

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

EDCI 776.001– Consultation and Collaboration in Diverse K-12 Settings
3 Credits, Spring 2019
Mondays, 4:30 – 7:10 pm. Robinson Hall, Room B 122

Faculty

Name: Tom Opfer, Ph.D.
Office Hours: By Appointment
Office Location: Program Office Thompson Hall 2600
Office Phone: Program Office 703-993-3640
Email Address: topfer2@gmu.edu

Prerequisites/Corequisites

Recommended Corequisite: [EDCI 777](#)

Required Prerequisite: [EDCI 790](#).

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.

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.

Required Texts

- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2017). *Interactions: Collaboration for school professionals* (8th 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:

- Pugach, M., Johnson, L., Drame, E., & Williamson, P. (2012). *Collaborative Practitioners, Collaborative Schools* (3rd 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 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
PBA 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.

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?

(Additional Details: 5 double spaced pages max)

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.

(Additional Details: You may do this in whatever format works best. I suggest a table. Think about this assignment from this perspective: How can you design something that will be a useful resource to help a brand new teacher to your school who joins your grade-level team. Start this assignment with a 1-2 sentence overview/description of the resource.)

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).

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.

Class attendance is both important and **required**. If, due to an emergency, you will not be in class, you must contact your instructor prior to class time. Learners with more than two absences may drop a letter grade or lose course credit.

- **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.

Online Participation/Attendance Policy

Students are expected to participate in **all** online discussions. Not participating in an online discussion module will be reflected with a zero for the week and as an absence. **Students with two or more absences will not receive credit for the course.**

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
Week 1 Jan. 28	Who are we? Introduction: Building Collaborative Classrooms	Murdock, L., Finneran, D. & Theve, K. (2016). Co-teaching to reach every learner. <i>Educational Leadership</i> , 73(4), 42-47.	
Week 2 Feb. 4	Worldviews of Teaching: Roles & Responsibilities	Friend & Cook (2017), Chapter 1 <i>The Changing Role of the ESL Teacher</i> , www.tesol.org/.../ccss_convening_final-5-7-13.p <i>ELL and General Classroom Teachers: Teaching for Success</i> , http://blog.ellelevationeducation.com/ell-educators-classroom-teachers-collaboration-for-success	
Week 3 Feb. 11	Intercultural Competency for Teaching in Culturally Responsive Classrooms	Friend & Cook (2017), Chapter 2 Ndura, E. (2004). Teachers' discoveries of their cultural realms: Untangling the web of cultural identity. <i>Multicultural Perspective</i> , 6(3), 10-16. Moyer, A. & Clymer, J. (2009). What Does It Mean to be Culturally Proficient? www.naesp.org Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i> , 53(2), 106-111.	
Week 4 Feb. 18	Developing positive environments for collaboration Learning the Skills of Collaboration & Consulting	Friend & Cook (2017), Chapter 3 Friend, M. (2016). Welcome to Co-Teaching 2.0. <i>Educational Leadership</i> , 73(4), 16-22.	Critical Reflective Journal Review
Week 5 *ONLINE Session Feb. 25	Building on our Strengths	Complete the Gallup StrengthsFinder assessment and review your results	
Week 6 Mar. 4	Analyzing our Strengths Conflict Management: Negotiation & Persuasion	Friend & Cook (2017), Chapter 5 & 9	

Date	Topic	Readings	Assignments Due
Mar. 11	NO CLASS – GMU Spring Break		
Week 7 Mar. 18	Meeting Student Needs Through Co-Teaching & Teaming	Friend & Cook (2017), Chapter 6 & 7 The Effectiveness of Co-Teaching Models: A Review of the Literature (2012). <i>The Hanover Report</i> , hanoverresearch.com 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.	
Week 8 Mar. 25	Models of Collaboration and Consulting in Diverse Classrooms: <i>Guest expert*</i>	Readings provided by our guest speaker	
Week 9 *ONLINE Session Apr. 1	Work from a desired location: Document Resource Analysis	Friend & Cook (2017), Chapter 4 <i>Review other class readings as you finalize your document/resource analysis</i>	
Week 10 Apr. 8	Meeting Student Needs Through Response to Intervention Evaluation and Follow Up: Principles & Techniques	Response to Intervention Resources for Teachers: http://www.specialeducationguide.com/pre-k-12/response-to-intervention/effective-rti-strategies-for-teachers/ Response to Intervention Archive of Articles/Disciplines: http://www.readingrockets.org/atoz/1145/all	Document / Resource Analysis Due
Week 11 *ONLINE Session Apr. 15	Work from a desired location: conflict analysis preparation	<i>Review class readings as you finalize your conflict analysis</i>	Critical Reflective Journal

Date	Topic	Readings	Assignments Due
Week 12 Apr. 22	Meeting Student Needs Through Collaborative Consulting Problem Identification: Assessment & Goal Setting	Friend & Cook (2017), Chapter 8 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 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.	Essay in Conflict Analysis Due
Week 13 <i>*ONLINE Session</i> Apr. 29	<i>Time for collaboration & consulting</i>	<i>Review class readings as you work on your co-teaching demonstrations</i>	
Week 14 May 6	Co-Teaching Demonstrations Final Course Evaluations & Feedback		Co-Teaching PBA
<i>All assignments/resubmissions due by May 6.</i>			

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

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, 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. 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) **Your 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 resources** 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

	Does Not Meet Standards (0/1)	Beginning to meet standards (2)	Meets standards (3)	Exceeds Standards (4)
<p>Planning 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>Resource Development 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>Instruction 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>Assessment 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>Engagement 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>Joint Involvement 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 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/> .

Rubric for Essay in Conflict Analysis

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?

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards (0/1)	Meets Standards (2/3)	Exceeds Standards (4)
Organizational Soundness/ Presentation and Mechanics	Lacks clarity and coherence. Is unprofessional in appearance and/or has mechanical errors that detract from reading.	Adequately organized, but lacks clarity or coherence in sections. Has a professional appearance with limited mechanical errors.	Well-organized, clear, and easy to follow. Has a professional appearance and is essentially error-free.
Conceptual soundness/ quality of ideas	Lacks clear-cut presentation of sound ideas and/or is loosely supported by sources.	Ideas are sound; sources are cited on a limited basis.	Ideas are insightful, coherent, and supported well by citations.
Logical thinking	Thinking is limited; ideas are undeveloped.	Thinking is convincing, but weakened by limited examples or reasons.	Thinking is highly persuasive with a strong thesis, reasons, and conclusion.
Use of sources	Sources are limited in use and/or in relevance to thesis.	Effective use of sources, although integration of sources into the argument could be improved.	Sources are integrated into the argument and directly support the thesis.
Applications to practice	Limited application of ideas to education theory, research, or practice.	Applications are good but lack integrated connection from theory to research to practice.	Excellent connections made to educational theory, research, and practice.

Rubric for Document/Resource Analysis

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.

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards (0/1)	Meets Standards (2/3)	Exceeds Standards (4/5)
Organizational Soundness	Lacks clarity and coherence.	Adequately organized, but lacks clarity or coherence in sections.	Well-organized, clear, and easy to follow. Specific school is identified.
Conceptual soundness/quality of ideas	Lacks specific names, titles, and contact information.	Limited names, titles, contact information, and areas of expertise.	Contains specific names, titles, contact information, and areas of expertise.
Presentation and Mechanics	Is unprofessional in appearance and/or has mechanical errors that detract from reading.	Has a professional appearance with limited mechanical errors.	Has a professional appearance and is essentially error-free.

Rubric for Critical Reflective Journal

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.

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards (0/1)	Meets Standards (2/3)	Exceeds Standards (4/5)
Organizational Soundness	Lacks weekly entries, clarity and coherence.	Adequately organized, but lacks weekly entries, clarity or coherence in sections.	Well-organized, clear, and easy to follow. There is a journal entry for each week.
Conceptual soundness/quality of ideas	Lacks clear-cut connection to prompt.	Ideas are sound. Not clear connections to the prompt and consulting and collaboration as a worldview in teaching.	Ideas are insightful and student makes connections to the prompt and consulting and collaboration as a worldview in teaching.
Reflective thinking	Reflection is limited and ideas are undeveloped.	Limited reflection provided.	Writing is highly reflective.
Connection to readings and discussions	Lacks an integration of ideas to class readings and in class discussions into the journal entry.	Limited integration of ideas to class readings and in class discussions integrated into the journal entry.	Connections to class readings and in class discussions are integrated into the journal entry.