

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

**Teaching Culturally, Linguistically Diverse & Exceptional Learners Program**

**EDCI 776-01  
Consulting and Collaboration in Diverse K-12 Settings  
3 Credits Spring 2016  
Monday, 4:30, Thompson Hall L004**

**PROFESSOR:**

**Name: Dr. Shannon King, PhD, NBCT**

**Office Hours: By Appointment**

**Phone: 703.409.5522**

**Email: sking27@gmu.edu**

**COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

- A. Prerequisites/Co-requisites
  - a. Completion of 12 credits in degree concentration.
  
- B. University Catalog Course Description

Focuses on ways in which practicing education professionals collaborate in serving diverse learners and their families. Explores methods for co-planning and co-teaching in the general education classroom and ways for sharing responsibilities for instruction and assessment. Includes ways for dealing with difficult interactions are part of understanding how to implement collaborative and inclusive models of education for diverse learners.
  
- C. Expanded Course Description

Not applicable

**LEARNER OUTCOMES or OBJECTIVES:**

This course is designed to enable students to:

1. Identify key elements of successful educator consultation and collaboration (Proposition 4).
2. Examine models of collaboration and consultation in K-12 settings (Proposition 5).
3. Discuss the rationale for using consultation and collaboration in K- 12 settings (Proposition 5).
4. Explain the importance of consulting and collaboration for the delivery of effective instruction for TCLDEL (Proposition 4).

5. Explain the importance of consulting and collaboration as part of reflective practice (Proposition 4).
6. Demonstrate essential communication skills including: consensus building, conflict management, negotiation and persuasion (Proposition 4).
7. Describe and apply the steps in the collaborative consulting process to problem solving student issues (Proposition 5).

### **PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS (National Board of Professional Teaching Standards):**

As part of the advanced capstone coursework for the master's degree this course encompasses standards from National Board of Professional Teaching Standards:

Proposition 4: Teachers Think Systematically about Their Practice and Learn from Experience.

- NBCTs model what it means to be an educated person – they read, they question, they create and they are willing to try new things.
- They are familiar with learning theories and instructional strategies and stay abreast of current issues in American education.
- They critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new findings into their practice.

- See more at: <http://www.nbpts.org/think-systematically-learn-experience#sthash.mqOb4pjx.dpuf>

Proposition 5: Teachers are Members of Learning Communities.

- NBCTs collaborate with others to improve student learning.
- They are leaders and actively know how to seek and build partnerships with community groups and businesses.
- They work with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development.
- They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of resources in order to meet state and local education objectives.
- They know how to work collaboratively with parents to engage them productively in the work of the school.

- See more at: <http://www.nbpts.org/members-learning-communities#sthash.uDU4DOni.dpuf>

### **REQUIRED TEXTS:**

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2013). *Interactions: Collaboration for school professionals* (7th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

### **Additional Recommended Readings:**

Idol, L, Nevin, A., & Paolucci-Whitcomb, P. (1994). *Collaborative Consultation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Pugach, M., Johnson, L., Drame, E., & Williamson, P. (2012). *Collaborative Practitioners, Collaborative Schools* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Charlottesville, VA: Love Publishing.

Walther-Thomas, C., Korinek, L., McLalughlin, V., & Williams, B. (2000). *Collaboration for Inclusive Education: Developing Successful Programs*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

### **COURSE ASSIGNMENTS AND EXAMINATIONS:**

1. Critical Reflective Journal (20 points) - participants will maintain a reflective journal throughout the course. This journal process is designed to help participants develop a frame of reference for consulting and collaboration as a worldview in teaching. Systematic and regular journaling will be used to provide evidence of growth as a reflective educator.
2. Essay in Conflict Analysis (20 points) – this essay will be designed around the three major points of conflict: incompatible goals; one solution; and, only one person can have the solution as outlined in your text. Identify one specific conflict that you have had to manage in the past. List the sequence of events and explain why you think the conflict belongs in that specific type. Address the notions of easiest/hardest to resolve and why?
3. Document/Resource Analysis (15 points) – focusing on a specific school setting (one in which you are employed or wish to be employed) construct a resource list with names, titles, contact information and areas of expertise for individuals who might serve as consultants in your classroom.
4. **PBA** Co-Teaching/Demonstration Episode (30 points) – the performance based assessment for this class is multilayered and will involve a minimum of two individuals. Paired participants will design a co-teaching episode, submit lesson plans outlining the shared responsibilities and conduct a micro-teaching demonstration in class. Further, each participant will evaluate the contribution of their peer and the overall demonstration will be evaluated by the instructor (see detailed instructions and rubric attached).

### **Course Expectations and Delivery**

This course is designed to model the effective elements of collaboration and consultation in the classroom. Therefore, we will engage in a wide variety of learning opportunities including but not limited to: discussion, mini-lecture, demonstration, videotape/online learning, and reflection both in writing and orally. As a result of the dynamic nature of the class all participants are

expected to:

Informed Participation (15 points): This class is based upon **informed** participation. Students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss the assigned content using examples from the text or other readings to support classroom experiences and knowledge about collaboration and consulting in professional learning communities. While your current knowledge as a teacher is important to your understandings, finding evidence and research-based support is critical to expanding your knowledge as a practitioner. Further, students are expected to actively participate in in-class activities, be supportive of their classmates and conduct themselves in a professional manner throughout the program. Finally, students are expected to arrive to class on time and be mindful of breaks and departure times from class. Any departure from the above expectations will result in a deduction of points in the participation grade – simply ‘being’ in class is insufficient to obtain full participation points.

| <b>Assignment Description</b>                | <b>Grade %</b> | <b>Standards Addressed</b>            |
|--|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Field Experience                             | S/U            | Requirement for licensure/endorsement |
| Critical Reflective Journal                  | 20             | Proposition 4                         |
| Essay in Conflict Analysis                   | 20             | Proposition 4                         |
| Document/Resource Analysis                   | 15             | Proposition 4, Proposition 5          |
| <b>PBA</b> Co-Teaching/Demonstration Episode | 30             | Proposition 4, Proposition 5          |
| Informed Participation                       | 15             | Proposition 5                         |

### **TK20 PERFORMANCE-BASED ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT**

Every student registered for any TCLDEL course with a required performance-based assessment is required to submit this assessment, Co-Teaching/Demonstration Episode to Tk20 through Blackboard (regardless of whether the student is taking the course as an elective, a onetime course or as part of an undergraduate minor). Evaluation of the performance-based assessment by the course instructor will also be completed in Tk20 through Blackboard. Failure to submit the assessment to Tk20 (through Blackboard) will result in the course instructor reporting the course grade as Incomplete (IN). Unless the IN grade is changed upon completion of the required Tk20 submission, the IN will convert to an F nine weeks into the following semester.

### **GRADING POLICY**

At George Mason University course work is measured in terms of quantity and quality. A credit normally represents one hour per week of lecture or recitation or not fewer than two hours per week of laboratory work throughout a semester. The number of credits is a measure of quantity. The grade is a measure of quality. The university-wide system for grading graduate courses is as follows:

| Grade | GRADING | Grade Points | Interpretation   |
|-------|---------|--------------|--|
| A+    | =100    | 4.00         | Represents mastery of the subject through effort beyond basic requirements                         |
| A     | 94-99   | 4.00         |  |
| A-    | 90-93   | 3.67         |  |
| B+    | 85-89   | 3.33         | Reflects an understanding of and the ability to apply theories and principles at a basic level     |
| B     | 80-84   | 3.00         |  |
| C*    | 70-79   | 2.00         | Denotes an unacceptable level of understanding and application of the basic elements of the course |
| F*    | <69     | 0.00         |  |

**Note: “C” is not satisfactory for a licensure course; “F” does not meet requirements of the Graduate School of Education**

## FIELD EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

The **field experience is a required component** of the teacher preparation program at George Mason University. All students will complete a minimum of 20 hours in field experience for this course. Documentation of your field experience using the Fieldwork Evaluation & Log is required which includes a signature from your field experience teacher(s) or supervisor(s). The Fieldwork Evaluation & Log is located on Blackboard.

**In-service teachers:** Field experience can often be conducted in your own classroom if you have access to the population of students required for the PBAs. Please consult your instructor if you have questions about the viability of your classroom for fieldwork in this class. You must register for your school as your field experience site in the online Field Experience Request form available here: <https://cehd.gmu.edu/endorse/ferf> You will check the box indicating that: *“I will arrange my own field experiences (observations and/or case studies) because I am a full-time contracted school system employee and will complete field experience at my workplace.”* The deadline to submit your field experience placement is September 15 (Fall) or February 15 (Spring). Failure to do so will result in an unsatisfactory grade for your fieldwork assignment. **If you are taking this course as part of a cohort program, please indicate “TCLDEL Cohort” on your request form FIRST, then select your program and placement location. HINT: Cohort courses have section numbers beginning with “6F” (e.g. EDUC 511.6F1).**

**Pre-service teachers:** If you are not currently working in a K-12 school, you will need to be placed in an appropriate fieldwork setting to complete your required PBAs and fieldwork hours. You must request a fieldwork site using the online Field Experience Request form available here: <https://cehd.gmu.edu/endorse/ferf> You will check the box indicating that: I will need George Mason (Clinical Practice Specialist) to arrange a placement for my field experiences (including observations and/or case studies). The deadline to submit your field experience placement is September 15 (Fall) or February 15 (Spring). Failure to do so will result in an unsatisfactory grade for your fieldwork assignment. **If you are taking this course as part of a cohort program, please indicate “TCLDEL Cohort” on your request form, then select your program and**

placement location. HINT: Cohort courses have section numbers beginning with “6F” (e.g. EDUC 511.6F1).

## HONOR CODE & INTEGRITY OF WORK

**Integrity of Work:** TCLDEL students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code (<http://oai.gmu.edu/honor-code/>). The principle of academic integrity is taken very seriously and violations are treated as such.

*Violations of the Honor Code* include:

1. Copying a paper or part of a paper from another student (current or past);
2. Reusing work that you have already submitted for another class (unless express permission has been granted by your current professor **before** you submit the work);
3. Copying the words of an author from a textbook or any printed source (including the Internet) or closely paraphrasing without providing a citation to credit the author. For examples of what should be cited, please refer to: <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/589/02/>
4. You may also not “reuse” fieldwork hours. Each placement must have 20 documented hours that are solely for each course that you are in; you may be at the same site, but the same hours may not be counted towards the same course.

## LATE WORK POLICY

At the graduate level all work is expected to be of high quality and submitted on the dates due. *Work submitted late will be reduced one letter grade for every day of delay.* Because we live in uncertain times, if you have any extraordinary circumstances (*think* flood, earthquake, evacuation) that prevent you from submitting your work in a timely manner, it is your responsibility to contact the instructor as soon as possible after the circumstances occur and make arrangements to complete your work. *It is up to the discretion of the instructor to approve the late/makeup work.*

## LAPTOP/CELL PHONE POLICY

Laptop use is permitted at the discretion of the instructor and for specific purposes as assigned in the class (e.g. small group work). Laptops will be closed during discussions, lectures and other assignments in class which require your full attention. Cell phones must be turned off/silenced during class periods. Cell phones may be used during break.

## GMU POLICIES AND RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS

- a. Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code (See <http://oai.gmu.edu/the-mason-honor-code/>).
- b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing (See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>).

- c. Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students solely through their Mason email account.
- d. The George Mason University Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) staff consists of professional counseling and clinical psychologists, social workers, and counselors who offer a wide range of services (e.g., individual and group counseling, workshops and outreach programs) to enhance students' personal experience and academic performance (See <http://caps.gmu.edu/>).
- e. Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with George Mason University Disability Services and inform their instructor, in writing, as soon as possible. Approved accommodations will begin at the time the written letter from Disability Services is received by the instructor (See <http://ods.gmu.edu/>).
- f. Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
- g. The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (e.g., tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing (See <http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/>).

## **PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS**

Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

## **CORE VALUES COMMITMENT**

The College of Education & Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles: <http://cehd.gmu.edu/values/>.

**For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, Graduate School of Education, please visit our website <http://gse.gmu.edu/>.**

**Proposed Schedule: EDCI 776 Spring 2016**

| Date   | Topic   | Readings   | Assignments Due  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Week 1</b><br><b>Jan 25</b><br>*ONLINE<br>Session | Who are we?<br>Introduction: Building Collaborative Classrooms            | Murdock, L., Finneran, D. & Theve, K. (2016). Co-teaching to reach every learner. <i>Educational Leadership</i> , 74 (4), 42-47.   | <b>Post your introduction to the Db and complete your pre-assessment</b>     |
| <b>Week 2</b><br><b>Feb 1</b>                        | Worldviews of Teaching: Roles & Responsibilities                          | Friend & Cook (2012), Chapter 1<br><br><i>The Changing Role of the ESL Teacher</i> ,<br><a href="http://www.tesol.org/.../ccss_convening_final-5-7-13.p">www.tesol.org/.../ccss_convening_final-5-7-13.p</a><br><br><i>ELL and General Classroom Teachers: Teaching for Success</i> ,<br><a href="http://blog.ellevationeducation.com/ell-educators-classroom-teachers-collaboration-for-success">http://blog.ellevationeducation.com/ell-educators-classroom-teachers-collaboration-for-success</a> |  |
| <b>Week 3</b><br><b>Feb 8</b>                        | Intercultural Competency for Teaching in Culturally Responsive Classrooms | Ndura, E. (2004). Teachers' discoveries of their cultural realms: Untangling the web of cultural identity. <i>Multicultural Perspective</i> , 6(3), 10-16.<br><br>Friend & Cook (2012), Chapter 2 & 5<br><br>Moyer, A. & Clymer, J. (2009). What Does It Mean to be Culturally Proficient? <a href="http://www.naesp.org">www.naesp.org</a><br><br>Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i> , 53(2), 106-111.                               | <b>Critical Reflective Journal Review</b>                                    |
| <b>Week 4</b><br><b>Feb 15</b><br>*ONLINE<br>Session | Developing positive environments for collaboration                        | Friend, M. (2016). Welcome to Co-Teaching 2.0. <i>Educational Leadership</i> , 74 (4), 16-22.  |  |
| <b>Week 5</b><br><b>Feb 22</b>                       | Learning the Skills of Collaboration & Consulting                         | Friend & Cook (2012), Chapter 3  | <b>Document/ Resource Analysis Due</b>                                       |
| <b>Week 6</b><br><b>Feb 29</b><br>*ONLINE<br>Session | Listening and Consensus Building  | Friend & Cook (2012), Chapter 4  | <b>Take the Strengths Finders survey and post your results to Blackboard</b> |
| <b>SPRING BREAK March 7-11</b>                       |   |  |  |



| Date   | Topic  | Readings  | Assignments Due                       |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Week 7<br/>March<br/>14</b>                               | Models of Collaboration and Consulting in Diverse Classrooms | Friend & Cook (2012), Chapter 8   |                                       |
| <b>Week 8<br/>March<br/>21</b><br><i>*ONLINE<br/>Session</i> | Conflict Management: Negotiation & Persuasion                | Friend & Cook (2012), Chapter 9   |                                       |
| <b>Week 9<br/>March<br/>28</b>                               | Problem Identification: Assessment & Goal Setting            | <i>Review class readings as you finalize your conflict analysis</i>   | <b>Essay in Conflict Analysis Due</b> |
| <b>Week<br/>10<br/>April 4</b>                               | Meeting Student Needs Through Co-Teaching                    | Friend & Cook (2012), Chapter 9<br><br>The Effectiveness of Co-Teaching Models: A Review of the Literature (2012). <i>The Hanover Report</i> , hanoverresearch.com<br><br>Mastropieri, M.A., Scruggs, T.E., Graetz, J., Norland, J., Gardizi, W., and McDuffie, K. (2005). Case studies in co-teaching in the content areas: Successes, failures and challenges. <i>Intervention In School And Clinic</i> , 40(5), 260-270.   |                                       |
| <b>Week<br/>11<br/>April<br/>11</b>                          | Meeting Student Needs Through Collaborative Consulting       | Leatherman, J. (2009). Teachers' voices concerning collaborative teams within an inclusive elementary school. <i>Teaching Education</i> , 20(2), 189-202. Doi: 10.1080/10476210902718104<br><br>Magiera, K., Lawrence-Brown, K., Bloomquist, K., Foster, C., Figueroa, A., Glatz, K., Heppeler, D., & Rodriguez, P. (2006). On the road to more collaborative teaching: One school's experience. <i>Teaching Exceptional Children Plus</i> , 2(5), 1-11.                |                                       |
| <b>Week<br/>12<br/>April<br/>18</b>                          | Meeting Student Needs Through Response to Intervention       | Response to Intervention Resources for Teachers:<br><a href="http://www.specialeducationguide.com/pre-k-12/response-to-intervention/effective-rti-strategies-for-teachers/">http://www.specialeducationguide.com/pre-k-12/response-to-intervention/effective-rti-strategies-for-teachers/</a><br><br>Response to Intervention Archive of Articles/Disciplines:<br><a href="http://www.readingrockets.org/atoz/1145/all">http://www.readingrockets.org/atoz/1145/all</a> |                                       |

| <b>Date</b>                         | <b>Topic</b>   | <b>Readings</b>                  | <b>Assignments Due</b>                            |
|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Week<br/>13<br/>April<br/>25</b> | Ethics of Collaborative Practice<br>Evaluation and Follow Up: Principles<br>& Techniques | Friend & Cook (2012), Chapter 13 |   |
| <b>Week<br/>14<br/>May 2</b>        | Co-Teaching Demonstrations<br>Final Course Evaluations & Feedback                        |                                  | <b>Co-Teaching/<br/>Demonstration<br/>Episode</b> |
| <b>Week<br/>15<br/>May 9</b>        | <b>Reflection &amp; Wrap UP</b>  |                                  | <b>Reflection &amp; Peer-<br/>Evaluation</b>      |

## Performance Based Assessment: Co-Teaching Episode Description & Rubric

The Performance Based Assessment for this course is a collaborative **Co-Teaching/Demonstration Episode (30 points)**. Working in teamed pairs (e.g. ESL & FL, ESL & Elementary, SPED & Elementary...) each team will prepare a teaching demonstration that reflects a model of collaboration (e.g., parallel, station, alternative, team). Each team will give a 45 minute demonstration of their collaborative teaching plan to the class. Each team will provide an evaluation of the contribution of each member of the team to the overall plans and demonstration. For the purposes of the PBA, the detailed **lesson plans** will be uploaded to TK20 by each member of the team. Lesson plans will be scored on TK20 in the first four areas (highlighted in yellow). The remaining scores will come from the demonstration.

Each team will prepare:

### a) Detailed lesson plans

Plans should address specific objective(s) for the 45 minute lesson, phases of instruction, what each teacher will be doing at each phase (e.g. work agreement), accommodations for specific students, and evaluation of co-teaching. Documentation of student outcomes related to instructional objectives including the types of student work to be included. See lesson planning format on Bb.

### b) Reflection on the contribution made to the co-teaching demonstration by each member. You independent written reflection should answer each of the questions below **providing two or three specific examples** or occurrences in your team that come to mind:

*What specific examples or occurrences did you have that demonstrates joint work on connecting or integrating ideas, strategies, or skills from sessions offered during this class?*

*What specific examples or occurrences did you have with your teammates that show joint/shared contributions to the planning and demonstration presentation?*

*What specific examples or occurrences did you have with your teammates that show joint/shared contribution to the development of resources to the planning and demonstration presentation?*

*What specific examples or occurrences did you have with your teammate that show joint/shared contribution to the development of assessment of potential student outcomes to the planning and demonstration presentation?*

*Evaluating your contribution and that of your teammate, rate the experience as to the level and quality of the contribution by each of you.*

4 = we jointly shared all preparation and demonstration planning and implementation

3 = we shared some planning and preparation but did most of our work separately and only came together for the demonstration.

2 = we each made some contribution to planning and preparation but (I/colleague) did the majority of the work for the demonstration.

1 = we divided the assignment and came together only for the purposes of the demonstration.

0 = this team did not work together at all, it was a mess.

### Rubric for Co-Teaching/Demonstration Episode

|   | <b>Does Not Meet Standards (0/1)</b>  | <b>Beginning to meet standards (2)</b>   | <b>Meets standards (3)</b>  | <b>Exceeds Standards (4)</b>  |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Planning (10)</b><br/>Collaborative planning is modeled by the team of educators focused on SOL grade level content standards</p>   | Lesson plan does not have sufficient evidence to determine it was jointly planned around grade level standard(s)  | Lesson plan provides some evidence of joint planning but one team member appears to have taken the lead.                                       | Lesson plan provides evidence of joint contributions reflecting the expertise of each team member                               | Lesson plan clearly identifies equal and integrated contributions by team members and reflects content expertise and teaching strengths         |
| <p><b>Resource Development (5)</b><br/>Teachers plan and model the implementation of classroom instruction that includes a variety of print, media, electronic and technology resources aligned with student needs.</p>     | No evidence in planning that indicates an equal distribution of resource development (e.g. handouts, hands on activities...)                                    | Some evidence in planning that resource ideas were generally shared but one member appears to have taken the lead.                             | Lesson plan provides evidence of joint resource development with contributions reflecting the expertise of each team member.    | Lesson plan clearly identifies equal and integrated resource development by team members and reflects content expertise and teaching strengths. |
| <p><b>Instruction (5)</b><br/>Educational professionals plan and model sharing roles and responsibilities for working with students in such a way that the distinction between generalist and specialist is not obvious</p> | Instruction is divided and appears to be unconnected to the learning goals. Both team members appear to be lead and it is disruptive to the flow of the lesson. | Instruction appears to be a 'trade off' with little flow or accomplishment of the goals of the lesson. One team member appears to be the lead. | Instruction appears to be equally shared but timing and pacing are impeding the flow of the lesson and accomplishing the goals. | Instruction is equally shared, pacing and timing are engaging and there appears to be no 'lead' teacher as the goals are accomplished.          |

|   |  |   |   |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Assessment (5)</b><br/>Teachers plan and model pre/post-assessment of student learning and use the information to plan, implement and adjust future instruction. Both teachers are actively engaged in delivering content and assessing student learning.</p> | <p>No attempt is made to use assessment during the demonstration.</p>  | <p>Teachers provide a discussion of assessment practices but do not engage students nor use it to modify instruction.</p>                       | <p>Teachers conduct a pre-assessment of student learning however they do not actively use it to differentiate or guide instruction.</p> | <p>Teachers are actively engage in assessment student learning and instruction. Pre-assessment of student learning is used to differentiate and guide instruction.</p>                 |
| <p><b>Engagement (5)</b><br/>Teachers model the use of a variety of instructional materials/methods to engage students and provide options for the students to demonstrate mastery of the content.</p>  | <p>Limited or no variety of instructional materials are used; one of the team appears to use all materials for the lesson demonstration.</p> | <p>Some variety of instructional materials are used jointly during the demonstration however only one member of the team uses the material.</p> | <p>Multiple options are provided to address different learner needs. Both teachers engage students in an equitable manner.</p>          | <p>Targeted materials are used with specific students to engage and allow students to demonstrate mastery of the content; both teachers are highly engaged with the demonstration.</p> |
| <p><b>Joint Involvement (5)</b><br/>Both teachers share the delivery and have equally active roles in leading the class. Both teachers are actively engaged in the delivery of core instruction</p>   | <p>There is no attempt to share or balance instruction; at least one team member takes over the demonstration.</p>                           | <p>There is an unbalanced approach to the teaching demonstration with minimal engagement during delivery.</p>                                   | <p>There is some balance between the team during the demonstration, both members display their expertise.</p>                           | <p>Both teachers share equally in the demonstration lesson, providing evidence of their expertise and skills relevant to their teaching assignments.</p>                               |