# Co-Teaching Practice Profile

Implementation with fidelity requires clearly described implementation criteria.   The Practice Profile framework has recently been developed by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) as a way of outlining implementation criteria using a rubric structure with clearly defined practice-level characteristics (NIRN, 2011). According to NIRN, the Practice Profile emerged from the conceptualization of the change process outline in the work

The Practice Profile template includes four pieces and is anchored by the essential functions. First, as a header is the foundation of implementation that philosophically grounds implementation. Then moving from left to right across the template are the essential functions of the practice, implementation performance levels, and lastly, evidence which provides data or documentation for determining implementation levels.

How to Use the Practice Profile

The essential functions align with the teaching/ learning objectives for each learning package. For each teaching/learning objective are levels of implementation. For some essential functions, proficient and exemplary implementation criteria are the same and in others, criteria differ. Close to proficient levels of implementation suggest the skill or practice is emerging and coaching is recommended for moving toward more proficient implementation. When implementation is reported at the unacceptable variation level, follow-up professional development in addition to coaching is recommended. The professional development provider should walk through the practice profile with the educator-learners, referring to the data and artifacts listed as suggested evidence. It is an important tool for self-monitoring their own implementation because it serves as a reminder as to the implementation criteria and is also aligned with the fidelity checklists.

| **Co-Teaching Practice Profile**  **Foundations present in the implementation of each essential component:** *Commitment to the success of all students and to improving the quality of instruction.* | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[Model of Co-Teaching: Instructional Components]** | | | | | |
| **Essential Function** | | **Exemplary proficiency**  **Ideal Implementation** | **Proficient** | **Close to Proficient**  *(Skill is emerging, but not yet to ideal proficiency. Coaching is recommended.)* | **Far from Proficient** *(Follow-up professional development and coaching is critical.)* |
| 1 | **Instructional Planning with Specialized Instruction**  *(On-the-spot,-to-day-to-day, week-to-week, and unit-to-unit planning of coursework)* | * Planning is regular and fully shared between both teachers * Teachers show the ability to plan “on-the-fly” to adjust lesson when student feedback during the lesson dictates the need * Lesson plans reveal evidence of IEP goals and objectives addressed through the curriculum * Grouping strategies are implemented almost daily to intensify instruction * Lesson plans explicitly show specially designed instruction being addressed within homework, projects, daily assignments and students response options | * There is give and take in the planning process * Plans are made explicitly outlining the role for both teachers in the classroom * Grouping strategies are used occasionally (once or twice per week) * There is some evidence of IEP goals and objectives being addressed during implementation of daily lessons * Learning styles and learning strategies are regularly considered in lessons | * Planning is rare and only “on-the-fly” * Lesson plans reveal the general educator teaches the group, the special educator assumes the role of helper * General educator accepts accommodations, but prefers the special educator plan and implement accommodations * Lesson plans show very little differentiation | * Only one teacher has a set of plans and materials * Only whole group co-teaching structures are used * Differentiation and learning strategies are not standard practice |
| 2 | **Assessments/Data/Progress Monitoring**  *(Systems of evaluation, maintaining course integrity, using data to improve learning conditions and opportunities)* | * Both teachers use a variety of options to progress monitor * Both teachers are comfortable with grading procedures for all students * Both teachers assess all students and are familiar with student performance in all situations | * Both teachers’ names are on report card/assessment reporting * IEP data is collected, analyzed, discussed, and reflected in flexible groups and activities * Teachers use alternate assessment ideas * More performance measures of assessment are being used | * Only the special educator collects data * One grading system, exclusively managed by general educator | * Two separate grading systems, separately maintained * No data is collected * Measures for evaluation are objective and only examine student knowledge of content |
| 3 | **Instructional Presentation**  *(Presentation of lessons and structuring of classroom activities)* | * Both teachers comfortably participate in the presentation of the lesson, provide instruction, and structure the learning activities * Flexible group instruction like station or parallel groups are the predominate configurations used for instruction * Strategies, differentiated instruction, multiple intelligences/ tiered lessons/ learning styles instruction are embedded throughout lessons regularly * IEP strategies are embedded as specialized instruction in the general education classroom | * Lesson structuring and presentation begins to be shared by both teachers * Both teachers direct some of the activities * Both teacher are willing to work with any student * Presentations are beginning to vary in instructional style, learning style, and differentiated practices * Students address questions and discuss concerns with both teachers * Accommodations and alternative instruction are implemented by either teacher | * Teachers struggle to map a student’s IEP goals and objectives onto the general education curriculum * Special educators spend most co-teaching time “helping” not teaching * Assisting or supporting instruction is used as the primary co-teaching structure * Accommodations and alternative assignments are implemented by the special educator | * Classroom teacher most often leads instruction * Teachers often present separate lessons * One teacher assumes the role of “boss” and the other helper * Presentations tend to be “traditional” in nature with mostly lecture * All students are expected to complete the same work; accommodations such as alternative assignments are not acceptable |
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