgomery, 2017). Co-teaching is an instructional style that TCs should be prepared to implement as it is currently being used in PE, especially in

schools with larger classes (Montgomery & Akerson, 2019). Today, teachers must use a variety of instructional strategies, encourage collaborative learning, and dedicate time to plan and collaborate with colleagues and other school professionals to ensure learner growth and to advance the profession (CCSSO, 2013; ISTE, 2019).

Another challenge found in paired placements is that TCs are evaluated on their individual lessons (not a co-taught lesson) and are not evaluated on their collaboration (Akerson & Montgomery, 2017; Chang, 2018). This can be changed to hold the peers accountable and provide greater feedback. Gardiner (2011) also suggests educating TCs on how teaching is moving to be more collaborative, the benefits associated with it, as well as and preparing TCs for the challenges that can be experienced. To be successful, co-teaching cannot just be done in student teaching; it needs to be modeled, taught, and practiced in earlier field experiences, and then supported throughout the program (Chang, 2018; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019).

With a need to understand how we can better support and prepare PE TCs in paired placements, this project established a training program for co-planning and co-teaching for PE TCs. The rationale was that by training TCs in co-teaching practices, the negatives previously found in paired placements could be avoided. This provides a deeper understanding for best practices in preparing TCs for collaborative environments. As there had yet to be a study that sought to solve these problems, this project aimed to address these issues by applying the recommended suggestions. This study fills a gap in the research by examining the effectiveness of co-teaching training in paired placements.

## **Purpose and Aims**

The purpose of this case study (Creswell, J.W., 2018) was to investigate the experiences of PETE TCs engaged in paired placements who underwent co-teaching training with scheduled co-planning. The information gathered from this not only provides feedback that can be used to better the university's programming but can also enhance the field experience for TCs which in turn can improve their self-efficacy, positively affect their socialization, and help with retention in the field. Physical educators who are trained by quality mentors that value teaching lifetime physical activity will be more likely to influence the next generation about the importance of PE.

**Specific Aim #1** – Identify how Physical Education Teacher Education paired placement Teacher Candidates describe challenges of co-teaching after completing a co-teaching and peer mentoring training program.

**Specific Aim #2** – Discover participants expectations for how peer mentoring and co-teaching might function in their professional lives as new teachers

## **Methods**

In a case study, the researcher may develop “an in-depth analysis of a case, often a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals” (Creswell, 2018, p. 14). The case study method is a holistic research method that investigates in-depth “why” and “how” questions (Yin, 2009). This allows several sources of information to be gathered to provide a complete picture of TC experiences. This study investigated the experiences of PE TCs in field experiences who are paired together for co-teaching in their field placement with one mentor teacher. Due to findings and suggestions from previous studies, the TCs were trained in co-teaching, co-planning, and peer mentoring before the semester began and were supported throughout.

## **Peer Mentoring and Co-teaching Program Design**

In PETE courses on campus, TCs practice planning together and teaching micro-lessons to the rest of the class. Despite practicing co-teaching in pedagogy courses before field experiences begin, PETE TCs at the university were always assigned individual placements for student teaching. Faculty decided that in the Fall of 2020, TCs in PETE were going to complete a paired placement and practice co-teaching. Due to the issues mentioned in the previous studies, TCs underwent training before the semester began, to prepare for co-teaching, co-planning, and peer mentoring (Montgomery & Akerson, 2019). As suggested, partnering of TCs and matching them to mentors was done by the university supervisor (Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). TCs worked together on planning, teaching, and mentoring strategies. TCs were educated on barriers and benefits to collaboration (Appendix A)(Gardiner & Robinson, 2011). As recommended, TCs were required to set aside blocks of time each day for planning and fill out a Co-Planning Action Plan (Appendix B) to proactively strategize how they would plan together throughout the semester (Jenkinson & Benson, 2017). They were also given a Lesson Plan Action Plan to help them plan together for lessons once out in the field (Appendix C). To further support TCs, throughout the semester, newsletters were created to send every few weeks. Each newsletter highlighted information that may be helpful to partners (Appendix A). Newsletters also contained challenges for the TCs to focus on or complete. This allowed for continuous communication with TCs in the field. Throughout the semester, TCs were able to contact the researcher to discuss challenges or strategies.

## **Case Context**

The TCs were two seniors in their final semester at the university. Ben came from an urban school district and played various sports in school, but basketball was his favorite. He is



known for being outgoing, loud, and a jokester. He plans to coach and teach PE in the future but would also love to one day be an inspirational speaker for troubled youth. Grace is from a smaller town and played sports throughout school, volleyball and soccer being her favorites. She has a more serious personality, tends to be introverted and can be soft spoken. Grace had various coaching experiences before student teaching and plans to coach and teach PE in her future. Throughout the program, Grace and Ben have had many classes together. The semester before student teaching, Grace and Ben were paired up for a field experience course.

Grace and Ben were paired up again for student teaching. As research has stated that it is important to use placements where mentors run programs that align with best practices, the mentors are carefully chosen for PETE TCs. The two mentor teachers chosen for this project, Coach M and Coach N, were previously used not only for mentoring student teachers but also for hosting a field experience class. A complete case context can be found in Appendix E.

### **Measuring Teacher Candidate Experience**

Case studies include multiple sources of data to provide in-depth descriptive and reflective data about the TCs' unique experience throughout the training (Patton, 2015). Data sources include TCs' documents, observations, and interviews. Documents collected from each TC included reflections (n=6) and lesson plans (n=6) that are submitted as part of the field course requirements. Based on previous studies, additional documents that were added in the data collection phase included a peer assessed lesson observation (n=1), peer collaborative assessment (n=1), and observation of co-taught lessons (n=3). TCs were also observed by their university supervisor (n=3) and the researcher on co-teaching lessons (n=3).

The TCs were assessed on lessons in the field by the university supervisor three times. The supervisor used the required Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) rubric

(Texas Education Agency, 2016) and provided feedback and guidance for future lessons. TC lessons for the supervisor had to be assessed individually. For these lessons, the TCs chose to do one-teach-one-assist. The supervisor's feedback focused on lesson content and pedagogical techniques to improve instruction and student engagement as that is the nature of the required field visit. However, the supervisor did provide feedback to help TCs in their co-teaching choices. The TCs were observed in the field three times by the researcher on different weeks than the supervisor. TCs were able to use any model of co-teaching that fit the needs of their lesson and were assessed on their collaboration. Feedback was more specifically directed at helping the TCs in co-teaching. Texas does not have a specific rubric for co-teachers. Most documents intended for observing co-teaching are based on special education classes. The document used in field observation was created by combining elements from the Co-Teaching Core Competencies Observation Checklist (Murawski & Lochner, 2015) and the T-TESS rubric. The two rubrics were overall complimentary as they are focused on best practices in teaching.

The reflections collected were journal entries where students discuss activities in the field, their learning experience, and goals. Lesson plans were submitted after teaching for the supervisor and included a reflection to discuss student learning outcomes and teaching reflection. Since TCs were required to submit individual work even though they were co-teaching, lesson plans and journals submitted for field experience grades did not reflect their partnership. TCs basically submitted the same lesson plans with a few small differences such as how they detailed their lesson introduction or closure. The reflections did not discuss co-teaching but did provided context for the current environment at their placements and how each school was dealing with Covid-19 and the various hurricane evacuations that occurred. The lesson plans submitted to the researcher for field observation reflected the TCs' co-planning since these plans were not part of

their graded coursework. The pair was able to better explain their individual roles for the lesson in each of these plans.

Although the pair was regularly giving feedback to each other on their co-taught lessons, it was mostly informal. Previous studies suggested having peers assess each other. For the peer assessed lesson observation, TCs planned a lesson together and then were required to observe their peer teaching alone and provide feedback as a peer mentor. This was done through the one-teach, one-observe co-teaching model. It presented them with an opportunity to practice observing, assessing, and providing feedback in a more formal manner. Documentation from this was helpful in seeing how the pair assessed each other compared to their mentors and supervisors. In line with previous research, their peer assessment confirmed that peers assess each other as accurately as a supervisor or mentor but may not be as detailed as a supervisor or mentor would be (Patton & Marty-Snyder, 2014). This also provided valuable feedback on their comfort in peer assessment and mentoring which is helpful in determining how to better prepare TCs for this in the future.

At the end of the semester, TCs were given the opportunity to assess their partner in their peer mentoring and collaborative efforts. Each TC provided a written score for their partner's skills on a 1-10 scale. TCs were asked to rate their partner's collaborative efforts in co-planning, co-teaching, and classroom management. TCs also rated their peer their peer mentoring. In the final individual interview, the TC was asked to expand upon why they provided those scores for their partner. The explanation provided an understanding of the dynamics of the partnership. TCs described how they felt about their partner's load in the tasks compared to their own load. This also helped to recognize if the partners felt the same way or different about their partnership.

Informal interviews were conducted with TCs throughout the semester. Interviews were after observations and lasted 15 to 30 minutes depending upon available time and how much TCs had to say. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. At the elementary, interviews were in the gym between classes or during a planning period. At the middle school, interviews were in the empty cafeteria to allow for a quieter environment. Initial questions were about how TCs felt about co-teaching and planning, peer mentoring, paired placement, their confidence in performing these in their next stage, and their personal PE experiences as a student. The questions and answers from each session influenced the questions for the next interview, as the researcher could not know all the questions to ask at the beginning (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) about the co-teaching challenges. At the end of the semester, an hour-long focus group interview was held at the middle school, with open-ended questions for the TCs to discuss and conclude their thoughts concerning the placement and program (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Upon completion of the field experience a separate individual interview was conducted through zoom with each TC separately. Final individual interviews with TCs about their personal experience was semi-structured. Broad questions formulated from previous interviews were used to allow participants to compose the meaning and then for the researcher to develop theories based on the evidence. Participants were able to view some of the questions before the interview which allowed them to answer more elaborately, provide examples, while still allowing the researcher to respond to questions or probe further (Mack et al., 2005; Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The final individual interviews lasted between an hour and an hour and a half.

### **Collecting and Analyzing Teacher Candidates Experiences**

Multiple sources of data were used to allow for triangulation of themes to support trustworthiness (observations, interviews, course work, peer assessments). Various sources of

data were cross-checked for consistency of information derived from them (Patton, 2015). Interviews with TCs and mentor teachers were recorded with a digital voice recorder. A multiphase approach of alternating questioning and analyzing steered the researcher to further collection and analysis which led to deeper understanding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) regarding participant experiences. Recorded interviews were sent to a transcription service and then checked against the original recording for consistency. An initial member checking strategy was employed through email for trustworthiness by first confirming accuracy of the participants statements and allowing them to add to or clarify their response. After verifying the interview verbiage, the researcher used thematic analysis to begin analyzing the data. Analysis began with repeatedly and thoroughly reading the data to become more familiar with it and consider themes. Initial interview coding used in vivo coding from the TC's statements (Saldana, 2016). In vivo coding uses the participants voices instead of the researcher's words.

Reflections and lesson plans submitted for student teaching were collected from the university supervisor. TCs sent lesson plans directly to the researcher before field observations. The peer assessed lesson was sent directly to the researcher from the TCs. The field notes from observations and the TC documents were inductively analyzed and the patterns were coded using descriptive coding (Saldana, 2016).

Second coding for all data was pattern coding which describes major themes (Saldana, 2016). The themes continued to reflect the participant voices as their words were used to shape the theme names. The ATLAS.ti qualitative software was used to store, organize, and categorize data. From here, a codebook was created to visually show the themes and examples from the data set. Inductive analysis and constant comparison were used (Patton, 2002). Inductive analysis involves looking at the data, finding themes, and then either connecting to theory or developing a

theory from the data. For this project, themes were supported by findings from various works. Deductive analysis was used through the lens of OST (Patton, 2015). Deductive analysis begins with a theory and as the data is analyzed the theory is either confirmed or not. Each incident in the data was compared with other incidents to identify similarities and differences (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Following the creation of themes, a second member checking strategy was used. Participants reviewed the themes through email and confirmed that the information reflected their perspectives. A peer debriefing with a colleague outside of the study was also used to confirm that the themes reflect the data collected. Next, the individual TC data (documents, interviews, observations) were compared to their peer and previous studies for repeating and conflicting experiences. A final codebook was created to reflect all themes (Appendix I).

Thick descriptions of the experience were used to ensure that the data was properly analyzed and by providing rich detail; with the amount of evidence provided it should be difficult for another person to conclude differently. With this type of writing, the reader is able to decide if the research will be able to transfer to their situation (Amnotte & Thomas, 2017). Beyond, triangulation, member checking, peer debriefing, audit trail and thick descriptions to promote trustworthiness, the researcher was also closely involved with the program to ensure prolonged engagement over the course of a year (Patton, 2002).

## **Results and Discussion**

In relation to aim one and two, there were four themes concerning the co-teaching training program. Regarding specifically aim number two, there were two themes concerning the future usage of the program. The following three themes will be highlighted: contrasting qualities, mutual benefits, and influential structure. These themes describe what the TCs experienced within the program as well as what the supervisor and mentor teachers shared. The

results are compared between participants as well as to previous research findings. The other themes that were beneficial will be summarized. These themes connect to previous research and how the program can be improved in the future. The last section connects findings with OST.

### **Contrasting Qualities**

Previous research noted the importance of strategically placing students based on strengths, abilities, and personalities (Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). The contrast in the two TC's strengths and abilities proved to be a good balance but even the difference in their personalities was a benefit. The mentors, university supervisor and even the participants, Grace and Ben, commented on the differences in style and personality between the pair. At the first interview, Grace and Ben seemed nervous about what type of questions they might be asked and kept their answers short. When Ben was talking about an area, he felt he needed to grow in, Grace cut in and encouraged him. This led to them each saying, "We are very different." Grace followed up with "And that helps so much, like if we were similar and we had the same issues. It would be not great." From then on, each interview the TCs constantly went back to their differences being incredibly valuable to their experience and growth.

Our differences compliment one another because like, we are better at different things.

And so that worked out really well. It's not like we're both good at one thing. And then

we both neglect another thing. It goes really well together. (Grace)

The pair were agreeable; as Grace stated, "We are very different, but both of us do get along with most people; that probably helps us." Both had also claimed interest in teaching middle school or higher as they felt the lower levels of elementary, was hardwork but more like "babysitting" than "coaching". This mirrors previous research that highlighted how similarities with co-teachers can

initially be good in helping them build relationships but true compatibility comes from using personal differences as strengths in co-teaching (Pratt, 2014).

Research in paired placements found that there was a reduction in management problems and pairs served more students (Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). It was noted that the lessons flowed smoothly as Grace and Ben naturally split up the work of dealing with specific issues such as discipline (researcher observation). The pair had different personalities with students which gave them specific roles or identities (researcher observation). For example, Grace was the main disciplinarian while Ben was the one who would offer students challenges or extend the lesson to keep students engaged. They possessed different strengths in teaching but that the pair worked well together to create fluid lessons where both shared equal responsibility for student learning (researcher observation; supervisor observation). Even though the TCs had the same prompts for journals, and they were at the same location, their reflections focused on different aspects of the experience. Ben focused on inclusion and classroom management while Grace focused on teaching skills and communication (TC journals). It is clear the two are very different.

The TCs not only noticed the differences in themselves but noted that their mentors had co-teachers who were different as well. Grace commented on the different dynamics between mentors and the various field placements they had been placed at but also drew on similarities between the placements.

So that was interesting to see just like the difference. I liked having both my placements, having two teachers that was really good. They (between the placements) have a lot of similarities when it comes to like, they have really good classroom management and like discipline stuff. Like overall that's, I feel like how they've worked together for so long



and like made it work for so long. ... That was interesting. So it makes sense that y'all would send me to good classrooms.

To add to this, Ben commented that the co-teacher mentors were different and that he found that to be effective not only in their partnership but also noticed how it was beneficial for different classes. He observed how each PE class naturally had a distinct character to it and how one co-teacher's personality may work better in dealing with certain aspects of a specific class. Both TCs commented that their mentors were different but that the reason they had been successful together over many years was due to focusing on good classroom management and respecting each other. The pair felt that having different strengths and weaknesses while having the same goals was more beneficial to their growth than partners with similar qualities and they felt their mentors helped reflect that. When planning for paired placements, it is important to ensure that the TCs have different strengths and weaknesses and their personalities complement not clash.

### **Mutual Benefits**

Paired placements provide support to each TC that they may not get in a singular placement. Reduced anxiety and improved teaching are two benefits that research highlighted for students in paired placements (Patton & Marty-Snyder, 2014) that was evident with this partnership. When asked how they felt about working together this semester the pair was thankful to have each other. Ben stated that he like the cooperativeness and Grace followed with "I think it takes a lot of stress off." Ben added "yeah, easier for sure. You can piggyback off each other, which helps when someone gets lost. It helps us get back on track. I like co-teaching; it's like two minds." Then Grace brought up an example of a kid crying in class and how she was able to go over to help them while Ben kept the class running smoothly and how she felt that was helpful. Ben started in with an example of how as they take turns leading it is easy to see when

you need to jump in and help your partner out. Grace commented that with all that is going on in the world, it is nice to have a partner to walk through school with.

It's really nice to have someone and like when we have like signed up for certification tests, get our finger printing stuff done, we've made sure to like talk to each other and so we were basically getting each other through school, like at the end of the day. And so I think just those kinds of experiences it's going to help you in the classroom be more collaborative if you're getting through college together at the same time.

The support received is seen as highly valuable (Harvey & Uren, 2019) and coming from the same program allows the TCs to better support each other on the educational journey (Ambrosetti et al., 2017) and even the supervisor noted this. "I noticed that the pair was going through the same experiences and were able to share/discuss/reflect on a daily basis about events or situations that occurred."

The TCs also commented on how they see this mutual benefit as a reason for most of the local PE classes having co-teachers. The mentors commented on the benefits they saw in co-teaching and paired placement. Coach N, one of the middle school mentors, talked about the advantages of being able to co-teach in PE and how it is important to leverage each other's strengths in lessons. Research also confirms effective co-teaching partnerships find ways to use their differences to strengthen their relationship and teaching (Pratt, 2014). The mentors and supervisor noted benefits to co-teaching and paired placement which mirrors what previous research had found concerning deeper reflection and appreciation of various perspectives (Mooney & Gullock, 2013). The university supervisor was pleased to see that the pair were reflective and used their discussion to better themselves (supervisor interview).

The pair talked before the lesson, during the lesson they communicated verbally and non-verbally, between classes adjusted, and then met at the end to reflect (researcher observation). At the elementary, the TCs were continually addressing various needs (e.g., untied shoes, injury, off-task behavior) while maintaining the flow of the lesson (supervisor observation; researcher observation). In the lesson plans sent to the researcher, it was clear the roles each TC had in the lesson and how they would assist each other. Although TCs focused on different subjects in their journals and did not discuss their partnership, each fixated on areas of strength and areas of weakness. Ben was good with engagement and Grace was good at classroom management and those are areas they were able to help each other in. The TCs throughout the interviews stated how they were able to support each other, how they felt both parties benefited, and how they see this as useful preparation for their future teaching careers. Ben noted that all schools they had been in had two or more PE teachers. The practice of team teaching and collaborating can be applied later when working with a co-teacher, teaching aide, paraprofessional, or even their own student teacher (Baeten et al., 2018). The TCs, the university supervisor, and the mentors all agree that paired placements and co-teaching are beneficial.

### **Influential Structure**

The structure of the paired placement effects its success. Previously, it had been found that paired placements may have a hard time scheduling planning (Jenkinson & Benson, 2017). At the elementary placement, the pair planned during the conference time, as well as before and after school. Ben said they liked to do practice walk-throughs as well. The pair also stated that when they could not get things done at school, they used text, phone calls, and shared documents to finish. At the middle school, both commented that the longer class times gave them more time to plan and that it was a quieter atmosphere. Although some students may feel vulnerable in

sharing their work with a peer (Faucette & Nugent, 2017), Grace and Ben leaned into it and said it helped them get better. Grace said that co-teaching was the easiest part of the program and she attributed that to the fact that they planned well. The TCs also commented on the different ways in which their mentors planned and how, in the future, they each hope to have a co-teacher who is open to their ideas and flexible in planning. It was clear they communicated well together (supervisor observation). The pair found ways to work together making their experience in co-planning different than previous research, however, according to the mentors and the supervisor the TCs could still improve in balancing their roles. “There were times that one of them would take the lead (one-teach-one-assist) and the other would teach the same lesson (for the next class) without making sure it fit their individual teaching styles.” (Supervisor interview).

It was recommended to have students practice co-teaching before entering student teaching together (Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). The TCS were paired together the previous semester and had co-taught in other classes. Both students commented that the little time they had together previously gave them some experience and prepared them for student teaching together. Another suggestion was for programs to provide support throughout the process (Harvey & Uren, 2019; Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). The partners had positive feedback concerning support within their program while also providing a suggestion for future semesters. Ben said that the department provided more support than they needed and to not stop that level of support. Grace also felt supported but had suggestions for providing partners a way to communicate about an issue in case a future partnership was not as smooth as her and Ben’s.

Both TCs were glad to have the opportunity to provide feedback about their partner’s collaboration. Overall, they rated each other with top scores in all areas of collaboration (co-planning, co-teaching, and peer mentoring) but Grace suggested that students be given more

opportunities throughout the semester to rank their peers. There was a time in the semester where she felt she carried more of the load and blamed herself for not speaking up or using Ben's help when he offered it. She felt that a check-in during that time could have resolved the issue and that this would be helpful in helping future partnerships early on if they are struggling.

From the documents collected for student teaching, it was noted that it would be helpful if paired TCs would be allowed to submit lesson plans and journals that reflect their work together. Although the lesson plans submitted by TCs for student teaching were basically the same, they did not reflect that they were co-teaching because they were told they needed to submit individual work. Journals contained similar observations but again did not reflect their partnership. The lesson plans submitted to the researcher showed how the pair was working together and trying to balance their roles, similar to the supervisor's observation it was noted that Grace carried the lead in planning a lesson for volleyball. The partners worked well together and taught and reflected as a team and their documents submitted for student teaching should be able to reflect that (researcher observation). The way in which a paired placement structures their planning and teaching affects their overall outcomes. Planning time, balancing the roles, practice in co-teaching and program support all influence the results of the partnership.

### **Other Themes and Advice**

The other themes found were productive dialogue, harmonize parts, and receptive approach. Peer mentoring requires partners to be open to receiving constructive feedback but also willing to assess their peer and provide him/her with thoughtful remarks as they care about their personal growth and their partner's growth (Le Cornu, 2005). The interviews and observations confirmed that peers assess each other accurately but may not be as detailed as the supervisor or mentor (Patton & Marty-Snyder, 2014). In the advice for future TCs it was noted

by all parties for TCs to harmonize their parts (interviews). The supervisor noticed that when it comes to balance it is not just about workload but working within your strengths. All involved understood that co-teaching is different than just groupwork as it involves true collaboration. To be successful in co-teaching, all parties found it important to be receptive (interviews). The attitude of a successful co-teacher in field experiences involves being receptive to new experiences and feedback as well as responsive to the demands of the internship.

The pair had a lot of advice for future students attempting to peer mentor in field experiences. Ben said to pay attention and learn from each other. Grace highlighted the importance of giving real feedback. Both encouraged TCs to be open-minded and build relationships with their partner. In observation, it was noted that the peers communicated regularly, worked as a team and made adjustments so lessons would function optimally. The TCs recognized their relationship and comfort with each other was a tribute to their success and that the best way to accomplish this was by starting early in the program.

### **Field Experience and Professional Socialization**

It is clear from their description of their experiences that in the acculturation phase both Grace and Ben experienced coaching and sports delivered through non-teaching methods in PE which exemplifies the TC perspective that PETE programs face (Ferry & McCaughtry, 2013; Flory, 2016). Both were inspired to enter the profession based on experiences with a coach which is a common theme in OST (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Placek, Dodds, et al., 1995; Templin & Schempp, 1989). Ben had a coach who helped him turn his life around and he wants to encourage troubled youth to walk a better path and he feels he can be that voice of inspiration. When asked about his future teaching methods, he said his PE experience was more old school and he would be taking what he learned from his mentors who were good at balancing discipline

and fun. He felt his mentors were strict and expected good behavior but still incorporated enjoyment and built relationships with students without being buddies.

Comparing their student PE experience with their field experience the TCs felt the mentors were great role models and that those were aspects they planned to emulate. In her individual interview, Grace shared some very specific stories from her personal PE experiences that should embarrass the profession. She said because she was athletic and had fun in PE she did not realize how bad her experiences were until she started taking PE pedagogy classes. This statement shows that the PETE program was successful in providing her with a dissatisfaction in what she experienced (LaVine, 2010; Matanin & Collier, 2003; Placek, Dodds, et al., 1995; Posner et al., 1982). Grace's attitude was that she wanted to provide better and give all students an opportunity to learn and find something they enjoy doing for physical activity. Although she had not always experienced the best practices in PE, she felt that "it's all a positive experience... because those bad experiences...taught me more than my good ones". In her field experiences, she specifically noted how her mentors were good with classroom management and discipline and how she will apply this to her future in PE and her current coaching position and how she hopes to be more inclusive than what she experienced in school. Both TCs showed that they are taking more from their mentors here than their previous experiences which aligns with research showing the importance of quality mentors (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Geisler, 2017; Hushman et al., 2013).

Concerning university classes, both TCs said they learned a lot in the department and would be taking many of the basic teaching strategies and activities with them. From their last semester, both TCs specifically took classroom management aspects from their placements to use in their future classes. From their experience the previous semester in internship, both TCs

mentioned activities and motivational aspects that they want to take from their last mentor. Throughout the experience the two talked often about their current and past mentors. At this time, it seems the TCs took more from their field experience than the acculturation phase which shows the importance of field experiences mirroring what the PETE program in ideals.

### **Limitations and Future Changes**

Over several years, the researcher worked with the pair which enabled a relationship to be built with them where they trusted advice and feedback was well received. Understanding the TC's strengths, weaknesses, and ambitions enabled the researcher to provide the best possible feedback in guiding them through co-teaching. However, a weakness is that this could influence the interpretation of the data, and this was counteracted through triangulation, member checking, peer debriefing, and using an audit trail. A clear limitation of the study are the effects from Covid-19. Besides the changes to how PE was implemented, there were adjustments to university student's ability to do internships. Many of the local schools allowed TCs enrolled in student teaching on their campus since they would be on campuses all day everyday but would not allow the internships that take place before student teaching as they felt those students brought in more exposure being at the school sporadically. This caused universities to have to provide TCs with observations through virtual videos from The Teaching Channel (Vu & Fisher, 2021). Due to these restrictions at schools, only two amicable TCs were able to complete the experience and provide feedback. However, qualitative case studies are usually smaller in sample size and the evidence outlined may help the reader find transferability and relevance to his/her setting. The relationship between the participants and the researcher could also mean there was participant bias which means a participant provides the answer he/she thinks the researcher wants to hear. To avoid this, interview questions encouraged participants to provide their



experience and feelings and were open-ended so as not to lead them. Due to COVID-19 and two hurricane evacuations, the field observations were cut from six or more visits down to three. More contact with the participants through email and longer interviews were used to ensure the researcher remained close to the project.

Previous research suggested that the peers be observed in co-taught lessons, assess each other through one-teach-one-observe, and be provided the opportunity to assess each other in mentorship and collaboration. These would be more effective if they were included into grades, however, this was not an option for this project. Providing more opportunities throughout the semester to evaluate peer collaboration is needed to ensure balance and true teamwork. TCs could use more practice in formally assessing each other and learning what instructional styles suit their abilities best and these practices can be easily added into pedagogy courses on campus. One thing the program can do to better prepare TCs for harmonizing is helping them learn styles and plans that fit best with their strengths and weaknesses. Paired placements in field experience are better suited for schools that already use co-teachers which means that not all PETE programs may be able to reduce the number of mentors needed.

### **Conclusion**

All participants in the experience noted positives but also had areas to improve how TCs harmonize. With a need to understand how to better support and prepare PE TCs in paired placements, this project established an educational training program for co-teaching and many of the negatives previously found were avoided. The issue with lack of preparation to co-teach was well negated by providing previous experience before student teaching and giving support throughout. Having TCs create a co-planning action plan and then following up with them about their scheduled planning seemed to be key in ensuring that planning time was efficiently utilized.

This case study not only provides feedback that can better the university's programming but also enhanced the field experience for TCs. TCs who are trained by mentors who value teaching lifetime physical activity for all students will be more likely to influence the next generation about the importance of physical activity. Although the TCs contributed much of their future plans in teaching to their positive field experiences with their mentors, a follow up on the TCs to see what type of teaching they implement in their own programs would be beneficial in determining what factors contributed most to their professional choices.

## CHAPTER II: DISSEMINATION

The initial dissemination of my research will be to the program stakeholders at my university. Lamar University is a public institution that is part of the Texas State University System. There are over 15,000 students who are part of five undergraduate colleges, one graduate college, and one honors college. The stakeholders in this project are the faculty members from the Department of Teacher Education and the Department of Health and Kinesiology, specifically the faculty from the PETE program and also those in Teacher Education who work with teacher candidates (TCs) in field experiences. The PETE program at Lamar has three full-time faculty and an adjunct faculty member. The program has a certification route which has more emphasis in teaching and a non-certification route which has an emphasis in coaching; however, the majority of non-certification students wanting to coach do have plans to certify post-baccalaureate to teach. Between the two routes in the degree, there are approximately 70 students enrolled. Within the PETE program, we will use this information as we continue to revise our program to better prepare TCs for their careers.

With the Teacher Education Department, a report of the findings will be shared with the Director of Field Experiences, University Supervisors, and Instructors. The Director of Field Experiences manages the field placement processes for the university. The University Supervisors are the faculty members who observe TCs' lessons and throughout the semester who work with mentor teachers and TCs and many of them teach within other departments on campus. Instructors are those who teach courses in the Teacher Education program and have students completing field experiences. Paired placements have been discussed and used a few times with other emphasis areas within this program, but they found many of the same issues that

were reported in previous research. Findings from this study may help the program as they are looking to be more collaborative and there is always a struggle to find enough qualified mentors.

## **Paired Placement Presentation**

### **Title Slide**

Beyond university coursework, field experiences have the greatest impact on TCs. It is important to maximize the quality of the experience. There are known issues that TCs can face in the field that affect the quality and impact of their experience. Universities have been experimenting with paired placements in field experiences. A training program was created to prepare paired TCs for co-teaching.

### **Occupational Socialization Theory**

Lawson (1986) described occupational socialization theory as a culmination of all experiences that initially guide a person to begin the career path of a physical educator and that later shape their perceptions and actions. There are three stages of occupational socialization theory: acculturation (personal PE experience as a student), professional (PETE program), and organizational (career in teaching) (Lawson, 1983).

Those entering the field of teaching are different than other professions in that students have already spent a significant amount of time in the area (LaVine, 2010; Lawson, 1983; Placek, et al., 1995). A major obstacle that PETE faces is that they can have a hard time changing the minds of TCs who hold fervently to their own philosophy and ideas about PE (Ferry & McCaughtry, 2013; Placek et al., 1995). Many PE TCs are acculturated from programs that used exercise as punishment, assessed based on dressing out and effort, viewed PE as recess, did not follow state or national standards (Castelli & Williams, 2007; Chen, 2006) or the program was solely engrossed in team sport content delivered through non-teaching methods

(Ferry & McCaughtry, 2013; Flory, 2016). These ineffective practices contribute to low quality PE, do not help children enjoy physical activity and are what PETE want to remove as they further contribute to the negative reputation and marginalization of PE (Blankenship, 2017; Hushman et al., 2013; Templin et al., 2019).

Geisler (2017) found that teachers attribute much of their perspective to field experiences from the professional phase. TCs were influenced by the mentor's teaching practices at the field placement more than their coursework (Hushman et al., 2013); therefore, it is important for placements to have the same PE ideology as the university (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

### **Field Experiences in Physical Education**

To provide insight for improvements, field issues must be studied as well as how these affect TC socialization (Abas, 2016). Effective experiences should be mutually beneficial for TCs and placement (CAEP, 2013), meaning placements should not be haphazardly assigned. The number of mentor teachers needed can overshadow the process of selecting mentors based on mentoring abilities (Tannehill & Goc Karp, 1992). Mentors have numerous roles and TCs can have unrealistic ideas of what the mentor will do (He, 2010). Mentors influence TC's socialization through their psychological support (Gunn et al., 2017; Hennissen et al., 2011). The mentor is not always adequate in providing both task assistance and emotional support (Hennissen et al., 2011). Due to the value of field experience and the variability encountered in the traditional model, it is important to consider alternative models of field experience.

### **Alternative Model of Field Experience**

TCs are placed at a school with peers but rarely is there a sanctioned assembly for peer mentoring or mentoring by other mentors (Valencia et al., 2009). Alternative models of field experience can capitalize on available resources by creating a community of learners. Paired

placement with peer mentoring means placing two TCs with one mentor teacher. This model leans on social constructivism. Social constructivist pedagogies have shown to augment students' sense of belonging and learning, which leads to retention (Richards & Gaudreault, 2016). Social constructivist strategies help TCs be reflective and encourages TCs to approach their subjective teaching theories and align their thinking with best practices (Richards & Templin, 2019).

Paired placements reduce the number of needed mentors which enables universities to focus on matching TCs and mentor teachers. Mentors with paired TCs reported having two TCS was not more work and there was a decrease in mentoring duties because the TCs had more people to consult (Lynam et al., 2015; Simons & Baeten, 2016). The burden to provide constant feedback and affective support was decreased as peer mentoring helped the TCs recognize their own needs (Harvey & Uren, 2019). Baeten & Simons (2016) looked at how students experienced paired TCs, and they reported that TCs were taking more risks in teaching styles and gave more feedback to students. There was deeper learning, higher engagement, and more differentiation was presented. TCs skills improve in observation, feedback, and reflection (Lynam et al., 2015). Peers collaborate on lessons, share resources, and benefit from each other's expertise and personal knowledge (Harvey & Uren, 2019; Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). This shows how TCs learn from each other and how they may acquire further understanding on a matter when they receive multiple perspectives (Andersen & Watkins, 2018).

### **Challenges Presented**

TCs lack experience in co-teaching and find it difficult to schedule a time for co-planning (Chang, 2018; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Jenkinson & Benson, 2017; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019; Ratcliff, 2016). Another challenge found in paired placements is that TCs were evaluated on individual lessons (not a co-taught lesson) and not evaluated on collaboration

(Akerson & Montgomery, 2017; Chang, 2018). To be successful, co-teaching cannot just be done in student teaching; it needs to be modeled, taught, and practiced earlier, and supported throughout the program (Chang, 2018; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019). To understand how to better support and prepare TCs in paired placements, this project established an educational training program for co-teaching for PE TCs. The rationale was that by training TCs in collaborative practices, the negatives previously found in paired placements could be avoided. This provides a deeper understanding for best practices in preparing TCs for collaborative environments.

### **Overview of Peer Mentoring and Co-teaching Program Design**

Due to the findings of previous studies, TCs underwent training before the semester began, to prepare for co-teaching, co-planning, and peer mentoring. TCs worked together on planning, teaching, and mentoring strategies. TCs were educated on barriers and benefits to collaboration. TCs were required to set aside blocks of time each day for planning and complete a co-planning action plan (Appendix B) to proactively strategize how they would co-plan throughout the semester. To further support TCs, newsletters were created to send every few weeks which contained helpful information and challenges.

The mentor teachers were carefully matched to the TCs. The mentors plan and introduce students to a variety of activities; they are not solely engrossed in sport. The mentors have received glowing feedback from previous TCs. The mentor teachers were those previously used not only for mentoring student teachers but also for hosting a field experience class. The semester before student teaching, a class of TCs went to the elementary one day a week and the middle school another. The course carefully progressed the teaching. Since this is no longer an option, the mentors see that TCs seem less prepared in the student teaching experience.

## Case Study Details

Data sources include TCs' documents, observations, and interviews. Based on previous studies, additional documents that were added in the data collection phase included a peer assessed lesson observation, peer collaborative assessment, and observation of co-taught lessons. TCs were also observed by their university supervisor and the researcher on co-teaching lessons. The TCs were assessed on lessons in the field by the university supervisor three times.

The TCs were observed in the field three times by the researcher on different weeks than the supervisor. Texas does not have a specific rubric for co-teachers. Most documents intended for observing co-teaching are based on special education classes. The document used in field observation was created by combining elements from the Co-Teaching Core Competencies Observation Checklist (Murawski & Lochner, 2015) and the T-TESS rubric. The two rubrics were overall complimentary as they are focused on best practices in teaching.

The six reflections collected were journal entries where TCs discuss activities in the field, their learning experience, and goals. Three lesson plans were submitted for the supervisor and three separate lessons were submitted to the researcher. For the peer assessed lesson observation, TCs co-planned and then were required to observe their peer teaching alone and provide feedback as a peer mentor. At the end of the semester, TCs were given the opportunity to assess their partner in their mentoring and collaborative efforts. In the individual interview, the TC was asked to expand upon why they provided those scores.

Informal interviews were conducted with TCs throughout the semester. Initial questions were about how TCs felt about co-teaching and planning, peer mentoring, paired placement, and their confidence in performing these in their next stage. At the end of the semester, a focus group interview was held, with open-ended questions for the TCs to discuss and conclude their



thoughts (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Upon completion of the field experience an individual interview was conducted through zoom with each TC.

### **Matching Mentors and Peers**

Findings from the project show, the mentor had a great effect on the TCs. The mentor teachers have a vital role in the education and socialization of TCs (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Geisler, 2017; Hushman et al., 2013). When selecting mentors, PETE must consider not only credentials but also personalities and beliefs. To be used for field experience, a mentor's program should align with the university's PETE program beliefs. Good teachers are not always good mentors and therefore PETE programs should also evaluate mentors based on TC feedback (Tannehill & Goc Karp, 1992; S. Wright & Grenier, 2018). Research noted the importance of matching mentor and TC personalities (Russell & Russell, 2011). When using paired placements, PE programs that have two or more teachers are more beneficial to the partners.

When partnering TCs for a co-teaching field experience, the personalities of the TCs should be taken into consideration (Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). PETE instructors who are responsible for arranging field placements want to balance the strengths and weaknesses of TCs to have them complement each other in the partnership. This also better prepares TCs to co-teach in the future with someone who may be different than themselves.

### **Co-teaching**

TCs should practice co-teaching and co-planning before student teaching and then be supported in field experiences (Chang, 2018; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019). In content courses, TCs practice micro-teaching to peers; group and partner lessons help build collaborative skills. It was noted that in these courses, it

would be wise to help TCs learn to tailor lessons to their strengths. If possible, in early field experiences, TCs can be partnered together to start building their co-teaching relationship.

It will be important to provide training before field experience to prepare TCs to work together off campus. Before beginning a paired placement, TCs should be explained the benefits and barriers to co-teaching (Gardiner & Robinson, 2011). TCs need to know collaboration is not just something the program is doing but that this practice can be applied later when working with a co-teacher or paraprofessional (Baeten et al., 2018). In initial training, TCs can practice various types of co-teaching. Then, throughout the semester, newsletters can be sent out that provide co-teaching, planning, and peer mentoring tips as well as give TCs challenges to complete.

Studies noted that TCs struggled to set aside time to co-plan (Chang, 2018b; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Jenkinson & Benson, 2017; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019; Ratcliff, 2016). To help TCs with this, they can be required to set aside blocks of time each day for planning and at the initial training they can complete a co-planning action plan (Appendix B) to proactively strategize how they can co-plan throughout the semester. Having the TCs create a co-planning action plan and having supervisors follow up with them about their scheduled planning seemed to be key in ensuring that planning time was efficiently utilized in this study. It was also noted from this study that, if possible, it would be better for paired placements if they were able to submit lesson plans and journals that reflected their partnership as opposed to separate works.

Previous paired placement studies were not having supervisors observing co-taught lessons but instead individual lessons and pairs were not evaluated on their collaboration (Akerson & Montgomery, 2017; Chang, 2018). Without these two items being assessed, the validity of the paired placement seems lost. Both were added to this study but it would be more meaningful if these are graded. The TCs were happy to evaluate their peer's collaboration, but it

was noted that they would like to do this throughout the semester. This would ensure that both partners are feeling like there is teamwork and any issues can be caught early.

Another suggestion was to provide support throughout the process (Harvey & Uren, 2019; Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). TCs had positive feedback towards support from the program and suggestions for future semesters. It was suggested that TCs are provided a way to express if there is an issue with his/her partner and that supervisors encourage TCs to contact them as soon as they have a concern so the obstacles can be addressed before they progress.

### **Peer Mentoring**

Physical educators observe, assess, and provide feedback; TCs can improve this practice through peer mentoring (Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). There is validity and value in peer mentoring (Andersen & Watkins, 2018; Harvey & Uren, 2019; Lynam et al., 2015; Patton & Marty-Snyder, 2014). TCs co-plan a lesson and then use the one-teach-one-observe method to assess their peer using both written and verbal feedback. Starting the practice in earlier courses should help TCS develop. TCs need more training in assessing each other and learning what instructional styles suit their abilities; this can be added into pedagogy courses on campus.

### **Findings**

It is important to strategically place TCs based on strengths, abilities, and personalities (Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). The contrast in the two TC's strengths and abilities proved to be a good balance but even the difference in their personalities was a benefit. This mirrors previous research that highlighted how similarities with co-teachers can initially be good in helping them build relationships but true compatibility comes from using personal differences as strengths in co-teaching (Pratt, 2014). When planning for paired placements, it is important to ensure that the TCs have different strengths and weaknesses and their personalities complement not clash.

Paired placements provide support to TCs that they may not get in a singular placement. Reduced anxiety and improved teaching are two benefits that research highlighted for TCs in paired placements (Patton & Marty-Snyder, 2014) that was evident with this study. The support received is seen as highly valuable (Harvey & Uren, 2019) and coming from the same program allows the TCs to better support each other on the educational journey (Ambrosetti et al., 2017). Even the supervisor noticed this. The practice collaborating can later be used when working with a co-teacher, paraprofessional, or even their own student teacher (Baeten et al., 2018).

The structure of the paired placement effects its success. Some paired placements struggle with scheduling planning (Jenkinson & Benson, 2017) but these TCs planned both during school and found ways to communicate outside of school. It was recommended to have students practice co-teaching before entering student teaching together (Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015). The TCs were paired up the previous semester and had co-taught in other classes and both commented that this prepared them for student teaching together. The TCs were glad to have the opportunity to provide feedback about their partner's collaboration. They rated each other with top scores in all areas: co-planning, co-teaching, and peer mentoring.

Other themes found were productive dialogue, harmonize parts, and receptive approach. Peer mentoring requires partners to be open to receiving constructive feedback but also willing to assess their peer and provide him/her with thoughtful remarks as they care about their personal growth and their partner's growth (Le Cornu, 2005). The pair had a lot of advice for future TCs attempting to peer mentor in field experience. Both encouraged TCs to be open-minded and build relationships with their partner. The mentors and supervisors noted that TCs needed to work on using their personal strengths in lessons.

Both TCs experienced coaching and sports delivered through non-teaching methods in PE which exemplifies the TC perspective that PETE programs face (Ferry & McCaughtry, 2013; Flory, 2016). Comparing their acculturation with their field experience, the TCs felt the mentors were great role models and that those were aspects they planned to emulate. Throughout the experience, TCs talked about their current and past mentors. At this time, the TCs took more from their field experience than the acculturation phase which shows the importance of field experiences mirroring what the PETE program in ideals.

### **Conclusion and Future Directions**

The issue with lack of preparation to co-teach was well negated by providing previous experience before student teaching and giving support throughout. TCs could use more practice in formally assessing each other and learning what instructional styles suit their abilities best and these practices can be easily added into pedagogy courses on campus. One thing the program can do to better prepare TCs for harmonizing is helping them learn styles and plans that fit best with their strengths and weaknesses. This case study not only provides feedback that can better the university's programming but also enhanced the field experience for TCs. TCs who are trained by mentors who value teaching lifetime physical activity for all students will be more likely to influence the next generation about the importance of PE. Although the TCs contributed much of their future plans in teaching to their positive field experiences with their mentors, a follow up on the TCs would be beneficial in determining what factors contributed most to their professional choices. This experience was able to fill gaps that were created when the program was forced to change. This can be adapted to other content areas who may be considering paired placements or peer mentoring in field experiences.

### CHAPTER III: ACTION PLAN

The research information will most immediately affect the Lamar University PETE program and how we move forward in training students to be more collaborative. Based on teacher candidate and mentor teacher feedback, changes will be made for the following semesters. This also helps as we continue to make changes to our curriculum to provide teacher candidates with a program that prepares them for the realities of a career as a physical educator.

Research has shown that there can be issues having enough quality mentor teachers for all TCs and that the PETE program should be involved in positioning their TCs in the field (Tannehill & Goc Karp, 1992). Mentor teachers are asked to do a lot; they are not always adequate in accomplishing both task assistance and emotional support (Hennissen et al., 2011) and TCs can have unrealistic ideas of what the mentor will do (He, 2010). This has been an issue in our department. Paired placements reduce the number of needed mentors and enables universities to focus on matching TCs with mentor teachers and using those who have worked well with the program previously. Also, by placing pairs of TCs together, opportunities for collaboration occur (Baeten & Simons, 2016a).

As paired placement with peer mentoring research showed many benefits, there were some issues found in previous research. TCs lack experience in co-teaching and find it difficult to schedule a time for co-planning (Chang, 2018b; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Jenkinson & Benson, 2017; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019; Ratcliff, 2016). With a need to understand how to better support and prepare PE TCs in paired placements, this project established an educational training program for co-teaching for PE TCs and many of the negatives previously found were avoided. The issue with lack of preparation to co-teach was well negated by providing previous experience before student teaching and giving support throughout. Having TCs create a co-

planning action plan and then following up with them about their scheduled planning seemed to be key in ensuring that planning time was efficiently utilized. Previous research suggested that the peers be observed in co-taught lessons, assess each other through one-teach-one-observe, and be provided the opportunity to assess each other in mentorship and collaboration. It was suggested that providing more opportunities throughout the semester to evaluate peer collaboration is needed to ensure balance and true teamwork. It was noted that TCs could use more practice in formally assessing each other and learning what instructional styles suit their abilities best and these practices can be easily added into pedagogy courses on campus. One thing the program can do to better prepare TCs for harmonizing is helping them learn styles and plans that fit best with their strengths and weaknesses.

The results show that further studies may be done on the occupational socialization, paired placement, peer mentoring, assessing peers, and co-teaching in field experiences. This study focused on a piece of the socialization process (the last phase of professional program). Although the TCs contributed much of their future plans in teaching to their positive field experiences with their mentors, a follow up on the TCs to see what type of teaching they implement in their own programs would be beneficial in determining what factors contributed most to their professional choices. Although there were many positives there is room for growth.

The information gathered from this study will not only provide feedback that can be used to better the university's programming but will also enhance the field experience for teacher candidates which in turn can improve their self-efficacy, positively affect their socialization and help with retention in the field. One of the main goals of field experience is to provide TCs a positive experience that reflects what they learned in the professional program. TCs who are trained by mentors who value teaching lifetime physical activity for all students will be more

likely to influence the next generation about the importance of PE. The findings will help to further develop the professional skills of our students in the areas of co-teaching, co-planning, peer mentoring, and socialization. The collaborative skills will hopefully help the teacher candidates to be more willing to be involved in professional learning communities as they enter the profession. The PETE program could also provide the rest of the Kinesiology department with their results. This report will help the faculty in charge of Exercise Science and Health practicums in preparing their students to be more collaborative as well.

These discoveries should also go beyond my local university. Because many PETE faculty members attend state and national conferences, the findings and recommendations will be submitted to The Texas Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance (TAHPERD) and the Society of Health and Physical Educators, the National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (SHAPE) as a poster presentation. There I can answer questions that other professionals may have. To reach an even larger audience and have the research findings easily found, I will disseminate my findings through academic publications. The target audience for these publications will be PETE faculty who work with students in field experiences. The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance (JOPERD) and Quest are two peer-reviewed options. From there, the work could be submitted to The Journal of Teacher Education because the research impacts more than just PETE. Co-teaching in field experience and the findings from this will be useful to all who work with future educators.

A follow-up with alumni would be most valuable in determining what has the greatest effect on the socialization process. Both teacher candidates who completed paired placements and those who completed singular placements would be needed to gather a complete picture of impact from the professional phase. A comparison could be made between the types of



placements, types of programs mentor run, personal acculturation phase and what the atmosphere of their current school was when they entered. From this information, the university could best determine how they can positively effect

## REFERENCES

- Abas, M. C. (2016). Difficulties in field-based observation among pre-service teachers: Implications to practice teaching. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 5(2), 101. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v5i2.4528>
- Akerson, A., & Montgomery, M. S. (2017). Peer-to-peer co-teaching: Idea to implementation. *SRATE Journal*, 26(2), 1–8.
- Ambrosetti, A., Dekkers, J., & Knight, B. A. (2017). Mentoring triad: An alternative mentoring model for preservice teacher education? *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 25(1), 42–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2017.1308093>
- Amnotte, W., & Thomas, J. (2017). *Mixed methods in kinesiology research custom ebook: University of north carolina at greensboro*. Human Kinetics.
- Andersen, T., & Watkins, K. (2018). The value of peer mentorship as an educational strategy in nursing. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 57(4), 217–224. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20180322-05>
- Angelle, P. S. (2006). Instructional leadership and monitoring: Increasing teacher intent to stay through socialization. *NASSP Bulletin*, 90(4), 318–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636506294843>
- Baeten, M., & Simons, M. (2016a). Innovative field experiences in teacher education: Student-teachers and mentors as partners in teaching. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 28(1), 38–51.

- Baeten, M., & Simons, M. (2016b). Student teachers' team teaching: How do learners in the classroom experience team-taught lessons by student teachers? *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(1), 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2015.1135226>
- Baeten, M., Simons, M., Schelfhout, W., & Pinxten, R. (2018). Team teaching during field experiences in teacher education: Exploring the assistant teaching model. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 377–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2018.1448780>
- Barnes, J. T., & Pujol, T. J. (2017). Improving student learning and professional preparation in health promotion utilizing partnerships. *Kinesiology Review*, 6(4), 357–361.
- Blankenship, B. T. (2017). We have met the enemy—And it is us. *International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education*, 1(2), 35–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24711616.2017.1282759>
- Blankenship, B. T., & Coleman, M. M. (2009). An examination of “wash-out” and workplace conditions of beginning physical education teachers. *Physical Educator*, 66(2), 97–111.
- Cabral, M. (2018). Idea bank: Apprenticeships and student teaching. *Music Educators Journal*, 105(2), 12–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432118811001>
- CAEP. (2013). *Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice—Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation*. Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. <http://www.ncate.org/standards/standard-2>
- Castelli, D., & Williams, L. (2007). Health-related fitness and physical education teachers' content knowledge. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 26(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.26.1.3>

- Chang, S. H. (2018a). Co-teaching in student teaching of an elementary education program. *Teacher Educators' Journal*, *11*, 105–113.
- Chang, S. H. (2018b). Co-teaching in student teaching of an elementary education program. *Teacher Educators' Journal*, *11*, 105–113.
- Chen, W. (2006). Teachers' knowledge about and views of the national standards for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *25*(1), 120–142.  
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.25.1.120>
- Clark, R., & Andrews, J. (2009). *Peer mentoring in higher education: A literature review*. WorldCat.org.  
[http://publications.aston.ac.uk/17985/1/Peer\\_mentoring\\_in\\_higher\\_education.pdf](http://publications.aston.ac.uk/17985/1/Peer_mentoring_in_higher_education.pdf)
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452230153>
- Council of Chief State School Officer. (2013). *Interstate teacher assessment and support consortium intasc model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0: A resource for ongoing teacher development*.  
[https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013\\_INTASC\\_Learning\\_Progressions\\_for\\_Teachers.pdf](https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf)
- Creswell, J.W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D., Hastie, P. A., & Kinchin, G. D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education and Society*, *13*(1), 97–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320701780779>

- Faucette, N., & Nugent, P. (2017). Impacts of a peer mentoring program on preservice physical educators' development. *College Student Journal, 51*(3), 355–362.
- Ferry, M., & McCaughtry, N. (2013a). Secondary physical educators and sport content: A love affair. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 32*(4), 375–393.  
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.32.4.375>
- Ferry, M., & McCaughtry, N. (2013b). Secondary physical educators and sport content: A love affair. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 32*(4), 375–393.  
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.32.4.375>
- Flory, S. B. (2016). Professional socialization experiences of early career urban physical educators. *European Physical Education Review, 22*(4), 430–449.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X15616074>
- Gardiner, W., & Robinson, K. S. (2011). Peer field placements with preservice teachers: Negotiating the challenges of professional collaboration. *Professional Educator, 35*(2).  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ988203>
- Geisler, T. M. (2017). *Examining The Socialization Of Physical Education Teachers: A Case Study (Dissertation)* [University of Vermont]. <http://scholarworks.uvm.edu/graddis/725>
- Gunn, F., Lee, S. H. (Mark), & Steed, M. (2017). Student perceptions of benefits and challenges of peer mentoring programs: Divergent perspectives from mentors and mentees. *Marketing Education Review, 27*(1), 15–26.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10528008.2016.1255560>
- Harvey, S., & Uren, C. D. (2019). Collaborative learning: Application of the mentorship model for adult nursing students in the acute placement setting. *Nurse Education Today, 74*, 38–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.11.022>

- Heidorn, B., & Jenkins, D. B. (2015). Supervision in physical education teacher education programs: Making the case for paired placements. *Strategies*, 28(2), 44–48.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08924562.2015.1002349>
- Hennissen, P., Crasborn, F., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2011). Clarifying pre-service teacher perceptions of mentor teachers' developing use of mentoring skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 1049–1058.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.03.009>
- Hushman, G., Napper-Owen, G., & Hushman, C. (2013). Exploring the process of conceptual change of pre-service teachers in a physical education teacher preparation program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 20(2), 109–124.
- International Society for Technology in Education*. (2019). Iste standards for educators.  
<https://www.iste.org/standards/for-educators>
- Jenkinson, K. A., & Benson, A. C. (2017). The assessment and mentoring program (amp): Final year pre-service physical education peer mentors perceptions of effective mentoring. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 17(2), 35–44.  
<https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v17i2.20769>
- LaVine, M. E. (2010). Socialization and student development: The living-learning community - An integration of theory and practice. *Future Focus (Ohio Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance)*, 31(2), 25–36.
- Lawson, H. A. (1983). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2(3), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2.3.3>

- Lawson, H. A. (1986). Occupational socialization and the design of teacher education programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5(2), 107–116.  
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.5.2.107>
- Le Cornu, R. (2005). Peer mentoring: Engaging pre-service teachers in mentoring one another. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 13(3), 355–366.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13611260500105592>
- Lee, O., Ravizza, D. M., Muller, S. M., & Satern, M. N. (2017). Navigating academia: Developing a road map for a professional journey for physical education teacher candidates. *JOPERD: The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 88(3), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2016.1270786>
- Lynam, A.-M., Corish, C., & Connolly, D. (2015). Development of a framework to facilitate a collaborative peer learning 2:1 model of practice placement education: A 2:1 model of practice placement education. *Nutrition & Dietetics*, 72(2), 170–175.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1747-0080.12133>
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide*. Family Health International.
- Matanin, M., & Collier, C. (2003). Longitudinal analysis of preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(2), 153–168.
- Mercier, K., Centeio, E., Garn, A., Erwin, H., Marttinen, R., & Foley, J. (2021). Physical Education Teachers' Experiences With Remote Instruction During the Initial Phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 40(2), 337–342.  
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2020-0272>

- Montgomery, M. S., & Akerson, A. (2019). Facilitating collaboration through a co-teaching field experience. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 21(1).  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1206822>
- Mooney, A., & Gullock, L. (2013). “Back to the future” Building mentoring capacity in physical education teacher education students. In R. Brandenburg & J. Z. Wilson, *Pedagogies for the Future* (pp. 85–98). SensePublishers. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-278-5\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-278-5_9)
- Murawski, W., & Lochner, W. (2015). *Co-Teaching core competency framework*. 2Teach.  
<http://nebula.wsimg.com/13e0321b34184bff731a8a33a76351f1?AccessKeyId=762D00E6E8616E18D161&disposition=0&alloworigin=1>
- Patton, B. J., & Marty-Snyder, M. (2014). Practical Applications for Using Peer assessment in physical education teacher education field experiences. *Strategies*, 27(6), 25–31.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08924562.2014.960121>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Placek, J. H., Dodds, P., Doolittle, S. A., Portman, P. A., Ratliffe, T. A., & Pinkham, K. M. (1995). Teaching Recruits’ Physical Education Backgrounds and Beliefs About Purposes for Their Subject Matter. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14(3), 246–261.
- Placek, J. H., Doolittle, S. A., Ratliffe, T. A., Dodds, P., Portman, P. A., & Pinkham, K. M. (1995). Teaching recruits’ physical education backgrounds and beliefs about purposes for their subject matter. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14(3), 246–261.  
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.14.3.246>



- Posner, G. J., Strike, K. A., Hewson, P. W., & Gertzog, W. A. (1982). Accommodation of a scientific conception: Toward a theory of conceptual change. *Science Education*, 66(2), 211–227. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.3730660207>
- Pratt, S. (2014). Achieving symbiosis: Working through challenges found in co-teaching to achieve effective co-teaching relationships. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 41, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.02.006>
- Ratcliff, C. (2016). *Co-teaching: How do teachers rate barriers to effective co-teaching?* [Governors State University]. <https://opus.govst.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1229&context=capstones>
- Richards, K. A. R., & Gaudreault, K. L. (Eds.). (2016). *Teacher socialization in physical education: New perspectives* (1st ed.). Taylor & Francis Group. <https://www-taylorfrancis-com.libproxy.uncg.edu/books/e/9781315679471>
- Richards, K. A. R., Housner, L. D., & Templin, T. J. (2018). Addressing physical education teacher socialization through standards-based reform of physical education teacher education. *Quest*, 70(3), 334–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2017.1388262>
- Richards, K. A. R., & Templin, T. J. (2019). Chapter 3: Recruitment and retention in pete: Foundations in occupational socialization theory. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 38(1), 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0212>
- Risko, V. J., & Reid, L. (2019). What really matters for literacy teacher preparation? *The Reading Teacher*, 72(4), 423–429. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1769>
- Rubin, H. H., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

- Russell, M. L., & Russell, J. A. (2011). Mentoring relationships: Cooperating teachers' perspectives on mentoring student interns. *The Professional Educator*, 35(2), 21.
- Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- SHAPE America. (2020). *School reentry considerations: K-12 physical education, health education, and physical activity*. [https://www.shapeamerica.org/advocacy/reentry/K-12\\_School\\_Re-entry\\_Considerations.aspx](https://www.shapeamerica.org/advocacy/reentry/K-12_School_Re-entry_Considerations.aspx)
- Simons, M., & Baeten, M. (2016). Student teachers' team teaching during field experiences: An evaluation by their mentors. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 24(5), 415–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2016.1271560>
- Tannehill, D., & Goc Karp, G. (1992). The student teaching practicum: Placement trends and issues. *Physical Educator*, 49(1), 39.
- Templin, T. J., Graber, K. C., & Richards, K. A. R. (2019). Chapter 9: Will pete survive in the 21st century? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 38(1), 68–74.
- Templin, T. J., & Schempp, P. G. (1989). *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach*. Benchmark Press.
- Texas Education Agency. (2016). *T-TESS Rubric*. [https://www.teachfortexas.org/Resource\\_Files/Guides/T-TESS\\_Rubric.pdf](https://www.teachfortexas.org/Resource_Files/Guides/T-TESS_Rubric.pdf)
- Valencia, S. W., Martin, S. D., Place, N. A., & Grossman, P. (2009). Complex interactions in student teaching: Lost opportunities for learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(3), 304–322. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109336543>

- Vu, P., & Fisher, C. (2021). Does Virtual Field Experience Deliver? An Examination into Virtual Field Experience during the Pandemic and Its Implications for Teacher Education Programs. *Open Praxis*, 13(1), 117–125. <https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.13.1.1191>
- Vumilia, P. L., & Semali, L. M. (2016). *Can the mentoring and socialization of pre-service teachers improve teacher education?* 6(2), 29.
- Wright, S. C. 1, Grenier, M., & Channell, K. (2012). University supervision within physical education teacher education. *Education*, 132(4), 699–707.
- Wright, S., & Grenier, M. (2018). Cooperating teachers' beliefs and teaching practices. *Journal of Research in Health, Physical Education, Sport & Dance*, 9(2), 20.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage Publications.

## APPENDIX A: PROGRAM OUTLINE

### Initial Training

- Brief introduction/review of to co-teaching and instructional styles
- Benefits of co-teaching
  - Multiple perspectives in planning and in reaching students.
  - Better student-teacher ratio. Higher engagement.
  - Flexibility in groupings and instructional styles.
  - Decrease in discipline problems and increase in overall classroom management.
- Barriers to co-teaching effectiveness
  - Time for planning. Time for building a relationship.
  - Determining grading with two teachers.
  - Student readiness. Teacher readiness and school support for co-teaching.
  - Different philosophies and miscommunications that causes the “Mommy-Daddy” issue.
- Modeling and practice of various styles.
- Co-planning Action Plan Document
- Lesson Co-Planning Action Plan Form

### Newsletters

- Review of Types of Co-Teaching
  - Challenges and Rewards to Collaborative Team Teaching
  - Focus on what are the challenges at the current placement and how these might affect your planning. Set goals together.
- Team Teaching and One Teach – One Assist
  - Review Team Teaching
  - Review One-Teach – One Assist
  - Reflect on how you could use both of these styles soon. What lessons might benefit from either style? How will you plan, teach and assess using this style?
- Station Teaching
  - Review of tips for teaching at stations or centers
  - Tips for working with large classes
  - Reflect on how you could use station teaching soon. What lessons might benefit from stations? How will you plan, teach and assess using this style?
- One Teach – One Observe
  - Review of how and when to use one teach- one observes.
  - Tips for being a good peer mentor.
  - Notes on observing and assessing.
  - Challenge – pick a lesson to use one teach – one observe. Complete the peer assessment form. Provide formal written and verbal feedback to your partner.
- Alternative Teaching and Parallel teaching
  - Review Parallel Teaching

- Review Alternative Teaching
- Reflect – When is Parallel a good choice? When might you try the Alternative Teaching style? What might be some challenges to Alternative Teaching that are different than the other styles?

Field Activities

- Peer evaluation – Use One Teach - One Assist. Provide written and verbal feedback.
- Observation of co-taught lessons.
- Peer assessment on collaboration and mentoring.

APPENDIX B: CO-PLANNING ACTION PLAN

<b>Planning Elements</b>	<b>Guiding Questions</b>	<b>What will this look like?</b>
Time and Place	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When will we plan together? (days of the week, time)</li> <li>2. Where will we meet to plan?</li> <li>3. How will we use our time effectively and efficiently?</li> </ol>	
Documenting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. How will we document our decisions and lessons for us all to see and use?</li> <li>5. What lesson planning template or format will we use?</li> </ol>	
Purpose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. How will we determine the focus for the lesson?</li> <li>7. How will we use standards and to establish a CLEAR PURPOSE for each lesson?</li> <li>8. How will we post this purpose in our classrooms so that both students and adults understand the purpose?</li> </ol>	
Learning Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. How will we decide on the learning activities and teaching strategies you will use?</li> </ol>	
Individual Students	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. How will we plan to keep the individual learning styles and multiple intelligences of our students in mind?</li> <li>11. How will be sure to differentiate to meet individual student needs?</li> </ol>	
Resources	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12. How will we share and use our resources during planning? (materials, technology, supplies)</li> </ol>	
Logistics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13. How will we plan on how to collaboratively set up for a lesson? (equipment, materials, tables, etc.)</li> </ol>	

Modified from Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESA 7 School Improvement Services).  
[https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Co-Teaching%20Modules/Module%201/04%20Co-Teaching%20Workbook\\_Action\\_Plan\\_CESA\\_SI.pdf](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Co-Teaching%20Modules/Module%201/04%20Co-Teaching%20Workbook_Action_Plan_CESA_SI.pdf)

APPENDIX C: LESSON CO-TEACHING ACTION PLAN

Teaching Elements	Guiding Questions	What will this look like?
Content	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TEKS?</li> <li>2. Activity?</li> <li>3. In what ways can we vary the content to meet learner needs and still meet our grade-level expectations and standards?</li> </ol>	
Learning Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. How will we decide on the learning activities and teaching strategies you will use?</li> <li>5. How will we plan for grouping and movement of students to meet all students' needs?</li> </ol>	
Process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Knowing that our students have unique learning styles and learning needs, how can we vary the way we <u>present</u> new learning to students and engage them to meet individual needs?</li> </ol>	
Product	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. How can we vary the way <u>students show us their understanding</u> and skills to meet their individual needs? (think of various assessments)</li> </ol>	
Technology	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. How will you share your roles using technology during instruction?</li> </ol>	
Teaching Style	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Which teaching routines will you share as a team?</li> <li>10. How will we use our own teaching styles in ways to benefit all of our students?</li> <li>11. Which style will work for this lesson?</li> <li>12. What strengths do each of us bring to this lesson?</li> </ol>	
Logistics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13. How will we plan on the clean-up of a lesson and transition?</li> </ol>	

Modified from Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESA 7 School Improvement Services).  
[https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Co-Teaching%20Modules/Module%201/04%20Co-Teaching%20Workbook\\_Action\\_Plan\\_CESA\\_SI.pdf](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Co-Teaching%20Modules/Module%201/04%20Co-Teaching%20Workbook_Action_Plan_CESA_SI.pdf)

APPENDIX D: CO-TEACHING PAIRED PLACEMENT OBSERVATION FORM

**Co-Teaching Paired Placement Observation Form**

**Teacher Candidates** \_\_\_\_\_

**School/ISD** \_\_\_\_\_

**Observer** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_ **Time** \_\_\_\_\_

**Grade/Subject/Topic** \_\_\_\_\_

**The following were observed during the visit.** *(check one or more)*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> One Teach/One Observe | <input type="checkbox"/> One Teach/One Assist |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parallel Teaching     | <input type="checkbox"/> Station Teaching     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Team Teaching/Teaming | <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative Teaching |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____           |   |

**Instructional Practices** *(NI, D, P, or A. See rubric on the following pages.)*

- Planning
- Assessment
- Instruction

**Content**

- Knowledge and Organization
- Instructional Approaches

**Environment**

- Diversity and Differences
- Classroom Environment

NOTES \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



Instructional Practices	Needs Improvement	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished
<p>Planning. Evidence: copies of lesson plans or other documents; materials ready and both teachers know where they are and how to use them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that this team co-plans.</li> <li>• Most planning, if done at all, is done by one teacher.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This team rarely co-plans and communicates primarily on the fly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This team co-plans at irregular times but does try to integrate both teachers' perspectives when possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This team co-plans its lessons and integrates both teachers' areas of expertise to the maximum extent possible.</li> <li>• Teachers don't have to check with each other about what to do or when to do it – they move fluidly through the lesson</li> </ul>
<p>Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that this team co-assesses.</li> <li>• One teacher is in charge of the grades and gradebook/lesson assessment.</li> <li>• No assessment was observed.</li> <li>• No higher-order thinking questions.</li> <li>• Little opportunity for student feedback/interaction .</li> <li>• Moves on even though there is evidence that few students demonstrate mastery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers assess his/her "own" students.</li> <li>• Questions promote limited response and some complex.</li> <li>• Some opportunity for student feedback/interaction.</li> <li>• Addresses some mistakes. Persists until some mastery is seen</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers use differentiated assessments occasionally and are willing to share responsibility for grading.</li> <li>• Questions encourage student complex thought.</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for student feedback/interaction.</li> <li>• Addresses student mistakes and encourages mastery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers share responsibility for creating assessments, grading, and for students' overall success.</li> <li>• Differentiated assessments are created when needed and both teachers are comfortable with adaptations</li> <li>• Questions encourage student complex thought.</li> <li>• Student-teacher and student-student questions and interaction encouraged.</li> <li>• Provides practical feedback for students. Uses the observation data for instructional adjustments.</li> <li>• Anticipates mistakes and addresses them before. Encourages students and persists till there is mastery.</li> </ul>
<p>Instruction. Parity and Active Involvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adults do not communicate with one another.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that this team co-instructs. One teacher is clearly responsible as evidenced in documentation/plans etc.</li> <li>• Not monitoring student participation.</li> <li>• Not recognizing or responding to student frustration, confusion, off-task,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adults use "I" language frequently (e.g., "I want you to..." Or "In my class..."), lacking parity.</li> <li>• One teacher is clearly "lead" however the other does have intermittent areas of responsibility</li> <li>• Monitoring some student participation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adults attempt to use "we" language and include each other, but it is clear that one adult is more used to "ruling" the class.</li> <li>• Both teachers are provided turns in co-instruction.</li> <li>• Regularly monitoring student participation and performance.</li> <li>• Recognizes when students become disengaged and adjusts activities, goals, or equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adults clearly use "we" language (e.g., "We would like you to..."), showing that they both share the responsibility and students know they are equally in charge</li> <li>• Teachers are comfortable in any role and roles are interchanging and fluid throughout the lesson plan.</li> <li>• Regularly monitoring student participation and performance.</li> <li>• Proactive to avoid students becoming confused, frustrated, or disengaged. Addresses</li> </ul>

	or disengaged behaviors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal response to student frustration, confusion, off-task, or disengaged behaviors.</li> </ul>		physical, social and emotional needs of students.
<b>Content</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>
Content Knowledge and prepared materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inaccurate knowledge pertaining to physical education.</li> <li>How the activity is relevant or meaningful has not been addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mostly accurate knowledge pertaining to physical education</li> <li>Activity relevant to some students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurate knowledge pertaining to physical education.</li> <li>Activity is relevant to most students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conveys proficient content knowledge in physical education that provides information for varying levels of student understanding.</li> <li>All students are engaged in relevant, meaningful learning as they are provided choices.</li> </ul>
Variety of Instructional approaches and teacher communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not appropriately sequenced throughout.</li> <li>Negative communication between teachers.</li> <li>Not collaborating; working separately.</li> <li>One adult is primarily leading for whole-group.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most activities appropriately sequenced.</li> <li>Communication between teachers is minimal or directive.</li> <li>Little collaborative work.</li> <li>One-teach, one-support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All activities appropriately sequenced.</li> <li>Activities and materials meet needs of all learners.</li> <li>Communication is limited but positive.</li> <li>Both are engaged in the same space.</li> <li>Students are taught using more than whole group.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All activities are logically sequenced throughout. Students understand how lesson fits into larger scheme (unit).</li> <li>Both adults communicate regularly in appositive and respectful way.</li> <li>Collaborating well.</li> <li>More than one of the co-teaching models is used.</li> </ul>
<b>Environment</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>
Learner Differences and Diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One-size fits all lesson. Activities and materials may not meet needs of all learners.</li> <li>Students do not talk to one another ever during class</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities and materials meet needs of most learners.</li> <li>Some students appear to be excluded from the student interactions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities and materials meet needs of all learners.</li> <li>Most students appear to be included in the majority of student interactions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities, materials, and assessments meet needs of all learners.</li> <li>It is evident from the students' actions and words that all students are considered an equal part of the class and are included in all student interactions</li> </ul>
Classroom Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no obvious plan for behavior management, nor do adults appear to communicate about how they are approaching class management, possibly inappropriate management.</li> <li>Procedures, directions, or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very little classroom management; mainly conducted by one teacher</li> <li>Some procedures and directions clear.</li> <li>Students need teacher direction to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Behavior management strategies are utilized but there is very little clear evidence of how adults have communicated about their use</li> <li>All procedures and directions clear.</li> <li>Students participate in groups and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is evident that adults have discussed how they will approach classroom/behavior management and adults are consistent in their approach</li> <li>Procedures, directions, transitions clear and efficient.</li> <li>Students take responsibility in managing group and</li> </ul>

	<p>transitions cause confusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students are unclear of their roles and may not remain active.</li> <li>• Teacher is managing supplies. All students may not be able to access supplies.</li> <li>• Activities or materials are unorganized or unsafe</li> </ul>	<p>manage group and supplies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity safe but there is disorganization or clutter that could cause safety issues or hinder learning.</li> </ul>	<p>manage supplies with limited teacher assistance. Students remain active.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity and materials are safe and organized. Equipment is handled efficiently. Class supports learning.</li> </ul>	<p>supplies which increases efficiency. Students are active majority of the class time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity and materials are safe, organized, and ran efficiently. Class feels inviting and objectives attainable for all students.</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---	---

Adapted from Murawski and Lochner (Co-Teaching Core Competency Framework) and the T-TESS rubric (Texas Teacher Evaluation & Support System)

## APPENDIX E: CASE CONTEXT

PETE classes in the curriculum include management skills, elementary methods, secondary methods, lifetime physical activity, inclusive physical education, and curriculum and planning. In the PETE classes, TCs practice planning together and teaching micro-lessons to the rest of the class. There is a focus on lifetime physical activity, differentiated instruction, and basic teaching methods to help students prepare for field experiences. Those on track for certification take classes that require field experiences over two years.

The TCs were two seniors in their final semester at the university. Ben came from an urban school district and played various sports in school, but basketball was his favorite. He is known for being outgoing, loud, and a jokester. He plans to coach and teach PE in the future but would also love to one day be an inspirational speaker for troubled youth. Grace is from a smaller town and played sports throughout school, volleyball and soccer being her favorites. She has a more serious personality, tends to be introverted and can be soft spoken. Grace had various coaching experiences before student teaching and plans to coach and teach PE in her future.

Throughout the program, Grace and Ben have had many classes together. The researcher taught Grace and Ben in a field experience class the semester before student teaching and in various PETE classes. Ben was also assigned to the researcher for advising. These experiences with Grace and Ben over several years enabled the researcher to build a relationship with them. Understanding their strengths, weaknesses, and ambitions enabled the researcher to provide the best possible feedback in guiding them through co-teaching.

The semester before student teaching, Grace and Ben were paired up for a field experience course. They were not able to finish their hours at the placement due to the shutdown for the COVID-19 pandemic. In the Spring of 2020, in an effort to reduce transmission of the virus, schools

shutdown in-person learning which forced education to move to online and remote learning situations which included PE (Mercier et al., 2021). During this time, most mentors did not include their TCs as they were charting new waters. However, the experience before the shutdown did give the TCs some opportunity to practice planning and teaching together. COVID-19 also affected their student teaching semester. There were many suggestions for returning to in person PE by SHAPE America such as physical distancing during activity, wearing face masks, cleaning equipment, reduced locker room usage, use of outdoor space when possible, sanitizing hands upon entry and exit, etc. (SHAPE America, 2020). The main differences the TCs noted was face masks, sending students outside more than usual, cleaning equipment between classes, and using more time changing clothes at the secondary level so that less students were in the locker room at a time. There were also two hurricane evacuations in the area and one hurricane caused minimal damage. Between schools changing their schedules due to COVID-19 (starting later than planned) and the hurricanes, the state reduced the number of required field days for the student teaching group from 70 days to 50 days.

As research has stated that it is important to use placements where mentors run programs that align with best practices, the mentors are carefully chosen for PETE TCs. All TCs must have field experiences at both the elementary and secondary levels. The mentors the PETE program works with at both levels have excellent classroom management skills which is important for TCs to experience and learn. The mentors plan and introduce students to a variety of activities; they are not solely engrossed in sport. They provide feedback to their students on skills instead of simply refereeing or running the activity. The mentors have received glowing feedback from previous TCs about their abilities to work with and encourage the TCs.

The two mentor teachers chosen for this project, Coach M and Coach N, were previously used not only for mentoring student teachers but also for hosting a field experience class. The semester before student teaching, a class of TCs went to the elementary one day a week and the middle school another. Coach M and Coach N both valued the opportunity to have the group in their respective gyms. The course carefully progressed the teaching process from small interactions to whole class teaching and the class was able to observe a student teacher and receive feedback and tips from them. This is no longer an option, and the mentors see that the TCs seem less prepared to start teaching at the beginning of the student teaching experience. Due to COVID19, many districts had closed their campuses and not allowed university students in their early field placements to get in person experience which has further reduced teaching readiness in the final semester.

APPENDIX F: PEER ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

LESSON TOPIC AND TITLE AND GRADE

---

TEACHER

---

<b><u>Instruction and Environment RUBRIC</u></b>	<b><u>Score</u></b>
1. Clear and specific communication (explanations, signals, activity, brief, etc.) Verbal and written. Conveys accurate content knowledge.	NI D P A
2. Makes learning goal clear to student. Information/activity is appropriate to the level of the learner. Integrates learning objectives with other disciplines.	NI D P A
3. Positioning for instruction. Quality demonstrations. Clear and efficient transitions, routines, and procedures. Instructor moves around the class giving attention to various students.	NI D P A
4. Students actively participate in groups, manage supplies and equipment with very limited teacher direction. The classroom is efficient, safe and organized to support learning objectives.	NI D P A
5. The activities and instruction follow a logical progression for the teaching session. Provides differentiated instructional methods and content to ensure students have the opportunity to master what is being taught.	NI D P A
6. Addresses student mistakes and follows through to ensure student mastery.	NI D P A
7. Monitors engagement. Adjusts instruction and activities to maintain students' engagement. Recognizes when students become confused or disengaged and responds to student learning or social/emotional needs.	NI D P A
8. Uses probing questions to clarify and elaborate learning. Provides closure.	NI D P A

LESSON COMMENTS -

---



---



---



---



---



---

*NI – Needs Improvement, D – Developing, P – Proficient, A – Accomplished.*

*Characteristics of each category scale are on the next page.*

<b>Instruction</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>
Accurate content knowledge. Clear and specific communication (verbal and written).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inaccurate knowledge pertaining to physical education.</li> <li>• Student confusion.</li> <li>• Lack of written communication or contains errors. Verbal unclear or erroneous grammar.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly accurate knowledge pertaining to physical education.</li> <li>• Verbal and written communication that is mostly clear with minor errors.</li> <li>• May notice student confusion and rephrase.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate knowledge pertaining to physical education.</li> <li>• Clear verbal and written communication that is correct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conveys proficient content knowledge in physical education that provides information for varying levels of student understanding.</li> <li>• Written and verbal communication is clear, correct, and reasoned.</li> </ul>
Learning goal clear to student. Developmentally appropriate. Integrates other disciplines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning goal unclear.</li> <li>• Goals challenge few students.</li> <li>• Content may not be aligned with state PE TEKS or not appropriate for student level.</li> <li>• Not connecting to student's prior knowledge.</li> <li>• Not integrating with other disciplines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some students understand learning goal.</li> <li>• Goals challenge most students.</li> <li>• Content mostly aligned with state PE TEKS and appropriate for student level.</li> <li>• Some connection to student prior knowledge.</li> <li>• Some connection to other disciplines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students understand learning goal.</li> <li>• Goals challenge all students.</li> <li>• All content aligned with state PE TEKS and appropriate for student level.</li> <li>• Connects to student prior knowledge and experiences.</li> <li>• Integrates relevant prior knowledge and connects to other disciplines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students can establish high goals for themselves in the lesson.</li> <li>• Lesson content aligned with state PE TEKS, appropriate for student level, and goals are measurable. Appropriate for diverse learners.</li> <li>• Adjusts lessons based on student prior knowledge. Guides students to connect to their experiences.</li> <li>• Integrate and reinforce concepts from other disciplines.</li> </ul>
Addresses student mistakes and follows through to ensure student mastery.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few opportunities for feedback.</li> <li>• Mistakes not addressed or discourages student.</li> <li>• Moves on even though there is evidence that few students demonstrate mastery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timely feedback.</li> <li>• Addresses some mistakes. Persists until some mastery is seen.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and specific feedback.</li> <li>• Addresses student mistakes and encourages mastery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides practical feedback for students. Uses the observation data for instructional adjustments.</li> <li>• Anticipates mistakes and addresses them before. Encourages students and persists till there is mastery.</li> </ul>
Uses probing questions to clarify and elaborate learning. Provides closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No higher-order thinking questions.</li> <li>• Little opportunity for student feedback/interaction.</li> <li>• No closure or lack of appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions promote limited response and some complex.</li> <li>• Some opportunity for student feedback/interaction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions encourage student complex thought.</li> <li>• Provides opportunity for student feedback/interaction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions encourage student complex thought.</li> <li>• Student-teacher and student-student questions and interaction encouraged.</li> </ul>



	time spent on closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closure provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided appropriate time for lesson closure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided time for student and lesson reflection. Bridges to next class. Connects to real world.</li> </ul>
<b>Environment</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>
Positioning for instruction. Quality demonstrations. Clear and efficient transitions, routines, and procedures. Instructor moves around the class giving attention to various students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students cannot see or hear. Lack of demonstrations.</li> <li>• Procedures, directions, or transitions cause confusion.</li> <li>• Instructor is not accessible to all students during independent practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most students can see and hear instruction. Demonstration provided.</li> <li>• Some procedures and directions clear.</li> <li>• Instructor is accessible to most students during independent practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students can see and hear. Demonstrations provided from multiple angles with main goal pointed out.</li> <li>• All procedures and directions clear.</li> <li>• Instructor is accessible to students and practice proximity control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students are involved in instruction and have opportunities to ask questions. Students are used in demonstrations.</li> <li>• Procedures, directions, transitions clear and efficient.</li> <li>• Instructor moves freely throughout the class to provide feedback and be accessible for students. Students know what to do when the instructor is working with other students.</li> </ul>
Activities and instruction follow a logical progression. Differentiation used to ensure students have the opportunity to master content.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not appropriately sequenced throughout.</li> <li>• One-size fits all lesson. Activities and materials may not meet needs of all learners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most activities appropriately sequenced.</li> <li>• Activities and materials meet needs of most learners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All activities appropriately sequenced.</li> <li>• Activities and materials meet needs of all learners.</li> <li>• Activity is relevant to most students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All activities are logically sequenced throughout. Students understand how lesson fits into larger scheme (unit).</li> <li>• Activities, materials, and assessments meet needs of all learners.</li> <li>• All students are engaged in relevant, meaningful learning as they are provided choices.</li> </ul>
Monitors engagement. Adjusts to maintain student engagement. Recognizes when students become confused or disengaged and responds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not monitoring student participation.</li> <li>• Not recognizing or responding to student frustration, confusion, off-task, or disengaged behaviors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring some student participation.</li> <li>• Minimal response to student frustration, confusion, off-task, or disengaged behaviors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly monitoring student participation and performance.</li> <li>• Recognizes when students become disengaged and adjusts activities, goals, or equipment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly monitoring student participation and performance.</li> <li>• Proactive to avoid students becoming confused, frustrated, or disengaged. Addresses physical, social and emotional needs of students.</li> </ul>
Students actively participate in groups, manage supplies and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students are unclear of their roles and may not remain active.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students need teacher direction to manage group and supplies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students participate in groups and manage supplies with limited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students take responsibility in managing group and supplies which increases efficiency.</li> </ul>

<p>equipment with very limited teacher direction. Classroom is efficient, safe and organized to support learning objectives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher is managing supplies. All students may not be able to access supplies.</li> <li>• Activities or materials are unorganized or unsafe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity safe but there is disorganization or clutter that could cause safety issues or hinder learning.</li> </ul>	<p>teacher assistance. Students remain active.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity and materials are safe and organized. Equipment is handled efficiently. Class supports learning.</li> </ul>	<p>Students are active majority of the class time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity and materials are safe, organized, and ran efficiently. Class feels inviting and objectives attainable for all students.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

## APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW GUIDE

### Co-Teaching Paired Placement Interview Guide

[Interviewees] it is good to see you both again. Thank you for your willingness to participate in my research study. Before we begin, I want to take a minute to review the purpose of this interview: I am interested in how you two teacher candidates feel about co-teaching, co-planning, peer mentoring, your paired placement, and your confidence in performing these skills in your next stage (your career). The information gathered will help in a few ways. One, I can understand what we can do to further help the two of you in your paired placement. Next, the information will help us improve our programming and enhance the field experience for future teach candidates. The goal is to increase self-efficacy (belief in oneself) and positively affect the socialization of the Physical Educators we send into the field. This may be used in possible research publications. The interview should take between 10 and 20 minutes.

Anything you say will be kept strictly confidential. I will transcribe this conversation and then remove your name and any identifying information from the interview and replace it with a pseudonym (fake name). This pseudonym will be used in place of your real name when referring to you in any research reports. Following transcription, the audio file from the interview will be destroyed. The resulting text file will be de-identified. This is to ensure that none of the information you provide me can be traced back to you.

I also want you to know that your participation in this interview and research project is entirely optional. You may drop out of the study at any point or decline to answer any question. While the risk associated with this study is low, some of the questions may make you feel uncomfortable or vulnerable. If this happens, feel free to say that you do not want to answer that question. In addition, if you say something during the interview and decide later that you do not want us to use it, please let me know and I can remove these comments. Also, I will later send you my interpretations of the interview and you will be able to provide clarification on if this accurately reflects your experience. I would like to record the interview with the understanding that the recording will be deleted after we have transcribed our conversation. Do I have your permission to audio record the conversation? [wait for response]

Before we begin with the interview questions, I want to give you an opportunity to ask any questions that you may have. [wait for response] Do you have any questions about the interview or any of the other information I have given to you before we begin? [wait for response] Okay, then let's begin.

## APPENDIX H: SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Initial questions are about how the teacher candidates feel about co-teaching, co-planning, peer mentoring, paired placement, and their confidence in performing these in their next stage. Further questions are spawned from teacher candidate's responses to the initial question.

### ***Paired Placement.***

New placement

1. When are you fitting in your scheduled planning sessions here? Tell what it is like and how it is going.
2. How does this middle school placement compare to co-teaching at the elementary school?
3. Do you have any thoughts on how Covid affects your placement here? Does it affect planning?
4. How are you including your mentor in your planning and teaching?

### ***Co-planning and co-teaching.***

5. How and why did you choose this style of co-teaching for this lesson?
6. Have you tried any other types of co-teaching instructional styles yet at this placement?
7. How do you feel about the lesson you just co-planned and co-taught? Do you feel more or less confident after teaching this lesson?
8. Are you having any struggles with co-planning/co-teaching right now? What are your goals for upcoming lessons?
9. How could your supervisor, your Mentor, or I better support you with the co-planning?

### ***Peer mentoring.***

10. I sent you a challenge to have you use one-teach-one observe so you can formally assess each other. (Read over challenge). How do you feel about that?
11. How could you two better support and critique each other?

## APPENDIX I: CODEBOOK

**Theme:** Contrasting Qualities

**Researchers Interpretation:** Paired peers having different strengths and weaknesses while having the same goals is more beneficial to the growth of the pair than partners with similar qualities.

### Examples from the data:

Interviews

#### *Differences in partners*

Ben – “we are very different. “

Grace – “And that helps so much, like if we were similar and we had the same issues. It would be not great.”

Grace – “We are very different, but both of us do get along with most people; that probably helps us.”

Ben – “I feel it was successful because of our differences. We kind of help each other”

Grace – “that's exactly what I was going to say.”

Ben – “you know? Cause we have different differences. So it's like, what she not good at, I'm probably good at. Like speaking loud. And what she's good at, which is explaining things, I suck at. So me piggybacking off her and seeing how she explained and slowed things down helped me. Cause I'm like she's really good at that. So like that was perfect for me. She articulates everything and it helps. So I like to co-teach and how it helped me with my skills.”

Grace – “He helps so much when it comes to like, if we're in the middle of the activity, he will literally just like change it real quick. And like, I'm totally fine with that because I tend to be high-strung, and I want to do it this way. But like in the middle of the lesson, if it's not going right or they're not having fun, then you have to change it and I'll get nervous. And like, I don't know what to do, but he'll be like, all right, we're going to do a point system. Then they're excited because they have something to work towards.”

Grace – “And so like, I think we, yeah, like he said, our differences complement one another because like, we are better at different things. And so that worked out really well. It's not like we're both good at one thing. And then we both neglect another thing. It goes really well together.”

#### *Differences with Mentors*

Ben – “All of them are very, very different. Not even going to lie. Each one of them are different in their own way, but all of them are good though. That's the crazy thing. You know, each one of them are good. Just, they all have different tactics and different things that they do, which I thought all teachers was kind of the same as certain things, but each one have different things for different students.”

Ben – “I feel as if each co-teacher have their own differences that, you know, could bump heads. I wasn't really there when they was, you know, developing each other and you know, learning each other. Coach F and Coach M, they had like that kind of mutual respect thing. They all like when one spoke the other one didn't when other ones spoke. Coach C and Coach

K.T., they're completely different. Like one is more outgoing and one, Coach C, is more quiet.”

Grace – “It's interesting to see the different dynamics and like, it's really nice. And it makes sense that we would co-teach together because that's what you're going to do in the future. And it doesn't like take away from what we've learned it. Like it helps us get better together.”

Grace – “So that was interesting to see just like the difference. I liked having both my placements, having two teachers that was really good. They (between the placements) have a lot of similarities when it comes to like, they have really good classroom management and like discipline stuff. Like overall that's, I feel like how they've worked together for so long and like made it work for so long. And so even though they are very different, their placements or their age level is very different. Like there's a lot of similarities with like you have these rules, you stick to them, you have a code of conduct. You have like a hierarchy as far as like, if you do this, this will happen. And you stick to it and they always kept their promises. And so that was good. That was interesting. So it makes sense that y'all would send me to good classrooms.”

#### Excerpts from Researcher Observations

##### Lesson 1 – One-teach-one-assist

- Ben took the lead role first. Ben did most of the directing with Grace assisting. Ben is loud and clear and does a good job of breaking down the important parts of the skill. Grace dealt with students who were not participating or following rules.
- Grace took the lead role in class two. The two have very different styles and strengths. Grace struggles to carry her voice across the gym but is good at speaking brief and providing clarity. Ben jumps in and reiterates when it appears some students did not hear. He moves around, gives feedback and challenges students to keep them engaged.

##### Lesson 2 – Begin team teaching and switched to Parallel

- Ben and Grace introduced the lesson together. Grace did most of the speaking for introduction. Ben stepped in to demonstrate and repeat when necessary.
- Grace gave more feedback on specific skills than Ben. Ben was trying to get students excited. When they were not trying or seemed bored, he added a point system to the game and started yelling and cheering to get them moving.

##### Lesson 3 – One-teach-one-assist

- Ben took the lead first. He was less confident today but still cheerful. Where there is an issue, Grace takes care of it or calls over the Mentor teacher for backup.
- Grace took second lead. Volleyball is a sport she coaches so was comfortable. The fact that at the beginning students are quiet and up close to see and hear about the rotation meant that she did not have to struggle with students hearing her today. In the activity, Grace focused on skills and students rotating between points. Ben focused on students being excited. Grace provided adjustments for students who struggled to serve.

#### Supervisor Comments from Observations

##### Lesson 1 – Begin with team teaching and switch to One-teach-one-assist

- They are so different, but it works. It is interesting to watch them together as they are trying to figure out their roles.
- Ben is easy to hear and gathers student attention quickly. He seemed to have a lot of fun while Grace seemed nervous, but I think the nerves are more directed at teaching younger students than my observing them.
- Grace has to use a whistle or Ben to get everyone's attention. She gives better more concise directions though. Her feedback was too general.

Lesson 2 – Begin team teaching and switched to Parallel

- Both have improved greatly at working with younger students. Ben did a good job of moving around and working with a variety of students. He did a good job of asking questions to students to involve them.
- Grace gave more specific feedback this lesson. She is good at noticing safety issues. She adjusted the way the students were rotating to fix this.

Lesson 3 – one-teach-one-assist throughout

- Grace had a lot of enthusiasm for this lesson. This time Ben took a different role and supported Grace more in keeping students on-task and focused.

Journals

*Different journal focuses which reflect their different personalities.*

- Ben. Diversity, inclusion, discipline, classroom management.
- Grace. Compares experiences to previous job as pediatric physical therapy assistant. Focus on teaching skills, having all students involved, communication, managing the gym environment.

**Theme:** Mutual Benefits

**Researchers Interpretation:** Being partnered up for field experience provide both teacher candidates with benefits they may not have in a singular placement.

**Examples from the data:**

Interviews

*Partners thoughts on benefits*

Ben – “I like the cooperativeness.”

Grace – “I think it takes a lot of stress off.”

Ben – “Yeah, easier for sure. You can piggyback off each other, which helps when someone get lost. It helps us get back on track. I like co-teaching, it's like two minds”

Grace – “Like earlier, a kid just started crying out of nowhere. I was like, let me go deal with that and I ran over to him. And then he's like taking over just fine without me. It's very helpful.”

Grace – “I think it was great. Like being able to work together and then if I'm talking and then I just forget a word instead of a long pause where the kids are just staring at me like that, it's just easy for him to step in and say something or I can step in and say something. Just helping each other. I think overall the lesson went really well”

Ben – “I'm like Okay, she that's she needs help projecting. I can do that.”

Grace – “Earlier, whenever I was yelling at the kids and I was about to have to blow my whistle again, he yelled at them for me and I was like, cool. That's great. Thank you”

Ben – “Every school we go to two teachers in PE, always two.”

Grace – “ I've enjoyed this for sure. It helps to have someone who's like going through it with you, especially with everything going on in the world. I feel like everyone says it like that, but for real, like, it's been really nice to have like partner”

Grace – “it's interesting to see the different dynamics and like, it's really nice. And it makes sense that we would co-teach together because that's what you're going to do in the future. And it doesn't like take away from what we've learned it. Like it helps us get better together.”

Grace – “It's really nice to have someone and like when we have like signed up for certification tests, get our finger printing stuff done, we've made sure to like talk to each other and so we were basically getting each other through school, like at the end of the day. And so I think just those kinds of experiences it's going to help you in the classroom be more collaborative if you're getting through college together at the same time.”

*Mentor and Supervisor thoughts on benefits*

Coach L. – “We are in a setting that allows us as professional to Co-teach. Having a Co-teacher allows you to bounce ideas off of each other. You have an extra eyes on the students at all times. You also have the ability to use each other’s strengths for each lesson.”

Coach K – (When asked what he thought about the paired candidates compared to the singular placements). “I think it’s good in that they are able to critique each other to make changes if needed.”

Supervisor – “I noticed that the pair was going through the same experiences and were able to share/discuss/reflect on a daily basis about events or situations that occurred.”

Excerpts from Researcher Observations

Lesson 1 – Begin with team teaching and switch to One-teach-one-assist

- Ben took the lead role first. Ben did most of the directing with Grace assisting. Grace stopped the lesson and made an adjustment due to safety in the middle of the activity. She helped tie several kid’s shoes. Grace helped with demonstration, management issues, and the closure.
- Grace took the lead role in class two. Ben helped with demonstrations, transitioning students to the two groups, keeping students on task, and closure. Grace dealt with issues from a student crying.
- Both lessons moved smoothly and were organized as they split the work up. Communicated before the lesson, brief verbal check-in in the middle, mostly non-verbal during communication during the lesson, talked after teaching both classes.

Lesson 2 – Begin team teaching and switched to Parallel

- Started with whole class teaching and switched to parallel for the remainder of the class until closure. Each ran one said of the gym. Transitions were efficient. Neither moved around the gym much and stayed at a central location on their side. There was plenty of co-teacher check-ins.



- Students switched courts twice. All students ended up working with both teachers. Transitions were efficient. Both moved around more this time trying to give more feedback.

Lesson 3 – One-teach-one-assist throughout

- Ben took the lead first. In trying to teach students how to rotate for the modified volleyball activity they were going to do, he seemed to have forgotten the plan and altered it on the spot to fit his needs. Grace did not correct him because the students were not confused, and it is not a traditional rotation. Grace helped students move from place to place and provided encouragement and feedback during the activity.
- Grace took second lead. Ben made sure students were attentive in the introduction and then helped transition students to courts. She closed the lesson.

Supervisor Comments from Observations

Lesson 1 – one-teach-one-assist

- Ben was good at motivating the students.
- Grace handled a lot of teacher duties in two lessons: hair bows & ponytails, tying shoes, bathroom needs.

Lesson 2– one-teach-one-assist

- Grace did a good job of noticing when students may have struggled and went to help them. She handled a student well who did not want to participate.
- Ben kept the lesson moving. He moved around and worked with a variety of students.

Lesson 3 – one-teach-one-assist

- It is clear that the pair are more comfortable at the middle school level. Grace is in her element with volleyball so Ben can lean on her knowledge of the skills.

Reflections/Journals

*Different focuses each submission connected with what they brought to the class.*

- Ben. Focused on inclusion and it was something he was good at. He also focused on discipline and classroom management because those are areas, he wanted to grow.
- Grace. Focused on teaching skills and managing the environment because those are things, she is good at. She focused on having all students involved and communication because those are areas she wanted to grow.

Notes from Lesson Plan

- Lesson plans submitted for researcher observation. The second lesson plan shows how the student's work together and balanced their roles. It is clear that Grace is leading. Ben is assisting with demonstrations, helping transition students, and extending the lesson.

**Theme:** Influential Structure

**Researchers Interpretation:** The way in which a paired placement structures their planning and teaching affects the overall outcomes of the partnership. How the program is designed to support students in their endeavors also affects the pair.

**Examples from the data:**

Interviews

*Co-planning with blocks of time set aside and how they work together*

Grace – “Usually we'll just sit over there during a conference or something and we'll plan it out or before school and then uh I tend to do the objectives and he'll help me out. I don't mind doing them and then also, I'm kind of good at doing them (in my own opinion, like personally). And so, that's working together, but then when it comes to like fleshing it out and doing the introduction in a way that it comes to talking to the kids, he's better at that, like the more or less formal, like it'll actually function right there.”

Ben – “We practice every time before we do it”

Grace – “Because you don't want to get up there and the deer in headlights have no idea what you're saying. And then feel like you're reading off a script, you know? And so we try to like practice it and then whatever, even if we wrote our lesson plan exactly this way, if we're like talking about, and that sounds really weird, just completely change it.”

Grace – “During conference and lunch. Um, so, and then we have each other's numbers, so we'll just like text.”

Ben – “We'll text, do you want to do this, let each other know we'll do we just get, get through it on our conference period.”

Grace – “The breaks are really nice here. I actually like it better here (planning wise).”

Ben – “Yeah it's quiet.”

Grace – “The conference period is when we plan ”

Ben – “We had to worry about kids coming in randomly at the elementary. Like they have a bell, they have a bell there, right?”

Grace – “No, but they would, uh, sometimes teachers would send the kids early and stuff.”

Grace – “I think the easiest part of it all was probably the co-teaching. Like if you have your co-planning together (which I think that was what we were actually really good at that) then your co-teaching is going to be a lot easier. And so our co-teaching actually was pretty easy. Collaborate together and make sure you're on the same page during the lesson. But if you plan well, then you should be on the same page.”

Grace – “Whenever we're planning our lessons, like he's there. And like, we have the idea together, but I tend to take charge of it and I enjoy doing so it's not like, Oh man, I'm doing like the whole thing. No, he's there, we're collaborating, but it's like, I do tend to take over. He's totally chill with it. And so when it comes to like the analytical stuff, like I am typing this up, like I'm good at that. And I enjoy it and then he he's good at like, he'll read it with me and we'll go through it together. And like, we're good, like no problem. But like, I think that level of collaboration where like, we know what we're good at and we're like doing it, we're still doing it together.”

Grace – “We fall into these roles. Like I think that might be what other people don't do, because if two people are trying to do the lesson plan together and they split it up and they're like, can you do this part? I do this part. You did this part. I did this part. I feel like it won't be collaborative. Even if like you do the same amount of work, like it's not going to be cohesive.”

*More than one semester of co-teaching*

Grace – “I think it definitely helped to do our observations together last semester, even though we only got like 17 hours (due to COVID), but that if we hadn't known each other at all going into this then”

Ben – cuts in “It would have sucked”

Grace – “I think it definitely prepared us for more because like we've had to do it so many times this semester.”

Ben – “Yeah. It was easier to plan now since we got little experience back then”

Ben – “Being with the kids every day for hours throughout the day, you kind of see the dynamic of the class. Like, okay, I know I can do this in this class or this”

*Feedback from mentor and supervisors on the pair's teamwork*

Supervisor – “There were times that one of them would take the lead (one-teach-one-assist) and the other would teach the same lesson without making sure it fit their individual teaching styles.”

Coach M – “The only weakness could be one was more “take charge” than the other. It may not be that way with others. But, they did work well together as a team.”

Coach N – Concerning a weakness “Working together to balance the lesson ideas and set-up”.

*Support in co-planning, co-teaching, and mentoring*

Grace- “Honestly, I think, um, I don't have any complaints about that. I think y'all have done a great job and like being open and like if you need anything, like I, yeah, I think we're good. Honestly.”

Grace – “Give them some sort of way to communicate if something's not good with the placement in any way, shape or form. Like I didn't ever feel y'all didn't give me that outlet. Like I said, I have y'all's information at any point I could have complained, but maybe give them an opportunity like early on for that, where like I'm not the one making the first contact maybe. Cause I don't think I would have really complained about it early on, but someone else who won't go as well as mine and Bens went. First of all, like genuinely, I don't know why but Ben and I, are pretty easy to get along with. I feel like we've both been in situations where we're in group work and stuff and we've done well and we've never really had much issue unless someone like really isn't doing anything. I don't think we've ever been that person to just like not do anything.”

Grace – “Um, I would say maybe more One-on-one stuff where like y'all talked to like me and then I can like air my grievances about Ben, maybe, well we didn't really have any friction, but like there was that time where I felt fatigued about it. Like almost more of a, like I needed to vent for just a second. Which I could have done that at any time. I could have contacted you

all, reached out and like told y'all I was a little frustrated, but at the end of the day, I don't really have a regret about not doing that because going through the whole semester with him, like I don't really have a long-term issue at all. Like I just, it was just fatigue in that moment.”

Ben – “I think you guys give more than what you guys should already be given anyway, you know, like, we can contact you guys anytime we need anything. You guys actually go out your way. You got to actually help us to get what we need to get done. So I feel as if you guys doing basically all you gotta do, don’t change anything. I think your support level is excellent. More support than I think most students get in their department. So shoo, I feel like y'all don't need to stop that.”

#### Supervisor Comments from Observations

##### Lesson 1 – one-teach-one-assist

- The pair communicated well. There was a lot of discussion and reflection.

##### Lesson 2 – one-teach-one-assist

- Grace needs to adjust lesson formations to her abilities. She struggles with voice projection and needs to plan around that.

##### Lesson 3 – one-teach-one-assist

- The program is on a volleyball unit, so Grace is doing what she has the most knowledge in and it was noticeable that Ben may have let Grace take the lead in planning and did not learn the skill and activity as well as he should have.

#### Peer Collaboration Scores

- Ben rating Grace
  - Co-planning – 10
  - Co-teaching – 9.7
  - Classroom management and discipline – 10
  - Peer Mentoring – 9
- Grace rating Ben
  - Co-planning – 7
  - Co-teaching – 9
  - Classroom management and discipline – 10
  - Peer Mentoring – 9

#### Justification of Scores from Interviews

Ben – The score he gave Grace for her co-planning. “BMS. She broke my scale, for her collaborativeness. And you know, planning its a 10 for a fact. She’s very, very good at collaborating. Very good at planning. She's actually a little bit more organized than me.”

Ben – the score he gave Grace for her co-teaching “This is an exhibit in a lesson. Oh, okay. So uh, like a 9.7. We were always working together.”

Ben – Score for Grace concerning balance of classroom management and discipline. “Crazy thing? I'd give her a 10 because she took care of a lot of the discipline. That's the crazy thing. She calm. She's more, like I said, she's more sort of a more strict.”

Ben - Score for Grace concerning peer mentoring. "I said 9. She's very corrective but it helps."

Grace – Score for Ben on collaboration in co-planning. "I think maybe I'll give us a passing grade collectively of a seven out of 10 because we got it done. We collaborated all that stuff, but yeah, he offered to help, but I'm just I'm a control freak, so. Okay."

Grace – Score for Ben on collaboration in co-teaching "Honestly, really, really high. I hesitate to give anyone a 10 out of 10 or anything, but like nine out of 10, I guess. Cause uh, whenever we worked together with teaching, we didn't really have any problems. And if he forgot something and I like stepped in and like, cause you know, we're co-teaching I stepped in and like said something about it or like, Hey, you forgot this. And then he would say it, like, he never got frustrated with it. He was just like, Oh, let me do that real quick. Or, and he never got mad if I stepped in and like said something to the kids like specifically and stuff like that. So I would give him like a really high grade for that. Like he did a good job and that's one thing he never came in unprepared."

Grace – Score for Ben on collaborating on classroom management and discipline. "I think, um, I tended to take like, the go talk to the kids if they were having trouble. And so that's one of those give and take things. So I would rate us or him highly on that because I would tell him, Hey, I got this. Or like, he did a really good job on, participation, like getting kids excited and involved. Like he did a really good job on that. And then, but with like specifically discipline stuff, like I think I'm just literally better at doing that. Like we just, and so we collaborated on the fact that I would, I would be like, I got it. You know. I say 9?"

Grace – Score for Ben on Peer Mentoring "We communicated a lot back and forth like especially after we taught one lesson we would figure out like what we need to change before the next group came in. He was better at walking through the lesson and talking it out loud. I'd say though I probably gave him more feedback. I'm just like really particular about stuff. He was encouraging though and like there wasn't a time we weren't communicating to help each other get better. So with that said I would say like a 9 maybe?"

#### Notes Lesson Plan

- Lesson plans submitted for student teaching. These do not reflect the student's work together. It is clear the lesson plans are basically identical, but they use terms like "I will" instead of showing where their partner assists. It is not obvious what role each teacher has in the lesson. Students are required to submit individual plans for their student teaching course. It would be a helpful if they could submit together.
- Lesson plans submitted for researcher observation. These lesson plans show the student's work together. It is clear the different roles they will hold in the lesson. Terms such as "we" are used. It also says, "Coach Ben will" or "Grace will". This helps to see how they have balanced their roles in the lesson.

#### Notes from Reflections/Journals

Journals do not reflect their work together. Students are given prompts and no prompts covered how they plan or work with their mentor on planning. That would be a helpful adjustment.

**Theme:** Productive Dialogue

**Researchers Interpretation:** Peer mentoring requires partners to be open to receiving constructive feedback but also willing to assess their peer and provide him/her with thoughtful remarks.

**Examples from the data:**

Interviews

*Feedback between peers*

Supervisor – “There was a lot of reflective teaching, feedback, and peer mentoring occurring. This would even happen between lessons when they would rotate who was lead teacher.”

Grace – concerning if they provide constructive criticism to each other “I really think so”

Ben – “she’s very corrective”

Grace – “we’ll sit there and practice as if there are kids in here and then we’ll like step in on each other”

Ben – “I need to get better at explaining things”

Grace – interrupts “I think you do pretty well. The kids don’t usually seem like they miss anything”

Grace – “I think the hardest part was peer mentoring and trying to give feedback to each other because we are peers. And so it almost like our whole lives, the only people who’ve ever told us what to do are like our parents and our teachers. And so to be at this age where like, once you get into your job and everything, like you are going to have people that same age as you giving you feedback, or maybe even younger than you. And it’s like, it’s difficult to get that feedback, but the more you try to, you just got to focus on, is that going to help them? And you got to get past the awkward”

Ben – “Yeah, so I wouldn’t know how to tell her this is wrong. I don’t want to tell her that she doesn’t know how to do this. You know, because this is my peer mentor. It’s like, I kind of suck at things too, so, I mean, I don’t know why I’m telling you what to do.”

Ben – Concerning how it feels to be assessed by his peer “comfortable. “

Grace – “yeah Because we know each other so well, so it was like, yeah, we kind of chillen”

Ben – “Yeah it was comfortable. I’m more comfortable with her up there with me, you know, because she’s not gonna be on my butt like ...”

Grace – “like y’all are.”

Ben – “yeah, y’all would tell me this, this, this, and she will probably be like okay, look, you did this and I’m gonna be like oh ok. I’m taking it more. I feel like I’m more comfortable with my peer watching for some odd reason.”

Grace – “We’ve been around each other, like every day. And so that same person watching you, is working with you are usually just like chilling with you. Like it it’s just a different vibe, so yeah, it was pretty comfortable, but it’s still like the whole idea of like the mentor, the mentor thing of like,

but afterwards you still have to do feedback. So it felt more uncomfortable as the person observing for me back then as the person doing it.”

Ben – Concerning verbal versus written feedback. “It's the same. I'm gonna write the exact same thing down that I'm telling you. It's going to be okay, well this your projection. Okay. Write that down because that's all like, she didn't really have that many problems. So it's just, uh, they go hand in hand to me with the verbal and the written. They're going to say it write down to the next same thing that I just told you.”

Grace – “Yeah. I would say that I have an easier time writing it down. I'm talking about it. Just like, um, I'm not as like outgoing and like, you know, verbal in general. And so it's like writing it down, writing it down was easier, but, and then it also made it easier for me to tell him, cause I'm like, let me read this and then give you, I might say more while I'm explaining what I wrote.”

Ben – I'm better at verbal. I can just tell you about that, this, this, this. But I do forget what I say sometimes.”

Grace – “co-planning the lesson that we then peer assessed helped make the assessment more comfortable

Ben – “it might have been different if we didn't plan it together”

#### *Peer mentoring with a future worker*

Grace – Stating how she thought it would be helpful. “Um, just like seeing what they did and like mistakes they made and like trying to be more cognizant of like how I am in that way, I guess”

Ben – “yeah, I learn from her. See what her strong suits are. I see on my own strong suits. So combined it. Like I said the differences helps me, I guess it's weird how our differences come together, but our differences help each other.”

Grace – Concerning working with a partner you do not know. “It makes me nervous (because of a current coaching experience). But like through this experience and seeing the dynamics of like Coach N and Coach T and then Coach F and Coach K, like they disagree on stuff.

Ben – “all the time.”

Grace – “And then like you get to a point where, you know, each other well enough and you can talk about those differences. And so, yeah. And like, Ben and are super different. Like if we can make it work anyone can.”

Ben – “yes, we are so different”

Grace – “but we're also pretty laid back. Yeah. Like I'm pretty like, like up here and like, I get like, I'm, um, I want to be in charge of kind of, but at the same time, like aren't a lot of things we can both be like laid back and like figure stuff out.”

Ben – “I'm not nervous. The only thing I'm worried about is, you know, if a teacher don't agree with what I say, but I also feel as if we could work together and they should consider that I have something to say that might help.”

#### *For those peer mentoring in the future*

Ben – “My advice would be really pay attention, you know, and see what you can, you can help whoever you mentoring with because, um, yeah, that's really what it is. I feel it's just to pay attention to her or not her, like, whatever it is, learn from them. That's my message.”

Grace – “ I would say like, just don't feel too awkward about it. Cause like, it can be really easy to just be like, “Oh yeah, that was good. No problems here.’ Like all A's, you know. But you're doing them a disservice and you want them to give you feedback. If you don't want feedback, then you don't want to get better. And so it's like, you're helping them get better and like, they're going to be impacting kids someday. So like you want them to be good at their job. And so the more you like, you don't need to be nitpicky or rude, but just be like real about the feedback and like be blunt. If you need to be blunt.”

Ben – “Really give feedback, really pay attention”

Grace – “don't just say hey good job”

Boy – “yeah, specific feedback. Not general feedback.”

Grace – “Talk to each other. Like, don't just be like coworkers that just show up, do your job and go home. Like you have to actually talk and like, make sure you're on the same page.”

Ben – “yeah, I feel that.”

Grace – “Cause like we checked all the time, make sure we have our stuff and all that.”

Ben – “yup, I reminded her today!”

Ben – “Have a relationship with that person. It's like what she said, you know, me knowing that she's there. I can always go to her. My advice is just to at least build some type of relationship with that person because you know, you don't want to just be, like showing up as coworkers, just, okay, Hey, how you doing? Then go on about your day. You don't even know, that person you are co-teaching with and you have to come up with lessons. Y'all get in a relationship, feed off each other. I feel That's the advice I want to give, get in a relationship with that co-teacher because it helps.”

**Theme:** Harmonize Parts

**Researchers Interpretation:** In co-teaching, partners must find an appropriate balance in their roles and leverage each of their strengths.

**Examples from the data:**

Interviews

*Peer comments on harmonizing and advice for future students*

Grace – “Whenever we're in the games classes where we'll be teaching and stuff, you have like a group of four, and someone will do the introduction, someone will explain the main activity. Someone will do the conclusion. So it almost sounds like some people are doing it from a completely different lesson plan. Like they're teaching the same game in completely different ways. And so it's really, it gets weirdly confusing whenever you're on other side and pretending to be a student, like...”

Ben – “If I'm doing this part, you're doing this part. We got two separate parts, you know. I'm not going to read your part.”

Grace – “Collaborate together and like when you're lesson planning, go through the parts together. Like if you don't have like, like we have the more dedicated roles, but like he's still going through it with me, you know? And so instead of having, like, you're writing the conclusion and I'm



writing the introduction, well conclusions and introductions have to be like, very hand-in-hand you need to write them at the same time together.”

Ben – “yup”.

Grace – “Like, even if it's going to take you longer to do it that way, because you can cut it in half and then take out the time, but it's not going to be cohesive.”

Grace – “Coaching is about being flexible and finding balance.”

*Supervisor and Mentor comments on harmonizing*

Supervisor – “Something that I would want to make clear with clinical teachers who are peer teaching is that they need to find that common ground when creating lessons. Know what they are good at and what they struggle with. They also need to understand the content that they are about to teach”

Supervisor – “I believe that I saw a both develop with the paired placement clinical teachers. One thing that I noticed was if the clinical teacher felt comfortable with the skill/activity they were teaching, that student would take the lead roll in lesson plan development. However, in this case, the partner would not contribute as much. Instead, they would teach it “as is”. The clinical teacher taking the lead in lesson plan development tended teach the lesson better.”

Coach M – “Help each other when needed and don’t overpower. Work together and don’t try to “standout” to the mentor teacher.”

Coach N – “I find common in most group work one bares more responsibility then the other.”

Coach N – “In our setting it is best to have co-teachers of the same gender.”

Coach N – “Having a male and female teacher with just female students restricts the male student teacher and puts more responsibility on the female student teacher.”

Coach N – “Be prepared to work together. The responsibility does not fall all on one student teacher. They must balance all lessons and work. In the end if they learn to work together their communication skills will increase greatly.”

**Theme:** Receptive Approach

**Researchers Interpretation:** For paired placements to be successful, all parties must be open to constructive criticism.

**Examples from the data:**

Interviews

*Peer advice for attitude with first time co-teaching*

Grace – “Just be like open-minded.”

Ben – “ Be open-minded and be ready to learn. You never did it before, you know, just be ready to listen and take in what you're learning. You never been, you never been in a school setting, so you don't know how, what you might learn. Your lesson might not work for this class, you know? So it's, I feel it's being open-minded with the mind to get where they need to be”

Grace – “And also, don't be like overly stressed because you'll be fine. I mean, it, really, you'll be fine. “

Ben – “Oh, to listen to I would suggests for the people that's going into the field next semester to listen to you guys. Um, and you know, since they've never actually been in, cause most of them haven't been in the field at all. Right, right. Yeah. So I was just telling them to listen to you and listen to the mentors and follow the mentors. Don't try to just go in there with the going there with an open mind, you know, don't, don't go on there with a, with a certain state where like, I don't want to do this or that's not how you supposed to do this or don't be questioning the teacher. You know, teachers have their certain rules and the way they handle their classes because they been there longer than you, they know more than you. And the main reason they have a job in the school district. So clearly they know what they're doing. They have their certification. So I feel as if next semester student need to just go in there with an open mind and be ready to learn because they're not going to know if you're like me. And we had a lot of time in the field, you know, before COVID-19 we had different field people we went to, so it didn't affect us, but for next semester they need to make sure they listen to you guys and be open-minded.”

*Mentor and Supervisor Advice for future students*

Supervisor – “Expect to co-teach in the future if you plan on being in the gym and/or coaching. This is how many physical education and athletic programs are set up.”

Coach M – “Be able to critique each other and not take it personally. Be willing to give as well as receive.”

# Co-Teaching Training and Paired Placements in Physical Education Teacher Education Field Experience

Jeanne Mullican  
Lamar University  
Department of Health and Kinesiology

## Overview

- Field experience impact on teacher candidates
- Issues with triad
- Peer mentoring with co-teaching as an alternative
- Study prepared teacher candidates for co-teaching

## **Occupational Socialization Theory**

- Stages of occupational socialization theory: acculturation, professional, and organizational (Lawson, 1983).
- Obstacles that PETE programs face
- Adopted teaching practices from Mentor over coursework (Geisler, 2017; Hushman et al., 2013)

## **Field Experiences in Physical Education**

- Number of quality mentors (Tannehill & Goc Karp, 1992)
- Matching mentors to teacher candidates
- Discipline knowledge, pedagogy, social and emotional support (Gunn et al., 2017; Hennissen et al., 2011)

## **Alternative Model of Field Experience**

- Two teacher candidates with one mentor teacher
- Decrease in mentor duties (Lynam et al., 2015; Simons & Baeten, 2016).
- Variety of instructional styles, more differentiation, higher student engagement ( Baeten & Simons, 2016)
- Students mentor each other and are reflective (Lynam et al., 2015).

## **Challenges Presented**

- Lack experience in co-teaching and scheduled time for a co-planning (Chang, 2018; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Jenkinson & Benson, 2017; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019; Ratcliff, 2016).
- Teacher candidates are evaluated on their individual lessons (not a co-taught lesson) and are not evaluated on their collaboration (Akerson & Montgomery, 2017; Chang, 2018) .

## **Overview of Peer Mentoring and Co-teaching Program Design**

- Partnering of teacher candidates and mentor matching done by the university supervisor.
- Training before the semester began
- Required to set aside blocks of time each day for planning

## **Overview of Peer Mentoring and Co-teaching Program Design**

- Completion of a co-planning action plan
- Newsletters and support throughout semester
- Peer mentoring and co-teaching throughout the semester

# Case Study Details

- Lesson plans, journals, supervisor observations, and researcher observations
- Peer assessed lesson observation and peer collaborative assessment
- Informal interviews, focusgroup interview, and individual Interview

# Matching Mentors and Peers

- Role in education and socialization of teacher candidates ( Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Geisler, 2017; Hushman et al., 2013)
- Consider credentials, personalities, curriculum and beliefs in matching (Russell & Russell, 2011).
- Teacher candidate feedback on mentors (Tannehill & Goc Karp, 1992; S. Wright & Grenier, 2018).
- Program must currently use co-teaching

# Co-teaching

- Practice before field experiences followed by support in field (Chang, 2018; Gardiner & Robinson, 2011; Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015; Montgomery & Akerson, 2019).
- Benefits and Barriers (Gardiner & Robinson, 2011).

# Co-teaching

- Blocks of time for co-planning
- Observation of co-teaching
- Support throughout from university



# Peer Mentoring

- Practice observing, assessing, providing feedback through peer mentoring  
(Heidorn & Jenkins, 2015)
- Assess a peer taught lesson and evaluate partner's collaborative efforts  
overall

# Findings

- Contrasting qualities
- Mutual Benefits
- Influential Structure

# Findings

- Other themes: productive dialogue, harmonize parts, and receptive approach.
- Professional socialization

# Conclusion and Future Direction

- Negatives previously found were avoided
- More practice in assessing peer and learning what instructional styles suit their abilities
- More opportunities to evaluate peer collaborate
- Follow-up necessary

# References

- Baeten, M., & Simons, M. (2016b). Student teachers' team teaching: How do learners in the classroom experience team-taught lessons by student teachers? *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 2(1), 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2015.1135226>
- Chang, S. H. (2018). Co-teaching in student teaching of an elementary education program. *Teacher Educators' Journal*, 11, 105–113.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D., Hastie, P. A., & Kinchin, G. D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 3(1), 97–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320701780779>
- Gardiner, W., & Robinson, K. S. (2011). Peer field placements with preservice teachers: Negotiating the challenges of professional collaboration. *Professional Educator*, 5(2). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ988203>
- Geisler, T. M. (2017). *Examining The Socialization Of Physical Education Teachers: A Case Study (Dissertation)* [University of Vermont]. <http://scholarworks.uvm.edu/graddis/725>
- Gunn, F., Lee, S. H. (Mark), & Steed, M. (2017). Student perceptions of benefits and challenges of peer mentoring programs: Divergent perspectives from mentors and mentees. *Marketing Education Review*, 27(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10528008.2016.1255560>
- Hennissen P., Crasborn, F., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2011). Clarifying pre-service teacher perceptions of mentor teachers' developing use of mentoring skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 1049–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.03.009>
- Hushman, G., Napper-Owen, G., & Hushman, C. (2013). Exploring the process of conceptual change of preservice teachers in a physical education teacher preparation program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 20(2), 109–124.
- Jenkinson, K. A., & Benson, A. C. (2017). The assessment and mentoring program (amp): Final year preservice physical education peer mentors perceptions of effective mentoring. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(2), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v17i2.20769>

# References

- Lawson, H. A. (1983). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3(3), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2.3.3>
- Lynam, A.-M., Corish, C., & Connolly, D. (2015). Development of a framework to facilitate a collaborative peer learning 2:1 model of practice placement education: A 2:1 model of practice placement education. *Nutrition & Dietetics*, 2(2), 170–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/174080.12133>
- Montgomery, M. S., & Akerson A. (2019). Facilitating collaboration through a teaching field experience. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 21(1). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1206822>
- Ratcliff, C. (2016). *Co-teaching: How do teachers rate barriers to effective co-teaching?* [Governors State University]. <https://opus.govst.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1229&context=capstones>
- Russell, M. L., & Russell, J. A. (2011). Mentoring relationships: Cooperating teachers' perspectives on mentoring student teachers. *The Professional Educator*, 5(2), 21.
- Simons, M., & Baeten, M. (2016). Student teachers' team teaching during field experiences: An evaluation by their mentors. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 4(5), 415–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2016.1271560>
- Tannehill, D., & Goe-Karp, G. (1992). The student teaching practicum: Placement trends and issues. *Physical Educator*, 49(1), 39.
- Wright, S., & Grenier, M. (2018). Cooperating teachers' beliefs and teaching practices. *Journal of Research in Health, Physical Education, Sport & Dance*, 9(2), 20.