

COTEACHING NARRATIVE

Leona Jackson Middle School

General Educator: C

Special Service Provider: S

Subject: ELA 6th-8th

Observer: Dr. Wendy Murawski

Date/Time: 8:00-9:00am February 21, 2012

When I arrived, Teacher 1 was at the front of the room and Teacher 2 was out of the room. The bell rang and Teacher 2 arrived within 2 minutes. Teacher 1 & 2 raised their hands and the students got quiet. Teacher 1 asked students if they had a nice weekend and then she went over the agenda with the group. Both teachers modeled participating and then listening quietly during Pledge of Allegiance and announcements. At one point, the teachers quietly had a sidebar about what was going to happen after announcements. Teacher 1 appeared to give Teacher 2 the Student Code of Conduct to review (as per announcements); nice way to ensure Teacher 2 got “face time” with the class at the beginning of the period. Teacher 1 asked students to add in ways to respect others; I like how you engaged kids with your questions to make sure they comprehend the Code. Teacher 1 referred to the Class Rules and Consequences; I would still love to see positive consequences posted in addition to the negative ones. [Insert: Teacher 1 later addressed this in class. Great!] Teachers took turns with each statement of the Code and both teachers elaborated as appropriate to ensure student understanding. This was an excellent example of **Team Teaching** to keep students’ attention and to increase their comprehension.

At the end of going over the Student Code of Conduct, teachers asked students to turn to a partner and identify one thing they would do to ensure they followed the code. Teacher 1 set the timer for one minute and both teachers circulated and engaged with students.

After the timer went off, both teachers moved to the front of the room and Teacher 1 used the “Equity Cards” to call on students randomly to have them respond. All students called upon were able to answer.

Teacher 1 mentioned that in addition to the negative consequences there are also “rewards” for following the rules. She asked students to come up with those and they identified: a pat on the back, Student of the Month, Crawford bucks, tickets/coupons, positive reinforcement, praise, etc. I am so happy to hear this! I would love to see a list up of “Positive Consequences” to be right next to the Negative Consequences already posted. That would enable both teachers to see a positive behavior and point to the board and reinforce that behavior by saying “I love how you just followed xx rule; because of that, I’m choosing to give you xxx positive consequence.” So much more powerful than the negatives!

On the agenda, the board states “Co-teaching: Station teaching”. I like seeing that teachers have planned for this proactively. The room environment is very supportive and demonstrates a lot of student work. The room is vocabulary rich, which especially helpful for English language learners and students with disabilities. I still only see Teacher 1’s name on the front door and front board. It would be easy to add Teacher 2’s name. Both teachers are actively engaged with students, however.

Teacher 1 used a very quiet voice to garner student attention by saying “If you can hear my voice, clap once.” Students clapped and quieted down quickly. When having students

read from the overhead, consider turning off the overhead lights so it is easier to read. The story mentioned hot dogs stretching from CA to PA. Just as I was thinking that it would be nice to have a visual, Teacher 1 pulled down a map to show students; well done! Teacher 1 asked students to identify what the main idea of the passage was; she asked students to think before they answered. Teacher 2 circulated and asked a few students to sit up. Teacher 1 worked with a student orally to help him go from a topic “selling hot dogs” to a main idea “A lot of hot dogs are sold in America.” After Teacher 1 explained what a supporting detail was, she asked Teacher 2 if she wanted to read the answer choices. It appeared that they hadn’t planned that, but that Teacher 2 was ready to jump in. After reading the answer choices, Teacher 2 told students she liked to eliminate the inappropriate choices. This is a good way to help students do test taking. The use of the Equity cards is helping ensure that even the quieter students are being asked to participate. Right now, quite a few students are starting to disengage. Just as I noticed this, Teacher 1 asked students to have a debate with the other students at the table to see whether they think the answer is A or D. Both teachers appear very attuned to when students are starting to disengage and they will get kids to talk to one another when that is about to occur. I also like how they are keeping these brain breaks short and sweet. They got student attention by using the Peace sign. Nice differentiation of ways to get attention.

Teacher 2 called out a few names to go into the room next door. 21 students stayed in the large group and 5 students went to the smaller room. Teachers were using **Alternative Teaching** (large group/small group). Teacher 1 introduced a new vocabulary word with

her large group and asked students to use their Writer's Workshop book and their Vocabulary sheet. Typically we do not recommend that students in the large group get new content when using Alternative Teaching approach as this means that the small group is missing out on the new content. The large group was learning the word "FACT" and Teacher 1 had students use thumbs up and thumbs down to show they understood what facts were.

In the small group, Teacher 2 had students read in turns from the book. On the board, it said "1. Choose topic, 2. Write questions, 3. Read article, 4. Find and highlight answers, 5. Paraphrase." Teacher 2 helped explain what "paraphrase" meant and clarified how important it was not to plagiarize. This group of students appears to have difficulty with reading; were they selected as the lower readers? How are they going to get the information that the rest of the class is getting on the new vocabulary? Are all students going to go through the small group eventually? I do appreciate the fact that teachers have this space and ability to work with small groups as needed. It appears that the teachers are using **Alternative Teaching** to work with students for Writer's Workshop.

I once again enjoyed observing these two teachers. I would have liked to see Station Teaching (as was on the agenda) but I still saw strong Team Teaching & Alternative Teaching. These teachers appear to have a great rapport and Teacher 1 is clearly willing to "share the stage" and actively includes Teacher 2 in the instruction.

Follow-Up from Last Meeting: At the end of last session, I had requested to see various co-teaching regrouping approaches. Teachers stated that they frequently use a smaller

group setting and have found it very effective. Teacher 1 had not received co-teaching training and had requested materials and training. I had asked Ms. Ruth Dill to get her copies of the materials and to put this team on the schedule for future professional development. Teachers told me that Teacher 1 did get those materials. The debrief time on the schedule for today does not work for the teachers so I got Teacher 2's email address and will find another time to debrief.

CO-TEACHING CHECKLIST: LOOK FORS**Leona Jackson Middle School**General Educator: CSpecial Service Provider: SSubject: ELA 6thObserver: Dr. Wendy MurawskiDate/Time: 8:00-9:00am February 21, 2012

	LOOK FOR ITEMS	0 – Didn't See It 1 – Saw an Attempt 2 – Saw It Done Well		
		0	1	2
Two or more professionals working together in the same physical space.	0= only one adult; two adults not communicating at all; class always divided into two rooms 1= two adults in same room but very little communication or collaborative work 2 = two adults in same room; both engaged in class & each other (even if not perfectly)			2
Class environment demonstrates parity and collaboration (both names on board, sharing materials, and space).	0=no demonstration of parity/collaboration; room appears to belong to one teacher only 1=some attempt at parity; both adults share materials and space 2=clear parity; both names on board/report card; two desks or shared space; obvious feeling from teachers that it is "our room"		1	
Both teachers begin and end class together and remain in the room the entire time.	0=one adult is absent or late; adults may leave room for time w/o reason related to this class 1=one adult may be late but for remaining time, they work together 2=both adults begin and end together, and are with students the entire time <i>*note – if adults have planned to use a regrouping approach (e.g., "parallel") and one adult takes a group of students out of the room (e.g., to the library), that is perfectly acceptable</i>			2
During instruction, both teachers assist students with and without disabilities.	0=adults are not helping students or are only helping "their own" students 1= there is some helping of various students but adults primarily stay with a few of "their own" 2= it is clear that both adults are willing to help all students & that students are used to this			2
The class moves smoothly with evidence of co-planning and communication between co-teachers.	0=all planning appears to have been done by one adult and/or no planning is evident 1=minimal planning and communication is evident; most appears to be done by one adult 2=it is clear that both adults had input in lesson and communicate regularly as class progresses			2
Differentiated strategies, to include technology, are used to meet the range of learning needs.	0=there is no evidence of differentiation of instruction or use of technology in the classroom 1 = there is minimal differentiation and use of technology; most differentiation appears to be focused on groups rather than individuals 2= it is clear that adults considered individual student needs and differentiation and use of technology is evident where needed to		1	

<p>A variety of instructional approaches (5 co-teaching approaches) are used, include regrouping students.</p>	<p>0=Students remain in large class setting; Adults rely solely on One Teach/One Support or Team 1= Adults regroup students (using Alternative, Parallel, or Station) at least once 2 = Adults use more than one of the 5 approaches (Friend & Cook’s One Teach/One Support, Team, Parallel, Station & Alternative); at least one of the approaches involves regrouping students <i>* note – if teachers have been observed using other approaches in the past and only one approach is observed today (e.g., Stations), it is acceptable to recall previous observations and give a 2 for using a variety of approaches as adults have demonstrated competency</i></p>		<p>1</p>	
<p>Both teachers engage in appropriate behavior management strategies as needed and are consistent in their approach to behavior management.</p>	<p>0= there is no obvious plan for behavior management, nor do adults appear to communicate about how they are approaching class management; possibly inappropriate class management 1=behavior management strategies are utilized but there is very little clear evidence of how adults have communicated about their use 2=it is evident that adults have discussed how they will approach classroom/behavior management and adults are consistent in their approach; clear communication between adults</p>			<p>2</p>
<p>It is difficult to tell the special educator from the general educator.</p>	<p>0=Observer could easily determine who was the general/special educator by their language/roles/ lack of parity. 1=Observer could tell who was the general/special educator but there was a clear attempt at parity between the teachers. 2=Observer would not be able to tell who was the general/special educator as parity was evident and adults shared the roles and responsibilities in the classroom.</p>		<p>1</p>	
<p>It is difficult to tell the special education students from the general education students.</p>	<p>0=Observer could easily determine who were the general/special education students by their lack of integration (e.g., students at back or separated from class). 1=Observer could tell who were the general/special education students but there was a clear attempt at inclusion of students for most activities. 2=Observer would not be able to tell who were the general/special education students as parity was evident and adults shared the responsibilities for working with all students.</p>			<p>2</p>

NOTES: Used Team Teaching to review Student Conduct rules at beginning of class; used Alternative Teaching toward the end of the period; excellent rapport between teachers

CO-TEACHING CHECKLIST: LISTEN FORS**Leona Jackson Middle School**General Educator: CSpecial Service Provider: SSubject: ELA 6thObserver: Dr. Wendy MurawskiDate/Time: 8:00-9:00am February 21, 2012

	LISTEN FOR ITEMS	0 – Didn't See It 1 – Saw an Attempt 2 – Saw It Done Well		
		0	1	2
Co-Teachers use language (“we”; “our”) demonstrates true collaboration and shared responsibility.	<i>0=Adults use “I” language frequently (e.g., “I want you to...” Or “In my class...”), lacking parity. 1=Adults attempt to use “we” language and include each other, but it is clear that one adult is more used to “ruling” the class 2=Adults clearly use “we” language (e.g., “We would like you to...”), showing that they both share the responsibility and students know they are equally in charge.</i>			2
Co-Teachers phrase questions and statements so that it is obvious that all students in the class are included	<i>0=Class is very teacher-directed and little involvement by students; questions/statements are general and not inclusive of all students 1=A few statements/questions are phrased to encourage participation from a variety of students. 2=A clear attempt is made by both adults to engage all students through the use of a variety of types of questions and statements.</i>			2
Students’ conversations evidence a sense of community (including peers with and without disabilities).	<i>0=Students do not talk to one another ever during class or specific students are clearly excluded from the student interactions. 1=Most students appear to be included in the majority of student interactions. 2=It is evident from the students’ actions and words that all students are considered an equal part of the class and are included in all student interactions.</i>			2
Co-teachers ask questions at a variety of levels to meet all students’ needs (basic recall to higher order thinking).	<i>0=Adults do not use questions or ask questions geared just to one level (to the middle or “watered down”) 1=Adults use closed and open questions at a variety of levels in a general manner. 2=Adults used closed and open questions at a variety of levels in a way that demonstrates they are able to differentiate for specific students in order to ensure maximum (appropriate) levels of challenge.</i>		1	

NOTES: Teachers communicated with each other on occasion. Student responses were elicited by using cards with names on them. Multiple opportunities were given for students to talk to each other at their tables to check answers.

COTEACHING NARRATIVE

Jackson Middle School

General Educator: McW

Special Service Provider: M

Subject: Social Studies

Observer: Dr. Wendy Murawski Date/Time: 9:00-9:45am February 21, 2012

When I arrived, Teacher 1 was at the front of the room and Teacher 2 was circulating and helping individual students. Teacher 1 was using the Elmo & writing notes from the story, as she faced the class. Teacher 1 used names of students in the room to get their attention as she said “Nothing is more aggravating than when you are not paying attention to what I am writing up here.” Teacher 1 also said “As Mrs. M and I are walking around and checking your story evidence, we are looking for paraphrasing and at least one direct quotation.” I like how Teacher 1 included Teacher 2 in that statement, making it clear that both teachers will be working with students. The phone rang and Teacher 1 went to answer it, as Teacher 2 continued working with individual students. Someone is installing software on Teacher 2’s computer so Teacher 1 told her it was up to her if she needed to go or not; Teacher 2 smiled and left the room at 9:07am. Teacher 1 continued to circulate around the room as kids were working. I was a bit disappointed that Teacher 2 chose to leave the room. I understand that teachers aren’t always able to schedule when things happen, but a common complaint of co-teaching is when general education teachers feel they can’t count on their special education counterparts being present on a consistent basis. Perhaps Teacher 2 could have asked an administrator to help the computer technician so she could continue to be in the room during instruction.

There appear to be 28 students in the room. There is a lot of movement right now as students are up, getting and returning books. Twice there was cursing. Teacher 1 heard the second incident and told the student to wash his hand (he cut his finger) and that she and he would then discuss the language. After the student returned from washing his hand, she stepped outside with him and quietly discussed the behavior. I appreciate how she removed him from the room and dealt with the behavior without embarrassing the student. The student came back and apologized for his language to me.

A few students are still up and moving around, trying to find their books. It is unfortunate that Teacher 2 is out of the room as it appears it would be helpful to have two teachers circulating right now to help with in-seat behavior and academic engagement. As I look around, I see some students actively engaged and clearly copying from the board, while others are just sitting and looking around and yet others are walking around. One young man in particular (with P letter jacket) has been standing up since I walked in 10 minutes ago.

A student asked a question and Teacher 1 clarified so that other students could also hear how to explain a quote.

Because this is such a large and active class, I would be interested in seeing how co-teachers could create smaller groups. For example, during this type of instruction, teachers could use Parallel Teaching so that both teachers would be working with $\frac{1}{2}$ of the class, rather than Teacher 1 having to circulate and take care of the entire class.

It is unclear to me, since I'm just sitting down and not walking around, if teachers are using techniques for differentiation. It appears that all students are using the same textbook and papers. Are any students received adapted materials? Is there enrichment built in for any students who are gifted or high-achieving? Can all students read this level of text? If not, how were they receiving adaptations? Are all students able to understand the text and do the assignment at this level? Could erasable highlighters or highlighter tape help some read and access the text? It is possible teachers have embedded differentiation techniques and I just cannot see them due to my position in the room.

Note: It is 9:14 (14 minutes after I arrived and the student in the P jacket just sat down for the first time.)

Teacher 1 used the "3-2-1" technique to get student attention. Students quieted down and listened. Teacher 1 explained story evidence. A student called out "What does 'optimistic' mean?" and Teacher 1 explained "hopeful." As voices began to rise again, Teacher 1 said "I'll wait" and used silence until all students were quiet and focused on her. She continued to explain her answers by using an example of a dialogue she had with a student in the class about his perception of Anne versus hers. Students are quiet as Teacher 1 is writing.

Teacher 1 asked students to read what she wrote. Students couldn't read it and she asked if they needed it larger, which they did and which she fixed. I appreciated her making the

Elmo larger as I wasn't able to read it before either. The purple pen might be a bit difficult for students to read. Teacher 1 asked kids to think about how they could make her statement "better". I like that she allowed students to work together to make this decision. She asked students to say "1,2, or 3" on rating her statement. The boy in the P letter jacket put up a 4. Most others were putting up a 1,2 or 3. Two boys sitting in front of me didn't put up their fingers and Teacher 1 asked them to do so. Teacher 1 told students that she wants feedback from the students regarding her writing, which is what students will be doing for their own writing in the future; that is a nice way to model what they are going to be doing.

Teacher 2 returned to the room at 9:23. She immediately began to circulate and work with individual students. She is clearly comfortable with the students and knows what they are working on, but she does look a bit frazzled and she moves quickly from group to group. Teacher 1 told the students that they would need to finish this work before they were excused for the period; students groaned. The student in the P letter jacket got up and began to walk around again; Teacher 1 asked him to have a seat. She repeated her request 3x and then he sat down.

The room environment is set up so that students are seated in "pods" of about 6 students per group. There is a large amount of student work posted around the room. Class rules are posted, as are negative consequences. I always recommend that positive consequences be posted as well so students know what could happen if they follow the rules, not just if they break them. If behavior is a major issue with this particular group of

students, that might be the perfect area for the special educator to bring in specific strategies. I would love to see her input being more strategic than just walking around, helping with individual students to get on-task. What specific positive behavior support or classroom management strategies are being used consistently in this class? What strategies have brought forth by the special educator for any students with behavioral disabilities or needs?

Teacher 1 went over to talk to the boy in P letter jacket. She told him he was being unproductive and he needed to be responsible for his own behavior. Teacher 2 continued to circulate around the room, helping a variety of students. As I look up now, there are 4 students with their hands raised, waiting for assistance. A student walked up to Teacher 1 and she said, "I'll help you when you sit down and raise your hand like Deron is." Again, I am struck by how the large group set-up might be less effective with this lesson than a smaller group set-up, even if both groups were doing the same instruction. That would enable both teachers just to focus on 14 students, instead of both trying to help all 28 students. Teacher 2 just told the student in the P letter jacket that he would be staying in for detention. I haven't observed any specific behavioral strategies used with him, though I don't know where he started behaviorally or if today would be considered a "good" or "bad" day for him or perhaps even a "typical" one.

Teacher 1 stated that "we need to work on our details" to Teacher 2. She told her that students rated her own work a "2" so she wanted to see even more detail than that.

Teacher 2 said "OK." This was the only conversation or interaction I observed between

the two teachers, so it is not possible to comment on their relationship. I'm unsure what type of rapport they have. Both continued to circulate until the end of the class period.

This is the class where I was told last time that the teachers are not co-teaching, but are just using "One Teach-One Support." It is not clear to me, having not yet spoken with the teachers, if they have chosen just to use an In-Class Support approach on purpose or by default. I do not know if they want to co-teach but don't have time, or if they would prefer not to co-teach. Because Teacher 2 was out of the room for the majority of the observation, I was only able to see One Teach, One Support with Teacher 1 in the lead role. I don't know if teachers typically share the stage more or if they are comfortable regrouping students.

The purpose of my observation is not to assess but to support and give feedback related to co-teaching. Given this active group of students, it does appear that two teachers who are willing to share responsibility and instruction would be a strong instructional choice for regrouping for differentiation and increasing academic engagement.

Follow-Up: Upon debrief, I learned that both teachers were familiar with co-teaching in previous teaching placements, though only Teacher 2 has been to my trainings. I told Teacher 1 that I would request a copy of my book for her from Ruth Dill. The teachers stated that they do not have sufficient time for planning, but they do regroup students for writing. Teacher 1 also mentioned that the students' benchmark scores have gone up from 9% to 79% (approx), which is impressive! They both identified certain students who continued to struggle, as well as students whose behavior and academics have improved.

CO-TEACHING CHECKLIST: LOOK FORs**Jackson Middle School**General Educator: McWSpecial Service Provider: MSubject: Social StudiesObserver: Dr. Wendy Murawski Date/Time: 9:00-9:45am February 21, 2012

	LOOK FOR ITEMS	0 – Didn't See It 1 – Saw an Attempt 2 – Saw It Done Well		
		0	1	2
Two or more professionals working together in the same physical space.	<i>0= only one adult; two adults not communicating at all; class always divided into two rooms 1= two adults in same room but very little communication or collaborative work 2 = two adults in same room; both engaged in class & each other (even if not perfectly)</i>		1	
Class environment demonstrates parity and collaboration (both names on board, sharing materials, and space).	<i>0=no demonstration of parity/collaboration; room appears to belong to one teacher only 1=some attempt at parity; both adults share materials and space 2=clear parity; both names on board/report card; two desks or shared space; obvious feeling from teachers that it is "our room"</i>	0		
Both teachers begin and end class together and remain in the room the entire time.	<i>0=one adult is absent or late; adults may leave room for time w/o reason related to this class 1=one adult may be late but for remaining time, they work together 2=both adults begin and end together, and are with students the entire time *note – if adults have planned to use a regrouping approach (e.g., "parallel") and one adult takes a group of students out of the room (e.g., to the library), that is perfectly acceptable</i>	0		
During instruction, both teachers assist students with and without disabilities.	<i>0=adults are not helping students or are only helping "their own" students 1= there is some helping of various students but adults primarily stay with a few of "their own" 2= it is clear that both adults are willing to help all students & that students are used to this</i>			2
The class moves smoothly with evidence of co-planning and communication between co-teachers.	<i>0=all planning appears to have been done by one adult and/or no planning is evident 1=minimal planning and communication is evident; most appears to be done by one adult 2=it is clear that both adults had input in lesson and communicate regularly as class progresses</i>	0		
Differentiated strategies, to include technology, are used to meet the range of learning needs.	<i>0=there is no evidence of differentiation of instruction or use of technology in the classroom 1 = there is minimal differentiation and use of technology; most differentiation appears to be focused on groups rather than individuals 2 = it is clear that adults considered individual student needs and differentiation and use of technology is evident where needed to</i>	0 (Elmo only)		

<p>A variety of instructional approaches (5 co-teaching approaches) are used, include regrouping students.</p>	<p>0=Students remain in large class setting; Adults rely solely on One Teach/One Support or Team 1= Adults regroup students (using Alternative, Parallel, or Station) at least once 2 = Adults use more than one of the 5 approaches (Friend & Cook’s One Teach/One Support, Team, Parallel, Station & Alternative); at least one of the approaches involves regrouping students * note – if teachers have been observed using other approaches in the past and only one approach is observed today (e.g., Stations), it is acceptable to recall previous observations and give a 2 for using a variety of approaches as adults have demonstrated competency</p>	<p>0</p>		
<p>Both teachers engage in appropriate behavior management strategies as needed and are consistent in their approach to behavior management.</p>	<p>0= there is no obvious plan for behavior management, nor do adults appear to communicate about how they are approaching class management; possibly inappropriate class management 1=behavior management strategies are utilized but there is very little clear evidence of how adults have communicated about their use 2=it is evident that adults have discussed how they will approach classroom/behavior management and adults are consistent in their approach; clear communication between adults</p>		<p>1</p>	
<p>It is difficult to tell the special educator from the general educator.</p>	<p>0=Observer could easily determine who was the general/special educator by their language/roles/ lack of parity. 1=Observer could tell who was the general/special educator but there was a clear attempt at parity between the teachers. 2=Observer would not be able to tell who was the general/special educator as parity was evident and adults shared the roles and responsibilities in the classroom.</p>	<p>0</p>		
<p>It is difficult to tell the special education students from the general education students.</p>	<p>0=Observer could easily determine who were the general/special education students by their lack of integration (e.g., students at back or separated from class). 1=Observer could tell who were the general/special education students but there was a clear attempt at inclusion of students for most activities. 2=Observer would not be able to tell who were the general/special education students as parity was evident and adults shared the responsibilities for working with all students.</p>		<p>1</p>	

NOTES: Used One Teach-One Support solely. Special educator was out of the room for a large portion of the observation, as someone was working on her computer in another room. I would have hoped that the special educator would have rescheduled the computer refresh or would have let them know she was teaching right now and wouldn’t be able to be there. Perhaps an administrator could have helped ensure that someone was there to watch the computer technician if that was necessary.

CO-TEACHING CHECKLIST: LISTEN FORS**Jackson Middle School**General Educator: McWSpecial Service Provider: MSubject: Social StudiesObserver: Dr. Wendy MurawskiDate/Time: 9:00-9:45am February 21, 2012

		LISTEN FOR ITEMS			0 – Didn't See It	1 – Saw an Attempt	2 – Saw It Done Well
					0	1	2
Co-Teachers use language (“we”; “our”) demonstrates true collaboration and shared responsibility.	<i>0=Adults use “I” language frequently (e.g., “I want you to...” Or “In my class...”), lacking parity. 1=Adults attempt to use “we” language and include each other, but it is clear that one adult is more used to “ruling” the class 2=Adults clearly use “we” language (e.g., “We would like you to...”), showing that they both share the responsibility and students know they are equally in charge.</i>					1	
Co-Teachers phrase questions and statements so that it is obvious that all students in the class are included	<i>0=Class is very teacher-directed and little involvement by students; questions/statements are general and not inclusive of all students 1=A few statements/questions are phrased to encourage participation from a variety of students. 2=A clear attempt is made by both adults to engage all students through the use of a variety of types of questions and statements.</i>					1	
Students’ conversations evidence a sense of community (including peers with and without disabilities).	<i>0=Students do not talk to one another ever during class or specific students are clearly excluded from the student interactions. 1=Most students appear to be included in the majority of student interactions. 2=It is evident from the students’ actions and words that all students are considered an equal part of the class and are included in all student interactions.</i>					1	
Co-teachers ask questions at a variety of levels to meet all students’ needs (basic recall to higher order thinking).	<i>0=Adults do not use questions or ask questions geared just to one level (to the middle or “watered down”) 1=Adults use closed and open questions at a variety of levels in a general manner. 2=Adults used closed and open questions at a variety of levels in a way that demonstrates they are able to differentiate for specific students in order to ensure maximum (appropriate) levels of challenge.</i>					1	

NOTES: Communication was primarily teacher-directed with teacher asking questions to students. Very little student-student communication that was encouraged by the teachers. Lots of student-student communication done on the side.