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Module 5: Co-teaching

**National Institute for Urban School Improvement**

The National Institute for Urban School Improvement (NIUSI) is funded by the Office of Special Education Programs at the U.S. Department of Education. The mission of NIUSI is to support the building of capacity in urban schools and school districts so that students with disabilities are engaged in high quality curriculum and learning experiences that improve their ability to succeed in school and in post-school opportunities. NIUSI works to develop powerful networks of urban local education agencies and schools that embrace and implement a data-based, continuous improvement approach for inclusive practices. Embedded within this approach is a commitment to evidence-based practice in early intervention, universal design, literacy, and positive behavior supports.

Part of NIUSI’s work is to link existing general education reform networks with special education networks and synthesize existing research into products that are made accessible in both print and electronic versions. These offerings support professionals, families, researchers, advocacy organizations, and others involved in the work to create culturally responsive, inclusive school communities.

**NIUSI Goals**

One of the main goals of NIUSI is to work collaboratively with educators in its partner districts in the area of professional development. This work is grounded in the beliefs that professional development must:

- address specific needs of states, districts, schools and communities with a focus on helping students achieve learning and performance goals;
- be a collaborative endeavor in which teachers, administrators, families and students are involved in the design, planning, and implementation;
- rely upon content and processes that are research-based and proven in practice; and
- be school-based, job-embedded, and continuously evaluated and adjusted to ensure effectiveness in meeting school and student learning goals.
Leadership Academy Model

NIUSI helps educators develop leadership skills for school change through Leadership Academies. In collaboration with schools and local universities, NIUSI creates these Leadership Academies for pre-service and in-service activities. The approach includes careful consideration of the content for professional development, application of adult learning principles, and selection of teams from schools and districts that can support their team members’ learning and practice. In this way, professional development can build on converged needs, create a sense of common purpose, and extend the creativity and skill of practitioners. Specifically, NIUSI works with urban school districts to build information systems that assist leadership teams to focus on goals for instructional, curricular, and cultural improvement and for empowering action research agendas among school professionals.

All academies are based on the National Institute’s assumptions that great schools:

- Use the valuable knowledge and experience that children and their families bring to school learning.
- Expand students’ life opportunities, available choices, and community contributions.
- Construct education for social justice, access, and equity.
- Build on the extraordinary resources that urban communities provide for life-long learning.
- Need individuals, family, organizations, and communities to work together to create future generations of possibility.
- Practice scholarship by creating partnerships for action-based research and inquiry.
- Shape their practice based on evidence of what results in successful learning of each student.
- Foster relationships based on care, respect, and responsibility.
- Produce high achieving students.
- Understand that people learn in different ways throughout their lives; great schools respond with learning opportunities that work.

Professional Development Modules

Systemic school change is a complex and difficult task. The challenge is great, but educators throughout our nation and other nations are actively engaging the opportunity to transform education and how we go about the work of teaching and learning in our schools. This module is
one of many developed by NIUSI for the networks of schools engaging their faculty, staff, families, students, and community members in ongoing renewal and systemic change.

Every module is designed around a particular aspect of school-wide improvement with academies that build knowledge, skills, and practices. The intent is simple: Build a common vision, vocabulary, and skill-set around essential elements of school improvement. The best way to implement this module is to bring together building leadership teams from a cluster of schools so that teams can learn from one another and create a practice community that can support innovation. The academies should be offered in sequence, spaced four weeks apart so that some application can occur between sessions, and that there is a plan for coaching on-site between academies.

Tips for Facilitating Leadership Academies

Before delving into the academy, please read through the following tips that can help your participants get comfortable and maintain their focus on learning and growing. We hope that you enjoy facilitating these learning opportunities as much as we have.

TIPS FOR GETTING STARTED.

Introduce the academy facilitators, and provide an overview of the National Institute for Urban School Improvement and the school or district that is sponsoring the academy. Talk a bit about what a Leadership Academy is, its structure and how it is designed and what the topic and objectives of this academy are. Explain the roles the facilitators will play and go over the agenda. Have participants introduce themselves and briefly tell what they’d like to learn or take away with them at the end of the academy, focusing on what would be useful to them in their practice. This should take no longer than 15 minutes. You are provided with a PowerPoint to lead this introduction.

TIPS FOR MOVING THINGS ALONG.

Included in the academy is a time schedule – stick to it! Try to begin and end on time, and keep the activities timed as closely as possible to the schedule. Encourage quick transitions between activities and instead of scheduling multiple breaks, invite people to get up to stretch, get a drink or use the bathroom as they need to. Remind participants how much time they’ll have to work on each activity and use the provided time cards to warn participants of the time remaining during each activity.

During discussions, try not to let one person dominate the conversation or go off on tangents that are narrowly focused on their own experiences. To “cut people off” politely, ask others what they think or ask a questions to get the discussion moving in a different direction.
TIPS FOR MANAGING ACTIVITIES.

Before beginning an activity, briefly review the activity with the group and discuss its purpose. Read through the tasks and look over supporting materials. Ask if there are any questions. Have each group select a person who will take notes and report to the larger group the outcomes of their discussion or work.

While the participants are working in their small groups, circulate from group to group to make sure they are on task and to answer any questions. Be available if a group gets stuck, but don’t interfere in the group process unless they need assistance.

TIPS FOR LECTURETTES.

Practice timing yourself so you don’t run over the allotted lecturette period. Plan on providing a variety of examples around preschool, elementary, middle, and high school settings.

TIPS FOR DEBRIEFING ACTIVITIES EFFICIENTLY.

Decide how to get the information from the groups. There are a number of strategies you might use. For example, you might have each group write their list of ideas and results during their activities on chart paper to display on the wall or a stand. A second strategy might be to have groups report one item from their list, rotating around the room until no one has anything new to offer. Whatever strategy you decide to use, you should set a time limit on the reporting and encourage people to try not to be redundant.

TIPS FOR PARTICIPANT QUESTIONS.

Provide participants with paper for note-taking. Urge them to save their questions for the Q and A period at the end of each lecturette so the academy does not run over the allotted time.

TIPS FOR LEAVE-TAKING.

To wrap things up, ask people to take a minute to think about what they learned during the academy. Ask the participants to complete the self-assessment and academy evaluation. Then ask them to share their thoughts and any last words. Use the overhead or chart paper to record what they say as a way to highlight new learning and congratulate the group on their hard work. If this is the first academy in a module, with more academies scheduled to follow, you may ask participants to do homework, either for reinforcement of their learning or as preparation for future learning.
Leadership Academies

The goal of all Leadership Academies is to create a network of skilled and knowledgeable teacher leaders, administrators, and family members who will serve as effective agents of change. The participants are predominantly teams of educational professionals from schools and districts who are organized to advance the knowledge and practice related to systems change and school improvement. The Leadership Academy creates a forum for open discussion and learning to help school and community members think more broadly and systemically about school improvement.

The following are the Leadership Academies in this module.

Academy 1: Working Together: General and Special Educators

This academy explores the elements of collaborative teaching relationships and the necessary institutional structures and professional skills needed to collaborate successfully.

As a result of the activities and information shared at this Leadership Academy, participants will:

- Identify expectations for collaboration and consultation between general and special educators
- Explore the skills that educators need to collaborate successfully
- Examine the time needed for successful collaboration and how buildings develop schedules that create time for collaborators to plan and evaluate together
- Examine current practice in their own buildings and identify strengths and needs

Academy 2: Co-teaching Strategies

This academy explores the research behind co-teaching as a professional development strategy as well as an effective instructional practice for students. A variety of co-teaching strategies are explored and evaluated in light of their impact on student and professional learning.

As a result of the activities and information shared at this Leadership Academy, participants will:

- Identify a set of co-teaching strategies and their research base
- Distinguish between exemplar and non-exemplars of practice
- Measure co-teaching skills and identify areas for improvement
- Examine how these models can be expanded to provide blended special and general education opportunities for students
- Analyze strategies for developing co-teaching skills and practices among their general and special education staff


**Academy 3: Co-Planning Curriculum Using State Standards**

This Academy provides the CLT with experience in co-planning curricular units.

As a result of the activities and information shared at this Leadership Academy, participants will:

- Provide a rationale for co-curricular planning in inclusive schools
- Explore the relationship between planning for state standards-based curriculum and IEP goals
- Tailor a set of planning processes to meet their own building context
- Identify ways to implement co-planning in their own buildings
Co-Teaching

Academy 1: Working Together: General and Special Educators
Academy 1: Working Together: General and Special Educators

This academy explores the elements of collaborative teaching relationships and the necessary institutional structures and professional skills needed to collaborate successfully.

Academy Outcomes
As a result of the activities and information shared at this Leadership Academy, participants will:

- Identify expectations for collaboration and consultation between general and special educators
- Explore the skills that educators need to collaborate successfully
- Examine the time needed for successful collaboration and how buildings develop schedules that create time for collaborators to plan and evaluate together
- Examine current practices in their own buildings and identify strengths and needs

Activities and Lectureettes
These activities and lectureettes support the Leadership Academy’s purpose and outcomes:

ACTIVITY #1: SHARING A CLASSROOM
This activity provides a background on co-teaching and gives participants a chance to identify their own feelings about co-teaching.

LECTURETTE #1: MAKING CO-TEACHING A SUCCESS
This lecturette is an overview of the eight components of the co-teaching relationship as given by Susan E. Gately and Frank J. Gately Jr. It also provides an explanation of the common co-teaching issues faced by new co-teachers.

ACTIVITY #2: BELIEVING IN CO-TEACHING
This activity gives participants a chance to apply their own beliefs to the co-teaching components outlined in the lecturette.
LECTURETTE #2: SCHEDULING CO-TEACHING
This lecturette reviews many scheduling issues that buildings face when implementing co-teaching.

ACTIVITY #3: TIME FOR CO-TEACHING
This activity gives participants a chance to analyze their own schools and come up with ideas on how to implement co-teaching.

Agenda
We constructed this Leadership Academy to occur within a 3-hour timeframe with 15 minutes or so for breaks and other time adjustments. The times listed below are approximate but reflect the time these activities and lecturettes have previously taken. Facilitators should be flexible, read their audience, and work to achieve the overall purpose and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:15</td>
<td>Introductions and Greetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:20</td>
<td>Activity 1: Sharing a Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:35</td>
<td>Lecturette 1: Making Co-teaching a success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:50</td>
<td>Lecturette 2: Making Co-teaching a success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:10</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:20</td>
<td>Activity 2: Believing in Co-teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:30</td>
<td>Lecturette 3: Time for Co-teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:50</td>
<td>Leave-taking and Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academy Materials
You should have these materials prior to conducting the Academy:

- Facilitator Handbook
- Academy PowerPoint Supplements (Overview, Lecturette 1, and Lecturette 2), and access to a PowerPoint presentation system
- PowerPoint timecards
- Name tags
- Chart paper
- Markers
- Tape
Participant Handouts

These handouts may be passed out together at the beginning of the academy. They are packaged together as the academy Participant Handbook:

- Activity handouts
- Copies of lecturettes
- Resources
- Self-Evaluation
- Academy Evaluation
**Introductions and Greetings**

**Academy Overview**

Spend some time introducing yourself, the module sponsors, and the Leadership Academy to the participants.

The overview provides you with Leadership Academy background information, this academy’s purpose and outcomes, and the agenda. If time allows, ask participants to introduce themselves by letting others know where they are from and their roles and responsibilities within their buildings.

**FACILITATOR MATERIALS**

Overview PowerPoint

**TIME LIMIT**

15 minutes

**SLIDE 1**

**Introduction**

Introduce the academy facilitators and the school or district that is sponsoring the academy.

Introduce the National Institute for Urban School Improvement. The National Institute for Urban School Improvement (NIUSI) is funded by the Office of Special Education Programs at the U.S. Department of Education. The mission of NIUSI is to support the building of capacity in urban schools and school districts so that students with disabilities are engaged in high quality curriculum and learning experiences that improve their ability to succeed in school and in post-school opportunities. NIUSI works to develop powerful networks of urban local education agencies and schools that embrace and implement a data-based, continuous improvement approach for inclusive practices. Embedded within this approach is a commitment to evidence based practice in early intervention, universal design, literacy and positive behavior supports.

As part of our work, we link existing general education reform networks with special education networks and we also synthesize existing research into products that are made accessible in both print and electronic versions. These offerings
support the efforts of professionals, families, researchers, advocacy organizations and others involved in the work to create culturally responsive, inclusive school communities.

One of the main goals of The National Institute for Urban School Improvement is to work collaboratively with educators in its partner districts in the area of professional development. Our work is grounded in the beliefs that professional development must:

- Address specific needs of state, district, school and community with a focus on helping students achieve learning and performance goals.
- Be a collaborative endeavor with teachers, administrators, families and students involved in the design, planning and or implementations.
- Rely upon content and processes that are research-based and proven in practice.
- Be school-based, job-embedded, and continuously evaluated and adjusted to ensure effectiveness in meeting school and student learning goals.

Leadership Academy Overview

Talk a bit about what a Leadership Academy is and its structure and design. Explain that timecards are used as a guide for participants to know how much time is remaining in each activity.

One strategy through which NIUSI helps educators develop leadership skills for school change is through the Leadership Academy model of professional development. In collaboration with schools and local universities, NIUSI creates these Leadership Academies for preservice and in-service activities. Our approach includes careful consideration of the content for professional development, adult learning principles, and selection of teams from schools and districts that can support their team members’ learning and practice. In this way, professional development can build on converged needs, create a sense of common purpose and extend the creativity and skill of practitioners. Specifically, we work with urban school districts to build information systems that assist leadership teams to focus on goals for instructional, curricular, and cultural improvement and for empowering action research agendas among school professionals.
SLIDE 3

Roles

Explain the roles the facilitators will play. Have participants introduce themselves and briefly tell what they’d like to learn or take away with them at the end of the academy, focusing on what would be useful to them in their practice.

SLIDE 4

Academy 5.1: Working Together: General and Special Educators

This academy explores the elements of collaborative teaching relationships and the necessary institutional structures and professional skills needed to collaborate successfully.

SLIDE 5

Objectives and Outcomes:

- Identify expectations for collaboration and consultation between general and special educators
- Explore the skills that educators need to collaborate successfully
- Examine the time needed for successful collaboration and how buildings develop schedules that create time for collaborators to plan and evaluate together
- Examine current practice in their own buildings and identify strengths and needs
Academy Agenda:

15 minutes: Introductions, Greetings, and Warm-up

25 minutes: Activity 1: Sharing a Classroom

15 minutes: Lecturette 1: Making Co-teaching a Success

20 minutes: Activity 2: Believing in Co-teaching

10 minutes: Break

10 minutes: Lecturette 2: Scheduling Co-teaching

20 minutes: Activity 3: Time for Co-teaching

30 minutes: Leave-taking and Feedback
Activity 1: Sharing a Classroom

This activity provides a background on co-teaching and gives participants a chance to identify their own feelings about co-teaching.

OUTCOMES MET IN ACTIVITY

• Identify expectations for collaboration and consultation between general and special educators

ACTIVITY SECTIONS

• Part 1: Introduction to Co-teaching and Collaboration
• Part 2: Personalizing Co-teaching
• Part 3: Sharing Thoughts About Co-teaching

COMPLETE ACTIVITY TAKES 25 MINUTES
Module 5: Co-teaching

Activity 1, Part 1: Introduction to Co-teaching and Collaboration

FACILITATOR MATERIALS

Co-teaching PowerPoint presentation

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS

None

ACTIVITY PURPOSE

This is an introduction to co-teaching and collaboration.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT

5 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE

Have the presentation set up and ready to go when the participants arrive. This will ensure that the time for this activity stays around 5 minutes.

ACTIVITY

Introduce co-teaching using the following PowerPoint slides. The slides cover the definition, benefits, and rationale for co-teaching.

SLIDE 1

Co-teaching:

Co-teaching is not the method our educational background prepared us for. Many educators may have chosen this profession because of the autonomy it offers, but co-teaching is a whole different ball of wax that will require new approaches.
Co-teaching Definition: Marilyn Friend, 2003

Co-teaching is a service delivery system in which two (or more) educators or other certified staff contract to share instructional responsibility for a single group of students primarily in a single classroom or workspace for specific content (objectives) with mutual ownership, pooled resources, and joint accountability, although each individual’s level of participation may vary.

Benefits of Collaboration:

- Sharing diverse knowledge, ideas, and expertise
- Awareness of successful teaching strategies
- Consistency and integration across grade levels and subjects
- Support from other professionals
- Moral support from colleagues
- Professional Growth

Information from Baltimore County Public Schools, May 2003
(http://www.bcps.org/offices/oit/Liaisons/DifferentiatedInstruction.doc)

Rationale for Co-teaching:

- Increases instructional options
- Improves program intensity and continuity
- Reduces stigma for children by avoiding pull-out situations
- Increases professional support

Information from Baltimore County Public Schools, May 2003
Activity 1, Part 2: Personalizing Co-teaching

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
Chart paper, markers

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
None

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
This activity allows participants to personalize co-teaching. It also prepares participants for the next part of the activity in which they share their thoughts with members from the opposite group.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
10 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE
The following is a small group activity that requires educators to team up in small groups of either general educators, special educators, or “other.” As stated in the front of the facilitator’s handbook, have participants identify themselves as either general educators or special educators on their nametags so the groupings can go smoothly and quickly.

ACTIVITY
Break participants into small groups. Try to separate groups into either general educators, special educators, or “other.” Participants will be asked to form mixed groups in the next part of the activity.

Ask groups to generate adjectives, feelings (positive and negative) and other thoughts about co-teaching. Also, ask them to identify general hopes and fears.
Activity 1, Part 3: Sharing Thoughts about Co-teaching

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
None

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
None

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
Participants share thoughts about co-teaching with members of opposite group and gain alternative perspectives about collaboration.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
10 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE
None

ACTIVITY
Ask participants to form new groups so that groups become a mix of general educators, special educators, and participants from outside the classroom. Ask the participants to share their thoughts about co-teaching with each other.
Lecturette 1: Making Co-teaching a Success

This lecturette is an overview of the eight components of the co-teaching relationship as given by Susan E. Gately and Frank J. Gately Jr. It also provides an explanation of the common co-teaching issues faced by new co-teachers.

FACILITATOR MATERIALS

Lecturette 1 PowerPoint

OUTCOMES MET IN LECTURETTE

• Explore the skills that educators need to collaborate successfully

LECTURETTE TIME LIMIT

15 minutes

Lecturette 1: Making Co-teaching a Success:

In this lecturette we explore the skills for successful collaboration.

8 Components of Co-teaching:

Susan E. Gately and Frank J. Gately Jr. propose 8 components of the co-teaching relationship. These are skills for successful collaboration.

1. Interpersonal Communication:

Effective interpersonal communication includes the use of verbal, nonverbal and social skills. There are three stages of the Interpersonal Communication component:

• Beginning stage: Communication occurs hesitantly; teachers seek to correctly interpret verbal and nonverbal messages, with more or less success. At this stage, teachers are usually dissatisfied.
• Compromising stage: Communication is more open. Teachers freely give and take ideas. They begin to use humor in their conversations with each other and their students.

• Collaborative stage: Teachers begin to use non-verbal communication. They become role models for their students.

2. Physical Arrangement:

Teachers must agree on the arrangement of the classroom including materials, students, and themselves. There are three stages of the Physical Arrangement component:

• Beginning stage: Physical arrangements are separate. Many times students with disabilities are seated together. The special educator may have little ownership of the materials in the classroom.

• Compromising stage: The two teachers begin to share materials. The special educator begins to move around the room more freely.

• Collaborative Stage: Students are intentionally dispersed throughout the room. The room is jointly owned and teachers move about fluidly.

8 Components of Co-teaching:

3. Familiarity with the Curriculum:

Competence and confidence in the general curriculum is important in the co-teaching relationship. There are three stages of the Familiarity with the Curriculum component:

• Beginning Stage: Special education is unfamiliar with the general educator’s content and methodology.

• Compromising stage: As the level of competence and confidence grows, the general educator becomes more willing to share in planning and teaching.

• Collaborative Stage: Both teachers appreciate each other’s skills that they bring to the content area.

4. Curriculum Goals and Modifications:

Co-planning curriculum is a responsibility shared by both the general and special
They are both responsible for the success of all students in the classroom. They must discuss the goals, accommodations, and modifications for specific students to be successful. There are three stages of the Curriculum Goals and Modifications component:

- **Beginning Stage:** Program is driven by textbooks and standards. Goals are test-driven. Accommodations and modifications for students with special need are restricted to those found in the IEPs.
- **Compromising Stage:** The co-teachers start to make additional accommodations and modifications for students with special needs.
- **Collaborative Stage:** Co-teachers realize the concepts that all students must know from most students should know.

### 8 Components of Co-teaching:

#### 5. Instructional Planning:

Instructional Planning happens on-the-spot, day-to-day, week-to-week, and unit-to-unit. Common planning time is essential for collaborative co-teaching to occur. There are three stages of the Instructional Planning component:

- **Beginning Stage:** In the beginning, co-teachers often use separate curriculum for individuals or small groups. Often, the general educator teaches the group, and the special educator takes on the role as assistant in helping the students who are off-task or struggling with an assignment.
- **Compromising Stage:** At this stage, the teachers take more time to plan together.
- **Collaborative Stage:** Planning becomes ongoing and shared. Planning happens both outside the classroom as well as during lessons.

#### 6. Instructional Presentation:

The presentation of lessons and structure of activities. There are two stages of the Instructional Presentation component:

- **Beginning Stage:** Teachers often provide separate lessons. As in the Instructional Planning step, one teacher often becomes the helper, assisting students who are struggling with the task.
- **Compromising Stage:** Both teachers start to direct some of the activities.
8 Components of Co-teaching:

7. Classroom Management:
Effective classroom management includes structure and relationships. In a structured environment, rules and routines structure the learning experience. The development of relationships and community also contribute to classroom management. There are three stages in the Classroom Management component:

- **Beginning stage:** Special educator usually takes on the role of “behavior manager”.
- **Compromising stage:** Co-teachers develop mutual development of rules and routines. They tend to look at group behavior plans, not individual plans.
- **Collaborative stage:** Both teachers develop classroom management system including rules, routines, and benefits for all students. At this stage, co-teachers start to focus on individual behavior plans.

8. Assessment:
Assessment includes developing systems for evaluating individual students, adjusting standards and expectations for performance to meet individual needs, while maintaining course integrity. There are three stages of the Assessment component:

- **Beginning stage:** Often two separate grading systems are maintained by the two teachers. Measurements are usually objective and solely examine the student’s knowledge of content.
- **Compromising stage:** Co-teachers explore alternative assessments. They use more performance measurements.
- **Collaborative stage:** Teachers appreciate the need for a variety of options when assessing progress. This may include individualization of grading procedures for all students.

**Whose students are these?**
Information adapted from the Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol.30, No.2, NOV/DEC 1997, page 8

Address this issue before co-teaching begins:
Who is responsible for the students in the classroom? The general educator teacher is
responsible for all of the students in the class, but how do these responsibilities change when the special education teacher is in the room? Who is responsible for the students with special needs? Under what conditions do these responsibilities change?

Who gives grades? How do we grade?
Perhaps the issue that warrants the most discussion prior to co-teaching is grading. Special education teachers are accustomed to grading based on the effort, motivation, and abilities of the students.

Whose classroom management rules do we use?
Most general and special education teachers know the types of academic and social behaviors they find acceptable and unacceptable. Over the years, they have established consequences for inappropriate behaviors. Rarely is there disagreement between teachers about the more extreme behaviors. The subtle classroom management difficulties that are part of the ongoing routines of running a classroom, however, can cause concerns for teachers. Often, the special education teacher is unsure about when he or she should step in and assist with classroom management. Teachers should discuss their classroom management styles and the roles they expect of each other in maintaining a smoothly running classroom.

What space do I get?
When special education teachers spend part of their day instructing in general education classrooms, it is extremely useful to have a designated area for them to keep their materials. A desk and chair that are used only by special education teachers provide them with a “base” from which to work and contribute to their position of authority.

Common Co-teaching Issues Continued:
What do we tell the students?
An issue repeatedly brought up by teachers is how much information should be given to students. Should students be informed that they will have two teachers? Should students know that one of the teachers is a special education and that she will be assisting some children more than others? The students should be informed that they have two teachers and that both teachers have the same authority. We think it is a good idea to introduce the special education teacher as a “learning abilities” specialist who will be working with all of the students from time to time. It is our experience that students willingly accept the idea of having two teachers and like it very much. In interviews we have conducted, many students who have participated in co-teaching classrooms tell us that having two teachers is better because everyone gets more help.
What do we tell the parents?

Teachers are often unsure of how much they should tell parents about their new teaching arrangement. One of the concerns that teachers have is how parents might react to having a special education teacher in the classroom for part of the day. It is our experience that these programs are most successful when parents are brought in early and are part of the planning process. Thus, parents are part of the process from the beginning and are able to influence the development of the program. Parents of average- to high-achieving children may express concerns that their children’s education may be hampered because students with special needs are placed in the classroom. Teachers report that these student fare as well or better, academically and socially, when students with special needs are in the general education classroom; and all students benefit from the support provided by the special education teacher (Arguelles, Schumm, & Vaughn, 1996).

How can we get time to co-plan?

The most pervasive concern of both general and special education teachers in co-teaching situations is obtaining sufficient time during the school day to plan and discuss instruction and student progress. This is of particular concern for special education teachers who are working with more than one general education teacher. Teachers report that planning often comes on their own time. Even when a designated period is established for co-planning, teachers report that this time gets taken away to be used for meetings and other school management activities. Teachers need a minimum of 45 minutes of uninterrupted planning time each week if they are likely to have a successful co-teaching experience. One suggestion made by several of the teacher teams with whom we have worked is to designate a day or a half-day every 6-8 weeks when teachers can meet extensively to plan and discuss the progress of students, as well as changes in their instructional practices.

Questions:
This is a question and answer period. Limit it to 3 – 5 minutes.
Activity 2: Believing in Co-teaching

This activity gives participants a chance to apply their own beliefs to the co-teaching components outlined in the lecturette.

OUTCOMES MET IN ACTIVITY
- Explore the skills that educators need to collaborate successfully.

ACTIVITY SECTIONS
- Part 1: Thinking About Values and Beliefs
- Part 2: Sharing Stories and Beliefs About Co-teaching

COMPLETE ACTIVITY TAKES 20 MINUTES
Activity 2, Part 1: Thinking about Values and Beliefs

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
None

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
Instructional Beliefs

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
Participants have time to reflect on what their values and beliefs in several important instructional areas.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
10 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE
None

ACTIVITY
Participants identify their three most important beliefs about each of the components of the co-teaching relationship. The five components of the co-teaching relationship are listed below:

1. Physical Arrangement
2. Curriculum Goals and Modifications
3. Instructional Presentation
4. Classroom Management
5. Assessment
Activity 2, Part 2: Sharing Stories and Beliefs about Co-teaching

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
None

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
None

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
Participants gain insight about the difficulties they may encounter when two teachers, with different beliefs, come together to teach one class.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
10 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE
You may have more general educators than special educators, or the other way around. If this is the case, use small groups for this activity instead of teams.

ACTIVITY
Ask special educators and general educators to pair up to compare their beliefs about the components of the co-teaching relationship. Next, have them identify similarities and differences between ideas, as well as supports they would need in order to come together in areas of difference.
Lecturette 2: Scheduling Co-teaching

This lecturette reviews many scheduling issues that buildings face when implementing co-teaching.

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
Lecturette 2 PowerPoint

LECTURETTE TIME LIMIT
10 minutes

SLIDE 1

Lecturette 2: Scheduling Co-teaching:
In this module you will examine the time needed for successful collaboration and how buildings develop schedules that create time for collaborators to plan and evaluate together.

SLIDE 2

How Do Schools Develop Schedules for Co-teaching?
Administrative support plays a large part in the success of co-teaching. The process of putting together a co-teaching system takes time. The best overall strategy for addressing scheduling is to work with a representative group from the school (each grade level; team, or department; an administrator, a representative from the related arts and/or vocational arts; other support staff (nurse, psychologist, speech/language therapist, ESL, or others); and paraprofessionals.

If this group begins its tasks of discussing scheduling before the close of the school year and continues it for two or three work sessions during the summer, a one-year plan can usually be developed. Staff members should be prepared for the fact that first efforts may not be completely successful. Instead of resorting to complaining, staff members should be encouraged to suggest alternatives to improve the schedule for the following year. The more a schedule is developed taking into account ALL services, the more likely it is to meet students needs effectively and efficiently.
Issues Between General and Special Educators:
When general and special educators collaborate, scheduling can become confusing and demanding. It usually takes several years for scheduling dilemmas to be resolved. That is, some co-teaching and in-class support is created, but many traditional classes or the resource program remains. Scheduling for inclusive schools is complex and iterative. For the first year or two, it is common to develop a partial schedule. Pooling resources and flexibility of schedule are major scheduling issues:

Pooling Resources:
If just one or two students need instruction in math, perhaps those students can attend a self-contained class during math instead of requiring a period scheduled by a resource teacher. In general, it is strongly advised that ALL special service providers participate in some in-class service in an inclusive school. If this is not done, teachers in self-contained programs themselves become isolated.

Flexibility of Schedule:
The schedules for special education teachers and paraprofessionals should retain some flexibility at the beginning of the year, particularly in elementary schools where it is easier to accomplish and there is a great likelihood that additional students will be identified during the course of the school year. That is, at least some time during the week should be reserved for new responsibilities; this time can be used in the interim for assessment, observation, consultation, and other duties.

Providing Services:
The next slides suggest ways for scheduling between general and special educators to provide inclusive services to elementary, middle, and secondary students.
It may be necessary for teachers to agree to stagger their instruction. If everyone in the school is teaching in the language arts for the first two hours of the day and most students’ needs pertain to language arts, problems arise. However, if some teachers begin this instruction later, services can be more readily scheduled.

Related arts (i.e: art, music, physical education, drama) schedules often drive the rest of the schedule in elementary schools. Although related arts certainly have difficulties in terms of teachers and space, inclusive schools need to analyze whether any alternative can be found. In some schools, an entire grade level attends such classes at one time so that the grade level can meet with the special educator.

In others, these teachers occasionally take a larger class group to facilitate planning. A special services provider might spend 1.25 hours in fourth grade. However, the precise use of that time (averaging out so that required services are delivered) could vary day-by-day depending on instructional priorities and activities in the various classrooms.

Middle School:
On Mondays the special education teacher co-teaches English; Tuesdays math; Wednesdays science; and so on. Every student receives services every day, but not always in the same subject. For the two weeks of instruction on integers co-teaching will occur in math every day. Then as the English class reaches its major research project, co-teaching switches to that class for the next two weeks.
Secondary Schools:
This is accomplished by first listing all the sections of separate coursework offered (either subject-matter classes or resource sections) and then making a commitment to reduce by a specific percentage the amount of such coursework (for example, 15% the first year, 8% the second year). In-class services are sometimes more readily scheduled. That is, these three students will have the same daily schedule. By placing two clusters of students in a class (six students), in-class services can be justified.

Questions:
This is a question and answer period. Limit it to 3 – 5 minutes.
Activity 3: Time for Co-teaching

This activity gives participants a chance to analyze their own schools and come up with ideas on how to implement co-teaching.

OUTCOMES MET IN ACTIVITY

• Examine current practice in their own buildings and identify strengths and needs.

ACTIVITY SECTIONS

• Part 1: Recording Daily Work Schedules
• Part 2: Analyzing Schedules
• Part 3: Sharing Ideas

COMPLETE ACTIVITY TAKES 20 MINUTES
Activity 3, Part 1: Recording Daily Work Schedules

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
None

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
Paper

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
Participants prepare for next activity.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
5 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE
None

ACTIVITY
Ask participants to write down their daily work schedule.
Activity 3, Part 2: Analyzing Schedules

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
None

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
Scheduling Questions

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
Participants analyze scheduling at their own schools.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
10 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE
The groups may see multiple gaps for their chosen topic. Urge them to strategize one gap solution at a time and move on to another if time permits (e.g., one gap may be skills, and then move on to another gap, perhaps resources.)

ACTIVITY
Using their schedules as a starting point, ask participants to use the scheduling questions to guide a conversation about scheduling co-teaching at their own school. Tell them that they will share their most creative ideas with the whole group.
Activity 3, Part 3: Sharing Ideas

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
None

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
None

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
Wind-up

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
5 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE
None

ACTIVITY
Ask small groups to share their most creative idea with the large group.
**Leave Taking**

*Leave Taking, Part 1: Self-evaluations*

**FACILITATOR MATERIALS**

None

**PARTICIPANT MATERIALS**

*Self Assessment*

**ACTIVITY PURPOSE**

The self assessment provides the participant with an objective means of evaluating the knowledge and skills gained in this academy.

**ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT**

10 minutes

**FACILITATOR NOTE**

None

**ACTIVITY**

Have participants complete the Self Assessment. Remind groups that their assessments will be collected for module assessment purposes and they do not need to put their names on the assessments.

1. What are two of the eight components that educators need to collaborate successfully and describe some of the stages they will go through to reach true collaboration?

2. Identify some of the issues teachers will face when trying to schedule co-teaching and provide ideas on how to overcome those obstacles.
Leave Taking, Part 2: Share Learning

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
Chart paper

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
None

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
This activity is meant to share evaluations.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
10 minutes

FACILITATOR NOTE
Collect the assessments and return them to the National Institute for Urban School Improvement along with the Academy Evaluations.

ACTIVITY
Return to whole group and ask participants to share their responses. Use chart paper to record what they say as a way to highlight new learning, and congratulate the group on their hard work.
Leave Taking, Part 3: Academy Evaluation

FACILITATOR MATERIALS
None

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS
Academy Evaluation

ACTIVITY PURPOSE
This activity provides module developers feedback from module participants.

ACTIVITY TIME LIMIT
10 minutes (This can be done as an exit activity. Participants turn the self-assessment and academy evaluation in as they leave.)

FACILITATOR NOTE
Collect the evaluations and return them to the National Institute for Urban School Improvement along with the Self Assessments.

ACTIVITY
Have participants complete the Academy Evaluation. This evaluation gives the developers a chance to see how the academy is being received and allows them to improve it as needed.
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Resources


Looks at the views of Tiffany Royal, a fifth grade teacher at Flamingo Elementary School in Miami, and education teacher Joyce Duryea, regarding co-teaching. How Tiffany felt about the training which she received to become an elementary teacher; Modifying models for co-teaching roles; Identification of several alternative models to grazing and tag-team-teaching. INSETS: Common co-teaching issues; Tips for co-teaching.


The long-standing gap between research and practice in general and special education has become a matter of national concern. Described in this article is a "blueprint" designed to bridge the gap based on lessons learned at the Juniper Gardens Children’s Project (JGCP). The goal of the blueprint is to initiate and sustain ongoing interactions between classroom teachers and researchers interested in using research-validated practices in local classroom settings. Its components are partnership, collaboration, consultation, and professional development. Discussed are the blueprint and some initial findings of its use. Considered are the implications of the blueprint and of successfully moving research into classroom practice.

In this article, the authors describe a change model that was developed and implemented over 3 years in 2 southern California school districts to promote inclusive practices. A study documented the change process and the impact of related district and site activities through interviews with general and special educators, administrators, and parents. Findings from the study indicate that all sites moved toward inclusive practices, with the participants reporting benefits for students with disabilities, the general education student population, and educational practices of general and special educators. Approaches in implementing inclusive practices differed, however, resulting in significant variability among schools in services provided to students with special needs. Implications in moving toward inclusive practices are discussed, including factors perceived as contributing to the change process, the configuration of services provided, and issues related to sustaining inclusive efforts. The data suggest the complexity of change and the diversity of programs that emerge from a common model of change. Balancing inclusion with specialized instruction for all students emerged as an important component of inclusive practices.


Researchers examined 4 elementary and 2 middle schools that were achieving exemplary results for all students in an effort to identify and describe critical indicators of overall school success. Embedded case studies revealed key capacity-building elements related to collaboration between general and special education teachers. These elements included a culture of shared responsibility, high expectations for all students and a sense of a professional community within the schools. The purpose of the project was to identify critical indicators of school success that could be translated into capacity-building activities that support positive outcomes for all students. Although all of these schools had strong collaborative communities and high expectations for all students, considerable variability was evident in other areas, including shared leadership and support for collaborative practices. This article addresses some of the factors that fostered or impeded the collaborative nature of these schools.


Studies the effectiveness of coteaching in a general education life skills class in providing inclusive instruction to students with and without disabilities. Case study of inclusive instruction; Context for general and special education collaboration; Planning ongoing accommodations.

Richard Rose, writing in this journal in his role as Research Section Editor (BJSE, Volume 29, Number 1), argued that teachers should learn to do research in collaboration with other professionals, as part of a drive to make teaching a ‘research-based profession’. In this article, Joan Forbes, Senior Lecturer in Educational Studies in the Faculty of Education at the University of Aberdeen, explores this idea in greater depth from her perspective as course leader for an MEd module on inter-agency collaboration. She proposes that recommendations for collaboration to support children with language and communication disorders do not attend to the difficulties involved between professionals from different backgrounds who use different discourses and draw upon different research evidence as a basis for practice. Her paper draws on ‘postmodern’ research approaches and Michael Foucault’s views of ‘discourse’ to examine a variety of theoretical perspectives previously applied to collaboration. It argues for the value of further theoretical diversity and methodological plurality and introduces discourse analysis as a tool for helping to understand the notion of collaboration. At the end of her challenging and intriguing paper, Joan Forbes offers some suggestions concerning the value of ‘new’ questioning kinds of analysis.


Focuses on the importance of the relationship between parents, special education teachers and therapists to the physical education of students with disabilities. Strategies for working together; Definition of collaboration; Barriers that can hinder the process of collaboration.

The National Institute for Urban School Improvement


Because research has found that differentiation of instruction for gifted students does not typically occur within the general classroom, collaboration between gifted and general education teachers is critical in order to ensure appropriate services to students with high abilities. Gifted education teachers are now being called upon to provide services to their students in the regular education environment. This fundamental change in setting mirrors mandated changes in special education, wherein students with disabilities are increasingly served in the general education classroom. This article provides a new definition of collaboration within the context of gifted education and expands on the utilization of
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coteaching as a collaborative strategy. Five models of coteaching originally developed for meeting the needs of students with disabilities were adapted, and examples of their use with gifted students in the general education classroom are provided.


This article explores the application and use of curriculum mapping as a tool to assist teachers in communicating the content, skills, and assessments used in their classrooms. The process of curriculum mapping is explained, and the adaptation of the process for special education teachers is detailed. Finally, examples are given of how curriculum mapping can assist both special and general education teachers in meeting the needs of students in the classroom. Although this article will apply the use of curriculum mapping data at the middle school level, the process of mapping is equally effective at the elementary and high school levels.


Functional assessment is a multi-step process that addresses operant variables to develop interventions that are both effective and socially valid. The purpose of this study was to determine whether a general education teacher could conduct functional assessment and treatment in her classroom after receiving training. We report data for one teacher whose application of functional assessment and treatment lead to a reduction of problem behaviors for two students. The teacher reported favorable responses to the acceptability of using functional assessment in the classroom.


Reviews special education progress on the three outcomes fundamental to ensuring high and challenging learning results for every exceptional learner. Reason quality teacher is the single most important factor in students' learning; Difference between how administrators and teachers perceive the need for and availability of communication and time for collaboration; One of the key elements of job satisfaction and retention; Vital role that quality professional development plays in improving students' outcomes.

Collaboration between special and general education teachers has received increased attention over the past decade as part of the effort to create inclusive classrooms and to blur the boundaries between programs and students. Yet collaboration can have multiple meanings. This special issue presents data related to collaborative practices derived from three projects funded under a U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs research priority, Beacons of Excellence. Research projects funded under this priority were to identify schools achieving exemplary results with students with disabilities, as well as with their peers. Researchers from the separate projects whose results are presented in this issue studied schools in very different contexts using different methodologies. Researchers identified characteristics of their schools and then came together to identify features common across all schools that appeared to be dominant forces in creating the exemplary schools. Collaborative practices were among a handful of such features that emerged across projects. Collaboration in these exemplary schools included both specific teaching practices as well as a climate and culture that supported a community of professionals working together to improve teaching and achievement for all students. Findings from these projects provide important insights into how schools are defining and implementing collaboration.


Discusses the requirements for individualized education programs, collaborations and assessments in the United States. Role of the 1997 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments in aligning special education policies with standards-based reforms; Increase in collaboration between general and special education teachers.


This article describes a promising form of professional collaboration: coteaching between a content area teacher and a special education teacher. In an investigation of a schoolwide coteaching model in an urban middle school that places students with disabilities in heterogeneous classrooms, researchers interviewed key school leaders and made detailed observations of coteaching. The study found that although content teachers conduct more of the instruction and special education teachers provide more individualized assistance, both use a full range of instructional roles. Essential to the success of coteaching partnerships were collaborative school structures, equal status rules for teachers, a commitment to all students' learning, and strong content knowledge.
Module 5: Co-teaching


Presents a strategy that may help teachers initiate and maintain effective collaborative relationships in high-poverty urban environments. Process used to assist general education teachers at the secondary level in understanding, planning for, and initiating collaborative relationships with special education teachers.


Discusses the requirements for teaching students with special needs in the U.S. Collaborations between special education teachers and typical classroom teachers; Cross-categorical licensure requiring special educators to be more prepared across disability areas; Perspectives of special education as a profession.


Investigates collaboration among school professionals and educators working with culturally and linguistically diverse and exceptional (CLDE) students. Perceptions, practices and needs of educational professionals as they relate to the service delivery of CLDE students; Development of the Collaborative Survey for teachers working with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse and Exceptional students; Impact of the trends toward collaboration among educators on the education of CLDE students.


Although pupils with disabilities are spending more time within the general education classroom, teachers have shown variable levels of willingness and interest in modifying their instruction to meet the needs of these pupils. Studies have indicated that simple modifications are the most likely to be implemented. This study surveyed resource teachers to determine how frequently paper and teacher-made paper instructional materials were being used in general education classrooms, and how those materials might be modified to enhance the likelihood of successful access by all students, including those with disabilities.

The constraints and complexity entailed in the provision of comprehensive special education services at a school site argue for the importance of using whole schools as a unit of analysis in special education efficacy research. The case studies summarized in this special issue represent an important step forward in understanding how schools that support positive academic outcomes for all students are configured. All studies found support for the importance of collaboration (although the forms varied by school). Other common themes were peer support, shared responsibility for student learning, administrative support for collaboration, and informal communication mechanisms that supplemented more formal contacts between general and special education. The case studies can serve as a stimulus for further debate about how to define exemplary outcomes in special education and the critical dimensions for characterizing schools’ services to students with disabilities. They also provide directions for future research in understanding the processes that contribute to positive outcomes for students in special education.


Reports on the findings of a survey regarding the involvement of special education personnel in the development of educational accountability systems in the United States. Objectives for schools to make incremental gains in student test scores including special education students; Benefits of the collaboration between general and special education staff; Focal evolution of alternate education assessments.


In this study, perceptions of inclusion for students with both mild and severe disabilities were explored. Collaboration issues related to inclusion were also examined. Specifically, 180 general education and special education preservice and inservice teachers were given a questionnaire on inclusion. In addition, they were given another questionnaire two weeks later after viewing a videotape of a boy who half the teachers were told had a mild disability and half that he had a severe disability. There were no significant differences for educational type or experience for the items that focused on the intensity level of including with mild or severe disabilities. There were significant students differences for the items addressing collaboration issues. After the videotape was introduced, there were significant differences for both educational type and experience for items on intensity of inclusion. Implications of these results were discussed with emphasis on the teachers’ apparent preference for a continuum of services.

Collaboration between general education teachers and special education teachers is often mentioned in the literature as a means of accomplishing the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education. The purpose of this study was to describe, using both qualitative and quantitative data, the communication and collaboration practices in four high schools with demonstrated success at including students with disabilities in general education and achieving exemplary outcomes for all students. School wide approaches and classroom-level factors associated with collaboration characterize the themes that emerged as important to the success of these high schools. A discussion of these results and implications for practice are presented.


Proposes four alternative models for co-taught classrooms that rely on flexible teacher schedules and the use of paraprofessionals. Benefits of cooperative teaching; Need for new instructional models; Traditional co-teaching; Collaboration scheduling.
Glossary

CO-TEACHING
Collaborative teaching between general and special education teachers.

FACILITATOR
A Collaborative Leadership Team process role. The Facilitator guides the meeting process and remains objective.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR URBAN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
The National Institute for Urban School Improvement (NIUSI) is funded by the Office of Special Education Programs at the U.S. Department of Education. The mission of NIUSI is to support the building of capacity in urban schools and school districts so that students with disabilities are engaged in high quality curriculum and learning experiences that improve their ability to succeed in school and in post-school opportunities.