

## Collaborative Team Reflection Rubric for Inclusive Teaching

**Inclusive Teaching Team:**

**Date:**

Element	Ineffective	Developing	Accomplished
<b>Instructional lead</b>	IS only viewed as “helper” or disciplinarian; Limited/no differentiation; One teach, one roaming; Constantly redirecting questions to lead teacher	Some differentiation of content (i.e., Students doing different levels of work); Some shared leadership of instruction; One teaching and one chiming in once in a while	Both leading instruction; Inability to determine who is GenEd or SpEd (teacher or students); Comfortable with different roles; Universal Design for Learning (UDL) evident; Differentiated lesson plans
<b>Responsibilities/ Accountability</b>	One person doing all the planning, grading and differentiating; Teacher preparedness, punctuality and/or attendance are a problem; No co-created/ improper use of curriculum map; IS needing permission to engage with students or instruction; Only have one set of responsibilities/role and no overlap	Some shared responsibilities for instruction, planning, assessing, grading and making accommodations using extended standards; Limited trust; Both accountable for student learning and growth; Either teacher occasionally late to class and/or unprepared with/without notification	High expectations for all students regardless of ability level; Both accountable for and implementing accommodations, planning (short and long term), grading (co-created rubric), teaching, behavior and classroom management; Both engaged in student learning/growth; Attendance, punctuality and preparedness of both teachers are not an issue rarely late, notification is always provided; Both engaged in instruction until the end of the class
<b>Expectations/ Commitment</b>	Expectations not clearly delineated or stated; Unrealistic/no expectations for students (too high or too low); Each teacher has different expectations leading to teacher contradictions and student confusion	Realistic expectations for all students; Shared (co-created) behavior plan that address IEP goals; Some use of co-created curriculum map; Consistent expectations in one or more areas, but not all (academic performance, grading, and behavior management); Evidence of some agreement on procedures	Expectations agreed upon in advance for all students (especially those receiving special services). Clearly articulated, co-created behavior plan that address IEP goals; Consistent use/implementation of co-created curriculum map: Expectations are posted and consistently applied with both teachers. A consistent trajectory for all students is developed according to their needs and applied by both teachers
<b>Communication</b>	No/limited communication; Undermining or inconsistent messages to students; Failure to confront issues; Non-responsive to suggested improvements; Inconsistent communication in planning for instruction	Fairly consistent use of non-verbal cues; Fairly consistent messages to students; Some evidence of confronting conflicts; Willing to address some changes suggested by co-teacher; Some consistent communication in planning for instruction.	Trusting, open, consistent use of non-verbal cues; Clear, consistent messages (academic & behavioral) to students; Use of inclusive language (I vs. we), Manage conflicts; Open to change or improvement; Offer/ask for help; Willing to have hard conversations; Regularly scheduled time for communication; Flexible ways to communicate; Monthly planning calendar
<b>Use of co-teaching models</b>	Use one model of co-teaching exclusively (1-teach/1-assist)	Use a variety of models with limited use of 1 teach/1 assist	Flexibly use all co-teaching models; Two teachers co-teach all day; Use all models comfortably with emphasis on teaming, parallel & station tchg. (Co-planning is evident in parallel and station tchg.)

## Collaborative Team Reflection Rubric for Inclusive Teaching

Inclusive Teaching Team:

Date:

<b>Student response</b>	Consistently go to one teacher, play one teacher against the other; Students view IS as “helper” and not teacher; Limited student engagement in the lesson	Go to either teacher but role-specific (intervention vs. content); Most students give some level of effort/engagement in the lesson	View both teachers equally, Students go to either teacher for assistance; All students fully engaged in the lesson
-------------------------	--	---	--