

Implementation of Coplanning Tool

Background on the development of the coplanning tool

- Goal was to create **indicators** of what **coplanning** looks like when done well & leads to the professional growth of BOTH teachers
- Tool was developed by examining research on coplanning, viewing clips of coplanning sessions, & eliciting the thoughts of coteachers & teacher educators
- Tool was revised based on feedback from teacher educators & coteaching researchers

How the coplanning tool could be used

- Coteaching facilitators could use the tool in workshops/trainings to operationalize coplanning & make coplanning more concrete
- Coteaching pairs could use the tool for self-reflection purposes in order to enhance coplanning implementation
- University supervisors could use the tool to provide targeted coteaching feedback/support, providing suggestions on what coplanning might look like & how it could be enhanced

Additional notes on use

- The tool is not meant to be evaluative, rather educative & a starting point for reflection & conversation
- The tool is meant to be used when the intention is collaborating on planning, not when one teacher is leading planning

Questions to consider when using the coplanning tool

- Does the coplanning session focus on planning for big picture (i.e., unit) or small picture (i.e., individual lesson)?
- Did planning occur outside of the coplanning session? If so, what role did each coteacher play in this individual planning?
- Is the lesson being coplanned going to be cotaught?
- Where in the program is the teacher candidate in learning how to teach? How might the stage in the program influence the level of collaboration achieved?

The tool may allow coteachers to self-reflect & determine...

- The level of collaboration & co-construction/cogeneration of ideas
- How much thinking (metacognition) was shared during the coplanning session
- Characteristics of the power dynamic including level of co-respect & shared responsibility
- The extent to which the collaboration led to the professional growth of BOTH teachers

Supplemental coplanning resources

- Research-based planning practices ([article](#))
- [Coplanning lesson plan templates](#)
- [Coplanning session structure](#)
- [10 tips for coplanning efficiently](#)

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
Content			
Planning practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Backward design</i> • <i>Data driven</i> • <i>Student need</i> • <i>Reference to specific instructional approaches</i> 	<input type="checkbox"/> Coteachers do not overtly utilize planning practices <input type="checkbox"/> No clear connection to learning goal and/or connection to prior student assessment & needs	<input type="checkbox"/> Coteachers utilize planning practices but do not overtly discuss their implementation/use <input type="checkbox"/> Coteachers identify a learning goal, but this goal is not grounded in previous student assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of instructional approaches & assessments but not in regards to identified goal <input type="checkbox"/> Focus on supporting student learning with general, whole-class scaffolds	<input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers utilize overt & research-based planning practices <input type="checkbox"/> Clear articulation of learning goal & discussion of students' prior knowledge related to selected goal <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of instructional approaches & assessments that align with goal & elicit evidence of student learning <input type="checkbox"/> Focus on supporting student learning with identification of scaffolds & supports for diverse learners
Discipline-specific content	<input type="checkbox"/> Coteachers not engaged in exploration or discussion of discipline-specific content	<input type="checkbox"/> One coteacher discusses & provides information on discipline-specific content	<input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers engage in discussion of discipline-specific content, collaboratively exploring and/or seeking clarification on content themes & concepts
Coinstructing roles & responsibilities for upcoming lesson	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited or no discussion of roles & responsibilities for upcoming lesson	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of roles & responsibilities for upcoming lesson; however, responsibility is not shared <input type="checkbox"/> Coinstructional strategy is selected but may not be the most appropriate strategy to support student learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers engage in overt discussion of & planning for roles for the upcoming lesson; responsibility is shared <input type="checkbox"/> Coinstructional strategy selected is most appropriate to support student learning
Logistics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pacing</i> • <i>Transitions</i> • <i>Material creation & distribution</i> 	<input type="checkbox"/> No discussion or too little discussion of lesson logistics	<input type="checkbox"/> Too much emphasis placed on discussion of lesson logistics	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate discussion of lesson logistics

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
Productivity			
How productive is the coplanning session? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structured & focused Outcomes accomplished 	<input type="checkbox"/> Coplanning session has no structure and/or focus <input type="checkbox"/> Little planning has been accomplished by the end of the session	<input type="checkbox"/> Coplanning session has a structure and focus, however, a planning goal is not articulated <input type="checkbox"/> Planning has been accomplished by the end of the session but next steps are unclear	<input type="checkbox"/> Coplanning session has a clear structure/agenda including the articulation of a planning goal <input type="checkbox"/> Coteachers summarize learnings from planning and identify next steps

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
Discourse			
What is the type & purpose of talk? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeking/providing clarification Asking questions Sharing ideas Explaining & justifying thinking 	<input type="checkbox"/> Few questions are posed; discourse includes statements that are mainly declarative and/or imperative <input type="checkbox"/> Discourse includes little or no sharing of ideas <input type="checkbox"/> Discourse includes minimal explanation/justification of thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> Some questions are posed and/or answered <input type="checkbox"/> Discourse includes some sharing of ideas <input type="checkbox"/> Discourse includes some explanation/justification of thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers identify problems/pose questions and seek solutions/answers <input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers share ideas <input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers share explanation/justification of thinking (e.g. decisions made, planning practices)

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
Discourse			
Who does the talking & controls the topic? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Balance in quantity of talk, turn taking</i> <i>Creating space for think time & input</i> <i>Sharing of topic control</i> 	<input type="checkbox"/> One coteacher does the majority of the talking; there is little or no turn taking <input type="checkbox"/> One coteacher engaged and directs planning, providing little room for input	<input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers talk but not equally; there is some turn taking <input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers engaged in planning but with unequal contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers talk equally; there is a balance of turn taking <input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers engaged in planning with equal contributions
What ideas are taken up & how are decisions made? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Uptake of ideas</i> <i>Joint problem solving & decision making</i> 	<input type="checkbox"/> Little or no uptake of ideas <input type="checkbox"/> One coteacher makes decisions for the pair <input type="checkbox"/> Disagreements remain unresolved	<input type="checkbox"/> Mainly one coteacher uptakes ideas <input type="checkbox"/> Some shared decision making <input type="checkbox"/> Disagreements may exist; however, the pair shows an attempt at resolving disagreement	<input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers uptake ideas equally <input type="checkbox"/> Decisions are made collaboratively <input type="checkbox"/> Disagreements are collaboratively discussed/resolved

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
Tone			
Body language & intonation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Active listening</i> 	<input type="checkbox"/> Coteachers do not sit near each other and engage in limited eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Body language does not show active listening for both coteachers <input type="checkbox"/> Coteacher's intonation shows disagreement and/or skepticism	<input type="checkbox"/> Coteachers sit near each other and engage in some eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Body language shows active listening mainly for one coteacher <input type="checkbox"/> Coteacher's intonation is both supportive and unsupportive and does not always match body language	<input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers are positioned toward each other with appropriate eye contact throughout <input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers lean in, nod/tilt head to show active listening <input type="checkbox"/> Both coteachers' intonation expresses emphasis, conveys surprise, and/or poses questions

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
Cooperating Teacher Stance			
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Leader/Follower</p> <p>Cooperating teacher is the leader, driving the conversation and decisions with little justification OR Cooperating teacher relinquishes most of the control to the teacher candidate</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Educator</p> <p>Cooperating teacher is the teacher educator, providing modeling and facilitating teacher candidate learning</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Collaborator/Learner</p> <p>Cooperating teacher is a collaborator, posing authentic questions, sharing ideas, and positioning themselves as a learner</p>
Teacher Candidate Stance			
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Follower/Leader</p> <p>Teacher candidate is the follower – observing and listening – with contributions mainly in response to the cooperating teacher OR Teacher candidate is the leader, driving the conversation and decisions with little justification, sometimes not open to the mentoring/feedback of the cooperating teacher</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Student</p> <p>Teacher candidate is a student, asking questions to clarify the thinking and decisions of the cooperating teacher</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Collaborator/Learner</p> <p>Teacher candidate is a collaborator, posing authentic questions, sharing ideas, and positioning themselves as a learner</p>