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The brochure on team teaching was originally written as a concise condensation of resource materials available. To facilitate use by study groups investigating the possibility of an educational innovation, an extensive bibliography was included.

Although originally intended for a limited distribution in Tulare County, the demand was not limited to the State of California, nor even to the Continental United States. Requests have been received from Europe and Asia as well as South America and Canada. Study groups from many parts of the country have requested copies. The brochure has been used in education classes in midwestern universities. ERIC has microfiched it under the code ED 011 469. When the stock of available copies was depleted, it was decided to reprint the original version with an up-to-date bibliography. With the depletion of a second run of the reprint, and with continued interest, a newly up-dated version has been made.

It is our earnest hope that these efforts will be of help to those interested in discovering new ways to teach children.
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Beginnings

By the mid-point of the twentieth century, the methods and techniques of public education in the United States were firmly entrenched. Americans were complacent about their schools and quite satisfied with the products of these schools, their children. Suddenly, a variety of powerful new forces altered the stability of the situation. The pressures of ever-increasing hordes of children to be educated with an accompanying shortage of qualified teachers, the explosion of man's knowledge and the intense socio-economic changes triggered by the new technologies, led to intensified concern with means to achieve quality education.

The White House Conference of Education in 1955 focused attention on the problems facing education. During discussions by the delegates, the suitableness of the formalized patterns of the past were questioned, and a climate favorable to new approaches emerged. As educators sought more effective means of grouping children for instruction and utilizing the teaching staffs, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, in May, 1956, appointed a Commission on the Experimental Study of the Utilization of the Staff in the Secondary School. The commission with funds from the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education experimented with differing ways to assign teachers to student groups. One of the experiments that attracted attention throughout the country was team teaching.

Concurrently, the School and University Program for Research and Development, a partnership of Harvard's Graduate School of Education and three Massachusetts schools' systems with the financial backing of the Fund for
the Advancement of Education began to develop a team approach. Team teaching, as evolved by SUPRAD, was first operational in Lexington's Franklin School in September, 1957.

Outlines of the team approach also emerged at Englewood, Florida and Carson City, Michigan in 1957. Literature on the subject appeared in the professional periodicals and team teaching was listed in the Educational Digest in 1957 and the Education Index for 1957-59. By 1958, there were fifty pilot studies. This had increased to three hundred by 1960 and over two thousand by 1963. As school begins this September, there will be well over five thousand teams operating. Some will be logical and well-planned, others will be ill-conceived.

The antecedents of team teaching are lost in the past; basically united effort is one of man's early ways of instructing the young, as in the family unit. Teachers have worked together, planned together for a long, long time. Historically, threads of team teaching can be found in the monitorial system, the one-room school, non-graded elementary classes, the Lancastrian, Dalton and Winnetka plans, and the definite contribution of Bay City, Michigan's teacher-aids. The team approach has been used in medicine and in industry; it is especially evident in the planning, development and implementation of aero-space technology. Group action seems to be a major theme in American democracy.

Variability of Concepts

Team teaching presents a profuse array of concepts to an ever-growing number of interested educators. Simply stated, a teaching team is a group of teachers who take joint responsibility for the instruction of a given segment of a school's population. The variety of concepts of team teaching
may be categorized as:

**Concepts of Occurrence** - the frequency of team function

1. **Fragmentary Team**: a group of teachers bring their classes together for a specific presentation.

2. **Adjuvant Team**: a group of teachers meet regularly to plan a series of presentations that may be given to their individual classes jointly.

3. **Partial Team**: the organization of structure of the school is altered to make a group of teachers responsible for the instruction of a joint group of pupils for a stated period of the school day.

4. **Total Team**: the organizational structure of the school is altered to make a group of teachers completely responsible for the instruction of a group of pupils.

**Concepts of Assignation** - the power inter-relationship of the membership of the team.

1. **Internship**: a beginning teacher is assigned to an experienced teacher to help with a larger-than-normal class.

2. **Trade-Clique**: a barter situation in which one subject is exchanged for another without disturbance of the basic classroom structure. "I'll take your art if you'll take my music."

3. **Coordinate Team**: two or more teachers join together as colleagues. All planning is with peers and no one teacher is designated as "leader".

4. **Associate Team**: two or more teachers cooperate together as peers with specialists on call for consultation or presentation.

5. **Team Hierarchy**: a group of teachers in which leadership is designated and responsibilities are assigned. In larger teams, a complex strata of line of staff may be operative in which assignments entitled: Team Coordinator, Team Leader, Senior or Master Teacher, Team Teacher, Auxiliary Teacher, Intern Teacher, Student Teacher, Teacher-Aid, Resource Specialist, and Team Clerk are delegated in full or in part.

**Concepts of Orientation** - the relationship of the teacher group to the pupil group and to instructional presentations.

1. **Horizontal Team**: the teaching team is responsible for all instruction for a given grade level. (Most frequently an elementary school team.)
2. Vertical Team: the team is responsible for a specific instructional area for a group of pupils comprising more than one grade level. (Usually at the high school level.)

3. Diagonal Team: the team is responsible for a subject area block for one or more grade levels. (As would be the case in a junior high.)

Team teaching embodies, or is accomplished by, many other staff utilization practices. Some new trends in education that seem closely allied with the team teaching movement are:

1. Variability of pupil grouping (generally small group/large group combinations),

2. Flexibility of scheduling (individualization through modular or staggered scheduling),

3. Differentiation of teacher roles (with or without salary differentials),

4. Utilization of technological devices (a multi-media approach),

5. Innovative interaction approaches in curricula (inquiry, research and/or programmed oriented),

6. Modification of plant design,

7. Re-assignment of non-teaching duties, and

8. Emphasis on student responsibility.

Claims

An analysis of results reported by current team projects alleges some or all of the following advantages may be obtained through a team effort:

1. Greater interaction of teachers resulting in the promotion of professional development and increased individual stimulation,

2. Release of teacher from routine tasks,

3. Method of induction with emphasis upon the growth factor of becoming an experienced teacher,

4. More efficient and more effective teacher preparation resulting in a varied and flexible presentation,
5. Exploration of and capitalization of special teacher talents, knowledges and training with the most qualified presenting instruction and with the distribution of assignments according to abilities,

6. Greater uniformity of instruction,

7. Avoidance of repetitious presentations,

8. Student group size related to the function of instruction,

9. Higher standards through raising pupil expectancies,

10. Greater identification and use of community resources, including talented citizens, and

11. Less interference with the instructional program through individual teacher absences.

Research

Even before experimentation in team teaching began, educational research had disproved the dogma so blindly accepted by many practitioners of education—the belief that the most productive sized group for instructional purposes was 25 pupils. Studies in class size had discovered that:

1. Large group instruction can be very effective in the presentation of factual information, especially when illustrated by means of visual aids,

2. Small groups are necessary for the efficient interchange of ideas. Pupils have the greatest retention when they can express themselves and interact with their peers, and

3. A great deal of knowledge, as presented in texts, publications and by the newer techniques of teaching machines, tapes, records, etc. can be learned independently.

Knowledge of this innovation in teaching methods is limited and tentative. Too much of the data is based upon opinion and not enough upon the results of depth studies. However, the results obtained provide enough evidence to justify further exploration and development of the team approach to school organization. More experimentation is needed, but emphasis in the future
should be on identification of variables through a greater control of conditions. It will be up to research to show if team teaching has any lasting virtues.

Research on team teaching has revealed only one fundamental fact: the team approach is no less satisfactory than conventional methods. If this result seems inconclusive, it is well to remember that no experimental approach to school organization or teaching methodology has proven significantly better than the conventional model with which it was compared. Whether the lack of tangible evidence that team teaching is an improved teaching method results from the "Hawthorne Effect" or from faulty measuring instruments, research must come up with answers to the questions:

1. Does better instruction result from team teaching?

2. What pupil gains are made under team teaching? Even though achievement, as measured by standardized tests, does not appreciably improve, are there areas of pupil development that do improve?

3. What happens in areas of problem solving, creativity, leadership, contribution to group activities, interaction with others and many other intangibles of a like nature?

4. What are the definite professional attainments accrued to the teacher in a team? Can these be obtained with less expenditure of time and energy on the part of the teacher?

When research has answered these questions, then a clear-cut decision on the worth of team teaching can be made.

Assumptions

What is the teaching process? Teaching is much more than imparting information, stuffing children full of facts. Teaching is planning. It is organization. It is preparation. It is causing behavioral changes in children. Most of all, teaching is evaluation of what has been done. The team approach is a means of restructuring instruction, emphasizing the
planning and evaluation factors without a de-emphasis of the other aspects in teaching.

What does acceptance of the team teaching concepts connote? The basic assumptions underlying the team organization are:

1. If we group pupils in large units for instruction and regroup them into smaller units for discussion, there will be more stimulation in the former and greater interaction in the latter units with better learning as a result.

2. If we deploy teaching staffs in order to take advantage of individual contributions of unique abilities and talents, better instruction is the result.

3. Better programming will result if we provide teachers with opportunities for cooperative planning.

Although such claims have been forwarded, acceptance of the team concept does not necessarily connote changes in the curriculum, greater use of non-certificated personnel or the retention of superior teachers. It certainly has not led to excessive specialization of teachers; every evidence to date points to the broadening of teacher concepts and the improvement of teaching talents. If there is any danger inherent in the acceptance of team teaching, it is a tendency to over-emphasize large group instruction without enough emphasis on small group work and independent study.

The emergence of this flexible structure allows many educators to live with unanswered controversies that previously demanded acceptance of either one or an opposing philosophy. Some of these either-or disagreements were: the self-contained classroom versus departmentalization; heterogeneous versus homogeneous grouping; graded advancement versus non-graded development; and, finally, large classes versus small classes. Until research gives us definite answers, team teaching permits educators to group children for instruction without making a decision on these prickly points.
Refinement

As with everything new, team teaching has operational "bugs". Some problems that will need to be faced and, hopefully, solved are:

1. Increased probability of teacher personality conflicts through a greater number of contacts,
2. Increased pressures of conformity,
3. Further impersonalization of teacher-pupil relations,
4. Teacher reluctance to give up the autocracy of the self-contained classroom,
5. Special salary increments to master teachers and team leaders conflict with the established principle of the single salary schedule,
6. Belief in equality of teachers with similar experience and training is challenged,
7. Dangerous appeal to over-emphasizing presentation in the learning process,
8. Increase in capital expenditure, especially in the early stages,
9. Difficulty of teachers to clearly understand their roles, especially since team teaching is still in the realm of experimentation,
10. Lack of flexibility in plant design to meet new demands,
11. Recruitment and training of master teachers and team leaders, and
12. Difficulty of replacement of a team member, once the team is established.

Analysis/Synthesis

The primary question to be answered before a team teaching project is launched is: What problems are solved that cannot be solved by any other means? A comprehensive survey of the literature is necessary before those who have become interested in the team innovation can answer this question to their own satisfaction.
If the answer to the primary question is affirmative, then a whole series of questions arise and must be answered to the satisfaction of the embryo team before a model for experimentation can be designed:

- What constitutes a teaching team?
- What are the basic elements that identify this approach and differentiate it from other teaching methods?
- What is the purpose of the team approach? Is this the purpose our specific team proposes to achieve?
- What educational climate is conducive to the introduction of this innovation? Can our school attain this favorable climate?
- What should be done to assure a successful undertaking? What should the administrative staff do to help? What special efforts should the team members make? Do the pupils in the teaching unit have a part? Do their parents? What about the non-team members of the school staff?
- What are the requirements for a team teacher? How are these measured so that selection of the team members may be made?
- How many teachers should compose the team? What should be their specific individual responsibilities and what should be their relationship to each other?
- What functions, other than instructional (administrative, guidance) shall be assigned team members?
- What non-teaching specialists shall be assigned the team? What shall be their duties and responsibilities?
- How many pupils will constitute a teaching team unit?
- Should the students comprising the team unit include more than one grade level?
- Should the scope of the team unit be limited to one subject or should an inter-disciplinary approach be used?
- How large a block of time should be allocated to the team unit? How shall this block be broken down into instructional, discussion and independent study units?
- What is the optimum size for large-group instruction? For small-group discussion?
- How is time for teacher-planning allocated in the daily schedule?
• How can the present plant and school resources be used in a team effort? How much conversion is necessary? What new special space will have to be constructed? What new educational materials will have to be purchased?

• How is appraisal going to be "build in" to the team project? What do we wish to achieve? (Refer back to stated objectives.) How can we best prove our goals have been achieved? Will new measurement instruments and statistical design be required?

• How much will this project cost? What part of this cost is peculiar to the introduction of an innovation, and how much will be a permanent feature of team teaching? Are these costs justified?

When the prospective team has answered this series of questions to their satisfaction, they are ready to begin planning for a team teaching project. As they plan, the team should keep in mind:

• The means for team teaching can be provided--how successfully the team operates depends upon each individual in the team.

• Enthusiasm is necessary--without it we cannot have good teaching, but enthusiasm is not enough; quality teaching must have expertise, both of technique and of instructional knowledge; planning; ability; and evaluation. Above all, superior teaching requires creativity. Team teaching is a form that allows freedom for the teacher to use these qualities. Whether team teaching becomes an integral part of American education or is soon discarded as another new "gimmick" that has failed will depend upon the thousands of teachers in the team projects all over this country.

Conclusions

Team teaching is a form, not a substance; an organization, not a program. As such, it cannot solve problems created by inadequate or incompetent instruction. A staff of mediocre teachers becomes a mediocre team; excellence of instruction may become available to larger numbers of students; but at the same time, it is spread thinner. Nor can team teaching solve problems stemming from the financing of the educational program. These must be solved through re-districting and increased amounts for education. Further, although many arguments are forwarded that team teaching will solve the
present and predicted teacher shortage by decreasing the teacher numbers needed to instruct a given group of students, experience has shown that classroom time gained by the use of large group instruction is shifted to time spent in small groups (ten-to-fifteen pupil discussion groups), cooperative planning and professional development.

There is no research evidence that team teaching increases pupil effectiveness. This may be a result of the crudeness of present-day measurement devices rather than a condemnation of the new approach; students might very well gain in areas admittedly inaccurately measured, such as critical thinking and creativity.

Team teaching is one approach to the search for new ways of organizing personnel for the teaching function that has resulted from a growing dissatisfaction with the restrictions and inadequacies of conventional teaching methods. It is an experiment. If a team teaching project is undertaken, it should be with full understanding of what can be achieved and what shortcomings are inherent in the structure. It might be wise to "build-in" an evaluation procedure in the initial experiment so that mature judgements could later be based upon evidence stronger than opinions. In initiating a team project, these postulates could be used as guidelines:

1. Extensive orientation and pre-planning is vital.
2. Adequate personnel and funds are essential.
3. Careful selection of each team member is necessary to mold a cohesive, compatible and inter-related team.
4. The team will go through a series of stages of development before it begins to function competently; evaluation should be withheld until full evolution has taken place.

If team teaching achieves educational approbation for no other reason, it is worthy of serious consideration as one of the most stimulating and effective teacher growth processes developed to date.
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