

**California State University San Marcos
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Mission Statement**

The mission of the College of Education Community is to collaboratively transform public education by preparing thoughtful educators and advancing professional practices. We are committed to diversity, educational equity, and social justice, exemplified through reflective teaching, life-long learning, innovative research, and ongoing service. Our practices demonstrate a commitment to student centered education, diversity, collaboration, professionalism, and shared governance.

**EDEX 638 Shared Leadership in Educational Excellence for All
(3 credit units)**

Instructors: Joe Wiseman jwiseman@sandi.net
 Stephanie Brown swebster@sandi.net

Course Description

In this course, participants develop and demonstrate an understanding of organizational systems and systems change agency through an examination of current theory, research, and practice in general and special education school reform. They explore models of and develop skills in leadership and management; advanced interpersonal communication; collaborative teaming and consultation; creative problem solving and conflict resolution; supervision, coaching, and training of others; resource procurement and provision; interagency coordination, and change agency. Participants apply skills to address curricular, instructional, assessment, and systems change challenges in school and community settings.

Prerequisites: This course is available to any credentialed teacher, with permission of instructor.

Education Specialist Level II Standards

The following table indicates the CTC Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Level II Professional standards addressed by EDEX 638 and the level (i.e., knowledge, application) at which each standard is demonstrated. Course objectives, assignments, and assessments are expressly designed to address these standards.

M/M/S	M/M/S	M/M/S	M/M	M/M	M/M	M/S	M/S
13	15	17	18	19	20	18	19
K/A	K/A	K/A	K/A	K/A	K/A	K/A	K/A

Key:

- M/M/S = Mild/Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Competency (number indicates CTC standard addressed)
- M/M = Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Competency (number indicates CTC standard addressed)
- M/S = Moderate/Severe Education Specialist Competency (number indicates CTC standard addressed)
- K = Competence at **knowledge** level
- A = Competence at **application** level

To support your completion of the professional portfolio in EDMX 661, in EDEX 638 you are required to evidence competence for three standards – Mild/Moderate Standard 20 and Moderate/Severe Standards 18 and 19. For those starting EDEX 660 this semester, you must post in TaskStream a reflective narrative and attach at least two evidences of performance for each of these three standards. For those with paper portfolios, place products from this course in the file folders corresponding to the standards

identified with each assignment's instructions. See the entire Level II competency checklist provided in EDEX 660 for more detailed descriptions of each standard and potential evidences.

Mild/Moderate Standard 20 - Collaboration and Consultation

The Level II program provides opportunities for each candidate to develop skills in communication, collaboration and consultation with teachers and other school personnel, community professionals, and parents. Each candidate is able to communicate relevant social, academic, and behavioral information in the areas of assessment, curriculum, behavior management, social adjustment, and legal requirements. Each candidate is prepared to serve in a coordination function before, during, and after special education placement has been made.

Moderate/Severe Standard 18 - Advanced Communication Skills

Each candidate demonstrates effective communication skills in the areas of respectful collaboration, managing conflicts, supervising staff such as paraprofessionals, and networking and negotiating, including family members.

Moderate/Severe Standard 19 - Leadership and Management Skills

Each candidate demonstrates leadership and management skills to coordinate and facilitate educational programs, including constructing and following efficient schedules that meet individual student needs and maximize available resources. Each candidate demonstrates the ability to work effectively within integrated service delivery models and actively participates in school restructuring and reform efforts to impact systems change.

Content Goals and Performance Objectives

The participant will:

- Goal 1. develop and demonstrate an understanding of organizational systems and systems change agency through an examination of current and emerging theory, research, and practice in general and special education school reform.**
(Standards M/M/S 15.1–15.5; M/M 19.2 & 19.4; M/S 19.1, 19.2, 19.5, & 19.8)

Objectives:

- describe frameworks for and approaches to systems change.
- articulate strategies for building consensus for a vision of caring, effective, and inclusive schooling.
- identify research-based and promising curricular, instructional, and assessment skills needed by educators to meet the needs of diverse learners.
- identify resources and incentives essential for school restructuring and reform efforts.
- identify the elements of the Ambrose Complex Change model illustrated in case studies of systems change toward inclusive education.

- Goal 2. explore models of and develop skills in leadership and management.**

Objectives:

- be acquainted with theory and research related to leadership, creativity, supervision, and consultation. (Standards M/M/S 15.1 – 15.5; M/M 20/1, 20.2, 20.3, 20/55; M/S 18.1, 18.4)
- articulate actions (i.e., vision, skills, incentives, resources, action planning) to facilitate the creation of caring and effective educational experiences at their school site and with families. (Standards M/S 18.2 & 18.4; M/S 19.1, 19.2, 19.5, 19.8)

Goal 3. explore integrated delivery of services and interagency coordination and collaboration.

Objectives:

- optimize the use of available resources in an integrated fashion. (M/M/S 15.1 – 15.3; M/M 19.1 – 19.4)

Goal 4. explore models of and develop skills in advanced interpersonal communication and collaborative teaming and consultation.

Objectives:

- demonstrate awareness of professional leadership, communication, trust building, and controversy management strategies when operating as team members within the school or community. (M/M 20.1 & 20.3; M/S 18.2, 18.2, 18.4)
- demonstrate improved collaborative teaming and problem solving abilities with colleagues and/or parents of learners with special educational needs. (M/M 20.1 -20-3; M/S 18.1, 18.4, 18.6)
- work with others to collaborative team to solution find student and systems challenges. (M/M/S 15.1 – 15.3; M/M 20.2, 20.8, 20.9; M/S 18.6)
- delineate theoretical approaches and culturally competent strategies such as the Kahler Process Communication Model (PCM) to work with families with diverse backgrounds and students with complex behavioral and academic needs (M/M/S 14.16, M/M 20.2)

Goal 5. explore models of and develop skills in creative problem solving and conflict resolution.

Objectives:

- examine and use creative problem solving methods, such as the Parnes-Osborne Creative Problem Solving (CPS) model and the Kahler Process Communication Model (PCM), to solve systems-level and student learning challenges. (M/M/S 13.2–13.4; M/M 20.3, 20.8, 20.9)

Goal 6. explore models of and develop skills in supervision, coaching, and training of others.

Objectives:

- use a model of supervision (i.e., Peer Coaching) to coach peers to develop instructional skills and provide supervision to paraprofessionals and others. (M/M 20.5; MS 18.6)
- develop an inservice training module to enhance the knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions of others (professionals, paraprofessionals, parents, students, community members) regarding a critical aspect of special education (e.g., legal rights and responsibilities, inclusive best educational practices, universal design strategies). (M/M/S 17.1, 17.2; M/M 20.6, 20.7; M/S 18.3, 18.5; M/S 19.4, 19.6)

Professional and Administrative Requirements

1. Attend all class sessions. Be on time for class and for online discussions. Please call the instructor when you are unable to attend class or when you will be late. It is the policy of the CSUSM College of Education that any student who misses 20% or more of class time, class sessions, or on-line discussion time may not receive a passing grade for a course.

2. "Person-first" language (e.g., "Student with Autism" rather than "Autistic student;" "Johnny who has Down Syndrome" rather "My Down Syndrome student") must be used throughout all written and oral assignments and discussions.
3. Word process all written documents. Keep a copy of all of your work. You will want these copies for your records and use as BTSA & Level II professional portfolio entries.
4. Complete and submit all assignments and discussions on the due dates for full credit. If you have extraordinary circumstances that impact completion of your assignments, please let the instructor(s) know. Contact the instructor immediately if you have questions or concerns.
5. Participate in class and on-line discussions and group activities and demonstrate positive interpersonal skills with classmates and guests.
6. Select a class "buddy" or two (e.g., WebCT Discussion teammate, Inservice Module teammate) to ensure that you receive information and handouts, if you must miss a class.
 Buddy Name: _____ e-mail: _____
 Phone: _____ Fax: _____
7. Task Stream Electronic Portfolio. Students enrolling in EDMX 660 for the fall 2006 and spring 2007 semester must register by the second class for TaskStream access for a minimum of two years. Fees are paid online at www.TaskStream.com. Students will post selected assignments and make reflective comments to evidence their competence with regard to the Level II standards identified in this syllabus. For TaskStream directions, go to:
 <<http://lynx.csusm.edu/coe/eportfolio/Task.Stream.Directions.htm>> For directions on writing TaskStream Narratives, go to: <<http://lynx.csusm.edu/coe/eportfolio/Narrative.Directions.htm>>

Texts and Readings

Cummings, C. (1993). Peering in on peers. Snohomish, WA: Snohomish Publishing Co. (CU)

Villa, R., & Thousand, J. (2000). Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together. (2nd ed.) Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes. (V&T)

Selected handouts and journal articles posted on WebCT

Course Requirements	<u>Maximum Points</u>
I. Live Class Attendance and Participation (4 points per class X 9 classes)	36
II. School-Based Leadership Applications	37
III. Live Reading Reactions	08
IV. WebCT Reactions and Discussion Facilitation	<u>19</u>
TOTAL MAXIMUM POINTS	100

GRADING SCALE (in percentages):

A	94-100	A-	92-93	B+	89-91
B	86-88	B-	84-86	C+	81-83

NOTE: The minimum acceptable grade for a course in the professional education sequence is C+, and a B average must be maintained.

II. School-Based Leadership Applications (37 points)

A. COACHING AND SUPERVISION OF OTHERS (12 points)

⇒ Reinforcement Conference (5 points)

(Standards M/M 20.5, M/S 18.5, M/S 19.6)

Using the Carol Cummings “Peer Coaching” model of supervision and coaching to observe, design, deliver, and critique your delivery of a “reinforcement conference” with another professional, a paraprofessional, or other support provider. You will submit the following as evidence of your completion of this assignment:

- 1) The labeled script of the observed lesson
- 2) The conference plan in a format similar to that presented on pages 86 and 87 of the Cummings text.
- 3) The Coaching Checklist completed with items checked, indicating completion of the conference elements used (i.e., introduction, teacher analysis, reinforcement objectives, follow up)
- 4) The Teacher Feedback analysis on a form similar to that presented on page 92 of the Cummings text.
- 5) If you conducted a pre-conference, notes of the pre-conference outcomes.
- 6) A ½ to 1- page analysis of your strengths and your professional growth goals for improving your skills in observing, scripting, labeling, conference planning and delivery, and pre-conferencing.

⇒ Alternate or Growth Conference (7 points)

(Standards M/M 20.5; M/S 18.5, M/S 19.6)

Using the Carol Cummings “Peer Coaching” model of supervision and coaching, observe, design, deliver, and critique your delivery of an “alternative conference” or a “growth conference” with another professional, a paraprofessional, or other support provider. You will submit the following as evidence of your completion of this assignment:

- 1) The labeled script of the observed lesson
- 2) The conference plan in a format similar to that presented on page 86 and 87 of the Cummings text. You must do the introduction, teacher diagnosis, reinforcement phases AND either the Alternative or growth phase, and follow up).
- 3) The Coaching Checklist completed with items checked, indicating completion of the conference elements used (i.e., introduction, teacher analysis, reinforcement objectives, ALTERNATIVE OR GROWTH OBJECTIVE SECTION, and follow up)
- 4) The Teacher Feedback analysis on a form similar to that presented on page 92 of the Cummings text.
- 5) If you conducted a pre-conference, notes of the pre-conference outcomes.
- 6) A ½ to 1- page analysis of your strengths and your professional growth goals for improving your skills in observing, scripting, labeling, conference planning and delivery, and pre-conferencing.

B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF OTHERS (18 points)

A great many of the Level II standards (Standards M/M 20.6 & 29.9; M/S 18.3, 19.4, 19.6, 19.7, 18.8) have to do with developing and delivering inservice training to others, including teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, parents, community members, school board members, and related service personnel (e.g., speech and language, OT, PT). For this school-based leadership entry, you will form a team of two to five people who have a similar inservice training interest. This team will identify an inservice need for a particular audience or a variety of audiences. Given this need, the team will meet face-to-face outside of class to develop a 1- to 2-hour inservice training module appropriate for the targeted audience(s). The module may be structured as a single 60 to 120-minutes training session, two 30 to 60-minute sessions, or three 20 to 40-minutes sessions, based upon the time frames you have available to deliver the instruction or the nature of the instruction (e.g., practice is required between sessions). Please note that your inservice module development team is NOT the same as your WebCT reading reaction team, although you may choose to work with one or more of your WebCT teammates if you share a common inservice need.

Inservice teams must meet have a **minimum of two face-to-face meetings** outside of class. Each face-to-face meeting must be documented in order to evidence participants' demonstration of Level II collaborative teaming standards (Standards M/S 18.1, 18.4, 18.6). Documentation requirements are described below. Your inservice team may earn one EXTRA CREDIT point for each additional, similarly **documented** face-to-face meeting held beyond the two required meetings.

The specific requirements of and steps for developing your inservice module are as follows.

⇒ **Team Meeting #1: Module Goals and Topic (3 points)**

PART 1 - Evidence of Face-to-Face Meeting #1 (1 point) – Team meeting documentation must be provided. This includes a) use of the agenda format recommended on page 284 of the Villa and Thousand text, b) evidence of use at least one of the processing procedures listed in Table 1 on pages 281 and 282, and c) completion of the “forming” and “functioning” sections of the checklist on pages 273 and 274. “Homefun” or division of labor on the part of team members in preparation for the actual module construction must be identified at the end of the meeting minutes. Online or e-mail planning among team members can and should occur subsequent to this meeting, but this first organizing meeting must be face to face.

PART 2 – Goals and Topic Outline (2 points) – A word processed description of the **outcomes of the first meeting** that identifies:

- a) the need for the module,
- b) the module's audience(s),
- c) at least two specific and observable and measurable objectives,
- d) a projected outline of the module's content and sequence, and
- e) any expected resources needed to develop the module.

⇒ **Team Meeting #2: Draft Module for Instructor Review (3 points)**

PART 1 - Evidence of Face-to-Face Meeting #2 (1 point) - Team meeting documentation must be provided. This includes a) use of the agenda format recommended on page 284 of the Villa and Thousand text, b) evidence of use at least one of the processing procedures listed in Table 1 on pages 281 and 282, and c) completion of the “formulating” and “fermenting” skills on page 275. “Homefun” or division of labor on the part of team members in preparation for the actual module construction must be identified in the meeting minutes. Note that additional face-to-face meetings likely will be needed to develop the draft module for instructor review (see Part 2 in the next paragraph). The team earns 1 extra credit point for each documented (i.e., agenda and outcomes recorded and submitted to instructor) meeting subsequent to meeting #2.

PART 2 – Draft Module for Instructor Review (2 points) - The **outcome of the second meeting** is a nearly final draft of the training module for the instructor's review. The module must be patterned after the module template and module examples presented in WebCT. The module must include a **Participant Evaluation** of the module. An evaluation may take the form of a pre/post-test on the module content, an assessment of what the participants learned and will use, and so forth. A component of the assessment also must be devoted to the **quality** of the delivery of the instruction (e.g., exemplary features of instruction, how instruction/materials could be improved).

⇒ **Final Module Preparation and Public Unveiling (12 points)**

PART 1 – Final Draft of Inservice Module (10 points) - Based upon instructor feedback, the team submits a revised final module that has addressed the instructor feedback. A complete hard-copy

set of materials is delivered to the instructor and an electronic copy of the module is posted on WebCT for classmates and the instructor to download.

PART 2 – Public Unveiling of Module with Handout for Classmates (2 points) - The team prepares an 7 to 8-minute public unveiling of the module. This unveiling is a group presentation of highlights of the module's audience, objectives, evaluation procedures, and activities, including a **mini-demonstration** of an actual component of the training and a brief **handout summary** of the module. All team members must have a role in the presentation.

C. SYSTEMS CHANGE FOR CARING AND EFFECTIVE INCLUSIVE EDUCATION (7 points)

⇒ **Restructuring Jigsaw: Teaching a Systems Change Example to Classmates** (5 points)
(Standards M/M/S 15.1, 15.2, 15.4, 15.5, 17.2)

In this entry you will describe in writing and teach other classmates how the five elements of the Ambrose Complex Change model (described in Chapter 5) are illustrated in two case studies of systems change. To accomplish this assignment, first read Chapter 5 of the Villa and Thousand text. Then read Chapter 14. Prepare a 1-page summary of the elements of complex change (i.e., vision, skills, resources, incentives, action planning) that impressed you from Chapter 14 and submit in class to your instructor (2 points). For the second part of this assignment, please read the systems change chapter – Chapter 15, 16, or 17 – that you selected in a previous class. Prepare to teach classmates about your selected chapter by preparing **four** copies of a 1-page handout/visual for instructing classmates on your selected “jigsaw-ed” chapter (Chapter 15, 16, or 17). The handout (3 points) should illustrate to classmates the ways in which your case study addressed the elements of complex change (i.e., vision, skills, resources, incentives, action planning). Submit one copy of your Chapter 15/16/17 handout to your instructor.

⇒ **Actions for Change Advice** (2 points)

(Standards M/M/S 15.1, 15.2, 15.4, 15.5, 17.2; M/M 19.2, 19.4; M/S 19.1 & 19.4)

Assume that you are a special educator at a school actively engaged in transforming from a traditional pull-out model of special education to an inclusive, co-teaching model with a vision of the Circle of Courage. Read or re-reading Chapter 5 and Chapter 3 (particularly pages 62 through 65 and the 1st paragraph on page 66). Given all of the recommendations for facilitating the phases of complex change, identify 5 key points for each of the 5 elements (vision + skills + incentive + resources + action planning) that you would offer your principal to help facilitate success in the change process toward an inclusive Circle of Courage vision. **This is an in-class assignment.**

III. Live Reading Reactions (Maximum Points = 8 points)

Each participant will prepare two “live” written reading reactions to be shared with classmates in the class sessions designated in the class schedule. The prompts for each reaction are as follows. Note that each prompt identifies the Level II standards addressed by the reading reaction.

Live Reading Reaction Prompts and Associated Level II Standards (8 points)

LIVE Class Reading Reaction #1: V&T Chapter 11 (4 points)

(Standards M/M 20.3; M/S 19.5)

Create a mind map, a graphic organizer, an outline, or some representation that will assist you in remembering the steps of Creative Problem Solving (CPS). Describe aspects of CPS that you already use in your creative solution finding. Describe aspects that you feel you need to further develop.

LIVE Reading Reaction #2: V&T Chapter 24 (4 points)

(Standards M/M/S 15.1, 15.2, 15.4, 15.5; M/S 19.1, 19.2)

Aaron synthesizes many of the concepts we tried to emphasize in this book by telling stories from his life and the life of his son. He speaks of cultural change, caring, obstacles, and courage. Much of what he really is speaking about is professional ethics and leadership. What from his message “spoke to you”

about leadership and professional ethics in education? What story from your own history as a student or teacher could you tell and then use to teach others about ethics and leadership (as well as change, caring, obstacles, and courage)? Bring to class to share with classmates..

IV. WebCT Reading Reaction Discussions and Discussion Facilitation (Maximum Points = 19 points)

Four reading reactions (i.e., reactions #3 through #6) are posted online in **four** separate **WebCT** discussion rooms. At the beginning of this course you will join a team of four members that will stay together throughout the semester and engaged in four discussion room conversations. You can earn up to 4 point for successful participation in each of the four discussions, for a maximum total of 16 participation points. You also will be required to facilitate one of the four discussions. You will earn an additional 3 points for this facilitation. Explicit requirements for discussion entries and facilitation are described in the following **Participation Performance Criteria** and the **Facilitation Performance Criteria** sections that follow. Please study these requirements very carefully before contributing to or facilitating a WebCT discussion.

There are multiple rationale for discussion room participation and facilitation.

- Each reading has been selected because it facilitates the participant's growth in one of more of the Level II standards (see standards associated with each reading reaction assignment). Participation is an authentic and interactive way to provide evidence of completion and understanding of the required readings and deepened understanding and application of the reading through cooperative group dialogue.
- Participation and facilitation enables you to demonstrate performance competence for six of the Level II standards – **Standards M/M 20.1, 20.2,20.3; M/S 18.1, 18.4, 18.6.**
- You increasingly will be expected to participate in professional development that requires this form of interaction. You need to develop a level of comfort and skill to easily and effectively participate in this type of instructional delivery. These five discussions give you the opportunity to develop this comfort and skill.
- In your job in the future, you likely will be expected to provide professional development to others and lead meaningful professional discussions. By serving in the role of discussion facilitator you have the opportunity to develop this important "teacher of other professionals" skill.
- You increasingly will be using web-based instructional approaches with your own students. Becoming facile in using web-based methods for communicating and teaching is the first step in you taking the lead to construct or at least facilitate this type of communication and discussion forum for your students.
- Rather than driving to Cal State San Marcos to participate in important discussions to bring learning to life, you can engage in the same discussions without having to travel. You are ensured rapt attention of your small group teammates in your streamed discussions and accountability for quality participation, as participation and facilitation performance criteria are clearly identified and articulated below.

Facilitation Performance Criteria and Steps (3 points per discussion room facilitation)

Each team member will serve as a WebCT discussion facilitator at least once. Team members will agree on who facilitates which room in the first two weeks of the semester. If a team ends up having only three members, one member will need to facilitate a second time. Your team must come to consensus as to who will facilitate the 4th discussion, since this person earn 3 EXTRA CREDIT points for facilitating a second time. Each discussion room needs a facilitator; to not have a facilitator for a discussion is not an option.

The performance criteria for and steps of successful facilitation are as follows:

- **STEP #1:** The facilitator “convenes” the reflection room. This means communicating with teammates to jointly select a deadline by which each members’ reading reaction will be posted, read by teammates, and commented upon by teammates (e.g., post by 8 p.m. on Monday evening). If necessary, the facilitator prompts teammates who do not post by the designated time in order ensure timely delivery of and responding to reflections. If adjustments in the deadline need to occur because of an unexpected crisis on the part of a team member, it is the responsibility of the facilitator to help the team negotiate a new deadline (Note: This demonstrates important conflict resolution and creative problem solving skills – **Standards M/M 20.3, M/S 18.1 & 18.4**)
- **STEP #2:** After all team members have posted and commented upon one another’s posting, the facilitator **formulates and posts a “follow-up discussion prompt”** in order to stimulate construction exchanges of ideas. As with the reflections themselves, the questions or prompts should activate higher level reasoning skills (i.e., **application** to real life situations, **analysis** of concepts or issues, **synthesis** of divergent perspectives, and **evaluation** that includes a justification for assessments and judgments).
- **STEP #3:** The facilitator “convenes” this follow-up exchange by proposing and getting agreement to a new “window of time” within which the facilitator’s prompts will be responded to by each team member e.g., if all reading reactions were posted by Monday by 8, p.m. the two prompts might be posted two days later on Wednesday at 5 p.m. and all exchanges might be expected to be completed by 9 p.m. on Sunday).
- **STEP #4:** Responses must stay within the same thread, so if a teammate does not “reply” but instead “composes” a reaction, the facilitator must prompt that teammate to reply. This ensures that all discussion comments stay with the particular question or prompt to which they refer. As the window for posting nears an end, if a teammate has not posted, the facilitator is to check in with the team member and, if necessary, negotiate a solution to whatever issue has arisen.
- **STEP #5:** After at least one contribution from each team member (including the facilitator), the facilitator posts a “group processing” prompt that is appropriate to the conversation and topic and a new “window of time” within which members are to complete their group processing postings. See page 281 and 282 of Chapter 10 in the Villa & Thousand text for sample group processing procedures. You are strongly encouraged to go beyond the procedures suggested in Chapter 10 and craft your own novel processing procedure.
- **STEP #6:** The final and culminating responsibility of the facilitator is to compose a **summary** of the discussion room from start to finish. This summary of approximately 2 pages in length must include:
 - a) a quote of at least one point from each member’s initial reflection (including the facilitator’s reflection) and a comment on why you selected it to highlight in the summary,
 - b) the follow-up discussion prompt with at least two key discussion points.
 - c) the group processing prompt and a summary of the participants’ processing, and
 - d) a personal reflection on the experience of performing the facilitator role (i.e., learnings, challenges, ways in which to improve in the future, what to teach others about how to be an effective facilitator).
 - e) If any team member fails to participate in any of the components of the room’s discussion in the timeframe agreed upon by members, this summary is where the facilitator reports to the instructor what the facilitator and team did to encourage and support that team member’s work completion and participation. If no such report is included in the summary, it is assumed that all team members participated fully, in a timely fashion, and with a high level of quality.

This summary should be submitted to the instructor as the last entry in the respective WebCT reaction room within 3 to 4 days of the last team member’s group processing entry.

Participation Performance Criteria and Steps (4 points per discussion room)

- **STEP #1:** As a participant in each room, you agree with your teammates upon a “window of time during which teammates’ reading reactions will be posted and read and comment upon by the teammates (e.g., sent by 8 p.m. on Monday evening and comment on one another’s reactions by Thursday evening).
- **STEP #2:** You post your reading reaction before the posting deadline. The criteria for a “ high quality” posting are as follows. The posting clearly evidences that you have read the reading materials and/or your teammates’ reflections. You may show this by making reference to the readings (e.g., via a quotation, via paraphrasing) or your classmates’ statements in your posting. Even if you disagree with a teammate’s perspective, your comments should always be respectful and professional in language and tone. Your dialogue should evidence your use of higher level reasoning skills (i.e., application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation). You also may pose your own questions to teammates.
- **STEP #3:** You read your teammates’ reactions and respond to their comments at least once during the designated “window of time” to which your teammates have agreed. Please **REPLY** (not compose) with at least one reaction to each teammate’s initial posting. Of course, additional postings are desirable and greatly encouraged. It is important to “reply,” rather than “compose” a new response, so that all of the dialogue regarding a particular topic stays with that topic This is good online communication etiquette, and it avoids confusion.
- **STEP #4:** After this initial conversation among members about their postings, the facilitator will ask for agreement to a second “window of time” for teammates to respond to a follow-up posting composed by the facilitator. Once the facilitator has posted the follow-up prompt, you will **REPLY** (not compose) with at least one response that reflects your perspective regarding this follow-up prompt. As with the initial conversation, additional postings are desirable and greatly encouraged. It is important to “reply” to a teammate’s comments rather than “compose” a new response, so that all of the dialogue regarding a particular topic stays threaded with that topic.
- **STEP #5:** Finally, the facilitator will post a “group processing” prompt about how well the group did in terms of the team’s interpersonal communication during the discussion. Teammates will agree to a final “window of time” and post, in a threaded fashion, their comments regarding how they all “got along” in the room.

WebCT Reading Reaction Prompts and Associated Level II Standards (19 points)

Note that each reading reaction prompt identifies the Level II standards addressed by the reaction.

WebCT Reading Reaction #3: V&T Ch. 10 and pp. 389-393

(Standards M/M20.1, M/M 20.2, M/M 20.3; M/S 18.2)

WebCT Base Team Discussion Facilitator for Reaction #3: _____

After reading Chapter 10, the Section III preface by Ann Nevin (pp. 249 – 253), and Lisa Houghtelin's story (pp. 389 – 393), identify a baker's dozen (13) new or expanded learnings regarding effective team functioning and why they are important for you to remember in your collaborative efforts. Note that many of you have read Chapter 10 before as part of the EDMX 631 Law and Legal Procedures course in the Level I credential program. Having been teaching in the field for a while, you should have quite an expanded perspective to share in your first WebCT team posting. Please post your learnings in the first of the WebCT discussion rooms.

WebCT Reading Reaction #4: V&T pp. 173–182 & 200–204; CU Ch. 6

(Standards M/M/S 13.2 – 13.4, 15.3; M/M 19.2, 19.4)

WebCT Base Team Discussion Facilitator for Reaction #4: _____

Read pages 173 – 182 and 200 – 204 of Villa and Thousand and Chapter 6 of Cummings. If you were to write your own chapter or rewrite these chapters, what of the content would you emphasize the most? What strategies or approaches would you add that would give teachers even more tools to use when differentiating and customizing instruction and assessment for students? Please post these ideas in the second of your WebCT team discussion rooms.

Web CT Reading Reaction #5: V&T Chapter 13 and “Maddie’s Story” (pdf file posted on WebCT)

(Standard M/M 20.6; M/S 18.6, 19.5)

WebCT Facilitator for Reaction #5: _____

In Chapter 13, related services personnel describe how their roles change when they share the framework described in Table 2. They also establish three criteria - 1) educationally relevant, 2) necessary, 3) only as special as necessary - for making decisions about related services provision. The journal article, “Maddie’s Story” illustrates how related services can be delivered in the fashion described in Chapter 13. For this reading reaction please comment on ways in which you can help related services personnel:

- a) think about and apply the three criteria for making decisions about related services provision when crafting supports and services for students, and
- b) restructure their roles in ways described in Chapter 13 and illustrated by the Maddie example.

Please post these ideas in the third of your WebCT team discussion rooms.

WebCT Reading Reaction #6: V&T Chapter 12 and Thousand, Villa, & Nevin “The many faces of collaborative planning and co-teaching” (pdf file posted on WebCT)

(Standard M/M 20.6, M/M20.8, M/S 18.6, 19.5)

WebCT Facilitator for Reaction #6: _____

In Chapter 12 Jeanne and Patricia paint vivid pictures of ways in which people might collaborate to educate all children in shared classrooms and curricula. In the Thousand, Villa and Nevin article four approaches to co-teaching are described and tips are provided for effective collaborative planning and teaching. Of the four co-teaching approaches (supportive, parallel, complementary, team) and their variation, which are the most appealing for you to try out with a colleague? (Try to pick at least one that you have not already implemented.) Why did you select the approach(es)? What is a challenge you may need to overcome to implement this approach? How would you approach overcoming this obstacle? Please post these responses to these questions in the last of your WebCT team discussion rooms.

Class Meeting, WebCT, and Inservice Meeting Schedule

Key to Abbreviations: WCT = WebCT Discussion and Facilitation
 IM = Inservice Training Module Meeting and Planning
 CU = Carol Cummings "Peering in on Peers" readings

Date	Session Topics/Activities	Assignments/Readings Due
01/24	Class #1 <i>Collaborative Teaming Revisited</i> <i>Inservice Module Overview & Timelines</i> <i>How to Read the Class Schedule & WebCT6</i> <i>Schedule WebCT Teams & Facilitation</i>	
01/31	WCT & IM Explore WebCT6 and inservice topics	
02/07	Class #2 <i>Web CT Teams Finalized</i> Inservice Module: Possible Topics & Formulation of Teams Peer Coaching: Pt. 1	
02/14	WCT & IM Inservice Meeting #1, Develop Inservice Topic Outline Web CT Reading Reaction #3	
02/21	Class #3 <i>Peer Coaching: Pt. 2</i>	<i>CU pp. 1-3 & Chs. 1, 2, & 3</i>
02/28	Class #4 <i>Peer Coaching: Pt. 3</i>	<i>CU Chs. 7, 8, & 9</i> <i>Inservice Goals Outline (3 pts)</i>
03/07	WCT & IM Web CT Reading Reaction #4 Inservice Meeting #2 - Develop Inservice Draft	
03/14	Class #5 <i>Process Communication (Jacque Thousand)</i> <i>Live Rdg. Reaction #1: CPS</i>	<i>Live Reaction #1 (4 pts)</i>
03/21	WCT & IM Web CT Reading Reaction #5 Optional Extra Inservice Meeting - Work on Final Draft Deliver Reinforcement and/ Alternate/Growth Conference	
03/28	WCT & IM Web CT Reading Reaction #5 or 6 Optional Extra Inservice Meeting - Finalize Inservice Draft Deliver Reinforcement and/ Alternate/Growth	
04/04	Class #6 <i>What's Ethics Got to Do With it?</i> Live Reading Reaction #2 Assign Restructuring Jigsaw for Class #8	<i>Live Rdg. Reaction #2 (4 pts)</i> <i>Reinforcement Conf. (5 pts)</i>
04/11	Class #7 <i>Introduction to Co-Teaching</i>	<i>Draft Inservice (3 points)</i> <i>Alt./Growth Conference (7 pts)</i>
04/25	WCT & IM Web CT Reading Reaction #6 Done! Optional Extra Inservice Meeting – Finalize Inservice Draft Prepare for Class #8 Jigsaw and Action for Change Advice	
05/02	Class #8 <i>Restructuring Jigsaw</i> <i>Action for Change Advice – In-class write (2 points)</i>	<i>Restructuring Jigsaw (5 points)</i>
05/09	Class #9 <i>Inservice Unveiling</i> <i>Course Evaluation & Celebration</i>	<i>Final Inservice Module & Handout (12 points)</i>

EDMX 638 TRACKING FORM

I. Live Class Attendance (36 points maximum)

Class #1 _____ 4 points
Class #2 _____ 4 points
Class #3 _____ 4 points
Class #4 _____ 4 points
Class #5 _____ 4 points
Class #6 _____ 4 points
Class #7 _____ 4 points
Class #8 _____ 4 points
Class #9 _____ 4 points

II. LEADERSHIP APPLICATIONS (37)

A. Coaching of Others (12 points)

Reinforcement Conference _____ 5 points (Due by Class #5)
Alternate or Growth Conference _____ 7 points (Due by Class #7)

B. Inservice Training Module Development (18 points + extra credit)

Goals (3 points)

Documentation of Meeting #1 _____ 1 point (Due Class #6)
Goals & Topic Outline _____ 2 points (Due Class #6)

Draft (3 points)

Documentation of Meeting #2 _____ 1 points (Due Class #7)
Draft Module _____ 2 points (Due Class #7)

Final (12 points)

Final Draft _____ 10 points (Due by Class #9)
Public Unveiling in Class _____ 2 points (Due Class #9)

Documentation of Extra Meeting _____ *1 point EXTRA CREDIT*
Documentation of Extra Meeting _____ *1 point EXTRA CREDIT*
Documentation of Extra Meeting _____ *1 point EXTRA CREDIT*

C. Systems Change for Caring and Effective Inclusive Education (7 points)

Restructuring Jigsaw _____ 5 points (Due for Class #8)
Action for Change Commitment (In Class) _____ 2 points (Due In Class #8)

III. Live Reading Reactions (8 points)

Reaction #1 (Due Class #5) _____ 4 points
Reaction #2 (Due Class #7) _____ 4 points

IV. WebCT Discussions & Facilitation (19 points)

WebCT Reaction & Participation #3 _____ 4 points
WebCT Reaction & Participation #4 _____ 4 points
WebCT Reaction & Participation #5 _____ 4 points
WebCT Reaction & Participation #6 _____ 4 points
Discussion Meeting Facilitation _____ 3 points
(Optional: Extra Credit Facilitation) _____ 3 points