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FOREWORD

The purpose of this handbook is to provide a description of KSU's yearlong clinical experience practice, Pre-Service Co-Teaching: A Mentor Model Approach that provides teacher candidates with multiple levels of support through the site coordinators, collaborating teachers, and developmental supervisors. Another unique feature of the program is that the collaborating teacher literally becomes a member of the educator preparation team through his or her on-going mentorship and modeling of best practices throughout the clinical experience.

KSU values the input from our partner schools and used this input to adjust and adapt this model to meet all stakeholders’ needs. To date, over 1,000 teacher candidates and collaborating teachers have participated in the development of this model. As always, our goal in offering this innovative model is to provide our teacher candidates with the time and support they need to become competent, confident, and committed professionals.

Sincerely,

Kim Dooley

Kim Dooley
Kennesaw State University
Interim Director, Center for Education Placements & Partnerships
Summer 2015 Task Force on Pre-service Co-teaching & Developmental Supervision

Chair: Dr. Toni Strieker, Department of Secondary & Middle Grades Education
Co-Chair: Ms. Kim Dooley, Interim Director, Center for Education Placements & Partnerships
Editor: Dr. Marcia Wright, Adjunct Professor of English Education

Contributors:

Dr. Eddie Bennett, Representative of Cobb County School District
Dr. Angela Blaver, Co-principal Investigator of the Teacher Quality Partnership Project
Dr. Darren Crovitz, Associate Professor of English Education
Ms. Kim Dooley, Assistant Director of the Center for Education Placement & Partnerships
Dr. Kim Gray, Professor, Department of Secondary & Middle Grades Education
Dr. Marie Holbein, Professor, Department of Educational Leadership
Dr. Lori Klinger-Maffe, Clinical Faculty, Department of Chemistry
Dr. Lee Langub, Department of Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Ms. Kim Harrison, University Supervisor, Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Dr. Kristin Hoyt, Foreign Language Education Department
Dr. Daphne Hubbard, Secondary & Middle Grades Education
Ms. Kay Peterson, University Supervisor, Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Dr. Woong Lim, Department of Secondary & Middle Grades Education
Dr. Kim Loomis, Department of Secondary & Middle Grades Education
Dr. Gwen McAlpine, Department of Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Dr. Susan Stockdale, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies
Dr. Cherry Steffen, Department of Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Ms. Joyce Thompson, University Supervisor in History Education
Ms. Teresa Turner, University Supervisor, Montessori Education
Dr. Anete Vasquez, Director of the Center for Education Placement & Partnerships
Ms. Lynn Wheeler, University Supervisor, Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Ms. Mary K Widener, Representative of Cobb County School District
Ms. Elizabeth Wingo, University Supervisor, Elementary and Early Childhood Education
INTRODUCTION

As teacher educators in the United States, our capacity to prepare competent P-12 educators who are ready to meet the challenges of 21st century schooling has been called into question (Darling-Hammond, 2006). Low student graduation rates and high teacher attrition rates have resulted in a national call to prepare prospective and practicing teachers with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to collaborate with colleagues and provide an equitable, high quality education for all students, particularly those from diverse backgrounds (Darling-Hammond, 2010). In 2010, the National Council of Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE) Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning recommended the transformation of clinical practice by: (a) Creating partnerships with schools to advance shared responsibility for teacher preparation; (b) Providing opportunities for prospective teachers to learn by doing; (c) Transforming curriculum, pedagogy, structure and delivery; and (d) Ensuring prospective and practicing teachers will know how to collaborate with colleagues.

Over the past several years, members of the teacher education faculty at KSU have worked in collaboration with educators in our local school districts to design, develop, implement, and evaluate an innovative model of clinical practices reflective of the Professional Teacher Education Unit’s theme: *Collaborative Development of Expertise in Teaching and Learning*. The new model, here within known as *Pre-service Co-teaching: A Mentor Model Approach*, is founded on the research-based practices of traditional co-teaching (Cook & Friend, 1995; Friend, 2005; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2010; Strieker, Zong, Gillis, Wright, & Stockdale, 2012) and pre-service co-teaching (Bacharach & Heck, 2012; Bacharah, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010; Badiali & Titus, 2010). Pre-service co-teaching provides
the infrastructure during student teaching for experienced and prospective teachers to collaboratively plan, deliver and assess instruction, without requiring the experienced teacher to relinquish his classroom. According to recent research (Bacharach et al., 2010), when the academic achievement of P-12 students who attend solo taught classrooms is compared to that of P-12 students who attend pre-service co-taught classrooms, those in co-taught classrooms statistically outperform their counterparts in reading and math. These results held for students who were eligible for services through Title I, Special Education, or ESOL.

While models of pre-service co-teaching are emerging at universities across the country (Strieker, Heckert, & Blaver, 2012), our approach is unique in several ways. First, the model ensures that experienced and aspiring teachers collaborate in ways reflective of the partnership principles defined by Knight (2007). Second, teacher candidates are given two additional layers of support during their field experiences. The primary support at the school site is provided by the collaborating teacher who assumes the roles of mentor and role model to guide the development of the teacher candidate throughout the yearlong clinical experience. The supervisor, whose work has changed in three important ways, provides university support for the teacher candidate. First, each supervisor is assigned four to six teams of teacher candidates and collaborating teachers; these assignments remain the same throughout Yearlong Clinical Practice I and Yearlong Clinical Practice II. (Please note that during the 2014-2015 academic year, these experiences were known as Teaching of Specific Subjects (TOSS) and Student Teaching, respectively.) Second, the supervisors are expected to adjust their approach to working with these teams in concert with the developmental needs of the teacher candidate. Third, the supervisors (herein
known as *developmental supervisors*) are expected to facilitate on-going dialogue between the teacher candidate and collaborating teacher relative to the use PSCT to support the learning of the P-12 students as well as the teacher candidate.

**PRE-SERVICE CO-TEACHING (PSCT)**

For our purposes, PSCT is defined as an “innovative approach that provides clinical experiences for teacher candidates who are supported by collaborating teachers who serve as on-going mentors and who model and share all responsibilities for the teaching and learning of a group of P-12 students. Throughout the experience, the teacher candidate and collaborating teacher establish a fully functioning co-taught classroom in which they share instructional space, materials and other resources. PSCT is an evidence-based approach that focuses simultaneously upon the development of the teacher candidate and the learning of P-12 students. Throughout the clinical experience, co-teachers are encouraged to co-reflect upon the teaching and learning process, and engage in co-generative dialogue to find creative solutions to complex problems of classroom practice” (Strieker, Shaheen, Digiovanni, & Hubbard, 2013).

Obviously, PSCT differs dramatically from traditional student teaching where collaborating teachers *host* student teachers that teach solo throughout the greater part of one semester. With PSCT, the shift of control in the classroom happens gradually. As described below, our approach deploys a cadre of developmental supervisors who provide yearlong support to the teacher candidate and collaborating teacher as they employ co-teaching to support research-based practices. In addition, the developmental supervisors facilitate co-generative dialogue between teacher candidates and collaborating teachers as the teacher candidates reflect upon their teaching, justify their instructional decisions and
theorize their practice. To summarize, PSCT is designed to maximize all of the human resources available to better meet the needs of the teacher candidate; and ultimately, those of the P-12 students.

KSU’s definition of PSCT has evolved from our experience, research, and study of the professional literature and is couched in a set of critical assumptions. First, it is assumed that each teacher candidate is placed with an outstanding collaborating teacher who actively models best practice, scaffolds instruction, and facilitates positive P-12 student outcomes. Second, it is assumed that PSCT serves as a vehicle for developing the teacher candidate’s knowledge and skills to teach all students in a standards-based classroom through culturally relevant and responsive instructional practices, positive classroom and student management, formative assessment, and collaboration with professional colleagues. Finally, for these purposes, evidence-based refers to our systematic approach to continuously improve the model by measuring the outcome and performance data of the B-12 students as well as that of the teacher candidates.

Effective PSCT

Throughout the clinical experience, the co-teachers engage in collaborative dialogue as they co-plan instruction, co-assess student engagement and performance, co-reflect upon teaching and learning, and co-generate solutions to problems of practice. PSCT provides the vehicle for collaborating teachers to act as mentor models for teacher candidates, thereby providing continuous, and often, instantaneous feedback and modeling of effective methods of instruction, assessment, and classroom management strategies. The mentor modeling approach allows the collaborating teachers to maintain greater control
over the quality of their classroom instruction, instead of releasing all control to the candidate who has little to no experience.

**Figure 1. The Cycle of Effective Pre-service Co-teaching.**

![Cycle of Effective Pre-service Co-teaching Diagram]

The cycle of effective PSCT is comprised of three components (e.g., co-planning, co-assessment and co-instruction) that are essential to the teaching and learning of the teacher candidate and the P-12 students and that are tightly aligned with edTPA.

**Co-Planning.** One of the main concepts of this innovative approach is *freedom and flexibility within form* (Knight, 2013). Therefore, teacher candidates are encouraged to use a district-approved lesson plan format, unless otherwise specified by your program area (e.g., learning maps, co-planning frameworks, checklists, etc.), which can be used to adequately frame a co-taught lesson.

**Co-Assessment.** Co-teachers are encouraged to use multiple types of formative assessment to measure P-12 students’ academic performance as well as their engagement
in learning. Because this is an evidence-based model, co-assessment is central to the effectiveness of PSCT.

**Co-Instruction.** Co-instruction is the *heart and soul* of co-teaching where two teachers work together in a systematic manner to employ high leverage teaching approaches that increase student engagement and learning. While co-teachers are encouraged to implement the models of co-teaching described by Friend (2005), KSU’s model of PSCT moves beyond these fundamentals so that co-teaching is used seamlessly to employ on-going formative assessment, classroom management, and differentiated instruction. Execution of the models is based upon the needs of the P-12 students as well as the professional judgment of the co-teachers.

**Co-reflection.** KSU’s model of PSCT recognizes co-reflection as an on-going process that occurs as teacher candidates and collaborating teachers co-plan new lessons, co-instruct, and co-review student performance data (Honigfeld & Dove, 2010). This cycle of effective co-teaching provides multiple and on-going opportunities for co-teachers to engage in co-generative dialogue and bring their knowledge and experience to bear in solving unique problems of practice. In this manner, teacher candidates learn to theorize their practice and justify their decisions related to planning, assessment and instruction.

**Benefits of PSCT**

According to Heckert, Strieker, and Shaheen (2013), there are four major benefits of PSCT to teacher candidates, collaborating teachers, and K-12 students, including: (a) Mentor modeling by experienced teachers; (b) Reciprocal relationships between teacher candidates and collaborating teachers; (c) Smooth transition of responsibility for planning,
instruction, management and assessment from the collaborating teacher to the teacher candidate; and (d) Increased ability to meet the needs of all students.

**Mentor Modeling.** As noted above, PSCT provides the collaborative infrastructure for collaborating teachers to become mentor models for the teacher candidates, thereby providing continuous, and often instantaneous feedback and modeling of teaching, assessment, and classroom management strategies. Collaborating teachers and teacher candidates literally “teach at the elbow” of one another, which allows the collaborating teacher to “step in” and provide support on an “as needed” basis (Roth & Tobin, 2002). By carefully scaffolding the experiences, the growth of the teacher candidate is more intentional and gradually allows him or her to assume greater responsibilities over time.

**Reciprocal Relationships.** The supportive partnership between the co-teachers provides comfort to the teacher candidate as he or she becomes more confident in the classroom and “learns the ropes.” Relying on the safety net provided by the collaborating teacher, the candidate continuously gains confidence, such that, overtime, both the candidate and the collaborating teachers feel comfortable to explore new and creative ideas for engaging their students and to take instructional risks. Thus, as the partnership grows, the co-planning of lessons and co-generation of ideas becomes commonplace.

**Shift Transition of Responsibility.** Teacher candidates and collaborating teachers report a smooth transition and shift of responsibility as the prospective teacher assumes the leadership role in the classroom. On-going mentor modeling increases the self-efficacy and confidence of the teacher candidate because the P-12 students perceive the candidates as another teacher with co-authority, not a student teacher.
**Ability to Meet Student Needs.** Assigning two teachers in the classroom naturally increases the ability to meet the needs of a diverse group of students, particularly those in need of individualized instruction or behavior management. PSCT also provides opportunities for P-12 students to benefit from teachers with different teaching styles and pedagogical preferences.

**Yearlong Placement as Context**

While some clinical experiences are one semester long, the preferred context of PSCT is a yearlong clinical experience. Yearlong placements provide teacher candidates the opportunity to experience an entire school year, under the guidance of a collaborating teacher, connecting the candidates with the entire school community including, but not limited to, faculty, staff, P-12 students, parents and guardians; and thus providing them time to work through novice teacher developmental stages. According to Gray, Stockdale, and Monti (2012), the purpose of yearlong placements is to provide novice teachers with “intentional and focused field experiences and allow collaborating teachers more leadership opportunities (pg. 8).” The model is designed to develop the performance and learning of teacher candidates and practicing teachers by creating a professional learning community whereby teachers engage in research-based practices, including on-going reflection on teaching and learning.

In 2012, Williams, Gray, and Stockdale conducted a qualitative study of the reactions of teacher candidates and collaborating teachers who participated in yearlong clinical experiences. Both groups indicated in their commentaries they had “grown tremendously” from the yearlong experience.
**Teacher candidates** consistently reported that they felt better prepared to teach because they had a more authentic picture of the reality of teaching. The yearlong experience gave them the gift of time: Time to monitor the progress of students across an entire school year, time to learn to manage a classroom of diverse learners, time to practice their craft and to develop the confidence to take instructional risks, and time to become a member of the professional community due to the ongoing collaboration with the teacher mentor and other faculty members.

**Collaborating teachers** consistently reported that supporting a teacher candidate increased their learning and understanding of the teaching and learning processes. Specifically, teachers reported that their ongoing explanations of specific methodology increased their understanding and also increased their willingness to take instructional risks.

**Intentional Partnership Development**

The cornerstone of PSCT is the quality of the relationship between the parties: the collaborating teachers, the teacher candidates, and the developmental supervisors. Therefore, this approach provides support for the intentional development of these critical relationships by encouraging all parties to employ the partnership principles described by Knight (2007). Knight’s principles provide a conceptual and common language for an innovative approach and form the foundation for the daily co-teaching practices of the collaborating teacher and teacher candidate. The seven principles are:

- **Equality**: While the positional relationship between the teacher candidate and the collaborating teacher may not be inherently equal, the knowledge, skills, and
dispositions of each teacher do have equal value in the teaching and learning process.

- **Choice:** Both co-teachers have choice in how lessons are constructed and assessed.
- **Voice:** The voice of each co-teacher is empowered and respected during all components of co-teaching.
- **Dialogue:** Co-teachers engage in on-going and authentic dialogue.
- **Reflection:** Co-teachers engage in on-going, deep and meaningful reflection.
- **Praxis:** Co-teachers apply their learning to real-life practice.
- **Reciprocity:** Co-teachers get as much as they give to one another.

**ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES OF KEY INDIVIDUALS**

**Teacher Candidates**

The teacher candidates who participate in PSCT are all KSU students in the senior year of their teacher preparation program. All teacher candidates initially enroll in Yearlong Clinical Experience I (YCE I) that includes an extended field experience of a minimum of 250 clock hours. (Formerly, YCE I was known at KSU as *Teaching of Specific Subjects (TOSS)*). Once YCE I has been successfully completed, the teacher candidates are eligible to enroll in Yearlong Clinical Experience II. (This field placement at KSU was formerly known as *Student Teaching.*) While it is preferred that PSCT occur during yearlong placements, there are numerous instances where it is conducted during traditional, semester-long placements. However, according to Gray et al., (2012), yearlong placements provide teacher candidates with the opportunity to experience the entire academic year that includes attending preplanning days, the opening days of school, the
instructional and professional development days between the KSU semesters, as well as the closing days of school.

Please note that even though the policies and procedures articulated in the 2010 Field Experiences Handbook for the PTEU apply to PSCT, there are three significant differences. First, the teacher candidate enrolls in a yearlong placement, which is felt to be the optimal context for PSCT. Second, both the teacher candidates and their collaborating teachers are asked to participate in the professional development series entitled, A Partnership Approach to Pre-service Co-teaching. (See Appendix A: PLU Series.) Third, the collaborating teacher and teacher candidate work together with the candidate’s developmental supervisor to implement the planning, instruction and assessment approaches that are addressed in the professional development series. In most situations this means that the collaborating teacher models the research-based practice for the teacher candidate who learns from the demonstration and practice.

During YCE I, the teacher candidate is obliged to comply with the overarching policies and procedures articulated in the 2010 Field Experiences Handbook. In terms of PSCT, both the teacher candidate and collaborating teacher are encouraged to intentionally use the One-teach/One-observe and One-teach/One-assist models in which the teacher candidate primarily observes and assists the collaborating teacher. Note: this does not mean that the co-teachers are restricted from using all of the models of PSCT from One-teach/One-assist to Team Teaching. It simply means that they are encouraged to use the models systematically and intentionally, beginning with those that are the easiest to implement. The professional learning series, A Partnership Approach to Pre-service Co-teaching (Strieker & Lozo, 2011), was designed to assist the co-teachers in honing their
skills in collaborating and co-teaching. Recommended practices and resources are available on-line at https://annex.kennesaw.edu/login/index.php

During *Yearlong Clinical Experience II* (currently known as Student Teaching) the teacher candidate is obliged to comply with the overarching policies and procedures articulated in the *2010 Field Experiences Handbook*. During the second semester, the roles and responsibilities of the teacher candidate quickly shift, creating a transfer of power from the collaborating teacher to the teacher candidate such that the teacher candidate is viewed as the main authority figure in the classroom. While co-instruction may not occur daily, the co-teachers should engage in some aspect of co-teaching daily whether it be co-planning, co-assessment, co-reflection, or co-instruction. Further, the experienced teacher should also collaborate with the candidate daily as they co-conduct formative assessment, classroom and student management, and differentiate instruction. Thus, during YCE II, the co-teaching components and models are used to seamlessly support the teacher candidate and the P-12 students throughout the instructional day.

During the YCE II, the teacher candidate and collaborating teachers also work closely with the developmental supervisor to assist the teacher candidate in developing a goal to improve his or her effectiveness, particularly in the areas of planning, assessment or instruction. (See Appendix D: GROW: Goal-setting Framework.) The GROW framework includes a mini-action plan that requires each person to state what they are going to do to assist the candidate in meeting the goal. For example, the teacher candidate may select a goal of improving her ability to provide feedback to her students. The team may select the *I do – We do - You do* co-teaching strategy, where the collaborating teacher demonstrates her approach to providing feedback to B-12 students, the collaborating teacher and teacher...
candidate provide feedback together to a large group of students, and then the teacher
candidate provides feedback (using the same approach) by herself. In this situation, the
role of the developmental supervisor may be to collect student response data during each
stage of I do – We do - You do to determine the progress of the candidate and the B-12
students.

**Collaborating teachers**

Collaborating teachers are identified and recommended by their school
administrators as outstanding teachers, who have the ability and desire to advise, support
and guide teacher candidates. Collaborating teachers have at least three years teaching
experience and are dedicated educators who constantly strive to meet the needs of all
students. They routinely go above and beyond minimum classroom teaching expectations,
are considered team players, and lifelong learners. These individuals also voice an interest
in the challenge and reward of sharing their expertise with teacher candidates, as well as in
the opportunities to participate in professional learning.

The qualifications of the collaborating teachers in yearlong placement are the same
as those for collaborating teachers as stated on page 34 of the 2010 Field Experiences
Handbook. Similarly, collaborating teachers are required to follow the university
guidelines for student teaching and working with a developmental supervisor found in the
handbook. During the first semester, the collaborating teacher is provided the opportunity
to complete the professional development program, *A Partnership Approach to Pre-service
Co-teaching*, with their teacher candidate. This important professional development was
designed to give collaborating teachers and teacher candidates the tools to maximize the
co-teaching experience for the P-12 learners as well as for the teacher candidates.
Therefore, all assignments are to be completed together as a team and relate directly to the field experience.

**The Developmental Supervisor**

Fundamentally the roles and responsibilities of university supervisors are unchanged and can be found in the *2010 Field Experiences Handbook*. In general terms, the One of the primary roles of the developmental supervisor is to evaluate teacher candidates on required outcomes and proficiencies measured on the Candidate Assessment of Performance on Performance Standards (CAPS), the edTPA, and the Observation Summary Form (See Appendix E: Observation Summary Form). Candidate mastery of these PTEUEPP-approved outcomes is viewed as important and necessary. PSCT is designed to support the candidate's learning and does not (should not) preclude the candidate from demonstrating mastery on desired outcomes and proficiencies.

Given that the supervisor's role is one of evaluation, he/she is required to: (a) Observe and provide feedback on a regular basis; (b) Handle difficult situations related to candidate performance; (c) Advocate for the teacher candidate and the collaborating teacher; (d) Scheduling monthly three-way observations and feedback sessions between collaborating teacher, teacher candidate and developmental supervisor; and (e) Provide program information to teacher candidates and collaborating teachers, e.g., graduation date.

*It is very important to note that while the fundamental roles and responsibilities of the university supervisor have not changed, the approaches taken to fulfilling those responsibilities have changed significantly with the move to developmental supervision. (See Appendix C: Developmental Supervision Graphic.)*
Again, the developmental supervisors work with the teacher candidates and collaborating teachers to find ways to seamlessly embed approaches to pre-service co-teaching with high leverage approaches to instruction and assessment that have been found to improve student engagement and learning (Knight, 2013). Effective developmental supervisors have a broad repertoire of communication, behavioral, and interpersonal approaches and are able to adjust their approaches to meet the developmental needs of the teacher candidate. For example, when the teacher candidate demonstrates great difficulties in making instructional decisions, has low abilities to manage the classroom, and seems emotionally immature, the developmental supervisor typically assumes a very directive approach, literally telling the teacher candidate what to do. At this point, the collaborating teacher may model specific classroom management strategies, giving the teacher candidate little room for independent decision-making. However, when the teacher candidate is self-directed, making research-based instructional decisions on classroom management and curriculum, the developmental supervisor assumes a non-directive approach, facilitating the co-generative dialogue. The result is a teacher candidate who is competent and capable of guiding his/her own professional development by means of specific goal-setting and planning.

Effective developmental supervisors guide the conversations by asking critical questions, rather than offering solutions or making recommendations. In doing so, the developmental supervisor facilitates dialogue where teacher candidates and collaborating teachers have opportunities to theorize the lesson and seek to understand the theory-to-practice (or practice-to-theory) implications as they co-generate ideas for improving teaching and learning (Roth, Tobin, Camambo, & Dalland, 2004).
In early fall, developmental supervisors are required to meet their co-teaching teams of collaborating teachers and teacher candidates during the first day of professional development on collaboration and pre-service co-teaching. At that time, the developmental supervisors begin to understand the nature of the relationship between the co-teachers and how to guide them in the upcoming year.

To improve their practice, effective developmental supervisors engage regularly in engage personal study and reflection. In addition, effective developmental supervisors form collegial partnerships and support one another through collaborative problem solving. Throughout the academic year, the supervisors form a professional learning community and study the literature to build their repertoire of supervisory practice. To that end, developmental supervisors are required to attend a minimum of three sessions of professional development each semester. In the spring of 2015, a self-study of KSU’s new model of developmental supervision was conducted at through qualitative analysis of the following data sources: (a) candidate, collaborating teacher, and supervisor focus groups; (b) Goal-setting protocols; (c) participant evaluation of sessions of professional learning; and (d) monthly reflections of developmental supervisors. Results of the study (Strieker & Dooley, 2015) revealed the following perceived benefits of developmental supervision, including the following:

- Increased growth of candidates, collaborating teachers and supervisors;
- Predominant use of collaborative approaches by the supervisors;
- Importance of intentional goal-setting in developmental of candidates;
- Increased interest in video and virtual observations; and
- Clear expectations and support for collaborating teachers as mentor-models.
Support Personnel

In addition to the developmental supervisors, many larger programs have employed or appointed other individuals to support the teacher candidates and collaborating teachers. In larger programs, each department or program is free to appoint university liaisons or clinical practice coordinators who report to their respective department chairs and who are responsible for coordinating the efforts of the developmental supervisors. Many times the faculty member who assumes one of these positions is also responsible for teaching in the program's method block; and is therefore, knowledgeable of the expectations for teacher candidates. In addition, many school principals who agree to host several student teachers appoint a lead teacher or an assistant principal to act as a site coordinator. The site coordinators act as the building-based contact person for all of the collaborating teachers at that specific school.

SUGGESTED SCHEDULE FOR TEACHER CANDIDATE & COLLABORATING TEACHER

Yearlong Clinical Experience I (TOSS)

Weeks 1-6

- Agree upon a schedule of days and times for the teacher candidate to work in the classroom.
- Introduce teacher candidate to the faculty, students and parents with whom he will work.
- Review materials and resources available in the school.
- Attend face-to-face session for Level 1-Module 1: Introduction to Pre-service Co-teaching
• Develop positive co-teaching partnership.
• Complete assignments and activities for Module 1 and upload.

**Weeks 7-12**
• Complete Level 1-Module 2: *Using PSCT to Co-Plan*
• Use *One-teach/One-observe* classroom instruction.
• Use *I do-We do-You do* to teach preferred instructional approaches and transition strategies.
• Hold a class meeting on classroom rules and procedures.
• Teach mini-lesson, using the Alternative Co-teaching Structure.
• Complete Level 1-Module 3: *Using PSCT to Co-Assess.*

**Weeks 13-16**
• Complete Level 1-Module 4: *Using PSCT to Co-Instruct.*
• Meet with co-teaching team to discuss transition to semester two of the clinical practice.

**Yearlong Clinical Experience II (Student Teaching)**

Throughout the second semester, collaborating teachers are asked to model effective, research-based practices and provide on-going feedback relative to the teacher candidate’s performance. In that regard, they are asked to co-plan with the teacher candidates, justifying their decisions based upon research and theory. Please be aware that while they are asked to co-teach on a daily basis, using the models of PSCT as appropriate, this does not mean that the teacher candidate and collaborating teachers co-instruct all day, every day. Rather, the co-teachers are asked to conduct the components (e.g., co-planning, co-instruction, co-assessment, and co-problem solving) of PSCT every day. In
terms of co-instruction, co-teachers are encouraged to use their professional judgment to determine how to employ the models to meet the needs of the P-12 students.

**Weeks 1-3**

- Review goals with collaborating teacher and developmental supervisor.
- Co-plan lessons and units in concert with GPS/CC and Literacy Standards.
- Develop adjusted questions and formative assessments.
- Co-instruct, co-reflect, and co-problem solve using feedback from developmental supervisor.

**Weeks 4-6**

- Design co-taught lessons to meet co-teaching goals.
- Co-instruct during observation and obtain feedback. (NOTE: Co-instruction may be one-teach/one observe with the collaborating teacher conducting the observation as well.)
- Repeat reflection cycle (co-plan, co-instruct, co-reflect) using feedback from developmental supervisor and collaborating teacher.
- Assure shift of power to teacher candidate.

**Weeks 7-9**

- Design co-taught lessons to meet co-teaching goals.
- Co-instruct during observation and obtain feedback. (NOTE: Co-instruction may be one-teach/one observe with the collaborating teacher conducting the observation as well.)
- Repeat reflection cycle (co-plan, co-instruct, co-reflect) using feedback from developmental supervisor and collaborating teachers.
Weeks 10-15

- Design co-taught lessons to meet co-teaching goals.
- Co-instruct during observation and obtain feedback. (NOTE: Co-instruction may be one-teach/one observe with the collaborating teacher conducting the observation as well.)
- Repeat reflection cycle (co-plan, co-instruct, co-reflect) using feedback from developmental supervisor and collaborating teacher.
- Participate in evaluation by attending focus groups, individual interviews, and/or on-line assessments.

CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN COLLABORATION AND CO-TEACHING

As noted above, teacher candidates who participate in this program are provided with multiple layers of support from their collaborating teachers and the developmental supervisors. To that end, all parties are provided the opportunity to learn more about PSCT and how to use PSCT to support teacher candidates in meeting the needs of diverse learners by employing research-based practices in differentiation and formative assessment. Research on teacher development consistently reveals that for educators to appropriately implement new learning, they need professional development that incorporates several key factors: (1) On-going emotional and technical support at the classroom level; (2) A forum in which they can articulate and understand their beliefs and how these beliefs influence daily practice; and (3) Opportunities for reflective analysis and dialogue (Strieker, Logan, & Kuhel, 2012).
Teacher candidates, collaborating teachers and developmental supervisors are provided incentives to enroll in a professional development program entitled, *A Partnership Approach to Pre-service Co-teaching* that employs the factors described above. The program is offered by KSU faculty as an on-line hybrid and is housed on the KSU Annex at [https://annex.kennesaw.edu/login/index.php](https://annex.kennesaw.edu/login/index.php). Upon successful completion, the collaborating teachers and developmental supervisors are eligible for one PLU according to state-approved formula (10 clock hours =1 PLU). Upon completion of the program, The Bagwell College of Education issues a *TQP Certificate of Collaboration and Pre-Service Co-teaching*. (See Appendix B: PLU Program) To receive the certificate, the teacher candidates and collaborating teachers must attend the full day session offered at KSU and then upload all required materials on a designated Moodle web site at the address provided above.

*Please note that all collaborating teachers and developmental supervisors who participate in KSU’s new yearlong clinical experiences are strongly encouraged to obtain this certificate so that they fully understand the differences between supporting candidates in yearlong versus semester-long clinical experiences.*

**RESEARCH AND EVALUATION**

*Pre-service Co-teaching: A Mentor Model Approach* was designed and developed based upon continuous internal program evaluation as well as external program evaluation and research. The internal program evaluation (Zong, 2012) addressed such critical questions as: How did the participating teachers and teacher candidates perceive the effectiveness of the co-teaching program? What are the identified strengths and challenges? What areas of improvement are needed for its future implementation? To that end, the evaluator analyzed multiple data sources (surveys, focus groups, artifacts and documents)
to address perceptions of novice and collaborating teachers of the program's effectiveness, impact, challenges, and possible improvements for revision. The results of this analysis provide guidance for the revision of program design and activities, improvement of lines of communication, etc.

KSU Researchers have obtained permission to conduct research in the areas of PSCT, co-teaching coaching and developmental supervision from campus and district review boards, including the KSU Institutional Review Board (IRB), the TQP Research Academy, the Cobb County School District, Cherokee County School District and the Marietta City School District.
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APPENDIX A.

Establishing the Context for Learning in a Co-taught Classroom

Candidate Name: _______________________________________________________

Supervisor Name: _______________________________________________________  

Collaborating Teacher: __________________________________________________ 

School: _____________________ Subject: ________________________________ 

Grade: ___________ Semester/Yr: ______________________ 

______________________________________________________________________

“Coaching is the art of identifying and developing a person’s strengths.” (J. Kise, 2006)  

Directions: During this interview, you elicit critical information from the co-teachers that the teacher candidate will use to establish his or her goals for personal improvement. Even though the interview is a semi-structured, which means that you do not have to ask each and every question explicitly, it does address all of the areas for which the teacher candidates is primarily responsible. Therefore, address as many questions as possible. Note: Ask the co-teachers if you may use a voice recorder to assure that you capture their complete responses. Also, it is best to let a bit of time elapse between the interview and the goal setting to give all parties time to think about the best next steps.

What would you like to share about yourselves?

• What are your beliefs about teaching and learning?
• What are your strengths and unique talents?
• What can you contribute to the co-teaching relationship?

What is your current reality?

Classroom and Colleagues.

• Tell me about your school/classroom environment.
• What does a typical day look like? What are you doing? What are your students doing?
• What pressures or challenges do you face on a regular basis?
• With whom do you collaborate on any given day, e.g., TESOL, SPED, etc.
• How is your co-teaching relationship emerging?

Describe your students.

• What populations(s) of learners do you teach? How many?
• What are the major needs of your students?
• What outcomes are your students striving for?
• What would help your students the most?

Instructional Practices with Co-Teaching
• What are your experiences so far with co-teaching?
• Have you completed the online modules?
• What co-teaching models have you used so far? Any questions about the models?
• What do you do when you co-plan?
• Do you have challenges with differentiating instruction at this point?
• Do you have challenges with classroom management and behavior?

What do you need to do to improve the performance of your students? (Note: The university supervisor will evaluate the desired competencies listed below.)

• Increase respect for, rapport with, and responsiveness to students with varied needs and backgrounds.

• Use a variety of teaching strategies that create engaging opportunities for students to construct meaning, interpret, respond to, and interact with the lesson content and relevant academic language.

• Link students’ prior academic learning and personal, cultural, and community assets with new learning.

• Elicit and build student responses to promote thinking and develop students’ abilities to construct meaning, interpret, respond and use academic language.

• Support students in using vocabulary and additional language demands to check or justify their constructions of meaning and interpretations of the lesson content.

• Understand and use the central concepts, tools of inquiry, standards, and structures of content in their chosen teaching fields, and creates meaningful learning experiences that develop competence in subject matter and skills.

• Create and employ equitable, and well-managed learning environments for all students.

• Engage in practices and behaviors during the lesson that demonstrate competence as a professional.

Based upon this conversation, what type of goals would you like to establish?

• Goals to improve the relationship and co-teaching practice?
• Goals for the teacher candidate on one of the areas in which she will be supervised?
• Goals to impact student engagement and/or learning?

Has anything else changed since you began student teaching that you would like to discuss?
APPENDIX B.

A Partnership Approach to Pre-Service Co-Teaching
PLU Program

10 clock hours=1PLU

Criteria for Admission: Meets criteria for position of collaborating teacher, teacher candidate or developmental supervisor.

This course provides collaborating teachers and teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to develop an effective co-teaching partnership; and ultimately, to increase the learning of P-12 students. To earn the PLU, collaborating teachers must conduct ten clock hours of activities and assignments with their teacher candidate during the candidate’s clinical experience. The course is taught as a hybrid online course, which means that the instructor will meet with the collaborating teachers and teacher candidates at least one time. Level 1 is comprised of four modules that address the fundamentals of PSCT as well as the application of the approach to daily classroom practice. While the modules, activities and requirements may change each year to meet the needs of the teachers, modules address a set of clearly defined objectives, organized as follows:

Module 1: An Introduction to a Partnership Approach to Pre-service Co-teaching.
Module 2: Using PSCT to Co-Plan.
Module 3: Using PSCT to Co-Assess.
Module 4: Using PSCT to Co-Instruct.
Developmental Supervision

SUPERVISOR AS EXPERT

- Candidate: high need for support
- Supervisor: high level of input
- High frequency of observations
- Communication: present, explain, direct alternatives

SUPERVISOR AS FACILITATOR

- Candidate needs opportunities for learning & exploration
- Equal input from all parties including supervisor, collaborating teacher, and candidate
- Average frequency of observations
- Communication: present, problem-solve, probe, collaborate, negotiate

- Candidate needs opportunities to direct own learning
- Candidate: high level of input
- Supervisor: low level of input
- Average frequency of observations
- Communication: listen, reflect, clarify, encourage

CO-PLANNING
CO-TEACHING
CO-ASSESSING

PARTNERSHIP

PRINCIPLES

- Directive Control Approach
- Directive Informational Approach
- Collaborative Approach
- Nondirective Approach

APPENDIX D.

GROW: A Goal-setting Framework

The juxtaposition of vision (what we want) and a clear picture of current reality (where we are relative to what we want) generates what we call ‘creative tension’: a force to bring them together, caused by the natural tendency of tension to seek resolution. The essence of personal mastery is learning how to generate and sustain creative tension in our lives. (p. 132) Senge, 1990.

According to Whitmore (2004) there are four steps to goal-setting that may be revisited several times before firmly establishing a goal that can be used to guide your work with the candidate. This process can also be used effectively as a simple framework for action research (Glickman, 2014; Costa & Garmston, 2002). Once the plan is developed, ask the candidate to make a personal Growth statement.

Goal: Before the classroom observations are conducted, conduct an interview with the candidate to determine the candidates’ overarching goal and desired outcomes.

1. Identify (and check!) an overarching goal that addresses one of four categories that align with edTPA, including planning, assessment, instruction, other. Use the “other” category when the candidate has concerns that are not necessarily instructional, e.g., idiosyncratic behaviors, relationship issues with CT. Sample questions that you might ask are: Do you have a goal in mind? Why did you select it? What is the outcome you want to create? What do you hope to accomplish?

2. State the goal and then describe the desired outcome. Sample questions: How will you know when you have reached your goal? What will your students be saying or doing? What will you be saying or doing?

Reality: This discussion has two parts. First, facilitate a discussion to determine if the goal is realistic in the current context (or reality). Sample Questions: Do the students have ample pre-requisite knowledge? What experiences have you that have prepared you to conduct this task? Does the CT use similar strategies in her daily practice? Also, use the questions in the interview, Establishing a Context for Learning in Appendix A. Second, determine the process for recording, observing or collecting evidence of success. Sample Questions: What types of data should we collect that will be the most useful to you? What type of other student data will you collect?

Opportunities and alternatives. Begin to create a plan of how to develop, refine or revise current practices to reach the goal as well as the alternative approaches, strategies, etc. Discuss theoretical considerations relative to the various approaches as well as the research underlying the practice.

Sample DS Questions: What do you want? Is what you are doing now getting you what you want? Why or why not? What else could you do? What are some strategies or activities you could employ to achieve your desired outcome? Why do you think that might work? What if it didn’t work? What would you do then? Are there specific student who need something extra or different? How can you use co-teaching to help meet those needs? What are the theories that underpin your stated opportunities and alternatives?
Who does what, when and why? With the candidate, complete a brief plan of action that specifically determines the roles and responsibilities of the developmental supervisor and the candidate.

Sample DS Questions: What do the teacher candidate and collaborating teacher see as an appropriate role for the DS? What models of co-teaching do the teachers feel would best support their instruction and students? When (and how) can they co-plan? Specifically, what will the teacher candidate do? Specifically what will the collaborating teacher do in terms of co-assessment, co-instruction, co-problem-solving, etc.

Candidate’s Growth Statement

Once the action plan is complete, ask the candidate to provide a statement of their understanding of how implementing this plan will result in their growth, as well as the growth of their students. There is an expectation that the candidate will be able to made general references to underlying theories and/or research.

Sample Questions: What motivated you to create this as a goal? What do you hope to learn from this? What impact will this have upon the learners in your classroom?

Final Note

- The GROW template must be completed early in the fall and revisited after each classroom observation. At that point, the teacher candidate may elect to: (1) stop pursuing the goal; (2) add a related goal; or (3) select a new goal related to the overall plan; (4) change the data collection, etc. The complete process does not have to be repeated until the beginning of the next semester. Candidates should include the GROW goal setting form as part of their reflection turned into supervisors periodically. All documents should be uploaded in Chalk and Wire immediately upon completion.

- The completed Observation Summary Form must be uploaded in Chalk and Wire immediately after completion.
**GROW - Goal Setting Protocol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Program Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Candidate:</td>
<td>Collaborating Teacher:</td>
<td>School:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects: Math &amp; Reading</td>
<td>Grade: 5th</td>
<td>Course (check one): YCE I (TOSS/Practicum II) YCE II (Student Teaching/Practicum II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** (Planning, Assessment, Instruction, Other)
Student learning - To improve learning of academic language of English learners.

**Outcome:**
English learners will read and comprehend academic language used in learning segment.

**Reality Assessment:** (Current situation, Method of data collection)
A ticket out the door will be used to assess students on academic language used during the lesson.

**Opportunities and Alternatives:** (Strategies, options, methods, approaches)
The collaborating teacher currently co-teaches part of each day with the EL teacher and the Special Education teacher, both of whom are focusing on academic language development of their students. TC will co-plan with CT and new colleagues and review WIDA “Can Do” descriptors to make recommendations of strategies for ELs.

**Who?** (Teacher Candidate, Collaborating Teacher, Developmental Supervisor)
All parties participate in co-planning, co-instruction, co-assessment and problem solving. TC creates a pre-assessment to guide the creation of flexible groups as well as "Ticket out the Door" assessments to check for understanding of academic language daily. CT will help monitor assessment and engagement.

**What?**
- co-plan engaging lesson with academic language instruction.
- co-assess to determine mastery of academic language using pre and post assessment and ticket out the door.
- collect observation data to monitor student engagement.

**When? Where?**
DS will collect data on student engagement while observing using the "on-task" technique during next observation. CT and TC will monitor student progress with academic language using formative assessments such as "ticket out the door".

**Why do you think this will work?** (Theory related to practice, research base)
Research done by Black & Wiliam in 2004 proves that informal assessments such as a ticket out the door, puts the teacher in a position to correct misconceptions and steer learning through feedback and instructional modifications. By monitoring student's growth frequently, the TC will be able to alter instruction and flexible groups to meet student's needs.

**Candidate's Professional Growth Statement:**
I will continue to strive to use daily formative assessments to inform my instruction and the feedback I provide to students. I wanted to enroll in a yearlong placement at a school with a high ESL population because I want to be able to teach all children. This school has a large population of ESL students that seems to grow daily. I think this trend will continue in Georgia, therefore I want to learn how to make ESL students successful.

---

**GROW - Goal Setting Protocol**

**Goal:** (Planning, Assessment, Instruction, Other)
Student engagement – To motivate students to become engaged and involved in the lesson over 90% of the time.

**Outcome:**
The students will not just be compliant and sit quietly while I present new material. The students will be engaged in the discussion, will answer questions, and have the correct materials out to participate.

**Reality Assessment:** (Current situation, Method of data collection)
Data will be collected by benchmarking on task behavior, ratio of interactions, opportunities to respond, and number of disruptions. (Stick, et al.)

**Opportunities and Alternatives:** (Strategies, option, methods, approaches)
The county has adopted Bring Your Own Technology; therefore, I will use apps as a personal response system for review of tests. Research shows that technological applications increase student motivation. I will use individual white boards to check for understanding and increase opportunities to respond; use a reward system for on-task behavior; use proximity control by TC and CT; Use game format to review for tests; give bonus points; drop lowest grade. (Behavioral Motivational Theory, Skinner)

**Who?** (Teacher Candidate, Collaborating Teacher, Developmental Supervisor)
TC participates in co-planning and co-instruction that incorporate technology to improve student engagement with CT. TC will video record lesson and do SWOT analysis on student engagement. CT will review video with TC and DS and make suggestions for improvements. DS will benchmark behavior during observation and collect engagement data on interactions, responses, and disruptions.

**What?** (plan and co-instruct engaging lesson with technology integration)
- co-plan and co-instruct engaging lesson with technology integration
- co-reflect with CT & DS viewing video
- collect observation data to monitor student engagement
- review observation data and draw conclusions

**When? Where?**
DS will collect data on student engagement while observing by benchmarking behavior, recording ratio of interactions, opportunities to respond and number of disruptions during next observation. CT and TC will monitor student engagement and use info from SWOT and data collection to improve student engagement.

**Why do you think that this will work?** (Theory related to practice, research base)
Based on Skinner’s behavioral theory, reward systems work because students make an association between a particular behavior and a consequence. This is why I will implement a reward system for on-task behavior in the classroom. By incorporating more opportunities to use technology and rewarding on-task behavior, my students will show growth because they will be more motivated to learn.

**Candidate’s Professional Growth Statement:**
If I can keep students engaged in the lesson, then hopefully they become more motivated to graduate and become successful. Students are motivated in a variety of ways and I need a wide array of motivational methods to be a successful teacher. My goal is to engage students and get them on the right path. I will continue to explore various strategies to increase student engagement.

---

Observation Summary Form for Developmental Supervisors

This form, based on the Georgia Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS), is to be completed by supervisors using evidence from the pre-conference, the lesson plan, the observation, the post-conference, and other sources. The form should be submitted by supervisors at least twice before the midterm and twice before the end of the semester during student teaching/YCE II. Some standards/criteria are repeated so that supervisors may use evidence from multiple sources – pre-conference, observation, post-conference – to inform the scores.

ONCE THIS DOCUMENT IS COMPLETE:
• Review the rankings for each standard, keeping in mind that any one standard may have been addressed in more than one section of this document.
• Decide upon an “OVERALL RANK” for each standard that will be entered into Chalk and Wire by the specified due date.
• List the sources of evidence that were used to determine the overall rank for each standard in Chalk and Wire.
• ATTACH THIS DOCUMENT TO THE RUBRIC IN CHALK AND WIRE AS AN “ANNOTATED DOCUMENT.”

Candidate Name Click to enter text  Date Click to enter text  Supervisor Click to enter text  Observation # Click to enter text
School/Grade/Subject Click to enter text  Collaborating Teacher Click to enter text
Person completing form  □ Cooperating Teacher  □ Supervisor  □ Candidate
Check one:  □ TOSS/Pract. I  □ Student Teaching/Pract. II  □ Yearlong Clinical Practice I  □ Yearlong Clinical Practice II

Part I Pre-Conference

Directions - The candidate should submit a lesson plan to the supervisor via Chalk and Wire before the pre-conference. The supervisor will review the candidate’s lesson plan before arriving at the observation site to inform the observation and evaluation.

A. Focus and Goal. Confer with the candidate before the observation to identify the area of focus for the observation and a goal for performance. This information does not go into Chalk and Wire.

Based on the pre-conference, what is/are the identified focus/foci of this observation? Click to enter text
B. Planning.
- Use evidence from the **pre-conference and the lesson plan** to inform rankings of the applicable standards and indicators below.
- Refer to the supplementary documents provided for details on the standards and indicators.
- **If there is no evidence for an indicator, it should become an identified goal for which the candidate should demonstrate proficiency by the mid-term or end of the semester.**
- **Score in relation to the standard, not in relation to each other or to a first year teacher.** A rank of "4" is exemplary and should be given only when a candidate demonstrates expertise, leadership, and role model skills, and it should be strongly supported with cited evidence and documentation.
- You may type directly in the form or complete it by hand. All data should be transferred into Chalk and Wire by the due date.

**Rankings:**
- **N/E = No Evidence**
- **Level 1 = Ineffective**
- **Level 2 = Needs Development**
- **Level 3 = Proficient**
- **Level 4 = Exemplary**

"Indicators for which there is "no evidence" should become goals for subsequent observations.

### Standard 2: Instructional Planning - The teacher candidate plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the needs of all students

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Analyzes and uses student learning data to inform planning.
- Develops plans that are clear, logical, sequential, and integrated across the curriculum.
- Plans instruction effectively for content mastery, pacing, and transitions.
- Plans for instruction to meet the needs of all students.
- Aligns & connects lesson objectives to state & local school district curricula & standards, and student learning needs.
- Develops appropriate course unit, and daily plans, and is able to adapt plans when needed.

### Standard 4: Differentiated Instruction - The teacher candidate challenges and supports each student’s learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Differentiates instructional content, process, product, & learning environment to meet individual developmental needs.
- Provides remediation, enrichment, and acceleration to further student understanding of material.
- Uses diagnostic, formative, & summative assessment data to inform instructional modifications for individual students.
- Develops critical and creative thinking by providing activities at the appropriate level of challenge for students.
**Standards 5: Assessment Strategies** - The teacher candidate systematically chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population.

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Uses assessment techniques that are appropriate for the developmental level of students.
- Involves students in setting learning goals and monitoring their own progress.
- Uses formal and informal assessments for diagnostic, formative, and summative purposes.
- Uses grading practices that report final mastery in relationship to content goals and objectives.
- Collaborates with others to develop common assessments, when appropriate.

**Standards 6: Assessment Uses** - The teacher candidate systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Uses diagnostic assessment data to develop learning goals for students, to differentiate instruction, and to document learning.
- Plans a variety of formal and informal assessments aligned with instructional results to measure student mastery of learning objectives.
- Uses assessment tools for both formative and summative purposes to inform, guide, and adjust instruction.
- Systematically analyzes and uses data to measure student progress, to design appropriate interventions, and to inform long- and short-term instructional decisions.

---

**Part II Supervisor’s Evidence from Observation**

**Directions**
- Type directly in this section or, if preferred, use other pages for handwritten notes from the observation. Please list observed evidence.
- Do not transfer your notes from the observation into Chalk and Wire; use your notes to inform the Reflective Dialog with the candidate during the post-conference.

[Click to enter text here](#)

**Part III Evaluation of Observation Evidence**

**Directions**
- When completing this section of the observation summary form, please rank each standard using and listing evidence from the observation relevant to the indicators to determine the candidate’s rating.
• Refer to the supplementary documents provided for details on the standards and indicators below.
• You may type directly in this form.
• If evidence for an indicator is not observed, it should become an identified goal for which the candidate should demonstrate proficiency in subsequent observations.
• Score candidates in relation to the standard, not in relation to each other or to a first-year teacher. A rank of "4" is exemplary and should be given only when a candidate demonstrates expertise, leadership, and role model skills, and it should be strongly supported with cited evidence and documentation.

Rankings:  N/E = No Evidence  Level 1=Ineffective  Level 2=Needs Development  Level 3=Proficient  Level 4=Exemplary

Indicators for which there is "no evidence" should become goals for subsequent observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</th>
<th>N/E</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Addresses appropriate curriculum standards and integrates key content elements
- Facilitates students’ use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction.
- Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real-world experiences and applications.
- Demonstrates accurate, deep, and current knowledge of subject matter.
- Exhibits pedagogical skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught and best practice based on current research.
- Bases instruction on goals that reflect high expectations for all students and a clear understanding of the curriculum.
- Displays an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2: Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>N/E</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher candidate promotes learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students’ acquisition of key knowledge and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Engages students in active learning and maintains interests.
- Builds upon students’ existing knowledge and skills.
- Reinforces learning goals consistently throughout the lesson.
- Uses a variety of research-based instructional strategies and resources.
- Effectively uses appropriate instructional technology to enhance student learning.
- Communicates and presents material clearly, and checks for understanding.
- Develops higher-order thinking through questioning and problem-solving activities.
- Engages students in authentic learning by providing real-life examples and interdisciplinary connections.
Standard 4: Differentiated Instruction - The teacher candidate challenges and supports each student’s learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.

Relevant Indicators for this Standard
- Differentiates instructional content, process, product, & learning environment to meet individual developmental needs.
- Uses flexible grouping strategies to encourage peer interaction and to accommodate learning appropriate needs.
- Demonstrates high learning expectations for all students.

Part IV Reflective Dialog

Directions - Use the open boxes to take notes during the post-observation conference with the candidate and CT. You may or may not have information for each box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>Co-instruction observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Teach/One Observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: Describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-teaching not observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2</th>
<th>Impressions of Teaching &amp; Learning from candidate and collaborating teacher.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Click to enter text:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#3</th>
<th>Review of Supervisor’s Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate should present conclusions based on evidence from observation, especially regarding the area(s) of focus/goals noted during the pre-conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Click to enter text:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary from Observation Evidence

Summary from Other Evidence (lesson plans, assessments, reflections, post-conference w/candidate & CT, etc.)

Click to enter text.
| #4 | Review Lesson Plan | Facilitate reflection on the lesson as planned compared to as delivered. Candidate should propose changes justified by theory and research when applicable. | Click to enter text. |
| #5 | Candidate's Growth Toward Goal(s) | Review current GROW | Click to enter text. |
| #6 | Next Steps | Modify current GROW or establish new GROW. | Click to enter text. |
| #7 | Developmental Approach Used by Supervisor | Directive Control | Directive Informational |
| | | Nondirective | Collaborative |

Additional Comments: Click to enter text.

---

### Part V Additional Information

**Directions**
- Use evidence from the post-conference with the candidate and collaborating teacher to inform rankings on the standards below.
- Please list evidence that was used to determine the candidate's rating.
- If there is no evidence for an indicator, the indicator should become an identified goal for which the candidate should demonstrate proficiency in subsequent observations.
- Refer to the supplementary documents provided for details on the standards and indicators below.
- You may type directly in the form.
- Score candidates in relation to the standard, not in relation to each other or to a first year teacher. A rank of "4" is exemplary and should be given only when a candidate demonstrates expertise, leadership, and role model skills, and it should be strongly supported with cited evidence and documentation.
### Rankings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/E</th>
<th>Level 1: Ineffective</th>
<th>Level 2: Needs Development</th>
<th>Level 3: Proficient</th>
<th>Level 4: Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Indicators for which there is "no evidence" should become goals for subsequent observations.

### Standards 5: Assessment Strategies
- The teacher candidate systematically chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population.

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Uses grading practices that report final mastery in relationship to content goals and objectives.
- Collaborates with others to develop common assessments, when appropriate.

### Standards 6: Assessment Uses
- The teacher candidate systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Provides constructive and frequent feedback to students on their progress toward their learning goals.
- Teaches students to self-assess and to use metacognitive strategies in support of lifelong learning.

### Standard 9: Professionalism
- The teacher candidate exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school’s mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession.

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**
- Carries out duties in accordance with federal & state laws, Code of Ethics, and established state & local school board policies, regulations, & practices.
- Maintains professional demeanor and behavior.
- Respects and maintains confidentiality.
- Evaluates & identifies areas of personal strengths & weaknesses related to professional skills & impact on learning and sets goals for improvement.
- Participates in ongoing professional growth activities based on identified areas for improvement.
- Demonstrates flexibility in adapting to school change.
- Engages in activities outside the classroom intended for school and student enhancement.
- Maintains appropriate interactions with students, parents, faculty, and staff.
- Engages in self-reflection about the success of the lesson after teaching; seeks feedback from mentor teacher about teaching and impact on student learning.

### Standard 10: Professionalism - The teacher candidate communicates effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning.

**Relevant Indicators for this Standard**

---

*Observation Summary w/Developmental Supervision – Revised F15*
• Adheres to school and district policies regarding communication of student information.
• Uses modes of communication that are appropriate for a given situation.
• Listens and responds with cultural awareness, empathy, and understanding to the voice and opinions of stakeholders (parents, community, students, and colleagues).
• Engages in appropriate conversations and maintains confidentiality of information related to students, parents, faculty, and staff. Such conversations include texting, messaging, social media, emails, etc.

• Review the rankings for each standard, keeping in mind that any one standard may have been addressed in more than one section of this document.
• Decide upon an “OVERALL RANK” for each standard that will be entered into Chalk and Wire by the due date.
• List the evidence used to determine the overall rank for each standard in Chalk and Wire.
• ATTACH THIS DOCUMENT TO THE RUBRIC IN CHALK AND WIRE AS AN “ANNOTATED DOCUMENT.”
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PARTICIPANTS IN THE 2011-2013 PILOT OF PRE-SERVICE CO-TEACHING

**Educator Preparation Unit at Kennesaw State University**
- Center for Placements and Partnerships
- College of Mathematics & Science, Department of Chemistry
- Bagwell College of Education, Department of Elementary & Early Childhood Education
- Bagwell College of Education, Department of Inclusive Education
- Bagwell College of Education, Department of Secondary and Middle Grades Education
- College of Humanities, Department of English

**PSCT Technology Advisor**
Ms. Jordan Cameron, Department of Instruction Technology

**Teacher Quality Partnership Project: Co-teaching Coaches**

Ms. Debbie Lozo, TQP Curriculum Consultant, Team Leader and Coach
Dr. Toni Strieker, Professor in Secondary & Middle Grades, Team Leader & Coach

Dr. Shogun An, Assistant Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Ms. Renee Besieger, Representative at South Cobb High School, Cobb County School District
Dr. Eddie Bennett, TQP Cobb County School District Representative
Ms. Kathy Curran, TQP Cobb County School District Representative
Dr. Michelle Dean, Assistant Professor, Chemistry
Dr. Lee Digiovanni, Associate Professor, Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Ms. Kim Dooley, Assistant Director of Center of Placements & Partnerships
Ms. Donna Green, TQP Cobb County School District Representative
Ms. Glenda Harkin, Part-time Faculty in Secondary & Middle Grades Education
Dr. Jennifer Heckert, Assistant Professor, Inclusive Education
Dr. Daphne Hubbard, Associate Professor in Secondary & Middle Grades
Dr. Charlease Kelly-Jackson, Assistant Professor, Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Dr. Gwen McAlpine, Associate Professor, Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Ms. Adrienne McAuley, TQP Cobb County School District Representative
Ms. Janet Peeler, TQP Cobb County School District Representative
Dr. Beth Peary, Part-time Faculty in Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Dr. Greg Rushton, Assistant Professor, Chemistry
Dr. Maria Shaheen, Assistant Professor of Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Dr. Cherry Steffen, Associate Professor of Elementary & Early Childhood Education
Ms. Patricia Thomas, TQP Cobb County School District Representative
Ms. Mary Kay Widener, TQP Cobb County School District Representative
Dr. Stacy Wegrzen, Part-time Faculty in Instructional Technology
Dr. Woo Lim, Assistant Professor in Secondary & Middle Grades
# Teacher Quality Partnership Project: Member Districts, Schools & Teachers
## Fall 2011-Spring 2013

### Cobb County School District
#### Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baker Elementary School</strong></td>
<td>Kimberlee Collins, Alvina Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ford Elementary School</strong></td>
<td>Laurie Cook, Cynthia Edwards, Patti Jones, Brandye Keasler, Ashley Miller, Libby Mitchell, Julie Poe, Kellee Strickland, Drena Varghese, Jennifer Wiltshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milford Elementary School</strong></td>
<td>Linda Gueller, Kristen Jones, Cathy Shaffer, Marissa Young, Mike Wolber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Shanty Elementary</strong></td>
<td>Amy Debusschere, Patricia Peacock, Jill Swanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hollydale Elementary School</strong></td>
<td>Andrea Moore, Deborah Palen, Maria Parker, Maggie Phillips, Carrie Smead, Cindy Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mountain View Elementary</strong></td>
<td>Jeffery Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birney Elementary School</strong></td>
<td>Lajuana Delaney, Robin Dillard, DeNell Davidson, Molly Lippert, Jennifer Odum, Kenya Ransey, Emily Tyson, Judith Seldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kennesaw Elementary School</strong></td>
<td>Debbie Barnes, Allison Greene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pickett’s Mill Elementary</strong></td>
<td>Pete Charrette, Nancy Childers, Suzanne Hilliard, Cara McArthur, Patricia Orton, Patricia Towne, Carolyn Schumacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair Oaks Elementary School</strong></td>
<td>Kim Carren, Fernandez, Hansbrough, Henning, Heather Johnson, Lori Rogers, Susan Sweat, Tiffany Whitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LaBelle Elementary School</strong></td>
<td>Meagan Anderson, Kelly Campbell, Beth Dettelbach, Terri Daniels, Edith Kincade, Kristin Knight, Nicole Wold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shallowford Falls</strong></td>
<td>Charlotte Fields, Michele Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County School District</td>
<td>Middle and High Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campbell Middle School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allatoona High School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kristie Bryan</td>
<td>• Julie Speeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sallie Butler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ann Marie Dubick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rhonda Lokey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shawnte Scott-Tompkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curt Wilbanks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Griffin Middle School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Campbell High School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joan Atkinson</td>
<td>• Erica Peddi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meghan Bisanz</td>
<td>• Consuelo Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hightower Trail Middle School</strong></td>
<td><strong>North Cobb High School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharlene Foster</td>
<td>• Dorothy Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michael Irving</td>
<td>• Bob Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palmer Middle School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Osborne High School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Melinda Allen</td>
<td>• Gloria Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Danielle Crump</td>
<td>• Christopher Bryce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tracy Demkowski</td>
<td>• Portia Gayle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sabreena Jiwani</td>
<td>• Annette Hansard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marci Nadeau</td>
<td>• Julie Kokan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Phyllis Neal</td>
<td>• Daniel Keiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stephanie Ryan</td>
<td>• Bobby Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michael Sawyer</td>
<td>• Andy Marzka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kristin Sembrat</td>
<td>• Shirlynn Mahaffey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smitha Middle School</strong></td>
<td>• Ann Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smitha Middle School (Con’t.)</td>
<td>• Verlynda Slaughter-Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Melinda Allen</td>
<td>• Erin Thaler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Danielle Crump</td>
<td>• Sherrye Tillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tracy Demkowski</td>
<td>• Amber Schoer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sabreena Jiwani</td>
<td>• Brittany Walker-Meade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marci Nadeau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Phyllis Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stephanie Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Michael Sawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kristin Sembrat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T. Strieker and K. Dooley, August 26, 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cherokee County School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Mill Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kimberly Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Melissa Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Misty Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tabitha Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ashley Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta City School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.L. Burruss Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lauri Bruton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shannon Burch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teresa Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Katie Guadette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tanya Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kathleen Gresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kathleen King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valerie Pfeffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mary Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta City Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Anthony Booker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rachel Brown-Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thomas Monti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ruquanda Epps-Primas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Co-generative Dialogue. Dialogue that naturally emerges from the co-reflection and problem solving of the collaborating teacher, teacher candidate and/or developmental supervisor. During these sessions the co-teachers create new and often novel solutions to complex problems of practice.

Components of Pre-service Co-teaching. There are four components of pre-service co-teaching, including co-planning, co-assessment, co-instruction, and co-reflection. Note that these components do not always occur as part of a linear teaching cycle and that co-reflection may happen before, during and after co-instruction.

Co-teaching Coach. Individuals who provide site-based, specialized professional development to the collaborating teacher and teacher candidate in using pre-service co-teaching to conduct formative assessment, classroom management, and differentiated instruction.

Developmental Supervisor. Individuals who supervise and evaluate teacher candidates in yearlong co-taught clinical experiences at Kennesaw State University. Developmental supervisors use a wide repertoire of behavior, communication, and interpersonal approaches that are tailored to the needs of the teacher candidates.

Formative Assessment. Informal assessment procedures employed by teachers during the learning process in order to modify teaching and learning activities to improve student attainment. It typically involves qualitative feedback (rather than scores) for both student and teacher that focus on the details of content and performance.

High Leverage Instructional Practices. Research-based strategies, approaches and/or activities that correlate with increased student achievement.

Job-embedded Professional Learning. Individualized professional development provided to teachers in their own classrooms, using the available resources.

Mentor Model. Continuous, and often, instantaneous feedback and demonstration of teaching, assessment, and classroom management strategies. Allows the experienced teacher to "step in" and provide mentoring on an "as needed" basis.

Collaborating teachers. Experienced teachers who work in concert with university faculty and developmental supervisors to guide, support, and advise teacher candidates during well-designed clinical experiences. Collaborating teachers work with their teacher candidates to establish a co-taught classroom. Throughout the instructional day they engage in mentor modeling as they co-plan, co-assess, co-instruct and co-reflect.

Models of Co-teaching. The models of pre-service co-teaching are the same as the models of traditional co-teaching described by Friend (2008) and include the following: One
Teach/One Observe, One Teach/One Assist, Alternative Teaching, Station Teaching, Parallel Teaching and Team Teaching.

Pre-service Co-teaching. “…An innovative approach that provides clinical experiences for teacher candidates that are supported by collaborating teachers who serve as on-going mentor model and share all responsibilities for the teaching and learning of a group of P-12 students. Throughout the experience, the teacher candidate and Collaborating teacher establish a fully functioning co-taught classroom in which they share instructional space, materials and other resources. PSCT is an evidence-based approach that focuses simultaneously upon the development of the teacher candidate and the learning of P-12 students. Throughout the clinical experience, co-teachers are encouraged to co-reflect upon the teaching and learning process, engage in co-generative dialogue to find creative solutions to complex problems of classroom practice” (Strieker, et al., 2013).

Teacher Candidate. Individuals who have been formally admitted to the teacher preparation program.

Traditional Co-teaching. “Co-teaching occurs when two or more certified professionals jointly deliver substantive instruction to a diverse, blended group of students within a single, physical space” (Friend & Cook, 201).

Student Engagement. Student engagement occurs when the student has made a psychological investment in learning.