

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Innovative Course Redesign Grant Reports

Teaching Resource Center

Fall 10-3-2008

Wilona Sessions, Keith Brockie Team Teaching Project Spring 2008

Wilona Sessions

Keith Brockie

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/trc-cd>



Part of the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

COLLABORATING THROUGH TEAM TEACHING (CTT) REPORT

Re CTT Pair: Billie Sessions & Keith Brockie

Class: Art 498 – Art Education: Digital Technology

A. Brief description of team teaching that was done.

Though there was about 60% overlap in the expertise of each team member – in general, Dr. Sessions was charged with theory, *Blackboard* discussions and readings. Mr. Brockie primarily handled the hands-on technology, and spear headed the original assessment of students' projects according to the technology criteria. Both team members shared “lecture” and classroom management and assessment.

B. Why/Purpose Teaching need(s) addressed by team teaching:

This team addressed: smooth integration of cooperative learning, art education theory, and active learning with assignments useful to pre-student teachers for their future curriculum planning and digital-based assignments. The team shared teaching skills, expertise and knowledge that strengthened the delivery of the information and most assuredly the assistance to students. Mr. Brockie brought to the course—current experiences from his high school classes, and Dr. Sessions' brought current theory/pedagogy of the field regarding technology.

C. Preparation:

What preparation(s) did you have to make to do team teaching?

It was quite apparent what skills and duties we each brought to the “table/computer,” so deciding who “did” what was a moot question. Together we reviewed the components of the previous year, reorganized the course schedule for better pacing and time commitments, reviewed the readings, reconsidered and reevaluated the student projects, and tightened the assessments of projects.

D. Administration:

What administrative issue(s) did you have to address to make team-teaching happen?

Not a problem – as Dr. Sessions was released from another course during the spring quarter to allow her time to deal with the reorganization, reevaluating, etc. of this course. Since Mr. Brockie is Adjunct faculty, he was paid for the course; otherwise the department could not have afforded his assistance and expertise—and therefore no team-teaching.

D. Student Reactions/ Expectations

How did the students react to being team-taught? Were their expectations different? Describe other student reactions or challenges encountered regarding students.

Mr. Brockie and Dr. Sessions have been working/teaching together for 12 years in various art education programs and classrooms, conferences, presentations, and co-teachers from elementary to university levels. The students appeared to appreciate the

seamless team teaching experience. They were clear on which teacher to contact for particular elements of the course. So, in a way the students expectations were different for each team teacher, because they knew which teacher was “in charge” of the various components. They knew that the team was on the “same page” and there were no instances or problems of “who was in charge” of which component, or power plays in any direction.

E. Teaching

What impact did this have on your teaching?

We each studied each other’s: “presentation style,” how we advised and worked with students, our interactions with students on *Blackboard* and assessment of projects. The Professor admired and studied the Adjunct [who is a full-time high school teacher] as he easily and skillfully worked one-on-one with the sometimes technology-frustrated students. Mr. Brockie has such a solid and tactful “computer-side” manner and Dr. Sessions studied his interactive abilities and his constant work on assessment strategies. Dr. Sessions has widened her experience and understanding of the potential of technology and additional styles of assessment.

Mr. Brockie found that Dr. Sessions' art education theory provided him with areas to emphasize on while presenting the hands-on technology. Mr. Brockie considered the needs of the future teachers and their students while organizing and modeling the technology. Dr. Sessions solid art education pedagogy in technology made Mr. Brockie’s integration and ideas relevant and practical to the students.

F. Evaluation

What did you do to evaluate the effect of team teaching on student learning? Your and your partner’s teaching skills?

Dr. Sessions and Mr. Brockie were in constant contact during the spring quarter debriefing the lessons and discussing how students were responding to the information and assignments. We were able to see any shortfalls in instruction or delivery and add supplemental resources very quickly. In the designing of studio projects there was deliberate and focused application of the pedagogy learned from the lecture and text, as well as the technological application, so measuring the students’ learning was very analytical. Newly designed assessment rubrics encompassed all pedagogy and technical objectives. Student feedback on end of the quarter teacher evaluations was very high, they indicated that two teachers were seamless. Both instructors studied the assessment rubrics for student projects and scores were agreed upon.

As previously mentioned, Dr. Sessions and Mr. Brockie have taught together in some capacity for 12 years. We are very comfortable with discussing what went well and what needed to be improved. In our debriefing sessions we not only discussed student achievement, but our own effectiveness as well. The constant debriefing and evaluation coupled with the openness of the instructors towards each others effectiveness resulted in high achievement by the students. Student grading was very fair due to the clear expectations agreed on by Dr. Sessions and Mr. Brockie.