AN ADMINISTRATOR'S GUIDE FOR SUPPORTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CO-TEACHING INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL WITHIN INTEGRATED ENL SETTINGS

Created for the Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages (OBEWL) at the New York State Education Department (NYSED) by the New York State Education Department Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages Strategic Planning Work Group for Co-Teaching in Partnership with the NYS Regional Bilingual Education Resource Networks.

Table of Contents

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

1

Preface

Teacher collaboration is not a new concept relative to the timeline of education. Many educators are familiar with co-teaching in special education settings, with the purpose of supporting the implementation of specially designed instruction for students with disabilities. What is *less familiar* is teachers collaborating to simultaneously provide English Language Learners (ELLs) with access to content while scaffolding to support the linguistic demands of the content with research-based English as a New Language (ENL) instructional strategies, all purposefully designed to propel the students along their continuum of academic, language, and social-emotional development. This shift underscores the deepening recognition of content-based language instruction as a more effective and meaningful vehicle toward language acquisition, rather than learning language in isolation outside of context-embedded learning environments. The delivery of content-based instruction may be achieved via a teacher dually-certified in both a content area and in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) or may be co-taught by a certified content area teacher and an ESOL-certified teacher collaboratively teaching within an Integrated ENL context, with the latter being the focus of this administrative guide. Achieving the intended goals of Integrated ENL through co-teaching requires a collective commitment to embracing a collaborative, integrated approach to meeting all the needs of our students. While there are widely accepted justifications to support the Integrated ENL Co-teaching model, questions surrounding the implementation often lack the clarity and guidance to support administrators in designing effective programs. We hope that this Integrated ENL Co-teaching Administrator's Guide will serve as a fundamental tool in defining both the vision and implementation of this collaborative model of instruction in support of ELLs.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

2

Part One (1):
Why does New York State utilize an Integrated ENL Co-Teaching Model?

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

3

Background: The Origins of Co-teaching in an Integrated ENL Model

Aligned with New York State Commissioner's Regulation (CR) Part 154, Integrated ENL classes may be taught either "by a teacher dually certified in the content area and ENL, or co-taught by a certified content area teacher and a certified ENL teacher" (NYSED, n.d., para. 5). This guidance document focuses on co-taught Integrated ENL, which can be further described as an instructional model involving two teachers working as a team with the purpose of pooling their collective and distinct expertise, experience, and instructional approaches within their co-teaching partnerships to differentiate instruction for diverse learners. Within the last decade, co-taught Integrated ENL has emerged as the prominent instructional delivery model to support ELLs in mainstream integrated classes, as opposed to stand-alone services (Abdallah, 2009; Carnock, 2016; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010). The goal of this instructional model is to support the development of English-language proficiency for ELLs through authentic content-based language acquisition in Integrated ENL classes (Bell & Baecher, 2012; Friend et al., 2008; Friend et al., 1993; McGriff & Protacio, 2015; Santamaria & Thousand, 2004).

Prior to 2014, the accepted method in New York State for ENL instruction was through a *pull-out* or *push-in* method. By leaving the classroom, the ELL students were isolated from the rest of their peers, depriving them of authentic opportunities to develop and engage in the academic content area and academic language that their peers were receiving. These practices prevented ELLs from sharing social experiences with other students, decreasing opportunities for ELLs to develop their English language skills by listening and interacting with their English-speaking peers. Further, the *pull-out/push-in* model did not cultivate collaboration between teachers to intentionally plan for supports and scaffolds to create opportunities for ELLs to engage in and successfully achieve the lessons' goals. Rather, planning was often unilateral, with the content area teacher taking the lead, and linguistic support offered as an afterthought, or not at all.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

4

The [Blueprint for English Language Learner Success](#) was developed to support the revisions to Commissioner's Regulation (CR) Part 154, which were implemented in September 2015. The first principle states that "Every teacher is a teacher of ELLs" specifically referring to the fact that all teachers, regardless of the content they teach, must consider addressing the literacy and linguistic gaps that impede ELLs from accessing the content and allowing students to participate in the classroom.

The intent of Integrated ENL Co-teaching is to maximize the academic experience and outcome for ELLs through a comprehensive instructional approach of integration. When we examine the concept of integration, we are referring to more than merely the surface level act of integrating content instruction and language instruction. Rather, we broaden our understanding of integration to include the integration of teacher expertise, as well as the intentional integration of students, by identifying ways of creating meaningful opportunities for student groupings which support student-led interaction and academic discussion, as well as peer feedback and modeling of language. These aspects of integration consider how students are supported in "mastering core content while also developing language proficiency and acquiring disciplinary literacy skills in English," (Honigsfeld, McDermott & Cordeiro, 2018, p.127) within authentic learning environments, rather than in isolation.

Benefits of Integrated ENL Co-teaching

Integrated ENL Co-teaching offers benefits to both students and teachers. It serves as a vehicle for professional growth and learning for educators. While this particular benefit parallels that which has been historically experienced within co-taught special ed contexts, the comparison ends there, as the intention of integrated ENL focuses on supporting the distinct linguistic needs of ELLs. Through collaboration, each teacher builds the capacity of their partner through a reciprocal exchange of language or content expertise, while also cultivating cross-cultural understanding and multilingualism among students. In other words, the co-teachers

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

5

can pool their collective experiences and instructional approaches within their integrated setting to differentiate and scaffold instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Cordeiro, 2021).

Another benefit of co-teaching in the integrated ENL classroom is the integrated curricula that supports language acquisition while simultaneously teaching new content. Co-teachers collaborate throughout each phase of the collaborative instructional cycle to plan, deliver, assess, and reflect on the differentiated instruction for all students. In this way, co-teachers support the four domains of literacy development—reading, writing, listening, and speaking—by addressing the linguistic demands of the academic content. Rather than teaching language through an isolated curriculum, the integrated curriculum is designed to ensure ELLs are provided with rigorous instruction and equitable access to the mainstream curriculum. As outlined in the NYSED [Integrated ENL Co-teaching Topic Briefs](#) (NYSED, n.d.), this integrated approach creates meaningful opportunities for English language learners to grapple with academic language while exploring the content.

In addition to the many benefits teachers experience through co-teaching, students in integrated ENL settings also reap distinct advantages. Keeping ELLs in the classroom affords them the opportunity to learn from their peers and provides access to the learning community which supports social-emotional learning (SEL). Students experience equitable access to grade-level and rigorous instruction and to the same academic opportunities as their peers. Further, all students benefit from learning in an environment which reflects the cultural and linguistic diversity of the community in which they will engage beyond their school walls.

Developing Your Vision Statement

The implementation of an effective collaborative co-teaching model is characterized by a school culture that cultivates parity among partnered teachers sharing common goals, responsibilities, and accountability for student outcomes (Creese, 2005; Friend et al., 2008). Such a school culture recognizes that co-teaching involves teacher collaboration with regard to the planning, delivery, and evaluation of jointly provided

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

6

instruction (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2018; Friend et al., 1993) and creates opportunities for the implementation of the full collaborative instruction model. Murawski and Bernhardt (2015) further described the criteria of this model, and identified five administrative goals to support effective co-teaching: (a) partner the right teachers; (b) establish scheduling strategies; (c) supervise and evaluate strategically; (d) provide professional development on inclusion, collaboration, and co-teaching; and (e) improve, increase, and institutionalize co-teaching practices. Each of these goals will be discussed herein, as they relate to partnerships between content area or general education (GE) teachers, special education teachers, and teachers of English to speakers of other languages (ESOL) supporting ELLs in Integrated ENL contexts.

Another factor in the effective implementation of co-teaching is clear articulation of a vision statement, through an intentional exploration of what it means to integrate teachers, to integrate students, and to integrate content and language instruction for ELLs, including what collaboration between general education, special education, and ESOL teachers should look like. In clarifying this vision, we need to deepen our understanding of all stakeholders, as described in NYSED's Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Education Framework (CRSE), along with reflecting on the following questions (1) How do we assess and address the school culture and environment to tailor our program to the specific needs of our community? (2) How do we address this in our curriculum to cultivate and reflect an inclusive learning environment? (3) How do we communicate our vision with consistency and clarity? As reflective practitioners, discussing and responding to these questions will serve as the foundation of a comprehensive vision statement to articulate and implement our collaborative practices. As additional resources, Appendix A, B, C, and D of this guide provide survey protocols to facilitate these discussions.

School districts must also think strategically about family and community engagement in the implementation of a successful integrated ENL co-teaching program. All teachers should be empowered to communicate with families in the language and mode of communication they prefer. As such, school districts

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

7

should consider what training will support successful use of translation and interpretation tools to ensure effective communication with families. This includes communication around parent-teacher conferences and the inclusive nature of the classroom. More broadly, the school district should consider how it informs all parents of the integrated ENL co-teaching model, including messaging to internal and external stakeholders around student placement and scheduling determinations. A letter to families may include information about (1) the goals and purpose of the English as a New Language program , (2) the school's philosophy of ELL success, inclusive of the integrated ENL co-teaching model, (3) parents' rights to information, including: (a) student placement and scheduling, (b) a high quality orientation that discusses state standards, tests, school expectations, and program goals, (c) their child's English language development, (d) a minimum of one annual meeting with school staff to discuss the students' overall learning and language development process, and (e) students' right to equal access to all programming and services offered by the school district, including those required for graduation (4) parents' rights to information in their preferred language and mode of communication, including the tools utilized by the school to facilitate this, (5) graduation requirements for receiving a high school diploma in New York State, and (6) opportunities for family engagement through community partnerships, parent information events, and programming for families.

Having established the *why* behind the implementation of the Co-taught Integrated ENL model, the remainder of this guide will shift to addressing the *how*.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

8

Part Two (2):

How can school and district administrators
successfully implement Integrated ENL Co-Teaching?

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

9

Implementing Co-Taught Integrated ENL

The collaborative instructional model involves a cycle of components to provide comprehensive linguistic and academic support for ELLs. To this point, Dove and Honigsfeld (2018) defined four distinct phases of the collaborative co-teaching instructional model: collaborative planning, collaborative instructional delivery/co-teaching, collaborative assessment of student learning, and reflection *on* action and *in* action. This collaborative instructional cycle emphasizes the shared responsibility for student learning and promotes teacher parity through every phase of the instruction and assessment process. Each phase supports the intentions of the collaborative co-taught model: to minimize ELLs' time spent receiving instruction outside of their classroom community, to create equitable access to rigorous curriculum, and to cultivate asset-based opportunities for all learners to engage in authentic student-centered language use reflecting their unique cultural and linguistic perspectives. Considerations within these four phases include partnering, programming, provisioning of resources and professional development.

Figure 1: *How to Approach…*

Step 1 Partnering	Consider partnering based on teacher dispositions as well as expression of interest from volunteers and keep existing effective partnerships intact
Step 2 Programming	Design master schedule considering co-taught classes first
Step 3 Provisioning	Explore innovative ways of allocating resources, including fiscal resources and human resources
Step 4 Professional Development	Supporting the co-teaching partnership at two key stages: initial implementation

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

10

Partnering

The district-level implementation of co-taught Integrated ENL programming is a critical component to its success (Carnock, 2016). A precursor to that success would be the effective partnering of teachers within this program, which, according to Bell and Baecher (2012) is largely influenced by teacher personalities and dispositions (see definition on page 24) toward collaboration. For this reason, care and attention must be given to the establishment of co-teaching partnerships, as "the process in which co-teachers are paired by administrators and teachers is essential to their success because the pairing will affect the interpersonal relationship in the partnerships" (Kregel, 2014, p. 3). While the implementation of co-teaching partnerships are often decided at the administrative level (directive approach), in some contexts there is also room to consider partnerships created through teacher volunteerism (teacher-driven), which typically increases teacher accountability and commitment to collaboration in support of ELLs.

Facilitated Approach

Administrators may employ a directive approach to form collaborative partnerships by assigning teachers to co-teach without their input. However, this can lead to mismatched partnerships lacking true collaboration. To mitigate this, administrators could use a more intentional directive approach, identifying teachers receptive to collaboration through surveys on their dispositions, interests, and experience with ELLs. This ensures teacher input is considered when forming partnerships.

Administrators may also make a regular practice of cultivating a collaborative school culture. This may include planning opportunities for teachers from different departments to work on schoolwide interdisciplinary projects and events where they can engage with colleagues and contribute their expertise while working on a shared goal. Similarly, administrators can strategically group faculty on projects like curriculum writing, which should always include both ENL and content area teachers, so that both the content and linguistic perspectives are simultaneously considered and embedded within instructional design.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

11

Structuring events in this way creates authentic opportunities for teachers to build each other's capacity within a collegial exchange, while also affording administrators the ability to observe how different individuals interact and collaborate, which can better inform their co-teaching partnership assignments.

Participatory Approach

When staffing and resources permit, an alternative approach to partnering co-teachers is to seek out volunteers who have expressed interest in supporting ELLs in a co-taught context. As stated previously, volunteerism may increase teacher buy-in, accountability and commitment to collaboration in support of ELLs. However, as a caveat, the teacher-driven approach to partnering co-teachers must be guided by administrator discretion to ensure that teachers expressing interest in co-taught integrated ENL are indeed qualified candidates to implement this collaborative instructional delivery model.

Other Partnering Considerations

For smaller or more rural districts with low ELL enrollment, establishing co-teaching partnerships may be impacted by the challenges of servicing a small number of ELLs over a geographically expansive area. Stemming from the principles of the Blueprint for ELLs, we acknowledge that all teachers are teachers of ELLs, and must work collaboratively to build their capacity in supporting both the academic and linguistic needs of all learners. Quite often, collaboration inherently becomes a universal practice within smaller districts, as limited staffing may require that all or most teachers support ELLs in co-taught settings. Utilizing resources outside the district, such as itinerant teachers or other certified ESOL educators, may also allow administrators to implement co-taught instruction in Integrated ENL contexts. In these environments, best practices for providing mandated integrated ENL services may involve communication across multiple buildings and/or districts, paired with proactive scheduling of students.

Regardless of how co-teaching partnerships are established, ongoing support and monitoring, which is discussed later in this manual, will allow administrators to determine the efficacy of each partnership in

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

12

supporting the academic and linguistic needs of ELLs, to identify areas in need of support through targeted professional development, as well as to inform decision making regarding continuity of existing partnerships. It is highly recommended that effective partnerships, or those progressing toward this level of proficiency, be sustained and supported with appropriate training and resources to cultivate continued development.

Programming

Designing a master schedule involves an intricate balance of programming and scheduling for students and teachers in a manner which encompasses all aspects of instruction and support. A chief concern during this process is assessing the demographics of student enrollment, to ensure that scheduling reflects best practices aligned with supporting the size and needs of the ELL student sub-group, which may differ from district to district, or even from building to building. According to NYSED (2021): The presence and population of English Language Learners (ELLs) vary considerably among New York State schools. Some communities have no ELLs, while others have small numbers of ELLs of wide-ranging ages; for instance, a district might have many ELLs in grade 2 but none in grade 1. Others have enough ELLs in a given grade to create one or more ENL classrooms per grade level. This demographic reality must, however, be balanced with what we know about best practices to use with this growing subset of our student body (para. 1).

In addition to the size of the ELL population, many other considerations influence our decision-making surrounding master scheduling. For example, ELLs' English language proficiency levels, as determined by annual NYSESLAT scores or NYSITELL score upon identification; and performance on state assessments, including Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Regents examinations. Additionally, the demographic of ELLs may include a subgroup of ELLs who are dually identified as Students With Disabilities (SWD). When drafting the master schedule, consider programming ELLs and ELLs with disabilities first, in order to prioritize these two areas of mandated student services.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

13

To best address and lessen the strain on staffing and instructional time for ELLs, Dr. Andrea Honigsfeld and Dr. Maria Dove recommended that districts consider using strategic clustering to group schools and students (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2019) as an effective strategy to approach master scheduling for ELLs. As another programming best practice, consideration should be given to limiting the number of co-teaching partnerships and content area subjects in which an ESOL certified teacher co-teaches, to allow for meaningful co-planning time between the ENL teacher and the content area teacher. This would provide more ENL instructional time without isolating ELLs and ENL teachers as well as making it more cost effective and raising achievement for all students. (Webinar: Collaboration For English Language Learners: Foundational Strategies for Successful Integrated Practices, April 2019). Clustering as a programming strategy can be accomplished in a variety of ways as described in the following sections.

Clustering for Integrated ENL Co-teaching

As staffing and resources allow, best practice is to go beyond compliance with the established minimum minutes of ENL services provided to meet the needs of students, which can often be achieved through co-taught Integrated ENL. In the first of eight recently published co-teaching topic briefs (2024), NYSED offers a list of recommendations to guide schools in programming services. However, for districts that do not have the financial or human resources to go above and beyond, clustering of students is a strategy that helps maximize human resources to ensure that the minimum weekly units of study are being met. In the following sections, we briefly discuss a variety of ways in which clustering may be implemented. This is not an all-inclusive list, and NYSED recommends that districts seeking further guidance on clustering reach out to their local Regional Bilingual Education Resource Networks (RBERNs).

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

14

Considerations Based on ELL Enrollment

When scheduling based on ELL populations, a suggestion is to cluster ENL students into the fewest number of classrooms possible. Be mindful, as per Commissioner's Regulation Part 154-2, there is no maximum number of English Language Learners that can be placed in one classroom. However, as it is suggested by Honigsfeld & Dove in NYSED Co-Teaching Topic Brief #1, *The Blueprint for English Language Learner/Multilingual Learner Success and Integrated English as a New Language* (2024), it is recommended that ELLs do not exceed 50% of the class roster to ensure opportunities for second language acquisition with native speakers. Clustering all Entering and Emerging ELLs together may make differentiation easier. Conversely, having mixed proficiency levels, including native English speakers in the classroom, allows for heterogeneous grouping and models of English speakers for newcomers.

It is important for those developing school schedules and placing students to consider how to best distribute ENL services to meet the mandated requirements across grade levels. For example, at the secondary level, schools should consider minimally placing ELLs in the fewest number of ELA sections possible at their respective grade level to ensure required co-taught support can be provided. The NYSED units of study call for a minimum amount of ENL instructional minutes in relation to English language proficiency level and grade level. The flexibility column of the chart affords districts the opportunity to integrate multiple content areas in support of ELLs.

When creating the elementary master schedule, priority should be given to staggering co-taught Integrated ENL blocks throughout the day, an initial focus on providing integrated instruction in ELA classes before distributing services across multiple core content areas. This practice would provide more ENL instructional time without isolating ELLs and ENL teachers. While it may be common for schools to have all students engage in ELA during the same time throughout the building, it can make it impossible for ENL teachers to co-teach across multiple grade levels. As such, consider staggering start times throughout the day

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

15

for ELA to accommodate ENL teachers, who co-teach across multiple grade levels. Schools should leverage

co-taught support during ELA to satisfy Integrated ENL minutes for ELLs of all proficiency levels. Consider

leaving room for ELLs who register throughout the year in these classrooms so they don't populate additional

classrooms that will then require co-taught support.

Considerations for Clustering by size/enrollment of ELL Population

Size of ELL Population*	Clustering Options
In situations where there is a small number of ELLs, within all grades in relation to the overall student population:	- Cluster the few ELL students at each elementary grade level together (creating a cohort) with one (1) classroom - Cluster the few ELL students at the secondary level within one section of ELA per grade level, with the classes staggered such that stand-alone instruction can also be scheduled with mixed grades (i.e. 9/10 and 11/12).
In situations where there is a mid-range population of ELLs within all grades in relation to the overall student population:	- Cluster the ELL population at the elementary level together with two (2) or three (3) classrooms. - Cluster the ELL students at the secondary level within one section of ELA per grade level, with the classes staggered such that stand-alone instruction can also be scheduled with mixed grades (i.e. 9/10 and 11/12). - Consider scheduling co-taught support in other core content areas based on Regents Exam and other relevant data as staffing allows.
In situations where there is a high population of ELLs within all grades:	- Create many integrated co-teaching classrooms at the elementary level. - Cluster the ELL students at the secondary level within various sections of core content areas at each grade level, ensuring that all Entering and Emerging students receive co-taught support during their ELA class. - Consider scheduling co-taught support in other core content areas based on Regents Exam and other relevant data as staffing allows.

*For additional recommendations related to clustering based on size of ELL population, please see _Integrated Co-Teaching in The English as a New Classroom Topic Brief One (1): The Blueprint for English Language Learner/Multilingual Learner Success and Integrated English as a New Language (ENL)_.

Districts with large secondary level populations of ELLs and the resources to create a sheltered section

of Integrated ENL/ELA (or other core content area) may consider grouping Entering and Emerging ELLs in their

first year of school in the US in these sheltered core content areas (Markos & Himmel, 2016). These

newcomers may face unique challenges regarding secondary school structure and culture and a skill gap

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

16

between the expectations of grade-level instruction in English and their present level of English proficiency. Additionally, districts who enroll significant numbers of Students with Interrupted/Inconsistent Formal Education (SIFE) may consider clustering SIFE into their own cohort for a pre-ninth grade year using the CUNY Bridges instructional resources. Beyond that, best practices suggest grouping students heterogeneously by proficiency level, regardless of the number of ELLs. (NYSED, 2022).

Districts with smaller numbers of ELLs, that would otherwise want to create a sheltered section but do not have a large enough student population to support it, need to rely even more on effective co-teaching partnerships. Teams are more equipped to address the necessary high level of differentiation when various levels of students are in the same classroom.

Considerations Based on District Size

For school districts with one elementary and one secondary building, schools should consider designating one classroom per grade level to receive ELLs. For school districts with multiple elementary, middle, and/or high schools, consider maximizing your human resources by considering an appropriate number of buildings within which to house your ENL program. Students should not be segregated into one building if possible, but also should not be spread across buildings in such a way that full services cannot be provided. This will allow you to concentrate resources into fewer buildings and provide streamlined programming in these buildings. It is worth noting that school districts that allow for school choice will have to explain to parents the reason their ELL-identified child needs to attend the designated school(s). Districts whose ELL populations grow significantly may choose to offer ENL programming in all schools in order to honor school choice policies.

Considerations Based on the Collaborative Cycle of Instruction

In addition to the student-centered concerns related to programming and scheduling, consideration must also be given to establishing collaborative structures to support the implementation of the full cycle of

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

17

co-teaching: co-planning, co-instruction, co-assessment, and co-reflection. For example, scheduling shared planning time for co-teaching partners is a critical element in cultivating the effective implementation and outcomes of the co-teaching instructional model. Co-teachers might focus on student-centered and project- or inquiry-based approaches that allow multiple entry points to content for multilingual learners.

In order to allow for adequate co-planning time for teachers, consideration should be given to the number of content areas and grade levels ESOL teachers are expected to support. This may involve engaging in district level reflection on contractual language concerning the allocation of planning or prep time provided to teachers. Ideally, contractually defined planning time should allow for a scheduled shared prep period for each co-teaching partnership. Schools should take full advantage of contractual time to schedule common planning time for co-teachers.

Provisioning of Resources

When implementing co-teaching in Integrated ENL settings, districts should assess their anticipated program needs in relation to both the human and fiscal resources required to provide mandated ENL services for the district's ELL population. This assessment will involve the previously discussed partnering and programming considerations.

Human Resources

An integrated ENL/co-teaching classroom pursuant to CR Part 154-2 requires personnel to be "qualified". Specifically, "Personnel qualified to teach Integrated ENL Language shall mean a dually certified teacher (i.e., English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) certification and content area certification). Or a certified ESOL teacher [co-teaching alongside] a certified content area teacher. In a K-6 bilingual program … personnel qualified to teach Integrated ENL means a common branch K-6 teacher with a bilingual extension." [CR 154-2.2(q)]

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

18

School leaders must be strategic in their hiring practices to respond to their current needs as well as to build capacity. Having dually certified teachers provide integrated ENL services allows a district to work toward ensuring that ELLs are getting integrated services beyond the minimum requirement. As such, school leaders should strive to recruit more teachers that can work in both settings, or work with current school staff to pursue obtaining an ESOL certification.

Schools may wish to encourage their content area teachers to obtain a "Supplementary Certificate" in ESOL. For example, NYSED offers grant opportunities for teachers to become certified in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and/or Bilingual Education (BE) through its "Clinically Rich Intensive Teacher Institute (CR-ITI) initiative" (see CR-ITI). Some school districts allow its use of Title II, Part A or Title III Immigrant allocation funds to support teacher development, including supporting course work. Consult with your local RBERN for support with teacher certification opportunities and refer to NYSED Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages and NYSED Office of Teaching Initiatives for recent memos.

Fiscal Resources

ELLs are funded for almost every component of school organization and services. Beyond ELL-specific funding sources, such as Title III ELL Allocation and Title III Immigrant Allocation, ELLs are included in the generation of multiple financial resources (e.g., state LEP aid, NYSTL, Title I, etc.).

Currently, nearly $700 billion flows through NYS K-12 public education systems through a combination of state, federal, and local dollars, and other private funds. Approximately 50% are local funds, 40% are state funds, and 10% are federal funds; each source comes with regulations dictating how, where, and on whom their funds may be spent. Administrators should consider using all sources of allowable funds to support integrated/co-teaching, not just Title III. ELLs are entitled to services funded by the sources below:

- Federal funds are allocated based on student need (e.g., Title I, Title III, IDEA, etc.)

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

19

- State funds are determined by a state-specific funding formula (i.e., state categorical and foundational aid)

- District funds are primarily from local resources (e.g., local tax, property tax, etc.)

Funding for Integrated ENL via a co-taught model is from a school's foundational allocation. However, Title I Schools that have been approved as a "Schoolwide Program" (SWP) and have opted for a "conceptual consolidation" model may combine most federal, state, and local sources to address the needs of the school using all available resources. Conceptual consolidation does not impact allowable expenditures for Title III, which must be used for supplemental services. Schools that are not SWP are considered "Targeted Assistance" (TA) schools subject to more restrictive guidelines – i.e., Title I "TA" Schools may only use its funds for students who are academically at-risk.

Professional Development to Prepare and Sustain Collaborative Partnerships

School leaders and administrators play a critical role in creating the collaborative structures needed to foster successful co-teaching partnerships. To ensure effective collaborations between the content teacher and the ENL teacher, the school leader should be thoughtful and intentional about establishing a plan for professional development and support which includes the preparation stage and sustaining stage of Integrated ENL Co-teaching. Administrators should consider attending professional learning alongside the teachers according to the suggested topics below. They may also benefit from seeking out professional learning opportunities related to scheduling, programming, funding, evaluative observations, and other topics specifically relevant to administrators.

Many of the professional learning and support measures listed below can be coordinated via partnerships with the New York State Education Department (NYSED) system of Regional Bilingual Education Resource Networks (RBERNs), which operates through the Office of Bilingual Education and World Languages

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

20

(OBEWL). The mission of the RBERNs is to develop and strengthen the skills, knowledge, and competencies of educators, parents and local communities, provide technical assistance, professional development and resource materials to support academic achievement of ELLs, and support NYSEDs commitment to higher standards for all students.

Preparing New Integrated ENL Co-Teaching Partnerships:

- introduction to the collaborative instructional cycle: co-planning, co-instruction, co-assessment, co-reflection

- the seven models of ENL co-teaching

- understanding the roles of co-teachers

- cultivating relational trust among co-teaching partners

- articulating a shared vision for classroom culture and expectations

- maximizing the contribution of expertise of both teachers

Sustaining Existing Integrated ENL Co-Teaching Partnerships:

- collegial circles in which co-teachers share their respective expertise to support the linguistic and academic demands of the Next Generation Learning Standards

- opportunities to plan, design, evaluate, and prepare instructional materials together

  - provide extended coverage or remunerated time on a regular basis to support long term planning and shared curriculum writing

  - encourage teachers to maximize technology to co-plan through shared document platforms and digital classroom platforms.

- joint attendance at all internal/external professional development opportunities including training and implementing new instructional programs or initiatives

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

21

- exposure to new instructional supports and best practices in support of ELLs through participation in professional organization conferences

- embedded coaching

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

22

Reflection

The goal of this guide was to provide tangible strategies for administrators to enable an environment where teachers can collaborate to simultaneously provide English Language Learners (ELLs) with access to content while scaffolding to support the linguistic demands of the content with research-based English as a New Language (ENL) instructional strategies, all purposefully designed to propel the students along their continuum of academic, language, and social-emotional development. Achieving the intended goals of Integrated ENL through co-teaching requires a collective commitment to embracing a collaborative, integrated approach to meeting all the needs of our students. This guide should be a launching pad for professional learning as well as a resource of ideas and tools to support district- and school-based decision making teams. There are many examples of effective practices taking place all across New York State schools that bring life to the ideas shared in this guide that we hope to share in subsequent publications.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

23

References

Abdallah, J. (2009). Benefits of co-teaching for ESL classrooms. *Academic Leadership Online Journal, 7*(1).

   https://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj/vol7/iss1/9

Bell, A. B., & Baecher, L. (2012). Points on a continuum: ESL teachers reporting on collaboration. *TESOL Journal,*

   3(3), 488-516. https://doi:10.1002/tesj.28

Bridges to Academic Success. (n.d.). https://bridges-sifeproject.com/

Carnock, J. T. (2016). *From blueprint to building: Lifting the torch for multilingual students in New York State.*

   New America.

   https://na-production.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/From-Blueprint-to-Building-Final.pdf

Cordeiro, K. E. (2021). Positioning co-teachers in an integrated English as a new language class: Making sense

   of teaching roles. Theses & Dissertations. 99. https://digitalcommons.molloy.edu/etd/99

Creese, A. (2002). The discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships: Language and subject

   specialists in mainstream schools. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4)*,* 597-616. https://doi:10.2307/3588242

Dove, M. G., & Honigsfeld, A. (2010). ESL co-teaching and collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher

   leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL Journal, 1*(1), 3-22.

   https://doi.org/10.5054/tj.2010.214879

Dove, M. G., & Honigsfeld, A. (2018). *Co-teaching for English learners: A guide to collaborative planning,*

   instruction, assessment, and reflection. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2008). Co-teaching: An illustration of the

   complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*,

   20(1), 9-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474410903535380

Friend, M., Reising, M., & Cook, L. (1993). Co-teaching: An overview of the past, a glimpse at the present, and

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

24

considerations for the future. *Preventing School Failure, 37*(4), 6–10.

https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.1993.9944611

Honigsfeld, A., McDermott, C., & Cordeiro, K. (2018). In L.C. deOliviera & K.M. Obenchain (eds.), *Teaching*

history and social studies to English language learners. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63736-5_6

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M.G. (2019). *Collaborating for English learners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M.G. (2023). *Co-planning: five essential practices to integrate curriculum and*

instruction for English learners. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Kregel, K. S. (2014). *Integrated co-teaching services: Investigation of the formation of teaching partnerships*

and professional development. (Publication No. 3733654) [Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University

Chicago]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Markos, A., & Himmel, J. (2016, March). Using sheltered instruction to support English learners. Center for

Applied Linguistics. https://www.cal.org/siop/pdfs/briefs/using-sheltered-instruction-to-support-

english-learners.pdf

McGriff, M., & Protacio, M. S. (2015). Similar settings, different storylines: The positioning of ESL teachers in

two middle schools. *Reading Horizons, 54*(1), 1-25.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3175&context=reading_horizons

Murawski, W. W., & Bernhardt, P. (2015). An administrator's guide to co-teaching. *Educational Leadership,*

73(4), 30-34. https://www.nesacenter.org/uploaded/conferences/WTI/2018/handouts/KB_PPF_Educati

onal_Leadership_Co-Teaching_Making_It_Work_An_Administrator's_Guide_to_Co-Teaching.pdf

NYSED & New York State Language Regional Bilingual Education Resource Network; Dove, M., & Honigsfeld, A.

(2024). *Integrated English as a New Language (ENL) Resources: Co-teaching topic briefs*. Website.

http://www.nysed.gov/bilingual-ed/integrated-english-new-language-enl-resources

NYSED. (2015). Commissioner's Regulation Part 154: *Questions and Answers:* Updated June 2015.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

25

NYSED. (2015). CR Part 154-2*: CR Part 154-2 Units of Study:* Updated June 2015.

NYSED. (2018). Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Education Framework.

NYSED. (2020). https://www.nysed.gov/file/equity-self-reflection-identified-schoolsdocx

NYSED. (2021). Forms and Waivers. https://www.nysed.gov/bilingual-ed/forms-and-waivers

NYSED. (2021). *Equity Self Reflection Identified Schools*. equity-self-reflection-identified-schools.docx.

   https://www.nysed.gov/file/equity-self-reflection-identified-schoolsdocx

NYSED OBEWL: *Blueprint for English language learners' success.* 2014

Santamaria, L., & Thousand, J. (2004). Collaboration, co-teaching, and differentiated instruction: A

   process-oriented approach to whole schooling. *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 1*(1), 13-27.

   https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ854544.pdf

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

26

Key Terms

Collaborative Instructional Cycle: consists of four interrelated phases: co-planning, co- instruction, co-assessment of student learning, and reflection

Co-taught Integrated ENL: An instructional model involving a partnering of two teachers, combining the expertise of Content/General Education, Special Education, and English to speakers of other languages (ESOL) teachers, collaborating to support English learners through integrated content and language instruction, and increasing opportunities for authentic interaction among English learners and their native English-speaking peers (Cordeiro, 2021; Dove & Honigsfeld, 2012).

Professional Disposition: Demonstrate genuine enthusiasm and optimism; Foster a positive climate for learning; Act on the premise that all children can learn; Provide positive, authentic feedback; Focus on possibilities rather than obstacles; Respond to challenges; Treat all forms of diversity as learning opportunities.

Provisioning: What a school provides for its pupils to support their learning and progress in school – the teaching, resources, use of the curriculum, support, enrichment activities and resources.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

27

Appendix A

Evaluation Survey
Collaboration and Co-Teaching for ELLs

Directions: Use the following statements to identify the successes and challenges of co teaching or collaboration activities in your school. Circle a number from 1 to 5 for each statement. (1 strongly disagree, 2 somewhat disagree, 3 neither agree nor disagree, 4 somewhat agree, 5 strongly agree)					
Leadership and Collaboration					
District and building administrators value teacher collaboration.	1	2	3	4	5
Building administrators encourage and support collaboration efforts between ENL teachers, grade-level/content teachers, and other specialists.	1	2	3	4	5
Professional development is provided to train teachers in collaborative planning and decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
Teachers are provided scheduled time to collaborate with other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher recommendations derived through collaboration are given serious consideration.	1	2	3	4	5
Teacher Collaboration					
ENL and general-education teachers maintain ongoing conversations about the teaching and learning of ELLs.	1	2	3	4	5
Teams of faculty members along with others in the school community work together to identify and solve ELLs' learning difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
ENL and general-education teachers converse across grade levels and content areas to promote understanding of ELLs and to share teaching strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
Teachers experiment with new ideas they learned through teacher collaboration.	1	2	3	4	5
Teachers collaborate with each other after school hours.	1	2	3	4	5
Shared Values for the Education of ELLs					
The school community together has established a common vision for the education of ELLs	1	2	3	4	5
ELL student learning is the responsibility of all teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
Formal and informal communication practices for the benefit of ELLs have been established between faculty and staff members.	1	2	3	4	5

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

28

Parents of ELLs and other community members have had formal opportunities to share their ideas and concerns about the education of ELLs	1	2	3	4	5
Teachers have had input in the decision-making process for the education of ELLs	1	2	3	4	5
School Support for Teacher Collaboration					
All teachers and staff members are perceived as valuable members of the school community.	1	2	3	4	5
Adequate time is provided for teachers and staff to meet and discuss ELLs issues.	1	2	3	4	5
Conversation protocols have been established to make optimum use of collaborative meeting time.	1	2	3	4	5
Teachers serve on committees to select new teachers, administrators, and other staff members.	1	2	3	4	5
Extracurricular activities are planned for faculty and staff to promote camaraderie and reduce isolation.	1	2	3	4	5
Shared School Practices					
Faculty and staff both individually and collectively reflect upon their practices with ELLs.	1	2	3	4	5
Teachers are able to determine their own professional-development needs with regard to ELLs.	1	2	3	4	5
Parents of ELLs are offered workshops on a regular basis throughout the school year.	1	2	3	4	5
Administrators participate in professional development activities along with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
Regularly scheduled collaborative team meetings are conducted by teachers to benefit the instruction of ELLs.	1	2	3	4	5

Adapted from Roberts, S. M., & Pruitt, E. Z., (2009). *Schools as professional learning communities: Collaborative activities and strategies for professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

29

Appendix B

School Culture Survey
Adapted from [School Culture Assessment](#)

Score the questions on the following scale:
(1) Never (2) Rarely (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Always or almost always

Task
- Teachers and staff collaborate on instructional strategies and curriculum.
- Teachers and staff are involved in the decision making process in regard to materials and resources.
- The student code of conduct is a result of collaboration and consensus among the staff
- The planning and organizational time allotted to teachers and staff is used to plan as a collective unit/teams rather than separate individuals.

Process
- When something is not working in our school, the faculty and staff predict and prevent rather than react and repair.
- School members are interdependent and value each other.
- Members of our school community seek alternatives to problems/issues rather than repeating what we have always done.
- Members of the school community seek to define the problem/issue rather than blame others.
- The school staff is empowered to make instructional decisions rather than waiting for supervisors to tell them what to do.
- People work here because they enjoy it and choose to be here.

Relationships
- Teachers and staff share celebrations and/or achievements that support the school's values
- Teachers and staff visit, talk, and/or meet outside of work hours to enjoy each other's company
- The school has frequent communication opportunities for teachers and staff
- The school supports and appreciates sharing of new ideas by members of the school
- There is a tradition of rituals, including celebrating special events, and recognition of goal attainment

Role of Administrators and Supervisors in Cultivating School Culture
- Administrators and supervisors value and actively cultivate a collaborative school culture
- Administrators and supervisors provide relevant professional development, guidance and support for teachers and staff to collaborate on instructional strategies
- Administrators and supervisors engage all teachers and staff in curriculum writing
- Administrators and supervisors regularly seek out contributions from teachers and staff concerning decision-making
- Administrators and supervisors create opportunities for teachers and staff to collaborate

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

30

Scoring Guide: Lowest score is 15 and the highest score is 75

       15-30 = Critical and immediate attention necessary.
       31-50 = Modifications and improvements are necessary.
       51-65 = Monitor and continue to make positive adjustments.
       66-75 = Maintain positive momentum.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

31

Appendix C

Equity Self-Reflection for Schools
adapted from [Equity Self-Reflection for Identified Schools](#)

The Equity Self-Reflection for Schools is designed to support schools as they consider how their school currently supports Culturally Responsive-Sustaining (CR-S) Education principles and allows for the creation of an equitable learning environment where all experience dignity, a sense of belonging, and inclusion.

The following tools are intended to help facilitate a discussion among members of the school community about how the school may want to proceed with supporting these principles.

The [NYSED Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Education Framework](#) guided the development of the Self-Reflection. The Self-Reflection is organized around four core principles, which correspond with the four (4) principles of the NYSED CR-S Framework:

1. Welcoming and Affirming Environment
2. High Expectations and Rigorous Instruction
3. Inclusive Curriculum and Assessment
4. Ongoing Professional Learning and Support

Directions

1. Discuss the Self-Reflection as a team, using examples from the CR-S Framework and NYSED resources. Focus on evaluating existing practices and decide which Self-Reflection Category best fits the school's current status.
2. After completing the Self-Reflection, identify opportunities to promote CR-S principles in your school district and review NYSED resources for further support.

Self-Reflection Categories

Emerging: Demonstrates beginning knowledge and skills with limited use of the defined practice.

Integrating: Exhibits an understanding and use of knowledge and skills in the practice, and performance is growing.

Sustaining: Sustains an exemplary level of practice.

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

32

A **Welcoming and Affirming Environment** feels safe. It is a space where people can find themselves represented and reflected and where they understand that all people are treated with respect and dignity. The environment ensures all cultural identities (i.e., race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, language, religion, socioeconomic background) are affirmed, valued, and used as vehicles for teaching and learning.

PRACTICES	E	I	S
Assume collective responsibility to learn about student cultures and communities.			
Foster close relationships with students and families, including working with families to gather insights into students' cultures, goals, and learning preferences.			
Assess school climate using a variety of measures (i.e., surveys, interviews, focus groups, informal gatherings) to collect diverse stakeholder impressions and experiences using questions that consider issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.			
Prioritize social-emotional learning programs, such as restorative justice.			
Highlight materials that represent and affirm student identities.			
Cultivate a school and classroom environment of affirmation and acceptance. Respond to instances of disrespectful speech about student identities by intervening.			

High Expectations and Rigorous Instruction prepare the community for rigor and independent learning. The environment is academically rigorous and intellectually challenging while also considering the different ways students learn. Instruction includes opportunities to use critical reasoning, take academic risks, and leverage a growth mindset to learn from mistakes. Messages encourage positive self-image and empower others to succeed.

PRACTICES	E	I	S
Initiate student-led civic engagement projects and school-based student leadership opportunities.			
Establish an inclusive space that encourages cultural identity development through affirming race, class, gender, sexual orientation, language, ability level, and any other differentiator.			
Provide opportunities for students to develop projects on social justice issues.			
Embed opportunities into curriculum and school operations for students and staff to critically examine topics of power and privilege.			
Facilitate teaching and learning practices that enable individuals to grow as independent learners, think critically, make meaning of new concepts in multiple ways, and apply learning to meaningful, real-world situations.			

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

33

Inclusive Curriculum and Assessment elevate historically marginalized voices. It includes opportunities to learn about power and privilege in the context of various communities and empowers learners to be agents of positive social change. It provides the opportunity to learn about perspectives beyond one's own scope. It works toward dismantling systems of biases and inequities and decentering dominant ideologies in education.

PRACTICES	E	I	S
Incorporate curriculum, texts, content, and assignments that activate connections to student experiences and identities and provide students with opportunities to discover, research, and build deep structural understanding of themes, content, and curriculum covered.			
Integrate current events into daily instruction.			
Encourage students to acknowledge and explore completing assignments in multiple languages.			
Use resources written and developed by racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse perspectives.			
Include students as co-designers of curriculum.			

Ongoing Professional Learning and Support is rooted in the idea that teaching and learning is an adaptive process needing constant re-examination. It allows learners to develop and sharpen a critically conscious lens toward instruction, curriculum, assessment, history, culture, and institutions. Learners must be self-directed and take on opportunities that directly impact learning outcomes.

PRACTICES	E	I	S
Create learning communities (i.e., professional learning communities, book studies, discussion groups, online webinars, digital subscriptions) for teachers and students to engage in topics that directly address educator and student identities and understand and unpack privilege.			
Provide opportunities for all staff to receive training on topics related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (i.e., critical self-reflection, disproportionality, anti-bias, developing racial literacy, combating racism, and microaggressions, etc.).			
Support teachers in conducting cross-curricular culturally responsive-sustaining planning sessions by providing forums for collaborative planning, drafting, mapping, and aligning.			
Disseminate self-assessment tools and resources for educators to assess and reflect on their implicit biases.			

(NYSED, 2021)

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

34

Appendix D

Understanding Your Linguistically Diverse Learners

Please answer the following questions:
1. How many English Language Learners (ELLs) are there in your building and district?
2. Do you know how many Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE), Newcomers, Long-Term ELLs, and ELLs with Disabilities are there in your district/building? How many?
3. What languages are represented in your building, in your district?
4. Write the names of two of the English Language Learners in your building. Ensure correct spelling.
5. Do you know the five (5) different levels of language proficiency? Where could you find that information?
6. Where are your English Language Learners from?
7. Draw the map of the country one of your ELLs is from.
8. Write the surrounding countries on the map you drew.
9. What do you know about that specific country?
10. How do you communicate with families of English Language Learners (ELLs)?

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

35

Appendix E

Sample Co-Planning Templates

Unit Planning Template for the Traditional Classroom

Unit Title: _____ **Anticipated Duration:** _____

Teacher A: _____ **Teacher B:** _____

🖥️ **Digital Platform (optional):**

❓ **Essential Question:**

Unit Objectives Aligned to Standards:

Content	Language

Activating/Providing Background Knowledge:

Instructional Strategies/Tools:

Teacher Modeling (When & How)	Guided Practice (When & How)
Group Work (When & How)	Independent Work (When & How)
Co-teaching Models (When, How & Why)	

Scaffolds				
👁️ Sensory	⊛ Graphic	Interactive	🖥️ Digital Resources	Social Emotional

Unit Assessment Plan:

Flores & Cordeiro (2020), adapted from Honigsfeld & Dove (2017)

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

36

Weekly Planning Template

Day/ Date	Content Objectives, Language Objectives & Standards	Co-teaching Model(s)	Instructional Strategies & Tools	Scaffolds	Formative & Summative Assessments	Post-Lesson Reflections
Mon.	_____ _____					
Tues.	_____ _____					
Weds.	_____ _____					
Thurs.	_____ _____					
Fri.	_____ _____					

Adapted from Martinsen Holt (2004) & Long Island RBERN (2015) funded by the New York State Education Department

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

37

Daily Lesson Plan Template

Day/Date	Standards	Content Objective	Language Objective	Vocabulary

Learner Activities	Instructional Strategies & Tools	Co-teaching Model(s)	
		Role of Teacher A	Role of Teacher B

Formative Assessments	Notes on Individual Students	Post-Lesson Reflections

Adapted from Honigsfeld & Dove (2008) and Long Island RBERN (2015)

An Administrator's Guide for Supporting the Implementation of the Co-Teaching Instructional Model within Integrated ENL Settings

38

New York State Education Department