

# Implementation of Coassessing Tool

## Background on the development of the coassessing tool

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

## How the coassessing tool could be used

- Coteaching facilitators could use the tool in workshops/trainings to operationalize coassessing & make coassessing more concrete
- Coteaching pairs could use the tool for self-reflection purposes in order to enhance coassessing implementation
- University supervisors could use the tool to provide targeted coteaching feedback/support, providing suggestions on what coassessing 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 analyzing student assessment

## Questions to consider when using the coassessing tool

- Who graded the student work that is being reflected upon?
- What is the type of assessment under analysis?
- 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 & reflection/analysis
- How much thinking (metacognition) was shared during the coassessing session
- Characteristics of the power dynamic including the extent to which both coteachers have an equal voice
- The extent to which the collaboration led to the professional growth of BOTH teachers

## Supplemental coassessing resources

- Data-driven reflection ([article](#))
- [Coassessing session structure](#) and [data discussion protocol](#)
- [10 tips for coassessing efficiently](#)

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
<b>Reflection Practices</b>			
<p><b>Analysis of student performance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>In relation to intended outcomes &amp; evaluative criteria</i></li> <li>● <i>With reference to patterns in data</i></li> <li>● <i>With reference to students as assets</i></li> <li>● <i>With implications for follow-up teaching</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> No clear connection to student performance in respect to intended outcomes and/or detailed criteria</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Patterns of learning identified for whole class or individuals but not both</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of student performance represents a deficit view of students and their backgrounds</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Little or no identification of next steps for instruction based on analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Connection made to student performance in respect to intended outcomes</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Patterns of learning identified for whole class and some individual students</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of student performance includes evidence of both deficit and asset-based views of students and their backgrounds</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Identification of general next steps for instruction based on analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clear &amp; accurate analysis of student performance in respect to intended outcomes &amp; detailed criteria</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Patterns of learning identified for whole class, individuals, and subgroups of students</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Analysis of student performance represents an asset-based view of students and their backgrounds</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Identification of detailed and appropriate next steps for instruction based on analysis</li> </ul>

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

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
<b>Discourse</b>			
<b>What is the type &amp; purpose of talk?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Seeking/providing clarification</i></li> <li>• <i>Asking questions</i></li> <li>• <i>Sharing ideas</i></li> <li>• <i>Explaining &amp; justifying thinking</i></li> </ul>	<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, analysis)

Criterion	Low-Level	Medium-Level	High-Level
<b>Discourse</b>			
<b>Who does the talking &amp; controls the topic?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Balance in quantity of talk, turn taking</i></li> <li>• <i>Creating space for think time &amp; input</i></li> <li>• <i>Sharing of topic control</i></li> </ul>	<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 analysis, 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 analysis 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 analysis with equal contributions
<b>What ideas are taken up &amp; how are decisions made?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Uptake of ideas</i></li> <li>• <i>Joint problem solving &amp; decision making</i></li> </ul>	<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
<b>Tone</b>			
<b>Body language &amp; intonation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Active listening</i></li> </ul>	<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
<b>Cooperating Teacher Stance</b>			
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Leader/Follower</b> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Teacher Educator</b> Cooperating teacher is the teacher educator, providing modeling and facilitating teacher candidate learning	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Collaborator/Learner</b> Cooperating teacher is a collaborator, posing authentic questions, sharing ideas, and positioning themselves as a learner
<b>Teacher Candidate Stance</b>			
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Follower/Leader</b> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Student</b> Teacher candidate is a student, asking questions to clarify the thinking and decisions of the cooperating teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Collaborator/Learner</b> Teacher candidate is a collaborator, posing authentic questions, sharing ideas, and positioning themselves as a learner