

**George Mason University**  
**College of Education and Human Development**  
**Teaching Culturally & Linguistically Diverse and Exceptional Learners**

EDCI 776 6F1—Consultation and Collaboration in Diverse K-12 Settings  
3 Credits, Summer 2018  
July 6-July 17 (Monday-Friday)—8:30 A.M.-3:20 P.M.  
Thompson Hall—Room #L028

**Faculty**

Name: Michelle Abrams-Terry, Ph.D.

Office Hours: Available by appointment before and after class

Blackboard Collaborate & Skype: Available by appointment

Telephone: (804) 337-8004

Email Address: [mabrams5@gmu.edu](mailto:mabrams5@gmu.edu)

**Prerequisites/Corequisites**

Completion of 12 credits in degree concentration.

**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.

**Course Overview**

Not Applicable

**Course Delivery Method**

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.

## **Course Delivery Method (Face-to-Face)**

This course uses a seminar format for its face-to-face classes, which means the course is highly participative and requires candidates to take an active role in the presentation of materials. Accordingly, attendance and participation are extremely important. Methods of instruction include teacher led class discussion, small group activities, student led discussions of selected research topics, and database search of research-based articles. It also includes presentations, cooperative learning activities, hands-on field experiences, PowerPoint presentations, discussion boards, and wikis.

In addition to face to face instruction, this course uses the Blackboard Learning Management system (LMS) for online modules, assignments, materials, and resources, and for posting the syllabus, rubrics, presentations, readings, videos, and other updates. Students are encouraged to visit the course's Bb website frequently to review the most current information and to keep up with any news, announcements and messages related to this course at <https://mymasonportal.gmu.edu/>

Overall course delivery is accomplished in a combination of ways in order to meet the needs of all learners and learning styles and include:

- Presentations (assisted by PowerPoint and other visuals/technology)
- Discussions (active involvement of candidates in learning by asking questions that provoke critical, reflective and metacognitive thinking)
- Cooperative Learning (small group guided learning interactions emphasizing learning from and with others)
- Collaborative Learning (heterogeneous interdisciplinary groups for content discussion and project design and implementation)
- Reflection Journals and Blogs (candidates keep a journal during the duration of the course and during their field and community experience where they record their observations, insights, and reflections)
- Student Presentations (research analysis and findings and performance based assessment work)
- Hands-On Field Experience (20 hours of field experience in a K-12 setting and community field experience as needed for the completion of the Performance Based Assessments [PBAs])
- Video Presentations, Additional Readings, Assignments, Questionnaires, and On-line Resources

## **Learner Outcomes or Objectives**

This course is designed to enable students to do the following:

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)

Upon completion of this course, students will have met the following professional 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/five-core-propositions#sthash.mqOb4pjx.dpf>

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 Text:**

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

## Recommended Texts:

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

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

## Course Performance Evaluation

Students are expected to submit all assignments on time in the manner outlined by the instructor (e.g., Blackboard, Tk20, hard copy).

## FIELDWORK REQUIREMENT

### Field Experience Record and Evaluation

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 is required as well as a signed statement from your field experience teacher(s) or supervisor(s). If you are taking more than one course in a semester, you must complete 20 hours per course (e.g., two courses require 40 hours of field experience). This means you may be completing different tasks for different courses in the same placement. Materials and products used for one course cannot be used for another course (e.g., videos, lesson plans, activities, etc.)

**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 and other assignments. 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 Week 2 of class. 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 Week

2 of class. 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).

**Virginia state or county cohort teachers:** Cohort Students are required by their district and by TCLDEL to complete field experiences as required by the Virginia Department of Education for this program. Each district has arranged for candidates to be able to work at K-12 grade levels in order to complete all licensure requirements. Please contact your district coordinator for further information.

**TCLDEL Fieldwork Log of Hours and Evaluation Assessment**

	Status of Student Work	
	1	0
Fieldwork Log of Hours demonstrates 20 hours of fieldwork completed, with a teacher-mentor or supervisor signature.	Complete	Not Complete

NOTE: Failure to submit documentation of successful completion of your fieldwork in a timely manner will make you ineligible to register for coursework, be recommended for licensure, or receive a grade for this course.

- **Assignments and/or Examinations**

<i>Assignment Description</i>	<i>Grade %</i>	<i>Standards Addressed</i>
Field Experience	S/U	Program Requirement
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

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 major points of conflict and strategies to address them. Identify one specific conflict that you have had to manage in the past. List the sequence of events and make specific text connections to support your reflection about what happened and why. Which aspects of the conflict were 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).

- **Other Requirements**

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.

- **Grading**

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**

See the University Catalog for details: <http://catalog.gmu.edu/policies/academic/grading/>

### **Honor Code & Integrity of Work**

**Integrity of Work:** TCLDEL students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code (<https://catalog.gmu.edu/policies/honor-code-system/>). 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.*

### **Course Withdrawal with Dean Approval**

For graduate and non-degree students, withdrawal after the last day for dropping a course requires approval by the student's academic dean, and is permitted only for nonacademic reasons that prevent course completion (Mason catalog). *Students must contact an academic advisor* in APTDIE to withdraw after the deadline. There is no guarantee that such withdrawals will be permitted.

### **Attendance Policy**

Students are expected to participate in all online discussions/activities and attend all classes.

### **Incomplete (IN)**

This grade may be given to students who are in good standing, but who may be unable to complete scheduled course work for a cause beyond reasonable control. The student must then complete all the requirements by the end of the ninth week of the next semester, not including summer term, and the instructor must turn in the final grade by the end of the 9th week. Unless an explicit written extension is filed with the Registrar's Office by the faculty deadline, the grade of IN is changed by the registrar to an F (Mason catalog). Faculty may grant an incomplete with a contract developed by the student with a reasonable time to complete the course at the discretion of the faculty member. The faculty member does not need to allow up to the following semester for the student to complete the course. A copy of the contract will be kept on file in the APTDIE office.



## Class Schedule

Date	Topic	Readings	Assignments Due
Day 1 Friday 7/6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions</li> <li>• Pre-course Survey</li> <li>• Conceptual Context for Collaboration: Multidimensional Framework</li> <li>• Building Collaborative Classrooms</li> <li>• Worldviews of Teaching: Roles &amp; Responsibilities</li> </ul>	Friend & Cook (F&C): Ch. 1  <i>Optional:</i> Pugach, Johnson, Drame, & Williamson (P, J, D, & W): Ch. 1 & 2  <a href="#">Implementing the Common Core State Standards for English Learners: The Changing Role of the ESL Teacher</a>  Ndura, E. (2004). Teachers' discoveries of their cultural realms: Untangling the web of cultural identity. <i>Multicultural Perspective</i> , 6(3), 10-16. (see .pdf in "Readings" folder in Bb)  Murdock, L., Finneran, D. & Theve, K. (2016). Co-teaching to reach every learner. <i>Educational Leadership</i> , 74(4), 42-47.	
Day 2 Monday 7/9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basis for Collaboration: Communication Skills</li> <li>• Communication Style Self-Assessment</li> <li>• Intercultural Competency for Teaching in Culturally Responsive Classrooms</li> <li>• Intercultural Competency Assessment/Quiz</li> <li>• Learning the Skills for Successful Collaboration &amp; Consulting</li> <li>• Listening and Consensus Building</li> </ul>	F&C: Ch. 2, 3, & 4  <i>Optional:</i> P, J, D, & W: Ch. 3, 4, 5, & 6  DeJaeghere, J., & Cao, Y. (2009). Developing U.S. teachers' intercultural competence: Does professional development matter? <i>International Journal of Intercultural Relations</i> , 33, 437-447 (see .pdf in "Readings" folder in Bb)  Moyer, A. & Clymer, J. (2009). <a href="#">What Does It Mean to be Culturally Proficient?</a>  Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i> , 53(2), 106-111.	<b>Journal Entry #1</b> due SUBMIT TO Blackboard (Bb) Journal
Day 3 Tuesday 7/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration in Practice</li> <li>• Models of Collaboration and Consulting in Diverse Classrooms</li> <li>• Meeting Student Needs through Co-teaching</li> <li>• Collaborative Problem Solving</li> <li>• Conflict Management: Negotiation &amp; Persuasion</li> </ul>	F&C: Ch. 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9  <i>Optional:</i> P, J, D, & W: Ch. 7, 8, & 9  Friend, M. (2016). Welcome to Co-Teaching 2.0. <i>Educational Leadership</i> , 74 (4), 16-22.  <a href="#">The Effectiveness of Co-Teaching Models: A Review of the Literature</a> . (2012). The Hanover Report  Mastropieri, M.A., Scruggs, T.E., Graetz, J., Norland, J., Gardizi, W., & 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. (see .pdf in "Readings" folder in Bb)	<b>Document/Resource Analysis List</b> due UPLOAD to Bb Assignment

Date	Topic	Readings	Assignments Due
Day 4 Wednesday 7/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration: A Community Approach</li> <li>• Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)</li> <li>• Meeting Student Needs through Collaborative Consulting</li> <li>• Meeting Student Needs through Response to Intervention (RTI)</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Small-group Co-teaching/Demonstration Episode meetings with instructor in the afternoon</p>	F&C: Ch. 10, 11, & 12  <i>Optional:</i> P, J, D, & W: Ch. 10 & 11  Leatherman, J. (2009). Teachers' voices concerning collaborative teams within an inclusive elementary school. <i>Teaching Education</i> , 20(2), 189-202. (see .pdf in "Readings" folder in Bb)  Magiera, K., Lawrence-Brown, K., Bloomquist, K., Foster, C., Figueroa, A., Glatz, K., Heppeler, D., & Rodriguez, P. (2006). <a href="#">On the road to more collaborative teaching: One school's experience.</a> <i>Teaching Exceptional Children Plus</i> , 2(5), 1-11  <a href="#">Effective RTI Strategies for Teachers</a>  <a href="#">Reading Rockets: RTI Articles</a>	<b>Journal Entry #2</b> due SUBMIT TO Bb Journal
Day 5 Thursday 7/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing positive environments for collaboration</li> <li>• Problem Identification: Assessment &amp; Goal Setting</li> <li>• Ethics of Collaborative Practice</li> </ul>	TBD	<b>Conflict Analysis Essay</b> due UPLOAD to Bb Assignment
Day 6 Friday 7/13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation and Follow Up: Principles &amp; Techniques</li> <li>• Co-teaching/ Demonstration Episode presentations</li> </ul>	TBD	
Day 7 Monday 7/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-teaching/ Demonstration Episode presentations</li> </ul>	TBD	
Day 8 Tuesday 7/17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-teaching/ Demonstration Episode presentations</li> <li>• Synthesis</li> <li>• Final Thoughts</li> <li>• GSE Course Survey</li> </ul>	TBD	<b>Co-teaching/Demonstration Episode Lesson Plan &amp; Reflection (PBA)</b> due Tuesday, July 17 <sup>th</sup> by 11:59 P.M. (EST) <b>SUBMIT TO Tk20 in Blackboard</b>  <b>Journal Entry #4</b> due SUBMIT TO Bb Journal
<b><i>All assignments/resubmissions due by Tuesday, July 17<sup>th</sup> (11:59 P.M. EST).</i></b>			

Note: Faculty reserves the right to alter the schedule as necessary, with notification to students.

## Rubric for Informed Participation

<b>Meets or Exceeds Standards (A) 15-14 points</b>	<b>Partially Meets Standards (B) 13-12 points</b>	<b>Attempts Standards (C) 11-10 points</b>
Consistently demonstrates strong determination in the pursuit of solutions and monitors his/her level of involvement.	Consistently shows determination in the pursuit of solutions.	Sporadically shows determination in the pursuit of solutions.
Often cites from readings; uses readings to support contributions/ often associates readings with the topics being discussed.	Occasionally cites from readings; sometimes uses readings to support contributions; occasionally associates readings with topics being discussed.	Rarely able to cite from readings; rarely uses readings to support contributions; rarely associates readings with topics being discussed.
Always actively participates; responds frequently to questions/comments; contributes insightful point of view.	Often actively participates; occasionally responds to questions/comments; occasionally shares point of view	Rarely actively participates; rarely able to respond to questions/comments; rarely shares point of view.
Always hands in assignments on time and completes Bb activities in a timely manner.	Most assignments are on time and completes Bb activities.	Assignments handed in after the due date and/or completes Bb activities late or not at all.
Always demonstrates commitment through preparation (e.g., readings, research, postings, journal reflections, etc.).	Generally prepared.	Generally unprepared.

## Rubric for Conflict Analysis Essay

Criteria	UNACCEPTABLE 13 & below	BEGINNING: Does not adequately meet expectations 14-15	DEVELOPING: Meets expectations adequately 16-18	ACCOMPLISHED: Strongly meets expectations 19-20
Personal conflict	Personal conflict and descriptions are limited or unclear; the length is not adequate for development. No evidence of exploring personal conflict.	Some personal conflict details and descriptions loosely connected; ineffective transitions, seems random. Little evidence of exploring personal conflict.	Some personal conflict details and descriptions present. Adequately explores personal conflict.	Paper contains relevant and meaningful personal conflict and descriptions. Thoroughly engages and explores personal conflict.
Content	Many details are not in a logical or expected order. There is little sense that the writing is organized.	Some details are not in a logical or expected order, and this distracts the reader. Includes information on three major points of conflict.	Details are placed in a logical order, but the presentation style sometimes makes the writing less interesting. Includes information on three major points of conflict.	Details are placed in a logical order and the way they are presented effectively keeps the reader's attention. Includes information on three major points of conflict.
Quality of analysis	Essay is superficial and/or with very little analysis.	Essay is thoughtful but lacks depth or complexity.	Essay shows thoughtful analysis that communicates sincere grappling with the questions.	Essay reflects thoughtful analysis that shows complexity of thinking and a well-constructed argument. Analysis is highly provocative. There is a "wow" factor.
Mechanics: language, grammar usage, APA style	There are many misspellings or grammatical errors and/or paper does not follow APA 6th ed. formatting requirements.	Although only some formatting requirements are followed and a significant number of misspelled words or poorly constructed sentences exist, the main ideas can still be identified.	Most of the formatting requirements are met fairly consistently, the layout used is easy to read and follow, grammar, mechanics and spelling used are basically correct, and there are only a few misspelled words.	All format requirements are met consistently, required sections are in the correct order; the essay is easy to read and understand; and all sentences are grammatically correct with only a few spelling or mechanical errors.

## 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, Exceptional Education & 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, each member of the team will upload the detailed lesson plans to TK20. 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.
- b) **Reflection** on the contribution made to the co-teaching demonstration by **each** member. Your 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 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> 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> 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> 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> 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> 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> 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>

## Professional Dispositions

See <https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/policies-procedures/undergraduate#profdisp>

## GMU Policies and Resources for Students

### *Policies*

- Students must adhere to the guidelines of the Mason Honor Code (see <https://catalog.gmu.edu/policies/honor-code-system/> ).
- Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing (see <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>).
- Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their Mason 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.
- Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with George Mason University Disability Services. Approved accommodations will begin at the time the written letter from Disability Services is received by the instructor (see <http://ods.gmu.edu/>).
- Students must silence all sound emitting devices during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.

### *Campus Resources*

- Support for submission of assignments to Tk20 should be directed to [tk20help@gmu.edu](mailto:tk20help@gmu.edu) or <https://cehd.gmu.edu/aero/tk20>. Questions or concerns regarding use of Blackboard should be directed to <http://coursessupport.gmu.edu/>.
- For information on student support resources on campus, see <https://ctfe.gmu.edu/teaching/student-support-resources-on-campus>

**For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, please visit our website <https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/> .**