

**Co-planning and Co-teaching for ELLs**

by

Lucy Sauter

August 5, 2022

A capstone project submitted to the Department of Education and Human Development of  
The College at Brockport, State University of New York in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for MS. Ed. in TESOL

**Table of Contents**

Abstract .....	3
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	4
Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	7
Chapter 3: Description of the Product and Tools .....	23
Chapter 4: Conclusion .....	31
References .....	37
Appendices .....	40
Appendix A: Google Form Survey .....	40
Appendix B: Research on Co-planning and Co-teaching .....	41
Appendix C: Strategies for Co-planning and Co-teaching .....	42
Appendix D: Excel Scheduling Document .....	43
Appendix E: Virtual Daily Planner .....	44
Appendix F: Excel Question Spreadsheet .....	45
Appendix G: Survey Questions .....	46
Appendix H: Common Barriers to Co-planning and Co-teaching .....	47
Appendix I: Discussion Questions .....	48
Appendix J: Google Form Questions .....	49
Appendix K: Professional Development Presentation Link .....	50

### **Abstract**

This capstone project seeks to provide the general education teachers and the English as a New Language (ENL) teacher at the Avon Middle School with the strategies and resources they need in order to effectively co-plan and co-teach in the mainstream classroom. The Avon Central School District is a small rural district with around one thousand students from kindergarten to twelfth grade. In this district, there is a very apparent lack of co-planning and co-teaching in the general education classrooms. The ENL teacher is often left pushing into the mainstream classroom and serving as a one-on-one tutor for the English Language Learner (ELL). This lack of co-planning and co-teaching strategies is due to a lack of knowledge on the topic as well as a lack of leadership support and guidance. Solutions to this problem involve a professional development series for the teachers and the administration of the school. This professional development series provides the audience with strategies for implementing effective instructional approaches and virtual resources that teachers can use as they begin to co-plan and co-teach. Conclusions to this research focus on the need for explicit instruction and professional development in order to effectively implement co-planning and co-teaching. Recommendations are for continued practice of co-planning and co-teaching strategies through additional professional development and reflections. The professional development should be modified in future years to reflect the feedback from the general education teachers, the ENL teacher, and the administration.

*Keywords:* English Language Learner, English as a New Language, co-planning, co-teaching, push-in, mainstream classroom

## Chapter 1: Introduction

English Language Learners (ELLs) are the fastest growing population in schools in the United States today, but the workforce and demographics of the teachers have remained relatively unchanged (Li & Peters, 2020). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, only about one quarter of the nation's teachers are non-white and only 9.4% are Hispanic (Bureau, 2022). Many general education teachers and administrators are at a loss for how to support this diverse population of students (Grunert, 2020). One approach for supporting ELLs in the classroom is Co-planning and Co-teaching. Co-planning and co-teaching are approaches to instruction where the English as a New Language (ENL) teacher and the general education teacher work together to plan and teach lessons that address both the content and language needs of the subject. Through my own observations of the ENL teacher at the Avon Central School District, there is a very apparent lack of co-teaching and co-planning. Conversations surrounding the topic of co-planning and co-teaching with the ENL teacher and the general education teachers have indicated a lack of understanding of the topic. Both the ENL teacher and the general education teachers explained that the absence of expectations from leadership as well as the deficiency of knowledge surrounding co-teaching and co-planning are the leading causes for the absence of these instructional approaches in their classrooms.

The absence of co-planning and co-teaching in schools negatively affects the ELL population. Research has revealed that ENL teachers working in a one-on-one push-in model instead of co-teaching negatively affects student learning as the increased anxiety and embarrassment of sitting next to the teacher impacts their ability to learn (Whiting, 2019). Research has also shown that collaboration between the general education teacher and the ENL teacher is needed in order to effectively implement both the content and language needs of the

new common core standards (Percy et al., 2017). In addition, co-teaching and co-planning have significantly increased the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) scores of the ELLs and the students are demonstrating higher proficiency levels as well as improved writing scores (Bauler & Kang, 2020 ; Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016).

The literature shows teachers' need for professional development and support from leadership to use the instructional approaches of co-planning and co-teaching (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015; Li & Peters, 2020). Without professional development and leadership support, the ENL teachers are often left pushing into a classroom and serving a very secondary role in the room. Many ENL teachers pushing into mainstream classes are not experiencing the ideal co-planning and co-teaching model. Instead, they are serving as a one-on-one push in tutor for the ELL in the class. Not only does this lack of co-planning and co-teaching negatively affect the ELLs in the class, but it also leaves the ENL teachers with a negative perception of pushing into mainstream classrooms (Whiting, 2017).

The purpose of this project is to provide teachers with effective strategies for co-planning and co-teaching. There is no “one way” to co-plan and co-teach and it is important that the teachers work together to find an approach that works best for them. In addition to providing teachers with effective strategies, this project intends to provide administrators with strategies to support the co-planning and co-teaching of the ENL and general education teachers.

In Chapter 2, I will review the literature that shows the need for co-teaching and co-planning, the need for a framework and leadership support in order to implement co-teaching and co-planning and different types of co-teaching strategies that will help to effectively educate ELLs. This literature will help to guide the professional development described in Chapter 3. The

professional development will provide teachers and administrators with strategies for effectively implementing a co-teaching and co-planning framework into our school district.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

This Chapter reviews the literature surrounding co-planning and co-teaching of ELL teachers. As discussed in Chapter 1, many general education teachers are at a loss for how to support ELLs. Co-planning and co-teaching are approaches to instruction where the general education teacher and the ENL teacher work together to address the content and language needs of each lesson. Through my own observations, a lack of understanding of co-teaching and co-planning has caused the absence of these approaches in the classrooms of the Avon Central School District. The literature reviewed in this chapter seeks to provide insight into the instructional approaches of co-planning and co-teaching for ELLs. Four themes emerged from the literature including the effectiveness of co-teaching and co-planning, strategies for co-teaching, barriers to co-planning and co-teaching, professional development, and collaboration. Before discussing these themes in this Chapter, I will first present the theories of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978) and inclusive pedagogy (Spratt & Florian, 2015), which explain the significance of co-planning and co-teaching and inform strategies for co-teaching and co-planning.

### **Understanding ZPD and Inclusive Pedagogy**

Vygotsky's notion of ZPD refers to what a learner can do on their own as compared with what they can do with the guidance and support of more capable peers (Eun, 2019). Much research has revealed the benefits of ELLs working with their peers of different language abilities (Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019; Whiting, 2019). Vygotsky (1978) argues the idea that learning is a very social process. Socialization between learners in class can help them go beyond their present learning capabilities (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019). Drawing on ZPD, many schools adopt the push-in model of teaching ELLs as it allows

ELLs to collaborate with their non-ELL peers in order to go beyond their current abilities (Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019; Whiting, 2019). Indeed, ZPD is used to support mainstreaming of ELLs in the general education classrooms (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019). In addition, inclusive pedagogy is also used to support mainstreaming of ELLs (Spratt & Florian, 2015).

Inclusive pedagogy is an approach to teaching in diverse classrooms that does not marginalize specific learners in the classroom community (Spratt & Florian, 2015). This approach seeks to make learning accessible to all students and responsive to their needs (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019). At the center of inclusive pedagogy is the idea of teacher collaboration. According to Honigsfeld and Dove (2019), inclusive pedagogy requires teachers of different specialties to work together to plan, teach, and assess lessons that meet all their students' needs (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019). The full inclusion of ELLs is a central focus of much of the literature surrounding the topic of co-planning and co-teaching (Bauler & Kang, 2020; Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015; Whiting, 2019). While co-teaching and co-planning often come with many barriers as discussed below, inclusive pedagogy continues to encourage teachers to work toward better collaboration.

The ZPD and inclusive pedagogy work together to support the inclusion of ELLs in mainstream classrooms. The ZPD argues that learners are able to go beyond their present abilities when working in collaboration with more capable peers. This idea supports ELLs spending more time in the general education classroom. Inclusive pedagogy is an approach that seeks to include all learners in the general education classroom while continuing to meet their needs. Both theories support the inclusion of ELLs in mainstream classrooms while acknowledging the need for additional support. While these theories support the push-in model



of the ENL working in the mainstream classroom, collaborative strategies are needed for both teachers to truly support the content and language needs of the lessons. It is essential to understand the history behind the push-in model of teaching in order to understand the necessity of effective co-planning and co-teaching strategies.

### **Background of the Push-In Model**

Co-planning and co-teaching are recognized and accepted approaches to teaching ELLs worldwide and are in classrooms in Australia, England, Canada, and throughout the United States (Bauler & Kang, 2020). Bauler and Kang (2020) explain how co-planning and co-teaching were initially just used for collaboration between the general education teacher and the special education teacher. Whiting (2019) explains how the No Child Left Behind Act (2002) called for increased accountability for ELLs in the classroom and mandated that ELLs spend more time in the mainstream classroom. In the past, ELLs had spent much of their time in ELL pull-out settings and had fewer interactions with their non-ELL peers (Whiting, 2019). In 2015, the collaborative partnership between the general education teacher and the ENL teacher further expanded by requiring that the teachers co-teach for at least 360 or 180 minutes each week, depending on the language proficiency of the student (Bauler & Kang, 2020). While there are mandates in place that require the collaboration between the general education teacher and the ENL teacher, there is still so much left unclear. The analyses of several surveys of ENL teachers across the United States revealed that many ENL teachers do not have an active role when pushing into the classroom and instead serve as one-on-one tutors (Whiting, 2019). Mandates are in place that require the ENL teacher to push into the mainstream classroom, but these do not ensure that teachers are effectively collaborating and co-teaching.

### **The Effectiveness of Co-teaching and Co-planning**

Co-teaching and co-planning are effective teaching strategies for ELLs. Research has shown that in classrooms where co-teaching and co-planning are effectively implemented, students perform at higher language proficiency levels and demonstrate improved writing skills (Bauler & Kang, 2020; Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016). The extended time in the mainstream classroom also benefits the ELLs as they have more time for socialization with their peers (Whiting, 2019).

Indeed, effective co-planning and co-teaching between a mainstream classroom teacher and an ENL teacher have improved ELL language proficiency. Bauler and Kang (2020) collected data over a three-year time span to review the effectiveness of co-teaching and co-planning. One aspect of collected data was The New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT). Results show proficiency scores of 1 and 2 decreased by 6.74% and 2.04% over the first two years of implementation, and students with a proficiency score of 3 increased by 3.64%, and students with proficiency scores of 4 and 5 also increased by around 2.5%. Results also show a steady increase in testing scores across the board for ELLs in co-taught classrooms (Bauler & Kang, 2020). However, it is essential to remember that standardized test scores often show a narrow viewpoint. A different study by Chandler-Olcott and Nieroda (2016) also supports the effectiveness of co-planning and co-teaching without relying on standardized test scores. Chandler-Olcott and Nieroda (2016) completed a formative study of a summer enrichment writing course over four years. This study revealed that the ELL's writing skills improved over the four-year period with a co-taught class through several periods of adjustments. The teachers in this study collaborated and made adjustments to their seating charts, their grouping, and their own planning in order to support the ELL's writing development (Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016). In addition, Li and Peters (2020) found an average increase

of 29.6% in ELLs' language skills through teacher collaboration. In this study, Li and Peters (2020) used descriptive data from monthly teacher reflections as well as student writing samples to support their findings. To further support the effectiveness of co-planning and co-teaching, Beninghof and Leensvaart (2016) found after one year of effectively co-planning and co-teaching, the median student growth percentile moved from a score of "approaching" to a score of "exceeds" which is the highest possible score in the state of Colorado (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016). Overall, two teachers collaborating in the classroom helps ELLs to improve their language proficiency and writing abilities as the teachers can use their own language and content knowledge to plan and teach effective lessons.

Co-planning and co-teaching are also beneficial to ELLs because they allow extended classroom time to socialize with non-ELL peers. Bauler and Kang (2020) explain how full inclusion of ELLs is essential and should be grouped heterogeneously in the classroom. This strategy allows all students to receive linguistic lessons about each topic, and the ELLs can grow from working with their non-ELL peers (Bauler & Kang, 2020; Whiting, 2019). When students were working on digital literacy projects in the study by Chandler-Olcott and Nieroda (2016), they were grouped by interest in the topic instead of by their language proficiency level. When ELLs with lower proficiency levels were grouped with non-ELLs, they received support from their peers (Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016). Through a survey of 107 licensed and employed ENL teachers in the United States, many teachers agreed that inclusion of ELLs in the mainstream classroom was beneficial to the ELLs as it allowed for more time to socialize with their peers in the mainstream classroom (Whiting, 2019). Further supporting the benefits of extended time in the mainstream classroom for ELLs, the ZPD (1978) describes learning as a social process. Having ELLs working in the mainstream classroom allows them to achieve tasks

beyond their present abilities (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019). Co-teaching and co-planning allow the ELLs to have more time in the general education classroom which helps them grow in their language proficiency through interactions with their peers.

Thus, co-planning and co-teaching are practical approaches to teaching ELLs. In classrooms where co-planning and co-teaching have been effectively implemented, quantitative data has shown an increase in state test scores. Qualitative data have also shown an improvement in writing skills for ELLs. The extended time in the mainstream classroom for socialization with peers as well as the collaboratively planned lessons that address both content and language needs are contributing factors to the success of co-planning and co-teaching.

### **Barriers to Co-teaching and Co-planning**

Time is a common barrier to co-teaching and co-planning. In the study completed by Bauler and Kang (2020), lack of time was a consistent barrier that was cited by many teachers across all three years of the study. The majority of the teachers (70%) responded in the first year by saying that a lack of time was impeding their ability to co-plan and co-teach, and this percentage grew to 87% in year 3. The analysis of qualitative data revealed that teachers did not see this lack of time as an obstacle entirely preventing them from co-teaching and planning but that this obstacle prevented them from reaching their full potential (Bauler & Kang, 2020). Similarly, teachers in McGlynn and Kelly (2019) and DelliCarpini and Gulla (2009) reported having many responsibilities throughout the day and are often left with no free time to collaboratively plan weekly lessons. DelliCarpini and Gulla explain that sometimes a schedule change is possible if the administration attempts to support co-planning in the district. However, most of the time, teachers are responsible for finding the time in their current schedules to plan (DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009; McGlynn & Kelly, 2019).

Also, a lack of clarity of their roles in the classroom often impedes the teacher's abilities to co-plan and co-teach. Throughout the three-year study completed by Bauler and Kang (2020), many teachers still could not clearly define their roles in the classroom as co-teaching. In a survey during the second year of the co-teaching implementation, 54% of the teachers responded to a question about their role by saying that the general education teacher would lead the lesson while assisting the other students. In an ideal co-teaching situation, both teachers would be viewed as equals in the classroom and have equal roles to serve. Whiting (2019) explained that when teachers do not have clear expectations of the role they should be serving in the classroom, the ENL teachers often end up serving as one-on-one tutors in the class. This role leaves the rest of the class without the benefits of having an additional teacher in the room, and it often leaves the ENL teacher unsatisfied with their position pushing into the mainstream classroom (Whiting, 2019). Likewise, DelliCarpini and Gulla (2009) and Yuen (2015) explain that ENL teachers are often viewed as secondary teachers and not as equals to the other teachers in the school. The general education teachers often lack an understanding of what the ENL teacher specializes in and, in turn, make wrong assumptions about their role in the classroom. They suggest meaningful conversations between teachers as a possible solution to this problem. The general education teacher and the ENL teacher need to understand better one another and their plans and goals for the year (DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009; Yuen, 2015). A lack of clarity in individual roles is a common barrier to co-planning and co-teaching. It often adds to confusion and frustration for the collaborative pairs working together.

Another barrier to co-planning and co-teaching is the lack of leadership support, which may lead to a lack of clarity in roles. Honigsfeld and Dove (2015) explain that leadership support is one of the critical factors of successful co-planning and co-teaching. The administration,

coaches, and curriculum leaders can all support the teachers (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015). Administrators in the school district described by Bauler and Kang (2020) supported their teachers' co-planning and co-teaching efforts by providing them with paid after school planning time. They also provided teachers with a day each month that teachers could have a substitute cover their classes so that they could collaboratively plan with one another (Bauler & Kang, 2020). In the survey by Whiting (2019), of 107 licensed and employed ENL teachers, many expressed frustration with their lack of control regarding which classes they joined and when. Administrators made these decisions without considering the ENL teachers' ideas, which led to more negative feelings toward pushing into mainstream classrooms (Whiting, 2019). Administrators must show support for their teachers while encouraging the co-teaching approach. Leadership must listen to the needs of the collaborating teachers and address these needs to the best of their ability.

In principle, a lack of time, expectations, and leadership support can make co-planning and co-teaching challenging. While recognizing the benefits of co-planning and co-teaching for ELLs, we must work with what we have in each district to overcome these challenges. Strong communication between collaborative teaching pairs and leadership can help move beyond these barriers.

### **Strategies for Co-planning and Co-teaching**

There is a wide variety of co-planning strategies that collaborative pairs of teachers can use to plan lessons that address both the content and language demands of a lesson. DelliCarpini and Gulla (2009) provide many examples of how teachers can collaborate and plan even with the lack of a common planning period. Teachers can meet once a week or once a month to begin planning strategies for working together in the class. Virtual plan books and planners are

available to share ideas when meeting in person is impossible (DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009).

Likewise, McGlynn and Kelly (2020) suggested the use of Google Docs to add comments to one another's plans virtually. When planning together, each individual teacher must understand their role. The content teacher is responsible for selecting the content standard and creating the lesson materials based on the selected standard. Next, the ENL teacher is responsible for selecting a language standard that corresponds with the lesson and building scaffolds into the lesson to address the language demands. These steps of planning can be completed at the same time during a shared planning period or can be completed individually through a virtual setting (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015). The wide variety of opportunities for co-planning allows collaborative teaching pairs to select whatever strategy works best for them.

There are different ways for general education teachers and ENL teachers to co-teach within a lesson. Bauler and Kang (2020) concluded through their study that co-teachers' most effective partnerships used various co-teaching models throughout their lessons. One of the most critical aspects of co-teaching is that both teachers clearly understand their role in the classroom and that they are viewed as equals in the classroom. Research revealed that after two years of co-teaching in a diverse school district in Long Island, New York, 87% of teachers could clearly define their role in the classroom (Bauler & Kang, 2020). McGlynn and Kelly (2019) provide examples of strategies that are used for co-teaching within a lesson. A few strategies listed are *one teach and one assist*, *parallel teaching*, *station teaching*, and *team teaching*. Co-teaching allows the collaborative pairs to split the students up into groups or work as a whole depending on the plans for the lesson. Taking turns leading the lessons, splitting the class in half to teach the lesson at the same time, or working in stations are all possible strategies for co-teaching (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015). When co-planning and co-teaching, it is essential to remember that

there is no one "right way" to co-teaching. Teaching pairs must work together to find a strategy that best fits their needs and the needs of the students.

Moreover, the strategies used to co-plan depend on the flexibility of the school schedule and the time that collaborative pairs can find to work together. Even with limited time, virtual planning allows for collaboration. When teaching together in the classroom, it is essential to remember that there is no "right way" to co-teach. Communicating with one another and finding strategies that work best for the students in the class is the most effective way to co-teach.

### **Extenuating Factors for Co-teaching and Co-planning**

Many different factors contribute to the effectiveness of co-planning and co-teaching. First, the entire collaborative cycle must be maintained for effective co-planning and co-teaching. Honigsfeld and Dove (2015) describe the collaborative cycle as co-planning, co-teaching, co-assessing, and reflecting. All aspects of this cycle are essential for effective teaching, learning, and growth (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015). Peercy et al. (2017) describe the co-planning stage of the cycle as a time where both teachers can build a shared understanding of content and language demands. Both teachers have different skill sets and can work together during this stage to build upon each other's specialties. During the co-teaching stage, there are many opportunities for learning and growth as teachers. Through observations of dialogues between a mainstream classroom teacher and the ENL teacher, collaborative teachers grow through the obstacles they face in the classroom (Peercy et al., 2017). Through co-assessing and reflecting, the teachers can assess the content and language performance. This cycle stage is also crucial for jointly analyzing student data and identifying areas for target intervention (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019).



A trusting relationship is needed for effective co-teaching and co-planning. Honigsfeld and Dove (2015) begin their article by emphasizing how neither the general education teacher nor the ENL teacher wants to give up control of what they are teaching. In order to begin effectively co-teaching, a trusting relationship must be formed so that each teacher knows what their role is to one another (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015). McGlynn and Kelly (2019) suggest getting to know your co-teacher and forming a relationship with one another to have more open communication (McGlynn & Kelly, 2019). Engaging in meaningful conversations with one another can provide deeper insight into who each person is as an individual and a teacher. These conversations can help avoid future miscommunication regarding their roles in the classroom (DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009).

Flexibility is an essential aspect of co-planning and co-teaching. As previously mentioned in this paper, the best co-teaching partnerships use a variety of teaching strategies within each lesson. There is no "right way" to co-teach, and teachers must be flexible and use whatever strategies work best for them and their current group of students (Bauler & Kang, 2020). When co-planning and co-teaching, two teachers with different areas of expertise share the class's responsibility. McGlynn and Kelly (2019) reference communication and flexibility as two essential factors for sharing responsibility for a class. Chandler-Olcott and Nieroda (2016) report the findings from a four-year formative study of a summer enrichment writing course. This study aimed to improve the students' writing abilities while also observing the teachers' ability to teach writing to a diverse group of students through collaborative teaching. This study reported that flexibility and adaptability were necessary factors for effective co-teaching. Throughout the four years of the study, the teachers made adjustments to the seating charts, the grouping style, and the way they planned. These adjustments were made throughout the four years of the study in

order to best help the students they were working with (Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016).

While having a set of strategies and plans prepared for co-teaching a class is essential, the ability to be quick-witted and adjust the lessons to meet the needs of students is crucial.

Many different factors contribute to the effectiveness of collaborative teaching.

Maintaining the entire collaborative cycle with planning, teaching, and assessing together will increase the effectiveness of lessons for the ELLs. Also, having a trusting relationship and flexibility will help the co-teaching partnership to be more effective.

### **Professional Development for Co-planning and Co-teaching**

Collaboration must be explicitly taught. Many pre-service teaching programs provide lessons and readings on the topic of collaboration, but this is rarely a skill that is explicitly taught (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019). Percy et al. (2017) describe the process and findings of a professional development designed to instruct teacher collaboration for 26 ENL and general education teachers. This study follows three teacher pairs and takes data from observations, lessons, and interviews. In the focus school district for this study, the teachers all had to follow the curriculum framework, which is a 300-page document with lessons and pacing for the entire year of English Language Arts. Through this curriculum framework, the collaborative pairs could focus on the skill of collaboration, and they worked together to follow the curriculum framework. In the professional development, they met monthly to explore the benefits and challenges of collaboration. When everyone in the school followed the same curriculum, the collaboration between the ENL teachers and the mainstream teachers was a much more attainable task. It could be taught explicitly (Percy et al., 2017). Each step of the collaborative process must be explicitly instructed when teaching collaboration. Honigsfeld and Dove (2019) explain specific goals for planning, mapping curriculum, teaching, assessing, and even

continuing professional learning. Most pre-service teacher preparation programs do not teach how to collaborate with another teacher, leaving many teachers entirely unprepared to teach their diverse classrooms of learners (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019). Beninghof and Leensvaart (2016) go into detail about the specific training and professional development provided to teachers in Colorado as the district implemented the co-planning and co-teaching approaches to instruction. This training followed an “I do, we do, you do” model and took place over several years. Collaboration was explicitly taught to the teacher pairs, they followed modeled practices together and finally they began to find the strategies that worked best for them (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016).

In addition to the professional development focusing on collaboration, general education teachers should also receive professional development on second language acquisition. McGlynn and Kelly (2019) explain how general education teachers often lack an understanding of the role of the ENL teacher as well as how ELLs can effectively learn. It is often a barrier to effective co-planning and co-teaching. Li and Peters (2020) used second language acquisition theories as a part of their professional development for teachers working with ELLs. Through this professional development, the general education teachers gained a stronger understanding of how to teach ELLs. Lucas et al. (2018) noted that professional development focusing on languages and how languages are learned helped the teachers to create and implement lessons for ELLs. Teachers came to understand the importance of teaching vocabulary. They also began to see connections between the English and Spanish language which helped them to form connections for their students (Lucas et al., 2018). Second language acquisition instruction helps all teachers to be better teachers of ELLs.

Finally, professional development for co-planning and co-teaching between general education teachers and ENL teachers should be an ongoing process. Approaches to co-planning and co-teaching should be continually reflected upon, and teachers should always try to grow in their practices (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019). Li and Peters (2020) describe a professional development program designed to teach general education teachers skills for working with ELLs. Many general education teachers have had little to no educational training on working with this diverse student population, leading to the ELL's needs not being met in the classroom. This professional development described by Li and Peters (2020) took place over a 10-month time span. This professional development did not follow the traditional workshop approach. Instead, it incorporated research and service components. Throughout the ten months, the teachers practiced the skills in the classroom and returned research data to their sessions. This professional development allowed the teachers to grow over time and develop fundamental skills that will help them be better ELL teachers (Li & Peters, 2020). In the professional development created by Percy et al. (2017), the five-month time span still allowed the teachers to practice skills they learned in natural classroom settings. This long period allowed the teachers to learn about new collaborative skills, practice implementing the skills, and then also reflect on the implementation. In addition, Beninghof and Leensvaart (2016) created a professional development training that took place over several years. Even after the initial explicit instruction, observations and feedback continued to take place to ensure that effective co-planning and co-teaching strategies were implemented in the classrooms (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016). The extended time for professional development for collaboration and teaching ELLs is necessary to develop applicable skills.

Co-planning and co-teaching are practical approaches to teaching ELLs, but these collaborative approaches do not always come naturally. Collaboration is something that must be explicitly taught so that teachers have clear expectations of what role they play. In addition, second language acquisition theories should be taught to all teachers of ELLs to ensure that they have a strong understanding of their student's needs. Professional development for collaboration and teaching ELLs must be taught over time to allow for practice and reflection.

### **Conclusion**

Co-planning and co-teaching and approaches to teaching ELLs have shown positive results in language proficiency levels and content knowledge. While research has shown the benefits of these approaches and mandates have required their implementation, many teachers across the United States still lack an understanding of how they can use this approach in their district. A lack of understanding of the topic and expectations from leadership are contributing factors to why these approaches are still not the norm in schools across the country. Through new strategies and ongoing professional development, collaborative pairs can begin planning and teaching together to meet the needs of English Language Learners.

The gaps in this reviewed literature do not allow the complete picture of co-planning and co-teaching to be clear. First, much of the research on this topic relies on qualitative data including interviews, journals, and observations. While this data are still helpful, quantitative data revealing test scores over a long period of time before and after collaborative teaching has been implemented would allow us to have a clear vision of the benefits. Mofield (2020) explains that the majority of data surrounding teacher collaboration lacks a strong base as the studies are often limited to small case studies, observations, and teacher reflections. Also, almost all of the literature on this topic focuses on very linguistically diverse school districts with an increasing

number of ELLs. Whiting (2019) also noticed this gap and points out how there is very little research done for co-planning and co-teaching in settings with a lack of diversity. In the Avon Central School District, a small rural school district south of Rochester, NY, the ENL teacher is pushing into classrooms with only one or two ELLs. This lack of diversity when pushing into the classroom creates a different setting than is described in much of the research on this topic.

However, the reviewed literature has helped inform the needs of teachers of ELLs. ENL teachers need support from leadership and clarity of expectations to have an equal role in the classroom. General education teachers need more support for working with ELLs and explicit instruction for collaborating with a specialized teacher. Critical conversations, clear strategies, and ideas for overcoming barriers are needed to begin collaboratively planning and teaching together. In Chapter 3, I will describe my professional development plan to provide general education and ENL teachers with strategies for co-planning and co-teaching. The professional development will also provide the administration with strategies for supporting the teacher in this new approach to planning and teaching.

### **Chapter 3: Description of the Product and Tools**

In this Chapter, I will describe a professional development plan designed to help the general education teachers and the ENL teachers at the Avon Central School District to effectively co-plan and co-teach in their integrated classrooms. The problem facing the Avon Central School district is an absence of co-planning and co-teaching due to the lack of leadership support and knowledge surrounding the approach. The ENL teachers in the district are often left pushing into the mainstream classrooms and serving as one-on-one tutors for the ELLs. As described in Chapter 2, research reveals that in classrooms where co-teaching and co-planning are effectively implemented, students perform at higher language proficiency levels and demonstrate improved writing skills (Bauler & Kang, 2020; Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016). Teachers in this district must learn strategies for co-planning and co-teaching and receive the leadership support needed to implement these approaches effectively in the classrooms.

#### **The Setting for Professional Development**

The Avon Central School District is a small district of around one thousand students from kindergarten to twelfth grade. This professional development will focus on the middle school teachers and administrators. The ENL teacher in the middle school has been working in the district for four years and expressed concern about co-planning and co-teaching. There are little to no expectations provided by the leadership in the district, and the ENL educator is often left working as a one-on-one tutor for the ELL in the class. Unlike many of the schools from the research provided in Chapter 2, the Avon central school district is not a very linguistically diverse school. There is only one ENL educator for the middle and high school, and this teacher is pushing into a wide variety of classes daily. Since the ENL teacher is likely to work with different teachers each year depending on the ELL's schedules, the initial professional

development session will be provided to all middle school teachers and the administration. This initial session seeks to provide teachers and administrators with a better understanding of what co-planning and co-teaching are, why they are essential approaches to instruction, and how they can be applied to the instruction at the Avon middle school. As mentioned in Chapter 2, professional development for co-planning and co-teaching should take place over a long period. Li and Peters (2020) described how their professional development took place over 10 months. Hence, teachers had the opportunity to practice what they were learning in the classroom and reflect on these practices. For this reason, two additional professional development sessions will be planned throughout the school year for the general education teachers working directly with the ENL teacher.

### **Agenda for Professional Development**

The professional development for this course will take place over a school year throughout three different sessions. The first session will be an hour-long and take place on the first superintendent's conference day, right before the beginning of the school year. This session will take place in the middle school library, where all staff meetings occur. The goal for the first professional development session is for the general education teachers, the ENL teacher, and the leadership in the middle school to all have a common viewpoint on co-planning and co-teaching as well as a plan for the year. As discussed in Chapter 2, Bauler and Kang (2020) emphasize that one of the most critical aspects of effective co-planning and co-teaching is that both teachers in the room clearly understand their role in the classroom. They also explained that leadership support is essential to co-planning and co-teaching (Bauler & Kand, 2020). For these reasons, the middle school administration must also participate in professional development so that each



member of the middle school community understands the role they play in supporting co-planning and co-teaching for ELLs.

The first step in working towards a common viewpoint of co-planning and co-teaching is understanding teachers' and administrators' current perceptions of co-planning and co-teaching. The first professional development session will begin with a google forms survey (see appendix A) that asks questions about current co-planning and co-teaching practices in the classroom. This survey will provide insight into where the teachers are currently at so that we all have a clear starting point. Teachers will be provided with two handouts after the survey and a group discussion of the questions. The first handout (see appendix B) will provide the teachers with research backing up the benefits of co-planning and co-teaching. This research will help to provide the teachers with credibility for the professional development session. The second handout (see appendix C) provides the teachers with a list of strategies for co-planning and co-teaching. The teachers will work in groups based on their content area to brainstorm how they could begin to co-plan and co-teach with the ENL teacher in their subject area. Since there is only one ENL teacher, she would move between groups during this time to participate in the different discussions. This activity would conclude with a group discussion of what ideas came up during the brainstorming sessions.

Next, teachers with ELLs in their classrooms will be provided three materials to support their co-planning and co-teaching efforts throughout the year. The first item (see appendix D) will be a link to a google excel sheet for the general education teachers and the ENL teacher to find at least one shared planning time each week. This will allow teachers to share their schedules and find a shared time to work on planning for lessons each week. Next, teachers will be provided with an online plan book through google docs (see appendix E). This plan book will

allow both the general education teacher and the ENL teacher to plan virtually and see one another's ideas even if they are not able to meet in person. Finally, all of the teachers and the administration will be provided with a link to an online question forum (See appendix F). This forum will be open and active for the entire year, allowing teachers to ask questions about co-planning and co-teaching as they arise in their practice. Once a teacher asks a question, I could provide an answer based on the research of literature from Chapter 2, or a different teacher could provide an answer based on the practices in their classrooms. This question forum will allow for continued learning in between professional development sessions.

The following professional development session will occur at the monthly staff meeting right after the first quarter ends. This time gap will allow teachers to become more settled in their classrooms for the year and the time they need to begin using co-planning and co-teaching in their classrooms. This second session is for the ENL teacher and the general education teachers with ELLs in their classrooms this year and will take place over 30 minutes. This session will begin with an anonymous survey asking teachers about their realistic viewpoints on implementing co-planning and co-teaching practices in their classes (see appendix G). Questions will ask how often general education teachers and the ENL teacher have met in person or online, what strategies have been helpful, and finally, what barriers have been getting in the way of effectively implementing these strategies. After viewing responses, there will be a group discussion to share successes and struggles. After the survey and group discussion, teachers will break up into groups based on their grade level and brainstorm solutions to common barriers (see appendix H). These common barriers will be listed from the literature reviewed in chapter 2 and any barriers that come up in the question forum provided at the first session. This second session will end with a whole group discussion of solutions. The barriers and possible solutions will be

noted and provided to the administrators of the building so that leadership support may also be provided.

The final professional development session will occur at the end of the year during the May monthly staff meeting. This session will take 30 minutes and focus on teacher reflections from the year. This session aims to assess teacher perception of co-planning and co-teaching, the effectiveness of these approaches to instruction, and finally, the effectiveness of this professional development. This session will begin with discussion questions surrounding the use of co-planning and co-teaching throughout the year (see appendix I). Teachers will discuss in small groups and share their experiences. Next, teachers will share out loud with the group answers to the discussion questions. This session ends with a final google form (see appendix J) that asks teachers about their individual perceptions, what successes they saw, what challenges they are still facing, and what could have made the professional development more effective. The answers to these questions will help guide future professional development in co-planning and co-teaching in the following years.

Overall, the intended outcome of this professional development is for teachers in the Avon middle school to better understand co-planning and co-teaching practices, so they can begin to implement these practices in their classrooms. Another outcome is for administrators to have a common viewpoint of co-planning and co-teaching practices with the teachers to support them. Each material and activity within the professional development work together to help teachers and administrators reach this common goal of implementing co-planning and co-teaching practices in the classroom. In the next section of this Chapter, I will discuss the rationale for the materials used throughout this professional development.

### **Rationale for Materials**

To begin, the literature reviewed in chapter 2 supports the timing of this professional development over a year. Professional development for teachers of ELLs should take place over a long period to allow for continued practice and reflection (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019; Li & Peters, 2020). Beninghof and Leensvaart (2016) explained how their professional development for co-planning and co-teaching took place over several years. After initial explicit instruction on strategies and techniques, a long period of practice and reflection was used to master these approaches to instruction (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016). Using this information found in the literature on co-planning and co-teaching, I planned for the professional development to take place over a year. The first session involves explicit instruction on the topic, and the follow-up sessions allow reflections on actual classroom practices. This literature also supports the online question forum (see appendix F) that allows teachers to pose questions they come across while practicing co-planning and co-teaching strategies in their classrooms. This online question forum will be provided to the teachers during the first session, and it will be active throughout the entire year. This allows teachers to help one another through their experiences of learning to co-plan and co-teach.

As previously mentioned, the first session will include explicit instruction on co-planning and co-teaching strategies. The literature reviewed in chapter 2 supports the need for explicit instruction at the beginning when learning to co-plan and co-teach (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019; Li & Peters, 2020). The information provided to the teachers (see appendix C) provided straightforward ways for the teachers to co-plan and co-teach. Strategies provided to teachers in professional development are based on the literature reviewed in chapter 2 (Bauler & Kang, 2020; DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015;

McGlynn & Kelly, 2020). These strategies are backed up by research and have been practiced throughout many studies.

Two common barriers to effective co-planning and co-teaching are lack of time and understanding of roles. The literature reviewed in Chapter 2 provides possible solutions to these common barriers. In order to overcome the lack of time many teachers face, DelliCarpini and Gulla (2009) suggest trying to find at least one shared time a week or month to meet in person. Based on this suggestion, teachers will be provided with a scheduling document (see appendix D) to assist the general education teacher and the ENL teacher with finding a common time to meet. DelliCarpini and Gulla (2009) also suggest using virtual plan books when meeting in person is not an option. For this reason, teachers will be provided with a virtual lesson outline document (see appendix E) where both teachers can plan out their objectives for each day. This virtual lesson outline document will be on a Google Doc so that teachers can add comments to one another's plans virtually (McGlynn & Kelly, 2020). In addition, the virtual lesson outline will help overcome the barrier of a lack of understanding of roles. As described in Chapter 2, Bauler and Kang (2020) reported that many ENL teachers do not know their role in the classroom. In appendix E, there are locations for both the general education teacher and the ENL teacher to write down their role in each lesson. The act of writing out the role will help both teachers to have a better understanding of their responsibilities for each lesson.

Finally, the surveys and discussion questions throughout the three sessions allow for continued reflections on planning and teaching practices (see appendices G, I, & J). As described in Chapter 2, there are many ways to effectively co-plan and co-teach. Bauler and Kang (2020) recommend using a wide variety of techniques. Finding the strategies that work best for each

teaching pair is essential. The surveys and discussion questions will allow teachers to share techniques that have worked well in their classes.

### **Conclusion**

The problem facing the Avon Central School district is a lack of co-planning and co-teaching. This professional development will provide teachers in the district with an understanding of co-planning and co-teaching practices. It will also provide teachers with resources they can use throughout the year to help them with their co-planning and co-teaching practices. In addition, this professional development will take place over a year to allow for continued practice and reflection. Finally, the school's leadership will participate in the professional development sessions to gain a better understanding of the benefits and barriers to co-planning and co-teaching. Having an understanding of the barriers will help the leadership to provide more support to the teachers.

## **Chapter 4: Conclusion**

As the ELL population in schools across the United States continues to grow, teachers must learn strategies that adapt to this new population of students (Li & Peters, 2020). An effective approach to teaching ELLs in the mainstream classroom is through collaboration of the ENL and the general education teacher. This collaboration is often referred to as co-planning and co-teaching but these approaches to instruction are not always effectively applied in the classroom setting. Through my own observations on the Avon Central School District, it is clear that the teachers lack the knowledge and support for co-planning and co-teaching practices. The ENL teacher is pushing into the classroom but not effectively co-planning and co-teaching with the general education teacher. While research supports the effectiveness of co-planning and co-teaching for ELLs, these strategies are not a “norm” in the classroom (Bauler & Kang, 2020).

While investigating why these strategies are not applied as often in the mainstream classrooms, several research questions arose: Are co-planning and co-teaching effective strategies for instructing ELLs in the mainstream classroom? What are the barriers that teachers face when trying to co-plan and co-teach? What are some effective ways to begin co-planning and co-teaching? What type of professional development is helpful when learning to co-plan and co-teach? Within this Chapter, I will summarize the literature that responds to these questions and discuss the implications that this research has on future education for ELLs and ENL teachers.

### **Summary**

I have reviewed many different sources of literature on the topic of co-planning and co-teaching. Many sources of literature show the effectiveness of co-planning and co-teaching through observations, writing samples, and test scores from long term case studies (Bauler &

Kang, 2020; Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016; Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016). Many other sources clearly outline strategies for co-planning and co-teaching as well as overcoming barriers (Bauler & Kang, 2020; DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009; McGlynn & Kelly, 2019; Whiting, 2019; Yuen, 2015). In addition, research on the topic of co-planning and co-teaching focuses on the professional development needed in order to effectively implement these strategies (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019; Peercy et al., 2017; Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016; Li & Peters, 2020). All of this research was used as a guiding force for the professional development series I created for the Avon Central School District.

The reviewed literature on this topic provided answers to my beginning research questions. The research supports the use of co-planning and co-teaching as effective strategies for teaching ELLs in the mainstream classroom. In studies following classrooms before and after implementing co-planning and co-teaching strategies, NYSESLAT test scores and writing proficiency levels were both seen to improve (Bauler & Kang, 2020; Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016). Descriptive data from another study also represented an increase in language proficiency for ELLs through teacher collaboration (Li & Peters, 2020). In the first session of my professional development, I provide teachers and administration with this research to support the concepts of co-planning and co-teaching.

The literature also clearly outlined common barriers that many teachers and school districts face when trying to implement co-planning and co-teaching practices. A lack of time, clarity of roles, and leadership support were all listed as common barriers (DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009; McGlynn & Kelly, 2019). While these barriers exist in most school districts, there are still many ways to overcome these challenges and continue practicing effective co-planning and co-teaching strategies. Meeting once a week, online virtual plan books, and clear expectations from



leadership are all ways that teachers at any district can overcome the initial challenges they face while co-planning and co-teaching (DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009; McGlynn & Kelly, 2019).

While the teachers at the Avon middle school are likely to face these barriers as they begin co-planning and co-teaching, brainstorming ideas and reading about different salutations will help them to face these challenges.

The reviewed literature on this topic also provided suggestions for how to begin co-planning and co-teaching. McGlynn and Kelly (2019) provided different ways to co-teach in a classroom and DelliCarpini and Gulla (2009) gave examples of ways that teachers can co-plan virtually when meeting in person is not possible. This information is all provided to the teachers during the professional development session to help them begin in the co-planning and co-teaching ventures. Finally, the literature on professional development for co-planning and co-teaching emphasized the need for ongoing learning (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019; Li & Peters, 2020; Percy et al., 2017). Following the literature, my professional development, designed for the teachers and administration of the Avon central school district, takes place over the course of a year. While learning new skills like co-planning and co-teaching, it is essential that teachers are given opportunities to practice and implement these skills in real classroom settings.

The literature reviewed on the topic of co-planning and co-teaching was all used to guide the professional development created for the Avon Central school district. This professional development will help teachers to collaborate with one another and will also help the leadership to support the teachers. This professional development has several implications for both the students and the teachers at the Avon Central school district.

### **Implications for Student Learning**

The ELLs will benefit from the co-planning and co-teaching strategies because they will have more effective instruction in the mainstream classroom. As described before, test scores for language proficiency have increased in co-planned and taught classrooms (Bauler & Kang, 2020). When teachers are using effective strategies for co-planning, they are thinking about both the content and language objectives of each lesson (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015). When lessons are carefully planned to address both the content and language needs, the ELLs are benefiting from the lesson.

Co-planning and co-teaching also results in more time spent in the mainstream classroom. For the ELLs, this allows for more time socializing with peers and collaborating with students of different language abilities (Whiting, 2019). In addition, Whiting (2019) explains how when the ENL teacher is working as a one-on-one tutor instead of really co-teaching, the ELL often feels shame or embarrassment. When feeling this embarrassment, it is more difficult to focus on the lesson and the tasks at hand.

The extended time in the classroom as well as the carefully planned out lessons that address the language needs of the topic will help ELLs to succeed in their classes. The professional development created for the teachers and administration of the school will have positive implications for the student's emotional and academic wellbeing.

### **Implications for Teaching**

There are several positive implications for teaching that will come from this professional development. First, teachers will learn about strategies for co-teaching in the classroom (Mcglynn & Kelly, 2020). Many of the teachers have not seen what effective co-teaching can look like in the classroom. Through learning about different strategies, both the general education teacher and the ENL teacher will have a starting spot for co-teaching together.

Next, teachers will work together to brainstorm ideas for overcoming common barriers to co-planning and co-teaching. As they work together to brainstorm ideas, they are more likely to persevere when challenged during the school year.

In addition, teachers are provided with resources that they can use throughout the year to collaborate with one another virtually. They will have a virtual plan book that can be used between the ENL teacher and the general education teacher. They will also have access to an online question forum where teachers can pose questions about challenges they are facing, and other teachers can respond with answers. Through providing the teachers with these resources, they will begin to overcome the challenges they face with co-planning and co-teaching.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

There are many different sources of literature that focus on co-planning and co-teaching for ELLs. Unfortunately, most of this research is completed in highly diverse school settings. In these school settings, there are multiple ELLs per classroom and there are several different ENL teachers for each school building. In the Avon Central School District, there is one ENL teacher that works with preschoolers through fourth grade and there is a second ENL teacher that works with the fifth through twelfth grade students. There is often only one ELL in a class at a time and this makes for a very different setting than is described in the majority of the research. I recommend that there is more research completed on co-planning and co-teaching strategies for these schools with less language diversity.

### **Final Thoughts**

As the ELL population continues to grow in the United States, it is essential that all teachers are prepared to teach this diverse body of students. Research has shown that co-planning and co-teaching are effective ways to teach ELLs in the mainstream classroom. Extensive

professional development that takes place over a long period of time is necessary for teachers intending to co-plan and co-teach. Professional development should include strategies for co-planning and co-teaching and should allow for practice with continued reflections. Through implementing co-planning and co-teaching strategies, both teacher and students will see positive outcomes.

### References

- Bauler, C., & Kang, E. (2020). Elementary ESOL and content teachers' resilient co-teaching practices: A long-term analysis. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 14(4), 338–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2020.1747163>
- Beninghof, A., & Leensvaart, M. (2016). Co-teaching to support ELLs. *Educational Leadership*, 73(5), 70–73.
- Bureau, U. S. C. (2022, April 12). *Review of two Texas counties shows gap in teacher/student diversity*. Census.gov. Retrieved June 9, 2022, from <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2022/01/nations-teachers-more-diverse-but-still-lag-racial-ethnic-makeup-of-students.html#:~:text=About%20one%20quarter%20of%20all,composition%20of%20the%20populations%20described.>
- Chandler-Olcott, K., & Nieroda, J. (2016). The creation and evolution of a co-teaching community: How teachers learned to address adolescent English language learners' needs as writers. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 49(2), 170–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2016.1144830>
- DelliCarpini, M., & Gulla, A. (2009). Success with ELLs: Creating space for collaboration. *The English Journal*, 98(4), 133–137. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40503283>
- Eun, B. (2019). The zone of proximal development as an overarching concept: A framework for synthesizing Vygotsky's theories. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 51(1), 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2017.1421941>

- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2015). Co-teaching ELLs: Riding a tandem bike. (co-planning and collaborative teaching for the sake of English language learners). *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 56–60.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2019). Preparing teachers for co-teaching and collaboration. In Oliveira, L. (Ed.), *The Handbook of TESOL in K-12* (pp. 405–421). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119421702.ch26>
- Li, N., & Peters, A. (2020). Preparing K-12 teachers for ELLs: Improving teachers' L2 knowledge and strategies through innovative professional development. *Urban Education*, 55(10), 1489–1506. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916656902>
- Lucas, T., Strom, K., Bratkovich, M., & Wnuk, J. (2018). Inservice preparation for mainstream teachers of English language learners: A Review of the Empirical Literature. *The Educational Forum (West Lafayette, Ind.)*, 82(2), 156–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420852>
- McGlynn, K., & Kelly, J. (2019). Assess your co-teaching chemistry through experience. *Science Scope*, 42(9), 30–35.
- Mofield, E. (2020). Benefits and barriers to collaboration and co-teaching: examining perspectives of gifted education teachers and general education teachers. *Gifted Child Today Magazine*, 43(1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217519880588>
- Peercy, M., Martin-Beltrán, M., Yazan, B., & DeStefano, M. (2017). “Jump in any time”: How teachers struggle with curricular reform generates opportunities for teacher learning. *Action in Teacher Education*, 39(2), 203–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1248302>

Spratt, J., & Florian, L. (2015). Inclusive pedagogy: From learning to action. Supporting each individual in the context of “everybody.” *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 49, 89–96.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.03.006>

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes* .

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Whiting, J. (2017). Caught between the push and the pull: ELL teachers’ perceptions of mainstreaming and ESOL classroom teaching. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*,

8(1), 9–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26390043.2017.12067793>

Yuen Yi, L. (2015). A glimpse into effectiveness of L2-content cross-curricular collaboration in content-based instruction programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.

18(4), 443-462. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2014.916654

**Appendix A:**  
**Google Forms Survey**

1. How would you define co-planning and co-teaching?
2. What has co-planning and co-teaching (between ENL teacher and general education teacher) looked like for you in the past?
3. What are the benefits of co-planning and co-teaching for the ELLs in your class?
4. What do you think the ideal co-planning and co-teaching setup would look like?
5. What are some barriers that have gotten in the way of you reaching the ideal co-planning and co-teaching setup?



**Appendix B:****Research Supporting Co-planning and Co-teaching Practices**

What has the research shown?

- NYSESLAT test results show proficiency scores of 1 and 2 decreased by 6.74% and 2.04% over the first two years of co-planning and co-teaching implementation, students with a proficiency score of 3 increased by 3.64%, and students with proficiency scores of 4 and 5 also increased by around 2.5% (Bauler & Kand, 2020).
- An average increase of 29.6% in ELLs' language skills was found through teacher collaboration (Li & Peters, 2020)
- The extended time in the mainstream classroom benefits the ELLs as they have more time for socialization with their peers (Whiting, 2019).
- A study of a summer enrichment writing course over four years revealed that the ELL's writing skills improved over the four years with a co-taught class through several periods of adjustments (Chandler-Olcott & Nieroda, 2016).
- A study found after one year of effective co-planning and co-teaching, the median student growth percentile moves from a score of "approaching" to a score of "exceeds," which is the highest possible score in the state of Colorado (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016).

**Appendix C:****Strategies for Co-planning and Co-teaching***Co-planning strategies:*

- Try and meet once a week or even once a month (DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009)
- Virtual plan books (DelliCarpini & Gulla, 2009)
- Use google docs for planning so that both teachers can edit online (McGlynn & Kelly, 2020)
- The content teacher is responsible for planning the lesson based on the content standard (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015)
- ENL teacher is responsible for selecting a language standard that corresponds and adding effective scaffolds (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015)

*Co-teaching strategies:*

- Use a variety of co-teaching models throughout each lesson (Bauler & Kang, 2020)
- One teach - one assist (McGlynn & Kelly, 2020)
- Parallel teaching (McGlynn & Kelly, 2020)
- Team teaching (McGlynn & Kelly, 2020)
- Take turns leading the lesson (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015)
- Work in stations and have the different teachers leading different stations (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2015)

**Appendix D:**  
**Excel Scheduling Document**

ENL TEACHER SCHEDULE	A Day	B Day		General Education Teacher Schedule	A Day	B Day
Before School				Before School		
Period 1				Period 1		
Period 2				Period 2		
Period 3				Period 3		
Period 4				Period 4		
Period 5				Period 5		
Period 6				Period 6		
Period 7				Period 7		
Period 8				Period 8		
Period 9				Period 9		
Period 10 (After school)				Period 10 (After school)		

**Appendix E:**  
**Virtual Daily Planner**

Week:

Day	Content Standard + Objective	Language Standard + Objective	Role of the Content teacher	Role of the ENL teacher
-----	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------

Monday

Tuesday

Wednesday

Thursday

Friday

**Appendix F:**

**Excel Question Spreadsheet**

Ask any question below that you come across while co-planning and co-teaching. Anyone can respond to a question if they have an answer!	Answers:
1	1

**Survey Questions**

1. Realistically, how many times have you met either in person or virtually with the ENL teacher during the first quarter?
2. What are some co-planning strategies that have worked well?
3. What are some co-teaching strategies that have worked well?
4. What have been some barriers to co-planning?
5. What have been some barriers to co-teaching?

**Appendix H:**

**Common Barriers to Co-Planning and Co-teaching**

Directions: Three common barriers to co-planning and co-teaching are lack of time, lack of clarity in roles, and finally, a lack of leadership support. In your groups, try to brainstorm ideas of how you could overcome these barriers within the Avon middle school.

Lack of time:

Lack of clarity in roles:

Lack of leadership support:

**Appendix I:**

**Discussion Questions**

1. What were some successes in co-planning and co-teaching that you experienced this year?
2. What were the persistent barriers to co-planning and co-teaching this year?
3. What improvements did you notice for the ELLs in your class this year?
4. What improvements did you notice for your mainstream students in your class this year?



**Google Form Questions**

1. What was a positive experience you had with co-planning and co-teaching this year?
2. What was a negative experience you had with co-planning and co-teaching this year?
3. How could the administration further support your co-planning and co-teaching practices next year?
4. What improvements did you notice with your students this year in a co-taught classroom?
5. What additions to this professional development will be beneficial for future years?

**Appendix K:**

**Professional Development Video Link**

<https://watch.screencastify.com/v/bhw7KoAh98PYNm2D9g7p>