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Coordinating Co-teaching for an ELL / Special Education Student

“Children already come to us differentiated. It just makes sense to differentiate our instruction in response to them.” (Tomlinson, 2014, p.42).

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In the past three years I have worked with students who are labeled as EBD (Emotional Behavior Development), DCD (Developmentally Cognitively Delayed), autistic and students with a learning disability. There have been students who tore up the whole room and ‘no response’ students who stared at the ceiling the whole time I tried to teach. I have even had a student that had not learned his alphabet sounds by 2nd grade and a 1st grader who had a stroke at a young age leaving his mind and ability to comprehend at the level of a four year-old. It has been a struggle for me to even determine where to begin to create a lesson plan for these students as an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher. While some ESL teachers may feel it is more of a special education issue and we do not need to focus on these students as much, I see it as an equally important dual service. I believe I have an important role to help these students, but how do I connect with them to see progress? This is my journey. This chapter introduces how I want to learn more about special education strategies to help me with these students and explains how to create a collaborative team among these inspiring teachers through a business model called Four Disciplines of Execution (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012). Together we can create the best pedagogy for every dually serviced student.
When a student is dually serviced in ESL and special education, a collaboration of the teachers from each department has so much to offer. Not only does the student benefit with lessons that are more coherent and scaffolds on what he knows, but also the teachers are more aware of the student’s progress and are working as a team for that student. (Levine, Lukens, & Smallwood, 2013). Hoping for this new teaching vision to come to life excited me to try something new, but if I wanted to see this change, it was up to me to prepare, plan and implement.

I usually work with dual eligible students on a one-to-one ratio because their disability makes it hard for them to keep up with the regular EL (English learner). Their disabilities range from speech issues, physical disabilities, and cognitive delays to learning disabilities. When I go to an Individual Education Plan (IEP) meeting I get to understand how the student is being serviced in special education. Biagini, Blatchley, Casey, Clarke, Diaz, Elliot, ….Watkins, (1987) shares that at an IEP meeting an individual educational plan for each student’s specialized needs is discussed. Specific goals and objectives must be designated and evaluated towards those goals and objectives. They must be recorded on a written document. (p. 7) For example, there could be one special education teacher working with phonics and reading comprehension and a speech teacher instructing about sentence structure and question formation. Since those are things I usually also teach my regular education ELs I decided to shift my approach and only focus on vocabulary and background knowledge. I couldn’t help but wonder if I was doing enough on my part and what might still be missing among all of us. I did not know all the detailed lessons the special education teachers used with EL students. I
realized it would help these students immensely if I were to form collaboration with their special education teachers.

It was clear that I was approaching the students from a language point of view, and they were servicing the students from a disability perspective. There were, however, several areas we seemed to overlap, but I was not sure where to focus. The special education teachers also expressed that they were unsure how we instructed our ELs. Finding the extra time to collaborate was very difficult especially since IEPs needed to be developed, various and multiple meetings had to be attended, we all had to create lesson plans and we had to spend time actually working with the students. I hoped to find a way that we could still collaborate, but where we would not need to sit down weekly to plan out individual detailed lessons.

During my research for this capstone, my husband introduced me to a business model that he uses at his job to guide projects. Through our discussions I discovered that perhaps I could blend my desire for collaboration with this business model called Four Disciplines of Execution (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012). It focuses on each person taking responsibility within the group instead of one person dictating directions to the whole group. I appreciated the structure of this program and decided it would be our foundation to this new collaborative team. This led me to my guiding question: “How can the components of the business model, Four Disciplines of Execution guide teachers’ collaborative instruction for EL students who also receive special education?”

My ESL department is challenged with how to teach some of these students who cannot work at the same rate as a regular English learner. We have no special education
training, except the one class we attend for re-licensure. Even though we do attend the class, it only helps to identify various categories of special education and does not provide the valuable detailed behavior and learning strategies that would help us teach these children in the classroom. This chapter introduces the issues associated with a lack of collaboration around dually serviced ELs and the benefits of working more closely together.

What Lead Me To This Study

During my literature research in the spring I was able to meet with a teacher from a neighboring school district that had already implemented a collaboration of ELL and special education dual services. (A. Habel, personal communication, April 7, 2014) Through her school district the team had researched and created a specific documentation for recording and addressing the needs of these dually serviced children. (Appendix A) This documentation and conversation was the springboard for me to learn and create my own record keeping. While the teacher I met with usually worked with more challenging disabilities, I had been working with a less demanding student that had a learning disability and a speech disorder.

The recorded document that I created from her insight included the same general content with additions that applied better for my student and situation. The original document included a description of a dual service, student ID number, student’s name, school they are attending, grade, special education teacher, special education program they were receiving, ESL teacher, language proficiency score. Finally, it included consultative service documentation and an additional box for notes.
The document that I created had all the same elements except the last portion. Instead of including the Consultative Service Documentation, I added test scores for a reading measurement called Fontas and Pinell and NWEA (Northwest Evaluation Association) scores heavily used by teachers to watch a student’s growth within my district. Under this category, I then created a box for each of the participating teachers on this team for dually servicing this student. In these boxes I wrote what the general objectives were for each of the teachers when working with the student. When using this document I hoped to preserve what we agree upon and have a visual reference for the teachers.

It was now my first time to see if it would work. The teachers I approached taught special education for children with a learning disability and a regular education class. I joined in the conversation by introducing and explaining my goal and hope for dually servicing our common student. They both expressed excitement about my proposal and were ready to meet with me. At this time it was the middle of April and our dually serviced student was in second grade. I still needed to connect with one more teacher that our student works with to complete this team. This teacher was a speech clinician that was more than happy to meet with everyone. I even met alone with her for breakfast to get to know each other and to discuss and understand each other’s departments. Our commonality of working with language was insightful. We both walked away understanding more of each other’s goals for our common student and each of our department’s ambitions.
That following week we all met in the mainstream teacher’s classroom. I arrived with the document that I had created and half filled out with the student’s name, personal identification, test scores and teachers attending with their days and time they service this child. I also brought a WIDA second grade level rubric that explained the student’s four different modalities of reading, writing, listening and speaking to our state’s standards. I wanted to explain how my department worked and our team’s growth measurement.

The special education teachers for learning disabilities and speech therapy brought the student’s IEP. Both teachers had their goals listed within the same IEP document. A copy of this was given to the mainstream teacher and me to follow along during our discussion of goals and accommodations. From this conversation, I wrote each teacher’s focused goal for the student, on our collaboration document.

Our meeting lasted for an hour and we left with a better understanding of each other’s general objectives for this child. At one point I did feel as though my objective for creating a collaborative lesson among the departments was lost in the mainstream teacher’s concern for the student’s disruptive behavior. I was not assertive enough to put everyone back on track with the original meaning for the meeting.

After the meeting, I printed out a copy of this document for everyone to use. (Appendix A) I nominated myself to be responsible for checking in on everyone in the group and set up future meetings.

Unfortunately, this never evolved to another group meeting and there was little weekly input on the student. Due to several tests during this time period, field trips, a field day and the student’s own breakdowns from the inevitable change coming at the end
of the year, availability to teach him and observe his growth was minimal. By the second week in May, I had given up on the teacher and student’s participation. There was only a month of school left. This was not a failure though. From this trial period, I gained some valuable experience. I now possessed a solid structure to use in the next term and had built relationships with the teachers. After this I was introduced to the business model of Four Disciplines of Execution to help us guide our structure and teamwork for future collaborations. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012)

In reviewing the literature, I found the most important parts to the success of my study, which most people fail to recognize, is that there needs to be a relationship with the other individuals first. (Fullan, 2002) In addition, to make sure they know what is in it for them and why you are doing this project. Once the connection is made, it helps to gain trust and support for your research. (Hill, 1996-2015) Then, when you are deep in the project, it makes their willingness to participate in the study go much more smoothly.

During the summer of 2014, while I was still reviewing research, I decided to send out a questionnaire to special education teachers at my school who had worked with dually serviced students in ESL. I wanted to know more about them and what questions they had for me. The questions were as follow:

1. How long and how often did you usually service a student with a disability?
2. What areas of language arts did you work on?
3. Did you co-plan with the mainstream teachers? How often?
4. What would you like to learn more about when working with an ELL? How can I help you? (Example: rubrics to show student’s ability, my objectives, etc.)
The answers to these questions helped me understand what they were looking for and provided a foundation for our future collaboration. The overwhelming response from all these questions came from the last question. They all felt disconnected from my ESL department and were longing to learn more about it and find a way to collaborate.

Role of The Researcher

In the spring of 2015 I worked on this study with three teachers that all work full time within the same school. We all have common preparation time in the morning before school and have been willing to even meet after school if that time works the best. These three teachers were selected due to a common student that we all teach and a second one that three out of the four of us also dually instruct. When asked to participate in this study each one said yes without needing time to think about it.

Background of The Researcher

My career in education began when I worked in a childcare center for eight years beginning in high school, during college and afterwards. Working with these younger children and getting a degree in early childhood education (infants to third grade) was critical to the growth of my early language development understanding. Next, I pursued a career in instructing elementary school aged children. There, I worked as a kindergarten enrichment teacher for three years. While teaching, I was fortunate enough to meet the ESL teachers my school, and it sparked my interest in a career change.

I quit my job and moved to Japan to teach English for a year. Not only did I get the experience of teaching English, but I also got to learn what it is like to move to new a
country. My entire environment had changed and I had to learn to navigate everything from language to their cultural customs. After my year in Japan, I came back to the United States, attended classes and received my second teaching license for K through 12 ESL.

My current ESL position is the same one that I have worked at for the past ten years. In this district, I have worked for the first six years with 5th and 6th graders and the last four years with kindergarten, first, second and third graders. My passion is to work with the younger students, and I am ecstatic that I have the opportunity to do this again. I continue to travel throughout different countries, traveling as the locals do to ensure I continue to learn about other cultures and customs. It also reminds me of how difficult it is to be an outsider, where someone cannot speak the language or have a complete grasp on the social norms. This helps me greatly to relate to the students and their parents as they adjust to living in the United States.

When I was a child, I too received services for special education for about four years. I understand the feelings and frustrations of the student who receives these services and will have to deal with these issues for a lifetime. I appreciated the patience and kindness of the teacher who worked with me. I know that I did not learn as fast and in the same way as my peers, but eventually I did find a methodology that worked. This is also where my passion for this research comes from. I understand how these students feel and I knew we needed to develop other methods to instruct them. I did not want to push it aside and say that it was a special education issue and not ESL. There has been an attitude between both the ESL and the special education colleagues that the student is the
other servicing department’s issue to handle. I believe this is the wrong way to think.

We both have a part in the student’s growth and need to work together. These students obviously need our dual services, and I felt the only way to do this was to coordinate and collaborate.

Guiding Question

How can the components of the business model, Four Disciplines of Execution, guide a team of teachers’ collaborative instruction for two EL students that also receive special education?

Summary

In doing this study, I hope to help other teachers who are puzzled with their role for a dually serviced student. I want to create a way to share the best and most effective lessons for these children. Taking the time to understand what each teacher is instructing strengthens our expertise and allows us to learn from each other and will hopefully benefit other teachers and future students.

Chapter Overviews

In the first chapter of this study, I introduced the reasoning for my study by looking at collaboration between different departments in a way that it has not been done at my school. I introduced a first attempt that began my journey toward a joint learning model to create a collaborative team. Chapter Two contains the literature review of research I evaluated for understanding IEPs, creating a document for collaboration and goal setting within the group to help us function effectively. Chapter Three describes the
case study that I developed and the methodology that supports it. Chapter Four unfolds the results of this research. Finally, Chapter Five encompasses the conclusion of this research by looking at the major findings and equally at the limitations found in this research. If this research was to be continued or changed, these points were also mentioned in this final chapter.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Even though the reading resources were limited on my specific subject, I was able
to identify and define the roles for ESL and special education students and then the
departments. I found advice on collaborative approaches and how to coordinate the
merger of multiple departments. Then I was able to distinguish these departments and
exhibit the similarities and differences to further define the roles. Next, advice from the
literature and another school district that has already implemented a similar program
helped to design this collaboration. Most importantly, I discovered an approach to
creatively set-up the merger of multiple departments that would provide well-coordinated
teaching strategies, detailed documentation and a community working together for a
dually serviced student. This chapter culminates with a clear definition of my research
goal.

Identifying An English Learner

As described by the Minnesota Department of Education (1991), the department
of ESL (English as a Second Language) qualifies students under two components. These
are the student’s use of a language other than English and the second looks at the
proficiency in English as measured by a language assessment.

Students are first identified when they enter the district. Within the paperwork
that the parents fill out regarding the student there is a category referring to the language
that is used at home. The questions would look similar to the one listed in Biagini, et al.
(1991) (n.p.), under the legal definition Minnesota statue 126.262.
1. What language does your child speak? ________________________________

2. What language does your child speak in your family? ____________________

3. What language does your child speak at home? _________________________

It refers to the language that is used at home and other languages that are spoken among the family. Once a child is identified as a possible LEP (Limited English Proficiency) student, an ESL teacher proceeds to give the student a test to measure their English proficiency. For our district this is a statewide entrance test called WAPT (WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test) by WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment). The results of this test determine if the child needs help with English proficiency for the classroom. The score on this test determines what level of service they will require, ranging from one to five. Level one is described as entering, two as emerging, three as developing, four as expanding and five as bridging. From here the teacher determines the amount of service that they are able to provide. Usually a Level One Entering student would receive more service time than a student that scored a Four Expanding. (WIDA; Biagini, et al., 1991)

Identifying A Student For Special Education

Every student must qualify for special education through a specific process to receive services. This process takes more detailed time than an ESL qualification of home language and then a test. The Minnesota Department of Education has developed a flowchart, which clearly lays out all the steps in the process from identification of a student’s struggle, meeting, testing to determine qualification and receiving services. The flowchart from Biagini et al. (1987) also provides a clear system for all special
education teachers to follow and allows others such as school faculty and parents to
determine where a student may be in the process. (See Appendix B) When a special
education student qualifies, an IEP (individual education plan) is designed for them and
the teachers have specific strategies to help the student learn and focus in a way that
works best for them.

Department Roles of ESL and Special Education

While it is clear that ESL teachers instruct students that are learning the English
language and special education teachers are addressing and teaching the impairment of
learning due to diverse reasons, there are deeper objectives and procedures that both
departments may be unclear about. Biagini, et al. (1991) concurred that once these
students are assessed and identified by either department, they need to determine how
these services would look. An article by National Education Association (2007, p.58)
shared an insightful chart from Catherine Collier on Difference Vs. Disability below in
Table 1.

**Difference vs Disability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Learners Common Errors in English</th>
<th>Language Disabilities in Native Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words not structured correctly</td>
<td>Confused sequencing when relating an event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words not verbalized correctly</td>
<td>Lack of interrelatedness of symbols of object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words with incorrect meaning</td>
<td>Poor organization or sentence structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errors in use of plurals</td>
<td>Delayed responses or reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect word order-misplaced verbs or articles</td>
<td>Poor Topic maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>Difficulty maintaining attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect verb tense</td>
<td>Limited use of age appropriate vocabulary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Errors in use of “the, those, these, a’ with nouns | Poor Memory
---|---
Incorrect use of omission of prepositions | Confused placement of words or phrases
Omitting enunciation of ‘s’ to indicate possession | 

Adapted from Catherine Collier, Difference vs. Disability, 1998

Table 1. Language Difference vs. Disability

ESL Department

Once a student is recognized as Limited English Proficient (LEP), a generic rubric created by Gottlieb, Cranley, and Cammileri (2007) from WIDA is used to guide the instructor in developing differentiated instruction for the individual student. (Appendix C) There are different grade level clusters for each of the rubrics. On the rubric’s vertical axis it lists the objectives of writing, reading, listening and speaking and on the horizontal axis it lists their proficiency level on a scale from one to five. These four important modalities are a part of the communication skills needed to function within the school and academics as it is listed by Minnesota Department of Education. This important information guides the ESL teacher to develop the lesson’s objective. An annual test by WIDA, called Access, is given each February or March to measure the student’s yearly growth. The ESL teacher then uses those test results to guide their students’ lessons for the following year. Below in tables two and three, Levine, Lukens, and Smallwood (2007) provided a similar chart and list of teaching strategies for the classroom teacher or special education teacher to use for scaffolding options in lesson plans. (p.19)
Table 2: GO TO Chart for Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indexed Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indexed Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indexed Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indexed Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The GO TO Strategies Matrix: Scaffolding Across Language Proficiency Levels

#### Listening

**Level 1**  **Teacher Talk** is accompanied by hand and body gestures. Talk is clearly enunciated, directions are modeled, speech is slower, and idioms are avoided.

**Level 2**  **Patterned Oral Language** uses a similar sentence structure and vocabulary within the context of a familiar classroom activity to help learners comprehend classroom routines.

**Level 3**  **Wait Time** of three to eight seconds provides the time needed for ELLs to comprehend the teacher’s question.

**Level 4**  **Paraphrase Passport** encourages learners to listen to their peers’ responses.

**Level 5**  **Video Observation Guides** pose guiding questions, topics, or chronology to activate a students’ prior knowledge and to increase auditory comprehension of the video before, during, and after viewing.

#### Speaking

**Level 1**  **Choral Reading** includes learners in the classroom conversation.

**Level 2**  **Think-Pair-Share Squared** encourages students to speak with other students.

**Level 3**  **Collaborative Dialogues** between the teacher and student promote academic language through strategies such as repeat, recast, reformulate, and prompt.

**Level 4**  Students can begin to give oral reports at this level, if their reports are scaffolded with note cards and opportunities to practice the presentation.

**Level 5**  Academic debates on various viewpoints can be scaffolded with **Graphic Organizers** or **Outlines**.

#### Reading

**Level 1**  **Teacher Read Alouds** scaffold the text content and provide an excellent model of reading in English.

**Level 2**  **Shared Reading** scaffolds the reading process through enlarged texts, activation of prior knowledge, pre-teaching vocabulary, and teacher instruction of basic reading skills.

**Level 3**  **Guided Reading** scaffolds the reading process through targeted instruction at a student’s proficiency level, increased teacher intervention, and leveled texts.

**Level 4**  **Jigsaw Reading** scaffolds independent reading by limiting the amount of the text provided and requiring students to share text information orally with peers.

**Level 5**  **Reciprocal Teaching** scaffolds the independent reading process through instruction and practice of four critical strategies: summarizing, clarifying, questioning, and predicting.

#### Writing

**Level 1**  **Key Sentence Frames** structure early attempts at writing when supported with word and picture banks.

**Level 2**  **Think-Write-Pair-Share** scaffolds early independent writing with extra time and a supportive learning partner.

**Level 3**  **Cloze Passages** that begin with sentences and lead into paragraphs provide structure and can be scaffolded with word or picture banks.

**Level 4**  Longer pieces of independent writing can be scaffolded with **Report Frames** that structure the discourse.

**Level 5**  Instruction in the process of writing a research paper can be scaffolded with opportunities for multiple conferences with teachers and peers.

---


---

**Table 3. Strategies for Language Proficiency Levels**
Special Education Department

The special education program at my school has several components to understand when working with the teachers and the students. Some of these include defining the special education categories, understanding how an Individual Education Plan (IEP) evolves, is documented and serviced and the federal mandated law that encompasses it. Learning all the parts of the special education department and how it works was what I needed to learn and apply with my dually serviced students. Through testing, students are determined to qualify for specific categories of disability and instruction. Each category has a detailed description that helps the instructor and others working with the learner understand the individual student’s challenges. (Biagini, et al., 1991) A student must qualify for one or more of the categories in order to receive services. Most often during an IEP meeting acronyms are used for these categories. When one does not work in this field, it is difficult to remember all of the acronyms. A website by the Minnesota Department of Education (2015) provides a complete list of the different disabilities and the acronyms that define them.

The IEP document encompasses a formal written procedure of instruction for each qualified student. It is created from tests that were given and input from the parents and teachers involved with the student. The IEP will guide the delivery of instruction for each of their specific needs. (Biagini, et al., 1991; Stanberry, 2014) The IEP document is a core element of the IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), which
guarantees that students with disabilities receive free and appropriate education. (Johns, 2013, p.53)

Stanberry (2014) and Biagini, et al. (1991) agree on these important components of the IEP that teachers should understand and know. The information listed within the document is exactly the service that the child will receive. Even if additional things are verbally discussed, unless it is written in the document, it will not be a part of the service. Components commonly found in this document are the teachers involved with the student, special education assessments, district and statewide tests, explicit planned instruction for the child, description of the service for the student, the teacher’s days and times involved in instruction and measureable goals. Once accepted into the program, the IEP team convenes once a year for placement and then once every three years for a new evaluation. (Johns, 2013, p. 54)

The IEP team members consist of the parents, the student when appropriate, general education teachers, special education teachers, an administrator, someone who is able to explain the instructional evaluation used to determine the special education and someone to interpret for the parents if it is needed. The IEP team gathers and reviews data such as medical, student’s background, parental concerns and student’s strengths. They also include additional assessment for the student’s academic level. After the team has looked at this information a measurable goal is set for that individual student. The team signs an agreement on the written IEP documentation to show that they agree on the decision for the goals made for the student. (Johns, 2013, p. 54)
Coordinating The Collaboration of Departments

It is important to establish collaboration between special education and ESL on the development of the instructional plan for the dually serviced student. The collaboration will allow us to address their linguistic, academic, and behavioral needs. (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2010) Developing the partnership between two departments takes time and consideration. Nguyen (2012) suggests finding time for the teachers to sit and learn about each other’s departments and even observing each other can provide information about the student’s needs and abilities. Nguyen further challenges collaborating teachers to “participating in workshops and seminars for each other’s departments to create an understanding for intervention techniques.” (p. 133)

When addressing the IEP, the ESL teacher should have the Access test results to coordinate the plan. The result of collaboration and familiarity with the student’s key issues that need to be addressed will enable his or her teachers to provide a more productive lesson. Consequently, their better understanding of the whole child will result in a greater success for the student. In our school district this has not been something that has been offered or suggested as the standard way of working. Collier (2014) presents insightful ideas on this collaborating while the IEP is in development. They include:

- Specific interventions which address special education needs
- Specific language acquisition interventions, which address the EL student’s L2 goals within context of his/her special education needs.
- Identification of service providers responsible for implementing and monitoring the integration of these services, and
• The time limits specific re-evaluation formats, dates and meetings.

• With respect to a child with limited English proficiency, the IEP team shall consider the language needs of the child as those relate to the child’s IEP, when:
  o The team develops the child’s IEP, and
  o The team conducts a meeting to review and, if appropriate, revise the child’s IEP.

• In considering the child’s language needs (as they relate to the child’s IEP), if the IEP team determines that the child needs a particular device or service … the IEP team must include a statement to that effect in the child’s IEP.

• For a LEP child with a disability, the IEP must address whether the special education and related services that the child needs will be provided in a language other than English.

(p.58)

Co-planning lessons with a desired outcome creates the foundation of this collaboration. The departments should create a predictable and reliable instruction that works toward the agreed outcome. The discussion of modifications from each group can be unified and implemented through manipulative, regalia, lists, picture clues and graphs. (Case & Taylor, Jan. –Feb. 2005; Cloud, 1988-12-00) Nguyen (2012) has generated these additional best practices for the collaboration of these two departments: Special Education and ESL:
• Predictable and consistent classroom management routines (diagrams, lists, easy-to-read schedules, etc.)

• Graphic organizers

• Additional time and opportunities for practice

• Repetition of major concepts using visual cues, pictures, physical gestures

• Identifying, highlighting, and clarifying difficult words and passages within texts to facilitate comprehension

• Emphasizing key vocabulary

• Helping students consolidate text knowledge by having the teacher, their peers, and ELs themselves, summarize and paraphrase

(p.136)

Another organized teaching method that would encompass the resources above with additional strategies and be helpful to dually serviced students is a program called Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). Echevarria, Vogt and Short (2000) created the SIOP model for ELLs in the mainstream classroom. Nguyen (2012) feels that the model’s eight components would not just help ELLs, but also be beneficial to special education pupils as well. The eight components include lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, review and assessment. (p.138) These components are highlighted by Sarah Adams (n.d.) in (Appendix D) with each of the eight categories broken down into teaching strategies that can be used in the classroom. Some additional examples from Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2000) display how students could be taught through
“connecting with their background knowledge, experiences and their prior learning, adjusting teacher speech, emphasizing vocabulary development, using multimodal techniques, promoting higher order thinking skills and grouping students appropriately for language and content development and hands-on materials.” (p. 13)

After meeting with my pilot group in the spring, I discovered that more than these things were still needed to make this a successful plan. I had to look outside the educational methods and research and understand the management piece. Being a teacher and not a trained business manager, I was introduced to a new technique in managing a group from a system called Four Disciplines of Execution. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) The business model is broken down into four essential components to make the collaboration effective. These include focusing on a single important goal, creating measurements to get there, using a scoreboard to watch for growth and holding each member of the team accountable. These pointers helped me to revisit why my initial collaboration in the spring did not succeed and what I could change for the future research. For example, making sure to focus on one objective at a time allows for that objective to be accomplished instead of additional new ideas that take away from the original goal. This happened when one teacher continued to complain about the behavior. There can be a separate list of these new ideas to revisit later after the first objective is done. So many people end up having thoughts and opinions to share, but staying focused on the beginning goal will take a group further instead of being bogged down by multiple goals. To create a unified team it is important to make sure everyone has a role. Otherwise it becomes a top down approach and people in the group
feel no ownership or accountability. Here are the Four Disciplines of Execution (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) in table four from the management training and how I plan to implement them into my collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>My Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The discipline of focus (Wildly Important Goal or W.I.G.)</td>
<td>WIG - Our group of teachers identified the student’s number one achievement goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The discipline of leverage</td>
<td>Each teacher then identified how his or her specialty could relate to the overall goal. Then each week each teacher would create a small lesson from his or her specialty that would move the student toward the goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The discipline of engagement</td>
<td>Lead Measure (small wins)- Weekly documentation of progress and small achievements that the student has made. Lag Measure (big win)- Overall Test Results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The discipline of accountability</td>
<td>Weekly meetings to discuss how each individual teacher’s last weeks specialty training went and what the next weeks specialty training will be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Four Disciplines of Execution implemented in teacher collaboration.

In conclusion, in order to create the optimum plan, one needs to have a guide on managing a group, things to consider when collaborating and a document to support these components.

The documentation for this type of collaboration had never been used in our school. In the spring of 2014 I met with a teacher that had created a form for their district. (Appendix A) It was intended to help in the collaboration of teachers who dually
work with students that have severe disabilities. It included teachers involved, current test scores, and each person’s responsibility. Fradd and McGee (1994) also had an intervention plan (Appendix E), but it was much more detailed with the specifics in the development of literacy and interventions than the document I received from A. Habel’s school district. (personal communication, April 7, 2014) (Appendix A)

The Gap

While researching this subject, I found that there were many articles on collaborating with mainstream teachers, but very few on-specialized teaching departments that dually service a student. When I mentioned this collaboration to numerous special education teachers at my school, they all reacted in a way that said that it would just make sense. They were excited and encouraged by this idea. Having all of our expertise coordinated for the optimum lesson for a student is more effective than the current method of individually teaching our own created lesson within the individual departments. While the book on the Four Disciplines of Execution provided multiple examples for coordinating collaboration in the business world, there was no reference in on how to apply it to teachers dually servicing an identified special education student. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, (2012). I thought it would be worthwhile to try in a school setting. This led me to my research question:

How can components of the Four Disciplines of Execution model guide teachers’ collaborative instruction of an EL student who also receives special education?
Conclusion

For this chapter I stated why I wanted to investigate the coordination of collaborating with special education and ESL services. The literature and personal research that I found identified the roles and departments of ESL and Special Education. I explored different collaborating models that people and teams have used. This was followed by how to coordinate the joining of departments. Included in this is a method called Four Disciplines of Execution, which is a managerial tool, used in the business world to bring teams together and get results. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) Although there are limited articles specifically on the collaboration of ESL and special education, I was able to collect enough information to begin my journey. The next chapter of this paper will be the methodology I will use to construct my study. I will explain the method I chose to collect and analyze the data. I will then discuss the validity of this data with the ethics considered when conducting this study.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to create collaboration for two students who were dually serviced in ESL and two departments from special education. Before this study was conducted, the departments and mainstream teacher had little or no collaboration and worked separately on their own goals and objectives. The purpose of this study was to come together and create a unified lesson for each dually serviced student with each of our departments’ specialties. In this study I wanted to know: How can the components of the business model, Four Disciplines of Execution guide teachers’ collaborative instruction for EL students who also receive special education? A secondary desire is that other ESL teachers could use my materials in the future to coordinate their own collaboration for dually serviced students. My study used a qualitative paradigm through a case study with data to support my research.

Chapter Overview

This third chapter defines the methodology that I used in this research. This chapter begins with a definition of my research and the methods that I chose to follow. A process called “natural and holistic representation” for this qualitative research by Mackey and Gass (2005) best identified the research that I was going to work on. They describe this component as “Aiming to study individuals and their events in a natural setting.” (p.163) This paper then discusses the qualitative research paradigm, data collection, procedure, data analysis, verification of data, and finally ethics.
Qualitative Research Paradigm

I conducted my research through a case study that focused on collaborating with several teachers that dually service two students. I began with a questionnaire for each of the participating teachers to fill out. While collecting data for this project I started with an initial document that showed the student’s test scores, a description of the collaborative model, and our agreed upon goal through this model. During the duration of the process I had a weekly check-in with all of the teachers that helped to guide our collaboration through a shared online document (Appendix F). This was created in a chart format that made it easier to collaborate. Finally, the teachers were given a post survey on how successful they thought that collaborative model worked.

A case study is the method that was chosen for this inquiry. It is important to note that this is a case study because it has “detailed descriptions of specific learners within their learning setting.” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p.171) In my case, I was studying multiple teachers who worked throughout the week with the same students. Since four people worked with these students, there was a strong need for partnership.

The data collection was gathered in a few different ways. I had started with an initial study in the spring of the 2014. During that summer I sent out a questionnaire to specific special education teachers to find out what they wanted to know about ESL. This prepared me for my research the following school year. In the fall of 2014 I conducted a pilot study to see if the idea of Four Disciplines of Execution would make my research successful. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) While I saw improvement in the collaboration, I still recognized the missing component of successful group
documentation. At the beginning of the spring 2015 research I created a shared online document (Appendix F) that would record the collection of information we primarily discussed in the group meeting, our shared goal and student data. Then we agreed to check-in every Thursday through our shared online document to discuss what had worked that week and what will be worked on the following week.

Data collection

Participants

When I began this current research, I was honored to work with three different teachers in different areas of teaching. These teachers involved a mainstream teacher, a speech clinician and a special education teacher whose focus was on children with learning disabilities. It was great to learn from each other while helping our students.

The mainstream teacher has worked for the district for decades and taught NUA (National Urban Alliance) strategies to other staff within our school. According to National Urban Alliance (2014) NUA mentors work with an entire school district to guide teachers and administrators to teach students in a way that builds on their strengths and engages them in their learning. Her passion in teaching was evident when she was in the classroom and taught other teachers NUA strategies. This teacher worked with both students everyday except when they are being pulled out for one of their services.

The next teacher had taught for more than 20 years as a speech pathologist and really enjoyed learning about other departments and explored new ideas. We had dually serviced the same student for the past two years. Last year I received the gift of watching her teach after we got to know each other and this really helped me better understand her
perspective and style. She had been the most excited by this project and really saw the vision of collaboration. She worked with one of the two students for two days a week lasting 30 minutes each time.

Finally, the third teacher involved is a special education teacher that had worked at our school for the past two years and had held this position at other schools for an accumulated 8 years. She graduated with a degree in special education and focused on students with a learning disability. She was always willing to try new alternatives to teaching and willing to help when asked. She sees both of these students twice a day, every day, during the instruction of reading and math.

Location

The school in this study was in a large suburb outside a main city in this state. The school incorporates the grades from kindergarten to sixth grade. The EL population at this school is 130 out of 600 students. The school has offered ESL services since it opened twenty-five years ago. The EL population has grown over the years. During this study, the three largest communities that we serviced were children from India who speak different languages, Spanish speakers and Somali.

Data Collection One

I began my research with an initial questionnaire to each of the teachers on the team. I sent them by email and then they replied back. This helped me to establish how they are feeling about this study and their input on the collaboration. Following are the questions that were given to them.
1. What are some teaching techniques that are working well that you use with the students that we dually service?

2. Have you worked with the ESL department in the past? What was your experience?

3. What would you like to see more of when working with ESL? What questions do you have?

4. What do you see as these students’ top goals right now?

**Data Collection Two**

My next data collection consisted of feedback that was collected each week among the teachers on the students’ weekly lessons. Each teacher focused on their agreed upon goals from our initial meeting. I decided to focus on what was and wasn’t working academically because the discussion of behavior would easily become the main focus. It would then distract from the academic teaching objective and bad behavior would become the main element within the shared information between teachers. Our discussion and decisions for our team were all recorded on the online documentation since it was a common device used by all staff in the building. I was able to create simple graphs and organization of our research on this page. At our first meeting we all agreed to put in our updated information on Thursdays. When someone forgot to fill in their portion I sent to a friendly reminder about how important their input was to all of us.

**Data Collection Three**

At the end of our recorded research I gave the teachers a post questionnaire. This not only gave me an insight on how well they felt the research went, but also more information to continually change and improve this new collaboration for dually serviced students. Here are the questions I used at the end of the research.
Final Interview for Participants

1. What is something new that you learned about teaching our student?
2. What part of the collaboration do you think worked well in this research?
3. What part of the collaboration do you think could be changed or eliminated?
4. What would you still like to know more about from the ESL department?
5. Would you want to collaborate in the future for dual EL and special education students?

Procedure

Pilot study

In the fall of 2014, a pilot study was established with what I had learned from the following spring research. We all focused on one student who was dually serviced student among us. This team included a mainstream teacher, a speech pathologist, a substitute teacher for special education in learning disabilities and my self. The only two teachers that were the same from the spring study were the speech pathologist and me. I had planned to start the second week of school but there were complication with finding a substitute teacher and my project was on hold until the end of September when she had felt comfortable with her new schedule and lessons.

At our first meeting we all decided to focus on Sun, Moon and Stars as a collaborative theme. We gave input to how we could each help according to our specialized field toward this common goal. Everyone left the first meeting knowing each other’s objective to focus on for this one student.
As the pilot study continued, finding a unified time to meet as teachers can be a hurdle with two people, but with four it gave me an opportunity to think outside the box and find another way for us to all connect. One of our obstacles consisted of special education teachers being busy with writing up IEPs and CST (Child Study Team) meetings and their own lesson plans. When we were unable to all meet at a specific time, I met with groups of two or each teacher individually. This had created more time on my part, which was challenging when I was already creating lesson plans for eight other classes. I had hoped that the more we did this pilot study, a routine would be established and require work on my part. Unfortunately, it didn’t get easier and we began to lose communication as the student began to refuse to learn when there was a change of the special education teacher returned from maternity leave. The mainstream teacher had not given us the test that was going to guide our lesson plans and objective from the first meeting. This is where I should have been more proactive in getting the test earlier. We did eventually receive the test the week it was due. The speech teacher and I had discussed how we could have prepared the student better for the test if the mainstream teacher had given it to us earlier. There were questions on the test that we could have physically moved the student through to understand the concepts.

It takes time to tweak and figure out what does and does not work. We learn when we fail, but one needs to believe in what one is doing and keep trying. That is why I continued to work collaboratively with this team for the remainder of the school year. I believe it made a difference in my teaching and I am more aware of what everyone else is trying to achieve for this dually serviced child.
Materials Used

The materials that were used for this study included ESL level charts, an IEP, the Four Disciplines of Execution model chart and a group agreement with past and future lesson that was accessible through online documents. The first time that the team of teachers met we brought materials that we thought would help each other better understand each other’s department and that department’s goals and objectives. From my ESL department I brought a quick reference chart that showed a student’s level and abilities they are able to do according to a state test called Access that is taken in late winter. (Appendix G) This chart points out the five levels that a student can be at with one being the lower and five as the highest. The Access assessment determines English language proficiency in academic reading, writing, speaking and listening. When someone uses this rubric there is a short list within each grouping that describes skills the student knows at that level. I highlighted where the level was for the students we were working with. The teachers at my table told me that they felt this was helpful. I didn’t want to give them things to read because I knew that we are all busy and it is hard to find the time to sit and read an article. I felt that an article would have been thrown away.

At this meeting I also introduced the business model of Four Disciplines of Execution for our collaboration. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) I first presented the business model’s main objectives. These included the team finding a common goal, steps to reach that goal, a scoreboard to watch the growth and accountability for each
member of the project. Then as a group we filled in a blank chart in online documents that pertained to the Four Disciplines of Execution infused with teaching. (Appendix F)

The speech teacher brought a copy of the student’s IEP to the meeting. She went through the speech section of the document. She read the three things that she was currently working on with dually serviced student. She was working on question formation and how as well as lengthening his sentences and vocabulary. The special education teacher that worked with students that have a learning disability pointed out important sections of the IEP that would apply to all of us. Accommodations for day-to-day use and for testing were things that we did not know were available to him. We were all thrilled with the idea of how we could collaboratively use these modifications to get a better understanding of what the child knew.

Finally, the last material that was used for this study was a group communication created through an online document. This document shares an example of the Four Disciplines of Execution as a model in one chart and then our group’s decision with this model for our collaboration. It also included test scores for the students from Access, NWEA and Fontas and Pinnell. Finally, charts were created below to document what was tried for the week and where the focus will be for the following week for each named teacher. If any of us needed to reference it, it was available for all of us.

Data Analysis

During this study I was able to explore different types of data to conclude the varying types of information needed for this project. I did this to help in support of the
framework for the Four Disciplines of Execution and to validate that the method worked. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012).

In order to establish the first goal, ‘Discipline of Focus’, I distributed a pre-questionnaire given to each of the teachers in our team. I started with a pre-survey that provided me with a clearer understanding of what the special education teacher, speech clinician and mainstream teacher were hoping to learn from me and if there was an interest in the collaboration. The most important piece of information I learned was which was each of the teacher’s department goals. We were able to use this information in a face-to-face meeting to establish a unified direction for all of us. We finally had a team’s wildly important goal. This was the first step securing buy-in for the new methodology and deeper collaboration.

This data that we collected from the pre-survey allowed us to move into the second discipline, ‘Discipline of Leverage.’ We were able to then use our wildly important goal and reflect back on the individual answers to determine which ones were still valid in the new paradigm or if we needed to change our individual goals. This data was essential because in conjunction with the survey, it was the second key step to secure buy-in among the teachers. McChesney, Covey and Huling (2005) commented that often programs fail because they are dictated to others; instead of having it built together. (p.36) When we sat down and wrote our responsibilities, we could see what each of us would be responsible for and ensure there were no gaps. Most importantly, identifying these roles produced accountability that each of us would have for these students. No one would want to let the other person down.
The second key piece of data collected was the facts gathered online through weekly entries of what each teacher had been doing. This allowed us to support the third discipline, ‘Discipline of Engagement.’ I created a simple chart that contained three key questions. Every Thursday, all of the teachers would enter the data in a chart with three key questions to be answered: ‘What worked well?’, ‘What didn’t work well?’ and ‘What will be taught for the next week?’ Later that day, I would review the responses to ensure it was entered. If anything was missing or was confusing, I followed up in person to acquire more information or get clarity. This validation of entry of information supported ‘Discipline of Accountability.’

The online document in Four Disciplines of Execution is also known as the scoreboard. This information provided a running dialogue between the three other teachers over the course of eight weeks. This provided us with the ability to adjust along the way when things were not working and stay on course when they were. McChesney, Covey, and Huling, (2012) describe it as “A compelling scoreboard that tells the team where they are and where they should be, information essential to team problem solving and decision-making.” (p.66) In the end, the regular discussions and planning helped to strengthen our lessons for the students.

The final piece of data that I gathered was a post-questionnaire, which, allowed me to validate whether, our initial goals around learning and collaboration actually worked during the study. I created a questionnaire that would ensure the most important aspects of the study worked, such as asking if the collaboration had increased and they wanted to do it again. I used a multiple-choice on-line survey that I sent out through
email. I choose to use multiple-choice questions, as it would make the responses more consistent and ensure that I would get the answers in a timely fashion. It also indicated if this collaborative model could be used in the future.

To ensure the reliability of the four different types of data I did the following things. First, for the survey, I collected the data and confirmed the information that the collaborating teachers gave me through separate email dialogue. Second, for the responsibilities for each teacher we met in person at a personal group meeting and I gathered what they would be responsible for through documentation. This is much more reliable as it is a collaborative approach where each teacher takes personal ownership of their role, rather than being told what to do and not really agreeing to it. The third part of the data was reliable because the pre and post-questionnaire was the same for each of the teachers. The fourth and final data was the running dialogue where each teacher was assigned and accountable for the weekly check-in for everyone in our team to see. It was helpful to see what everyone worked and focused on.

Verification of Data

The qualitative research paradigm for this study needed to be conducted in a clarifying way to ensure the validity of the data that was collected. This was most strongly shown through the triangulation of the four data collections that were investigated. Using these multiple methods ensured a view from different sources that focused on the same goal (Mack & Gass, 2005). The collection of surveys from the teachers, documentation of our roles, pre- and post-test questionnaires, and data collection throughout the process provided for varying perspectives (Mack & Gass,
2005). Using these four methods allowed me to gain an understanding of our roles, objectives, achievements and struggles. This gave a full picture of the study with a new collaborative team focused on helping the dually serviced student.

Ethics

Since there were three people that were involved in this study I needed to consider and reflect upon the ethical conduct. In respect to the participants’ feelings, I needed to respect their emotions and establish a safe environment, whether in a personal group setting, individually or the discussion on the online documents. There needed to be a feeling of trust and interest in what we were trying to achieve. I did my best to write about the facts and not my opinions during the investigation.

For all of the above-mentioned reasons, this study employed the following safeguards to protect informants’ rights:

1. The school’s principal was informed of and agreed to my study.
2. This study was approved by Hamline University.
3. Pseudonyms were used in my final presentation of the project.

Conclusion

In this chapter I explained my methodology, the case study for the research paradigm, the participants and the location involved in this study. Next, I discussed the four different ways that I collected data through my qualitative research paradigm and how I ensured its reliability. In the following chapter I will present the results of investigation.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The results to the question, “How can the components of the business model, Four Disciplines of Execution guide teachers’ collaborative instruction for EL students who also receive special education?” are in this chapter. The Four Disciplines of Execution will also be paired with the data that was collected to compliment these essential goals. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) The data for this study was collected through an initial group meeting, questionnaire for the teachers at the beginning and end of the research and a running weekly dialogue through online documents. The documentation from the teachers and me were presented and our final outcome of this new collaborative teaching model is discussed.

Discipline One: The Discipline of Focus

Schwabel (2012) introduced the first discipline by explaining, “Extraordinary results can only be achieved when you are clear about what matters most.” (p.1) This research began by me first trying to understand what was important to my new team members. In order to achieve this I sent out a questionnaire by email to each of the teachers before our first team meeting.

The first question that I asked was, “What are some teaching techniques that are working well that you use with the students that we dually service?” The teachers answered the questions in different ways. The mainstream teacher focused on responsive classroom strategies and IPads. The special education teacher listed instant rewards for minor tasks. Finally, the speech clinician incorporated good visual and tactile materials.
Secondly I asked, “Have you worked with the ESL department in the past? What was your experience?” The mainstream teacher had worked with the ESL department and found the experience varied depending on the ESL instructor. Both the special education teacher and the speech clinician had not worked with the ESL department extensively, but have dealt with ESL students.

The third question I asked was, “What would you like to see more of when working with ESL? What questions do you have?” All three teachers were looking for more collaboration between the departments. The mainstream teacher was especially looking for updates on individual student’s progress. The special education teacher was interested in finding ways to incorporate similar themes in instruction, instead of being segmented.

Finally, I inquired, “What do you see as these students’ top goals right now? The teachers had all very different objectives in what they were doing with the student. The one similarity was that the mainstream teacher and the special education teacher were trying to identify ways to improve behavior. The mainstream teacher’s other top goal was for the student to achieve progress in reading and math. Lastly, the speech clinician was focused on developing the student’s skills regarding a unit on maps.

Then as a team we built a similar second chart for recording our weekly individual and team commitments. We would use this chart (As seen in table 5.) throughout our weekly meetings to measure our progress. It will be alluded to in several of the disciplines below.
## Goals

| 1. W.I.G: Wildly Important Goal: | **Geography:**  
* Continents and oceans  
* Distance scale  
* Compass rose (N, S, E, W, NW, NE, etc)  
* Map scale  
* Types of maps: Political, Physical, Climate, Resource map (where do they have cows), and Road  
* Atlas  
* Country research |
| --- | --- |
| 2. The discipline of leverage | **Mainstream teacher:** She will teach the content of Geography to the class when the student is there.  
**Speech clinician:** prepositions and directions  
**Special Education:** symbols, types of maps, scales, identifying countries  
**ESL:** background knowledge from city to world map, describing land markings on a map |
| 3. The discipline of engagement | * Weekly check-in using an online document on Thursdays  
**Assessments:**  
* **Map activities about continents, oceans**  
* **Fill in the map**  
* **Packet work**  
* **Research on country** |
| 4. The discipline of accountability | * Ensuring the weekly check-in weekly through either online document or group discussion |

*Table 5. The Four Disciplines of Execution chart with our collaborative agreements*
The first discipline by McChesney, Covey and Huling (2012) also included “Focus on the Wildly Important Goal.” (p.23) This is commonly referred to as WIG. They explain that limiting the overall goal to one or two helps to keep the group manageable with a strong focus. (p.35) As a team we decided to start with one goal, but needed to choose between two goals we all felt were important. Our first idea was to focus on the mainstream teacher’s curriculum during social studies. The children were going to learn about geography. If this were chosen we would each use our service to address the objectives for the students to achieve. Our next choice was behavior. For both students behavior was a large barrier that put a hold on learning. If the student’s behavior was not in control, we could not teach. Since this was an issue for three of the four teachers, we decided to focus on curriculum.

McChesney, Covey and Huling (2012) stated that another important element of this first goal entailed, “Every WIG at every level must contain a clearly measurable result, as well as the date by which that result must be achieved.” (p.38) Our team decided that the completion of the written project on a country and a mapping packet would be our measurable goals.

Discipline Two: The Discipline of Leverage

The second goal of execution was titled, “Discipline of leverage.” The objective within this goal is coming up with the right lead and lag measures. It is critical that we understood exactly what the lead and lag measures were for our team as illustrated in this definition by McChesney, Covey, Huling (2012):
“While a lag measure tells you if you’ve achieved the goal, a lead measure tells you if you are likely to achieve the goal. For example, while you can't control how often your car breaks down on the road (a lag measure), you can certainly control how often your car receives routine maintenance (a lead measure). And the more you act on the lead measure, the more likely you are to avoid that roadside breakdown. We call them lag measures because by the time you get the data the result has already happened. A lead measure is predictive, meaning that if the lead measure changes, you can predict that the lag measure will also change. A lead measure is also influence able; it can be influenced by the team.” (p.45-46)

First we established our lag measure, which was that our students would complete the two required projects, a packet on maps and a report on a country. We then needed to establish our lead measure. As a team we discussed and decided how we could use our service toward achieving the lag measure and overall WIG. To do this, we created a list of all the things that the students would need to know. From this list we discussed the areas of geography we wanted to teach and wrote them as individual objectives:

**Mainstream:** teach the content of geography to the class when the student is there.

**Speech Clinician:** prepositions and directions

**Special Education:** symbols, types of maps, scales, identifying countries

**ESL:** background knowledge from city to world map, describing land markings on a map

From our larger objectives, each individual established a weekly goal of material for the student to learn. Finally, outside of the check-in we then personally broke the objectives
down into individual lesson plans. We would treat the completion of each lesson plan as our lead measure.

**Discipline Three: The Discipline of Engagement**

“Discipline of Engagement” was the third discipline in this series. It proposes, “When everyone on the team can see the score, the level of play rises, not only because they can see what’s working and what adjustments are needed, but also because they now want to win.” (McChesney, Covey, Huling, 2012, p.68) In my past experiences I had tried to keep track of what everyone was doing through a string of e-mails. This method was not a clear visual for everyone to keep track of the progress and if we were reaching our goal. This time I decided to use an online document, (Appendix F) a device that allows everyone to see the same document. Luckily, this is a technique that was already being used for other sources in our school and everyone was familiar with it.

In order to track and record this information, I used the chart created for each discipline to track our weekly goals, and the results of the work. This chart would be our team’s scoreboard. It is important to note, that since I used a form online we would add information on a weekly basis, we could see the other team members’ current and future lessons. We would also know if the student was making progress toward their lag measures. In addition, since we all understood that we may overlap each other, the student may learn rapidly, or need more time, we all needed to be aware of the changes. An online document allowed us to easily see these adjustments and we could all shift as needed. (This is shown in table 6.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>What went well/ what did not</th>
<th>What will I work on next week?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/16/2015</td>
<td><strong>Mainstream Teacher.</strong> Finishing up report on their country</td>
<td><em>Finish map packet</em> <em>Start plants and their life cycle</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Clinician. <strong>Student A</strong> needed to work on comprehension of prepositions: near, far, close, top, bottom, by, beside Definition of: intersect</td>
<td>Continue with prepositions as they relate to two-dimensional maps and following directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Special Education Teacher</strong> MCA Testing Continued to worked on reading map keys, navigating population maps, cardinal directions <strong>Student B and Student A:</strong> Difficulty focusing. Got discouraged more easily because it was harder for them. Didn’t understand what “population” meant nor do they have a strong personal connection to reading highways symbols and travel.</td>
<td>Work on reading various map keys, identifying symbols, and continuing to navigate various types of maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ESL Teacher</strong> <strong>Student A:</strong> We worked on one page in his geography packet. We also created a map on a car and map key to explain it. <strong>Student B:</strong> I only had one day with him. Tornado Drill We worked on his report for his country.</td>
<td>We will watch a time lapsed video on a seed changing into plant. *Pretest: Can you tell me the steps of what happened? *Read a story on the subject. *Posttest: Verbally discuss the life cycle of a plant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. **Collaborative Check-in: This is one of our weekly collaborative check-ins through an online document.**

The results of the online document provided teachers with an ongoing chart that displayed what had worked and what still needed re-teaching. The mainstream teacher
would document what the objective was for the week. Then each of the teachers would teach toward that objective using the previously agreed upon focus. They would make notes on how their area of focus was going. A key example of creating focused engagement was when the mainstream teacher set an objective for the students to create a report on a country. This allowed the speech clinician to focus their work on prepositions to help the student describe the location of the country in the continent. The special education teacher made a goal to focus on the compass rose. I then decided to teach specific vocabulary around population. It was interesting to note that when the special education teacher who reviewed it a week later found that the students had already forgotten the meaning. This gave her an opportunity to reteach the vocabulary and let the team know that the students had not learned the vocabulary. The consistent focused work kept us all working toward a similar goal and could easily find ways to support each other. The end result of the documentation around the country specific report was that the students did successfully finish the project.

**Discipline Four: The Discipline of Accountability**

The final discipline on this model was titled, “Discipline of Accountability.” The online document included the charts for this collaboration model. This device incorporated an additional weekly check-in chart for each teacher addressing what went well and what needed work for the week and finally what they planned to work on the following week. It had been agreed upon at the first meeting that the check-in date would
be every Thursday. Generally this would be enough to ensure that everyone fulfilled their commitments. Occasionally I would have to hold them accountable. I did this in two ways. First, I would send a reminder to all of the teachers on missed sections. I would give them 5 days to try and catch up because I understand that it was a Friday the following day, then the weekend and first day back to work for the week. Second if they were not able to fulfill their commitment, I would check-in with them in person. This occurred numerous times with one teacher, as they felt so overwhelmed with their other daily objectives. When we met in person, I ended up recording her responses face-to-face and typed it in for her. The average time it took me to record my responses was two to five minutes. By using both of these techniques, I was able to hold the whole team accountable for the success of the students.

Even though there was a lack of response here-and-there at times to filling in the online document, the overall goal of collaborating under a common theme was uniting for me. In the past we worked on separate objectives that had no alignment with one another. Now we were all working toward a common goal. For example our common goal that we were all focusing on was geography and then instructing our service through that common theme.

Post Research Questionnaire

After our last online document check-in we were all assured that the two students had completed their projects, I built a survey to assess the results. I thought it was important to include questions to see if the goals were met from the pre-project
questionnaire, whether we improved collaboration and if the Four Disciplines of Execution model was successful. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) I chose to include nine close-ended questions to ensure both an accurate response and fast completion. I also had two open-ended questions, plus room for comments on several other questions to ensure that the teachers could elaborate on the results of the project. In order to ensure that I received well-crafted responses to the open-ended questions, I distributed the survey when the teachers had a normal workload without a high-level of additional activities. Finally, to guarantee I got a timely response, I had sent out the questionnaire on a Sunday night, with a three-day deadline. I was shocked to see that all three teachers responded to the questions within 12 hours. (Appendix H)

Their responses varied in ways that surprised and challenged me for future collaborations. There was not a response needed for each question, but some teachers chose to include one. One teacher chose to skip 3 of the questions, but I was able to personally talk with her, ask her the questions and I recorded them. Here are their responses to my questions.

Teaching Techniques

1) Did you learn or use any new teaching techniques from the collaboration and if so what techniques did you use?

   a) a) None  MT/ SET /SC
   b) b) Reward
   c) c) Visual
   d) d) Manipulative
   e) e) Culturally relevant
   f) Other: Please Explain
Speech Clinician:
I made it a point to use visuals and manipulatives when working with Student A and also to make lessons functional and practical.

Special Education Teacher:
I was already using all of these strategies in the room.

Experience with ESL

2) How would you rate your experience working on this project and is it something that we should use in the future for dual EL and special education students?

a) 1 – Very Poor
b) 2 - Poor
c) 3 - OK
d) 4 – Good SET /MT
e) 5 - Very Good SC

Please explain your reason:

Speech Clinician:
This has been an excellent experience (5)!! I am the Speech-Language Pathologist working with Student A. I loved following through on classroom units to ensure Student A was comprehending, remembering and expressing his learning / using the information being taught.
I would definitely work together with ELL and classroom teacher with other students to accomplish rich, meaningful learning for our students.

Special Education Teacher:
It was nice to implement teaching skills that were being taught directly in the classroom. Also, it appeared to have more of a purpose when working with ESL and special education because the students would occasionally say, “Hey! I did something like this with Ms. Graham!” Their confidence appeared higher when they worked on assignments and it was easier for me to have connections with them when they talked about their day.

Collaboration

3) Did Collaboration with the EL department and Special Education Improve due to this project?

a) Yes SC /SET /MT
b) No
Speech Clinician:
Yes, the collaboration of ELL/ESL and SPED ED did improve on this project. ESL Teacher was instrumental in creating and following through with the goals and objectives that were created at the beginning of the year and kept the channels of communication open and practical.

Mainstream Teacher:
Knowing what people were doing was helpful

4) *What part of the collaboration do you think worked well in this research?*

Speech Clinician:
ELL students with Special Education needs present with more issues than other ELL students. Consequently the collaboration plan was able to address receptive and expressive language practice with reading, math, behavioral and social concerns. This also increased the TEAM focus to work together for the best possible programming. It increased the effectiveness of working with the family as well.

Special Education Teacher
I liked having a joint site to go to where everyone could put in feedback on their progress with the students.

Mainstream Teacher:
I liked how everyone was helping the kids with learning the same subject.

5) *What part of the collaboration do you think could be changed or eliminated?*

Speech Clinician:
I would keep all parts of the collaboration model. We will learn to be more efficient as we use this model with other ELL students with Special needs.

Special Education Teacher
While time is always limited, one or two more collaborations in person would be helpful so that more information can be shared and so we can help problem solve any challenges/confusions we are facing. For example, I’m not sure when the general education class actually finished working on maps/geography.

Mainstream Teacher:
I think as a tip if I would have had an e-mail reminder and link to the online document, it would have made it easier to respond.

6) During the project we choose to focus on the subject goal of geography and not address behavior as part of the collaboration. If we did it over, what path would you choose:

   a) **Focus only on a subject goal of geography for check-ins**  SC
   b) Choose a subject goal at the beginning, but not check-in on it. Instead use our check-ins to focus on behavior
   c) **Focus on both a subject goal of geography and a behavioral goal for the check-ins** SET / MT
   d) Focus only on a behavior goal for check-ins

Speech Clinician
(A) I liked focusing on a subject. I could build on vocabulary, prepositions, concepts, etc to build on language skills.
AND I felt as though each of us worked on behavior as a secondary goal. It was important but each one of us had to deal with it in the subject area. AND Keep checking in with each other online

Special Education Teacher:
(HUGE CORRELATION BETWEEN SUCCESS AND BEHAVIOR)

7) Did you find the weekly check-in system via online valuable to understand what others were working on and decide your focus for the next week? Please rate:

   a) 1 – Very Unhelpful
   b) 2 – Unhelpful
   c) 3 – **Average** MT
   d) 4 – **Helpful** SET
   e) 5 – **Very Helpful** SC

Speech Clinician
(E) - It was helpful and beneficial. I liked seeing how others were addressing the goal area.

8) If we were to use check-ins for a future student, what method would you prefer:

   a) Check-in via online only
   b) Check-in during a 10 minute stand up meeting only
   c) **Alternate between online check-in and a 10 minute stand up meeting** MT
d) **Other – Please Explain**  SC/ SET

**Speech Clinician**
OTHER: I think we need the TEAM meeting at the beginning of the year to set up the structure and goal/subject focus. I like the online documents for weekly check-ins. For Student A, we also had two meetings with mom about behaviors.
We also had two parent conferences.
Ten minute check-ins are OK but I would not want them to be the basis of our communication/collaboration.

**Special Education Teacher**
Other – Please Explain: Either stand up meetings + online every week that is short and sweet OR stand up meetings + online every other week that is a little more in depth, detailed, and specific.

9) **How often would you recommend using check-ins for the future?**

   a) Daily
   b) Twice a week
   c) **Weekly**  SET
   d) **Bi-Weekly**  MT
   e) **Beginning and End of Project**  SC
   f) Other – Please Explain

**Speech Clinician**
(E) Beginning and end of project would work best for me.
I liked helping Student A gain more "depth" of knowledge in the area of geography/maps.
The classroom moved on to other projects. I would like to see Student A learn in depth in fewer areas rather than skimming over the tops of all subjects.

**Special Education Teacher:**
Weekly (Holds staff more accountable without being weighed down!)

10) **How aware were you of how the student was progressing toward the goal of completing the map packet and a report on a country.**

   a) 1 – Very Unaware
   b) 2 – **Unaware**  MT
   c) 3 – **Somewhat Aware**  SC
   d) 4 – **Aware**  SET
   e) 5 – Very Aware
Speech Clinician
(C) I knew the class has moved on to other areas but I wanted to continue with the map packet to ensure he truly understood what he was doing/learning.

11) Would you like to continue the same online collaboration until the end of the school year?

a) Yes  SC/ MT
b) No  SET

Speech Clinician
I would be willing to continue online, but in a new subject area and if the rest of the team agrees.

Special Education Teacher:
No (only 5 weeks left and we are not working on geography much anymore. I would be willing to continue it if the rest of the team wants to but it may be more sporadic with finishing up state testing and then doing NWEAs).

Mainstream Teacher:
But not weekly

Conclusion

Through this research I learned another way of implementing and exploring a new teaching model for collaboration. I started with a pre-questionnaire to gain trust in our team that their opinion and service was essential to the team. This was one of the two essential parts of the first discipline of focus. The second one entailed creating a WIG, which meant a wildly important goal. (McChesney, C., Covey, S. R., & Huling, J., 2012, 23 & 24). At our first and only sit down meeting we decided ours would be to concentrate on geography. Discipline number two introduced leverage. At this same first meeting we chose a lag measure for our collaboration of the students finishing there map packets and reports on their countries. We even decided to create individual goals pertaining to this lag measure during our service time. Discipline number three looked at the engagement of the group. This was where we used online documentation to record and display for
the team what went well and what did not. The final question each person answered was what they would work on the following week. This kept us engaged in each other’s lessons and supported what they needed to know. The last discipline of accountability addressed the involvement of each teacher. At the first meeting we decided to have everyone enter her data for the week on Thursday. While there were concerns with one teacher participating less than the rest of them, I was able to find effective methods to compensate.

Our overall goal for the students was a success because they were able to finish the projects due to our interactions online. As a collaborative team, we were teaching the same subject and not separated lessons that were unrelated by each of our departments. My feeling about this collaboration was that it was a great first pilot that brought us together as team for the first time. Additionally, it left us with many ideas for how to improve the system for the next student. In this chapter I presented the results of my data collection. In Chapter Five I will discuss my major findings, their implications, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

In this research I wanted to find how the components of the business model, Four Disciplines of Execution, guide a team of teachers’ collaborative instruction for two EL students that also receive special education? Although this was a new business model that no one had ever tried in our school, I had felt it was the outline we were looking for when collaborating between different departments. This final chapter will reflect on the major findings, limitations, implications and further research on this topic.

Major Findings

In this research I have gone from writing my own individual lesson plans pertaining to ESL to now collaborating with other teachers that also service the same student. This has not only been an enlightening experience for me personally, but also for the members of our newly created team. Through this research on collaboration, three things have stood out as the most helpful for future collaborations. They consist of the importance of relationship building, the collaboration that the Four Disciplines of Execution model provided and the importance of spending some time focusing on behavior of the student to ensure improvement. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) These are the three items that provided enough value that I will continue to use and expand on them for future students.

Relationship Building

Before this research began my relationship with the special education department was minimal and collaboration was no more than recognition of the dually serviced
student. Teachers on either side had said that the student was more of an ESL issue or a special education issue. I was creating lessons through only my vision of ESL. It was not until I started to work with more of these students that I realized that the importance of learning more about special education. I began to ask a lot more questions on the best approaches to gain their attention and understand how they learn. Some of the teachers could see that I had an investment with them and I started to realize how much more would be achieved through collaboration.

Before my research with the Four Disciplines of Execution model began, I was able to do two pilot studies to get a better idea on how to develop this collaboration. This is where I began to get more buy-in from the other teachers. This key component of the first discipline explains that if your team does not believe in you or the project, it is less likely to succeed. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012, p.261) During the course of the study it was clear that our relationship had improved. Before we began, we used to just say “Hi” in the hallway. As the work progressed we had more and more meaningful one-on-one conversations, some even pertaining toward achieving the student’s unified goal.

The teachers also shared how critical it was to be in regular communication with each other. (Nguyen, 2012) Following the initial meeting to set up how we would work with the student we all filled in our progress on a shared online document. In the post-survey questionnaire, two of the three teachers really enjoyed the ongoing communication between the team through the online document and were able to reference it easily when needed. Even though this worked well, the teachers craved more face-to-face communication. In looking at the post-study questionnaire, the teachers
taught me that they would have liked to have more group meetings. They would prefer for them to be stand up meetings that usually only last 10 minutes, but they felt only having one at the beginning wasn’t enough. The special education teacher even said, “Weekly (Holds staff more accountable without being weighed down!)”

Finally, after the study was complete, as part of the post-research questionnaire, I asked the teachers “How would you rate your experience working on this project and is it something that we should use in the future for dual EL and special education students? The teachers’ responses to this question rated it as a four or five out of five in finding the model was successful. They also commented that they found this new relationship valuable. They all agreed that they would want to continue this process and continue to grow from it. One example was that the speech clinician commented, “I would definitely work together with ELL and classroom teacher with other students to accomplish rich, meaningful learning for our students.”

Collaboration and Four Disciplines of Execution

The second major finding in my research was that The Four Disciplines of Execution established a successful structure that we did not have before. When following this model McChesney, Covey and Huling (2012) highlighted that it is important for all four components to be used in order to fully see change and growth. (p.261) Even though most of the disciplines had success, it was our first try and we saw how there could still be room for improvement. This is common for most individuals trying to implement a new system. The key to success is to learn from the mistake, adjust for the future and try again.
The success of this structure was not only noticed by our team, but by the students. During the post-study questionnaire, the special education teacher said, “It was nice to implement teaching skills that were being taught directly in the classroom. Also, it appeared to have more of a purpose when working with ESL and special education because the students would occasionally say, “Hey! I did something like this with Ms. Graham!” Their confidence appeared higher when they worked on assignments and it was easier for me to have connections with them when they talked about their day.”

Discipline one, establishing the Wildly Important Goal (WIG), was critical in helping the team to find a common goal and direction. This was important because before the study began, we all were working in different directions and did not scaffold at all. Here was what each of the teachers thought our original goals were: The speech clinician said, “Identifying ways to control his behavior and the triggers that go with it. Finding motivators to engage him.” The mainstream teacher said, “The team is working collaboratively with the classroom teacher regarding a unit on MAPS. The student will learn about reading different kinds of maps including: road, physical, climate, resources and political maps.” The special education teacher replied, “Continue on progressing with reading and math as well as being on task and having appropriate behavior so he can make the most of his learning time. Top goal for Student One behavior focus on not shutting down and on expressing his feelings, thoughts and needs. Continue to progress in reading and math so he feels confident in himself.” After our initial meeting we established an initial goal to focus on geography. Each of us established how we would use our skills to move the students forward. The speech
clinician shared this response in the post-study questionnaire, “I liked focusing on a subject. I could build on vocabulary, prepositions, concepts, etc to build on language skills.”

Discipline Two, the focus of leverage was about assigning a lead and lag measure in achieving our goal toward geography. We established a lead measure to have each teacher write down and complete a goal in working with the student each week. The lag measure was to see if the students could complete the geography packet and write a paper on a country. The reason the lead measure worked out well for us was that we kept them simple. We could all see if each of us was setting goals and if we were completing them weekly. While it would have been great to have a lag measure to improve test scores on a standardized test, that was too big and too far away for us to focus on. It was much easier to see the end when it is completing one individual unit. We could use very similar goals for each of the units we worked on throughout the year. It would be interesting to know if we applied Four Disciplines of Execution to the students units throughout the year if they would have performed better on standardized tests at year end.

Discipline number three pertaining to engagement was the discipline that needed the most improvement. Four Disciplines of Execution model recommends that each team build a visual scoreboard that is reviewed by the team weekly to assess progress. (McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) We instead choose our scoreboard to be the online document to make notes around progress toward the new skills and behavioral challenges. The challenge with this was that it became very hard to assess how far along the student was with each teacher by just reading the notes. When asked how the
teachers felt about being aware of the students’ progress their answers ranged two to four out of five, from feeling unaware, somewhat aware, to aware. We had agreed upon having the projects be our final goal, but we did not have markers along the way to see how the students were doing. In the future, I would ask each teacher weekly to indicate a percentage of success toward knowing the skill and display it online through the document for all to see.

The fourth and final discipline of accountability had success and struggles. This was where the teachers went to the online document once a week for a check-in on how the students were succeeding, struggling and needs for future lessons. The key to doing questions is that it holds the team members accountable. Others could see this too as evidenced during the wrap up questionnaire, I asked, “How often would you recommend using check-ins for the future?” The special education teacher replied, “Weekly (Holds staff more accountable without being weighed down!”

Though all three of the teachers felt the check-in was helpful, one of them only checked-in once over the six-week period. For this teacher, I sat down and discussed the struggle and implemented a substitute system to assist her in her ability to participate. She was feeling very consumed with regular schoolwork and did not feel confident in using the online document. This is why in the report she requested to use a string of emails instead of the online service. She had a stronger comfort level with emails than the online document. For her, I walked to her room and checked in with her once a week and asked her the questions and typed it in for her. This was an extra step for me, but she was open with the information and she was an important member of our team.
Finally, one of the best methods of success indicating that The Four Disciplines of Execution worked was that the students completed their projects. In the past, the students have never finished their assignments and they would have been handed in partially finished. Knowing that we were able to help complete the projects also proved to me that we were not skipping information that these students needed to know.

The Importance of Behavior

The last major finding in my research was the importance that behavior plays on learning. At our first meeting we waffled back and forth on if the WIG should be geography or behavior. Since three out of the four teachers had trouble with this, we decided on a unified WIG of geography. However it was good to have the same focus for all the teachers; in the end the three out of four teachers felt that they were rarely able to teach the material on geography due to the interfering behavior. While the students did show some progress on these skills, more could have been obtained if the behavior would have been under control. Some of us would go days and weeks unable to teach. We had help from social workers, behavioral specialists, tried getting help from parents, but this was all draining from our instructional time. When my team was asked what the WIG goal should have been, they indicated a dual WIG with behavior and geography. I agree with the teachers that the behavior became so consuming that I had less time to teach the children.
Limitations

Whereas this study was worthwhile and helped me to grow as a teacher, there were limitations to the progression and achievement of the research. They ranged from knowing how to use online documentation, teaching techniques, more group meetings and teaching to themed objectives. While no one person is to blame, it is a learning experience for each of us to experience and learn and grow from.

When we sat as a team, we discussed and agreed upon using an online documentation as a tool to check-in on the current and future state of the student. One teacher never mentioned that this was not a system that she felt comfortable with. It was through the lack of entering this weekly information that I found out it was too much for one of the teachers. She was already feeling overwhelmed with multiple tests at the end of the year, single student to teacher assessments, and grading that she put learning this system at the end of her list. Since she was the mainstream teacher, she really led our group in us finding ways to support her. This is why I typed in the information for her. For the future I’m not sure if I would want to be walking to her room once a week for this information that takes less than 3 minutes to fill in the information online. We just needed to find another system that she felt more comfortable with or train her to use the shared online documentation.

Another limitation that arose was the limited face-to-face group meetings. We only had one of these at the beginning of the research. The team of teachers mentioned that they wished we had met one or more times within those six weeks. To avoid a long meeting after school there was a suggestion that we could do a stand up meeting. This
would alleviate it going on for a long period since we would be standing. Usually a sit
down meeting is more likely to last longer. It had become common for teachers to have
one on one exchange with each other in the hallway. The drawback of this was that the
great information they shared in a pair was then lost for the whole team.

At the beginning of the study I used a questionnaire to find out what teaching
techniques that everyone used when working with the students. (Nguyen, 2012) I had
planned to put this into my online report and I did not. Even though it was a part of the
discussion at the first meeting, documenting it would have helped to make it more
effective. The questionnaire at the end of the research showed that the teachers did not
use any of the teaching technique suggestions we spoke about in our first meeting. In the
future I would have asked each person to come to the meeting with two or more teaching
techniques and two to three examples on how they were used with them with the student.
The techniques would then be listed in our online documentation. The clarifications of
these techniques are important because some of them can be misunderstood. For
example, the strategy of having culturally relevant lessons was misunderstood by one of
the teachers. She wanted the students to write about birthdays and the student had not
had or been to a birthday party. This was an opportunity where I suggested focusing on a
holiday that I knew he celebrated. The student was calmer the next day and was able to
complete the project. I like that she discussed the issue with me and we were able to find
something that worked for that child.

The final limitation that was found was the ability to use themed objectives. Our
themed objective or WIG was geography. When I attended college I learned to use single
themes for an overall objective, but supporting it with needed skills in reading and math. The special education teacher was struggling with the idea on how to use geography in reading. She only decided to use it in math for measurement. I wasn’t sure if I should suggest how to teach through a theme or if this would create a problem because it was a teaching strategy I was taught and I was telling her that my way was better.

Even though my team and I had limitations, we were also able to learn and grow from this experience. Our overall agreement to continue this collaboration shows that we understand it isn’t a perfect system yet, but we are evolving. The speech clinician even mentioned, “We will learn to be more efficient as we use this model with other ELL students with special needs.”

Implications

This school year came to an end, but it has brought about ideas for improvement for next year’s collaborative team. Knowing that I have the interest and involvement from the teachers in this team encourages me that we can make some simple changes in the fall and have even better success. The things that would be most beneficial are focusing more on the behavior in our WIG and creating a better scoreboard throughout the themed units.

Though the students were able to finish their projects at the end of the unit, which was our WIG (team goal), we all felt the students still could have learned more. The two students that we all worked with for the collaborations already had behavioral issues before this study began. Since we didn’t include this as a part of our WIG, we did not have a strategy to attend to the disruptive behavior. It affected our results because we
were unable to even teach the objectives that we had decided on as a team. This would go on for days to a full week at a time. When looking at the chart from online, it is clear in our statements that there was a lack of teaching due to behavior. In the future, if the behavior were already a known issue, it would need to be included as a second WIG. To take this a step forward we could even have a staff meeting with strategies to help the teachers in all departments in working with disruptive behaviors in the classroom. Nguyen additionally suggests, “participating in workshops and seminars for each other’s departments to create an understanding for intervention techniques.” (p. 133) While the book suggests having no more than two WIGs, these seem like the two most important issues that would have helped the students to advance even more. We didn’t just want the students to finish the projects, but gain knowledge to scaffold toward further learning in the future. Adding this second WIG would have made it even more effective.

As a team we created a scoreboard through an online document that expressed what each of us had decided to focus on in lessons for the present and future to reach our WIG. Even though we were clear on the goal of finishing the two projects for geography, the teachers varied in their answers on how they felt about the progression through the lesson. The question I gave them was, “How aware were you of how the student was progressing toward the goal of completing the map packet and a report on a country?” Their diverse answers were unaware, somewhat aware and aware. Yet, no one had felt very aware, the fourth choice. This is another area that we could have improved in. The teachers had not felt that they were able to see the progression throughout the unit.
For the next fall, I would like to create an additional mini chart that could report small assessments to show the growth of specific skills within the unit that needed to be achieved. I believe by just weekly entering on the chart a percentage of the skill learned by each teacher would be enough to create an effective scoreboard. I believe that this would additionally help us in seeing the specific skill and to know what is a source of weakness or strength that needs to be addressed or was successful.

Further Research

The beginning of this journey has lead to multiple roads to explore and new areas to learn about. The three things in the future I look forward to is the amount of time to work on this collaboration, finding alternative technology to equally collaborate and the varying departments attending the other department’s workshops.

This research only lasted for six weeks and the teachers in my team agreed that it was such a short time to really see the full outcomes of this collaboration. If we had begun this in the fall and continued throughout the year it would have given us more data to discuss and learn from. While I had already learned and grown from my pilot studies before this research, I will continue to grow and improve from this research for the following fall season. Next time, I would even consider also answering the same questionnaires or creating one as a group and then dispersing all of our results to everyone through an e-mail or group meeting.

Even though we had all agreed to collaborate online, one teacher was intimidated with this recording system. For the next fall season I have two choices. Either I would
need to sit down and train the teacher that is uncomfortable with the online
documentation or I would need to look into other alternatives. If I did look into
alternative collaboration charts, it would need to be clear and simple to read. That is why
I changed from a string of emails to an online service, because it was unclear visually
compared to the chart built through the online document.

I have been very excited to work with all of these teachers. It fascinates me to
learn from their angle of teaching. Within this time period, I feel that I have learned
ways to work with the students that I didn’t know before. In the future I see huge
benefits in attending workshops teaching about learning disabilities, speech therapy and
grade level curriculum. In turn I would enjoy having these teachers come with me to
learn more about ESL. As a team this cross training would only make us stronger and
service our students even better. (Cloud, 1988).

Conclusion

In this case study I attempted to find a way for the special education department, a
speech clinician, a mainstream teacher and ELL department to collaborate for two dually
serviced students with a business model called Four Disciplines of Execution.
(McChesney, Covey, & Huling, 2012) Through this model we unified on working toward
a main goal, assigned each teacher a skill to work on, recorded our findings,
communicated between departments, used an effective checklist and showed progress of
the students. This model that was intended for business was also seen to be beneficial in
the busy world of teaching. In this final chapter I focused on major findings, limitations
that arose, implications that could help someone else and further research that could assist in working with a dually serviced student. I look forward to the following fall with our improvements and collaboration as a team and look forward to better servicing of our students.
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COLLABORATION GUIDE EXAMPLE
## MULTILINGUAL DEPARTMENT

**EL Dual Eligible Service Plan for Direct Service**

Dual Eligible students are those who qualify for EL services and are also enrolled in Federal Setting 3 and 4 Special Education programs. English as a Second Language classes have the goal of helping English learners achieve English proficiency. This is accomplished by providing English instruction with visual, kinesthetic, interactive and emotional support to make curriculum accessible for all English learners at all levels of proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s Name</th>
<th>Student ID #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed Teacher</td>
<td>Special Ed Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Teacher</td>
<td>Date of most current WIDA Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type</th>
<th>Test Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>Alternate Overall Composite Score _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>W-APT Reading _____ Writing _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening _____ Speaking _____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Direct Service Expectations* – See Continuum of EL Service for direct service expectations.

Goals/Learning Targets

---

Multilingual Dept. | AH/ME | Nov. 2013
*Note to classroom teachers and/or social workers:* At the end of each school year, the most recent copy of this plan should be placed in the student’s regular education file for EL service documentation purposes. EL documents are not to be placed in due process folders, as ELL is a regular education service provided to all students who qualify.
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SPECIAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT AND IDENTIFICATION PROCESS
Figure 1

Steps in the Assessment and Identification Process

1. **Pre-referral**: No → Potential Problem Resolved
   Yes → Parental Notification

2. **Referral**: No → Assessment Not Warranted
   Yes → Parental Consent

3. **Assessment with Interpreter**: Parental Input

4. **Eligibility Determination**: No → No Special Education Services Provided
   Yes → Parental Input

5. **IEP Development**: Parental Consent

6. **Special Education Services Provided**
   - Program Evaluation
   - Annual Review
   - Reflection
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WIDA
Reprinted with permission from WIDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Reading/Listening</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beginner Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Can Do Descriptors: Grade Level Cluster 3-5**

For the group of English Learners Performing at or near Grade Level 3, English Language Learners can produce or produce the following results:

1. Read, view, and listen to grade level texts and media.
2. Comprehend the main ideas and details.
3. Engage in conversations and discussions about the text and media.
4. Write about personal experiences and events.
5. Produce simple oral presentations.
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EIGHT COMPONENTS OF SHELTERED INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION PROTOCOL
Eight Components of Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol

(SIOP) http://www.d11.org/doi/esl/SIOP.htm

1. Preparation - English Language Learners need to be prepared for learning by being able to communicate about the learning experience. They need to be able to ask for help when they need it. They should know the following basic learning phrases or sentences:
   - “I don’t understand.”
   - “Would you please explain that to me?”
   - “Would you please show me how?”
   - “What information do I need to remember?”
   - “Is that important for the test?”
   - “What is the most important part?”

   Learning a new language mirrors the process we go through when we acquire our first language. English learners typically start with a pre-production, or silent period, when first introduced to English. During this period, students begin to comprehend English, but do not yet attempt to speak it. This period can last from a few days to many months, depending on the student. As ELLs continue to learn English, they begin to produce one or two word phrases, and then move to sentences. As students are acquiring English, they will often struggle with grammar and pronunciation, but our emphasis should be on conveying meaning, not grammatical perfection.

2. Building Background - Teachers can build background connections for English
Language Learners by making purposeful connections to prior learning, by teaching the most important vocabulary, and by trying to connect the content to something the student may have already experienced. Building background can be accomplished through use of the following:

- **KWL Charts** - Students chart what they KNOW, what they WANT to know, and what they LEARNED

- **Pre-Reading Activities** - Walk through the text discussing the topics and photos before reading, or looking through a chapter backwards for the big picture view of the entire text.

- **Using Symbols** - students use post it notes with check marks, question marks, and plus signs to label a new text during the first reading. Check marks mean, "I understand this part.” Question marks mean, “I need help with this part.” Plus signs mean, “This is something new I’ve learned.”

- **Student Journals** -

- **Personal Dictionaries** -

- **Four Squares Vocabulary** - paper folded into 4 parts: part 1 includes an illustration, part 2 includes a sentence, part 3 includes a definition, and part 4 includes the vocabulary word.

- **Similar Words** - Similar Words - Palabras Similares Booklet includes 1000 varied reading level words that are similar in spelling and pronunciation in both English and Spanish. Print front to back.

- **Making Predictions** - students survey the text and predict what they think they will be
learning.

- **Text-to-Self Connections** - Research clearly shows that prior knowledge (including experiences and emotions---or schema---is a major factor in students being able to comprehend what they read.

- **Text-to-Text Connections** - Research shows that students who are explicitly taught and use strategies that activate prior knowledge comprehend better than students who don’t.

- **Guided Comprehension** - Students learn comprehension strategies in a variety of settings using multiple levels and types of text. It is a three-stage process focused on direct instruction, application, and reflection. Current studies demonstrate that when students experience explicit instruction of comprehension strategies, it improves their comprehension of new texts and topics (Hiebert et al., 1998).

- **Concepts and Vocabulary** - includes strategies and scaffolding for pre-reading

- **Vocabulary** - When teaching ELL students new vocabulary, it is important to select the *key vocabulary* for any given lesson or unit. Here are some guidelines to help you decide which words to teach. The next section will provide some ideas from Northshore School District in Bothell, Washington on how to teach new vocabulary. Tell the student the word and move on if:
  
  The word does not represent a new concept

  Students need to understand for this activity but are not likely to need it again

- **Teach the student the word if:**
  
  The word represents a new concept
The word crosses content areas or has multiple uses
The word is important for students outside of this activity

• **Teaching Vocabulary to ELLs**

  Pronounce the word

  Provide a definition (show, paraphrase, act out, create experience)

  Post definition for reference

  Introduce in context in which it occurs or in a familiar context

  Relate word to students' prior experiences. Create an experience that demonstrates meaning

  Word walls

  Generate and record sentences (building from original context or familiar context)

  Use word often in instruction. Point it out in other content areas, have students find it in other contexts, classes, out of school.

  Add to word bank or student-made dictionaries

  Use first language to clarify

  Word webs

  Semantic-analysis chart, concept maps.

  Act out, use visuals or real objects (regalia)

• **General Principals for Teaching ELLs** - Language acquisition theories have highlighted four key principles that can be directly applied to the mainstream classroom.

  These principles are important for all students, but are of particular importance to
English language learners (Jameson, 1998)

3. **Comprehensible Input** - Teachers should make assignments clear by using vocabulary students can understand, and by providing a variety of instructional experiences including:

- **Total Physical Response** - teachers use hand gestures, facial expressions, and whole body movement to illustrate concepts or vocabulary words. Students emulate the movements.

- **Vocabulary Cards** - Vocabulary Cards - Tarjetas del Vocabulario - 1500 most commonly used words in English with Spanish translations. Words are clustered by category and fold to the size of a business card.

- **Similar Words and Opposite Words** - includes 1000 varied reading level words that are similar in spelling and pronunciation in both English and Spanish.

- **Vocabulary Picture Puzzles** - when printed from to back, these vocabulary games allow students to work alone or in pairs or small groups to discuss targeted vocabulary words in a social setting while playing a game.

- **Confusing Words Bulletin Board** - students add commonly used slang phrases and idioms to a chart for other students to interpret.

- **Read Along Audio Files** -

- **Video Resources** -

- **Web Resources** - 26 sites (A-Z) that support teachers in teaching English Language Learners.

4. **Student Strategies for Success** - English Language Learners can benefit from
knowing specific strategies to use that increase comprehension including the following:

- **Survey, Question, Read, Review Recite** - display the steps in each stage of SQRRR

- **Questions in a Can** - teacher or student-created questions ranging from lower to higher-level questions are placed in a can. Students draw questions and answer in a team discussion.

- **Gallery Walks** - Students write or draw the most important ideas from a section of assigned text.

- **Split Page Note Taking** - Before reading, students write who, what, when, where, or why questions on the left side of the page and after reading, students write answers on the right side.

- **Similarities and Differences Using a Venn Diagram**

5. **Interactions** - Student-to-teacher and student-to-student interactions can be enhanced through the following:

- **Sufficient Wait Time** - In most classrooms, students are typically given less than one second to respond to a question posed by a teacher. Research shows that under these conditions students generally give short, recall responses or no answer at all rather than giving answers that involve higher-level thinking. Increasing the wait time from three to seven seconds results in an increase in: 1) the length of student responses 2) the number of unsolicited responses 3) the frequency of student questions 4) the number of responses from less capable children 5) student-student interactions 6) the incidence of speculative responses. In addition to pausing after asking questions, research shows that many of these same benefits
result when teachers pause after the student's response to a question, and when teachers do not affirm answers immediately.

- **Group Consensus** - the teacher asks specific review questions. Students seated in groups of 4 or 5 write their answers and share them with other group members. Groups must discuss until they reach consensus. The group answer is submitted to the teacher. Points can be scored if the teacher chooses to make the review competitive.

- **Find Your Partner** - each student is given a vocabulary card with either a definition or a term written on it. Students are asked to find the matching card. Then students share with the class the pairs they have made.

- **Academic Relays** - See examples on the D11 web:

6. **Lesson Delivery** - Effective lessons clearly state for English Language Learners both the content standard and the language standard. Effective lessons are paced to accommodate the learner and keep the learner engaged for at least 90% of the lesson.

- Research-based strategies for listening, speaking, reading, writing, and ELL Advocacy from experienced ELL students.

7. **Practice / Application** - English Language Learners need hands-on materials, opportunities to practice and to apply concepts learned, and opportunities to integrate reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills.

- **Bingo** - provides students a hands-on opportunity to review vocabulary or math facts. Students can review Spanish and English vocabulary words or mat families, or other basic content by completing their own bingo cards. Dried beans can be used
as playing pieces.

- **Graphic Organizers**

- **Compare and Contrast**

- **Fishbone Diagram** - used to identify causes and effect or main idea and supporting details

- **Concept Webs Using** *Inspiration* **software**

- **Pizza Pieces** - parts of stories or events over time are assigned to individuals or small groups, which must write summaries of the assigned part of the story. Students or groups share their part as the pizza pieces are reassembled to make a whole.

- **Review Games for ESL Students** - PowerPoint is used as the method for providing vocabulary review. The PowerPoint files can be adapted by teachers to include specific vocabulary words for a content area.

- **Vocabulary Card Review Games** - 5-minute fillers and other strategies to help students learn vocabulary words. The decks of cards listed below by category are in Microsoft Word format so teachers can create word lists of 13 words for any content.

- **Pyramid Game** - Major facts and concepts from a unit are written on 6 papers, which are taped to the wall in a pyramid shape face down. First students form pairs to play the first round of pyramid. One student (Clue Giver) is given a review sheet and one minute to see how many of the vocabulary terms or concept the Clue Receiver can accurately name. Play continues with the Giver and Receiver changing roles and passing the review sheet. After several rounds the two players
with the highest scores move to the final round. The Clue Caller faces the wall with the pyramid shaped pages on it. The Clue Receiver faces the classroom. The teacher begins play by turning over the bottom left-hand card. The Caller gives clues and the Receiver guesses. After a correct answer the teacher turns over the next page and play continues until all pages have been revealed or time runs out.

- **Computer Review Games** - includes PowerPoint vocabulary review games that can be played alone or in pairs. Students keep score for their partners.

8. **Review and Assessment** - a comprehensive and deliberate review of vocabulary, and key content area concepts, and language standards will enable ELL students to demonstrate mastery. Expecting students with a limited vocabulary to perform well without intentional support or “sheltered instruction” will undoubtedly guarantee frustration and failure.

- **Table Discussion Groups** - students discuss answer to questions similar to those that will be on the assessment.

- **Simultaneous Roundtable** - students help each other review by writing their team number on a paper that is passed from one student to the next. Each student adds a fact about a given concept then passes it on to the next writer. Teams are given a short time frame to complete the task i.e. 2 minutes.

- **Find a Person Who Knows** - students are given review sheets with as many questions as there are students in the class. Students move around the room finding someone who knows an answer. Students can receive only one answer from each person.

- **Pyramid Game** - Major facts and concepts from a unit are written on 6 papers, which
are taped to the wall in a pyramid shape face down. First students form pairs to play the first round of pyramid. One student (Clue Giver) is given a review sheet and one minute to see how many of the vocabulary terms or concept the Clue Receiver can accurately name. Play continues with the Giver and Receiver changing roles and passing the review sheet. After several rounds the two players with the highest scores move to the final round. The Clue Caller faces the wall with the pyramid shaped pages on it. The Clue Receiver faces the classroom. The teacher begins play by turning over the bottom left-hand card. The Caller gives clues and the Receiver guesses. After a correct answer the teacher turns over the next page and play continues until all pages have been revealed or time runs out.

Check My Work - the teacher writes a list of review statements or facts on a transparency. The sentences include incorrect information much like a mad lib. For example, “Sponge Bob was the first president of the United States, and was elected in 1997.” Students point out the mistakes and say fill in the correct information for the class.
Appendix E:

DATA SHEET AND INTERVENTION PLAN
DATA SHEET AND INTERVENTION PLAN

Data Sheet and Intervention Plan for ______________________________________

School: ___________________________ Grade: ____________________________

Teacher: ___________________________ Starting Date: _______________________

Primary Home Language: ________________________________________________

Language Dominance Evaluation Results: __________________________________

Acedemic Prgram(s): __________________________________________________

Transition Initiated/Area(s): ______________________________________________

ACEDEMIC AREA ASSESSED:  Reading  Math  (Circle One)

Classroom Level Text: __________________________________________________

Probe: ____________ Correct/ min: ____________ Error/ min: ____________

Suggested Level Text: __________________________________________________

Probe: ____________ Correct/ min: ____________ Error/ min: ____________

Goal Leel Text: _________________________________________________________

Probe: ____________ Correct/ min: ____________ Error/ min: ____________

Reading Comprehension Assessment:

Method: ______________________________________________________________

Results:  ______________________________________________________________

If non-text based apprach to instruction is used, indicate area and method(s) of assessment:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Intervention: __________________________________________________________

What: __________________________ will receive instruction in _________________

__________________________ to increase _____________________________

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

How: Materials used: __________________________________________________
Strategies used: _________________________________________________
Language(s) used: _______________________________________________
When: ___________________________________________________________
Where: ___________________________________________________________
Self-Management Strategies to be taught: ____________________________
Study Skills to be Taught: ________________________________
Additional Comments: _____________________________________________
Documentation of Progressed: Attached is a graph indicating student scores
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ONLINE DOCUMENT USED FOR TEACHER COLLABORATION
What does this mean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>My Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The discipline of focus (Wildly Important Goal or W.I.G.)</td>
<td>WIG - Our group of teachers identified the student’s number one achievement goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The discipline of leverage</td>
<td>Each teacher then identified how his or her specialty could relate to the overall goal. Then each week each teacher would create a small lesson from his or her specialty that would move the student toward the goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The discipline of engagement</td>
<td>Lead Measure (small wins)- Weekly documentation of progress and small achievements that the student has made. Lag Measure (big win)- Overall Test Results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The discipline of accountability</td>
<td>Weekly meetings to discuss how each individual teacher’s last weeks specialty training went and what the next weeks specialty training will occur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we decided on for Student A and Student B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Our Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. W.I.G: Wildly Important Goal: Geography: * Continents and oceans * Distance scale * Compass rose (N, S, E, W, NW, NE, etc) * Map scale * Types of maps: Political, Physical, Climate, Resource map (where do they have cows), and Road * Atlas * Country research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The discipline of leverage</td>
<td>Mainstream Teacher: She will teach the content of Geography to the class when the student is there. Speech Clinician: prepositions and directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student A’s current test scores:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fontas &amp; Pinnell</th>
<th>NWEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/18/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
<td>Reading 158 (17%ile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Reading 158 (10%ile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>Reading 161 (17%ile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2014</td>
<td>Reading 168 (15%ile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Reading 176 (18%ile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Reading 176 (18%ile)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student A’s current academic struggles:**
*Inference and feeling questions are very hard
* Express from self-first and then how characters feel
### Thursday Weekly Check-in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2/26/2015</th>
<th>What went well/ what did not</th>
<th>What will I work on next week?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Mainstream Teacher.** | **Student A:** He is interested in geography, but the skills are hard for him. His behavior was a stopping point for a couple of days.  
**Student B:** He would definitely like to be a part of the group he is in. He finds it difficult to keep up, however, and to contribute at the level of the other kids. | **Student A:** Find books on countries that are at his reading level (might be tricky!) And, continuing to be on top of his behavior issues.  
**Student B:** Find ways that he can contribute to the group responsibly. Also staying on top of his behavior issues. |
| **Speech Clinician.** | **Student A:**  
Used Leapfrog talking globe to label continents, countries and capitals.  
Discussed NESW and compass rose.  
Went to window of the school to orient self to NESW. | **Student A:** Use paper compass rose to label directions.  
Use written directions to create a map/road. |
| **Special Education Teacher** | **Student A:** Refused to participate in class. We have only introduced scales one day so far due to student absences.  
**Student B:** Appeared to like working on scales. He seemed to want to learn but was distracted by others in the room. We will continue to work on this skill when there aren’t as many distractions in the room. | **Student A:** Continue to work on scales in Math. Begin working on using symbols to read maps.  
**Student B:** Continue to work on scales in Math. Begin working on using symbols to read maps. |
| **ESL Teacher** | **Student A:** I did not see him this week due to testing.  
**Student B:** We worked on testing listening, reading, writing and speaking. During testing I found that he has a very hard time with retelling information and pulling out information that was verbally told to him. I didn’t realize this was his area of weakness. | **Student A:** background knowledge from city to world map, describing land markings on a map  
**Student B:** verbally discussing the knowledge from city to world map, describing land markings on a map |

| **3/5/2015** | **What went well/ what did not** | **What will I work on next week?** |
| **Mainstream Teacher.** | **Student A:** Used Leapfrog globe to review.  
Student A was readily able to write in NESW directions on paper and also NE, SE, NW and SW.  
Exercise to follow directions on paper (i.e. 2 dots South, 3 dots East): 50% accuracy.  
Marked dots too quickly and made mistakes. | Practice following directions using NESW coordinates.  
Practice following verbal directions using globe (3-D).  
He will verbalize directions for me to follow on paper.  
I will give verbalize directions for him to follow on paper  
Review continents |

| **Speech Clinician.** | **Student A:** Refused to participate in class. We have worked on scales for 5 days now.  
**Student B:** Is now exhibiting work refusal behaviors. Once he gets going, he does well but does need assistance. | **Student A:** Continue to work on scales in Math. Begin working on using symbols to read maps.  
**Student B:** Continue to work on scales in Math. Begin working on using symbols to read maps. |

| **Special Education Teacher** | **Student A:** | **Student A:** |
| ESL Teacher | **Student A:** I finished his ESL state testing.  
**Student B:** I was not able to see Student B because I was out sick on Thursday and Friday | **Student A:** background knowledge from city to world map, describing land markings on a map  
I want to find out what country he is doing research on. He couldn’t remember either. We can start reading and discussing information he is learning and I will make sure he has the background knowledge.  
**Student B:** verbally discussing the knowledge from city to world map, describing land markings on a map. We will read and learn more about the country he is studying. I will focus on background knowledge he needs to know for his report. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3/12/2015</th>
<th><strong>What went well/ what did not</strong></th>
<th><strong>What will I work on next week?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clinician</td>
<td><strong>Student A</strong> brought a book about the country he is doing a report on and note cards to write facts. He found neighboring countries on the map. Related facts: dust storms, bananas, flags, capitals, animals.</td>
<td>Map directions. Following and giving directions on a map. Types of climates, products mountain ranges from the country he is reporting on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Student A:</strong> Continued to work on scales in class but had difficulty completing work due to behaviors. <strong>Student B:</strong> (same as last week) Is</td>
<td><strong>Student A:</strong> Continue to work on scales in Math. Begin working on using symbols to read maps. <strong>Student B:</strong> Continue to work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
now exhibiting work refusal behaviors. Once he gets going, he does well but does need assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL Teacher</th>
<th>Student A: We looked at the country for his report on an online mapping software and read information on the internet about it. We discussed worlds like, population, capital, and currency. These were things he would be writing about in his report.</th>
<th>Student A and Student B: We will read more about countries and record facts. I will also practice categorizing items with them. They will need to do this to organize his notecards and write his report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student B: I only saw him one day because he got sick on the second day. But we also did an online mapping software on his country for the report and read and recorded information about it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haven’t begun maps yet because it has been taking a long time to complete reading/writing activities due to behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3/19/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstream Teacher.</th>
<th>What went well/ what did not</th>
<th>What will I work on next week?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Their rough draft on their assigned country was discussed with the student, but written out by a paraprofessional. *Only Student B finished an assignment on staying healthy picture and writing. *Student A is able to verbally express what he knows about the country, but not write about it.</td>
<td>*They will be rewriting their final drafts and creating a map of their country. *In Pic collage they will be creating a one-page brochure for their country. *Start map packets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clinician.</td>
<td>Used stencil maps to follow directions using NESW. Practiced Student A giving the teacher directions. Created map of speech room. He created a map of his bedroom.</td>
<td>Use world atlas to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td><strong>No update:</strong> Skills have not been addressed due to absences and behaviors.</td>
<td><strong>Same hopes!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Student A:</strong> I met with Student A on Monday and not the other two days due to dentist and behavior. On Monday we reviewed the word population and compared the different countries populations. We also looked at pictures from his family’s country that he was reporting on and discussed them. (Environment, life style, etc.) <strong>Student B:</strong> We practiced categorizing things in an app. He now knows the meaning of the words: Capital, currency, and population. He did not know them before. He also practiced simple map direction. He got frustrated with just the directions of right and left. We practiced strategies to remember the difference.</td>
<td><strong>Student A &amp; Student B:</strong> We can discuss, use and create a key box on a map. I also have a couple apps to practice their mapping skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/2015</td>
<td>What went well/ what did not</td>
<td>What will I work on next week?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clinician.</td>
<td>Raz kids- reading and comprehension questions.</td>
<td>Follow up with Raz kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>No Update</td>
<td>No Update (same as last week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Student A</strong>: We used an app to follow simple mapping directions. He did well with this. We also reviewed the words: population, currency and capital. I was not able to see Student A everyday due to behavior. <strong>Student B</strong>: I did a quick review of the vocabulary from last week. We then worked on directions and the symbols used in a key on a map.</td>
<td><strong>Student A and Student B</strong>: I will teach them about symbols and how they tell us things and represent something. We will start with common everyday symbols and then move to symbols that would be on the types of different maps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4/9/2015</th>
<th>What went well/ what did not</th>
<th>What will I work on next week?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Teacher.</td>
<td>MCA testing First two chapters in map packet</td>
<td>Finish the map packet Finish the final report on their country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clinician.</td>
<td>Practiced for computerized testing Maps and graphing. He is able to do it but needs step-by-step assistance to complete the work.</td>
<td>Work with Maps re: climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>MCA Testing</td>
<td>Work on reading map keys, navigating maps, cardinal directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student B:</strong> Participated and did very well. He knew all directions and caught on quickly that he can’t skip steps when reading maps (i.e. you HAVE to refer to the key)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student A:</strong> Negative behaviors...no work completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Student A:</strong> He read a book to me on how to read map keys. We stopped and discussed the different types of maps. He then created his own map with a map key. <strong>Student B:</strong> He worked on the map packet that the mainstream teacher had in class. He moves slowly, so he came to class with it half done, but enjoyed helping others in his group since he was ahead of them. He said that he enjoyed being a leader.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | **Student A:** Work on the classroom packet together. *
| | *Maybe we should all meet to see what the next unit would be about. I believe this is the last week for maps. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4/16/2015</th>
<th>What went well/ what did not</th>
<th>What will I work on next week?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Teacher.</td>
<td>Finishing up report on their country</td>
<td>*Finish map packet *Start plants and their life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clinician.</td>
<td><strong>Student A</strong> needed to work on comprehension of prepositions: near, far, close, top, bottom, by, beside. Definition of: intersect</td>
<td>Continue with prepositions as they relate to two-dimensional maps and following directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>MCA Testing Continued to worked on reading map keys, navigating population maps, cardinal directions <strong>Student B and Student A:</strong> Difficulty focusing. Got discouraged more easily because it was harder for them. Didn’t understand what “population” meant nor do they have a strong personal connection to reading highways symbols and travel.</td>
<td>Work on reading various map keys, identifying symbols, and continuing to navigate various types of maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Teacher</td>
<td><strong>Student A:</strong> We worked on one page in his geography packet. We also created a map on a car and map key to explain it. <strong>Student B:</strong> I only had one day with him. Tornado Drill We worked on his report for his country.</td>
<td>We will watch a time lapsed video on a seed changing into plant. *Pretest: Can you tell me the steps of what happened? *Read a story on the subject. *Posttest: Verbally discuss the life cycle of a plant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4/23/2015</th>
<th>What went well/ what did not</th>
<th>What will I work on next week?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Teacher.</td>
<td>MCA testing</td>
<td>Life cycles: starting with plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clinician.</td>
<td>Worked on I pad with story comprehension and sequencing. Student A was not “available” on 4/23 to come to speech class.</td>
<td><strong>Student A</strong> needed to work on comprehension of prepositions: near, far, close, top, bottom, by, beside. Definition of: intersect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Special Education Teacher | MCA Testing Continued to worked on reading map keys, navigating population maps, cardinal directions, climate maps  
**Student B and Student A:** (Same) Difficulty focusing. Got discouraged more easily because it was harder for them. | **Student A and Student B:** Need to work on reading population maps and street maps. They do well at using the map keys/legends to understand what symbols are but they do not necessarily know what the symbols mean (i.e. didn’t know what the word “population” meant). They do well at less complex maps with fewer details. They know the directions well (N, E, S, W, NE, SE, NW, NE) |
| ESL Teacher | **Student A:** We worked on finishing his country report. He was MCA testing the other times I saw him.  
**Student B:** He finished his written report on a country with me. Their classroom finished last week. We began to identify what a Life Cycle means. He couldn’t explain it. The water cycle was his only connection to this. We began identifying the life cycle of a plant. | **Student A:** I want him to identify what a life cycle means. I will assess him on what he knows and share with the group. We will move on to arranging pictures of a plant life cycle.  
**Student B:** We will read a non-fiction story and arrange pictures and write about the life cycle of a plant. |
Appendix G:

WIDA STANDARDS FOR THIRD GRADE
### Level 6: Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehend and interpret continuous text</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and evaluate text</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate text for multiple perspectives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesize multiple sources of information</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare and contrast ideas across texts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw inferences and make predictions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite evidence from text to support claims</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate author's purpose, point of view, and bias</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 6: Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft and revise</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit and proofread</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write for multiple audiences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use clear and concise language</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize ideas logically</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate writing conventions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 6: Speaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listen for meaning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions to clarify meaning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak clearly and concisely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in discussions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate language in different contexts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 6: Listening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listen for meaning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions to clarify meaning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak clearly and concisely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in discussions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate language in different contexts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H:

POST QUESTIONARIE TO TEACHERS
Teaching Techniques

1) Did you learn or use any new teaching techniques from the collaboration and if so what techniques did you use?
   a) None
   b) Reward
   c) Visual
   d) Manipulative
   e) Culturally relevant
   f) Other: Please Explain

Experience with ESL

2) How would you rate your experience working on this project and is it something that we should use in the future for dual EL and special education students?
   a) 1 – Very Poor
   b) 2 - Poor
   c) 3 - OK
   d) 4 - Good
   e) 5 - Very Good
   Please explain your reason.

Collaboration

3) Did Collaboration with the EL department and Special Education Improve due to this project?
   a) Yes
   b) No

4) What part of the collaboration do you think worked well in this research?

5) What part of the collaboration do you think could be changed or eliminated?

Methodology

6) During the project we choose to focus on the subject goal of geography and not address behavior as part of the collaboration. If we did it over, what path would you choose:
   a) Focus only on a subject goal of geography for check-ins
   b) Choose a subject goal at the beginning, but not check-in on it. Instead use our check-ins to focus on behavior
   c) Focus on both a subject goal of geography and a behavioral goal for the check-ins
d) Focus only on a behavior goal for check-ins

7) Did you find the weekly check-in system through the online document valuable to understand what others were working on and decide your focus for the next week? Please rate:
   a) 1 – Very Unhelpful
   b) 2 - Unhelpful
   c) 3 - Average
   d) 4 - Helpful
   e) 5 – Very Helpful

8) If we were to use check-ins for a future student, what method would you prefer:
   a) Check-in via online only
   b) Check-in during a 10 minute stand up meeting only
   c) Alternate between online check-in and a 10 minute stand up meeting
   d) Other – Please Explain

9) How often would you recommend using check-ins for the future?
   a) Daily
   b) Twice a week
   c) Weekly
   d) Bi-Weekly
   e) Beginning and End of Project
   f) Other – Please Explain

10) How aware were you of how the student was progressing toward the goal of completing the map packet and a report on a country.
    a) 1 – Very Unaware
    b) 2 – Unaware
    c) 3 – Somewhat Aware
    d) 4 - Aware
    e) 5 – Very Aware

11) Would you like to continue the same online collaboration until the end of the school year?
    a) Yes
    b) No
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