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ABSTRACT: Coteaching involves 2 certified teachers: 1 general educator and 1 special educator. They share responsibility for planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction for a diverse group of students, some of whom are students with disabilities. In this article, the authors review models of coteaching and the research base for coteaching and describe coteaching as it is currently practiced. After arguing that educators have not yet realized the potential of coteaching, the authors propose a new framework for looking at coteaching and a blueprint to guide its implementation differently in different instructional environments.
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Johnson Elementary. The 90-min reading block is in full swing in a bustling Grade 2 classroom. The students have huddled around a pocket chart on the reading rug as Mrs. Johnson, the classroom teacher, slips letters in and out of slots to teach hard and soft consonant rules. While children scurry back and forth to the chart, Mrs. Kennedy, the special education teacher, sits next to Jonathan, encouraging him to raise his hand, repeating teacher questions, and refocusing his attention. Next, the class returns to their seats to choral read a story containing the new word patterns. While Mrs. Johnson calls on individual readers and signals to the class to chime in, Mrs. Kennedy helps Jonathan sound out words, track with his finger, and turn pages in tandem with his classmates.

JFK High School. Mr. Harper is busy leading a class discussion about causes of the Revolutionary War with his Grade 9 history class. As he lectures on the impact of the Sugar Act and the Stamp Tax, Ms. Jeffries, the special education teacher, walks around the classroom, pausing briefly to watch students work or to refocus students who seem to be off task. She stops at Stephanie’s desk and quickly draws a graphic organizer that might help with note taking and, whispering quietly, corrects some of the notes that Stephanie has written and shows her how to use the graphic organizer.

THESE SCENARIOS, ALTHOUGH FICTITIOUS, reflect coteaching practices that educators have seen commonly in visits to elementary and secondary schools. In 1995, the National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion reported that coteaching was the most frequently used special education service-delivery model for inclusive classrooms. Now, more than a decade later, its popularity has only increased—and for good reason. First, schools are facing tremendous pressures to demonstrate their effectiveness. Responding to the national thrust for school reform, states have established academic content standards across a range of curricula defining what students should know and be able to do to be considered proficient and ready to advance to the next grade or to graduate high school. The standards-based reform movement has focused attention on the importance of students mastering a body of content in the sciences, social studies, world languages, technology, and literature. That shift requires teachers to deepen both their content knowledge and their knowledge of the specific pedagogy necessary to promote student proficiency in that content. Research in general education schools and classrooms attended by students without disabilities suggests that highly qualified teachers significantly increase student performance (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Sanders & Horn, 1998; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2002). In these settings, teacher quality contributed more to student achievement than did any other factor, including student background, class size, and class composition (Sanders & Horn). In addition, researchers have equated teacher quality with teachers’ content knowledge and content-specific pedagogical expertise (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2008).
2004; Rice, 2003). Essentially, highly effective teachers are content specialists. Coteaching has been proffered as one way of ensuring that students with disabilities benefit from content instruction taught by content specialists in general education classrooms.

Second, each reauthorization of PL 94–142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975), most recently the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, has increased legislators’ commitment to educating students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Students with disabilities are educated with students who do not have disabilities in general education classrooms. They are exposed to the same curricular content and academic standards per state or school district guidelines. Following the lead of prominent inclusion advocates (Cook & Friend, 1995; McLeskey & Waldron, 1995; Roach, Salisbury, & McGregor, 2002) and to make this LRE placement more palatable to general education teachers, special education teachers, and parents of students with disabilities, more school districts are placing special education teachers in general education classrooms to work alongside the general educator.

IDEA of 1997 introduced the notion that students with disabilities should participate fully in statewide accountability efforts and should be held to the same high achievement standards as are students without disabilities, and IDEA of 2004 reiterated that notion. The requirement to report accountability data by disaggregated groups (e.g., students with individual education programs [IEPs]) has compelled school districts to either return students with learning or behavior disorder to their home schools and regular classrooms or to simply avoid alternate placements (McLeskey, Hoppey, Williamson, & Rents, 2004) so that these students can be exposed to the instruction and curriculum that will prepare them for state tests.

For more than 30 years, special educators have advocated for students with disabilities to be educated in the same setting as their nondisabled peers. Now, the law requires that students with learning and behavior disorders learn the same content and demonstrate competence on the same tests as their nondisabled peers. Educators see coteaching as the most likely vehicle for accomplishing both goals.

**Research Base for Coteaching**

Coteaching is a special education service-delivery model in which two certified teachers—one general educator and one special educator—share responsibility for planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction for a diverse group of students, some of whom are students with disabilities. Theoretically, coteaching draws on the strengths of both the general educator, who understands the structure, content, and pacing of the general education curriculum, and the special educator, who identifies unique learning needs of individual students and enhances curriculum and instruction to match those needs. Coteaching accomplishes multiple objectives. First, students with disabilities are taught the general education curriculum by a general education content specialist. Second, it provides students with disabilities (and their at-risk but not-yet-identified peers) greater access to that curriculum through the special education teacher who provides help and support (Thousand & Villa, 1989).

Advocates have promoted coteaching as a service-delivery model that will ensure that students with IEPs receive whatever support is necessary for them to function successfully in general education classrooms. Advocates expect that by placing the special education teacher in the room, educators will make a wider range of instructional practices available to all students in general education classrooms, ensuring that students who are at risk also receive support. Advocates expect that by reducing the student–teacher ratio in general education classes, coteaching will provide more opportunities for students with IEPs and at-risk students to interact with a teacher and participate actively in class activities. By not singling out individual students for assistance and instead bringing assistance to the entire class, coteaching will reduce the stigma associated with needing extra help. Last, coteaching will help general education teachers learn to reach a broader mix of students by making appropriate accommodations. Advocates consider coteaching as an essential vehicle for job-embedded professional development for general education teachers.

Most of the published literature on coteaching focuses on logistics, generally emphasizing that coteaching is difficult to do well without careful, ongoing coplanning; enthusiastic pairs of teachers compatible in teaching philosophy (as well as temperament and personality); and strong administrative (principal) support (Bauwens, Hourcade, & Friend, 1989; Friend & Cook, 2003; Gately & Gately, 2001; Reeve & Hallahan, 1994; Vaughn, Schumm, & Arguelles, 1997; Walther-Thomas, Korinek, McLaughlin, & Williams, 2000). Some articles provide rich descriptions of coteaching in elementary, middle, or high school classrooms (see Baker & Zigmond, 1995; Walther-Thomas, 1997; Weiss & Lloyd, 2002), often recommending that teachers adopt a particular arrangement (usually the one-teacher–one-assist arrangement, sometimes the team-teaching arrangement) and use it exclusively.

Several researchers have reported mainly high levels of satisfaction among all constituents once a coteaching model has been implemented (Pugach & Johnson, 1995; Purkey & Smith, 1985; Volk, Elliot, & Cobb, 1994). General education teachers, often initially skeptical about sharing their classroom space, generally come to enjoy having in the room a second adult who can provide not only assistance to students but also adult conversation to the general education teacher. The special education teacher generally feels liberated from the confines of the special education resource
room or self-contained classroom and feels good about reaching more students.

But does coteaching work? Research on the effectiveness of coteaching is still in its infancy (Weiss & Brigham, 2000; Zigmond, 2003), and data on achievement outcomes for students with disabilities in cotaught classes have been particularly elusive. Klingner, Vaughn, Hughes, Schumm, and Elbaum (1998) found that students with disabilities and students at risk significantly increased fall-to-spring reading achievement in cotaught classrooms. The gains were not significant for math achievement. Welch (2000) found that team teaching improved the academic gains of all students in two elementary-level classrooms, but the overall increase in mean performance of students with learning disabilities was not statistically significant. However, Welch noted that the practical significance of students’ progress was encouraging. Specifically, students with IEPs participating in the study exceeded targeted goals for reading fluency and word recognition gains. In studying various models of coteaching in two Grade 8 inclusion classrooms, Rea, McLaughlin, and Walther-Thomas (2002) concluded that students with disabilities who were taught in the general education classroom with coteaching support received higher course grades in language arts, math, science, and social studies than did their peers in pull-out programs. However, the groups earned comparable scores on state achievement tests. Researchers have shown coteaching to increase the social competence and social acceptance of students with learning disabilities. Vaughn, Elbaum, Schumm, and Hughes (1998) found that the number and quality of students’ friendships improved when students transitioned from exclusionary educational settings back into the general education classroom supported by coteaching or consultation models. The same was true for levels of peer acceptance. Overall, because of the changing face of special education and the charge for greater accountability and achievement, educators need large-scale, long-term research using noncotaught comparison groups to examine academic and behavioral outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Current Coteaching Practices**

Simply putting two teachers (one trained in general education, one trained in special education) in a room and telling them to work together does not accomplish the lofty goals described by advocates of coteaching. Even when pairs of teachers have received professional development in the variety of models of coteaching, most are unlikely to establish an educational environment in which students with learning and behavior disorders are likely to make achievement gains. Recent data illustrate this point. In a quantitative classroom observation study, Magiera and Zigmond (2004) explored whether coteaching changed the instructional experience for middle school students with disabilities in ways that would likely enhance achievement (e.g., producing smaller instructional groups, more time on task, more teacher–student interactions, and greater student participation). They found that it did not. Zigmond (2004, 2006) replicated these results in two studies of coteaching in 14 secondary schools in science classes and social studies classes, respectively.

Furthermore, a qualitative study of the role and contribution of the special education teacher in cotaught secondary school classes characterized the special education teacher as follows:

a nice addition, an occasional relief for the GET [general education teacher], and more attention to students when class is organized for small group (team) or independent seatwork. But none of what we saw would make it more likely that the students with disabilities in the class would master the material. We did not hear the SETs [special education teachers] chime in with carefully worded elaborative explanations. We rarely heard SETs rephrase something already said to make the explanation clearer. We virtually never saw the SET provide explicit strategic instruction to facilitate learning or memory of the content material. (Zigmond & Matta, 2005, p. 73)

Zigmond and Matta (2005) hypothesized that if students with disabilities were mastering the content and earning passing grades in these high school courses, it was not because of something special that the special education coteacher was doing. If students with disabilities were not mastering the content and not earning passing grades, the kinds of coaching and team teaching that they experienced were not likely to make much difference in academic achievement. The special education teachers shared the instructional burden but did not make a unique contribution. When students were organized into teams or small groups or given independent in-class assignments, the special education teacher was there to answer a question or help with a solution. However, there was no sustained instruction for students having particular difficulties, no reteaching for students who had not reached mastery, and no strategic instruction for students who tended to need explicit instruction in strategies. The special education teachers helped in the general education classroom and chimed in when they had something to add, but they did so without much thoughtfulness or preplanning.

**Redrawing the Blueprint: Special Education Coteachers**

Educators have not made the potential of coteaching real. But before they reject it, we propose a redrawing of the blueprint, making more explicit both expectations and procedures for the special education teacher’s role in the partnership. Many authors have described variations on the coteaching dance or marriage, but few have proposed explicitly when to use each model of coteaching. In this
article, we review some current coteaching models, propose a new framework for coteaching, and provide two mnemonics to guide the implementation of coteaching strategies in different instructional environments.

**Current coteaching models.** One of the first theoretical models of collaborative teaching (Cook & Friend, 1995) proposes five variations on coteaching:

1. **The one teaching—one assisting** variation requires one educator to retain the instructional lead in the classroom while the other teacher moves through the room and provides assistance and support to the students as necessary.

2. **Station teaching** involves dividing the instructional content and the physical space of the classroom into two or more zones. Each teacher assumes responsibility for teaching a segment of the content at a prearranged station while students rotate through the stations.

3. **Parallel teaching** requires the two teachers to jointly plan instruction, which they then deliver simultaneously, each teacher delivering instruction to half of the students within heterogeneous groupings.

4. **Alternative teaching** allows for a configuration of one large group and one small group and permits intensive instruction for students with special learning needs in a reduced teacher–student ratio. Simultaneously, the other instructor provides instruction to the large group.

5. **Team teaching** encourages parity between both teachers in planning and instruction. The teachers continually alternate the role of primary instructor within individual lessons.

Other theoretical models followed. For example, Vaughn et al. (1997) retained the options of parallel teaching, station teaching, and team teaching but enhanced the instructional aspects of the one teaching—one assisting model. In that model, while one teacher leads the class, the other teacher provides brief intensive instruction to individual students, student pairs, or small groups.

Walther-Thomas et al. (2000) further elaborated on coteaching models. As with Friend and Cook (2003) and Vaughn et al. (1997), the coteaching options of parallel teaching, station teaching, and alternative teaching coexist, but the one teaching—one assisting option is replaced by a variation referred to as interactive teaching (Walther-Thomas et al.). In this format, the two teachers present instruction to the whole group, alternating the role of instructional leader for periods of 5–10 min. Because the lead teacher role changes frequently, both teachers have several opportunities to serve as the primary educator (Walther-Thomas et al.).

**Alternative coteaching framework.** Aforementioned models of coteaching described the delicate dance enacted by the two teachers as they share a single instructional space. Another way of framing coteaching is to describe the number of lessons being delivered simultaneously when there are two fully certified teachers in the classroom. Appendix A summarizes the three broad lesson configurations made possible by coteaching: both teachers instructing a single group of students, each teacher actively instructing his or her own group of students, and neither teacher involved in group instruction. In all cases, either the special education teacher or the general education teacher can serve in the role of first teacher or second teacher. The advantage of this alternative framework is that it focuses on the number of instructional groups in a cotaught class and not on the nature of the interactions between the two teachers. It recognizes team teaching as just one of several configurations in which only one lesson is occurring, and not as the ideal model of coteaching.

**When To Do What?**

The practice of coteaching must be as dynamic as the needs of the students it serves. But to be maximally responsive, special education coteachers need guidelines for when to do what. They need to shape their coteaching role not to the whim, personality, or forbearance of their general education partner but to the instructional possibilities and practicalities of the curriculum being taught. For instruction in skill subjects such as reading and mathematics, coteaching should increase students’ opportunities to respond and engage. Two teachers make it possible to have two instructional groups simultaneously. Two instructional groups reduce the teacher–student ratio, providing students in each group more opportunities to respond and teachers of each group more opportunities to monitor student engagement and provide more frequent and faster corrective feedback. In these skill subjects, two teachers in the room should translate into two lessons being taught. Small-group instruction, rather than whole-class instruction, should be the norm. Increased use of parallel teaching, station teaching, or alternative teaching should result. Thus, in basic-skill classes, the special education coteacher plays a pivotal role: Rather than simply helping, the special education coteacher must TEACH (see Appendix B).

- Target the skills and strategies that a particular student needs to learn.
- Express enthusiasm and optimism.
- Adapt the instructional environment.
- Create opportunities for small-group or individual, direct, intensive instruction.
- Help student apply skills learned to content classes.

Different sets of challenges arise for the special education teacher who is coteaching in content subjects. These classes (e.g., sciences, social studies, English literature) are generally characterized by a large-group lecture or discussion followed...
by individual or small group assignments or projects. The goal is information sharing, not skill acquisition; small-group instruction is not a common practice (see Zigmond, 2006; Zigmond & Matta, 2005). In these settings, the norm would be any of the one-lesson or no-lesson configurations outlined in Appendix A. The role of the special education coteacher is one of SUPPORT, not only for students with disabilities in the classroom but also for his or her general education partner (see Appendix C).

- Study the content.
- Understand the big ideas.
- Prioritize course objectives.
- Plan with the general education teacher.
- Observe the students in the class as they listen to instruction.
- Rephrase, repeat, and redirect.
- Teach your coteacher to do it all on his or her own.

Summary

It is clear that coteaching is not something that just happens. For it to be a productive use of the special education teacher’s talents and training, coteaching must be dynamic, deliberate, and differentiated. It must unite the science of specially designed instruction and effective pedagogy with the art of reorganizing resources and schedules to provide students with disabilities better opportunities to be successful in learning what they need to learn.

Thus, if the content of the cotaught class is reading or mathematics and there are two teachers in the room, there should be at least two lessons going on; the special education teacher should not be helping students get through the curriculum or complete their homework assignments but instead should be actively teaching fundamentals to a small group of students (or one student) in ways that increase students’ active participation and provide immediate and individualized corrective feedback. If the content of the cotaught class is science, social studies, or literature and two teachers are in the room, one lesson might be going on, but the special education teacher is not sitting next to one student helping him or her follow along or chiming in with an interesting anecdote. Instead, the special education teacher should be actively observing students’ facial expressions and body language for signs of confusion, scrutinizing students’ written work for errors in note taking, and interrupting the flow of the lesson to ask questions that students are too shy to ask, emulating the metacognitive processes that students should be engaging in, providing clarifications and elaborative explanations, and reminding students of strategies that might be helpful in understanding and retaining the new information.

In other words, the special education coteacher should make a unique contribution to each cotaught lesson. By focusing on actively TEACHing students the core academic skills and SUPPORTing their learning of content, special education coteachers can retain what is special about special education and can help students with disabilities to survive and even succeed in general education classrooms.
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## APPENDIX A

### Configurations of Coteaching: How Two Teachers Can Spend Their Time in Cotaught Classes

#### One Lesson: Both Teachers Instruct a Single Group of Students

- First teacher teaches the lesson; second teacher records attendance or completes other clerical duties.
- First teacher teaches the lesson; second teacher works with students outside of class, runs an errand, or leaves to get or copy materials.
- First teacher teaches the lesson; second teacher observes students’ responses or takes data.
- First teacher teaches the lesson; second teacher moves around the room, using proximity strategies to control student attention and behavior, or looks over students’ shoulders to check on accuracy of student work.
- First teacher teaches the lesson; second teacher sits next to one student to keep him or her on task, help the student follow along in the text, or coach him or her through completion of an assignment.
- First teacher teaches the lesson; second teacher disciplines students.
- First teacher teaches the lesson; second teacher models note taking.
- First teacher teaches the lesson; second teacher prepares materials for homework or later lesson.
- Both teachers actively engaged in teaching the whole class. Teachers may alternate the instructional lead.

#### Two Lessons: Each Teacher is Actively Instructing a Group of Students

- Class is divided into at least two teacher-supported stations; a third station may be an independent station or supervised by a third adult. Each station covers different content material but all students eventually rotate through all stations.
- Class is divided into two equal-sized heterogeneous groups; each teacher instructs half the group on the same lesson.
- A small group of less than half the class is taught by the first teacher; second teacher instructs the larger group on another topic.

#### No Group Instruction: Neither Teachers Involved in Group Instruction

- Both teachers engage in some task but do not talk to each other or students.
- Both teachers check student work.
- Teachers discuss current or future lesson with each other.
- First teacher monitors, second teacher observes.
- First teacher monitors, second teacher works with materials.
- Both teachers review, or preview, content material with no more than three students at one time.
Target the skills and strategies a particular student needs to learn. Most students with learning or behavioral disorders (L/BD) in inclusive settings are far behind their peers in mastery of basic skills and are unlikely to benefit from large-group skill instruction moving at a normal pace. They are also unlikely to cover the entire curriculum for that grade level in the time available. The special education coteacher must help set curricular priorities for students with individualized education programs (IEPs) as they work to close the achievement gap.

Express enthusiasm and optimism. School is difficult for students with L/BD. They need to work longer and harder than students without L/BD and, despite the extra effort, they often experience failure. It is no wonder they are not optimistic about academic success and do not invest vigorously in learning (Guthrie & Davis, 2003; Margolis & McCabe, 2004). Researchers have shown that teacher enthusiasm is key. A teacher’s positive attitude, high expectations, and high levels of enthusiasm can turn around students’ negative reactions to learning (Brigham, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 1992).

Adapt the instructional environment. General education classrooms are often noisy and confusing, not conducive to focused, intensive, teacher-directed instruction. One major drawback to the inclusive classroom may be the high level of distraction (see Baker & Zigmond, 1995). Special education coteachers in skills classrooms must take the lead in modifying the instructional environment, seating arrangements, and instructional dynamics to maximize instructional outcomes.

Create opportunities for small-group or individual, direct, intensive instruction. Students with L/BD need to learn more in less time to make up lost ground. They also need highly structured and strategic instruction to learn what other students may intuit. In a cotaught inclusive classroom, the special education coteacher needs to do more than sit next to the student during whole-class instruction and help him or her follow the reading, spelling, writing, or math lesson. The coteacher needs to provide intensive, supportive, direct, and explicit small-group, teacher-directed instruction. Small groups increase students’ opportunities to respond and receive corrective feedback.

Help student apply skills learned to content classes. Multiple research studies have shown that students with L/BD often fail to apply effective learning strategies across relevant learning contexts (see Chan & Cole, 1986). The special education coteacher needs to help these students link the comprehension strategy learned in reading class to text reading in science or the social studies, link the writing strategy learned in language arts to homework or project assignments in other subjects, and so forth.

Study the content.

Understand the big ideas. To support students’ understanding of content and general education teachers’ differentiated delivery of content, special education coteachers must know the content. They must relearn and sometimes newly learn the facts, concepts, and principles of the subject matter being taught. This is perhaps one of the greatest challenges for special education coteachers, particularly at the secondary level (Weiss & Lloyd, 2002). Although they do not need to become the content expert in that classroom—that is the benefit of the partnership with a general education teacher who is a content specialist—they need to thoroughly understand the big ideas associated with that content to be able to effectively adapt and modify instructional materials; reinforce new concepts; restate, rephrase, or reteach difficult ideas; and create unique ways for students to access essential content information.

Prioritize course objectives. Those who plan courses of study use logic and experience to determine how much can be accomplished in one grading period, semester, or school year, and curriculum specialists organize or pace instruction so that most
students can learn what they need to learn in the time they have to learn it. Students with learning and behavior disorders (L/BD) generally start each school year knowing less than their classmates, have more to learn, and take longer to learn it (Zigmond, 1996). The special education coteacher must work with his or her partner to set priorities within the general education curriculum and to decide which parts of each curriculum are essential and need to be mastered and which could be omitted without jeopardizing a student’s progress the following year. The curriculum for students with L/BD has already narrowed—as it has for most students—to focus on what will be assessed on the statewide accountability test. For students who are difficult to teach or find it difficult to learn, the curriculum probably needs to be narrowed even more (Schumm, Vaughn, & Harris, 1997).

Plan with the general education teacher. Lack of time to plan together is one of the major obstacles to successful coteaching (Bauwens & Hourcade, 1995; Walther-Thomas, 1997). To be effective, coteachers need to learn to work together so that each performs relevant and meaningful tasks that promote student learning (Trent, 1998). Planning together moves this agenda forward. Not only do the teachers decide who will do what during class sessions, they also develop a shared mindset about the big ideas that all students will learn and identify potential trouble spots and possible accommodations for the students who will need them (Schumm et al., 1997).

Observe the students in the class as they listen to instruction. Rephrase, repeat, and redirect. In content-subject cotaught classes, teachers may take turns leading and supporting instruction. The supporting teacher—usually the special education coteacher—assumes the critical role of observing and evaluating students’ learning. This coteacher is actively listening and diagnosing student engagement, interest, and understanding. At the first sign of confusion, he or she interrupts the flow of instruction with elaborations and explanations to clarify difficult concepts or restate the lead teacher’s key points. This coteacher models for students the metacognitive processes they should be engaging in to make sense of the content. He or she asks the questions students should be asking and verbalizes the strategies that will be useful for finding answers or completing assignments. The coteacher is active, visible, and most importantly, audible. This teacher can think on his or her feet and does not ignore a single teachable moment.

Teach your coteacher to do it all on his or her own. In the long run, coteaching as a routine service delivery model is not only an inefficient use of resources (teaching a content class is typically not a two-person job), it is counterproductive because it fails to build capacity among general education teachers. A qualified general education teacher should be an expert not only in the content being taught, but also in content-specific pedagogy that reaches a diverse student body. No advocates for coteaching (e.g., Bauwens & Hourcade, 1995; Cook & Friend, 1996; Vaughn, et al., 1997; Walther-Thomas, et al., 2000) have proposed that coteaching is an intermediate service delivery model; it is a vehicle for teaching general education teachers how to reach students with disabilities effectively on their own. Special education teachers as coteachers can relieve the burden from the general education content specialist by developing and implementing adaptations and modifications appropriate to individual students with disabilities, but doing it for them is not the same as teaching them to do it themselves. For a planned, gradual release of responsibility, the special education teacher must make explicit to his or her general education partner what he or she is doing and why. An effective coteacher thinks of the role of coteacher as temporary—a partnership that will last for a few years before the special education teacher moves to another partner to begin the job-embedded professional development again.