CASE STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COGNITIVE COACHING BY

AN INSTRUCTIONAL COACH IN A TITLE I ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

A Record of Study

by

LINDA A. REED

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 2006

Major Subject: Educational Administration

CASE STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COGNITIVE COACHING BY

AN INSTRUCTIONAL COACH IN A TITLE I ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

A Record of Study

by

LINDA A. REED

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved by:

Co-Chairs of Committee,	Virginia S. Collier
	Lynn M. Burlbaw
Committee Members,	Kathryn B. McKenzie
	Luana Zellner
Head of Department,	Jim Scheurich

May 2006

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

Case Study of the Implementation of Cognitive Coaching by an

Instructional Coach in a Title I Elementary School. (May 2006)

Linda A. Reed, B.A., Stephen F. Austin State University;

M.Ed., University of Houston

Co-Chairs of Advisory Committee: Dr. Virginia Collier
                                  Dr. Lynn M. Burlbaw

This research is a qualitative case study involving eight participants—seven teachers and one instructional coach at an elementary school. The student population of this school was a Title I eligible elementary campus with students of mixed ethnicity. The purpose of the study was to document teachers' perceptions and understanding of the implementation process and those factors they perceived that inhibited and facilitated the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

The method of inquiry was an instrumental case study at a single site that included a minimum of three one-on-one interviews with each of the eight participants. These interviews triangulated with historical data and observations provide the information to tell the story of the implementation process and extend the reader's understanding of the implementation process. The themes revealed in the research included: (1) lack of understanding and clarity of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, (2) influence of the campus leadership, (3) teacher's willingness or resistance to change educational practice, (4) relational trust, (5) influence on instructional change, and (6) increased student achievement.

This research study offers implications for both practice and theory. There are specific implications for administrators, instructional coaches, principals, and teachers as they implement the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. There is a need for clear, well-defined expectations for implementation at both the campus and district level. In addition, personnel responsible for the implementation process at the campus and district level must be trained in the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. Teachers must be aware of the process and terminology pertinent to the implementation process. The Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process provides the opportunity for teachers to restructure their educational practice as they to engage in professional dialogue and reflection with instructional coaches, principals, and peers. Further studies on the connection between relational trust and the implementation process, would provide educators and researchers a fuller understanding of the factors that support the process of implementing innovative reform models in schools.

DEDICATION

To my husband and best friend, Ron Reed, who for 38 years has encouraged me, given me the space to attempt new endeavors, has made me laugh, and held me when I cried. He has driven me to A&M when I know he had much better things to do, like play a round of golf. He has told me I had to finish, when I wanted to quit. He never questioned why I was embarking on this journey at this point in my career. Without his support and love, I could not have accomplished this goal.

To my son, daughter-in-law, and grandchildren, Brian, Ann, Jackson, and Caroline Reed, you keep me grounded and help me remember the importance of family in the overall scheme of life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Behind a brown conference room door off the main hall of a bustling and busy

elementary school an instructional coach shared her thoughts about the implementation

and use of Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations at Rolling Ridge Elementary School.

While the intercom summoned students to the front office and shared information about

field day events, she patiently reflected on the five year implementation process that she

described as both challenging and rewarding. Her statements provide a snapshot into the

implementation process of Cognitive Coaching from the perspective of the instructional

coach.

> The original concept for us was that we would come into the schools to work
>
> with just third and fourth grade (teachers). Our job was originally written for two
>
> years, we were thinking that is how long we would be away from our jobs. I
>
> really thought I would be going back to my school after two years…That first
>
> year it was just getting to know the teachers. They wanted us to take a couple of
>
> months to get in and build trust and get to know the teachers. This was such a
>
> whole politically new thing. Not every school had one [an instructional coach]
>
> and that became a very political issue…I think there was really not even a job

This record of study follows the style of *The Journal of Educational Research*.

description of this at the beginning, it was vague. We want you to do these

things. We hope the scores go up.

As I probed to understand her perception of how the implementation of

Cognitive Coaching process evolved overtime she shared,

Maybe it is in the semantics, to effectively use coaching conversations.

When I look at those two young teachers who had conversations with coaches

from their earliest years to now [5 years]…Our coaching conversations allowed

them to think about their instruction in a different way, so that it is an

internalized way of doing planning and reflecting conversations…Almost within

their head or when they ask each other questions about what they are doing or

what they are thinking about doing. I will see them having those conversations,

'I am trying this in writing…I am going to do this and this. This is what I am

going to be looking for the kids to do.' It is almost like they are telling the parts

of the planning conversation they have done in their own head.…asking for some

feedback from their cohort that is at a different grade now. Then together they

talk about refinements to what they would do. I just really see them think that is

the way they should go about planning. They think it is a piece of good

instruction.…You will hear them afterwards, 'Oh, this and this happened…oh, I

used that but I wouldn't do that next time…I would use that the second lesson.'

They are thinking about that and how they would adjust it.

These quotes provide the instructional coach's perspective on the journey of

implementation of Cognitive Coaching over a five year period. She paints a descriptive

picture of two young teachers utilizing portions of Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations as a natural part of their collaborative process often unaware of the process.

Statement of the Problem

The instructional coach's description provides a snapshot of the ambiguity at the beginning of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] and the description of the implementation process overtime. Fullan (2001) defined implementation as "putting into practice an idea, program, or set of activities and structures new to the people attempting or expected to change" (p. 69). Researchers have found the implementation process complex and regardless of the human and financial resources spent, little has changed in terms of educational practice (Cuban, 1999; Elmore, 2002b; Fullan, 2001; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane, 1999; Spillane and Jennings, 1997). Consistently researchers have searched for a deeper understanding of the implementation process and attempted to identify those factors that inhibited or facilitated successful implementation.

For over 30 years researchers have studied implementation. These studies have focused on leadership or change agents, policy, and systems to determine how they impacted the implementation process. Researchers have found that leaders must have the knowledge and skills to communicate and facilitate the implementation process (Elmore, 1997, 2003a; McLaughlin, 1990; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane and Jennings, 1997; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002; Sykes, 1991). Often policies designed to bring about change were vague and in reality created confusion (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Confrey, 2000; Elmore, 2002b; McLaughlin, 1990; O'Neil, 1995; Smith and

O'Day, 1991; Spillane, 2000, 2002; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002; Sykes, 1995). In spite of good intentions, systems within the educational setting created an environment that neither supported nor facilitate change (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Hanson, 2001; Kofman and Senge, 1993; Senge et al., 1994; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane, 2002; Sykes, 1991). Repeatedly, researchers acknowledged the critical role of teachers in the implementation process.

In spite of the leadership, policy, or systems, researchers contended that teachers ultimately determined successful implementation of an educational practice or program (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Cuban, 1999; Elmore, 2002a; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001; Spillane, 1999, 2002; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002). In order for teachers to change their current educational practice they needed the will, knowledge, skills, and capacity to change. Teachers, however, have been inundated by mandates and policies that conflicted with and confused the implementation process. Schools have many times adopted more than one innovation or reform thus creating incoherency. Researchers consistently found that educational change occurred at the classroom level (Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001; Spillane, 1999; Sykes, 1996). This study focused on the teachers' perception of the implementation process and those factors they perceived that inhibited and facilitated successful implementation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study focused on the teacher's perception and understanding of the implementation process and those factors they perceived that inhibited and

facilitated successful implementation. This study documented and provided an

explanation for the experiences of the instructional coach and the teachers to better

understand the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process in which they were

involved over a 5 year period. Master teachers served as instructional coaches and

provided on-site staff development for classroom teachers. Their role provided

opportunities to utilize the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process as they engaged in collegial

conversations with teachers to coach and guide them through changes in their

educational practice (Pleasant Valley Educational Association [PVEA], 2005a). The

instructional coaching model within this study incorporated the use of Cognitive

Coaching[SM] conversations. The instructional coach developed relationships through the

use of Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations that teachers characterized as collegial.

This study on implementation focused on the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process

developed by Garmston and Costa (2002) and posited as a nonjudgmental, mediation

process that involved planning, reflecting, and/or problem- solving conversations that

support collaborative teacher interaction. The authors' believed that the interactive

process developed communication skills to help teachers think about teaching decisions

and encouraged professional development and self-evaluation. Therefore, when

dialoguing about educational practices, teachers engaged in coaching conversations with

an instructional coach.

This case study focused on a school in which the instructional coach had been

formally trained and utilized the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process over a five year period.

Hall and Hord's (2001, p. 5) implementation research studies concluded that "most

changes in education take three to five years for implementation at a high level."

Therefore, the number of years this school has been involved with Cognitive

Coaching^{SM} is critical to the study.

      As previously stated, the study concentrated on the teachers' perception of the

implementation process and those factors that inhibited and facilitated implementation.

Within this study I defined teachers' perceptions as their personal opinions or beliefs

about the implementation process. Individual teacher's filtered their decision to engage

in the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process with the instructional coach through their personal

beliefs and opinions. At times, personal beliefs and opinions appeared to influence and

create difficulty with the implementation process.

      Review of the literature found that implementation of a reform, innovation, or

practice in a school or system were difficult and complex (Cuban, 1999; Elmore, 2002b;

Fullan, 2001; Spillane, 1999). Researchers have continued to question why teachers'

instructional practices do not change even with clearly defined expectations of a specific

educational practice. Researchers have found that even when change in educational

practice occurs, it was often difficult to sustain. This case study aspired to expand

understanding and knowledge by focusing on the teacher's perception of the

implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process through

the eyes of eight participants at one school site.

Research Questions

Guiding this qualitative study were three research questions focusing on teachers' perceptions. These questions provided a schema around which to construct meaning and deepen the understanding of the implementation process. The three questions were: (1) What are the teachers' perceptions of the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process? (2) What do teachers' perceive as obstacles or factors that inhibited the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process? (3) What do teachers' perceive as contributors or factors that facilitated an effective implementation of the use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process?

It was never my intent to get specific answers to these questions. Rather, I designed these questions as a heuristic tool to guide the study and construct meaning. Ultimately, these questions led to a deeper understanding of those factors that influenced change in educational practice as a result of the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. I designed and constructed this study to gather information and deepen understanding of teachers' perceptions.

Assumptions and Limitations

I identified two critical assumptions in the design and construction of this research study. First, I assumed the fidelity of the use of the Cognitive Coaching process and teachers openly and honestly sharing their perceptions of that process. I ensured fidelity of the study through research methods that built rapport and persistently probed the research questions until interviewees redundantly and repetitively responded to the

questions. I worked to develop teacher's trust to ensure that teachers would openly share their perceptions in order to deepen my understanding of the process.

Second, I assumed that the use of triangulation, member checking and peer debriefing would provide opportunities for clarification and deeper understanding. Stake (1995) stated that, "Triangulation substantiated an interpretation or clarified different meanings with the interviewee" (p. 173). Based on Stake's work, I repeatedly listened to tapes and reviewed transcripts for clarification of specific points. Review of tapes and transcripts provided instances to triangulate information among interviewees and with observational data. Member checks required that I take interpretations back to the participants and ask them to confirm those results (Merriam, 1991, p. 169). I utilized peer debriefing through contact with a colleague familiar with qualitative and interpretive case study methodology. These three components of qualitative research supported the fidelity of the study and provided opportunities to substantiate and clarify meaning.

"Qualitative research studies derive meaning and understanding out of complex interrelationships within social context" (Stake, 1995, p. 39) and also "interprets beliefs and behaviors of participants" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 387). Researchers have not designed qualitative or interpretive studies to establish cause and effect relationships or to generalize to universal contexts. Rather, they designed studies to understand the uniqueness of individual cases and constructed meaning. By design, this study involved only one small elementary campus and depended on one-on-one interviews with

individual teachers and the instructional coach. Due to this design, the findings of the study have limited generalization or applicability to other campuses.

This study also depended on faculty and staff being willing to commit time for one-on-one interviews. Educators have often identified time as a major concern for teachers in school settings. Therefore, I considered the time factor and its impact on teachers' depth of reflection about the implementation process. In order to gather information, I had to obtain time to meet with the staff and conduct the interviews to collect data for analysis.

Qualitative research has depended on the researcher as the major instrument for data collection and analysis (Merriam, 1991). Therefore, I considered my limited experiential background as a researcher in my design. As a doctoral student, my experience with individual, in-depth research studies was limited and might affect the quality of the data collection and analysis. However, my professional experiences have been broad. As a former teacher, principal, and assistant superintendent I have been actively involved with the implementation process of many programs and innovations, specifically with the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. These experiences have biased and colored my views both positively and negatively. Therefore, the quality of this research study depended on my ability to collect and analyze data to derive meaning and construct understanding without research bias.

Methodology

Stake (1995) stated that "qualitative research assumes that knowledge is constructed rather than just discovered" (p. 99). I designed my study to construct meaning through the examination of the teachers' perceptions of the implementation process.

The study examined the teachers' perceptions of the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. While researchers have focused on leadership or change agents, policy, and systems to determine how they impacted the implementation process, few studies have talked with teachers about their perceptions of the implementation process (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 1997, 2003a; Fullan, 2001; O'Neil, 1995; Senge et al., 1994; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane and Jennings, 1997; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002). Many studies focused on changes teachers made in their educational practice in specific instructional areas such as math or language arts. However, limited studies focused on the teachers' perception of the implementation process itself. This qualitative case study focused on the teachers' perception of the implementation of an instructional coaching model that used Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations as a major tool.

This study utilized qualitative research methodology (Stake, 1995). Stake defined an instrumental case study as one that "provides information and insight into specific issues for understanding" (p. 3). This instrumental case study focused on implementation and the teachers' perception of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process used

by an instructional coach. I conducted this study at an elementary school over a three

month period using a purposeful sample of staff members.

For this study, seven teachers and one instructional coach at the school site

provided a purposeful sample (Merriam, 1991, p. 64) chosen from a total of 23 faculty

and staff members. The criteria for selecting the interview samples included choosing

an instructional coach along with teachers involved with the implementation process of

Cognitive Coaching for three to five years. The seven teachers represented a range of

experience collaborating with an instructional coach and varied levels of enthusiasm for

the use of the coaching model and understanding of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

They also represented a wide range of teaching experience and years of service at the

identified site. Staff members at the campus have actively been involved with the

coaching model and the use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process for five years. The

instructional coach in this study served this campus for all five years and has been

consistently involved in the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. District

personnel identified this school as one of the original sites to implement the Cognitive

Coaching[SM] conversations through the use of instructional coaches based on their

academic needs and challenges. The purposeful sample selected, reflected the makeup

of the staff at the campus selected for the case study.

Interviews, observations, and historical data provided the information and data to

tell the story of the implementation process at the campus.[1] Interviews provided the

major source of data. These interviews focused on the teachers' perception of the

---

[1]Note: To protect the identities of the school and the school district, as well as the
teachers and administrators, all names are pseudonyms.

implementation process. Initially, I met with the teachers and the instructional coach to establish rapport and clarified their understanding of the research study. Garmston and Costa (2002) defined rapport as "consciously building a relationship with another person through the use of posture, gesture, tone of voice, language, and breathing skills" (p. 105). I developed rapport by meeting with the staff and actively listening to their responses in both interviews and observational settings.

Following the initial meeting, each participant participated in a minimum of three interviews which ranged from 45-60 minutes. Additional follow-up interviews were conducted through webcam and e-mails. These interviews provided opportunities to clarify information and probe for additional information. During these interviews, participants reflected on the implementation process and responded to questions as they reflected on factors that both inhibited and facilitated the successful implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. These interviews provided the data for analysis that deepened the understanding of the implementation process.

Interview data also consisted of both field notes and audiotape transcriptions. I transcribed and coded each interview session. I provided participants member checks at the beginning of each session in order for them to review statements from previous interviews and verify that my summaries accurately represented their perceptions. Participants clarified and refined their perceptions as needed and my transcripts of the interviews provided a major source of information.

In addition to interviews, I collected historical data on the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} from a district perspective as applied to this school site.

Observations of faculty meetings, team meetings, and individual conferences provided

data to triangulate and support information gathered during the interviews. Interviews,

observations, and historical data together provided the information to tell the story of the

implementation process.

Overview of the Chapter Content

This chapter provides an overview of the research study which was introduced

through a participant's perspective of the implementation process and included an

introduction to the review of implementation research. Review of the literature revealed

few studies on implementation from a teachers' perspective. Therefore, this provided a

strong argument for a case study on the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] from a

teacher's perspective. This chapter articulated the statement of the problem, the purpose

of the study; the general guiding questions to construct meaning and understanding,

Chapter I included the assumptions and limitations of the research study and

summarized the methodology.

Organizational Structure of This Research Report

Having provided an overview of the research used in this study, I felt it necessary

to orient the reader into the further organization of this study. Chapter II provides a

critical assessment of 30 years of literature on implementation research. It also includes

a review of literature on implementation theories at the classroom level. In addition, the

chapter includes definitions and literature pertaining to the instructional coaching model and descriptions of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

Chapter III provides methodological details of this qualitative case study including definitions and descriptions of qualitative research characteristics. The details of the methodology include the selection of the school site and the participants for this study are addressed. I describe the role of the researcher as the instrument of the study along with the process of building trust and rapport and outline in detail the process of data collection and analysis. Finally, I discuss the researcher's role and the development of trustworthiness within this chapter.

In Chapter IV, I introduce and describe the district and campus setting. I share the district historical perspective of the implementation of the instructional coach and the use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations. The background of the implementation of the instructional coach and use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process are described through teachers' conversations shared in one-on-one interviews.

Chapter V includes the findings of the study. I share with the reader the patterns and themes that emerged through analysis of the data.

In Chapter VI, I discuss the analysis, findings, and the conclusions of the study. I identify the implications these findings have on theory and practice. Chapter VI contains recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

For over 30 years the American public and public officials have pushed for change in educational practice. Reformers at the national, state, and local level have focused on improving instruction for all students and creating policies that require teachers to be well trained as they implement new innovations and reform. Reforms have attempted to change structures, organizational and pedagogical methods. Yet, review of the literature on implementation research found that researchers identified limited changes and reform in educational practice (Cuban, 1999; Elmore, 2002b; Fullan, 2001; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane, 1999; Spillane and Jennings, 1997).

The initial cry for reform during the last decade began with the launching of Sputnik. In 1957 Sputnik created an impetus for American schools to provide a stronger foundation for students in math and science. The demand for schools to improve student achievement resulted in continual educational "reform," "change," or "innovations" (Knight and Erlandson, 2003, p. 178). Historically, two other major events propelled the continued discussion of reform and change in educational practice. In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) released a report which challenged educators and brought attention to what many considered a mediocre educational system (NCEE, 1983). This publication launched accountability systems and statewide testing. In 1989, President Bush and 50 governors in Charlottesville, Virginia drafted the national goals for education (Elmore, 1997). The most recent

historic impetus for change is the No Child Left behind Act that targeted not only the improvement in student achievement but specifically addressed the need for highly qualified teachers (National School Board Association, 2003). The national impetus for change and reform in educational practice continued to call for change in educational practice. This demand for educational change centered on the growing concern for successful academic achievement of all students within the public school system and brought pressure on teachers to change their methods of instruction.

The public's and educational system's constant focus on the reoccurring theme of achievement gaps between ethnic groups have been the driving forces for educational change. Minority groups in public education systems have lacked success in public school systems. Public school systems have not been successful with all groups of students and this achievement gap is a visible reminder. The gap has identified the variance of student achievement levels between both racial and socioeconomic groups. Schools have identified distinct gaps between middle class white students and economically disadvantaged students of color (Rothman, 2002). The changing demographics in the U.S. have intensified the achievement gaps and brought great challenges to the public education system.

These changing demographics across the nation have also brought about the need for teachers to use an array of skills and techniques to work with diverse groups of students. The 1970 U.S. census identified the population as basically white or black, only 1.4% of the population of races other than white. In the 1990's, the Hispanic population increased by 13.0 million people. In the early 1900's the census identified

1-in-8 residents in the U.S. as white; at the beginning of the 21st century, the census

identified "1-in-4" as white (Hobbs and Stoops, 2002, p. 78). Teachers within the public

school system have faced growing diversity of students that speak a language other than

English. This diversity has created new and challenging issues for the public schools

and a continual need for educational change. This result has been a plethora of

innovations and reforms that schools have attempted to implement over the last 30 years.

Unfortunately, researchers have found that the implementation process often falls short

of the intended goal (Cuban, 1999; Elmore, 2002b; Fullan, 2001; Smith and O'Day,

1991; Spillane and Jennings, 1997; Sykes, 1995)

The demands to meet the needs of the diverse racial and socioeconomic groups

have required changes within the educational system and successful implementation of

new strategies and techniques. Fullan (2001) defined implementation as the "process of

putting into practice an idea, program, or set of activities and structures new to the

people attempting or expected to change" (p. 69). Regardless of the impetus for change,

researchers have identified the difficulty with implementation of reforms and

innovations. Researchers have studied implementation in terms of leadership or change

agents, policy, and systems to determine how these factors impact change in educational

practice (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Confrey, 2000; Elmore, 1997; Hall and Hord, 2001;

Spillane, 2000). While other factors impacted implementation, a large number of studies

focused on leadership, policy, and organizational systems.

First, researchers studied implementation from the perspective of a leader's

ability to translate and advocate for change within the educational system. Consistently

researchers identified as critical to the implementation process, the leader's knowledge, and understanding of the process, reform, or innovation. Leaders needed the knowledge and ability to articulate, demonstrate, and facilitate understanding of the innovation or reform and create a clear vision of the implementation process. Therefore, leaders organized and provided training that created opportunities for teachers to interact in dialogue or discourse about the innovation or reform. Many studies centered on the structural or organizational changes leaders made within the school setting. Leaders made changes within the organizational structures that resulted in little change in educational practice. Often leaders or change agents focused on the form of the innovation rather than the function. Leaders at the state, district, and campus level often relied on policy to bring about change with limited success (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Confrey, 2000; Elmore, 2002b; Hall and Hord, 2001; McLaughlin, 1990; O'Neil, 1995; Silin and Schwartz, 2003; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane, 2000, 2002; Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer, 2002; Sykes, 1995).

Second, researchers argued that often policy brought about little change in educational practice. Historically, implementation research on policy originated with the Rand Change Agent study in the 1970's. The Rand Corporation sponsored The Rand Change Agent Study (McLaughlin, 1990) conducted by the U.S. Office Education. The study found that, while federal policy prompted local schools to undertake projects, the policy did not ensure successful implementation of the innovations. This seminal study caused policymakers to reconsider how change occurred and the importance of studying the implementation process.

Policy prompted schools to undertake projects but did not ensure successful implementation. Researchers studied policy to determine alignment between the intent of the policy and the eventual implementation. Researchers (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Spillane, 1999, 2000, 2002; Sykes, 1991) found that many times the implementation changed the educational practice for a period of time but eventually people returned to close proximity of their original practice. Implementation studies focused on coherency and understanding of policy by leader's responsible for the implementation. Often the leaders responsible for the implementation lacked a clear understanding of the policy themselves to provide the training and leadership to bring about needed change (Elmore, 1997, 2003a; McLaughlin, 1990; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane and Jennings, 1997; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002; Sykes, 1991). In addition to leadership and policy, researchers studied organizational systems to determine their impact on the implementation process of reforms or innovations.

Third, researchers have studied the organizational systems within schools to discover how these systems reacted to reforms or innovations to bring about educational change. School cultures and organizational models comprise systems unique to each school setting. Research studies documented the resistance to change within organizations. Even when schools and organizations created a culture conducive to learning, researchers found change was often difficult to sustain long-term (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Hanson, 2001; Kofman and Senge, 1993; Senge et al., 1994; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane, 2002; Sykes, 1991).

Researchers agreed that whether the study was on leadership, policy, or systems change occurred at the classroom level (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001; Spillane, 1999, 2000, 2002; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002). Researchers agreed that leaders' various styles influenced the implementation process and that policy designed to influence implementation alone did not ensure that implementation and change in educational practice occurred. Systems within the school setting could support the implementation but ultimately implementation and change depended on teachers. Changes were found to be difficult for teachers which slowed down and stopped the implementation process.

Review of the literature consistently concluded that it was difficult to sustain change in educational practice (Elmore, 2002b; 2003a, 2003b; Sykes, 1991). Therefore, many of the patterns and themes within the literature created the working premise that there would be difficulties during my study on the implementation by an instructional coach of Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations. In my study an instructional coach acted as a resource at the campus level to support teachers as they implement instructional techniques in math and language arts. The coach provided on-site staff development for teachers and created opportunities for professional, collegial relationships (Joyce and Showers, 2002). The instructional coach used the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process to support teachers in self-directed learning. This process allowed individuals opportunities for self-evaluation and reflection (Costa and Garmston, 2002a). This study centered on seven teachers and one instructional coach at the school site who

participated in one-on-one interviews focusing on the implementation by an instructional coach of Cognitive Coaching[SM].

A common theme that evolved during my review of the literature is the importance of teachers as the key agent in order to changing educational practice (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001; Spillane, 1999, 2000, 2002; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002). While many studies looked at leadership, policy, and organizational systems, none of the studies focused on the teachers and their perceptions of the implementation process. Researchers have noted the importance of the teacher as the key change agent but often the studies have focused more on the implementation of educational techniques in math or language arts rather than teachers' perception of the implementation process itself. I identified the need for deeper understanding of how the implementation processes influences an individual teacher's educational practice.

The central question in this study focused on the teachers' perception and understanding of the implementation process and those factors they perceived that inhibited and facilitated successful implementation. This study focused on the use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process by an instructional coach. I attempted to understand the implementation process from teachers' perspective at one school site. Therefore, it is important to understand the role teachers play as key agents in the implementation process (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Cuban, 1999; Elmore, 2002b; Hall and Hord, 2001; Spillane, 2002).

Teachers as Key Agents in the Implementation Process

Many researchers have observed that for the process of change to take place, teachers have to question their current practice, unlearn that which has become natural, and discard their deeply rooted understandings of how teaching and learning occurs. They have to be willing to abandon their current practice and accept new instructional techniques or methodology. For that reason, individual teachers and teacher autonomy impacted any effort to change educational practice (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001; Spillane, 1999; Sykes, 1991, 1996).

The seminal research study by Hall and Loucks (1978) in the 1970's focused on the importance of the individual teacher. Their extensive research at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin resulted in the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM). This model centered on the concerns expressed by individuals or teachers as they dealt with the adoption of innovations as a part of the implementation process. Spillane (1999) defined the space where change occurred at the individual level as the "zone of enactment" (p. 144). It was that space in which the teacher encounters the reform and construed or operationalized the idea. Individuals varied in their willingness to accept change. Some people grasped the change easily; others resisted change even if they understood the expectations (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001; Spillane, 1999, 2000, 2002; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002). Researchers identified teachers as the key to successful implementation.

There was a second factor identified as interfering with the process of implementation which grew out of the educational system itself. Over time, teachers have maintained a great deal of autonomy within the American educational system. Teacher autonomy coupled with the human resistance to change created a roadblock for the implementation process. Schools were built in an "egg carton style" where individuals taught in separate rooms which provided opportunities for isolation and encouraged individual autonomy. When the school door closed, teachers made individual decisions about instruction; therefore, implementation of an innovation would or would not occur (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 1997, 2003b; Sykes, 1991). This teacher autonomy coupled with human resistance to change was identified as creating a roadblock for the implementation process.

As a principal and assistant superintendent, I have dealt with the challenge of implementing a variety of reforms and innovations. I found through experience that implementation occurred only if teachers first recognized a need to change and then willingly embraced new methods of instruction. Often, teachers began the process of change and then their resistance intensified and resulted in an attempt to negotiate what they willingly changed. As a leader, I had to understand the need for change and communicate that need to teachers. Often my own interpretation or understanding inhibited successful implementation. I found that change in educational practice had to be driven by student need for teachers even to consider adjusting their current practice. Often teachers argued that change had to occur with the students and parents rather than recognizing the need for change in their own classroom practice.

Classroom Implementation Research Theories

Implementation theories have provided background and arguments which explain the difficulty and complexity of implementation at the classroom level. These theories have provided an understanding of factors that interfere or inhibit the implementation process. First, researchers recognized the developmental nature of the implementation process. Teachers changed their practice in stages; therefore, the development nature of the implementation process must be acknowledged (Elmore, 2003b; Hall and Hord, 2001). Second, teachers must have the will and capacity to change. They must willingly recognize a need for change and then make those changes (Elmore, 2003b; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001). Third, teachers' foundational norms and beliefs influenced how they approached teaching and learning. Their current norms and values must change as a part of the implementation process. This inability to change norms and values often inhibited the implementation process. Teachers found it difficult to change standards and values (Elmore, 2002b; 2003a, 2003b; Sykes, 1991). Fourth, teachers not only must willingly change but recognize the knowledge and skills needed to implement the innovation or reform. They must understand their current practice and recognize the changes that have occurred as the new practice evolved. Next, they needed the knowledge and skills to understand the form and function of an innovation or reform. Last, researchers discussed the issue of coherency for individual teachers as it related to the implementation process. Each of these implementation theories is discussed in the following sections.

Developmental Process

Researchers have found that individual teachers changed their practice in stages and have thus characterized the implementation process as developmental not linear. For that reason, change was viewed as a process, not an event that occurred when teachers attended a one day workshop (Elmore, 2003a; Silin and Schwartz, 2003; Sykes, 1996). Innovation or educational changes have been determined to take place slowly in stages. It normally took three to five years for a high level of implementation (Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001). This argument supported the distinct stages in Hall and Hord's (2001) CBAM. They found that individuals focused on "self" during the first stage of the implementation process. During this stage the researchers found individuals were concerned with gathering information and determining how the implementation affected them rather than being concerned with the implementation itself. Their concerns focused more on personal needs rather than the management of the task.

According to Hall and Hord (2001), the second stage of implementation focused on the management of the task. Teachers became proficient in the new innovation or reform and focused on implementation, organization, management, and scheduling. At this stage people built coherence of understanding and capacity. Also people at this stage made adjustments and interpreted implementation in a way that changed the intended practice to closer approximate their current practice (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Spillane, 2002; Spillane and Jennings, 1997; Sykes, 1995).

In the final stage of implementation, which might be the second or third year, teachers were found to deal with the impact of the implementation. They began to

consider the consequences of the implementation. For instance, they questioned how this implementation impacted students and other faculty members. At the impact stage teachers were found to collaborate and cooperate with others in regard to the innovation and refocused on the benefits of the innovation or to consider needed changes. Individuals moved through these stages based on their own abilities to make change and grasp the understanding of the innovation or reform. Within one school researchers found teachers at each of the levels of concern. The CBAM gave definition to the varied stages of the implementation process and provided a framework for understanding individual reactions to the implementation of change.

The argument that implementation occurs developmentally in stages was supported by Fullan's (2001) identification of the implementation dip. He found that the dip emerged in the early stages of implementation when there were many problems and much confusion in the early stages of implementation. Hall and Hord (2001) suggested that Fullan's implementation dip occurred during the management phase of the implementation process. This also coincided with the phase in which Elmore (2003a) contended people built capacity and coherence in varied stages. Elmore found that there would be significant gains early in the implementation phase, followed by periods in which implementation slowed, and then resulted in later significant gains. He explained how people learned during the implementation process:

> We do not learn in an easy straightforward, incremental fashion, any more
>
> than we develop our cardiovascular capacity in a simple, linear way. We learn in
>
> part by tearing down old preconceptions, trying out new ideas and practices, and

working hard to incorporate these new ideas and practices into our operating

model of the world. It takes a while for these ideas and practices to "take," but

when do, they often result in learning at the individual and collective level.

(p. 10-11)

Change occurs developmentally overtime and in stages. Consequently, each individual

moves through those stages at varied rates. Therefore, teachers differ in their level of

implementation during the stages of the implementation process.

Will and Capacity for Change

Teachers respond to change in many different ways and some are more resistant

than others. This reality impedes the implementation process. For change to occur,

individual teachers must have the will and capacity to change their educational practice

during the implementation process. They must have the motivation to change and align

their practice with recommendations from the district or campus level. They must also

have the capacity to conform to the practice being recommended. Teachers must build

the capacity to deal with change (Fullan, 2001; Knight and Erlandson, 2003; Spillane

and Jennings, 1997).

Often educators delve into the implementation of a new innovation rather than

taking the time for teachers to build capacity and understand how change evolves. The

previous section identified the stages of the implementation process. Educators need the

opportunity to understand occurs during the implementation process. Because change is

inevitable teachers must understand how change or implementation occurs in order for

change to occur efficiently and with minimum disruption to the system.

Teachers' willingness to learn has often been influenced by his or her disposition toward learning. If teachers have recognized the need to make change in order to meet the learning needs of students they are more willing to learn and change educational practice. If teachers have not seen the need to change educational practice they do not put forth the effort to implement new practices. Spillane (1999) related the story of three elementary teachers with whom he worked in a research study in a district attempting to reform language arts instruction. The three represented a first year teacher, one with five years of experience, and the third with 20 years of experience. The three differed in terms of disposition and willingness to engage in the language arts reform within the school district. Two of the three teachers wanted to reflect on their language arts instruction and reconstruct their practice using writer's workshop and connections with reading and writing. One of the teachers had no desire for further learning in the area of language arts because she had taught five years and felt she knew all of the current information. She perceived that others needed the opportunity to catch up and saw no reason to reflect on her practice. In contrast, the experienced teacher openly and willingly learned and the first year teacher immediately enrolled in a masters program. This story provided a clear example of how teachers stopped the implementation process of an innovation or process through their unwillingness to change. The teachers who willingly changed also valued continuous learning. Their beliefs and values about teaching and learning created the foundation for their instructional practice (Elmore, 2002b, 2003b; Sykes, 1991). As teachers learned and changed their practice, norms and values also changed.

Norms and Values

Individual teachers have fundamental norms or standards embedded in their daily instructional practice. These norms have determined what they value about teaching and learning. The implementation process has stopped when teachers' rudimentary norms and values clashed with expected norms of the innovation or educational technique to be implemented. For example, if an implementation process resulted in a change in instructional practice in mathematics, the teachers had to clearly understand the norms in order to adjust their current practice. If the expected goal of the implementation reform created mathematical classrooms where students worked together to construct meaning but the teacher valued a quiet controlled class, implementation of the reform might never occur (Elmore, 2002a, 2003b; Sykes, 1991).

Implementation researchers argued that teachers set norms based on their own practice and values because of the lack of an established technical core of knowledge that clearly identified effective educational practice. Teachers commonly utilized traditional whole group teaching methodology and resisted change in practice (Elmore, 2002a; Sykes, 1991). Elmore (2003b) worked in schools for over 15 years and contended that teachers clung to the traditional style of teaching. He believed that individual teachers acting along shaped group norms and values. For that reason, Sykes (1991) and Elmore (2002a) argued that in order for teachers to restructure norms and values they needed to engage in professional collaboration. Elmore and Sykes encouraged processes where teachers worked together in groups to learn through dialogue and discussion. Elmore (2002a) argued that teachers must collectively change

their practice in order for norms and values to change. Teachers needed clear and well-defined expectations and standards in order to change practice.

Teachers needed well-defined norms of expectation prior to the implementation process. Elmore's (2003b) work with low performing schools found that without a clear vision or expectation, even if teachers worked together, they set norms based on their current practice. He shared an example of a low-performing middle school that made improvement but then their scores trended downward. He worked with this campus to look at practices and help the administration understand the dip in improvement gains. Early in the implementation phase of the school improvement plan, the school established teacher norms of expectations to ensure student success. The teachers identified the following norms: students would work hard and be enthusiastic and teachers would keep students engaged. He found that "good teachers in the middle school adopted a style in which they were virtually doing all of the work in the classroom and the students were doing very little" (Elmore, 2003b, p. 10). The teachers established the following norms: the students needed to be engaged, pay attention, create few discipline problems, and respond in a timely fashion to teacher questions. Students worked at a factual level and if teachers asked higher level questions, the pace felt slow and teachers moved on quickly to other questions. The established norms did not address strategies to support higher order thinking skills which were needed for long-term sustained progress. If teachers were at the heart of change they established internal accountability or set norms based on their current practice, therefore, little change occurred (Elmore, 2002b, 2003a; Sykes, 1991). In order for teachers to change norms or

values, they must develop knowledge and skills of the expected practice and understand what they must adjust or change about their current instructional practice in order to reach the expected practice.

Knowledge, Skills and Ability to Change

To implement reforms or innovations teachers must have the knowledge and skills to understand how to reconstruct their current practice. Teachers have used their prior knowledge and experiences to construct new meaning through the use of schemas or links of knowledge structures. The depth of their current knowledge and skills and their ability to process, organize, and interpret determined if change was to occur. They have learned the new knowledge and skills through the lens of understanding from their current practice. Teachers' pedagogical past contain instructional techniques out of which new practices have evolved. Teachers must scaffold their new learning from the old practice in order for change to occur and be sustained. Often teachers reframed a new innovation or practice but little change occurred if teachers did not create mental models that allowed them to connect the past experience to the new practice and understand the difference. Ultimately teachers have allowed change to occur (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2003b; Spillane, 2002; Sykes, 1996). Cohen and Ball (1990) argued:

> Changing one's teaching is not like changing one's socks. Teachers
> constructed their practices gradually, out of their experiences as students, through
> their professional education, and their previous encounters with policies designed

>to change their practice. Teaching is less a set of garments to be changed at will
>
>but rather a way of knowing, of seeing, and of being. (p. 335)

Teachers have developed understanding, have deepened their knowledge, and gradually have adopted new skills.

Development of knowledge and skills required teachers not only to encode information about the new practice but recognize that the new practice required changes. Teachers assumed during the learning process that the new information resembled their current practice. If a teacher perceived the new knowledge as congruent with their current practice, the implementation process derailed and little changes occurred. Teachers must question, unlearn, and discard the practice they have spent years developing for change to occur (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2003b; Spillane, 2002; Sykes, 1996). In addition, change is hard and this results in teachers needing a sophisticated level of understanding to help them construct new practices that differed from their current practice. Teachers within the same school might construct different understanding of the changes that must occur for implementation of a new practice.

Educational jargon creates confusion that often interferes with the implementation process. Teachers have needed a common language to facilitate communication during the implementation process. Researchers have found that even with common language, teachers' perceptions differed in how to reconstruct their current practice (Spillane, 2002; Spillane and Jennings, 1997).

Spillane (2002) provided the example of a research study of 25 teachers who supported the implementation of national and state standards in math and believed they reconstructed their current practice. He provided the following description:

> While reporting support for reform themes such as 'mathematics as problem solving' the sense they made of those themes was influenced by their tacit models of mathematics knowledge. Only a few of the teachers understood the core ideas of the reform as transforming notions of mathematical content and doing mathematics, emphasizing principled over purely procedural mathematical knowledge. Many of the teachers in contrast, understood the mathematical standards in ways that involved no fundamental changes in what counted as mathematical knowledge. These teachers saw the standards through the lens of their current practice, and the understanding they constructed failed to reflect the sort of fundamental change in extant practice pressed by reformers." (p. 399)

The theme of failed understandings and only procedural changes prevailed throughout the review of literature on implementation research. Teachers lacked the understanding that they needed to make fundamental changes in how they delivered or facilitated instruction, therefore, implementation stalled or failed (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a, 2002b; Spillane and Jennings, 1997; Sykes, 1995, 1996).

Researchers found that teachers involved in training models have needed opportunities to develop a deeper understanding of the new knowledge and skills they were expected to implement (Elmore 2002a, 2000b, 2003b; Spillane, 2000; Sykes, 1996). They have needed a clear idea of what they were trying to achieve. There is

consistent research that teachers have developed new knowledge and skills through rich conversation around their teaching and learning that facilitated the implementation process. This type of conversation used a cognitive framework where teachers reconstructed their existing knowledge in order to facilitate change in educational practice (Elmore, 2002a, 2003a; Sykes, 1991, 1995, 1996).

Initiatives to change educational practice included professional development. Researchers found conventional professional development inadequate. They recognized that sending teachers to workshops and "hoping" that they implemented the intended practice inadequate. Teachers needed opportunities to reflect on their learning and practice with other teachers. Professional discourse and dialogue created opportunities to clarify misunderstanding and for teachers to discuss implementation of the new practice. Without discourse and dialogue with other teachers, the change process often stalled (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a; Spillane, 2002; Sykes, 1995, 1996).

For change to occur, teachers also needed a clear roadmap of the required knowledge and skills. Teachers have not willingly learned new skills if they perceive that the people responsible for implementation have limited understanding. Also they have not willingly attempted to change their current practice if they perceived a lack of commitment on the part of the campus and district to stay with the change long term. As a principal, I have heard teachers say, "I will use the math workshop when I know the district is going to stay with this process. I don't want to learn a new fad and then have to change again" Researchers have agreed that teachers needed a clear vision and understanding of the new knowledge and skills and a belief that once they changed their

practice they will not be asked to change again in the near future (Elmore, 2003b; McLaughlin, 1990; Smith and O'Day, 1991; Spillane, 2002; Sykes, 1995).

Knowledge of Form and Function

In order for teachers to change their educational practice, they needed to understand that innovations and reforms have both form and function. Implementers often focused on the form of the innovation rather than the function. For example, implementation of mathematical reform might focus on form that included learning activities, materials, grouping procedures, or student work. The implementation of the math form might focus on the observable knowledge and skills. Function might focus on understanding the important mathematical knowledge critical to learning and grasping mathematical concepts. Function might involve the process of problem solving that uses manipulatives to demonstrate understanding of mathematical principles. This use of function created understanding at a much deeper level than just the ability to do computational skills (Spillane, 2000). Spillane (2000) used the example of the implementation of problem solving from a study of mathematical reform within a school district to describe the importance of understanding form and function. Teachers and district leaders examined the changes in mathematics in order for the implementation of the problem solving model to occur. The conversation focused on the form of the mathematical problems. Spillane (2000) stated, "The mathematical reform involved changing the form of the story problems students worked on but did not involve any changes or deeper understanding of principled mathematical knowledge" (Spillane, 2000, p. 150). The conversations by teachers related more to making the story problems

realistic and real-life story problems rather than deepening the understanding. Teachers needed the ability to recognize and understand both the form and function of this innovation in order to change educational practice.

Coherency

Teachers sometimes have developed the knowledge and skills to change their educational practice but must function daily in fragmented school cultures. Teachers have struggled to attempt to construct coherence when schools organized and chopped information and knowledge into small bits and pieces. For example, schools are generally organized by classroom, grade levels, subject areas, and pull-out programs for special needs. Rowan, Correnti and Miller (2002) observed that research consistently indicated that teachers' instructional autonomy within classrooms itself produced incoherence within this fragmented organizational structure. Senge noted in an interview with O'Neil (1995) that the "fragmentation in the education process is extraordinary" (p. 20). He argued that a school's theory of knowledge organized itself into separate segments in terms of content knowledge. Like Rowan, Correnti and Miller (2002), Senge perceived that educational institutions reinforced teacher autonomy and focused on the individual.

This focus on the individual meant that teachers had to individually and willingly relinquish autonomy. They must assume the responsibility to create coherence in order to change educational practice. The implementation process has derailed through the fragmentation teachers confront on a daily basis.

Teachers have faced fragmentation when they implemented more than one innovation simultaneously. Researchers recognized that implementation takes three to five years with clear, well-defined expectations (Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001). In an attempt to improve learning for all students, schools have adopted more than one innovation which leads to complexity within the school setting (Knight and Erlandson, 2003). This adoption of multiple innovations has resulted in confusion and weakened the opportunity for successful implementation of any single change. Fullan (2001) referred to Anthony Bryk's work with the Chicago public schools in school improvement as examples of the impact of multiple innovations. Bryk (2003) described the Chicago public schools as "Christmas tree schools" because they took on so many innovations they became like decorations (p. 27).

Smith and O'Day (1991) argued that this incoherency of innovations in the school setting resulted in what they termed "project mentality." This phenomenon occurred because of political pressure to produce results in a short period of time (p. 237). Silin and Schwartz (2003) identified that the tendency for proliferation of reforms within schools made it difficult for teachers to focus on the process of change with regard to specific programs or reforms (p. 1586). Schools might create an environment of confusion when teachers were expected to perform as jugglers and implement more than one innovation. Teachers needed time to focus on implementation and change their educational practice.

While teachers have ultimately implemented national, state, and local level policy incoherent policy at any of these levels creates fragmentation that interferes with

a teacher's ability or willingness to change. Smith and O'Day (1991) argued that "the fragmented, complex, multi-layered educational policy system" acted as a barrier to the development of successful schools and impeded successful implementation (p. 237). Too often, local implementers have interpreted ambiguous and unclear policy mandates for teachers. Inherently implementers have created local policy interpretation of mandates in order to provide the stimulus for change in teacher practice.

Teachers at the school setting have worked to make sense of the many mandates that are a reality in their everyday world. Real change in educational practice has required a coordinated effort. Many states have attempted to create consistent standards in curricular areas. However, this attempt for coordination has interfered with change in educational practice because of the number of standards around which teachers have to organize their educational practice. Teachers have to understand key curricular ideas in order to go from standards to practice. Elmore (1997) insisted that teachers needed to focus on key ideas rather than attempt to manage a large array of standards. Teachers needed an environment of coherence that provided support for them to willingly develop knowledge and skills to make changes in their educational practices. Teachers had to willingly muddle through policy, mandates, and standards in order to construct new meaning and overcome the lack of coherence that impeded change in educational practice (Elmore, 1997; Fullan, 2001; Knight and Erlandson, 2003; Rowan, Correnti and Miller, 2002; Silin and Schwartz, 2003; Smith and O'Day, 1991).

The implementation process often stopped at the teacher level. Fullan (2001) very wisely stated that "educational change depends on what teachers do and think—it's

as simple and complex as that" (p. 115). Researchers (Elmore, 2002a, 2003a; Hall and

Hord, 2001) supported this contention with studies that identified change as a process.

Teachers' unwillingness to build capacity and understand how change occurred often

derailed the implementation process. A prerequisite for implementation required

teachers to change their norms and values. Teachers needed knowledge and skills to

change their educational practice when confronted with too many innovations or vague

policies. The key to successful implementation of innovations or reforms rested in the

hands of teachers.

Cognitive Coaching[SM] Implemented Through an Instructional Coaching Model

This case study focused on the teacher's perception of the implementation by an

instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. The instructional coach

supported teachers at the selected school site through the use of the Cognitive

Coaching[SM] process. The interactive Cognitive Coaching[SM] process developed by Costa

and Garmston (2002b) was posited as a nonjudgmental, mediation process that involved

planning, and reflecting, and/or problem-solving conversations that supported

collaborative teacher interaction (pp. 4-9). This interactive process develops

communication skills that require teachers to think about teaching decisions and

encourages professional development and self-evaluation. The Cognitive Coaching[SM]

model was designed to create teacher dialogue and discourse to provide an avenue for

self-directed learning. Implementation researchers recommended dialogue and discourse

as a component of professional development because it might provide the stimulus for

teachers to change their educational practice (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a; Spillane, 2002; Sykes, 1995, 1996). Cognitive Coaching[SM] creates opportunities for conversations in which teachers self-reflect on their instructional techniques in specific content areas with an instructional coach.

The instructional coaching model within the district served as an integrated resource for school-based, job-embedded, professional development at individual campus sites (PVEA, 2005a). The district created this instructional coaching model based on the National Staff Development Council (2001) Standards for Staff Development. These standards called for staff development which required resources to support adult learning and collaboration, provided educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate, and deepened educators' content knowledge.

Researchers identified the need for educators to learn over time within the context of their work consistent with the NSCD standards (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, 1995; Joyce and Showers, 2002; Lieberman and Miller, 1981). Showers and Joyce's (1996) seminal research on peer coaching evolved out of studies on teacher staff development. They reviewed evaluations of staff development where fewer than 10 percent of the participants implemented what they learned (1996, p. 1). They perceived peer coaching as a mechanism to increase classroom implementation of instructional strategies and curriculum. The peer coaching model has provided opportunities of support for teachers and time for teams of teachers to work together through the implementation process.

Lieberman and Miller (1981) and Darling-Hammond (1998) identified the importance of an infrastructure that supported teacher learning through modeling, coaching, and problem-solving. Their work supported models where teachers consistently engaged in discussion and discourse around their students and instructional techniques. This model shifted from the old "teacher off campus in-service" model to an on-site staff development model where teachers consistently engaged in self-evaluation of their instructional practice with colleagues. School districts involved in their study developed roles and new structures that supported teachers in this collaborative process.

Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) stressed the need for teachers to collaborate as a part of the implementation process. This collaboration provided opportunities for self-reflection. They recommended school cultures with expectations for collegial and professional learning to create opportunities for professional development. Collaboration provided those opportunities for educators to share knowledge among themselves. Teachers engaged in conversations that focused on student work, assessment, and instructional techniques.

The selected school district in this study implemented an instructional coaching model in order to impact student success through changes in instructional techniques and teacher behavior. The district provided initial training in the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process and follow-up throughout the year for instructional coaches. Instructional coaches used Cognitive Coaching[SM] as a major tool when they worked with teachers to change and adapt instructional techniques to meet the needs of their students.

Costa and Garmston based Cognitive Coaching^{SM} on the premise that change in perception is the prerequisite to changing behavior. The authors (Costa and Garmston, 2002b) argued that "all behavior is produced by thought and perception. Teaching is constant decision making and to learn something new requires engagement and alterations in thought" (p. 8). They based their belief on the fact that humans continue to grow cognitively. Therefore, they believed that one's ability to change educational practice increased as one examined current practice and reconsidered assumptions that guided and directed those practices. They found that teachers reconsidered their assumptions as they engaged in conversation with peers and supervisors.

Cognitive Coaching^{SM} includes three types of conversations designed to develop teacher collaboration. First, reflecting conversations requires coaches to summarize, recall information, compare and analyze relationships of learned information, construct new meaning, and reflect on their conversation with teachers. Throughout this process coaches pause, paraphrase, listened closely, and inquire about new learning (Costa and Garmston, 2002a). Second, the planning conversations involve establishing a focus for personal learning and the process for self-assessment. The conversation ends with reflection on the coaching process and refinement for future conferences. The problem/solving conversations utilize the planning and reflecting process, but focus on situations where teachers "felt stuck, unclear, or lacked resources; experienced a crisis; or requested external assistance" (Costa and Garmston, 2002b, p. 34). These three Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations serve as the foundation for self-directed learning.

The Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations are designed to develop cognitive capacities for self-directed learning and fostering a sense of holonomy. The Cognitive Coaching[SM] process supports people to become self-directed individuals. The Cognitive Coaching[SM] training process develops the capacity to mediate conversations and to support others as they develop the capacities for self-directedness in themselves. Self-direction involves self-management, self-monitoring, and the ability to modify. The process establishes and maintains trust in oneself, relationships, processes, and the environment (Costa and Garmston, 2002b). Holonomous people become aware of their individuality, along with the recognition that they are a part of systems. They recognize that they are part of something greater than themselves, i.e., families, schools, organizations, or teams. Teachers in a school setting make autonomous decisions; however, as a part of a larger system their decisions ultimately influence the culture and people within the system. Cognitive Coaching[SM] provides the foundation for this process.

Costa and Garmston's (2002b) Cognitive Coaching[SM] process grew out of their professional experiences and backgrounds that brought them together to study teacher evaluation and clinical supervision. Subsequently, the authors envisioned Cognitive Coaching[SM] as an important process for supporting teachers as self-directed learners and enabling them to cope with the current emphasis on standards, high accountability, and increased demand for changes in educational practice. Educators have utilized this process to support teachers as they face challenges in the public school system and pressure to change their educational practice.

This literature review identified the difficulties in changing educational practice. School systems spent large amounts of both human and financial resources to change educational practice and yet the implementation process of many innovations and reforms failed (Elmore, 2003a; Fullan, 2001; Knight and Erlandson, 2003; McLaughlin, 1990; Spillane, 2002).

Overview of the Chapter Content

As an area superintendent I assumed responsibility for the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^SM process district-wide. The district in which I worked trained principals, assistant principals, and instructional specialist who coached and worked with teachers over a four year period. I found that even after training, staff members struggled to utilize the process of Cognitive Coaching^SM. In review of the literature I found limited research on the process used to implement Cognitive Coaching^SM (Edwards, 2001). The co-directors for the Center for Cognitive Coaching^SM expressed concern and a desire to understand what makes the implementation process so difficult from their perspective. School districts spent funds on training, materials, and development of district trainers and yet few districts sustained the process long-term. I had great difficulty finding sites that consistently used the process after 10 years of training and commitment. It supported my premise that I would find difficulties with the implementation process. This study focused on teachers' perception and understanding of the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching^SM conversations used by an instructional coach at one school site.

Cognitive Coaching[SM] creates dialogue and discussion that provides teachers opportunities to self-reflect and change their practice to meet the needs of their students. Therefore, I assumed, this process of Cognitive Coaching[SM] itself would make the implementation successful. Yet, my difficulty in finding schools and districts that have implemented and sustained the use of Cognitive Coaching supports the difficulty and complexity of the implementation process. Clearly the research identified teachers at the heart of the implementation process (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 1997, 2003b; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001; Spillane, 1999, 2002; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer, 2002). Therefore, I need to understand the teachers' point of view and their perception of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] at the school site. The central question in this study focuses on the teachers' perception and understanding of the implementation process and those factors they perceived inhibit and facilitate successful implementation. This study attempts to deepen an understanding of the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching[SM] used by an instructional coach.

Studies have continued to search for answers in order to understand difficulties that have occurred during the implementation process and changes in educational practice. The public and public officials have pushed for change within the educational system for over 30 years. Reforms have attempted to change structures, organizational, and pedagogical methods. Yet, based on researchers' finding, the review of the literature indicated little has changed (Cuban, 1999; Elmore, 2002b; Fullan, 2001; Knight and Erlandson, 2003; Spillane and Jennings, 1997).

Researchers have studied implementation from the perspective of leadership, systems, and policy. Ultimately, change occurs at the teacher level regardless of the systems within a campus, the leadership to support implementation, or the policy developed to drive and design the change process. Implementation often stops at the classroom level. Researchers (Elmore 2002a, 2003a; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001) argued that change occurred in stages and characterized implementation as developmental. They have found that a teachers' level of personal concern and lack of understanding of the implementation process deters successful implementation. In addition, teachers must have the will and capacity to change for implementation to occur. Teachers' foundational norms and beliefs will determine how they approached teaching and learning. Change in teachers' current norms and values must occur as a part of the implementation process. The implementation process often stopped because teachers resisted changing standards and values (Elmore, 2002b, 2003a; Sykes, 1991).

In addition, teachers must willingly change and acquire the knowledge and skills to implement the innovation or reform. As new practices have evolved they must understand their current practice and recognize how change occurs. Teachers change their practice through the lens of their current practice which might interfere with the change process. Teachers attempted new practices but in reality their instructional techniques or practice continues to closely resemble their past practice (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a, 2002b; Spillane, 2002; Spillane and Jennings, 1997; Sykes, 1995, 1996). Unclear policy and multiple innovations within a school setting created confusion and lack of coherence. This confusion and lack of focus interfered with a

teacher's ability to understand where to put their attention and thus make expected changes (Elmore, 1997; Fullan, 2001; Knight and Erlandson, 2003; Rowan, Correnti and Miller, 2002; Silin and Schwartz, 2003; Smith and O'Day, 1991).

This case study focused on the teachers' perceptions of the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching[SM] used by an instructional coach. The literature indicated that the implementation process often stopped at the teacher level. Therefore, the question must be asked as to what factors inhibited or facilitated successful implementation from a teacher's perspective. Are there factors at this particular school site not previously identified in review of the literature? The search for answers to these questions guided this case study.

The next chapter describes the research methodology of the case study on the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. The chapter describes the site, the participants chosen, and the methodological details of the study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The study documented teachers' perception of the implementation process and factors which inhibited and facilitated successful implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. Teachers' perceptions furthered understanding of the implementation process and those issues which both interfered and contributed to the success of the implementation. It was not my intent to search for causal factors but rather understand the complexity of implementation from a teacher's point of view. I did not attempt to explain why things were a certain way at the school site but rather described the teacher's perception at that site during a particular period of time. I used qualitative research methods to study this implementation process.

Stake (1995) identified five traits common to qualitative research methodology:

1. Qualitative research pressed for understanding of complex interrelationships rather than cause and effect (p. 37).

2. Qualitative research conveyed the experience and understanding to the reader through thick description of events that happened within the setting (p. 39).

3. Qualitative research called for the person most responsible for interpretation, the researcher, to be in the field, making observations, exercising subjective judgment, analyzing and synthesizing, all the while realizing their own consciousness (p. 42).

4. Research questions in qualitative studies sought patterns of unanticipated as well as expected relationships (p. 41).

5. Qualitative researchers believed that knowledge is constructed rather than discovered (p. 99).

These five characteristics guided the research study.

The intent of this qualitative research study was to document the teachers' perceptions to better understand the complexity of the implementation process and what they perceived occurred at the school site. I intended to take the reader along on the journey and bring to life the elementary school setting where I conducted the research. As the primary instrument I gathered, analyzed, and synthesized the data while being conscious of my own personal views and perceptions. Rather than rush to assertions or possible findings, I continued to probe and gather data to allow themes to emerge over time. Analysis entailed looking at the data and being cognizant of patterns and themes that evolved, some of them unexpectedly. I constructed knowledge by constantly gathering data and creating synergy through the collection and analysis of the data using qualitative case study methodology.

Case Study

Merriam (1991) defined a case study as a "design employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved. The interest is in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in discovery rather than confirmation" (p. 19). She concluded, "the single most defining characteristic of case study research lies in delimiting the object of study of the case" (p. 27). The case study

bounded and "fenced in" the unit of study. The boundary of this study centered on the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Various functions occurred daily within the complex settings of schools allowed opportunities to extend beyond the boundary of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. I found new educational practices in language arts, math, and state testing being simultaneously implemented along with the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process at this school. Nonetheless, I focused on the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process which bounded this study.

Qualitative case studies are characterized as being particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic (Merriam, 1991, p. 29). Particularistic in this study infers to the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process by an instructional coach over a five year period. Both Stake (1995) and Merriam (1991) identified the finished product of a case study as one that provided a rich, thick description of a particular phenomenon or setting. Merriam's (1991) characteristics identified a qualitative case study as heuristic in that the thick description extended the readers' understanding and insight of a particular case.

This case study focused on the perceptions of eight participants—seven teachers and one instructional coach. It was never my intent for them to represent the total staff of 23 people, but for reader's to understand the story of implementation through their eyes. Their perceptions extend the reader's understanding of this instrumental case study.

This qualitative research study extends the reader's understanding through an instrumental case study at a single site. Stake (1995) defined instrumental case study as one that "provides information and insight into specific issues for understanding" (p. 3). This study centered on the process of implementation. I studied implementation through the teachers' perception of the implementation by an instructional coach of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations. The study utilized case study methodology at an elementary school site within one semester over a six month period.

The following sections outline the procedures used in this case study. In the first section I describe both the selection of the district and campus site. The second section describes the selection process of the participants. The fourth section clarifies how rapport and trust was built between the researcher and the participants. Last, I clarify my role as the major research instrument of the study.

Site Selection

The following criteria were used to select the site for this study. The site must have had training for teachers and administrators, teachers' needed to have knowledge of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process, and there should be organizational structures of support at the campus and district level. I identified school districts that trained administrators and other personnel in the use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. It was my intent to find districts where teachers were actively involved in planning, reflecting, and problem-solving conversations with administrators and personnel trained in Cognitive Coaching^{SM.} I preferred teachers to be aware of the process and acknowledge the use of the coaching techniques. I hoped to find that teachers and staff

used the process formally and informally during reflecting, planning, and problem-solving conversations. In addition, I looked for sites where the organizational structure of the campus provided opportunities for the staff to engage in dialogue and reflective practice. It was my intent to find districts and campuses which supported the implementation process through both training and expectations. Specifically, I needed sites where the principal, assistant principal, and/or district administrators' supported and modeled the coaching process. It was my intent for the site to utilize the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process as the foundation of the evaluation process.

The criteria for district selection required that I find school districts involved in the training and implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process for at least three to five years. I based this time frame on Hall and Hord's (2001) research that identified the need for a three to five year period for implementation to occur. The Co-Directors of the Center for Cognitive Coaching[SM] identified five district sites. They identified districts within Texas and surrounding states that have been actively involved with this process for more than three years. I talked with school district personnel and regional service centers for each of the identified districts as I went through the selection process.

The selected campus site must also have been involved with the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] for three to five years. In addition, the selected school site was required to be a Title I eligible school.

Subjects

There were a total of 23 teachers and specialists assigned to the selected school site; only 13 assigned full-time. Many of the specialists taught at more than one site due

to decreased enrollment. The seven teachers and the instructional coach who participated in the study were assigned full-time to this campus. Six of the seven were regular classroom teachers; one was a special education teacher with students assigned from other schools within the district. The special education teacher worked closely and co-taught with the intermediate teachers.

The participants selected for this study were six classroom teachers, one special education teacher, and one instructional coach. A subject selection matrix (C) guided the selection of the participants involved in the one-on-one interviews. I selected a purposive sample (Merriam, 1991, p. 64) of teachers to be a part of the study through the use of a subject matrix. The matrix identified the various categories of teachers for consideration. The criteria for selection organized the teachers by categories which considered years of teaching experience, variety of grade levels, leadership roles, union membership, diversity, and training in Cognitive Coaching[SM].

I considered individual teacher's experience working with the instructional coach critical to the selection process. The instructional coach implemented the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process at this school site. Therefore, I developed my understanding of the implementation process through the teachers' perceptions of their work with the coach and the use of the process. Three of the seven teachers consistently worked closely with the instructional coach during the five year period. The other four teachers' experiences ranged from limited to those who worked one-on-one. The instructional coach worked across grade levels with all of the staff during the current school year in which the study was conducted.

I selected eight participants from the total staff—seven teachers and one instructional coach. These subjects represented teachers from both primary and intermediate grade levels. They ranged from four years to 24 years of teaching experience. Four of the eight have taught only at Rolling Ridge Elementary—they began their teaching experience at this site. One of these four had the unique perspective of being both a teacher and a former student at this campus. One of the participants retired at the end of the school year after 24 years of teaching experience. All the participants were Anglo females. This campus had no ethnic diversity among the classroom teachers and only two male staff members—one an itinerant librarian.

Even though there was limited ethnic and gender diversity among the participants, the voices and the perceptions of the eight participants still varied greatly. All the teachers at this campus were members of the union, but only one served as the representative for this campus to the union. The union actively questioned the instructional coaching role, even took surveys to consider whether the position should be continued. Therefore, the participant who served as the union representative provided a different perspective and a voice important to the research study. Only the instructional coach had participated in the formal training in the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. She brought an understanding to the study far different from the other participants. The special education teacher worked with an instructional coach in another school district. This experience allowed her to articulate understanding of the process of change during coaching conversations at a far deeper level than many of the other participants. She also brought the experience of a life-long physical handicap and provided the voice of challenges which varied from

all the other participants. This study contained diversity through the perception and voice of the participants.

Rapport and Trust

It was essential to build rapport as I probed participants' perceptions of their experiences working with the instructional coach implementing the Cognitive Coaching^SM process. The study centered on the teacher interviews. Therefore, I needed to build rapport and create an environment where teachers responded openly and honestly. I began with introductions to the faculty and staff. I explained the purpose and process of the case study at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. I made the faculty aware that the entire staff would not be a part of the one-on-one interviews and participants would be selected through established criteria.

I selected participants through discussions with the principal and the instructional coach using the selection matrix (Appendix C) and established criteria. I initially met and talked with the selected participants individually and in small groups. At these meetings I clarified the process, reviewed the consent forms prior to their agreeing to be a part of the study. I gave them opportunities to ask questions and clarify their individual roles. If they had reservations we discussed these in small groups or individual meetings.

I understood the possibility that some participants would have reservations due to the time constraints of the study. I discussed the importance of honoring their time and assured them of flexibility to meet their needs. They identified times convenient to meet with me and I used those times to establish the interview schedule. The identified times

involved one of their weekly planning periods or times when the principal or the

instructional coach agreed to cover their classes. I shared my background at both the

faculty meetings and during the small group introductions.

My background experiences as a teacher, principal, and administrator provided a

basis for them to trust that I understood issues about time, feelings of anxiety, or the

need to make adjustments at the last minute. Teachers needed to understand that

flexibility was an option. These discussions and assurances were a necessary part of the

process to build and maintain trust.

It was critical for teachers to trust that what they told me remained confidential.

I discussed the issue of confidentiality at the initial meeting. I assured them of the

confidentiality of their comments as participants, the identification of the school and the

school district. I explained the process of member checking to each of the participants.

I recognized the importance of the process in terms of building rapport. The more

people felt their words or actions were not going to be "twisted" or taken out of context,

the more I built trust. Each interview provided an opportunity for them to clarify any

misperceptions or confusion with what they thought they had said. The consistent use of

this process at the beginning of each interview session or through the use of e-mail

created an environment where they expressed feelings of trust and a desire to be honest

about their perceptions.

Instrument of the Study

I participated as the major instrument for data collection, gathering, and analysis.

I acted as "observer as a participant" during observations and interviews (Merriam,

1991, p. 93). Merriam identified this role as one "known to the group" and supported by the people being studied (p. 93). Training in Cognitive Coaching[SM] allowed me to understand terminology and probe for understanding while gathering and collecting data in both interviews and observations.

As an area and assistant superintendent, I took part in the training process of Cognitive Coaching[SM] and assumed district oversight responsibility for implementation. As principal and assistant superintendent, I have been responsible for overseeing or working with staff to implement various programs and processes. This allowed me both as a researcher and an educator to understand the complexity of the implementation process. Having served eleven years as a principal in an at-risk school gave me a "sense of credibility" with the participants. This credibility created an environment of trust in which to collect data.

Data Collection

I collected data through the use of interviews, observations, and documents which provided historical and descriptive data of the implementation process at the district and campus level. I gathered data within the campus to determine teachers' perceptions of the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Teachers shared perceptions of the process itself and factors which inhibited or facilitated successful implementation. Teachers shared through interviews how those factors influenced their educational practice. As a researcher, I collected

documents and historical data along with observations and interviews to provide the

information to tell the story of the implementation process.

Interviews

      Interviews are a major source for data collection. The interviews focused on the

teacher's perception of the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive

Coaching^{SM} process. I designed and constructed the study to further understanding of

the implementation process and those contextual issues which influenced the

implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. Understanding evolved through the use of

one-on-one interviews with the participants. The participants were teachers and one

instructional coach at the school site. The interviews were guided by three semi-

structured research questions.

      A research question protocol (Appendix A) guided the questions during the

interviews. The protocol contained questions to probe for understanding of the three

basic research questions. These questions provided a schema around which to construct

meaning and deepen the understanding of the implementation process. These three

questions were: (1) What are teachers' perceptions of the implementation of the

Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process used by the instructional coach?, (2) What do teachers

perceive as obstacles or factors which inhibit the implementation of the Cognitive

Coaching^{SM} process?, and (3) What do teachers perceive as contributors or factors which

facilitate an effective implementation of the use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process?

Questions were not limited to these and I probed for further understanding while

collecting information and data. Questions were not static and new questions evolved

throughout each of the interviews. However, questions during the interviews were

bounded by the intent of the study.

Each of the seven teachers participated in a minimum of three interviews which

ranged from 45-60 minutes. The instructional coach participated in four 60 minute

interviews. The coach's additional interview focused on the Cognitive Coaching[SM]

training and her understanding of the implementation process at the school site as

gleamed from teacher interviews. I collected interview data through audio-tapes and

generated line numbered transcripts of each interview. Three teachers participated in

webcam interviews in order to clarify and refine portions of earlier interviews. I

conducted additional member checks through e-mail. I determined the number of

interviews per participant based on the redundancy of the information provided and the

need to clarify information as it evolved. I triangulated observation data along with

information gathered during the interview process (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000).

Observations

The observations focused on conversations at faculty meetings, small group

meetings, and team meetings. The observations provided the opportunity to document

the instructional coach's use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process at the school site in

varied settings. I documented field notes (Appendix B) with a code sheet to organize

understanding of observed behaviors specifically those pertinent to the Cognitive

Coaching[SM] process. Copious written notes were generated during each of the

observations. Observations of the school setting and daily activities developed a clear

picture along with documents and historical data of the setting in which the study took place.

Documents and Historical Data

Documents and historical data collected both within the district and at the campus site contained information related to the implementation of the instructional coaching model and the training and implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. These included documentation of the implementation process and trainings provided by personnel at the district and campus level. I collected pictures and historical data pertinent to the campus and district site to create a better understanding of the community and area in which the study took place. I also collected campus data that pertained to strategic improvement plans, state testing information, and data used essentially to create understanding for the reader.

Data Analysis

Data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously through an interactive process. Stake (1995) "contends that the qualitative researcher concentrates on an instance, trying to pull it apart and put it back together again more meaningfully— analysis and synthesis in direct interpretation" (p. 75). I collected data immediately and analyzed with the intent to determine the teacher's perception of the implementation process and use the data to guide questions with subsequent participants. I analyzed the data through the use of key words or phrases for common categories or patterns that shaped further data collection points and questions. I consistently used the basic

research questions to analyze information to develop codes and understanding of the

implementation process of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. Throughout the data analysis process,

I coded data using tentative categories. I transcribed interview tapes in order to identify

evolving patterns to guide further study.

I constantly analyzed data and evolving patterns through category construction

(Merriam, 1991). This construction occurred through constant comparison of incidents

and participants' remarks. Through analysis I found patterns within the research central

to the issue of implementation. I analyzed data for emerging patterns during the case

study and continuously constructed meaning by chunking key phrases together around

themes or patterns. For example, early within the study the issue of leadership evolved.

So, I knew I needed to probe and clarify teachers' perception and understanding of

leadership in terms of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. This constant

analysis and probing deepened understanding and supported the trustworthiness of the

study.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness of the study depended on my ability as the researcher to

establish trust with the reader. The reader had to trust I followed the outlined process

and that the findings or assertions were based on data collected, not just my veracity. I

established trustworthiness through the use of triangulation of data, member checks, and

peer examination. Stake defined triangulation (as cited in Denzin and Lincoln, 2000) as

"a process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning, verifying the repeatability of

an observation or interpretation" (p. 443). I analyzed individual responses for coherence

and congruency of perception. I utilized the data from observations and documented

material to support the perception of the implementation process generated by the

participants.

These perceptions helped provide better understanding of the implementation

process. Because of previous training, I recognized Cognitive Coaching^{SM} behaviors

and vocabulary common to the process. Participant awareness and understanding of the

process varied significantly. Both the obstacles that inhibited implementation and

factors which facilitated successful implementation emerged. However, throughout the

process I continually probed and questioned that participants felt their perceptions were

represented. I consistently used member checks. Merriam (1991) defined "member

checks as taking data and interpretations back to the people from whom they are derived

and asking them to confirm the results" (p. 169). Transcribed notes provided a source to

substantiate those understandings. I consulted with a peer reviewer as a part of the

process during varied phases of the study. I worked with him to reflect on the process,

and gather perceptions in order to continually make adjustments as needed during the

study. The expertise of the co-chairs provided another source for input throughout the

process. I used these basic procedures in this qualitative research study to establish

validity and reliability.

Overview of Chapter Content

This chapter provides information concerning the general methodology and detailed descriptions of the research development of the study. I designed and conducted the study to better understand the implementation process at this school site. The study evolved and transformed through interviews and observations which focused on the teachers' perceptions of the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

Chapter IV brings to life the background and setting of the study. In this chapter I share the participants' perception of the implementation process, the role of the instructional coach, and specific instances to define how the implementation process evolved.

CHAPTER IV

BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH STUDY

The complexity of the implementation process became evident during the early phase of the research study. Selection of the school site necessitated adjustments to the original criteria for selection. The lack of schools and school districts that met the original criteria outlined in Chapter III demonstrated the difficulty in identifying schools in which to study the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

The following section describes the necessary adjustments to the original criteria in order to identify the selected site. The next section describes the setting and historical understanding of the community and area in which the study was conducted. The third section provides detailed descriptions of the seven teachers, the instructional coach, and the current principal. This section also provides the historical background of the implementation of the instructional coaching model and the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process from the participants' perspective. The last section clarifies the role of the instructional coach and the use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] Process.

Revised District/School Site Selection

It became apparent to me that none of the original criteria to identify school districts implementing Cognitive Coaching[SM] were going to be met by any of the five districts under consideration. Budgetary constraints in most districts did not allow all

administrators, instructional support personnel, and teachers to be trained. None of the

school districts used the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process as their formal model of

evaluation because either state testing or a state evaluation system superseded this

process as an evaluation model. Only one of the districts used the reflection, planning,

and problem-solving conversations through an instructional coaching model on a regular

basis. I found inconsistency from school to school within districts in terms of an

organizational structure to provide the time needed for the coaching conversations. One

of the school districts did not want to participate in a research study. Therefore, the

issues and concerns of the implementation process became obvious even in searching for

a school district. In selecting the site for the case study, the intent of the study remained

constant but I adjusted criteria.

  I revised the original criteria and used the following to select the school district.

First, I maintained the expectation that districts had to be involved with the

implementation process for at least three years as outlined in implementation research by

Hall and Hord (2001). Second, the district must have implemented a formal mechanism

to support the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. This mechanism should include both

instructional coaches and/or campus personnel. Third, the district must have supported

and trained personnel in the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. Fourth, districts must have

modeled and sustained the implementation process. In addition, the school districts must

be willing to allow a research study on the implementation process. Only one school

district met the revised criteria.

Background and Setting of the Research Study

District Site

Pleasant Valley County Schools was highly recommended by the Co-Directors of Cognitive Coaching^SM and met the adjusted criteria. Even though this school district is located outside of Texas, it is the most appropriate site based on the revised criteria. They have implemented the Cognitive Coaching^SM process over a five year period through the use of instructional coaches. The district extensively trained and provided follow-up for these coaches in the Cognitive Coaching^SM process. The instructional coaching model formally included the use of the reflection, planning, and problem-solving conversations. As a district, they have developed a formalized plan and a strong commitment to the strong commitment to implement and sustain the Cognitive Coaching^SM process.

I selected Pleasant Valley County Schools as the district in which to conduct a six month instrumental case study on the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^SM. This county sat in a 780 square mile area (more than half the size of the state of Rhode Island) with a total population of 530,000. Thirty-nine small school districts consolidated in 1950 to form Pleasant Valley County Schools with seventeen communities currently represented. District personnel expressed strong interest in a research study to better understand the implementation process.

The Executive Director of the Department of Learning and Educational Achievement (DLEA) in Pleasant Valley expressed interest in a research study that focused on the implementation process. She had assumed responsibility for the training

and development of the instructional coaches. Through discussion, she identified school sites to consider and I identified three specific criteria. First, the school had to be a Title I school. This was one of the criteria in my research proposal as well as my own personal criteria. I wanted to study a school that had challenging demographics and a diverse population which was more of a possibility in an eligible Title I campus. Second, the school had to be involved with the implementation process for three to five years. This criteria was based on Hall and Hord's (2001) research that implementation occurs over a three to five year period. Therefore, I wanted a campus that had been involved with the process long enough for there to be the possibility of implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. Third, there needed to be some consistency with personnel involved with the process. This consistency allowed individuals time to work together through the implementation process. After discussion and conversation with the Executive Director (DLEA) and the principal, one school emerged as the most appropriate site, Rolling Ridge Elementary School. This school was located in a large county school system.

Area Description of Pleasant Valley County Schools

The Pleasant Valley county school system was located in a 780 square mile which contained residential and business communities. The county school system was a diverse area with smaller homes valued at a hundred thousand dollars or less to very affluent areas with homes over a million dollars. Within this county were expensive up-scale apartments as well as large housing units in need of repair. There were new areas being developed and older areas built in the early 1950's. This county consisted of

seventeen communities with older areas settled as early as the late 1850's and new

residential areas built over the last ten to fifteen years. There were communities with

strong city governments and others areas annexed within the larger metropolitan area.

This large geographic area contained business communities with large hotels and

commercial office buildings clustered throughout the Pleasant Valley County School

area. Major malls within the county attracted people from across the state. Three major

freeway systems connected sections of the district. A major boulevard served as a north-

south thoroughfare through the county. A major interstate ran through one section of the

boundary of the Pleasant Valley County Schools.

County Schools Test Data

On state tests, the Pleasant Valley County schools have scored above the state

average in reading and writing and consistently met the state average in math. Student

scores averaged 76% in reading for grades 3-6 over the last two years; 66% in writing

for grades 3-6 for the same period. Records indicated a slight increase in math scores in

grades 3-6 from 66% to 75.6% over the last two years. While the aggregate scores

remained above the state average, the county school system faced challenges to meet the

needs of a growing diverse population.

The school system's Strategic Plan identified the need to increase the aggregate

state scores of the Hispanic, African American, American Indian, and those students

identified as economically disadvantaged. The scores of these student groups ranged

from 18% to 20% below the district aggregate in reading and writing. The gaps between

the student population groups were larger in the area of math. The district set a goal to

increase math scores for the Hispanic population from 36.6% to 41.5%. The aggregate

district math scores were currently 75.6%. Even if the district met the goal of 41.5% for

the Hispanic math scores there was still a 39% gap in achievement which identified the

need for significant improvement in this area. This district was compelled to attempt to

address the widening disparity between student populations and low socioeconomic

students which resulted in their implementation of the instructional coaching model to

support teachers to meet the needs of a changing student population.

Per Pupil Expenditure/Student-Teacher Ratio/Graduation, Drop-out Rates

Regardless of this achievement gap, Pleasant Valley County Schools continued

to set high standards in order to provide a strong academic program for all students.

Pleasant Valley County Schools reported in their 2003-2004 Annual Report that the

district spent $5,776 per student. The district maintained student teacher ratios of 24:1

in kindergarten, 20:1 ratio in first, second and third grades, 24:1 ratio in fourth grade,

and 28:1 in fifth grade through high school. Eighty-one percent of the students in the

Pleasant Valley County Schools graduated. However, despite this high graduation rate,

there was a wide variance in dropout rates among the seventeen high schools which

reflected the challenge to maintain high standards across the district. Drop-out rates

ranged from .04% to 5.9% with an average of 2.4%. Pleasant Valley County Schools

faced daily challenges to meet the needs of their growing diverse population. This

diversity was obvious as I drove through areas within the county school system.

School Site

One school site emerged during conversations with the Executive Director (DLEA) based on the identified criteria, Rolling Ridge Elementary School. Both the Executive Director (DLEA) and the current principal identified Shari, the instructional coach, as highly trained and effective in the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. She had served this campus for all five years of the implementation process. Shari became an instructional coach in language arts the first year; remained for language arts and math in the second year and continued full-time for both language arts and math at this site after the third year. I identified this as one of the most important aspects for consideration. Fewer personnel changes allowed focus on the implementation process itself rather than changes in personnel.

The leadership at the campus site represented the only significant personnel change. The majority of the staff and the instructional coach remained consistent over the five year period. Consistent leadership remained at this school site for four of the five years. The new principal, Maria, currently assigned to this campus previously held the position of an instructional coach trained in Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. Therefore, the coach and principal have been involved with the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process for all five years. I considered the principal and instructional coach's consistency and knowledge an important factor in the selection of the school site. In addition, this K-6 elementary school site had met the criteria for five years as a targeted eligible Title I school based on the percentage of students identified for free and reduced lunch. During the year in which I conducted my research they became a school-wide Title I campus

based on the percentage of students identified for free and reduced lunch which allowed them to serve all students at the campus site.

Description of the Rolling Ridge Community

The major interstate acted as a boundary to the Rolling Ridge community where I conducted this study. Rolling Ridge Elementary School was located in an area reminiscent of the 1950's. This area grew from a small farming community originally settled during the late 1800's to a bustling and vibrant suburban city during the 1950's. This community has grown from a population of 600 in 1904 to a population of 102,000 in 2004. Industry and strong schools propelled the growth of the area. This growing community became a part of a larger school system during the 1950's.

In 1950, the voters agreed to consolidate the school system with approximately 39 other small districts to form the Pleasant Valley County Schools. The 1950's produced heightened anxiety of nuclear annihilation as a result of the Cold War era and the fear of growing communism. The Rolling Ridge community was in close proximity to an atomic weapons plant. One of the junior high schools within the area became the community bomb shelter, considered a necessity in the early 1960's.

The small homes within the Rolling Ridge Elementary School community reflected the period of the late 50's and early 60's. Many of the well-manicured homes had single car garages in the front and a stoop at the front door through which you entered the small 3 bedroom, one bath home. Driving around Rolling Ridge Elementary neighborhoods I saw larger ranch style homes that accommodated two cars in the driveway and reflected the period of the 60's when the U.S. became more of a two car

society. In contacting area real estate agencies I discovered that some of the smaller homes in the area sold for $150,000 to $200,000. Many of these homes have been remodeled but sell for seven to eight times the original cost of the house. Many of the homeowners have chosen to remain within the community after retirement.

This community housed a large retired population. Throughout the interviews teachers noted the growing retired population within the community. One of the teachers said, "I am not sure, I think almost 80% of the area is retired." Another young teacher who grew up in this community said, "I don't think it is as high as 80% but I know that many of my grandparents' friends who live in the area are retired." Throughout the interviews this perception emerged again and again. The street in front of the school dead-ended into a road along which ran walking trails and a park. On the other side of the park was a large retirement apartment community which reinforced the teachers' perceptions. The area surrounding the school contained homes, a church, and an apartment complex.

A large New England style red brick church with an imposing white steeple overlooked the school playground. Five homes which sat on a ridge behind the playground and the church appeared to have been built in the wrong area. These five homes that cost in excess of $750,000 were built in a newly developed community. These large homes with Victorian turrets or sprawling patios did not fit in with the surrounding community. None of the children in these new homes attended the elementary school. Some were vacant and teachers speculated that if children lived in these homes they attended private schools in the area. The large red brick church housed

a small private school where children played on the parking lot of the church next to the sprawling playground of the public school.

The only apartment complex within this community was located across the street from the church. The small old French chateau style apartment complex housed approximately 50 families. The top half of the complex had asphalt shingles half-way down the side and window air conditioners protruded from each apartment unit. This apartment complex sat in an open field with no landscaping and was surrounded by telephone and utility poles. A bright orange sign hung from the roof and advertised "Now leasing from $399 per month." It sat back from a winding two lane highway that ran among the homes, by the church, and past the newly developed community. This apartment complex exemplified the changes and complexity of the community within which the elementary school resided.

This community had a strong business component outside the boundaries of the elementary school in which I conducted the study. This area housed well-known fast food chains, restaurants, grocery stores, the local K-Mart, liquor stores, a local coffee shop similar to Starbucks, and small strip shopping areas. A local German delicatessen featured German grocery items along with newspapers and magazines written in German which hinted at the background of locals within the community. As I drove past homes, churches, and businesses I felt the Rolling Ridge community reflected the immense growth of the 1950's and made one feel that time had stood still in that area.

Description of the School Setting

Rolling Ridge Elementary School sat back from the road among small homes with one car garages. This one-story school had recently been remodeled and updated. The old flat top roof and original red brick contrasted with the architecturally updated designs which included new red brick. As you walked in the large enclosed entrance between two aluminum doors you immediately saw the front office behind a long row of windows to the right. The secretary and clerk sat in a large expansive office behind counters that separated them from the parents and children who entered the office. The principal's office and the clinic were adjacent to this area. A cabinet to the right held sign-in sheets and visitor badges required of anyone who entered the campus. The main office opened onto a hallway that led to central corridor of the school.

Colorful children's artwork with words of encouragement lined the bottom of the long entry wall outside the main office. The front area of the building contained large windows with blue trim. Personalized posters with individual pictures of the principal, secretary, clerk, and the school nurse had been posted in these large windows in the entry. Brief autobiographies were pasted below the pictures which introduced the four individuals, the principal, secretary, clerk, and school nurse, as a wife or a mother or a grandmother and introduced the four individuals. The autobiographies described their hobbies and activities in which they were involved outside of school. The last sentence contained a statement about each person's pride. Maria, the principal, stated, "I am proud to be a teacher at Rolling Ridge" which indicated how she perceived her role. It also personalized her to the parents and students as they entered the building. Each

teacher had a similar poster outside of their individual classroom. Throughout the building hung posters introducing and celebrating the teachers and students at Rolling Ridge. Without entering a classroom, you developed an understanding of the staff who taught on this campus. The main corridor outside the office led to a library at the end of the hall.

The library entrance contained large display areas which housed student work and student descriptions of various programs in which they have participated. For example, a large bold typed poster contained descriptions of fifth grade experiences at the district Outdoor Lab. As you entered the library you immediately saw four computer stations housed along with a counter where students returned or checked out books. Large tables to the right accommodated teachers meetings or students working with teachers. The remainder of the library contained rows of shelving housing the library collection. The back of the library looked out on an open courtyard in the center of the building.

As you walked from the library you stood in a hall which led to two wings containing classrooms, the cafeteria, the gymnasium, and multi-purpose areas. Each of these long halls was comprised of dark red brick on the bottom with concrete blocks pointed white along the top section. These long halls opened to the individual classrooms. Each hall contained at least one bulletin board used to display student work or announce upcoming events. The U shaped building consisted of two long wings off of the main front hall where the library and office were located.

Teachers have broken the monotony of these long red brick and concrete halls with student work that lined corridors off the main front hall. They have displayed first grade story stretchers, fifth grade math story problems using fractions. The kindergarten students have outlined their bodies on large pieces of yellow paper. These large self-portraits with stick hair, colorful clothing, and ill-proportioned limbs adorned the halls outside the Kindergarten classroom. Each student measured themselves with blocks, paper chains, or their hands. They dictated a statement about their measurements which the teacher pasted to their individual pictures. Throughout the building I sensed the pride teachers have in students as they displayed their work in various content areas. The teachers in this small elementary school worked hard to display this pride in every area of this small school.

Demographics – District Site/School Site

Pleasant Valley County Schools included a total of 247 schools with a student population of 84,478 students during the school year in which I conducted the study. Pleasant Valley County Schools consisted of five pre-school centers serving three to five year olds, 93 elementary schools, 19 middle schools, 17 high schools, 8 optional schools, and 11 charter schools. The school system divided area schools into articulation areas by communities in which they resided. This neighborhood concept accounted for the wide range of student populations particularly within the elementary schools. The average elementary schools housed 300-400 students. However, some schools maintained a student population as low as 220 while other elementary schools accommodated 720 students.

Rolling Ridge Elementary School was one of those smaller schools within the Pleasant Valley County Schools system and served students in grades K-6. The total population over the last few years had decreased to 250 students. The impact of the rising cost of the homes in the area combined with an increase in the number of rental homes impacted the student population of the school. Teachers repeatedly shared the issue of declining enrollment as I talked with them in one-on-one interviews.

Two young teachers reflected on their perspective of the declining enrollment in this particular school. One of the teachers attended school at Rolling Ridge and another lived in the area. One who had lived in the area but attended another elementary school stated," When I grew up there were a lot of children and large families. My cousins all went to this school. My aunt and uncle lived down the street. Very few people moved." The young teacher who attended Rolling Ridge stated. "I grew up across the street from the school and went to school here." It was her perception that the number of retired people in the community along with the transient nature of others impacted the enrollment. Both teachers perceived that the school had changed in terms of the demographics of the student population.

The student populations in Pleasant Valley County Schools varied across individual campuses in terms of the make-up of socioeconomic status of the student population. Within the Pleasant Valley County Schools there were only 20.21% of the students on free and reduced lunch. The elementary school where I conducted the study had a much larger percentage of lower socioeconomic students. Fifty-three percent of the students at Rolling Ridge Elementary School qualified for free and reduced lunch.

This school had been identified as a school in need of Title I assistance over the last five years based on the number of students identified for free and reduced lunch. The school became a school-wide Title I school the year in which I conducted my study.

While the school had an enrollment of 250, they had experienced a growing mobility rate as a result of the growing number of rental properties within the school community. School records indicated a 34.9% mobility rate during the 2003-2004 school years and a 26.3% mobility rate during the school year in which the study was conducted.

The majority of the students within the county schools were white with a growing Hispanic population. Seventy-seven percent of the county school student populations were white, 16% Hispanic and the other seven percent were identified as black, American Indian, and Asian. The increase over the last ten years had been most pronounced in the Hispanic population. The Hispanic population has grown from approximately 6,000 students to more than 13,000 students (Personal notes, faculty meeting, May 4, 2005).

The student population within the county schools mirrored the make-up of the population at Rolling Ridge Elementary. Seventy-one percent of the students at Rolling Ridge were identified as white. The white population included immigrant Russian students. The number of Russian immigrants had decreased at this school site over the last few years but still accounted for a small portion of identified white population. The Hispanic population accounted for 23% of the total student population. However, none of the students were served in a bilingual Spanish class. An English as a Second

Language teacher taught fifteen to twenty students who required assistance under state guidelines for English language support. The other five percent of the student population consisted of Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian. Teachers noted the changes that had occurred over the last four to five years in terms of the diversity and increased challenges of the student population.

As I interviewed teachers, observed faculty and staff meetings few expressed concerns about the diversity in terms of students speaking other languages or difficulty communicating with students or parents. The focus and conversation often turned to expectations of students, lack of parental support, and economic factors rather than cultural differences. Teachers referred to parent support and perceived a lack of support due to the parents' work schedule. I attended a faculty meeting which focused on tolerance and understanding and promoted teachers valuing diversity. At the principal's request the school system provided this diversity training to help teachers and staff understand how their perceptions and biases impacted teachers' expectations of students.

Impact of Decreasing Student Enrollment at the School Site

In my first visit to Rolling Ridge Elementary School I interviewed Maria, the principal, and Shari, the instructional coach, to review the staff roster and select teachers for the one-on-one interviews based on the selection matrix (see Appendix C). Through our discussions I became aware of the impact low student enrollment had on the organizational structure of the school and teacher turnover. Many of the teachers were itinerant and served more than one campus. For example, the art teacher rotated between two schools each day to provide art to some of the smaller campuses. This was

true of many of the specialists who taught music, physical education, etc. As I reviewed

the staff roster, I noticed several of the teachers at grades three through six taught classes

identified as multi-grade. For example, a teacher taught a 3-4 grouping, another taught a

5-6 grouping and yet other teachers had only a 4th grade or a 5th grade. In discussion and

interviews both the principal and teachers indicated these grouping were not created

because of a multi-grade grouping philosophy. Rather, they had been a necessity in

order to facilitate grade levels with limited numbers of students. The student population

at third and fourth grades had only enough students to create one third grade class and

one fourth grade class. The third grade has a 20:1 ratio and fourth grades a 24:1

teacher/student ratio. Maria had to create a new third or fourth grade class after the

student population reached more than 20 in third grade and 24 in fourth grade. Neither

grade level had enough students to make a full class. Therefore, it became necessary to

combine students from third and fourth grade to create a class with an appropriate

number of students (at least 12 to15 students).

Students in fifth and sixth grade were grouped in three 5/6 classes. The teachers

regrouped during the day for each of the content areas. The special educational teacher

worked with this team and took fifth graders in specific subject areas. Grouping varied

from year to year based on the number of students at the intermediate level. Primary

grades maintained the state student-teacher ratio and there were no multi-age groupings

at this level.

Decreasing student enrollment impacted both teacher turnover and teacher

assignments. Only thirteen of the twenty-five teachers assigned to this campus taught

full-time at this site. The librarian, the ESL teacher, one of two Title 1 teachers, the

specialists in P.E., Art, Music, Band, the speech therapist, a psychologist, social worker,

and one of the special education teachers were assigned to more than one campus. Many

of these teachers each spring applied for full-time positions at other campuses.

Therefore, this particular campus continued to have turnover in specialized areas.

Decreasing student enrollment continually challenged the administration and the

teachers at this elementary campus.

School Site Test Data

Teachers in grades 3-6 at Rolling Ridge Elementary School administered state

tests each spring in reading, writing, and math for the state accountability system. This

school had been targeted five years earlier to receive an instructional coach because of

low test scores in all content areas. While there has been improvement over the last

three years in state test scores, specific grade levels continue to have scores below 70%

as indicated in Table 1. The state Department of Education requires that students at the

elementary level (K-6) achieve a score of 70% in order to be identified as proficient on

the state assessment. Therefore, any scores below 70% in reading, writing, or math are

considered a target area for improvement.

Table 1.—Rolling Ridge Elementary School State Test Scores

State Test Scores	3rd Grade Subject Area (%)			4th Grade Subject Area (%)			5th Grade Subject Area (%)			6th Grade Subject Area (%)		
Year	R	W	M	R	W	M	R	W	M	R	W	M
2005	85	71	85	63	47	50	63	50	67	59	59	59
2004	80	47	*	58	60	*	45	39	48	59	58	41
2003	67	45	*	69	39	*	56	40	36	52	50	*

*Content area not tested in that subject area during the school year.

The scores in Table 1 reflect the percentage of students who scored advanced and proficient on the state test at grades 3-6. Students identified as advanced demonstrated an exceptional level of knowledge in the specific content area based on the state standards. Students identified as proficient demonstrated the ability to meet the identified state standards of proficiency in that specific content area. Therefore, these percentages reflect those students who met or exceeded the state standards. Table 1 indicates the continued need for improvement in all grade levels specifically fourth, fifth, and sixth. While the one-on-one interviews focused on Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations, participants often alluded to the constant pressure for improved student achievement on state assessment tests.

Participant Descriptions and Perspective of the Implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM]

Description of One-on-One Participants

As described in Chapter III, a subject selection matrix (Appendix C) guided the selection of the participants involved in the one-on-one interviews. I selected a purposive sample (Merriam, 1991, p. 64) of teachers to be a part of the study through the use of the subject matrix. I selected the participants through review of school records and conversations with the principal and instructional coach. The matrix identified the various categories of teachers for consideration. The criteria for selection organized the staff by categories which considered years of teaching experience, variety of grade levels, leadership roles, union membership, ethnicity, and training in Cognitive

Coaching[SM]. The participants selected for this study were six classroom teachers, one special education teacher, and one instructional coach.

The one-on-one interview process with the eight participants deepened not only my understanding of the teachers' perceptions of the implementation process but also my understanding of the district and campus site. During my initial visit to Rolling Ridge Elementary I met with each of the participants. The purpose was to obtain their consent to be involved in the study, to review the study in detail, and to give them opportunities to ask questions and clarify their role as a participant. I clarified how the interviews would be structured and gathered information from them as to the most appropriate time of the day to meet with them individually. I began the one-on-one interviews during my second visit to the campus. It was important to build rapport and trust in order to gather honest perceptions about the implementation by an instructional coach of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. My nervousness as I began this study faded somewhat as I met with the first interviewee, Barbara.

Barbara. Barbara was a young, newly married teacher in her late 20's who had taught fifth/sixth grades for six years at Rolling Ridge. She had taught a fifth/sixth grade class, fifth grade, and was scheduled to teach a sixth grade class in the coming school year.

Barbara moved to the Pleasant Valley County Schools from outside the state. In addition to teaching a fifth/sixth grade class she coached girls' high school volleyball after school. She shared her pride in the fact that the teams she has coached have gone to the state championship for two years and regrets that they have not won. Her

commitment to both the coaching and the teaching, however, was evident. Her ability to interact and work with students outside the classroom was obvious as I attended a "rock and mineral sale" her fifth/sixth grade students hosted in order to raise funds to support events for the fifth/sixth grade classes.

Barbara had rapport with both students and staff members which was obvious as I observed her in faculty and team meetings. She appeared to be a focused, goal oriented teacher. She was often the teacher campus personnel turned to for help with technology. She was immediately identified as the teacher who would assist me with the installation and use of the webcam. This campus leadership was confirmed by Shari who related the following observation:

> Barbara at staff meetings was always a great participant… She has evolved into a school leader, whereas before she was always under the shadow of a teacher who is no longer on the campus. You would never have really known she was a leader.

This leadership became obvious as I observed team meetings where Barbara was the fifth/sixth grade team leader and facilitated and worked through projects with her team.

Barbara had completed her undergraduate degree with a major in elementary education and a minor in special education. She had completed her work for a Master's in Curriculum and Instruction along with two other young teachers on the campus. All three of the teachers' involved with the masters' program pointed to their collaborative work together as an important learning process for them as they developed their teaching skills.

Barbara was one of the first to make me aware that as a teacher she was very "foggy" about the instructional coach and the use of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. She, however, could describe how the instructional coach engaged in conversations, "I noticed some times that when she sits and talks with you she has this way of repeating what you are saying." In addition, in our first interview she described a particular way in which two of the teachers who had experience with the instructional coach interacted with each other, "I knew (they) had almost a different language in how they talked with each other, the terms they used."

Marilyn. This lack of awareness continued as I moved to my next interview with Marilyn, who appeared to be in her 40's and had a different perspective than other teachers on the campus. She came to teaching from the business world. She left the business world for a ten year period during which she worked in the home raising her three children.

> I thought about what I was going to do for the rest of my life and decided that I wanted to fit with the kid's schedule, plus I wanted to give back to society. So I thought teaching was a good way. My mom was an art teacher…One of the other things too…my oldest daughter has a learning disability, so to me it is critical that every child should have the opportunity to succeed…I think that I am a life-long learner.

This attitude of expectation became a common theme I heard from Marilyn throughout the one-on-one interviews.

Marilyn had taught Kindergarten at Rolling Ridge for four years. She had a business undergraduate degree and previously worked as a sales engineer for IBM. While she had taken an alternative route to teaching, she had completed a master's degree in education which allowed her to obtain a master's and teaching certification simultaneously. She had only taught at Rolling Ridge Elementary. However, because her children attended the Pleasant Valley County Schools, her experiences with the school system were broader than her teaching experience at one school site.

She was a very animated teacher who had a great sense of humor and added some levity to the intense conversations and dialogue during the one-on-one interviews. She was the only kindergarten teacher in the building. Kindergarten classes in this district were half day. Initially, when she was hired four years ago, she taught one kindergarten class half-day. Eventually, during that first year of teaching at the campus, increased enrollment in kindergarten allowed her to teach full-time. However, because Marilyn had no teaching partner, at times, she felt isolated and alone.

As I began to gather Marilyn's perception of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] she was very honest and outspoken from the beginning about her access to the instructional coach. "I did not have an assigned mentor the first year because I was part-time. I was not assigned to work with Shari but she would help me if I asked." Despite her limited access to the instructional coach she understood the importance of the instructional model.

Marilyn, however, understood how the instructional coaching model evolved. As a taxpayer in the Pleasant Valley County School system she remembered the initiative from a district perspective six years ago.

I know when we got our extra money for the state scores, maybe about six years ago, they put coaches in the classroom to help with third and four grade state scores so we could get the mil levy money. I remember this from when I was doing my student teaching and through the media.

Her background as a community resident, parent, and teacher provided a wider lens of perspective.

Diane and Ann. Two of the young teachers at the campus had a much closer working relationship with Shari than any of the other teachers I interviewed. Diane and Ann had taught third grade together when Ann joined the faculty five years ago. Both worked with the instructional coach during the implementation phase of the instructional coaching model. While they were unaware of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process itself, they both recognized that Shari and Jane, the other instructional coach who worked with them that first year, had a specific style in which they interacted. They worked closely in coaching conversations that first year with Jane, the math instructional coach, who left the campus after the first year of implementation. Ann and Diane also worked with the instructional coach and two second grade teachers over a three year period through a Read to Achieve Grant. They had more extensive experience with the instructional coach and coaching conversations than any of the other five teachers who participated in

the one-on-one interviews. Regardless of this experience, they had limited knowledge of the specific terminology or process embedded within the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

Ann. Ann began teaching during the first year in which the district implemented the instructional coaching model and the use of Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations. Ann had the unique experience of having attended Rolling Ridge Elementary as a student. Ann grew up across the street from the elementary school and student taught at Rolling Ridge with Connie, a second grade teacher. Her perspective allowed her to compare and contrast the school across a wide time frame. She functioned as my historian and could share many stories and a different perspective on the campus and district background.

She was in her fifth year of teaching. She had taught third grade for four years and currently taught a fifth/sixth multi age class. She was returning to fourth grade for the next school year to team again with Diane. The third grade, fourth grade, and third/fourth grade teachers worked together as a team.

Ann began teaching third grade in the middle of the year after graduation in December. As she remembered,

> It was an awkward time. I substituted here for semester and then I got a job. I began as a Kindergarten teacher and then when there was a third and fourth grade job open and I was hired for the third grade position. I really didn't have to interview at all.

She had been closely connected to this campus for many years. She and her husband had purchased a home in the area. In fact, she was a runner and in order to maintain a

healthy life style often she ran to school. She was an energetic, friendly young teacher

who had a strong commitment to the school and the community. She was also very

honest and open in her recollection of the implementation process.

Ann very clearly remembered the implementation of the instructional coaching

model. She was aware that the implementation focused on the third and fourth grade

teachers. She was the only teacher who remembered a meeting with a chart in which the

two instructional coaches outlined their role in that very first year. None of the other

third or fourth grade teachers could remember such a meeting. Shari, the instructional

coach, remembered after I specifically read through Ann's recollection, there was such a

chart. In spite of Ann's clear memory of the instructional coach she had little awareness

of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process even though she recognized there were structured

conversations with Shari particularly beginning in the second year of the implementation

process.

Ann had completed her Master's in Curriculum and Instruction along with

Barbara and Diane. Ann currently taught with Barbara in the fifth/sixth grade team and

had previously taught with Diane at third grade. They were close friends and all three

felt a special bond and a connection at this campus. During the one-on-one interviews,

Shari described the master's program and how it had become a bond for these three.

Barbara, Ann, and Diane did a master's degree where you worked as a

collaborative group. You could take as much as you wanted out of it and those

girls got their money's worth. They said, 'We are going to learn, we are going to

write, we are going to study together, and we are going to be together.'

This bond of learning was very evident as I talked with each one of the three during the one-on-one interviews. Barbara recognized there was a process in how Diane and Ann worked together even though she had no terminology to apply to the process.

Diane. Diane, an active hiker with a high energy level had taught third grade at Rolling Ridge Elementary for seven years. She was in her late 20's and planned to be married during the summer months. She was the team leader for the third/fourth grade. She had previously done practicum work at this campus prior to being hired. She had also attended elementary school in the area, a private Catholic school. She grew up in the community adjacent to the Rolling Ridge area. When she graduated she committed to taking the first job she was offered in the area. When Rolling Ridge Elementary was the first to offer her a position she wasn't sure this was the place for her. She spent her first year in a temporary building with 32 students. Then in her second year "the school was remodeled, she had a great teammate, and she felt much better about the school."

Diane was very knowledgeable about how the implementation of the coaching process evolved at this school site. She perceived the instructional coaches as a "gift." She was very open about the resistance of teachers to work with the instructional coach. As a young beginning teacher she recognized the importance of getting help and support from an instructional coach. While she did not identify specific types of Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations or terminology, nonetheless, she recognized the importance of the conversations she had with Shari.

They made me more reflective, more conscious of what I am doing, how it is

really best for the kids. Shari does all the things that help communication,

repeating what we say, paraphrasing.

While Diane lacked the terminology to describe specific Cognitive Coaching[SM]

processes she acknowledged a structure in how Shari interacted with her. She also had

become aware of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process during the current school year when

she attended Adaptive Schools Training with a team of teachers from Rolling Ridge.

Adaptive Schools (Garmston and Wellman, 1999) is a training model that facilitates

collaborative groups and incorporates many of the components of Cognitive

Coaching[SM], e.g., paraphrasing, reflection. The district provided this training to teams

from individual schools in conjunction with district implementation of Cognitive

Coaching[SM]. Diane noted that prior to the current school year, none of the teachers at

Rolling Ridge had attended this training.

Diane had great pride in the state test scores at third grade over the last two years

(see Table 1). While they had experienced a dip in scores one year, they had made

significant gains in reading and math over the last two years. She attributed this to the

work with the Read to Achieve Grant, the coaching conversations with the instructional

coach and the second grade team, and her personal work with her Master's program.

She had completed a Master's in Curriculum and Instruction with Barbara and Ann. She

was a young leader on this campus and other teacher's during the interviews referred to

the success she and Ann had with their students on the state test. Diane had a high level

of expectation for herself and was at times frustrated with teachers who did not set those same high expectations for their students and themselves.

Connie. One of the seven teachers who participated in the one-on-one interviews was Connie, a second grade teacher who had also been a part of the Read to Achieve Grant with Diane and Ann. I heard about Connie from other teachers as I went through my first round of interviews. Teachers would refer to how much I would enjoy meeting Connie and the high level of respect they had for her as a teacher and professional. She was a very experienced teacher. Connie was a middle-aged teacher who began teaching in 1969 and taught until 1975 when she became a full-time mother and homemaker.

She began substitute teaching in 1988 and returned as a teacher at another campus in Pleasant Valley County Schools in 1989. She was originally offered a position at Rolling Ridge but did not want a full-time position. When her position became full-time she transferred to Rolling Ridge as a full time primary teacher. She had taught first and second grade at Rolling Ridge, including a one-two loop where she moved with her students from first through second grade. She had also been a Title I teacher working with eligible Title I students. She had previously taught in other school districts prior to returning to teaching in 1989.

She was a great source to describe the changes that had occurred at Rolling Ridge over the last fifteen years. When she first began teaching at Rolling Ridge the campus did not qualify as a Title I campus. She had specifically noticed the change in the poverty level of the students over the last four to five years. She perceived that many of the homes in the area had become rentals and people who could not afford a down

payment, rented homes in the area. Connie also noted the change in student enrollment over the years, "We went from 400 students to 250 over the years I have been here."

Connie valued professionalism. Several times during the interview process she would make reference to professionalism of teaching. Her husband was the Vice-President of one of the universities in the area. She related her perception of interacting with lay people who did not appreciate nor understand the hard work classroom teachers face on a daily basis.

> It frustrates me that lay people think we are dumbing down and really we are ratcheting up! They have no clue. Do you want to hear my pet peeve? When I am in a setting (and I go to a lot of university functions with my husband in town or across the country), they say 'What do you do' and I say, 'I teach 2nd grade.' It is almost like they pat me on the head and say they are so cute at that age. And it frustrates me that people are clueless about the quality of the work I do and the importance of the work. It really irritates me. That is my pet peeve.

It was her perception that conversations with the instructional coach had in fact raised the level of professionalism at this elementary school. She stated "It has been a shift in not just trying to cover material for the sake of covering material but trying to raise the quality of instruction to the 'fatigue of the teachers.'" My interviews with Connie really confirmed what others had indicated that she was the ultimate professional and a quiet leader that others looked to for guidance.

Connie had served as Ann's supervising teacher. Therefore, her influence on both Ann and Diane through their work together in the Read to Achieve Grant had been

instrumental in the development of these two young teachers and had also influenced this very veteran teacher. Even though Connie also had difficulty identifying the terminology and specificity of Cognitive Coaching[SM], she did recognize that as she interacted with the instructional coach there seemed to always be a "plan." This lack of specificity and ability to describe the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process continually evolved throughout the one-on-one interviews.

Judy. The only non-regular classroom teacher who participated in the one-on-one interviews was Judy, a special education teacher. She described her classroom as an island. She had the district students who needed a more restrictive environment. They were identified as Significant Identifiable Emotionally Disturbed students. As she stated, "I really don't belong to the school but I belong to the district and am housed in this school." She had taught at this campus for ten years. She described how her students had been mainstreamed and began to have access to regular classrooms over the ten years she had worked at the campus. She taught students in grades four to six and her students ranged from nine to twelve years of age.

> When I first came here it was a one-way street. Once you got in my class you never got out. Now we do a full range of inclusion depending on the needs of the child. I started that first year with one teacher in 5/6. And it has grown from one to an expectation with all teachers. Through the years I have tried to work at building relationships with the primary teachers. There have been times when there have been little guys who have started showing signs of problems; I

could see the "writing on the wall". So, I have acted as resource for the primary

teachers.

Judy was a committed teacher who recognized the importance of helping students stay

within the regular classroom setting as much as possible. This need to have students

gain access to the regular classroom was the reason she team taught with the fifth/sixth

grade teachers. She would restructure her class during the math period and teach one

group of fifth/sixth grade students. This purpose was two-fold in that it helped facilitate

small work groups in math and allowed her to meet the needs of her students. As I

listened to her during the interviews it stirred those old emotions I had as a special

education teacher for 15 years. Her commitment was strong, but she also recognized

that gaining access for those students was dependent on her ability to build relationships

with individual teachers.

While Judy had taught for ten years at Rolling Ridge, she had 22 years of total

teaching experience. She began her work in a pre-school daycare and originally got her

undergraduate degree in the area of general education with an elementary certification.

After graduation she taught kindergarten in a private school. During the six years she

taught at this school she met a little boy with severe emotional needs which motivated

her to get her Master's degree in the area of special education. While working on her

master's Judy worked in a residential treatment center for adolescent boys 7-12 years of

age.

From the very beginning, Judy was one of the few teachers who articulated

knowledge of the coaching conversations. Prior to teaching in the Pleasant Valley

County Schools, she had worked with instructional coaches in another district in the area. Therefore, her prior experience helped her understand how to work with an instructional coach and gave her insight into coaching conversations even though she did not always identify the process as Cognitive Coaching[SM]. In addition, the instructional coach provided an avenue for Judy to collaborate and work with another teacher rather than being isolated on her "island."

Judy had a unique perspective as she worked with students with special needs. She had a pronounced physical handicap in that her arms and hands were not in proportion to her body. However, this physical handicap did not slow her down in anyway nor did it keep her from being one of the most positive participants. At the end of one of our one-on-one interview she shared her perception that this physical handicap had interfered in her ability to secure a teaching assignment at a school closer to her home. Therefore, she had an empathy with her students that many others might not have understood. She brought a different perspective to the study and was the only non-regular classroom teacher.

Helen. One of the participants in the one-on-one interviews, Helen, had a distinct perspective on the implementation and use by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Helen had been very resistant to working with the instructional coach by her own admission. She was also perceived and identified as resistant by many of the other teacher participants. At the end of her very first interview she described her own lack of enthusiasm.

Perhaps when you talk to the younger people they are more enthusiastic than

I am because I hate spending a large amount of time on something where there is

no conclusion. You meet and you meet and there is no conclusion so you go

back to your old way or you find a new way but it is not systemic in the school.

With this very first individual interaction, I began to understand that she brought an

important voice and perception to the study.

Helen, who retired at the end of the school year of the study, began her teaching

career in 1968. Helen taught in other states as she transferred with her husband who was

a lawyer. She initially taught in an inner city school system in another state. She taught

in a school district where there was voluntary busing and dealt early in her career with

the issues of integration and bussing. She received her Master's degree in special

education in 1978. She was certified to teach emotionally disturbed and learning

disabled students. She had worked in the Pleasant Valley County Schools for 30 years.

She taught special education for 15 years within the district and had been at Rolling

Ridge for 18 years. She taught the last 15 years in regular education. She had taught

fourth, fifth, and sixth grades during that time span. She had taught split grade levels at

different periods during those 15 years. Helen presently taught in the fourth grade even

though her favorite grade to teach was fifth.

Very quickly, Helen identified that she was the campus union representative. I

asked her to clarify the role of the union in Pleasant Valley County Schools since many

of the teachers I interviewed earlier had referred to the union during our initial

conversations. She explained that, in Pleasant Valley County Schools, the union is more

of an "association rather than affiliated with the AFL-CIO." The school district in the adjacent metropolitan area was affiliated with the AFL-CIO. Within this state, individual districts have the option of affiliation or of maintaining an association status. Nonetheless, this association has contract negotiations with Pleasant Valley Schools on a yearly basis. Every teacher assigned to Rolling Ridge was a member of the Educational Association which functions as a union with district regulatory power.

At times, her perceptions appeared to reflect the concerns of the Pleasant Valley County Schools Educational Association. Many of her stated concerns, e.g., use of teacher planning time, cost of the instructional coaches, role of the instructional coach paralleled those concerns I read in the Association Newsletter. Therefore, I perceived from our conversations that some of Helen's resistance was founded in concerns expressed by the union or association at the district level.

I also found myself both fascinated and somewhat intimidated by Helen. She was so forthright during our first interaction that I almost felt she had an agenda and I was following her agenda rather than my own research design. During that first meeting she made little eye contact with me, her answers and reflections were short and to the point. Our interview was scheduled for an hour but she immediately let me know what time she would need to leave and it ended in less than an hour. I questioned my ability to build rapport with her. However, our second interview was much more relaxed and I felt that while she was very honest and at times blunt we were also beginning to connect. We both seemed to relax. Her eye contact with me during the second interview was much more direct and at the end she even shared a newspaper article about the role of

the instructional coach that was in the Pleasant Valley Educational Association Newsletter. I felt that Helen brought a dimension and voice to the study that might not have been heard otherwise.

Helen consistently demonstrated a lack of awareness and understanding of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. She became aware of the specific process of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} when she attended Adaptive Schools Training with Diane and other staff members during the current school year. Helen stated, "If I had known Shari [the instructional coach] was using that technique with everyone, I wouldn't have felt so wary. I wish I had had the Adaptive Schools Training earlier so I would have known what she was using." Helen's statement demonstrates not only her lack of awareness of the process but also confusion about Shari's role. Helen was a fourth grade teacher, yet maintained throughout our four interviews that she was never aware that the instructional coaches were hired to work with third and fourth grade teachers. This theme of vagueness and lack of understanding of the role of the instructional coach was a common theme from teacher to teacher but was expressed in different ways throughout the one-on-one interviews.

Shari. Shari, the instructional coach, had been assigned to Rolling Ridge Elementary School for five years. She was married, a middle-aged mother of two and worked incessantly throughout the month I was on the campus. Her energy level and organization were obvious as she moved from one team meeting to another and helped teachers organize individual student data. As we began or ended our interview session,

someone was always standing outside the door waiting to have "just a minute" with Shari. She was an integral part of the campus.

She began teaching in 1976 at another elementary school within the Pleasant Valley County Schools after completing student teaching at that campus. Prior to her assignment in 1999 to Rolling Ridge Elementary her experience had been exclusive to that one elementary school site. She began working at the previous campus in a fourth, fifth, sixth grade team during a period when the school was a year round school. She took an extended leave of absence for a period of time during which she had two daughters. She returned to the same campus and taught second grade for nine years and then third grade for nine years.

Not only had Shari taught in this school district for more than twenty-five years, she had also been a parent in the Pleasant Valley County Schools. She had two daughters, one in college, and the other a Senior in high school. Both children had gone through the Pleasant Valley County School system. Shari's parents lived in the area and she had a history and background with the community and metropolitan area surrounding the Pleasant Valley County Schools.

Shari was assigned as one of the first instructional coaches during the initial phase of the implementation process in 2000. She began this position believing she would be away from her campus for two years. Shari worked with three different principals over a five year span. During the first year of implementation she was assigned as one of two half-time instructional coaches to work with the third and fourth grade teachers in language arts at Rolling Ridge. The next year she was assigned to two

elementary schools half-time and responsible for both language arts and math. It was not until the third year that Shari was assigned full-time to Rolling Ridge and had the flexibility to work across grade levels with all teachers, specifically those whose students took the state assessment test. Despite the ability to engage in coaching conversations with teachers other than those assigned to third and fourth grade, this did not become a reality.

Cognitive Coaching[SM] was one of the tools the district wanted instructional coaches to have in their toolbox. Shari explained, "It was one of the tools they wanted them to use to have conversations with people." While the instructional coaches were trained in the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, "No ever told us as coaches to be explicit about what these conversations are called. They never asked us to identify the specific steps and share that they have a lot of power to them." Maria, the principal, who served as an instructional coach prior to being named the principal at Rolling Ridge concurred that they were never "coached" to share the terminology and process itself but just to have the conversations.

Both Maria and Shari perceived that the role of the instructional coach often depended on the vision and understanding of the campus leadership. At times this created dissonance when Shari's concept of the role and expectations differed from the campus leadership. Her perception, however, was congruent with many of the teachers who questioned the use of the instructional coach prior to Maria being assigned as principal. Her role as an instructional coach had been clarified and solidified during the current school year under Maria's leadership. Maria's background as a coach, her

training in the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process, and her understanding of the role of the instructional coach had allowed Shari to work with a principal who had common expectations and goals.

       <u>Maria</u>. The current principal, Maria, was in her first year as a principal. She was not a formal participant in the study, however, she was such an integral part of the study I have included her description in the participant section. Teachers consistently referred to her throughout the interview process.

       Maria was a diminutive, energetic, young grandmother who had an infectious laugh. For the previous four years she had been an instructional coach at an elementary school in the Pleasant Valley County Schools. She had taught seven years as a K-2 teacher and six years as a 3-4 teacher. All of her experiences were in the Pleasant Valley County Schools. She was one of the first instructional coaches to be hired as a principal. She felt strongly that in this first year she had to set a clear vision for her expectations for teachers and staff. Teachers' dialogue concurred that during the current school year there had been a focus on staff development and teachers engaging in dialogue and conversation. Maria's experience and use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process made the process itself more transparent and less invisible to teachers.

       As a first year principal, Maria perceived herself on a learning curve and at times felt overwhelmed. Regardless, the majority of the teachers expressed appreciation and a high level of respect for the new principal. They felt that, as a campus, they had real goals and there were common expectations for all of the teaching staff. During the month that I spent at Rolling Ridge I attended a faculty meeting on diversity training

titled "Value and Respect: Redefining Tolerance." Prior to the workshop the principal asked if I would give her input as a former principal on my perception of the training and the staff reaction. It was an opportunity for me to observe the staff, the training, and Maria's approach as she set expectations with the staff.

Maria wanted the staff to have this training because she felt that many had not really admitted that the population and the poverty level of the campus had changed. She recognized that change was hard and some staff members were in denial about the level of expectations they had for all of the students. She was concerned that at times they set expectations for students based on that child's socioeconomic level or ethnic background. This was an excellent example of how she assessed campus and staff needs and then slowly provided opportunities for people to engage in dialogue and conversation about those challenges that they faced as a group. She did not push but provided opportunities for staff to develop new skills and awareness for the need to change overtime. However, she did set high expectations for all staff members, teachers, clerical staff, and teacher assistants. While she may have felt that she was on a learning curve, many of the teachers articulated the changes had occurred because of her leadership. Maria's background as an instructional coach allowed her to provide strong instructional leadership.

Historical Background of the Implementation of the

Instructional Coaching Model and the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} Process

District Perspective

Districts in this particular state have been allowed to propose increased levels of funding termed mil [sic] levies. The voters approved an increase to the tax rate which provided the district with additional 25 million in funds to increase funding specifically for student achievement. This allowed the district to lower student teacher ratios, increase staff development, and provide instructional coaches for teachers. Under the Performance Promise, the district could receive up to $20 million in additional revenue over a three year period beginning in 2000-2001 if student performance on the state test increased by 25% during those three years.

The implementation of the instructional coach occurred at a district level as a result of a Performance Promise mil levy in 1999. The Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process in the Pleasant Valley County Schools was implemented through the use of an instructional coach.

The district implemented the instructional coaching program during the 2000-2001 school year using a portion of the Performance Promise funds. I conducted my study during the fifth year of the implementation process. The current Executive Director (DLEA) originally was assigned as a principal on special assignment to oversee the implementation of the instructional coaches.

The current Executive Director (DLEA) and her immediate supervisor and the director of staff development were charged with creating a training model for the newly

identified instructional coaches. District administrators perceived that the district needed

to make immediate improvement in student achievement as measured by the state test.

The current Superintendent and the previous Executive Director (DLEA) researched

staff development models and committed to the use of the campus-based coaching

model. The implementation team created a resident staff development model targeting

twenty-seven master teachers as instructional coaches to work with third and fourth

grade teachers. The district administration provided training for the instructional

coaches to use the skills and tools of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. Each instructional coach

had four days of training provided by one of the Co-Directors of Cognitive Coaching[SM].

The 27 teachers received on-going training on a weekly basis. They worked in schools

Monday through Thursday and participated in training sessions on Friday. The Co-

Director for Cognitive Coaching[SM] recalled the first year they did not provide the full

eight-day Cognitive Coaching[SM] Foundational Seminar. Rather, the district provided

four days of training which encompassed some training in Cognitive Coaching[SM] skills.

The training also included specific training in how to develop rapport and trust with

teachers at the campuses where they were assigned as instructional coaches. According

to historical data the Center for Cognitive Coaching[SM] provided the full eight day

training to all instructional coaches during the 2001-2002 school year, the second year of

implementation.

　　　　During the first year of implementation, the school system assigned two

instructional coaches half-time to targeted campuses. One instructional coach worked

with math at third and fourth grades and the other with literacy. All district personnel

and historical data indicated the district hired these instructional coaches to support third and fourth grade teachers in math and language arts at targeted elementary schools. Interestingly, I found conflicting statements about which grade levels were assigned instructional coaches. Teachers assigned to third grade during the first year of implementation indicated coaches were hired to work with them. Helen, the fourth grade teacher did not recall the instructional coach being assigned to her grade level during the first year of implementation.

During the second year of the implementation, 2001-2002, the district restructured the instructional coaches' assignments and one coach was assigned to each school to work in both language arts and math. During the second year the district also implemented the instructional coaching model at the middle schools. While the high school currently had no instructional coaches assigned to their campus, each high school created teams during the second year of implementation to study the instructional coaching model and identify how to utilize coaches in the future. District personnel trained all instructional coaches in the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} Foundation Seminar and the Co-Director for Cognitive Coaching^{SM} provided assistance and follow-up training to the instructional coaches during the second year of implementation.

The county school system district personnel faced a difficult period during the third year of implementation. Pleasant Valley County Schools did not meet the 25% student achievement as required by the 1999 Performance Promise mil [sic] levy. Therefore, the administration was faced with a three million dollar budget shortfall. The Pleasant Valley School Board directed the staff to cut eight personnel units from the

instructional coaching model which resulted in the reduction of a total of 16 instructional coaches. District administrators identified sixteen elementary sites that would no longer have instructional coaches. The district restructured the middle school instructional coaching model and coaches worked with both language arts and math. The high schools implemented the coaching model in all 21 high schools through the use of high school staffing positions. During the 2002-2003 school year the district trained all new instructional coaches in the Cognitive Coaching[SM] Foundation Seminar and trained returning instructional coaches in a five-day advanced training. The district continued to provide weekly training each Friday in order to provide on-going support to the instructional coaches. The Executive Director (DLEA) and the Director of Staff Development became Trainers of Cognitive Coaching[SM] in order to reduce long-term training costs. Through these measures the Pleasant Valley County Schools maintained the integrity of the instructional coaching model despite budget costs. The same model was maintained during the fourth year of implementation, the 2003-2004 school year.

The year during which I conducted the study, the instructional coaching model and training followed the same pattern established over the previous three years. The new instructional coaches trained in the eight day Cognitive Coaching[SM] Foundation Seminar, second year coaches participated in the five day advanced training, and the Co-Directors of Cognitive Coaching[SM] provided two additional days for all instructional coaches. The Co-Directors of Cognitive Coaching[SM] encouraged me to consider Pleasant Valley County Schools because of the training model and the consistent use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process by instructional coaches. They believed that this

particular school system had developed an institutionalized process for implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}.

Early in the process of implementation, the Pleasant Valley Educational Association (PVEA), which teachers referred to as the union, questioned the use of funds and the instructional coaching model. While teachers referred to the educational association as a union, the Pleasant Valley Educational Association was not affiliated with the AFL-CIO but did have regulatory power through contract agreements with the district. The Educational Association did not perceive they had been actively involved in the development of the instructional coaching model nor did they understand the role of the instructional coach. Teachers district-wide expressed concern about the coaches and how their role differed from administrators. In 2003, the union contract established a process to create an on-going, 12 member Instructional Coach Committee to address district-wide concerns. The Pleasant Valley Educational Association expressed concerns about the workload and the use of teachers' planning time to work with the coach before and after school. Some teachers viewed this as a violation of their current contract. I acquired a copy of the Pleasant Valley Educational Association Newsletter which detailed the work of the Instructional Coach Committee composed of teachers, coaches, principals, and central administration. Therefore, I selected the campus union representative as one of the teacher participants in order to be sure all view points of the implementation were represented.

Campus Perspective

One of the first themes that evolved during the initial phase of the study was the teachers' ambiguous understanding of the implementation process of the instructional coach and use of Cognitive Coaching[SM] as identified earlier. Teachers' perception of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process was intertwined with their understanding of the implementation of the instructional coach. The instructional coach was the vehicle through which Cognitive Coaching[SM] was implemented. Therefore, if they did not have access to the instructional coach or were resistant to work with the instructional coach they had limited or little experience with the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

Despite a clearly defined process outlined at the district level, there was limited understanding of the process at the campus level. Teachers' comments demonstrated their lack awareness and understanding of how the process evolved /or implemented at both a district and campus level. Consistently, however, teachers acknowledged that Shari had been assigned to the campus for the five years during the implementation process. Her consistency and Maria's experience was one of the major reasons the Executive Director (DLEA) originally encouraged me to talk with Rolling Ridge Elementary School. Instructional coaches in those early years of implementation were moved and reassigned and often campuses did not have the same coach over a five year period. Despite changes within the district, Shari remained at Rolling Ridge having been one of the two original half-time coaches assigned to Rolling Ridge to work with third and fourth grades in language arts and math. Only a limited number of teachers were aware that her original role was to work with third and fourth grade teachers.

Nonetheless, several noted the instructional coaches were hired after voters approved the Performance Promise mil [sic] levy which focused on improving student achievement.

The county school system assigned Shari to two elementary campuses during the second year of implementation to support teachers in both language arts and math and focus on student achievement. Beginning in the third year she was assigned full-time to the campus and teachers were not exactly sure which grade levels the district or campus targeted for assistance. Many teachers assumed that Shari's focus in those early years were the grades in which state tests were administered, grades three through six. Beginning in the third year of implementation, Shari was assigned full-time to Rolling Ridge Elementary. From the teachers' perspective her focus was to work closely with teachers whose students took the state assessment test and those teachers involved in a Read to Achieve Grant.

Read to Achieve Grant

The instructional coach identified the Read to Achieve Grant as the vehicle through which she instituted and formalized both Cognitive Coaching^{SM} and the consistent use of the coaching model. At the end of the first year, the principal requested the instructional coach work with Helen and another fourth grade teacher to write a Read to Achieve Grant. One of the teachers accessed a copy of the grant written by another school in the district which had earlier received the same type of grant. Therefore, Shari worked with the fourth grade teachers to apply for the grant that focused on literacy at second and third grades and provided a summer school for those students going into fourth.

From Shari's perspective, writing this grant was a daunting task. She acknowledged this was her first attempt at writing a grant. She described the process she used to develop the grant. Not knowing where to begin, "I got Richard Allington's book, *What Works for Struggling Readers* and just started reading through chapters. I took a survey from first and second grade teachers and looked at the five components of reading." She asked them to identify what they perceived as the critical components for reading. Through survey and discussions with teachers, she identified the need to focus the Read to Achieve Grant on fluency and comprehension. Then she stated, "I decided I would be selfish. I wrote in that we would have collaborative, collegial conversations on a once a month basis at least 6 times a year for half days." The school was awarded the grant for three years. She assumed responsibility for the implementation of the grant at the beginning of the new school year, her second year on the campus. During that second year she was the only instructional coach assigned to Rolling Ridge and assumed responsibility to support teachers in both language arts and math.

Teachers acknowledged again and again the importance of the Read to Achieve Grant to both the instructional coaching model and the use of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. The kindergarten teacher, Marilyn stated, "It [the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process] has been successful in the grade levels where she [the instructional coach] worked with the Read to Achieve grant, where they really did a lot of planning and the coaching process." Marilyn felt that the growth of instructional professionalism at the second and third grades was a direct result of the instructional coach and the teams working together through the Read to Achieve Grant. In addition, Judy stated that the Read to Achieve

grant "was a big piece" of what contributed to the continued use of the coaching process. She related the story of a time when she asked Shari why she even bothered to stay in a building not always friendly for an instructional coach. Judy remembered Shari's response as, "Shari stuck it out because she had a commitment to the grant." I asked Shari why she stayed when others recognized the difficulty in working with some of the teachers. She stated, "I think that was probably by year two the previous principal was getting vibrations that I wanted to leave . She encouraged me to go where the teachers wanted me, i.e., Ann and Diane" who were an integral part of the Read to Achieve Grant. Even though Judy was not a teacher directly involved with the grant, she recognized the importance the grant had to continued use of the instructional coach and the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

Helen was admittedly resistant to the use of the instructional coach, nonetheless, she acknowledged the relationship the instructional coach built with those teachers involved in the grant. "It looked to me like a structured sequence on covering things and we [fourth grade] worked more haphazardly." Teachers acknowledged an awareness of the Read to Achieve Grant and its importance to the development of the instructional coaching model and the use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

The instructional coach described the process of building what she termed a fabulous collaboration. "The second grade teachers were two veteran teachers who understood reading, and had a handle on what guided reading was about." Connie had been Ann's student teacher. Shari described the development of collegiality and collaborative conversations among the four teachers.

So here we have these two baby teachers and these two veteran teachers and over those three years of time they became those interdependent colleagues who saw each other as having strengths and were willing to say, 'What do you think, do you think I was right on about this kid? It was really the consistent place where we could talk about student…I structured those conversations around reflecting questions. What evidence do we have that these students are not progressing? What evidence do we have that we should be moving these kids as a group? What is your evidence? Always having them bring that data with them. We have been reading in level 24 now for three weeks and they are consistently at 95% and they are really moving along like the leaders of the second grade. We were talking about instruction but always basing it on the data piece.

Shari's description deepened my understanding of how the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process was used as a tool to guide collegial conversations.

Three of the four teachers involved with the grant, Ann, Diane, and Connie, described similarities in terms of the process of the instructional coach and the use of the Cognitive CoachingSM process. However, their description conveyed the development of the collegiality from a personal point of view. Diane related how she perceived the group came together during those grant meetings. "The first 15 minutes were socializing and catching up with each other. We really needed to start to build those relationships among each other, later we could be honest and say I am struggling with teaching fluency." Ann described how the grant was structured to provide consistent time for

them to meet together and impact their educational practice, "We met once a month for

at least half a day, sometimes a full day. The grant allowed for subs and Shari was so

great giving us resources. My reading instruction improved dramatically from that

grant." Connie described the process which occurred during those grant meetings.

> We would always have some article, chapter, or video and then we could
>
> debrief.… What we liked about it, what we pulled from the article. Then Shari
>
> was more of a mediator, probably part of the coaching process, she kept the
>
> conversation going among the four of us. She asked questions such as, 'If you
>
> were actually in the classroom how would that work?' Then we would debrief.

This description brought to life the role the instructional coach played during collegial

conversations that were an integral part of those grant meetings.

The Role of the Instructional Coach and the Cognitive Coaching[SM] Process

Job Description and Role of the Instructional Coach

As I dug through the historical data I found detailed job descriptions of the role

of the instructional coach in the teacher association newspaper. The teachers'

association had been actively involved at a district level in defining the role of the coach

and developing an evaluation tool to assess the effectiveness of the model. This article

defined the instructional coach as a resource integrated into the school to provide

campus-based, job-embedded, professional development (PVEA, 2005b, p. 5). Both

Maria and Shari confirmed this position was supported by the district's DLEA which

focused on increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap. The role of

the coach was to provide support for professional development through collaboration, consultation, and coaching.

The district held the instructional coach responsible for collaborating with the school principal and the staff to plan and provide for coordinated, purposeful, deliberate action that include collaboration, supporting new and experienced staff. They were responsible for providing feedback, modeling, training teachers, and coordinating resources at individual campuses. The instructional coach's job description required them to facilitate team and department work, co-teach, and consult with staff. They provided informal and formative observations that facilitate coaching conversations specific to the teacher's data. Instructional coach's helped to design, implement, and assess the school site's induction program for first and second year teachers.

The instructional coaches collaborated in the design and implementation of a professional development plan at individual campuses that aligned with each school's Strategic and School Accreditation Plan. This entailed the development of meaningful professional development based on the analysis of school-wide data. The instructional coaching model within the Pleasant Valley County School reflected the National Staff Development Council (NSDC, 2001) Standards and Models which provide school based support for teachers in the form of instructional coaches.

Teachers at Rolling Ridge reflected the district's intent as they constantly described the instructional coach as a "resource." Barbara explained, "She is a resource. She can tell me where to go or she will contact somebody and find the information for me." Ann described her role as a teacher for teachers. She said, "I didn't look at it as

someone to boss me around but someone who was going to have time to work with me."
She also acknowledged that the instructional coaches' years of experience made her feel
that she "knew curriculum from a teacher's point of view." Marilyn perceived the
coaching role as more of a mentor. While teachers recognized the instructional coaching
role as one of support they lacked clear understanding of her assigned role at this
campus.

Teachers had great difficulty identifying the specific teachers or grade level at
Rolling Ridge to whom the instructional coaches were initially assigned. Ann was the
only teacher who remembered a specific meeting during the first year with the third and
fourth grade teachers in which the two half-time coaches defined their role. Neither
Helen nor Diane who were in third and fourth grades, could recall a particular meeting
when the instructional coaching role was defined. This inconsistency and inability to
describe the role of the instructional coach was prevalent throughout the study.

While teachers recognized the role of the instructional coach as a resource, they
had limited understanding of the exact job description at Rolling Ridge. Shari confirmed
that in the beginning there was really no job description. "At the beginning it was
vague…they wanted the scores to go up. Now they really know what it is they want
from us. That first year it was very nebulous." Barbara described this nebulousness
when she said,

> I think the biggest frustration was not knowing the role, with the
> implementation it seems we would have more staff development about the role as
> a (total) staff so we would know what the job is. How are we suppose to use her?

When it first started five years ago I had no idea. That has been the biggest

frustration for me from the beginning.

This feeling of frustration was equally evident to Marilyn who stated in a follow-up e-

mail after reflecting on our conversations, "As teachers we are left to guess what the

coach is ultimately responsible for. For coaching to be successful here and in the

district, coaches have to communicate why they are at the school and what they are

doing." While teachers articulated limited understanding of the instructional coach, I

immediately became aware that there was even less understanding or awareness of the

Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

The Cognitive Coaching[SM] Process

While the district had a well-defined implementation process from a district

perspective, this same level of understanding was not always evident at the campus

level. Teachers were tentative in their understanding of the Cognitive Coaching[SM]

process. The Cognitive Coaching[SM] process developed by Garmston and Costa (2002)

encompasses three specific types of conversations: reflection, planning, and

problem/solving conversations. As I interviewed teachers and Shari, it became apparent

that, in addition to a lack of recognition of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, teachers

also were limited in their recollection of the different types of conversations. Therefore,

I developed a protocol (See Appendix D) that contained components and types of

questions asked during reflecting and planning conversations. I used this protocol to

guide questions during one of the one-one-one interviews to better understand their

perception of the process. The instructional coach herself identified the reflection

conversation as the process she used most consistently. As I read and listened to the

interview transcripts I attempted to pull apart and put together the teachers' words to

listen for examples of the Cognitive Coaching^SM process. Teachers shared examples of

questions that Shari often used in conversations such as, "What are some things you did

to make that happen? What are some specific patterns or trends that seem to be

emerging?" These are examples of reflection questions found in the learning guide of

the Cognitive Coaching Foundation Seminar (Center for Cognitive Coaching, 2002,

p. 61). The instructional coach expressed that she used reflection conversations more

often because" talking to people about what they have done seems more natural and

people are willing to take their time for that." Connie acknowledged that she had heard

many of the questions as she read through the reflection questions (See Appendix D).

However, she stated, "I was never aware of any process; I thought it was just the

instructional coach and her personality in how she worked with us."

　　　　The instructional coach perceived that she used the planning conversations when

she worked with the teachers through the Read to Achieve Grant. A planning

conversation includes clarifying goals; specifying success indicators or a plan for

collecting evidence; anticipating strategies, approaches and decisions to monitor the

plan; identifying personal learning; and reflecting on the coaching process. As an

instructional coach she used only portions of those steps. Shari began the planning

meetings with asking questions about the standards and helping teachers clarify why

they were teaching something. The teachers involved with the grant felt they actually

used the personal learning a great deal. Diane remembered, "We ended up talking about

that [personal learning]. What do you want to make sure you do well and we would talk about those things." Connie recalled the personal learning from the perspective of the teachers new to the teaching profession. "I thought some things they would know automatically, they didn't. I realized that stuff over the years [that you learn], they were interested in hearing some of the strategies that worked." She described the meeting process as follows,

> I could see in Shari's mind she knew where she was going. We were a very
> active discussion group so it was hard to rope us in. Shari would analyze the
> data, trying to have us figure out why the data showed what it did. Where we
> could go next?

This quote clarified that teachers really had an innate awareness of a process or a format as she worked with teachers particularly those involved with the Read to Achieve Grant. Judy perceived, "The instructional coach, moves you along but you don't recognize she is doing that. You think you are doing it yourself but really you are growing and she is pushing to do that." There was an invisible awareness of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process even if they did not often have names to attach to the process.

Overview of the Chapter Content

The historical background of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] and the instructional coaching model provided a framework of understanding as I gathered and analyzed data. The perception of the implementation process from a district and campus perspective provided a schema to begin to listen and look for evident patterns

within the data. The historical background along with the understanding of the campus and district environment provided a structure for comprehension as data evolved during interviews and observations.

I analyzed data for patterns that emerged during the case study and continuously constructed meaning by chunking key phrases together around themes or patterns. I introduced the theme of lack of understanding and clarity of the Cognitive Coaching process in this chapter. In the next chapter I extend those themes and describe additional patterns or findings.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Themes emerged immediately and others evolved over time as I analyzed and synthesized the data. I introduced the theme of lack of understanding and clarity of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process in Chapter IV. Cognitive Coaching^{SM} was a district initiated implementation. The implementation was neither designed nor planned at the campus level which created this void of understanding at the campus level. During my initial visit to Pleasant Valley County Schools, I gathered the background information on the implementation of the instructional coaching model and the use of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} from the Executive Director of the Department of Learning and Educational Achievement. There was no written historical outline of the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. Based on my initial meeting with the Executive Director I developed a historical outline of the implementation process (See Appendix G) to use as a reference and to share with both Shari the instructional coach and the Co-Directors of Center for Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. During the early interviews I perceived that teacher's defined the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} in terms of their work with the instructional coach. Therefore, the implementation process became dependent on their interaction and work with the instructional coach.

The influence of the campus leadership on the implementation process solidified as I interviewed teachers and specifically Shari, the instructional coach. Teachers and Shari readily identified the campus leadership as a major factor in the implementation

process. It was both an obstacle and a contributor to the implementation process.

Campus leadership also closely aligned with the theme of teacher's resistance or their

openness and willingness to change. This was a central theme to which teachers referred

throughout the study and aligned with researcher's findings reviewed in Chapter II.

The theme of the development of relationship and trust evolved more slowly as I

analyzed the data and synthesized the findings in attempt to understand the

implementation process. Teachers' provided examples of their level of trust with the

instructional coach and defined trust in terms of characteristics. This was a finding that

was not surprising, but had not been prevalent in review of the implementation research.

The theme of influence on change in educational practice solidified as I probed to

understand what contributed to and interfered with the implementation process. Student

achievement was a theme that evolved as a by-product of teachers' descriptions of the

Read to Achieve Grant. I discovered a synergy and interrelatedness among each of the

six themes as I interviewed and conducted the research study.

Lack of Understanding and Clarity of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} Process

Implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} and Instructional Coach- District-Initiated

During my initial visit I interviewed the Executive Director for Learning and

Educational Achievement (DLEA) to understand the context and process of the

implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} from a district perspective. The Directors of

the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} Center previously identified the Executive Director for DLEA

as instrumental in the development and implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] in the

Pleasant Valley County Schools.

The implementation was neither designed nor planned at the campus level based

on my initial interview with the Executive Director of DLEA and Shari, the instructional

coach. Rather the implementation of the instructional coach was designed by the

Department of Learning and Educational Achievement (DLEA) after the voters' passed

a mil[sic] levy tax to focus on increased student achievement. The instructional

coaching model was designed at the district level and implemented targeted campuses

(Personal Interview, Executive Director of DLEA, April 2005). The Executive Director

shared that in order for the Pleasant Valley County Schools to meet the Performance

Promise to the taxpayers, the district "identified schools where we had the greatest

opportunity to increase student achievement." The district identified the campuses and

the 27 coaches that were initially placed on those targeted campuses during the first year

of implementation. This description was confirmed by an article in the Pleasant Valley

Educational Association Newsletter (2005).

As a result of the passage of the Performance Promise mil[sic] levy in 1999,

Instructional coaches (IC) were added to support targeted elementary schools in

an effort to improve student learning. Based on research that clearly

demonstrated the advantages of school-based instructional support, PVEA

actively supported the action and, in fact, lobbied a wavering school board.

In the early phase of the interview process, I began to hear that teachers perceived the implementation by an instructional coach of Cognitive Coaching[SM] as a district initiative.

As I probed and questioned who advocated for the instructional coaches, teachers often identified the district administration. Marilyn stated, "I think it is probably the administrative staff. It is the group in the administration that probably does push for it. I don't think it is the school board." Judy, the special education teacher, attended many district meetings because students were placed in her classroom from schools across the district. She recalled conversations from district meetings,

> I am not really sure who advocated for the process. I know it had to do with the Performance Promise money…(It) appeared to pay for them I guess. We (the teachers) needed training. We needed someone we could work with. We heard information in district meetings.

When asked the question who advocated for the instructional coaches, Helen, the fourth grade teacher stated

> Our Superintendent. I don't think many of the teachers. Although we were asked in surveys and the surveys came back through the union. The union did not necessarily think Cognitive Coaching[SM] [instructional coaches] were worth the money we were spending. The Superintendent feels that they are.

Helen interchangeably used Cognitive Coaching[SM] and the instructional coach and I often had to ask her to clarify her statement as indicated in the quotation above. Helen

shared. "The Superintendent is really big on Cognitive Coaching[SM]. I believe that is what she was before she rose to her rank as Superintendent."

In fact, according to both the Executive Director and Shari, the Superintendent was a proponent of Cognitive Coaching[SM] but not trained in Cognitive Coaching[SM]. During my interview with the Executive Director she shared that Director of Staff Development in Pleasant Valley County Schools during the initial phase of implementation was trained in Cognitive Coaching[SM] which resulted in this process being implemented in conjunction with the instructional coaching model. Additional members of the district administrative staff had both awareness and training in the Cognitive Coaching[SM].

Teachers' believed that district personnel, the Superintendent, and administrative staff, were instrumental in the implementation of both the instructional coaching model and the use of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. In none of the interviews did teachers identify the campus leadership as the initial group that planned and designed the implementation of the instructional coach or Cognitive Coaching[SM]. Cognitive Coaching[SM] was never described as a campus-initiated process.

In my initial meeting with the Executive Director, Shari, and Maria I asked about the training provided to the campus leadership. All shared that principals were not trained in the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. In fact, the training over the last five years had only been provided to the instructional coaches. An individual principal would have to request training. There are instructional coaches such as Maria, who are now principals and they represent a small group of principals trained in Cognitive

Coaching[SM]. Prior to the implementation of instructional coaching, some schools in the area had received the Cognitive Coaching[SM] training but not specifically through a district initiative. Shari, had previously been trained in Cognitive Coaching[SM] when she was a teacher at her former campus. However, this training was not required throughout the district.

Teachers confirmed that the current principal, Maria, had been trained as an instructional coach. As Shari described the training provided to the instructional coaches, I probed for the personnel who were trained in Cognitive Coaching[SM], specifically principals or personnel within the curriculum department. I wanted to understand the systemic nature of the training at Rolling Ridge and throughout the county school system. Shari remembered the following personnel included in the training.

> The heads of those departments. Science, Social Studies, Math…It could have been the math department people did not come until that second year, even though math has been more a part of us. I guess that maybe in the second year when we did the eight days—everyone who was in those departments. I remember the Director of Foreign Language, Music, Art, P.E.… they were there. People were there from assessment. There is a gigantic group of people who have been trained."

Those trained were staff members within the DLEA. Principals were not included among those involved in the Foundational Seminars for Cognitive Coaching[SM].

Despite my awareness of the Cognitive Coaching^SM training, it was imperative that I understand Shari's perception of the Cognitive Coaching^SM training provided to the instructional coaches within the Pleasant Valley County Schools.

> The early ones [training sessions] were the planning and reflecting conversations…It was always about building that trust and rapport…The significance of that…Every time we have always gone back and talked about that [trust and rapport] with new layers of coaches….That is so significant to build that trust and rapport to make your work become meaningful because of that credibility piece….Always every year, we have to go back to that and touch on how that impacts your work. Then we have to do the practice, so much practice is embedded in the building relationships, planning conferences, reflecting conferences and a lot of conversations where you practice the pausing and paraphrasing. That is the essence that was embedded every single time at those practices.

Her description provided an understanding of those specific types of conversations in which she had been trained. It provided terminology and language that I listened for as I interviewed teachers.

Even though many teachers could not identify the training as Cognitive Coaching^SM, they were aware that there was a formal training of some type. They had particularly become aware that there was a process during the current school year when Maria, who had been an instructional coach, was assigned as Principal. The teachers

recognized that Maria had knowledge of the process because of her prior experience as a coach. Judy stated her perception as follows:

> She [Maria, the principal] is very strong as a teacher leader. She is an educator first and foremost. Yes, she has the principal piece but there is no doubt that she has walked in that coaching role. Through the whole process she has been a part of teaching teachers. She models, she is constantly dialoguing, she will question. Even in her approach in addressing an issue, she is questioning.

Ann also commented on her awareness of Maria's training. "Maria knows what a coach is supposed to be used for. She is aware how to efficiently use a coach. She was a coach for four years." Teachers acknowledged Maria's skills and recognized that she brought a different perspective because of her background.

Teachers acknowledged Maria's skills and recognized that Maria and Shari used similar language, asked them similar questions, and used similar structures in meetings. Marilyn shared an experience in which Maria clarified the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process with her earlier in the year.

> I wasn't aware of it [Cognitive Coaching^{SM}] until Maria mentioned it in one of our meetings. I was one of the people she asked her boss to watch and Maria explained, what she would be doing during the observation. She was trying to take me a step up in my teaching. Since these kids are doing this…How do you think you will get them to take the next step? She said that 'Shari does such a great job at coaching you don't even know that she is doing it.' I thought—you are right.

Diane identified that "Maria was known as being 'the' coach, the best in the district."

She recognized the similarities and felt that Maria had been a strong influence on Shari

during the current school year.

> I feel like for first time Shari used the paraphrasing and the
>
> questions…which got me going…she kept asking questions over and over again.
>
> I see Maria do that a lot when I meet with her, which really makes you reflect on
>
> what you are doing.

It was Diane's perception that, during the current school year, Shari was utilizing the

Cognitive Coaching^{SM} skills more than she had in the past.

One of the most detailed descriptions of coaching conversations was provided by

Ann as described her observation of Maria, the new principal.

> Maria never interrupts people. She listens to what you are saying….and then
>
> she paraphrases and she has great wait time when she is thinking about things.
>
> She pauses. I don't know…Maria really asks good questions that help me think
>
> and help you get to what you are trying to think about… For example, I was
>
> trying to decide about the grade level where I would teach next year and she was
>
> using questions to help me think what that was the best thing for the school, for
>
> me. She didn't say that exactly, she just made me think.

I probed to see if she saw Shari use the same process over the five years they had

worked together. Ann replied, "I do, but I see Maria doing it more." I asked her to

reflect on the process Shari used, "I did notice Shari paraphrasing, pausing and those

types of things." As I listened to teachers' conversations I heard them compare and

contrast the process Shari had used with them in conversations to Maria's interaction with them during the current school year.

Judy had been one of the teachers who acknowledged having been involved in coaching conversations prior to the current school year. I perceived that her understanding helped her appreciate having more than one person trained in the use of coaching conversations.

To me that has been the coolest part about having Maria this year, I don't have one coach, I have two. Both are so good at being able to sit down and discuss instructions with me and talk about questions and answers. To me it is like this sponge, 'give me more.'

Regardless of her excitement at having two people trained in coaching conversations, there was little awareness of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process itself.

The teacher's description of the principal's use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process belies the fact that in early interviews I began to recognize that very few of the teachers understood or recognized the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, the varied types of conversations, or terminology. During the first interview I specifically asked the question, 'When did you feel like the process of Cognitive Coaching[SM] began to occur at this campus?" Barbara was the first interview and answered the question in reference to the coach. "My first year we did not have any coaches in the building…The first year there were no coaches and the second they began to use the process. When Shari came, that is when I saw the process begin." As I attempted to clarify that I was really focusing on the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, Barbara responded with "My only

process is Shari." During my initial meeting with the participants there was little

reaction when I would ask about the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

During my second interview I questioned Marilyn and asked her to "Describe the

implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. What does it look like to you?"

She readily admitted, "I don't know the definition of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}." She gave

an example of when she first heard about Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. I have been doing

Reading Recovery [primary literacy program] training this year. They [the trainers]

talked about Cognitive Coaching^{SM} in Reading Recovery." Marilyn noted that the

Reading Recovery trainers described Cognitive Coaching^{SM} as a process where, "People

are asking questions so that they are thinking about what they are doing."

My third interview was with Diane, who had taught third grade and worked from

the beginning with the instructional coaches. Therefore, I thought I might hear more of a

process answer from Diane. I asked the question, "How do you describe the

implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process?" She answered the question by

identifying the instructional coaches that she worked with as follows,

> The instructional coach was brought to us as a gift for third and fourth grade
>
> teachers. That is why Ann and I were able to be on the beginning because we
>
> were both third grade teachers….I think actually Ann and I am most aware of
>
> how it evolved because when the process first started…That must have been my
>
> second or third year. It was Ann's first year. We had Shari and we had Jane [as
>
> instructional coaches]. The first year we had two people and we didn't really

process is Shari." During my initial meeting with the participants there was little

reaction when I would ask about the Cognitive Coaching^SM process.

During my second interview I questioned Marilyn and asked her to "Describe the

implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^SM process. What does it look like to you?"

She readily admitted, "I don't know the definition of Cognitive Coaching^SM." She gave

an example of when she first heard about Cognitive Coaching^SM. I have been doing

Reading Recovery [primary literacy program] training this year. They [the trainers]

talked about Cognitive Coaching^SM in Reading Recovery." Marilyn noted that the

Reading Recovery trainers described Cognitive Coaching^SM as a process where, "People

are asking questions so that they are thinking about what they are doing."

My third interview was with Diane, who had taught third grade and worked from

the beginning with the instructional coaches. Therefore, I thought I might hear more of a

process answer from Diane. I asked the question, "How do you describe the

implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^SM process?" She answered the question by

identifying the instructional coaches that she worked with as follows,

> The instructional coach was brought to us as a gift for third and fourth grade
>
> teachers. That is why Ann and I were able to be on the beginning because we
>
> were both third grade teachers….I think actually Ann and I am most aware of
>
> how it evolved because when the process first started…That must have been my
>
> second or third year. It was Ann's first year. We had Shari and we had Jane [as
>
> instructional coaches]. The first year we had two people and we didn't really

meet with them. We met more with Jane than with Shari. They went to two

different schools.

Again the question was answered in terms of the personnel rather than the process.

Therefore, I began to adjust the question and acknowledge that the instructional coach

and the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process were implemented simultaneously.

It was my hope as I began the interview with Connie that I would get a much

higher level of understanding from this veteran, experienced teacher. I asked, "I want

your perception on how the implementation occurred on this campus?" Her answer only

raised my anxiety. "It is all really very vague to me. I know there was a year that the

district funded coaches and every building got one. It is my understanding that some

buildings had to share a coach." Again, she answered the question in terms of the

personnel, not the process. This vagueness, lack of awareness, and inability to describe

the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process itself became a theme that continued throughout the

interview process. I recognized, as researcher, that I would have to continually probe the

teachers' perception of the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} through their

individual work with the instructional coach.

Instructional Coach's Role in the Implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}

I had heard initially from the Executive Director of DLEA and Shari that the

Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process was implemented through the instructional coaches as

they worked with third and fourth grade teachers. Therefore, as I began my first

interview with Helen, a fourth grade teacher, I assumed she would have a great deal of

information and knowledge. In spite of her background, she consistently claimed

limited knowledge. I posed the question, "How would you describe the implementation

of the use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process." I again identified that I was studying

the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process but recognized that I would

need to study this process through the implementation of the instructional coach. She

answered, "We had monthly meetings. Shari was half time here and half time at another

elementary school. Shari would meet with us along with the other elementary school

[where she was assigned]." I probed for her perception of interaction and opportunities

to work with the instructional coach. Helen stated,

> I didn't work with Shari the second or third year. In the fourth year, I met
>
> with her a lot. She did sample lessons and worked with me in my classroom with
>
> the students. Their lessons were always geared to the state test. When she was
>
> doing demonstration lessons she knew more about what to expect from the state
>
> test scores and how to help with the test. We had to work on those because we
>
> had to raise the test scores or we would have been in a big trouble.

I continued to probe her understanding of why she did not work with the instructional

coach when in fact through other interviews I had become aware that the instructional

coaches were hired to work with third and fourth grades. Therefore, during the second

interview I specifically asked, "Why do you think you did not have more access or were

not able to use Shari when she was targeted to work with you in those first two years?"

She again clarified, "I am not sure she was targeted to work with us. They were always

targeted to work with K-2." I continued to probe and stated that it was my

understanding, "They [instructional coaches] were targeted to work with third and fourth

grades." She insisted, "They didn't work with fourth grade. Third grade used them a lot but fourth grade didn't. Therefore, I asked, "Did you ever have a meeting where you sat with the coaches?' Her answered surprised me,

> Yeah, we use to meet in here [the interview room] with the coaches. We did those charts, what was important I think they probably said they were suppose to help us with our implementation of the standards. I know with Jane we did what we should be teaching in math and what month…We didn't do that with Shari the first year. Shari didn't work with fourth grade very much.

I completed this interview recognizing that I would have to continue to clarify Helen's perception which alluded to both confusion and possible resistance.

I wove the question of the target grades levels where the instructional coach used coaching conversations into all three one-on-one interviews with Helen. In addition, I addressed this lack of clarity in our last follow-up webcam interview.

> Helen, you stated that you were unclear about the role of the coach and you consistently did not know that she was suppose to work with you—in spite of so many others indicating they knew she was to work with the third and fourth grades because of the Performance Promise. In our last interview you talked about meetings with the coach and stated that 'they probably were suppose to help us with the standards.' Can you clarify those meetings and what you did understand?

Helen reiterated and explained her understanding of the meetings and the role of the instructional coaches.

We [Helen and teammate] were teaching straight fourth grade and never met

with any other grade level than ourselves. We met with Shari and Jane and the

purpose was to set a calendar for what we were going to teach. We met with

Shari at other times in the conference room regarding our students, I was not sure

if that was the first or second year.

Throughout all of the four interviews, Helen consistently maintained that the previous

principal never shared the role of the coach nor her expectation for the use of the

instructional coach. From the first interview with Helen, I recognized her resistance but

also recognized her lack of understanding which she adamantly maintained throughout

all of the interview sessions.

Among all the teachers there was a sense of confusion about the role and use of

the instructional coach in addition to the lack of awareness of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM}

process. In the early phase of the implementation process it appeared the role of the

instructional coach had not been clearly defined at this campus. Barbara clarified,

I think a lot of people were really confused, not knowing how to utilize Shari

and we just weren't sure what was going on. I think there were a lot of people in

this building at that time who did not want to change and did not want any advice

on how to teach…and so that was what was really hard for me as a teacher. I

was coming in with all these new ideas from college. You think you know

everything and you don't know everything and it is scary. So all I had to go from

was what these people who had been teaching for years told me to do…and so I

think maybe there were teachers more like myself who needed someone who

knew the best practices and who knew how to guide us.

Barbara had only worked closely with Shari during the current school year. Therefore, it

was my hope that those who had worked closely with the instructional coach throughout

the five years would have a better understanding.

Ann, a former third grade teacher presently assigned to fifth/sixth grade, had the

most vivid description of the role of the instructional coach beginning with the first year

of implementation.

When I first came to the school Shari's job was shared with another coach.

There was a math coach and Shari was a literacy coach at the time. I remember

them coming in and explaining this is what a coach is and this is what it is not.

They had a T-chart and they put magnets of what it is and is not. They explained

the process to us and I was really relieved and excited to have that coming in my

first year. I was a third grade teacher.

During the interview Ann described the chart shown in Table 2.

Table 2.—2000-2001 T-Chart of the Instructional Coaching Role

What Coaching Is	What Coaching Is Not
They are here to give feedback	They are not here to be judgmental
To help you	They are not here to criticize
Here to observe and talk with you	They did not want us to feel like they were
Act as a resource	hovering over us making judgments

During our next interview, I shared Table 2 with Ann, who acknowledged that the chart

was as a correct representation of her description.

I also shared this chart with Shari and she confirmed there was such a chart an wondered out loud what happened to the chart. She recalled, however, "A T-chart with three components. We had two graphic organizers over time. We also had a Venn diagram that overlapped. We really evolved and things kept getting printed as we evolved...it really was the Ex. Director of DLEA's brain child." She remembered that she and Jane (the other half-time coach the first year) shared this model with both the third and fourth grade teachers.

There was inconsistency among the teachers assigned to third and fourth grade in terms of clearly defined descriptions of the instructional coaching role. Ann had a vivid description of the role of the instructional coach, Diane recalled the implementation of the instructional coach in terms of personnel, and Helen professed limited understanding. My level of anxiety grew as I attempted to understand teachers' perceptions of the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process by an instructional coach.

As I probed to understand the role of the coach, teachers described how the coach was used by the previous administration rather than giving their own description of her role. Judy stated. "The previous administration has really used the coach as an administrative secretary…She helped with paperwork, did what she needed her to do for the administration, she filled out the accountability plan." Connie described the use of the coach as follows: "It seems to me that the previous principal was using Shari as a Vice-Principal and so Shari would fill in the gaps of her [principal] weaknesses." Diane observed, "The previous principal saw Shari as an Assistant Principal….We never saw

Shari…She was going to meetings for the principal, giving us information at staff

meetings that the principal should have been giving, calendars and what not."

Teachers were unclear of Shari's role, particularly in the first three years of the

implementation. They had difficulty articulating or even recognizing the process. After

the first round of interviews, I was struggling to find ways to probe and clarify the

questions concerning the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process and

understanding of the role of the instructional coach. Therefore, as I shared my

understanding of individual's recollections of the process at the beginning of the second

interviews, I also gave them an outline of the implementation process at Rolling Ridge

based on a compilation from the initial one-on-one interviews and the initial interview

with the Executive Director of DLEA (See Appendix G). I used this as a catalyst for

discussion during our second one-on-one interviews.

Throughout the second interview process I shifted my questions from asking

specifically about the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process and began asking the participants

"To think of an example of where the instructional coach helped them think through and

reflect on instructional techniques." I was asking them to describe a process in which

they interacted with the instructional coach rather than asking them specifically about

the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Marilyn was one of the first I asked the question

about a coaching process. She shared, "Last year ….I would show her things…We

would meet in the halls and I would ask her what did she think about that…like more

snippets." She noted that "Maria has brought up coaching a lot more…..I am sure Shari

used it with me but I wasn't aware of it."

Diane described the process as she compared the teachers and Shari's interaction in previous years with the current school year. "She [Shari] does all the things that help communication, repeating what we say, paraphrasing. This year she is starting to put the questions on us more. Before, she was just giving information. This year I have seen her become more of that coach. She will ask us reflective questions."

Connie's description varied from the other descriptions. She acknowledged there was an agenda and that she could see that Shari had a plan for where she was going. She described the process as follows:

Shari and I are always talking and we are always talking professionally. I am always sharing with her ideas that I get and I can ask her questions for myself—I am not aware of it in terms of a coaching process. Do I get a lot from my conversations with her, absolutely. But I don't see it as a structured process because we have a relationship—professional peers so we feed off of each other.

Regardless of the agenda or plan, Connie did not see this as a process but rather a type of conversation she had with the instructional coach. These responses indicated a wide variance of understanding about the role of the instructional coach and specifically an inability to articulate and describe the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. While teachers could not describe Cognitive Coaching^{SM} they did realize there was a process to how they engaged in conversations with Shari.

Judy was the only teacher who articulated a specific process during her initial interview. She stated, during her first interview, that "She forces me to be reflective. I feel like she is pulling pieces out all the time." In addition, she was the only one of the

teachers who acknowledged that she [Shari] worked with her one-on-one. Other

teachers perceived they had worked with her more in teams. Judy said,

> I have to tell you I have been thinking a lot about this coaching piece. I
>
> know she is coaching me…It is a natural part of our conversation. It is not like
>
> she formally says now we are going to do the cognitive piece. When we are
>
> looking at what we have done and when we are talking through….It is where
>
> when we are looking at what we have done, it just happens.

When I asked Judy, "To think of an example of where the instructional coach helped her

think through and reflect on an instructional technique" she was able to describe her own

thinking process.

> I think the way it helps me the most is that it forces me to focus my
>
> thinking, focus my planning, when I have an idea and I am thinking I am on a
>
> track and when I go through the conversation it validates me or it forces me to
>
> refine that thought.

Each teacher had an awareness of a "way" in which they interacted with the instructional

coach even though none of them identified the process as Cognitive Coaching[SM].

During the third round of interviews with the participants, I created an outline of

the reflection conversation and planning conversation utilizing Cognitive Coaching[SM]

tools found in the Costa and Garmston (2002a) Cognitive Coaching[SM]*, Foundation

Seminar Syllabus*, revised by Hayes and Ellison, the Co-Directors with the Center for

Cognitive Coaching[SM] (Appendix D). Throughout the interviews teachers had shared

their limited awareness of the process. I wanted to utilize this outline of the reflection

and planning conversation to expand our conversation. I shared the outline of the reflection and planning conversations and asked participants to share their perception of their awareness or recognition of questions or structures identified within the outline. Barbara noted, "When my eyes went to those [reflection questions] right away, I recognized those." She also shared that when the team (during the current school year) set and looked at the state test scores for their students, she was conscious that they set "Goals, what did we want to get out of this, she [Shari] always made sure we had an objective or a goal." Marilyn was much more tentative in her ability to articulate specific terminology or wording. After reading the reflection question stems, she responded, "I believe I have heard them but not exactly that way." Connie also had little awareness of either the planning or the reflection questions. "I think these are real specific questions and I don't think we did that." This just continued to confirm my belief that teachers had limited awareness that the instructional coach was using a specific process that involved reflection and planning conversations.

As I shared the outline of the reflection and planning conversation with Diane, I expected her to recognize many of the questions and demonstrate a high level of awareness since she had worked closely with Shari over the past five years. Surprisingly, she stated, "I think the thing we used the most was the personal learning part. That was a big thing at the end of last year." She also recognized many of reflection question stems. She responded, "I still hear her [Shari] say that a lot…" What are some things you did to make [it] happen?" Diane also noted, "There are some questions about the lessons I always wanted her to do but she has never come and

observed my lessons." The question to which she referred was, what did you notice during this lesson? Even with the outline of the reflection and planning conversations there still limited recognition.

Ann looked through the outline of the reflection questions and immediately recognized one specific question, I definitely know this alternative one, 'What might be an alternative to the use of an instructional technique.' When we were talking about math facts this year, she [Shari] would say, 'What are some alternatives, research doesn't show that learning those help'…

Consistently teachers had much more awareness of the reflection questions than they did the outline of the planning conversation.

When I asked Shari to describe the process she thought she used the most she responded, "I used reflection conversations. And that was strictly a time thing. You might have 15 minutes when you were there for that week." She was referring to the first two years when she was not on the campus. Prior to the current school year, Shari's only extended amount of time to work with teachers was during the Read to Achieve Grant.

Shari was the only participant trained in the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, she had a unique perception of the use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, and the knowledge teachers needed to engage in coaching conversations. She shared an example of working with Ann who previously taught third grade and now teaches at the fifth/sixth grade level.

Sometimes I can just ask a couple of questions, have them think about some

things. With Ann I can't do that as easily now that she is at the 5-6 level…There

is a flat-out lack of knowledge. That is another thing when I go back to those

first years of working with Diane and Ann in third grade, Cognitive Coaching[SM]

was wonderful. But if you have teachers who are new and they have no bag of

tricks to draw on, then you (the instructional coach) have to be more of a

consultant, that is what I have found this year. I feel like I have gone back to the

beginning in many ways with Ann because she really does have a lack of

knowledge of the content and the stamina that is required of intermediate

students at the fifth and sixth grade level.

Shari's statement identifies her perception that a teachers' level of expertise determines

how she structures her coaching conversations.

Shari also shared an interesting reflection of her own coaching conversations,

"The one thing I don't use in my conversations very often is that cognitive shift piece."

This shift mediates a persons thinking and acts as a catalyst to engage a person's mind to

see new possibilities (Costa and Garmston, 2002b, p. 83). Shari described a

conversation with one of her supervisors who questioned why at times the coaching

conversations did not include this cognitive shift that guided thinking.

We [instructional coaches] have a lot of planning and reflecting

conversations….It is always with new people….When we work with the next

group of new teachers …I always revert back to the early pieces because quite

often I am working with people who are relatively new.

Those early pieces are the reflection and planning conversations. Therefore, the level of questioning and reflection depended on the skills and experience teachers brought to the conversation. Nonetheless, teachers with varied levels of experience had difficulty describing reflection and planning conversations. As I listened and analyzed the data, it became apparent that the theme of lack of understanding and clarity of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process was closely aligned with the influence of the campus leadership.

Influence of Campus Leadership

Principals at each campus determined the use of the instructional coach and his or her access to individual teachers. Shari's description of the differences between Rolling Ridge and the other elementary campus to which she was assigned half-time during the first two years of implementation is an example of the campus influence.

Both [the principals] had the perception that I would just come in and show all the teachers these models and I did talking with both of them.…It took more with the other principal ….she got the idea …the conversations will help …she really bought in…She thought it was the fascinating part… I did more collaborating with teams ….She would gather teams…We would have conversations. I would ask them one of those coaching questions…'What do you think when we look at these scores on your third grade reading? What do you think affected that?' We would focus on the data. Here at Rolling Ridge it was very much more of the "fix it" model in her [former principal] mind and that was hard for her to break …She really just wanted us (Shari and Jane the second

instructional coach assigned the first year) to be in there teaching in all those classrooms. We had to talk…No, no, that is not what we are going to be doing…..

This example illustrates two different models of the instructional coaching model based on the philosophy and understanding of the campus leadership. It was apparent in talking with both the Executive Director of DLEA and Shari that the campus leadership had not been instrumental in planning the implementation. Yet the implementation was dependent on their understanding and willingness for teachers to engage in coaching conversations.

From the very beginning of the research study I began to hear that the campus leadership influenced the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Teachers perceived the campus leadership as both an obstacle that inhibited the implementation and during the current school year a contributor to effective implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. The change in campus leadership provided a contrast in leadership style and a lens through which teachers shared their perceptions.

As previously stated, teachers perceived that the instructional coach and the use of Cognitive Coaching[SM] as a tool was a district-initiated innovation. The Pleasant Valley Educational Association Newsletter identified the role of the instructional coach to provide school-based support for teachers in the form of instructional coaches and on-site staff development (PVEA, 2005b). Shari perceived that throughout the district, principals assumed that the role of the instructional coach was, "Someone who was

going to come in and tell the third and fourth grade teachers what to do so that it raised

their [student] test scores." Shari perceived that across the district, some principals

understood that the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations were important and embraced

the coaches collaborating with teams and individuals. Conversely, other principals

wanted "fix-it" models and preferred the instructional coach to be in classrooms

teaching. Therefore, while the implementation by the instructional coach of Cognitive

Coaching^{SM} was district initiated, the responsibility for implementation relied on campus

leadership.

Use of the Instructional Coach

Consistently, as teachers talked about the implementation process they shared

their perception that over the past four years Shari had been used inappropriately.

Teachers perceived that during the first years of the implementation process, the

campus leadership at Rolling Ridge neither advocated nor understood the Cognitive

Coaching^{SM} process. They perceived that the previous principal "misused" the

instructional coach and often Shari functioned as an assistant principal rather than an

instructional specialist to support teachers. In trying to understand her perception of the

role of the instructional coach, I asked Barbara how the previous principal used the

coach during the initial phase of the implementation process, she responded,

> I am not sure. I think the previous principal misused her…I first perceived
>
> she was an assistant principal here. I don't know if that was my principal
>
> misusing her. She ended up doing a lot of administrative stuff….I see now that

there were things she was doing that were not her job. Now I see what she is

supposed to do?

When I questioned why she perceived a difference now, Barbara acknowledged that this

was the first year she had worked closely with the coach. During our second interview,

Barbara stated, "I didn't know if I was suppose to be working with her…That is why I

used her as a resource." This again confirmed the limited understanding the role of the

instructional coach who was the catalyst for the implementation of Cognitive

Coaching^{SM}.

As I questioned Judy to share her perception of the implementation process of the

coaching process at this campus, she answered in terms of how the instructional coach

was being used.

Shari came in, I did not see a real receptiveness. I also felt that the previous

principal we had was not utilizing all of Shari's talents so it was hard for her to

get into the class. She was using her kind of like an assistant principal and more

as her gofer girl. She had her doing little stupid tasks that did not relate to what

she was needing to do. I felt like there were a lot of things [instructional

techniques]…not moving our building forward to come up to speed with

everyone else. So Shari was going to meetings and getting information…

This use of Shari as an assistant principal or vice-principal began to be a repetitive

theme. Ann, the former third grade teacher now assigned to fifth/sixth grade stated,

"The coaching process can be one of the biggest parts of student achievement…You can

not force it upon people…The principal before used Shari as an assistant principal."

Marilyn stated, "In previous years she [Shari] was doing more forms…She was like an assistant principal. This year she is really truly being a coach. Teachers defined her previous role as an instructional coach in terms of paperwork, meetings, forms, administrative tasks.

Teachers stated that under the previous campus leadership the instructional coach was used to teach classes. The instructional coaching role was designed to build capacity among the teaching staff through the use of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations. Judy used a baseball analogy to share the importance of the coach building capacity among staff, "For example, the baseball coach doesn't necessarily go out and play the game for the kids, he gives the kids the skills to play the game." Regardless of the intent of the instructional coaching model, teachers stated that the previous principal used Shari to teach in identified classrooms. Marilyn shared her observation,

Last year she [Shari] spent a lot of time in fourth grade. She was teaching the classes that is what happened…We never saw her. I can't say she never coaches me…She never got to coach last year, she was sick of teaching the classes. The principal assigned her to teach."

Helen supported this perception as she described, "During the fourth year [the previous school year] year I met with her a lot. She [Shari] did sample lessons and worked in the classroom with the students….I think last year was the most effective. She did come in and do sample lessons, she worked with the kids and she did some of the paperwork." Shari perceived her working in the classroom as "A 'fixit' model" with specific teachers

and other teachers perceived her teaching classes as an inappropriate use of the

instructional coach. The teacher with whom she worked perceived the most effective

use of the instructional coach. Reality, it seems, was in the "eye of the beholder" and

dependent on each individual teacher's perception. Teachers varied in their

understanding of how the instructional coach was to interact with teachers and support

them in their classroom.

Teachers specifically reported that, during the previous year, Shari worked in

specific classrooms. Ann openly shared her perception that, "Shari was previously used

with teachers that the former principal was not comfortable with the way they were

teaching." Diane observed, "She did a lot in fourth grade and with one of the fifth/sixth

grade teachers. I felt for a while there she was the reading teacher for those kids, and I

think the pressure was on from the [previous] principal and Shari put it on herself to be

in there everyday teaching..." Teachers expressed frustration that Shari (the instructional

coach) was used to compensate for teachers' weaknesses rather than engage in coaching

conversations with those teachers to improve instructional practice. Teacher's statement

referred to their resentment that some teachers worked to learn new techniques and make

adjustments to meet the needs of the students while other teachers were resistant to

change and just wanted the instructional coach to teach in their classes. Marilyn's

statement reflected many of the others that I heard, "Last year she spent a lot of time

teaching at one grade level. She was teaching the classes. The teachers were not

accountable." I often heard frustration with faculty members who they perceived did not

want to learn and grow professionally but just remain dependent on the instructional

coach.

Teachers attributed their awareness of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process during

the current school year to a change in campus leadership and opportunities to hear about

the process as they attended district trainings. I referred earlier in this chapter that

Marilyn became aware of Cognitive Coaching[SM] during the current school year while

attending a primary literacy training program. Marilyn also described a faculty meeting

in which Maria specifically talked about the coaching process and identified the use of

paraphrasing.

> They question you, they ask you…they [Maria and Shari] paraphrase and
>
> help you with your thinking. They talked about paraphrasing in our staff
>
> meetings…Maria was in our group and she said that is what she did when she
>
> was coaching. Before, it was never brought up. She [Maria] has brought up
>
> coaching a lot more…I am sure Shari used it with me but I wasn't aware of it.

Barbara was one of the first to describe a process or a particular method Shari has when

she meets with teachers for discussion.

> There are some ways she [Shari] has discussion. I have noticed some times
>
> that when she sits and talks with you she has this way of repeating what you are
>
> saying. Here is what you guys are saying. I don't know if there is a technical or
>
> the processes she uses…She has never said this process I am going to use
>
> is.....She never says—I am now using this.

This heightened awareness became evident as teachers shared about opportunities and experiences during the current school year.

Through the interviews with Helen, Ann, and Diane I came to understand that all three had learned about the Cognitive Coaching^SM process during the current school year while attending the Adaptive School training with Maria and Shari. Prior to that they were not even aware there was a process. Helen shared, "I am one of the ones who had to go to training on Adaptive Schools...First semester for four full days. We went through everything Shari uses." I asked if she was aware of those strategies.

> No…The paraphrasing, the reflective thinking, and the way meetings are led….That was my first time to go through it and I understand…I think it was called Adaptive Schools…I understand that was Shari and Maria's fourth or fifth time. So, after they had been through it so many times it appears more natural the things they are doing….Reflective thinking.

Ann confirmed that people began to understand the process being used after a small team attended Adaptive Schools training during the current school year.

> What I am aware of, maybe it isn't Cognitive Coaching^SM, but maybe more of the paraphrasing, positive intentions. It is terms we learned when I went to training with them. It was this year. There were three full day trainings. I can't remember what it was called, collaborative team work. I went with Shari, Maria and two other teachers….It was to help people with their meetings in schools working as a collaborative. There were norms, like you are never judgmental.

You always think positively, always paraphrase, it is a very structured way of

thinking, a process.

The one teacher I thought might be aware of a specific process used by the instructional

coach prior to the current school year was Judy. She consistently referred to having

worked a great deal with the instructional coach and was also one of the teachers Ann,

Diane, and Marilyn identified who worked closely with Shari. Surprisingly she was not

aware of Cognitive Coaching[SM] nor did she identify this as a specific process.

When we are looking at what we have done [instruction] and when we are

talking through it…It is where we are looking at what we have done. It just

happens…I want the information. I want the process. I want the growth…She

makes me work it through. At first it was highly annoying. Now that I have

walked it through with her it [coaching conversations] forces me to be a deeper

thinker and more reflective before I even get to her.

Even though she could describe the process, she was not aware that the instructional

coach was trained to use the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

Throughout the interview process I had struggled to pull out teacher

understanding of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process During the final one-on-one

interview I asked Connie "Is there anything else you would like to share as you think

about the instructional coach trained in Cognitive Coaching[SM]?" Connie reflected,

Well, I don't know if it is important for the teachers to really understand

there was a process…If Shari or Maria thinks it is important that we are aware of

this process then as teachers we probably need to get an outline of it. I don't

know if it is really important...If she working with us and having success, then

for us to understand the structure of it all…Maybe it happened more than we

knew but is was so entwined with our conversations we just didn't understand it

was structured and we are not able to identify it…It is like when you are raising

your kids…They are not aware first and foremost you are showering them with

love, you are building their self-esteem.. you are building responsibility but it is

happening in everything you do 24/7 and you can't put the words to it but that is

O.K.

I reflected on Connie's comments and continued to search for the teacher's

understanding and perception of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. I recognized that

while the process was not evident, nonetheless, teachers did recognize that they had

engaged in some type of conversation more often during the current school year.

Throughout the interviews, teachers alluded to the fact that, during the current

school year and with Maria's leadership, there had been a more systemized process

through which teachers had time to engage in conversations with the instructional coach.

Marilyn identified that during the current school year, "She [Shari] is doing more

coaching…I think because we are doing K-2 meetings this year and we have time to

discuss and work through…I have more access…" This was a theme that I heard

repeated over and over. Barbara noted that this year, Shari has come in and had

meetings with the fifth/sixth grade team. Her perception was, "She opened that door for

me."

Barbara compared the use of the instructional coach during the current school year with the previous four years,

This year is the first [year] we have had team meetings with her as a coach. There were probably three years when I never even sat and worked with her. It has changed a lot this year. Now I am seeing how she is suppose to be utilized. No one really knew my old principal was not using her correctly. The coach is more involved in the instructional process. She gets us together as a team. She helps and guides. It has changed a lot and I am beginning to understand more. I thought I had an idea because of her title, instructional coach, but I never saw her doing that.

Marilyn reinforced the influence of the campus leadership on the implementation process and use of the instructional coach. "She [Shari] is doing a lot more coaching…This year she is really truly being a coach…We are having some really great half day team meetings which has made us more cohesive as a group." Ann reinforced Marilyn's perception,

This year we have team meetings on Tuesdays and Maria and Shari come in and talk about what we are doing in reading and they use coaching. They have been doing that with the whole staff.

Teachers perceived she was really functioning as an instructional coach during the current school year under new leadership.

Several teachers noted that during the current school year, the instructional coach and principal were working together. They perceived the instructional coach along with

the current principal was more focused on staff development. Connie reflected that,

"The previous principal was not a strong instructional person so she relied on the

instructional coach….Maria is really strong instructionally and into staff development. I

think she and Shari work in tandem." Judy stated, "Shari is more focused on what her

job is. When we have staff development she has more of an opportunity to actually walk

in her practice and Maria does the same thing. I feel they do it as a tandem." Spillane ,

Diamond and Jita (2003) have argued that school leadership should, in fact, be stretched

over both the social and situational context of the school setting. Based on their

research, "The distributed leadership framework incorporates the practice of multiple

individuals in a school who work at mobilizing and guiding school staff in the

instructional innovation process" (p. 535). Judy and Connie's description of Maria and

Shari working in tandem is an example of distributed leadership.

However, for Helen this distributed leadership model was perplexing and her

perception of the principal and instructional coach working together was in distinct

contrast with the other teachers.

> I see no difference between Shari's role and the principal's role. Every
>
> meeting with Maria, Shari is in there. I am actually not sure what Maria's role is.
>
> This is her first year. But when we have been meeting weekly, Shari is generally
>
> in charge of all our learning or curriculum that we are suppose to learn as faculty.

She stated that at times it was difficult to differentiate between the role of the principal

and the role of the coach. While the majority of the teachers expressed increased

understanding about the role of the instructional coach they still continued to lack clarity

in terms of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations. The influence of the campus

leadership was a major theme that all the teachers acknowledged both inhibited and

contributed to the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}.

Expectations

Consistently, I heard from teachers that working with the instructional coach and

engaging in Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations was perceived as optional under the

previous campus leadership. Elmore (2003b) argued that teachers need clear and well-

defined expectations in order to change their norms and educational practice. During the

initial phase of the implementation process, the campus leadership's expectations were

not clear nor well-defined at the campus level. Ann gave the example, "If some people

did not feel comfortable with the process and they decided to tune it out—it was kind of

an option." At the beginning of Diane's second interview, I gave her the compilation of

the implementation process based on teacher interviews (Appendix G). She immediately

responded to the statement that teachers perceived the use of the instructional coach as

optional. "I like how you have in here that it was optional. I agree. I don't think it was

supposed to be optional, but it came across to some people that it was optional."

As Shari reviewed the compilation at the beginning of the second one-on-one

interview she shared that the use of the instructional coach was not optional for those

involved with the Read to Achieve Grant.

That is really the way to put that. In thinking about that…once that Grant

[Read to Achieve] was in place…it was not optional for them [2nd and 3rd

grades]. It became a requirement as a part of having those funds. So for them,

once we had the grant, it was not optional. Coaching around other things…but as

it related to literacy, it was not optional.

So I clarified, "For everyone else it was optional, is that your perception or reality?"

Shari immediately responded, "I would say reality. If someone mentioned that they did

not want to spend the time, it was out. I probed further, "Did she [previous principal]

actually come and tell you, you are not to go work with that grade level." Shari gave the

following example, "She [the former principal] would say, 'I was talking to "so and so",

she is not going to have anytime this week, let's just not worry about her.' Early on I

was told when I asked about working with the fifth/sixth grade team, a former fifth/sixth

grade teacher was taking care of them…Don't do anything about that." This limited her

options to engage in coaching conversations with teachers at each grade level

Helen alluded to the time issue and people having the option to not work with the

instructional coach as she shared,

You know we [teachers] are guaranteed so much time that is not suppose to

be taken up with meetings because I read that pretty closely. I make them [Shari

and Maria] adhere to that or at least acknowledge when they are taking up

planning or lunch times or making people stay after school for coach's meetings.

This supported the perception that teachers could voice concerns and opt out of working

with the instructional coach.

In contrast, during the current school year with new leadership Judy stated, "It

[working with the instructional coach] has become an expectation. It is not an option

anymore. It is an expectation." Shari described in detail her perception of Maria's expectation.

> I think we are smack in the middle of change in that transitional piece at this moment in time because Maria brings a new perspective because she has been that coach. She sets the bar higher for the teachers. I think that now they all know that this is the expectation that they have those conversations with me. Whether it be something short, something long, but that we are discussing their instruction related to their student achievement.

Teachers reinforced that Maria has clear expectations that all teachers will work with the instructional coach and engage in conversations to impact their educational practice. The use of the instructional coach is no longer considered optional. Ann, Barbara, Helen, Marilyn all referred to weekly or half day meetings with the instructional coach during the current school year which confirmed Shari's statement that Rolling Ridge Elementary was in transition in how they used the instructional coach.

During the month period I was at Rolling Ridge Elementary, I had opportunities to observe teams work in groups, a K-2 meeting for the Early Math Intervention (EMI) Grant, and one first grade meeting on the DRA literacy assessment. I observed the fifth/sixth grade team in three different settings.

On one extended visit to Rolling Ridge, the fifth/sixth grade team had a full day planning in which Maria, the principal, hired substitutes in order for them to meet as a team to discuss and organize sixth grade student records to send to the middle school for the coming year. They met to organize and level guided reading books for the coming

year. I observed them in two different meetings during the course of the full day

planning. I coded the observation using forms shown in Appendix B. This allowed me

opportunities to listen for evidence of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} terminology and to

organize the observation. During the initial phase of the fifth/sixth grade meeting they

reviewed and looked at student data. Shari stated that "You have a body of evidence to

review on each individual student. You are to focus on all of those pieces that tell the

story of reading, not writing." The teachers organized and looked through the student

data and then were instructed how to code the information into the computer system to

provide a "snapshot" of the student reading levels for the middle school. As this portion

of the meeting concluded, I noted that there was no reflection on what they have learned

nor did I hear the instructional coach guiding this meeting with any type of questions.

During the next segment of the meeting they worked to organize and level their

fifth/sixth grade materials for inclusion in a campus guided reading room. The

instructional coach began by establishing the goal which they all agree is "To organize

and level books for fourth, fifth, and sixth grades to build the literacy library." They

discussed how they were going to organize the books, would they use a coding of "A to

Z", or was there another way. The instructional coach asked, "Is there a better way than

to organize in the library? Could the organization be in more than one room? Think

about how to set it up? How can we make it more user-friendly?" The teachers shared

that there were three rooms for fifth/sixth grade and three rooms for third/fourth grade.

They wanted to centralize in the library. Barbara, the team leader asked, "Where do we

stand on fiction and non-fiction?" As a group they decided they wanted to first, "Take a

look at what is back in the book room and then establish a system for organizing the books." They then established independent jobs they were each going to do and a time they would meet back together. During this portion of the meeting I heard the instructional coach use more guided questions. I was not able to attend the end of that segment of the meeting due to a scheduled interview but I recognized that after two hours of observing this meeting I never consistently heard the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} terminology and consistent reflection which supported my conclusion that the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process was not consistently used in varied setting which may have added to the lack of understanding and recognition of the process. Nonetheless, what I was seeing was that teams were having time to work together which confirmed what I was hearing during the one-on-one interviews.

Accountability

Review of the transcripts of the one-on-one interviews found that teachers perceived that the campus leadership failed to hold teachers accountable to engage in coaching conversations during the early phase of the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. Teachers perceived that under the previous campus leadership teachers were not held accountable to change educational practice to meet the needs of their students. They felt this had an impact on the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process and use of coaching conversations. Teachers felt that Maria held teachers more accountable for their educational practice. Judy recalled sitting in a team meeting the previous year along with the former principal, Shari, and a representative

from the math department. This particular team needed to increase the math scores of

their students on the state test, which were the lowest scores on the campus.

It was like the problem was there but we totally danced around it and didn't

take a look at our instruction, there was no expectation by the principal that

maybe the scores were looking the way they were because we weren't using best

practices……some teachers just pretty much blew it off and we had some

discussion but we couldn't go to a deeper level, it was very superficial and it was

obvious the principal wasn't expecting the staff to change their current practice.

Connie felt the current leadership "really holds our feet to the fire." It was her

perception that Maria wants the staff to be professional and continue to grow as

professionals. Marilyn perceived that teachers are held accountable for their students'

achievement and gave an example of this accountability during the current school year.

We [K-1-2] talk about accountability. Where are the kids going to be in

writing? What is it going to look like in their writing? We have been looking at

the (writing). We are now talking more about what each teacher is doing. I

really like that. So that we say, O.K. first grade we need to work on these types

of things. We have writing samples; we show how we get kids to do certain

things…. We also did that in math. We had to give a math assessment and then

we had to bring that to a meeting. It wasn't a team meeting, a staff meeting

[whole faculty]. People were really honest…Sure people got upset but it is more

accountability. At the beginning of the year, she [Shari] had everyone test to find

out the level they were on. What an eye-opener….We each had to go around the

room….They [faculty] were a part of the conversation. They [Maria and Shari]

asked what are your ahahs?...People are aware that they are accountable. They

understand they are accountable. Gosh darn, everyone does their guided reading

groups everyday. Writing has to be taught….Teachers are also held accountable

because they are going to have to show their work to each other….Now we have

time to talk, then go do it, and bring yourself back and show us what you did.

Therefore, teachers perceived that during the current school year they were held

accountable to engage in conversations with the instructional coach and principal to

discuss best practices and student achievement.

Teachers being held accountable to engage in conversations with the

instructional coach no longer left the decision to a teacher's willingness to engage in

conversations. Teachers began to use the phrase "openness and willingness" to describe

why they perceived that some teachers worked more closely with the instructional coach.

Visible Use of the Coaching Process

Teachers referred to the use of protocols as they described the changes in the use

of the instructional coach under the new principal. Protocols were not something I

recognized from the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} training and literature. Therefore, I probed

their understanding of the protocols used by the instructional coach and the principal.

Judy was one of the first to refer to the use of protocols.

When we do staff development there are protocols and the protocols are

followed. There is an outcome when we finish. From day one we have goals. It

is very directed. Before it was so "lackadaisical"…Now it is purposeful. There

is a beginning and ending time. There are norms set. If we used a protocol we

finished and followed the protocol. If we set out to talk about our mission

statement, we went through a process. When we left it was done…That is really

what I see a big difference this year or last and the past years. Things are taking

shape. There is a direction and we are not wandering off.

I still had questions as the word protocol began to surface during other one-on-one

interviews as a major change and expectation under the current leadership.

Diane provided a detailed example of a particular faculty meeting where Shari

and Maria utilized protocols.

They (Shari and Maria) use a lot more protocols. Our staff meetings are

guided by those. We have an article that we are reading. They give you an index

card and as you go through the article you pick out one sentence that catches

your eye; one word that caught your eye; one phrase that caught your eye.

Everyone has a minute to respond to the phrase that I have chosen. Also, they

split our staff up into 2 different groups and those groups are supposed to be team

building (See Appendix H for samples of protocols).

She also provided an additional example using math as the focus of conversation and

shared how they worked through this protocol at a faculty meeting.

A lot of times they will have a protocol, a theme. One was with math, taking

fourth grade multi-step math problem. First we had to do the math problem.

Then we talked about what we would need to do create a model where students

would be able to solve those problems. It has to be systemic. They [Maria and

Shari] do a lot more of this type of discussion. They are just starting this year

and next year we will do a lot more work in those groups.

Connie also shared an example of the use of protocols and how they extend her thinking,

Maria has something for us to read or we get it to read ahead of time. Shari

and Maria are always using protocols to share out. Sometimes they do it at our

grade levels and sometimes across grade level. Generally you walk away having

learned something but being accountable for adding one more thing to your

repertoire. I do think over the year they have introduced a lot of things to

become better teachers.

Teachers concluded that these protocols helped them reflect and think through the use of

educational strategies.

I questioned if these protocols were in fact Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations

utilizing reflecting, planning, or problem-solving conversations. Shari clarified during

her interviews that the protocols utilized some of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process

along with other tools in which they had been trained by the Executive Director DLEA.

I questioned if they were trained in other structures e.g., Annenberg's Critical Friends

that utilize protocols in their training model. She explained,

They (Executive Director DLEA and staff development trainer] used

protocols with us but we were not trained in the Annenberg, Critical Friends.

They just used protocols probably more as the year went on [during

training]…Some of us with Title I schools had the opportunity to attend the

Critical Friends training…It was that summer before I became full-time here

[Rolling Ridge].

I was familiar with the Annenberg Critical Friends training which utilizes "protocols." I

had been involved with this process as a principal; therefore, when teachers used the

term protocol I questioned whether the instructional coaches were provided this training

as a tool. Some of the protocols were borrowed from other processes but the majority of

the protocols Shari used, focused on the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

Shari shared a sample of one of the protocols she utilized during a cross-grade

level primary math meeting I observed. This protocol (See Appendix H) was used

during a meeting for an Early Math Intervention (EMI) Grant who involved the

Kindergarten, first and second grade teachers. Marilyn, the kindergarten teacher

explained that the EMI grant was not a "program but a way of thinking about math. It is

basically that kids need to develop number sense." The teachers had half-day substitutes

in order for them to administer a one-on-one assessment to their students on addition

and/or subtraction strategies depending on the level of the students. I attended a

summary meeting where they discussed the student assessments using a "Reflecting

Conversation Protocol (Appendix H)." Marilyn, the kindergarten teacher, and Connie,

the second grade teacher, were a part of this group. In addition, there was one first grade

teacher and a second grade teacher that had not been a part of this interview process. As

a group they began with what was termed a "one minute whip around to share their

general impressions. One of the second grade teachers shared, "I am impressed by what

they knew." Another made the observation that you "have to spend time to get more

information." The first grade teacher shared, "Good to work with individual child."

Marilyn shared her surprise that kindergarten students could verbalize "doubles plus

doubles."…She explained for my benefit,

> Doubles are one of the strategies we want the students to learn. So if they
>
> learn their doubles it will help them use mental math for other facts. So, if they
>
> know $5 + 5 = 10$, then they will be able to use this to figure out $5 + 6 = 11$. Then
>
> they can go in all different directions with numbers.

The teachers focused on the math vocabulary they had learned to use through the EMI

grant and reflected that the assessment was well-rounded. One of the teachers noted the

assessment was more about how to guide instruction. A second "whip around" provided

the opportunity for teachers to share a students' response that were interesting or

surprising. The first grade teacher was surprised that her students started right away

with doubles. She shared, "I did not introduce to do that...It was O.K. to explore

numbers." Connie observed that "Students use counting as a default mechanism when

they can't do a math fact." Marilyn was, "disappointed that her students had difficulty

verbalizing strategies."

As a group they compared, analyzed, inferred, determined cause and effect by

asking, "Are there patterns in what students knew and were able to do." Marilyn noted

"Students understood the cause and effect pattern of 'more than.' For example, six is 2

more than 4." The first grade teacher noted that it was "important for students to have

wait time in order to compare and analyze a problem." The first grade teacher made two

reflections that were more about the instructional techniques she needed to provide for

students to have success, i.e., the wait time and the earlier recognition students can go further than what she has introduced. Teachers then discussed constructing new learning and applications through discussions around the question, "What ideas would you like to try in your classroom as a result of today's assessment and conversations." Connie wondered out loud, "Why I didn't do this informal assessment sooner?" Each teacher noted the importance of continually assessing and the first grade teacher felt she "needed a good pre-assessment." Marilyn requested that they correlate some books to use with the EMI strategies. The final portion of the reflection protocol asked them to reflect on the process of the assessment and the reflection protocol. The first grade teacher noted, "This makes me feel better." At least two of the teachers reflected that they needed to look at a way to structure the assessments. I heard them utilize vocabulary specifically about "doubles" and "more than" in addition to the appreciation for the number sense their students had developed. This protocol provided the framework for discussion and reflection of the primary teachers work with Early Math Intervention Grant.

Shari clarified that she was beginning to use these types of more formalized protocols during the current year and this study had in fact made her reflect on the need for a more formalized process. She stated,

Sometimes we would have large staff group meetings and I would embed some of those questions in terms of whatever they were suppose to be having a conversation about…I would see this as my opportunity to throw a few 'raindrops' in so that some people at least would have had that experience. I would structure the questions as a protocol that had reflecting questions in there

that they were going to do as a part of their group conversation as a staff but

definitely I did word it as that because the previous principal did not want me to

use those words [Cognitive Coaching^{SM}]. She was not into that.

This formalization of the process made teachers more aware of the need to engage in

coaching conversations. However, they still had difficulty articulating exactly what a

coaching conversation entailed.

I introduced the lack of understanding of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} and the inability

of teachers to recognize and use Cognitive Coaching^{SM} terminology in Chapter IV and

reintroduced this in Chapter V. The instructional coach's directive from the previous

principal to refrain from utilizing Cognitive Coaching^{SM} terminology made it difficult

for teachers to become more conscious of the process. However, based on the data I

collected during observations the use of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} terminology was

somewhat sporadic and teachers were unclear as to what constituted a coaching

conversation.

The campus leadership strongly influenced the implementation of Cognitive

Coaching^{SM} by an instructional coach. This district-initiated process was dependent on

the skills and ability of the campus leadership. Teachers again stated that the use of the

instructional coach depended on the campus leadership. The participants in the one-on-

one interviews perceived that teachers had to have clear expectations and be held

accountable to engage in coaching conversations around their instructional practice.

Under new leadership, teachers began to understand they were to engage in Cognitive

Coaching^{SM} conversations with the instructional coach.

Teachers consistently shared examples of Cognitive Coaching[SM] and the use of coaching conversations as a more visible and conscious process on the campus during the current school year. However, teachers continued to share that they didn't totally understand the process and had limited success at identifying and describing the process. However, teachers were very cognizant that, through their work with the instructional coach they had made changes in their instructional practice to meet the needs of their students.

Open and Willingness to Change/Resistance

The theme of teachers' openness and willingness to change instructional practice versus resistance evolved during the early phase of the research study. In order to implement Cognitive Coaching[SM] teachers had to be open and willing to engage in conversations with the instructional coach about their educational practice. As I listened during the interviews and reviewed tapes of the transcripts I heard the key words "open", and "willing to learn" repeated again and again. Teachers were insistent that teachers' openness contributed or their resistance inhibited the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. This finding of teacher's openness and willingness to learn supported the implementation research reviewed in Chapter II and was consistent with the findings of researchers over the last 30 years.

Teachers consistently embraced working with the instructional coach and engaging in coaching conversations, with the exception of Helen. Even though they couldn't identify the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, they recognized during the current

school year that there was a more formalized process. Helen acknowledged the importance of working with the instructional coach the previous year. Her preference, however, was for the instructional coach to work with the students in her classroom rather than engage in coaching conversations with her.

Open and Willingness

The pattern of openness versus resistance to work with the instructional coach became a major theme that I heard throughout all of the subsequent interviews. Teachers' used the key words professionalism, attitude, or willingness to posit the theme of openness and willingness and its influence on the implementation process as they contrasted other teachers lack of willingness and professionalism**.**

Teacher professionalism was a key word often interspersed in conversations about openness and willingness to learn. Connie, often identified professionalism as an important aspect in people being open and willing to learn, " I feel our staff now are really professional, almost all of them. The feeling in the building that people want to do their best and they want their students to do their best. They are always learning and sharing." I probed to understand, "Did you always feel that way?" She responded, "No, I would say a number of years ago it was not like that [professional] and some saw it as a job." There had been a change in staff that resulted in teachers' opening and willingness to learn. Judy shared a similar perspective during our third interview. "I started here ten years ago; there are only four people left from the original staff…The majority of the people here want to learn, they are professional and on an individual level, they are not stuck." It was important to Judy that people were open and willing to learn and change.

Ann confirmed this perception as she shared, "I think since Shari has been used more like a coach this year there are still people that are resistant but less than before. The resistance is more passive aggressive resistance." Participants consistently referred to the need for teacher's to grow professionally through their work with the instructional coach.

Marilyn continually defined her work with the instructional coach as an opportunity to grow professionally.

> I consider myself a professional and I feel like I have taken responsibility for developing myself professionally…She [Shari] is this resource I can go to…She is not somebody who is just watching me and trying to tell me what to do…I feel we are peers.

As I probed, "What makes people open and willing to learn?" Marilyn shared a perception that I would hear from more than one teacher.

> I think you have to be secure with yourself and that you don't know everything and that you want your best for your students. You want your kids to be the best they can be and you want to be a fantastic teacher and that seeing the kids grow is a reflection of you and a pride in your school. You want to use that coach to move on.

For many of the teachers meting the needs of their students and helping them "move on" was important as a professional.

Connie's common theme of professionalism persisted as she shared, "If you are professional, you are self-motivated, you will take the ball and run." In addition to

defining openness and willingness as professional, teachers also identified themselves as life-long learners and perceived that they liked to learn new techniques and looked for best educational practices. Barbara described the process of wanting to continue to learn as she reflected on what made people open and willing to change.

> I have always wanted to succeed. That internal drive to do the best I can just in everything. When I was a waitress, I wanted to be a supervisor…That is just my personality in teaching I want to be doing the best I can do for the kids, for the principal or for whoever. I want to make sure I do my job.

This commitment to being open and willing to change in order to be a life-long learner was theme I heard throughout the research study.

Teachers' openness and willingness to engage in conversations with the instructional coach were also dependent on their access. Both Barbara and Marilyn noted that they only began to work with Shari during the current year and previously felt their access was limited. Barbara shared, "I knew I had access…I didn't use her and didn't know how I was suppose to use her." Marilyn, on the other hand, previously shared that she had been informed by the previous principal that she did not "get" a coach because she was in Kindergarten. Therefore, while the two teachers were open and willing to change, the internal campus system precluded interaction.

Teachers defined openness and willingness to learn new practices as an attitude. Connie strongly believed that teaching wasn't just a job for her but rather a lifelong career. Diane described teacher attitude and recognized being willing to learn was not just limited to young teachers.

I think it depends on each individual's attitude. I don't want to say the

younger teachers were willing to change and be more open. I know there was a

younger teacher who was not open to work with Shari and she was a pretty new

teacher like I was and then we had a second grade teacher who was close to

retiring and she changed her instruction a ton from Read to Achieve …I think it

depends on the individual person.

Diane's example is a powerful reminder that desire to grow and learn is not dependent

on a teacher's level of experience but rather their individual desire to be a life-long

learner.

This story parallels Spillane's (1999) experience of the three elementary teachers

with whom he worked in a research study in a district attempting to reform language arts

instruction as described in Chapter II. His study included one first year teacher, one with

five years of experience, and the third with 20 years of experience. The three differed in

terms of disposition and willingness to engage in the language arts reform within the

school district. Spillane found that the young teacher who had taught five years felt that

she knew the most current information and was not willing to change or adjust her

language arts instruction. Diane's example aligns with Spillane's findings as she

described the young teacher who did not want to learn and the veteran teacher who

continued to learn and make changes in her educational practice even as she reached

retirement.

As teachers described their openness and willingness to learn, they identified

themselves as self-assured and willing to reflect on their educational practice. In

addition, there was an openness and willingness from Shari, the instructional coach, which supported teacher's willingness to be open. Barbara described why she was open and willing to learn working with Shari.

> I think of her as being open. I know that she is knowledgeable, and know that when you go and ask her for advice or resources she is always more than willing to do what she can to help you. After you do that a few times then you see that if I went to her and said I need help with my guided reading. She wouldn't go, oh, you are doing your reading wrong…I feel like I can trust her when it comes to the coaching thing and wanting advice.

Being open and self-assured is a characteristic that was important for both the teachers, as well as the instructional coach.

Self-assuredness was evident as Marilyn described her own willingness to engage and work with an instructional coach. "I think I am reflective—I like constructive criticism. It makes me a better teacher. I think you have to be secure with yourself and know that you don't know everything." Ann stated that, "I have always had the idea that teaching is about learning—you are always a student." This issue of being open and willing to learn was pervasive throughout the interview process.

Diane reinforced her reflection that being open and willing to change educational practice was not dependent on the number of years a teacher taught during her final webcam interview as she clarified her understanding of teacher attitude. "I mean willingness to work, open to resources, and want to work with a coach. Some teachers feel they know everything, they are afraid to change. They are afraid to admit what they

are not doing." Like Diane, teachers defined their own willingness and self-assurance as they compared and contrasted other teachers' unwillingness and insecurity.

In contrast, teachers referred to other faculty members who resisted continuous learning and were more comfortable maintaining the status quo in terms of educational practice. Diane shared an example of a teammate she was working with during the current school year. "She is a textbook person, not a lot of hands on with the students….Shari has tried to model and work with her." Because Diane had worked with Shari from the beginning Diane explained, "I totally understood where Shari was coming from. She was using me as a resource to come along [work with this teacher]…When we were working on fractions, I was breaking it down and pulling together the materials and writing the plans for the week. I would say pull this to this concept. This is how you do this portion." Diane perceived that while they worked together in teams this teacher was resistant or demonstrated a "negative attitude" to working with the instructional coach and changing her existing educational practice.

Barbara, the fifth/sixth grade teacher, explained that prior to this year she probably didn't work as much with the instructional coach because of a former teacher with whom she taught. "He is a person who, really, he didn't seem to like a lot of feedback from anybody necessarily. His having that attitude probably made me go with the flow with him more." This provided a clear example of the resistance by some teachers to work with the instructional coach and engage in coaching conversations.

Diane reflected on a comment she heard Maria, the principal, make in reference to when people change.

> Maria said…that you only change if you feel the heat…or get burned or
> something. I know Shari has tried with my teammate this year…I don't how you
> get people to be open.

The lack of openness and willingness at times worked against the implementation process. Teachers described teacher resistance as a result of individual's lack of willingness and openness to examine their educational practice.

Resistance

Teachers perceived teacher resistance as a major obstacle to the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process by an instructional coach. There were three specific types of resistance teachers identified. First, teachers identified resistance as a pervasive attitude by individual teachers. Second, they identified the resistance of the union or the Pleasant Valley Educational Association. Third, they identified resistance to change.

Resistance as a Pervasive Attitude

Teachers identified a limited number of classroom teachers on the campus who were not in favor of either the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process or the instructional coach at both the primary and intermediate levels. Ann's perception was that some teachers "saw no point" in working with the instructional coach and engaging in Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations. Both Connie and Ann used the phrase some teachers felt, "It [engaging in coaching conversations] was just one more thing." In addition, both Diane and Ann along with Barbara felt that the instructional coach was resistant to work with

some of the teachers. Barbara stated, "You can get a vibe when teachers want you in their room and when they don't…. I think there are some teachers out there who do not want somebody else in their room observing and telling them how to improve….I am sure Shari felt that from some of the teachers."

This resistance was clearly defined as Judy shared how she saw staff members respond to working with the instructional coach particularly with previous fifth/sixth grade team members. She noted that two of fifth/sixth grade team members were no longer teaching at the campus. "I did not see a lot of respect for her [Shari's] knowledge and information. I saw that when she would go through strategies [instructional techniques], it was not valued at all and to me that was ugly." This supported Shari's reflection that she was told not to work with the fifth/sixth grade team in previous years, far different than the experience she was having with the current fifth/sixth grade team.

Teachers perceived that attitude influenced resistance from individual teachers. Diane referred to attitude as she answered my question, "What do you perceive as obstacles to the implementation process?"

> The leadership on the campus and teacher attitude. Those are the two. Even this year with Maria, we have new leadership who is supportive and behind the coaching process but we still have staff members who don't want to listen and want to keep on doing their own thing.

This undercurrent of frustration with other faculty members was evident as I talked individually with participants.

Research participants shared their perception that teacher attitude often influenced whether individual teachers used the instructional coach and made changes in their educational practice. Judy gave an example of this type of resistance.

> There has been resistance from individuals whose perceptions was, 'I don't need anyone to come and tell me how to be a professional. I am a professional. I don't need someone to tell me how to be a teacher, I am a teacher.' What they are missing from that is the idea that we are still learners too. If we don't keep learning, if we don't keep on the edge of learning then how can you be a teacher that equips kids for the world…There is a perception if I bring a coach in, that shows I am weak

This resistance was often identified in terms of both the time and insecurity people felt as they engaged in conversations that identified a need for instructional change.

Ann shared her perception of how she saw teachers respond to working with the instructional coach.

> There were people who were real resistant. They saw no point in it [engaging in coaching conversations] and they felt like it was just one more thing….There is staff development that comes with a coach coming in to talk to me. Those were those kinds of complaints going on.

Marilyn perceived that at times people were resistant because they knew working with the coach involved making changes in one's instructional practice. "If you aren't doing everything you could be doing and you have to meet with a coach and she is saying, 'Have you thought about this or the other', then you might have resentment."

Teachers acknowledged that there was not only resistance to working with the instructional coach but also resistance on Shari's part to engage in conversations with teachers she considered resistant. Marilyn described a scenario in which the instructional coach did not work with teachers. "I think what I have seen is that you as a teacher had to seek out the coach, because, last year [not so much this year] if you did not seek out the coach and you wanted to do your own thing, then the coach would not come and find you.

This perception was reinforced by Diane who described the previous years at Rolling Ridge, "You could have been doing whatever you wanted…Nobody cared when you showed up or when you left. I think she [Shari] could have done anything she wanted.. …Why didn't Shari do the same thing?" There was a lack of understanding of why the instructional coach did not work more consistently across the campus by both teachers like Diane who worked closely with the instructional coach and Marilyn who would seek out help.

I asked Shari to respond to this perception of resistance. She shared that while she was working with the previous principal she was told, "Just go where they want to work with you." I asked how she might work with resistant teachers based on her background and experience over the last five years rather than just avoiding interaction with them.

I think I would be more direct and talk to them. 'I notice that you don't seem to be interested or where are you in your career right now? What makes you less interested in change right now? We are being driven by our scores, [the

scores] can't keep going down. What do you think we might do? Doing what

you are doing right now how will we be able to change the process? If you keep

doing what you have always been doing you are going to get the same thing.' I

think that is one of the places people don't want to move out of. It is like this is a

comfort zone for them, 'I like doing it this way.' Maybe even asking some of

those questions that have to do with…'What could you do in the model you are

using to make this change.

The instructional coach acknowledged that she had not been as direct and did not work

with teachers who were consistently resistant. This internal resistance inhibited the

implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process because it was dependent on both

teachers and the instructional coach engaging in conversations to support change in

educational practice.

Resistance of the Union [Pleasant Valley County Educational Association]

Teachers at Rolling Ridge perceived the county school system's teacher union as

a factor fostering the resistance to the implementation by an instructional coach of the

Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. They remembered the teacher union questioning the role

of the instructional coach and the use of teacher planning time during the early phase of

the implementation process in the 2000-2001 school year. Teachers recalled completing

a union survey about the instructional coaching model during the 2000-2001 school year,

the first year of implementation. As I probed for who did not advocate for the

instructional coach, Marilyn specifically identified the union and noted, "I think the

teacher union [did not advocate], some of the teachers…because we vote for coaches

through the union. We had to vote do you want to cut the coaches?" Helen related the feelings of many union members as she shared, "I am hearing that people are angry that we are paying coaches to do what used to be covered by the principal and maybe a language arts specialist. We are paying someone full time to do that." These types of emotions were what led the union contract to establish specific language that addressed the instructional coaches who were identified as teachers on special assignment. As noted in Chapter IV, Article 45 of the 2003 union contract (PVEA, 2005b) established a process to address union concerns about how the instructional coaches were being used and how their role differed from the administrators. "This article created an on-going,12-member Instructional Coaches Committee made up of teachers, coaches, principals and central administrators. Their job was broadly defined to make recommendations regarding the instructional coaches program" (PVEA, 2005a, p. 5). This committee functioned as an oversight committee of the instructional coach.

Resistance to Change

As I probed and questioned teachers about this evolving theme of resistance to work with the instructional coach and to engage in the coach conversations they felt this resistance was a result of teachers not being comfortable with change. An article in the Pleasant Valley Educational Association Newsletter alluded to this resistance as it quoted a staff member of the Pleasant Valley County Schools Educational organization,

> This work [district committee] has added significance…because it also
>
> provided an opportunity to address teacher concerns about the never-ending
>
> stream of new curriculum, or skills, or programs teachers 'just had to learn.'

Adding to the perception of overloading is the fact that planning time, as well as

before and after school time was being taken up, a violation of the contract, with

what was loosely called 'staff development' (PVEA, 2005a, p. 5).

This comment supported Helen's contention that she had to be sure they [Shari and

Maria] adhered to the union contract in terms of planning, use of lunch times, or

requiring people to stay after school for coach's meetings.

I myself was cognizant of some resistance on the part of individual teachers as I

worked to schedule observations. I had asked to observe a variety of grade levels and

individuals working with the instructional coach during the month I was on campus. I

wanted these observations to be "real observations" not just scheduled for my

convenience. One of the observations was for me to observe the two first grade teachers

working with the instructional coach to input their DRA assessment scores into a district

computer system and reflecting on their students' progress After several attempts to

schedule observations with the first grade teachers, I finally met with the instructional

coach and one of the two first grade teachers. The other first grade teacher had just

'chosen' not to attend the meeting, despite our having rescheduled several times. The

other first grade teacher stated, "She is not coming." In fact, when the instructional

coach sent for the other first grade teacher, she was no longer on campus. This

particular teacher had been identified by both the instructional coach and other teachers

as one of the primary teachers resistant to engage in coaching conversations.

Barbara stated, "They [teachers on the campus] are comfortable with what they

have done for years and it is a lot of work to change." Ann stated, "I feel like she [Shari]

had so much information, you have to be open for the process to work. There were some

people who were not open. Some people just didn't think it was helpful having those

conversations." The theme of resistance was interwoven consistently throughout the

interviews with all of the participants.

There was also a sense that this resistance resulted from teachers being afraid to

admit what they were not doing or a result of their own insecurity. Helen stated, "In

order to engage in coaching conversations with an instructional coach, I would have

needed the knowledge of the coach not sharing my questioning or inadequacies with the

principal." Helen shared that because she was nearing retirement in her educational

journey, she wasn't willing to try attempt new educational practices. I probed for her to

expand on that perception. She perceived that,

> I think the county decided that [she would not try new education practices]
>
> when they wouldn't let me take the classes [Guided Reading for Intermediate
>
> grades]. They decided they weren't going to invest anymore time in my
>
> educational experience, I didn't decide that. I applied to be a part of that
>
> training.

I then questioned if not being allowed by the county to take the course influenced how

she felt about other processes? She responded with, "Yes." She again reiterated that. "I

wish I had the Adaptive School training—so I would know what they were using." This

was in reference to the use of Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations. Because of several

other answers throughout our conversations, I asked specifically about her learning

style? "Do you need to see the big picture?" Her response was, "Yes, I need

that…Unless I see where we are going and where we are starting and the midpoint it is hard." Because I perceived that her resistance often came across as skepticism I asked, "Are you skeptical sometimes?" She replied,

> I am not skeptical, I am just thinking that we have done that before…This county switches their emphasis so much…they are looking for the perfect solution. They drop something we have done before and then try to tweak it up.

Helen believed that her resistance resulted from her perception that education was cyclical and there really were not new techniques but just recycled educational practices with a new emphasis. "I was thinking you are just going to tell me more things, you are going to call it different names or have a different emphasis." She really did not perceive the need for change nor was she convinced that the change was all that different from what she was already doing.

Helen was described by the other teachers as one of the teachers most resistant to the coaching conversations, which she confirmed. When I specifically asked her if there was resistance to the instructional coach she responded, "I don't see resistance, I am beginning to see a lack of respect for the follow-through on some of the things they are doing." Throughout the interviews, her statements demonstrated that some of her resistance came from not understanding.

This example supported my findings as I reviewed the literature on implementation research. If a teacher perceived the new knowledge as congruent with their current practice, the implementation process was derailed and little changes occurred (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2003b; Spillane, 2002; Sykes 1996). This

perception had in fact kept Helen from engaging in Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations with the instructional coach.

As Helen and I discussed her perception of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] she volunteered that she often did not engage in coaching conversations because did not agree with the instructional coach.

> I became reluctant to work with her because I disagreed with some of the things that she said we needed to do. She would say, 'research shows that this works' …well, you can find research to support any avenue you want to go. So, it became a point of do it my way or I am not going to help you through this….I questioned some of the things that she had worked on with K-3 [teachers] and it was new to us [Helen and her teammate]. We weren't just seeing the same thing.

The issue of research to support varied points of view surfaced in more than one of Helen's one-on-one interviews. In addition, Helen noted in order to be less reluctant to work with the instructional coach, "I think I would have needed materials and ready access…I was reluctant to adopt a whole new learning process without more support and available materials." Helen brought a very different voice and an explanation of the resistance within the study. The other six teachers and the instructional coach had different perceptions and their own understanding of the resistance. Helen brought to life an understanding of resistance from a personal point of view.

This synchrony of teacher resistance and its influence on the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] was evident as teachers discussed the teaching staff at Rolling Ridge. Throughout the interview process, teachers referred to the number of teachers

who had taught at this campus for many years and perceived that there was a resistance to making adaptations in their instructional techniques. Connie and Judy noted the number of resistant teachers had decreased over the last year few years as teacher turnover occurred on the campus. Connie shared an example,

> I think a coach has to do that [work one-on-one] with the staff members who are not self-motivated. We did a book study with comprehension strategies [during the previous year]. We had even talked as a staff to introduce one or two a month so that systemically we would be using the same terminology and focusing on improving reading comprehension. My teammate and I put it in our lesson plan book but most of the building didn't. When I brought it up to the previous principal, she said 'Well, the intermediate grades really don't want to do that so we are not going to do it. Well, you know that is sad….We [Connie and her teammate] thought they were so valuable, we started implementing them like the next day.

This was an example of teachers' influence and ability to resist changes in educational practice which had resulted in a lack of innovation and reform at Rolling Ridge.

Neither Judy nor Marilyn perceived Rolling Ridge as a "progressive" campus and shared examples of their surprise, when they joined the faculty, at the lack of progressiveness. Marilyn noted, "Some teachers were not very progressive. If I brought "strategies or techniques' people didn't want to hear about it." However, she noted the more progressive work they were doing during the current school year in math through the EMI grant. Connie related, however, that the number of resistant teachers was

decreasing due to teacher turnover during the past two years. Ann described her

perception of this resistance to change during two different interview sessions.

> You have to decide to be open. You just can't force people to adapt to the
> coaching process. Some people just aren't ready for it. I don't know if they ever
> will….People felt like they (Shari and Jane) were intruding …like I know what I
> am doing, why do I need help. I feel like there was a lot of that going on but now
> it has changed.

Teachers who were more open and felt that they had successfully worked with the

instructional coach perceived that other teachers just didn't recognize the value of the

instructional coach using Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations. Marilyn shared her

perception that

> If there were teachers who did not want them [instructional coach], it would
> be disgruntled teachers who felt like they did not get enough or teachers who
> coaches were trying to come and change. Some teachers just don't want to
> change. They throw problems back on the kids.

Teacher's had to value their work with the instructional coach in order to engage in

coaching conversations.

Teachers perceived resistance as a major obstacle to the implementation by an

instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. Teachers defined resistance in

terms of individual teacher attitude, union resistance, and resistance to change. Teachers

perceived that those who were not resistant and valued coaching conversations also had

a high level of trust with the instructional coach.

Relational Trust

The theme of trust and relationships evolved slowly and did not surface until the second and third interview session. I often wondered if teachers had to feel that they could trust me in order to share their own perception of the issue of trust. Teachers often referred to the relationship they built with the instructional coach as a key contributor to the implementation and use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Even though teachers seldom identified conversations as Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations, they identified a structure and a process through which they interacted with the instructional coach. Shari confirmed that those structures and processes were the Cognitive Coaching[SM] reflection or planning conversations. As I probed and clarified statements, teachers defined trust in terms of characteristics they recognized when they interacted and engaged in conversations with Shari or observed her work with other teachers. Barbara, Marilyn, Diane, Connie, Ann, and Judy defined the instructional coach as a person who is approachable, knowledgeable, respectful, and non-judgmental. Each shared examples of her open communication and indicated that it took time to build this relationship with her. Helen, did not have the same level of trust with Shari. However, by her own description she had not worked closely with Shari but for one of the last four years. Time and opportunity appeared to be critical attribute to build a positive, trusting relationship.

Trust

The theme of trust evolved as teachers described their interaction with the instructional coach. Teachers shared their perception that when they worked closely with Shari over time they felt they could trust her and really wanted her guidance and advice. While they may not have always known the exact terminology of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}, they recognized she was guiding them in their thinking. Marilyn described the respect and trust to work Shari built over time.

> Progressive and innovative…She [Shari] is willing to share and wiling to help you grow as a professional….Basically one of the biggest reasons that I change my teaching is because I respect her…I know I can go and talk to her about anything…We have good conversations.

Those teachers who had been a part of the Read to Achieve grant described the trust they built among the team of second and third grade teachers along with the instructional coach.

Diane described the process of building trust as she described the Read to Achieve Grant meetings. "We met at least once a month for a day or half day as a group and we just started knowing that you could trust each other, you could work with each other."

Ann, also, described the trust she built over time with Shari and those teachers involved with the Read to Achieve Grant. Ann began working with Shari during her very first year of teaching.

I would say the first year, the first year was different. I felt a little bit paranoid at times. I don't know if this has anything to do with it but the kind of morale of our school was very different. There was a lot of gossip going on and I felt kind of paranoid about what people were saying about me. I have to say I didn't know if Shari looked at me as a valid teacher. I was this baby teacher…My first year with her I felt very grateful about her and I felt like I took in everything, but I have to say that I wasn't totally at ease about things I did and said. I was a little bit hesitant because I of the gossip. That has changed a lot.

Throughout the one-on-one interviews Ann described the evolving process of building relationships as she became more secure and built a high level of trust.

In some ways, I would say that what changed was that I ignored the gossip and started looking at the positive…I talked to my mentor (Connie). She helped me with my attitude and she didn't see things like that as much, so I had to readjust my outlook…I felt really insecure my first year …I felt a little hesitant on being honest …what I was thinking and feeling. The second year…I put myself in a better place I have to say….[She reflected back on the first year] 'They are probably saying this about me or thinking this. When you say that to yourself a whole lot it can affect your relationship with people. It has changed a lot…I feel like there is more energy. I am not saying there isn't conflict, there is always conflict, our focus is really just on the kids more….Just like with Shari and I…everybody's relationship in the building…it takes time to build that…it just doesn't happen in a year. I would have to say when that changed, maybe it

was my perception of the morale, it got better once I chose to look at things

differently

Ann perceived that she learned to trust and openly share with the instructional coach and

other team members specifically those involved with the Read to Achieve Grant.

Judy worked closely over the five years with the instructional coach and

expressed a high level of trust as she worked with the instructional coach.

I trust that whatever feedback she gives back to me is honest. She is

competent in her knowledge base and yeah, it is totally a trusting thing…She

keeps the confidence. If I tell her something she will not go tell the whole world,

it is totally in confidence unless I tell her she can.

Conversely, Helen the fourth grade teacher, did not have a trust level with the

instructional coach. She perceived this lack of trust was a result of sharing confidential

information as it related to individual teachers.

I think there was a trust level. The previous principal was really good about

telling you what everyone said about you, which made the trust level not there.

So with me, I think how much do I trust her [Shari] to help or is she going back

the principal and saying are these the things that I see Helen lacking…The trust

level just wasn't there…I have always been real wary of administration.

In addition, her lack of trust was exacerbated by her lack of understanding of the

coaching process. When I shared the outline of the planning and reflecting conferences

she acknowledged recognition of some of the processes.

I think she has used all of these processes at some point…I just learned when

we went to Adaptive Schools, that was a process. It seemed to me that she was

questioning…I didn't know it was a process. To me she was questioning my

methods or the [way I did things].

I inquired as to how Helen would have felt if she had been aware of the process from the

beginning of the implementation process.

I would have felt a lot different…If I had some idea these are the strategies

that she is trained to use to have us look at our way of teaching, that would have

helped. That would be so helpful and if you knew that this was the process they

were using with everyone…You feel isolated and where we [Helen and her

fourth grade teammate] really felt wary was after we had low test scores…We

felt that Shari was questioning our teaching…If I had known she was using that

technique with everyone, I wouldn't have felt isolated.

Helen admitted that, as she became more aware of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process she

might be more willing to ask for help but she would have to know that what she talked

about with an instructional coach was kept confidential.

I asked Helen to clarify conflicting statements that had made during her previous

interview.

You shared two different perceptions about how you would have felt if you

had known about the process. First, you said did not feel that they [coaching

conversations] were sincere once you realized through Adaptive Schools that

there was a process. Then you said you would have felt differently if you had

known there was a process. You might have been more open and realized that

Shari was not just questioning your teaching and your instruction but that she

was using this process with everyone.…These are two very different

perceptions? Clarify your thoughts.

She had to think and reflect on her responses. After thought and time for reflection she

shared, "After reflection, my last interview with you is more correct. Once I understood

the process and the expectations I felt less stress and I would not have been as hesitant to

work with a coach." Helen's response to my probing and questioning became much

more relaxed and I also became more comfortable in having her clarify her perceptions

without feeling that I was judging her statements. I recognized that, in order to have

open and honest conversations, understanding the process was important to Helen.

Helen, also, did not perceive that she had a relationship with the instructional coach.

She stated, "I didn't have any relationship. Last year she came in to work with us to

raise our test scores…But we had no relationship." Helen's response is indicative that

people have to make connections and take the time to develop a relationship built on

trust.

Trust was consciously built by Shari as a part of her initial training. The

Cognitive Coaching[SM] Foundational Seminar (Costa and Garmston, 2002a) includes a

specific section on building trust and rapport. Trust is defined as, "The belief that those

on whom we depend will meet our expectation of them" (Ellison and Hayes, 2002,

p. 23). Costa and Garmston (2002b) state that Cognitive Coaching[SM] "relies on trust,

any manipulation by the coach is incompatible with the goals of trust and learning"

(p. 97). The Co-Directors of the Cognitive Coaching^SM, as I met with them during my research study, stressed the importance of building trust as I met with them during my research study. Instructional coaches were trained in processes, techniques, and use of language to build trust and rapport with individual teachers.

Throughout that first year of training both district personnel and the Cognitive Coaching^SM trainers stressed the importance of building trust to the instructional coaches.

> I think part of it is at the very beginning, we [Shari and Jane the other instructional coach] did anything we could, especially on those first days of school. You know when you are hanging out, people are putting up their bulletin boards. 'Oh, can I help, can I staple things for you?....the Executive Director of DLEA said [during the initial training] that is what it might mean, helping teachers put up books in their classroom or whatever. Here these people [instructional coaches] are and we [teachers] don't know what they are going to do to us…You were constantly looking for ways to do that [build trust]; In the lounge eating, having conversations, learning about people's families. How long have they been here. I think Connie and her teammate liked telling about the history of the school. Tell me more about how did this team become this…Get those pictures in your head of how things worked and what they did. I think I tried to be careful, especially at the beginning, well, I am still pretty careful about …what was going on in their classroom. I was not this little tattletale down to the office or whatever about what was going on in their classroom. I

know some coaches destroyed their trust and rapport with that particular

behavior. If the previous principal knew something or asked me about something

specific, I would give her the facts but that is where I would try to leave it at that.

Sometimes people would say, 'I just don't know anything about this [ex: guided

reading]…Don't tell the principal…I don't know but could you tell me?'…I

would just say, yeah, this is about guided reading…This is where you find

this….It is O.K. if you don't know this district document.

Building relationships and trust was something Shari recognized as critical to her

success as an instructional coach.

Open Communication

Trust was built as teachers perceived that they had open communication with the

instructional coach. She made them feel that they were on the same level. She wasn't

their "boss." Barbara described the relations she and Shari built as they worked closely

during the current school year.

I think it is that open communication between us….I can go and talk to her

about anything…that open communication, it helps you feel comfortable. In the

past, especially when I was beginning, I was afraid I was going to do something

wrong and maybe I didn't want to know I was doing something wrong. I don't

know what it was, now it is nice when I go to her. I know if I am doing

something wrong I know that she will not say 'Oh, you are a horrible teacher.' I

feel like I can go to her and say, 'How can I get better?' It is not looking at me

negatively. It is like, O.K., she wants me to learn, and she wants me to get better.

Maybe it is who she is. I feel like she and Maria are open to us coming and wanting to get better. They are not looking at it as a negative thing. We all aren't perfect.

Open communication was key to building trust between individual teachers and the instructional coach.

Trust was built with the instructional coach as teachers engaged in conversations with her and found that she really listened to them. Diane described her relationship with Shari as she worked closely with her as a result of the Read to Achieve Grant. "She really listened to us and we could share ideas." Marilyn shared the behaviors she observed as she worked closely with Shari during the current school year and reflected on the "snippets" of time they had worked together prior to that year. Marilyn did not originally feel that Shari had coached her. During our second interview, she reflected on her interaction with Shari. "She is so good to listen to me. She gets excited for me, She says, 'see what you did with this, that really worked'…She is helping me see that. She does coach me a lot." Marilyn's reflection allowed her change her own understanding of how she worked with the instructional coach. Shari's ability to listen and interact with the teachers helped build a relationship.

Teachers perceived that, after they built a relationship with her, they could be honest and tell her they were struggling with a certain aspect of their teaching. They could tell her that they just "bombed a lesson" or were confused. She would guide them through their thinking and help them reflect on their teaching. Barbara referred to this as she shared, "When we sit down, they [Shari and Maria] probably have an idea about

where they want us to go, but they guide us into that spot." Teachers shared their

personal feelings and perceived that they could be honest because of her openness and

the respect with which she demonstrated as they worked together.

Approachable/Respectful

Trust was developed between the teachers and the instructional coach as teachers

found her to be approachable. When I posed the question about why teachers continued

to engage in conversations with the instructional coach, Marilyn responded, "First of all,

she is approachable. If she made me feel like I was a complete idiot every time I used

her I wouldn't work with her….she doesn't make you feel stupid when she explains

things to you." Shari's approachable demeanor allowed teachers who had relationships

with the instructional coach to feel "safe" to engage in coaching conversations.

Judy perceived that if she was having difficulty implementing an educational

technique the instructional coach never made you feel inadequate. "Shari will give you

feedback, but it is not in a way that you walk away feeling putdown or criticized."

Connie noted,

> I don't know how other people feel, but I think she has a really great
>
> personality. She has such a great personality that [I feel she is] positive,
>
> encouraging, and not critical or better than you are. She has a personality that
>
> fits that job and she has the knowledge.

Whether teachers used the word personality or they described what made her

approachable they identified characteristics that made them want to engage in coaching

conversations.

Teachers perceived that Shari's and Maria's personalities have allowed them to feel comfortable to engage in coaching sessions. They perceived that Shari respected them and felt she wanted them to grow professionally. I observed a fifth/sixth grade meeting led by both Shari and Maria where the team was meeting to develop class lists for the coming year. The protocol to group the classes looked at Gender, English as a Second Language Students, students with an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP), and an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP), behavior, leadership abilities, and reading levels. They were going to build two very solid learning communities and not assign names or teachers to the grouping. This was a different process than they had used in the past and it would mean that Barbara, who functioned as team leader, might not be able to have siblings of students she had in the past and she might not be able to move to sixth grade with some students. The other two fifth/sixth grade teachers were not going to be at that grade level in the coming year, therefore, the change in structure to build the classes affected only Barbara.

During my second one-on-one interview with Barbara, I used the opportunity to gather her response to the new format that Shari and Maria had used in working through the creation of the fifth/sixth grade classes for 2005-2006 during their team meeting. I recognized that a portion of the process involved Cognitive Coaching[SM] strategies using reflection and that both Shari and Maria guided the process with questions. They referred to "positive presuppositions," a term defined in Cognitive Coaching[SM] Foundation Seminar Learning Guide (Ellison and Hayes, 2002, p. 51). Coaches are taught to support language structures that assume the positive about a person or, as they

structure a question, to pose that question with positives rather than a negative. In this case, Shari was asking the teachers to think of the positive aspects of each child rather than the negative aspects to consider for grouping.

I wanted to understand Barbara's perception and understanding of the grouping process. I began by stating, "It was really nice to watch you as a team, you had a difficult task yesterday afternoon, grouping classes. How did you feel about the meeting and the process?." She gave a very open and honest response.

Honestly, I did feel a little frustrated. I felt frustrated because how we did the lists was different than what we have ever done. It was new, change is hard and what was hard is that I have been here for six years and I have a real bond and connection with a lot of families in the community. I have had their siblings and sometimes there are families I have had three of their children now and I felt kind of frustrated because I couldn't fight for those kids I would love to have. Usually when we sit down and do class lists we sit down and look at all those other things. We'd say I had so and so's other kids so I want them in my room for that community kind of piece and I felt like that wasn't even an option.

I inquired as to how she felt when they completed the process, "When you finished how did you feel?"

The class lists looked really balanced. I still feel like maybe we could have balanced them with granting some of those fifth graders now that loop with me…I have always seen huge growth and I had a concern because half of my class won't be in room next year no matter what list look like. But what was nice

was that Maria asked me how I felt this morning….I felt more validated. I

understood the protocol and I think it is a very fair protocol. It is hard this year

because of the connection I already have with those fifth graders…I feel a lot

better. I was stressed out about it leaving last night… I respected the process—I

thought it was a fair process, it is just hard when you have that personal

connection.

I questioned her comfort level with the process, "Do you think you could have been at

that point [comfort] with that process if you had not worked so closely together this

year?

No, I don't think so, because I trust both Shari and Maria and I trust their

professional judgment that is why I was able to sit back and say, 'Let's do it this

way, let's try it.' Otherwise, if I had not seen them be successful with some other

protocols they have done ….I trusted what they were doing and it probably is

because we have worked so closely together. I knew that if I talked to Shari or

Maria later they would at least listen to what I had to say. This list was tentative,

it was not a final list. I thought, why battle it now….Let's do the protocol but if

there is something I needed to speak up about, I could do that later.

While this was more of administrative task, it was a very clear example of a teacher that

had just worked closely with the instructional coach and the new principal during the

current school year and built a bond of trust.

Knowledgeable

Teachers described Shari as knowledgeable and trusted her instructional skills. During the initial interviews I heard teachers refer to the instructional coach as a resource. Teachers recognized that when they met with her or engaged in conversations she had a wealth of knowledge and resources. Barbara identified that she used Shari as a resource. "When there is something I don't understand or ideas I need, I use her as a resource. She can tell me where to go or she will contact somebody and find the information for me…She [Shari] is an expert in the content areas and we can utilize her expertise or knowledge as to where to go.." Teachers perceived that she was extremely knowledgeable, innovative, and resourceful. They perceived that she willingly shared professional knowledge and helped teachers grow professionally. Diane described the impact on her educational practice.

> I have grown through all this with the instructional coach because I have been using her from the beginning. She has come in and done modeling for me, I have used her as a resource. So, I have worked with her and I am very solid with my instruction.

Marilyn reflected that, in spite of her knowledge, "She will tell you she doesn't know kindergarten but she will say, Marilyn, I will get the question answered for you." When I probed about how that made her feel, she reflected, "It makes me think she doesn't know everything and that is O.K. with me….Maybe I am asking a good question."

Teachers described her as knowledgeable, progressive, and innovative yet a person who was willing to admit that she did not know everything. Teachers indicated those qualities made it comfortable to communicate with the instructional coach.

Non-judgmental

Teachers used the word non-judgmental to describe working with the instructional coach. She built trust with them because they never felt she judged them but rather guided them as they engaged in conversations with her. During interviews, teachers used the word non-judgmental or non-threatening. Judy described her interaction with Shari.

> I think there has to be a non-judgmental or non-threatening piece so that they
> [instructional coaches] are approachable. What I saw with a lot of people is that
> they [teachers] worry, 'Do you think I am not doing that job.' That tentativeness,
> 'Do you not think I am competent?' Shari is not that way—she will give you
> what you ask for and she will take you as far as you can go.

Shari acknowledged that she consciously worked at being non-judgmental.

> That is another thing, I do not feel that I was ever judgmental, even if I saw
> the most appalling thing in their class…They would have never known it by my
> body language or anything else like that.

Cognitive Coaching[SM] training teaches that during a "reflecting conversation, the coach provides the teacher with data nonjudgmentally" (Garmston and Costa, 2002b, p. 51). Therefore, Shari's intention to be nonjudgmental was aligned with her Cognitive Coaching[SM] training.

Time

If the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] was dependent on teachers engaging in conversation with the instructional coach, time became a critical factor in that process. Teachers have to have time to meet with the instructional coach in order to build a relationship and engage in reflection, planning, or problem-solving conversations. Teachers perceived time as an obstacle that inhibited the implementation and use of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

The teachers involved with the Read to Achieve Grant referred to the time Shari had to work with the teachers involved in the Read to Achieve Grant and identified time as a major factor in why they built such a strong relationship. While teachers acknowledged the time that was spent with second and third grades when they had the Read Achieve Grant, those who were not a part of the grant felt that she worked at times too much with one grade level. Barbara made reference to this as she discussed that, as a team, they never sat down to map out their curriculum until the current year. "We have never sat out and mapped our lesson until this year….The primary teachers had the Read to Achieve Grant. It left the intermediate teachers in the dust." Marilyn, Barbara, Helen, and Mary Jo all referred to the fact that the instructional coach worked closely with the second and third grades during the previous years. Marilyn described what she saw watching Shari work with the second and third grade team, "I saw instructional professionalism grow when the second and third grades did the Read to Achieve…They worked together, they got time to meet as a group. They saw professional speakers…They developed cohesiveness, grew as professionals and friends." Each of

the seven teachers I interviewed consistently referred to the Read to Achieve Grant and the importance of that grant to the relationship the second and third grade teachers built with the instructional coach and each other. Teachers perceived that, in order for there to be effective implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, everyone needed to have access and time to work with the instructional coach.

Six of the seven teachers perceived that they built trust with the instructional coach as they engaged in coaching conversations. They identified and described the instructional coach as approachable, knowledgeable, respectful, and non-judgmental. They perceived they built trust through her open communication and each felt it took time to build a relationship with her. Cognitive Coaching[SM] training provided a background of understanding and helped instructional coaches utilize techniques and processes to build and rapport with individual teachers with whom they worked.

Influence on Change in Educational Practice

As teachers shared their perceptions of the implementation by an instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process they identified changes they had made in their own educational practice as a result of their work with the instructional coach. Despite the fact that teachers did not use nor define the process as Cognitive Coaching[SM], nevertheless, teachers recognized that these conversations influenced their instruction. This theme or pattern evolved as I continually probed and clarified their understanding and perception of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

Lack of Professionalism/Change with the Campus

As I searched for obstacles and contributors to the implementation process I expected to find a wide array of programs and processes being implemented at the campus site. As I probed and questioned my way through the interviews I began to hear teachers describe their campus as "not very progressive." They found it difficult to identify programs initiated at the campus level. The programs they identified, e.g., social studies, science, were district-initiated. Connie, Mary Jo, Helen, and Shari had taught in other schools, therefore, their experiences allowed them a lens through which to compare progressiveness at this campus. Barbara, Marilyn, Michelle, and Ann had taught only at this campus, their educational training was relatively recent. Consequently, throughout the interviews they shared their surprise when they came to this school and recognized how entrenched teachers were in the traditional mode of instruction.

Diane provided an example as she described a committee on which she served whose purpose was to bring the schools in the area together to build connections among the campuses and strengthen the schools in the area.

> I am on this committee …all the schools that feed into Rolling Ridge High School. It is an area committee that we started because our schools are dropping so in number…There are two teachers from every building… I hated going to hear what all these other schools were doing…I knew nothing about what they were talking about…I felt bad because Rolling Ridge was never a part of things going on.

This perception of a lack of progressiveness and implementation of new programs was prevalent as I interviewed teachers.

As I talked with Judy about innovations and programs being implemented at Rolling Ridge, she referred in more than one interview to a lot of teachers here [Rolling Ridge] who were "stuck." I asked her specifically what she meant by that. "Well, they are stuck in that they were not going to accept benchmarks, standards in education…There was not a lot of staff development." This lack of training was a common theme that I heard from many of the participants.

Ann made a reference to Rolling Ridge being a "dark" campus when she was first came to the campus five years ago. I asked that she explain what she meant by this statement? Was she talking about the building or the people? She clarified, "The building and the way people were." She noted that the building had been renovated and was much lighter and open. She remembered, "People were really isolated. Staff meetings had nothing to do with staff development." Connie, however, had begun to see a shift in teachers approach to their teaching. She stated, "There has been a shift in not just trying to cover material for the sake of covering material but you are just trying to raise the quality of your instruction, sometimes to the 'fatigue of the teachers.'" Based on teacher's comments I concluded that there had been a lack of innovations and reform at Rolling Ridge as opposed to too many initiatives, innovations, and reforms often prevalent at many school sites. However, from teacher's comments, I sensed that over the last several years with changes in teaching staff and with the change in leadership

during the current school year, there had begun to be more interest in working with the instructional coach to make changes in educational practice.

Coaching Conversations

Interestingly, teachers began to share, when I first started interviewing them, that they hadn't really thought about the process the instructional coach used and the influence those conversations had on their educational practice. Through the interview process, they became more reflective as they shared their perception of the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} conversations. While Helen consistently maintained she had limited access to the instructional coach, nonetheless, she shared her belief that the reflection conversation,

> …her conversations remind me to go back and do the things I have forgotten
> to do. As long as I have taught, sometimes I assume baseline knowledge that is
> not new in this area… it helps me to go back and do more background
> questioning and explaining …Although I do not think any of the cognitive ideas
> are new, sometimes we forget.

This statement confirmed her belief that educational strategies and techniques are not new but cyclical. Helen perceived the coaching conversations as a vehicle to remind her of instructional techniques she felt she had forgotten to use.

From Ann's perspective the coaching conversations "Made me look at my teaching a different way." I asked her to expand on why she felt this way.

> By my questions being answered with their [Shari and Maria] questions for
> me to think about. They redirect me to resources or they get me resources.

Again just having that abundant resource to go to at anytime with questions about my teaching …it [coaching conversations] have certainly changed my teaching. If I couldn't find the answers, I would have figured out someway… I think it has helped me reflect on what the districts wants. Ann has worked closely with Shari along with Diane over the past five years.

Shari reflected on her work with Ann and Diane who were first and second year teachers when she began to work with in her first year of implementation.

I think those two teachers didn't look like first year teachers or young teachers very long, when I think about third year teachers in the building where I originally came from. The [third year teachers in her previous campus] didn't look anything like Ann and Diane looked like after three years…Ann and Diane were people you could depend on to give solid instruction. Whereas, any other third year teachers are still in that floundering state…Both Ann and Diane had high consciousness about what they needed to do.

This consciousness was evident as I interviewed both Ann and Diane during the one-on-one conversations.

Judy explained how she had transferred the coaching conversations to her classroom. "Today we [the class] were talking about probability and I stopped with the kids and started taking them through my thinking. I was modeling for them what my thinking was like." She moved from this reflection to describe how she plans, "I look at the benchmark and I put my activity in and my planning together so that by the end of that time I have covered the benchmarks I am

suppose to." Not only had the instructional coaching and working with the instructional coach influenced techniques but also goals that she set for her students. She felt conversations with the instructional coach made her think through how she approached an instructional techniques and her planning. The coaching conversations and her work with Shari and the Read to Achieve Grant changed her instructional techniques in her classroom. Ann shared the following example:

> I did not know that I was actually supposed to teach and call it fluency. I am doing that this last month in my class, focusing on fluency and reading with expression. I am using those words with my kids and I had not really every done that before. It [coaching conversations] gave me ideas. Like having a kid read a poem and timing themselves to see if they can read it faster, recording their voice to see if they can read with more expression. Pausing where they need to. I am focusing on that more and the language I am using with my kids is more specific than it was before, not that I didn't teach fluency but not in the same way.

While teachers could not always articulate specific terminology for Cognitive Coaching^{SM}, they could provide examples of how working with the instructional coach had influenced and changed their instructional techniques.

Change in Educational Practice

Teachers perceived that individual and group conversations with the instructional group influenced their educational practice. Throughout the interview process, teachers identified changes in their literacy instruction. At each grade level, they gave examples

of how they had changed their guided reading instruction by working with the instructional coach. These changes might be in the use of non-fiction, fluency, or writing. Each of the teachers, including Helen, gave examples of how they interacted with the instructional coach and engaged in conversations with her about their educational practice during the current school year. Helen gave the example, "Shari did come in and teach a lesson for my class on how you figure out what the big picture is after you read a certain article. Why was that article written? What were the purposes of reading circles?" In spite of Helen's insistence on her lack of experience with the instructional coach, she provides this example along with her statement that she now uses more non-fiction since she worked with Shari. Judy also provided an example of how coaching conversations had impacted her instruction. "After working with Shari, I don't stay limited to my textbook anymore… Now I look at materials and look at them for units, I just look at things differently." These examples confirmed that the reflective process in which Shari engages with teachers facilitates change in educational practice even when there is resistance and lack of understanding.

Diane shared a specific example of how the coaching conversations and meeting through the Read to Achieve Grant influenced her instruction.

For 3 years with the grant either from the other second grade teachers or from Shari [we talked about how] to teach fluency, how to get kids to write written responses to their reading. We worked on phonemic awareness, she was definitely a resource. One meeting, we said we are having trouble with fluency and students not being fluent readers and we feel like this is affecting their

comprehension—and in the next meeting we would come back and she or

another teacher had pulled an article about fluency. We would go through it and

read it independently. We would highlight and then we would have a

conversation about it as a group….What are you going to take from this

article…How are you going to change your instruction from what you just

read…How can we move kids along by reading this information…How are we

going to move kids along in their reading?...The fluency piece really stands out

for me. That was always an important portion of the reading. I did not know that

I was actually suppose to teach and call it fluency….I am using those words with

my kids and I had not really ever done that before. I am focusing on that more

and the language I am using with my kids is more specific than it was before—

not I didn't teach fluency but not in the same way.

Diane's description reinforced Shari's reflection that both Diane and Ann had grown

over the years to be very knowledge teachers and conscious of the instructional

techniques that they used. Shari commented on the influence of the Cognitive Coaching

conversations in how Diane and Ann approach planning for instruction. She saw them,

Reflect on all the aspects of their instruction…the planning part…are you

going to collect your data? What instructional techniques they were going to use?

Always thinking about the broader picture…I see when I look at Diane and Ann

how they have that template in their heads.…paraphrasing and asking appropriate

probing questions that are going to lead them to that next spot.

Shari's comments confirmed earlier statements that the coaching conversations had influenced both Diane and Ann's instruction.

I continued to be intrigued that while teachers struggled to identify the process of Cognitive Coaching[SM], they acknowledged changes in their instructional practice over time as they engaged in individual conversations with the instructional coach and met in cross-grade level groups with the instructional coach. Helen credited incremental changes in her educational practice to her limited work with the instructional coach. When I probed for an example of a change in educational practice she shared the following:

> We [Helen and her teammate] do a lot more in non-fiction and we do a lot with the non-fiction category in what to look for—the importance of why it was written, the vocabulary ….I didn't put a lot of emphasis on non-fiction. Before we did a lot of group work with fiction and the kids liked to read fiction more. So, I have really implemented my non-fiction and with that I have combined my non-fiction with my social studies. We do use our social studies a lot for non-fiction reading.

Like Helen, other teachers provided examples of how their educational practice had changed despite their inability to identify the process of Cognitive Coaching[SM].

Barbara had worked closely with the instructional coach during the current school year. I asked her to reflect or think of something that had changed in your instructional practice during the current school year.

There are a lot of things I do (differently). Well, for example with guided reading. I think seeing her model a lesson and seeing the way she organized her guided reading was something I did not know how to do. For example, you have 6-8 kids. I wasn't sure how to manage the running record part of it. In the past, I had the kids all read aloud from chapter books or whatever. Now we are doing short text…You are suppose to be doing running record once a week with these older kids. I wasn't sure how she did that while having the other kids doing what they are suppose to be doing, reading independently…It was good to see her model and her suggestion was to have them read and go from kid to kid to kid or target one or two kids. She told me about it and then she actually showed it to me when she came and did the lesson…I had never done before and now I use it…. In our conversation when we debriefed, she asked me, 'What kinds of things did you see? Is there anything you would like clarified or something I can go deeper into? That was really the conversation I had. I told her what I observed, she gave me feedback.

This invisible process had resulted in change in educational practice in spite of their confessed lack of awareness and their inability to articulate and define the process. Shari reflected on how powerful the process of Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations might be if the implementation had been more explicit and well-defined.

They have a lot of power to them. So we [Shari and Maria] are thinking that for next year that is something that we might be very explicit about. It is called

Cognitive Coaching^{SM} and we are going to have a planning conversation and this

is what the outcome of that planning conversation should be.

Elmore (2003b) argued that teachers needed a clear vision and expectations as teachers

worked together to change educational practice. As I listened and reviewed tapes, I

wondered how the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} might have been different

with clear, defined goals and teachers' understanding of the process. Despite the lack of

clarity, there were many examples that demonstrated the influence coaching

conversations had on teachers' instructional techniques.

Student Achievement

The theme of student achievement evolved as teachers consistently referred to

the success of the third grade teachers and students. Teachers correlated success to

increased student scores on the state testing program. Specifically, teachers noted

students in third grade had made the largest gains in reading over a three year period.

Every teacher, including the third grade teacher, credited this success to the Read to

Achieve Grant and the consistent cross-grade level work of the second and third grade

teachers with Shari. Even though Helen was somewhat resistant to engage in coaching

conversations with Shari she acknowledged "something positive" was happening at the

third grade. "She [Shari] developed over the years of the grant a real relationship with

the second and third grade teachers…I think that K-3 Grant [Read to Achieve] was good

for them but it really put fourth grade at a deficit." When I questioned if she felt they

should have been involved in the grant, she responded, "No, I just feel like they were getting a lot of help and we were floundering."

As stated previously, Shari identified the Read to Achieve Grant as the only formalized avenue she had for implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] during her first four years on the campus. It was akin to a small laboratory study of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] existing within a larger setting. It provided a model of implementation in a setting often disadvantageous to the implementation process.

Overview of the Chapter Content

Lack of understanding and clarity of the Cognitive Coaching process, campus leadership, openness, resistance, and trust were evident themes. This lack of awareness of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process was a central theme that influenced the research study. It caused me to have to adjust questions, probe deeper for understanding, and recognize that the instructional coach was the vehicle through which I had to study the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. While teachers could not identify the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process, they could describe a process they used with the instructional coach. Therefore, slowly the theme of change in educational practice evolved as they shared their perceptions of the implementation by the instructional coach of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Student achievement was an undercurrent that teachers perceived as the motivation for the implementation of the instructional coach who engaged in coaching conversations. Collectively these themes evolved from the interviews along with observations, and historical documents during the research study.

In the next chapter I discuss these themes and findings particularly as they relate to research. I also consider the implications for theory and practices based on these findings and make recommendations for further research and conclude the study.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The study revealed six varied themes. The lack of understanding and clarity of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} evolved early in the study. The influence of the campus leadership, teacher's openness and willingness or resistance to change, development of relationships and trust, and the influence and change in educational practice were the major themes that evolved through analysis of the data. Student achievement was a theme that surfaced as teachers attributed the success of the third grade students on state testing to the collaboration of the second and third grade team with the instructional coach. The interrelatedness of the theme of campus leadership, trust and teachers' openness and willingness to learn became more apparent as I analyzed the data and synthesized the findings . While gathering data on the implementation process the multi-faceted nature of the process became so apparent.

Lack of Understanding and Clarity of the Cognitive Coaching Process

Throughout the interview process, I perceived ambiguity and lack of awareness on the part of teachers of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. Teachers involved in the study were tentative in their understanding of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process and had little awareness that there were specific well-defined process, e.g., reflection and planning conversations. Teachers consistently acknowledged that the instructional

coach and the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process were implemented simultaneously. While

teachers identified the use of reflection and questions used during conversations with the

instructional coach, they did not see the connection to the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

Teachers had little recognition of participating in "planning conferences," even though

they recognized the activities of setting goals and personal learning. I concluded that

this lack of understanding interfered with the implementation process.

Researchers have characterized the implementation process as developmental not

linear. Hall and Hord (2001) have identified distinct stages in the implementation

process. The second stage of the implementation focuses on the implementation,

organization, management, and scheduling. Implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}

was dependent on teachers engaging in coaching conversations with an instructional

coach. Neither the principal nor the teachers at the campus level were trained in the

Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. The teachers never even had an opportunity for an

overview of the process. Therefore, it was dependent on the instructional coach to

organize, manage, and schedule implementation at the campus level. The instructional

coach during the early years of the implementation was discouraged from using any

Cognitive Coaching^{SM} terminology. Therefore, this type of restrictions created an

environment that interfered with teacher's ability to build understanding of the process.

Teachers increased level of awareness of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process, was

a direct result of a change in campus leadership. In addition, teachers had opportunities

to attend district training, i.e., Adaptive Schools Training, during the school year in

which the study was conducted. Adaptive Schools Training provides limited

understanding to participants of the terminology and concepts of the Cognitive

Coaching^SM process. Chapter II identifies teachers as key agents in the implementation

process. Spillane (1999) defined the space where teachers embrace an innovation or

reform as the "zone of enactment." It is the space where a teacher encounters the reform

and constructs or operationalizes the idea. Teachers' understanding of the innovation or

reform is influenced by those with whom they interact in that "zone". In reality, the

teachers never had the opportunity to enter the zone of enactment until the current school

year when they became more aware that the instructional coach was using a specific

process, Cognitive Coaching^SM. Professional dialogue and discussion creates a zone of

enactment to support implementation. Teachers who attempt to implement a process

individually rely on their own understanding of the innovation or reform. The teachers

who were a part of the Read to Achieve Grant created a zone of enactment where they

shared their collective understanding as they engaged in coaching conversations which

influenced their educational practice, irregardless of the fact that they were not aware of

a specific process.

Influence of the Campus Leadership

The complex process of implementing Cognitive Coaching^SM was dependent on

two key factors at Rolling Ridge Elementary School. The synergy between the

leadership at the campus level and teacher's willingness to engage in conversations.

These two factors created conditions that both support and impede the implementation of

Cognitive Coaching^SM. Because implementation of Cognitive Coaching^SM was

dependent on the instructional coach; refusal and resistance to work with the coach blocked the implementation process.

The implementation process of Cognitive Coaching[SM] in Pleasant Valley County Schools depended on the campus leadership, specifically the principal, or a team to fulfill the role and function as change agents at the individual campuses. Sykes (1996) and Elmore (1997) both argued that change agents must support teachers as they reconstruct their educational practice and help teachers build on their prior beliefs and knowledge through the use of reflection. This was the role of the instructional coach to support teachers as they reconstructed their practice and specifically engage teachers in Cognitive Coaching[SM] reflection conversations. Elmore's (2002a) contention is that this type of leadership is vital to improve an organization's performance and there must be deep understanding of cognitive and affective skills necessary to make those changes. The change agent did not have to be the principal but could in fact be a team who shared the leadership. The instructional coach was given the role of "change agent" in the implementation process.

Therefore, to support the use of the instructional coach was a key factor in the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. Teachers quickly identified leadership as both an obstacle and a facilitator of the implementation process. The district had designed a model to implement Cognitive Coaching[SM] through the instructional coach. The implementation at the campus level was dependent on the principal and the relationship teachers established with the instructional coach. In this case, teachers perceived the previous principal had neither the skills nor an understanding of the

process to consistently implement the instructional coaching model and the use of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. For example, the model was designed specifically for the instructional coach to engage in coaching conversations with the third and fourth grade teachers. This scenario was confirmed by all but one teacher I interviewed, the instructional coach, and the Executive Director for Learning and Educational Achievement (DLEA). The historical data also connected the instructional coach with the third and grade teachers in the initial phase. I interviewed three of the four teachers assigned to third and fourth grades during the first year of implementation; all three agreed that the two part-time instructional coaches did not work with the fourth grade teachers.

The fourth grade teacher I interviewed maintained she never understood she was to work with the instructional coaches during the first year or the following years of implementation. She held fast to this belief despite the pervasive amount of contradictory data. She contended that she only worked with the instructional coach in the year prior to the study when the coach modeled lessons in her class and worked with students.

The change in leadership during the year in which the study was conducted provided a background for teachers to recognize the different styles of leadership and the skills of the current principal. This change in leadership provided them the ability to differentiate between a principal who had no training and experience with Cognitive Coaching[SM] as opposed to a principal who had extensive training and had used the process for over five years. The current principal had been an instructional coach and,

therefore, worked cohesively with the instructional coach at Rolling Ridge Elementary.

Spillane, Diamond, and Jita (2003) studied distributed leadership over a four year period.

Their study explored how leadership was stretched over multiple individuals. They

termed the phrase "collective leading" to characterize when "two or more leaders work

together to co-enact a particular leadership task" (p. 538). In this case study, the

instructional coach, and the current principal were collectively leading to implement the

Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process, a far different model than the one used during previous

years of implementation.

     Prior to the year in which I conducted the study the teacher's perceived the

campus leadership had not worked closely with the instructional coach. If a teacher used

the union rules about planning time as a reason not to work with the instructional coach,

they were not required to work with her. The previous principal suggested the

instructional coach concentrate on those teachers who were willing to work with her. In

one-on-one interviews, teachers shared examples of when staff members flatly refused to

work with the instructional coach and the principal supported their request through non-

action. In some instances, teachers reported that often teachers with the lowest scores on

the state testing simply refused to work with the instructional coach and the previous

leadership did not demand otherwise. In an age of high accountability on state tests and

pressure on campus leadership this was astounding.

     Therefore, the contrast between the current and previous leadership created an

opportunity for teachers to differentiate between the two leadership styles, the

expectations, and the knowledge and skills. There was a synchrony between a teacher'

resistance or willingness and campus leadership. The synergy of the two appeared to either inhibit or facilitate the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

Open and Willingness to Change/Resistance

The theme of teachers' openness and willingness aligned with researchers' beliefs that in order for change to occur, individual teachers must have the will and capacity to change their educational practice during the implementation process (Knight and Erlandson, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Spillane and Jennings, 1997). Sykes (1991) and Elmore (2002b) identified that a teachers' willingness to learn has often been influenced by his or her disposition toward learning. I consistently heard teachers refer to being life-long learners and valuing learning. Researchers contend teachers who willingly change also value continuous learning. Those teachers who expressed a desire to make changes in their educational practice also willingly engaged in Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations with the instructional coach.

This attitude of openness or willingness to learn was embedded in teachers' individual perceptions and reflected Hall and Hord's (2001) Stages of Concern in the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM). The stages of concern are arranged in a continuum which focuses on self at the informational and personal level to a more task-oriented process at the management level. The three upper levels of the continuum focus on consequences, collaboration, and the refocusing of the innovation. My study focused on the implementation by an instructional coach of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. As I read through the interview transcripts, teacher's comments coincided with the identified levels of concern. Three of the seven teacher participants ranged from those who had

little experience with the instructional coach to one teacher who identified herself as resistant.

As I listened to the interviews and transcripts of the more resistant teacher, it became apparent to me that her level of concern was personal. Her comments focused on her uncertainty about working with the instructional coach. She consistently perceived there was never an expectation for her to work with the coach even though she taught in one of the grade levels for which the instructional coaches were hired. She was not sure working with the coach would make a difference in her educational practice and she was hesitant because she did not understand the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

The other two teachers willingly engaged in coaching conversations but their experiences prior to the current year were limited. Their discussions focused on the management level of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}. They described the organization, scheduling, and the process they went through as they made decisions during team and cross-grade level meetings. They were cognizant that the instructional coach encouraged them to reflect on their instructional practice and both felt they were making changes in their educational practice because of their conversations with the instructional coach.

The other four teachers in this study have worked consistently over the past five years with the instructional coach. While at times they did not identify the specific terminology of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}, they were aware there was a style through which they worked together. Three of the four [Diane, Ann, Connie] worked with the instructional coach through the Read to Achieve Grant. The fourth teacher, Judy,

requested the help of the instructional coach when she was first assigned to the campus. In addition, Judy had experience working with an instructional coach in another school district. Therefore, she willingly and openly sought ways to have coaching conversations to support changes in her educational practice. The language these four teachers used focused on the impact their conversations had on their teaching and their students' achievement. They had a high level of consciousness that these conversations and cross-grade level meetings were powerful. They consistently referred to the coordination and cooperation as they worked with the coach and other teachers to adjust and make changes in their educational practice. Their statements parallel those statements outlined in the impact level of the Stages of Concern. Teacher's attitude of openness or willingness to learn was embedded in their individual perceptions.

Researchers identified teacher autonomy as a stumbling block to the implementation process (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 1997, 2003b; Sykes, 1991). Teachers within the campus at Rolling Ridge had a great deal of autonomy prior to the current school year. Teachers acknowledged that engaging in coaching conversations was optional. Teachers confirmed that individual teachers closed their classroom doors and made their own decisions about teaching strategies. Judy described a meeting in which a particular grade level was faced with extremely low student performance scores on their state assessment in math, and yet they decided that they did not need to change their practice. Teacher's abilities to make autonomous decisions coupled with human resistance to change often created roadblocks for teachers' to engage in coaching conversations.

There appeared to be synergy between the themes of campus leadership and teachers' willingness and openness to learn. As resistance increased, the opportunity for implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process decreased. Likewise, as teachers' openness and willingness increased, so did the prospects for implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] to occur.

Relational Trust

Relationships and trust evolved slowly as a theme but eventually became interconnected with teachers' willingness or resistance to engage in coaching conversations with the instructional coach. There was interdependence between Cognitive Coaching[SM] and the level of trust. Teachers contended they worked closely with the instructional coach because they trusted her and they felt they could be open with her. The resistant teacher felt she did not work with the instructional coach because of a lack of trust. She described herself as, "was wary of the administration" and perceived the instructional coach closely connected with the administration. Comments about trust began to underscore the importance of trust to the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching[SM].

The authors (Costa and Garmston, 2002a) of Cognitive Coaching[SM] identified trust as a basic premise for implementation to occur. They identified the following factors as consistent with the research on developing trusting relationships

> Maintaining confidentiality, being visible and accessible, behaving
>
> consistently, keeping commitments, sharing personal information about out-of-
>
> school activities, revealing feelings, expressing personal interest in other people,

acting nonjudgmentally, listening reflectively, admitting mistakes, and demonstrating professional knowledge and skills. Trust grows stronger as long as these behaviors continue, but a relationship can be seriously damaged when someone is discourteous or disrespectful, makes value judgments, overreacts, acts arbitrarily, threatens, or is personally insensitive to another person. (p. 97)

These traits were often cited by teachers as reasons why they were willing to engage in coaching conversations with the instructional coach even though they seldom identified the process as Cognitive Coaching[SM].

As I reviewed the literature on implementation research, trust was not a prevalent theme in the implementation literature. I began to search for literature that would provide a better understanding of trust as it influenced the implementation process. My search led me to the seminal work of Bryk and Schneider (2002) which was most comprehensive and defined relational trust. They had reviewed their own studies and the literature from disciplines outside of school organization in order to better define this issue of trust. Their book "pulls together" many of the comments I heard as I reviewed and listened to the transcripts of the one-on-one interviews. Teachers commented that the instructional coach was approachable, knowledgeable, respectful, non-judgmental, and shared examples of open communication. These are characteristics of how teachers understood they developed a trusting relationship with the instructional coach.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) also heard similar comments about trust as they interviewed school leaders, teachers, and parents in twelve Chicago elementary schools. These researchers, along with a team from the University of Chicago, studied the reform

efforts in the Chicago Public Schools over a three year period and added to the body of implementation research. As they explored the literature on the topic of trust, they identified trust as a key element of implementation. However, they found there was little systematic research on the topic. Therefore, they reviewed the literature and their own field notes to focus on the "distinctive qualities of interpersonal social exchanges within a school community" and coined the phrase "relational trust" (p. 12). They viewed relational trust as the "social exchanges of schooling as organized around a distinct set of relationships." Within these relationships they posited, "A dynamic interplay among four considerations—respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity." Interestingly, these four characteristics correlate with those characteristics teachers identified as important to the development of the trust relationship with the instructional coach as they engaged in coaching conversations.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) described respect in terms of how conversations take place within the school setting between teachers and children, teachers with teachers, and teachers with administration. They contend that "a genuine sense of listening to what each person has to say marks the basis for meaningful social interaction" (p. 23). This respect involves awareness of the importance each role plays within the school setting as it relates to a child's education. These descriptions of respect and listening were common traits I heard attributed to the instructional coach throughout the one-on-one interviews.

Early during the interview process I heard teachers describe the instructional coach as knowledgeable and competent. Even the resistant teacher felt the instructional

coach had a great wealth of resources and lamented her [the teacher's] inability to access those. Recognition of competence or an "individual's ability to execute their formal role" was the second criterion identified by Bryk and Schneider (2002).

Bryk and Schneider (2002) found that "interpersonal trust deepens as individuals perceive that others care about them and are willing to extend themselves beyond what their role might formally require" (p. 25). For the teachers at Rolling Ridge their relationship deepened as they found her to be non-judgmental. This particular characteristic was important for them as they built and sustained a working relationship with the instructional coach and engaged in coaching conversations.

The fourth distinctive characteristic for relational trust was integrity. Bryk and Schneider (2002) posited that people established integrity through consistency between what people said and what they did. Integrity for the teachers at Rolling Ridge centered on her honesty during the coaching conversations and her ability to maintain confidentially as she interacted with them in Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations.

While the theme of trust was not surprising it was not evident throughout review of the literature. As a former principal and assistant superintendent I knew instinctively that building trust was an integral part of implementation of any program or process. Teachers and administrative staff had to trust that the process on which we embarked as a team was important and worthwhile for both the students and the staff. Parents had to trust that a new educational program would support rather than interfere with the learning process. As the theme of trust evolved it reinforced my belief that building trust is critical to any implementation process.

Influence on Instructional Change

The implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] by an instructional coach influenced and brought about change in educational practice, in spite of teachers limited understanding of the process. What teachers did recognize, was that they did have opportunities to engage in conversation with the instructional coach. The majority of the teachers recognized Shari's importance as a resource and her knowledge of instructional strategies. Review of the literature argued that teachers have to reframe a new innovation or practice. Little changes, if teachers do not create a mental model to connect their new learning to their old practice (Elmore, 2003b; Spillane, 2002). The findings of this study support this argument that when teachers engaged in coaching conversations with the instructional coach and other teachers, they had opportunities to create new mental models and attempt new strategies and techniques they might not have otherwise attempted without support.

Even though teachers had difficulty describing the Cognitive Coaching process, they did perceive that their instructional practice changed as a result of engaging in coaching conversations. Throughout the literature review in Chapter II, researchers contend that teachers learn as they engage in processes where they work together in groups. They found that professional discourse and dialogue creates opportunities for teachers to clarify misunderstanding and to discuss implementation of new practices (Cohen and Ball, 1990; Elmore, 2002a; Spillane, 2002; Sykes, 1991, 1995, 1996). The Cognitive Coaching[SM] process creates opportunities for teachers to engage coaching conversations around their instructional practice. It is a powerful process which teachers

acknowledged influenced their instructional practice, even if they had limited access or there was resistance.

This change in educational practice was also influenced by a teacher's willingness to engage in coaching conversations and learn new educational techniques. While there are five major themes, they overlap and some have greater influence than others, i.e., campus leadership. Therefore, while the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] influenced change in educational practice, it did not occur unless a teacher was open and willing to change. Teachers also had to recognize there was need to change. Many of the participants referred to a renewed sense of professionalism at Rolling Ridge Elementary and they perceived that as the staff developed a more professional attitude, it also brought about teacher's willingness to change their educational practice.

The literature review in Chapter II, identified teachers as key change agents. Implementation theories provided background and arguments which explain the difficulty and complexity of implementation at the classroom level. First, researchers recognized the developmental nature of the implementation process (Elmore, 2003a; Hall and Hord, 2001. Second, teachers must have the will and capacity to change (Elmore, 2003a; Fullan, 2001; Hall and Hord, 2001). Third, teachers' current norms and values must change as a part of the implementation process (Elmore, 2002b; 2003a, 2003b; Sykes, 1991). Fourth, teachers not only must willingly change but recognize the knowledge and skills needed to implement the innovation or reform. The findings in this

study are supported by the implementation research and the influence of teachers on the implementation process.

Student Achievement

The influence of an instructional coach's use of Cognitive Coaching[SM] on student achievement evolved as a theme as teachers talked about the success of the third grade students on the state test. They perceived student success on the state test correlated with the third grade teachers opportunity work as a cohesive team as a result of the Read to Achieve Grant. This grant provided the opportunity for the second and third grade teachers to work closely on literacy over a three year period. Connie gave a very specific example of how their conversation impacted student achievement in writing.

> At one of our grant meetings, actually more than one, our focus was writing. We watched some videos and discussed writing… the premise of the videos is that you can actually teach kids to be better writers. It is not like some have the gift and some don't. There are very specific things that you can do. I never learned [some of these techniques] in college or workshops that I have gone to over the years. Shari introduced those to us in the grant meetings.

This example was supported as review of test data confirmed that the third grade writing scores have improved over the last three years. Teachers attributed the success of the third grade students to the collaboration of the second and third grade team and the instructional coach over a three period. While this was not a major theme, it related to the influence of change in educational practice and the trust that was built among this team as they worked together over a three year period.

The themes of lack of understanding and clarity of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM}, influence of the campus leadership, development of relationship and trust, the influence on change in educational practice, and student achievement provided a basis for a deeper understanding of the implementation process. The findings of the research study provided a basis to develop implications to consider as schools and systems attempt to implement Cognitive Coaching^{SM} and other innovations or processes.

Implications for Practice and Theory

This instrumental case study has important implications for both the theory and practice of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} as well as other processes or innovations. There are specific implications for practitioners as they implement the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process or other innovations. First, campus leadership must be actively involved in the design as well as the implementation of the innovation or process. As I listened to teachers' discussions and their frustration with the previous leadership, I also understood how difficult it was for that principal to implement an innovation or model for which she was not trained. Having been both a principal and an assistant superintendent, I understood that principals have difficulty implementing a process they don't understand. They need to be a part of the planning process and work with the district administrators prior to the implementation at their campus site. Implementation of any innovation is dependent on campus participation in the development and design of the implementation model.

Second, campus leadership must have the training and well-defined guidelines for implementation. Principals and the campus leadership must not only be a part of the planning process but also understand what is expected of them during the implementation process and what they must establish as expectations for their campus. If the implementation is district-initiated there must be clarity of expectations for campus leaders, teachers, and staff. If the district had trained principals along with representative teachers on the Cognitive Coaching^SM process and the role of the instructional coaching model there would have been less confusion and ambiguity.

As a principal, I found it beneficial to use a small project design team at the campus level. This was extremely effective to guide the implementation of programs or processes. I found it important to include teachers who represented a wide array of voices at the campus level. I needed to listen to that very resistant teacher in addition to the teacher leaders on which you could always depend. Regardless of how the guidelines are developed, campus leadership needs a model or roadmap to guide the implementation process.

Third, while teachers may not need the eight day Cognitive Coaching^SM seminar training model, they do need an awareness of the process and terminology used by an instructional coach, principal, or assistant principal. They need to understand how the instructional coach uses the Cognitive Coaching^SM process as a tool. This lack of knowledge created a void and allowed teachers to "fill in the gap" with their own misunderstanding. One of the teachers sent me a follow-up e-mail with her reflection about training and teacher understanding of the process.

As I am reading this summer about instruction for my independent reading groups, one of the items that continually comes up about teaching is that telling your students what to do is not enough, we need to have explicit instruction and to provide our students with powerful examples to make them grow. This is where I see that coaching is failing. As teachers we are left to guess to what the coach is ultimately responsible for. For coaching to be more successful at our campus and throughout the district, coaches have to communicate why they are at the school, what they are doing, can they benefit the quality of the student, teacher and community, and be explicit in their instruction and expectations.

This teacher has tremendous insight and supports my contention teachers need awareness of the process in order for implementation to occur. Implementation must include explicit training in the innovation or process in order to build capacity and understanding at the campus level.

Fourth, leadership at both the campus and district level has to recognize the importance of building relationships and commit the time needed for development of those relationships. This is one of the most critical components, yet it is the one often overlooked. The Cognitive Coaching[SM] process relies on trust in order to be effective. Trusting relationships are an integral part of the training model and yet we rush to implement a process rather than take the time to build trust and rapport. Teachers and the instructional coach must have the time to build trust and time to engage in those very important Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations. The Read to Achieve Grant at this

campus was an excellent example of what happens overtime when teachers are allowed to develop collegiality and build trust to work together to change their educational practice. They had time to meet together monthly over a three year period and they recognized how time benefited their students in the long-term. The teachers involved with the grant did not have great success in the very first year and even faced some difficulty during the second year. However, they recognized in years three to five, they had developed strong educational techniques which accounted for their students' success. This time frame also coincides with Hall and Hord (2001) contention that implementation takes three to five years. The model used in the Read to Achieve Grant became a working prototype for other grade levels meetings and cross-grade level teams during the current school year with the new principal's support.

This structure [providing extended time to meet by team] was evident as I observed meetings during this study at the campus site. I observed faculty meetings, team meetings, a cross-grade level primary grant meeting, and a fifth grade team meeting specifically to organize their classes for the coming school year. In the primary grant meeting they utilized a reflecting conversation protocol to guide their discussion. Each teacher had a copy. This is a type of protocol to which teachers referred during the interviews assuming that directly related to the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process.

Fifth, educators have to recognize that implementation of any innovation or reform is a process. It takes time to build capacity and understanding within a faculty/staff. Hall and Hord's (2001) implementation research clearly defined the implementation process as a three to five year process. Too often, we tend to give up on

a process before it is fully implemented and just assume it is not working. Pleasant

Valley County Schools committed to a long-range plan at a district level to support a

resident staff development model and commit to training instructional coaches in

Cognitive Coaching^SM. While it might have been easy to abandon the instructional

coaching model and the use of the Cognitive Coaching^SM process at Rolling Ridge

Elementary school, both the instructional coach and the current leadership see the value

in the process. Therefore, they committed to follow-through on the implementation

process and be more systematic in the use of the Cognitive Coaching^SM process.

Sixth, the issue of teacher experience and time also impacted the instructional

coach's ability to implement the Cognitive Coaching^SM process. The instructional coach

perceived that the use of the Cognitive Coaching^SM process varied in terms of teacher

experiences. She referred to utilizing more of the reflection and planning conversations

particularly as she worked with new teachers. It was her perception that she had to build

strong instructional practices with new teachers in order to have a base of knowledge to

engage in Cognitive Coaching^SM conversations. She also perceived that she needed time

to build that knowledge in order to engage in deeper coaching conversations and probe

for "cognitive shifts." Any innovation or process will be dependent on individual

teachers level of knowledge and experience.

Last, there are implications that the theoretical structures of Cognitive

Coaching^SM process have long-term effects on a teacher's ability to restructure their

educational practice. The process of Cognitive Coaching^SM centers on the use of

reflection and collaborative, collegial conversations. These two factors have been

identified as a basis for teachers making changes to their educational practice. Sykes (1991) and Elmore (2002a) both encouraged processes where teachers worked together in groups to learn through dialogue and discussion. Lieberman and Miller (1981) and Darling-Hammond (1998) identified the importance of an infrastructure to support teacher learning using models where teachers consistently engaged in discussion and discourse around their students' work and instructional techniques. The instructional coach identified the role of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] conversations as teachers analyze data to drive instruction in this era of high stakes accountability.

The findings of the study demonstrated the need for guides for both trust and rapport (See Appendix F) and planning conferences or conversations (See Appendix E). The importance of trust and rapport has been noted in both the findings and the discussion of the study. The literature on Cognitive Coaching[SM] is void of an outline to describe the process of building rapport and trust. Therefore, I developed two tools to be used by practitioners in the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process [Appendix F and G]. Hall and Hord (2001) developed the concept of Innovation Configuration maps to provide a roadmap for both implementation and evaluation of the implementation process. This tool uses clear word-picture description of a process and sequences specific observable behaviors during the implementation process. These tools would be beneficial for use in the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching[SM] and adaptable for implementation of other innovations. Through the interview process, I perceived ambiguity and lack of awareness on the part of teachers of the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Therefore, the research findings imply a need for a detailed

process to both guide and evaluate the use of the Cognitive Coaching process. The Innovation Configuration Map will serve as a guide for both the instructional coach and provide understanding for teachers involved in the process.

Last, the implications of this study are that there are not separate factors around which theories are developed rather interrelated theories that must be considered as parts of a whole. Specifically, within this study I found that teachers' willingness and openness to learn often resulted in developing trust to work with an individual or group to make changes in their educational practice overtime. A teachers' resistance often resulted from teachers' lacking the confidence and the skills to make changes in their educational practice. Rather than identifying independent factors as they relate to teachers as key agents in educational practice, these factors must be considered in terms of their interdependence.

Recommendations for Further Research

This case study, along with the findings of Bryk and Schneider, identified the need for additional research on relational trust as it relates to schools. As I reflect on the literature review in Chapter II, I find limited reference to trust. My conclusion, however, is that for teachers to be willing to change, to learn new instructional techniques, and to change norms and values they have to trust in both the process and value the changes they are being asked to learn. They have to trust that change in educational practice will result in higher levels of achievement for their students and that they, the teachers, are capable of learning and internalizing this new technique. The issue of trust underpinned

many of the implementation theories without being explicitly identified. Therefore, I am of the opinion this is an area of research for further study.

Cognitive Coaching[SM] is a process to support teachers as they engage in conversations around their educational practice. The current high-stakes testing and accountability has become a driving force to bring about change in educational practice. A study that focused on student achievement as it relates to individual teachers engaging in coaching conversations might be an informative study. It would provide an understanding of both the impact of this type of collegial process, as well as, deepen understanding of how teachers utilize such a process to meet the demanding challenges to increase student achievement.

The Cognitive Coaching[SM] process includes reflection and involving teachers in collegial conversations which researchers identify as an integral aspect for teachers to make changes in their educational practice. Too often in education we want the "quick fix" when in reality it takes time to develop processes to sustain long-term change in educational practice. We have studied the process of implementation for over 30 years. It would behoove the educational system to "slow down" and allow a strong reflective process to become a major tool used by practitioners as they engage in working with teachers to change educational practice.

I studied the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] focusing on teachers' perceptions at one school site. Future studies might include additional voices of the administration at the school site and teachers or administrators who are no longer on campus. These types of study would provide additional information about the

implementation process to both administrators, as well as the Executive Directors of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. It would add to the story of implementation and those factors that inhibit and contribute to the implementation process.

Another consideration would be to have a study that focused on the perceptions of the instructional coaches across the district. The instructional coaches have been consistently trained in the Cognitive Coaching[SM] process. Their understanding and perception of the implementation process would be an important point of view for both the administration and the outside consultants responsible for the training and support of the implementation process. Cognitive Coaching[SM] is used as a tool by the instructional coaches at the high school, middle school, and elementary level. How do those perceptions vary across those three levels? Are there considerations needed at each level to facilitate implementation?

The findings of this study calls for further research on the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM]. The difficulty I had in identifying schools and school districts that had implemented the process for more than three years indicated the difficulty in sustaining this process. Therefore, additional studies might include those districts in which the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] has not been successful. What are the major factors that inhibited the implementation of Cognitive Coaching[SM] or what might have facilitated a more successful implementation? This type of study would add to the body of knowledge and help practitioners better understand the difficulties of the implementation process and their role in the implementation process.

As a former administrator, I chose to focus my research study on the implementation process because of my own frustration in sustaining innovations over a long period. As I reviewed studies specifically available on Cognitive Coaching^{SM}, I found that many of those studies were quantitative rather than qualitative. There is rich data and understanding to be derived from a qualitative case study. This type of study provides opportunities to share information and reflect on the implementation process. Therefore, there should be consideration for further qualitative studies for those interested in researching the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

Further studies on relational trust as well as the process of implementation would continue to help practitioners, as well as researchers, better understand the implementation process. These studies would add to the body of knowledge about the implementation process.

Conclusion of the Study

This instrumental case study provided a window of understanding into the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} through the perception of individual teachers and the instructional coach. A provocative aspect of the study was my finding that teacher's could only describe their perceptions of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} through their interaction with the instructional coach. Teachers defined Cognitive Coaching^{SM} as they described the implementation of the instructional coaching model and the role of the instructional coach. This district initiated innovation resulted in ambiguity and

vagueness of the process itself at the campus level. Nonetheless, teachers recognized there was a process they used as they talked and worked with the instructional coach.

The influence of the campus leadership was evident through the contrast of the leadership styles of the previous and current principal. While they approached the implementation process very differently, the current principal had the training and knowledge to understand the process and the ability to facilitate the use of the coaching conversations.

Teachers' openness and willingness to learn contrasted with individual teacher's resistance to change. Often that resistance was exacerbated when teachers did not have a clear understanding of the process nor the self-assurance to acknowledge their lack of understanding. It was much easier to be open when individual's had a sense of trust and had built a relationship with the instructional coach.

Teachers worked closely with the instructional coach when there was a high level of trust. Teachers developed relationships that they described as respect, competence, the instructional coach's personal regard for others and integrity. These characteristics provide a framework through which relational trust is built.

Teachers engaged in coaching conversations with the instructional coach and acknowledged that these conversations influenced and changed their educational practice. Opportunities for teachers to engage in professional dialogue and discussion are fundamental to create an impetus for change in educational practice. The Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process is a tool that provides opportunities for teachers to engage in deep,

collegial conversations. As teachers changed their educational practice, particularly through the Read to Achieve Grant, student achievement was a by-product.

I found that while teachers may not appreciate their own ability to articulate the implementation process, they have a strong knowledge of how implementation occurs. Given the opportunity they provided a rich and descriptive picture of the implementation process through their personal reflection.

As a former administrator, I recognized the importance of the campus leadership being actively involved in the planning and implementation of any innovation or reform. As educators we need to be much more explicit in defining the implementation process and setting very clear and concise expectations. I have always innately understood the importance of building relationships but this study emphasized the need for people to have time to build relationships and engage in deep, collegial conversations. Those responsible for the implementation at both the campus and district level need to understand the developmental nature of the implementation process and how change occurs.

I appreciated the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process prior to this study. Through the teachers' perceptions, I better understood the role of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process as a tool to engage teachers in professional dialogue and discussion. The influence of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process, despite the lack of understanding, demonstrates the power of the process.

Teacher's perceptions told the story of the implementation process. As I listened to their perceptions, I appreciated the difficulties and complexity of implementation.

Teachers are the key agents in the implementation process and they act as the gatekeeper to determine if implementation of a process or innovation occurs. As practitioners we still have a great deal to learn about the implementation process.

REFERENCES

Bryk, A.S. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(*6*), 40-44.

Bryk, A.S. and Schneider, B. (2002). Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Center for Cognitive Coaching. (2002). Learning guide. Highlands Ranch, CO: Author.

Cohen, D.K. and Ball, D.L. (1990). Relations between policy and practice. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *12*(*3*), 331-338.

Confrey, J. (2000). Implementation research as a means of linking systemic reform and applied psychology in mathematics education. *Educational Psychologist*, *35*(*3*), 179-192.

Costa, A.L. and Garmston, R.J. (2002a). *Cognitive Coaching*[SM]*: A foundation for renaissance school,* 2nd Edition. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Costa, A.L. and Garmston, R.J. (2002b). *Cognitive Coaching*[SM] *foundation seminar, learning guide,* 5th Edition. Highlands Ranch, CO: Center for Cognitive Coaching[SM].

Cuban, L. (1999). Reforming again, again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher, 19*(*1*), 3-13.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership*, *55*(*5*), 6-11.

Darling-Hammond, L. and McLaughlin, M.W. (1995). Policies that support

professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *76*(*8*), 597-

605.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd

Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Edwards, J. (2001). *Cognitive Coaching*[SM]*: A synthesis of the research*. Highlands

Ranch, CO: Center for Cognitive Coaching[SM].

Ellison, J. and Hayes, C. (2003) *Cognitive coaching: Foundation seminar learning

guide.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Elmore, R.F. (1997). The politics of education reform. *Science and Technology*, *14*(*1*),

41-50.

Elmore, R.F. (2002a). Hard questions about practice. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(*8*),

22-26.

Elmore, R.F. (2002b). The limits of change. *The Harvard Education Letter*, *Jan/Feb*,

8-9.

Elmore, R.F. (2003a). A plea for strong practice. *Educational Leadership*, *61*(*3*), 6-10.

Elmore, R.F. (2003b, April). *Knowing the right thing to do: Low performing schools

and performance-based accountability*. Paper presented to the National

Governor's Association Policy Education Advisors Institute, Los Angeles, CA.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change,* 3rd Edition. New York:

Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Garmston, R.J. and Costa, A.L. (2002). *Cognitive Coaching^{SM}: A foundation for renaissance schools.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Garmston, R.J. and Wellman, B. (1999). *The adaptive school: A sourcebook for developing collaborative groups.* Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon Publishers, Inc..

Hall, G. and Hord, S. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hall, G. and Loucks, S. (1978). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. *Teachers College Record, 80*, 36-53.

Hanson, M. (2001). Institutional theory and educational change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *37*(*5*), 636-661.

Hobbs, F. and Stoops, N. (2002). *Demographic trends in the 20th century,* Series CENSR-4. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Joyce, B.R. and Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*, 3rd Edition. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Knight, S.L. and Erlandson, D.A. (2003). Harnessing complexity: A framework for analyzing school reform. *Planning and Changing*, *34*(*3 and 4*), 178-196.

Kofman, F. and Senge, M. (1993, August). Communities of commitment: The heart of learning organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, *22*, 5-23.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (1981). Synthesis of research on improving schools. *Research Information Service,* 583-586.

McLaughlin, M.W. (1990). The Rand Change Agent Study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(*9*), 11-16.

Merriam, S.B. (1991). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE). (1983). *A nation at risk. The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National School Board Association. (2003). *NCLB action alert: Tools and tactics for making the law work*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Standards for staff development*. Oxford, OH: Author.

O'Neil, J. (1995). On schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Peter Senge. *Educational Leadership*, *52*(*7*), 20-23.

Pleasant Valley Educational Association (PVEA). (2005a, May). The role of instructional coach. *Pleasant Valley Educational Association Newsletter*, *31*(*8*), 5.

Pleasant Valley Educational Association (PVEA). (2005b, May). Pleasant Valley instructional coach oversight committee reports on work. *Pleasant Valley Educational Association Newsletter*, *31*(*8*), 5.

Rothman, R. (2002). Closing the achievement gap: How schools are making it happen. *The Journal of the Annenberg Challenge, 5*(*2*), 1-11.

Rowan, B., Correnti, R. and Miller, R.J. (2002). What large-scale, survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from the prospects study of elementary schools. *Teachers College Record*, *104*(*8*), 1525-1567.

Senge, P.M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R.B. and Smith, B.J. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook.* New York: Doubleday.

Showers, B. and Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. *Educational Leadership*, *53*(*6*), 12-16.

Silin, J.G. and Schwartz, F. (2003). Staying close to the teacher. *Teachers College Record*, *105*(*8*), 1586-1605.

Smith, M.S. and O'Day, J. (1991). Systemic reform. In S. Fuhrman and B. Malen (Eds.), *The politics of curriculum and testing: The 1990 yearbook of the politics of education association* (pp. 233-267). New York: Falmer Press.

Spillane, J. (1999). External reform initiatives and teachers' efforts to reconstruct their practice: The mediating role of teachers' zones of enactment. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *31*(*2*), 143-175.

Spillane, J. (2000). Cognition and policy implementation: District policymakers and the reform of mathematics education. *Cognition and Instruction*, *18*(*2*), 141-180.

Spillane, J. (2002). Local theories of teacher change: The pedagogy of district policies and programs. *Teachers College Record*, *104*(*3*), 377-420.

Spillane, J. and Jennings, N.E. (1997). Aligned instructional policy and ambitious pedagogy: Exploring instructional reform from the classroom perspective. *Teachers College Record*, *98*(*3*), 449-482.

Spillane, J., Diamond, J., and Jita, L. (2003). Leading instruction: The distribution of leadership for instruction. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 35*(*5*), 533-543.

Spillane, J., Reiser, B. and Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, *72*(*3*)*,* 387-431.

Stake, R.E. (1995). Case studies. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd Edition (pp. 434-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sykes, G. (1991). In defense of teacher professionalism as a policy choice. *Educational Policy*, *5*(*2*), 137-149.

Sykes, G. (1995). Learning, teaching, and administering: A response to Rowan. *Educational Administration*, *31*(*1*), 143-151.

Sykes, G. (1996). Reform of and as professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *77*(*7*), 464-468.

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Questions Protocol
1. What are the perceptions of teachers of the implementation of Cognitive Coaching^{SM} at an elementary school?
1-a. How would you describe the implementation of the use of the coaching process?
1-b. How is the coaching process used on this campus?
1-c. Tell me about your training in Cognitive Coaching or training/practice in the use of Cognitive Coaching skills, i.e., planning maps, reflective practice, and reflective conversations.
1-d. What particular skills do you use most in the coaching conversations?
1-e. If you were involved in the 8 day training who else was at the training?
1-f. Was the training done before or after school started?
1-g. What type of continuous training occurs after the initial training?
1-h. If you attended the 8-day training—Tell me about the flow of training over those 8 days? Was the schedule conducive to processing those concepts?
1-i. How does a conversation with a coach who has been trained in the Cognitive Coaching process help you as a teacher?
1-j. When are you aware that you are using the coaching process?
2. What do teachers perceive as the obstacles to the implementation process of Cognitive Coaching^{SM}?
2 a. Circumstances under which Cognitive Coaching was implemented?
2-b. Who advocated for the process? Who did not?
2-c. Did the coaching process provide the skills needed to effectively use coaching conversations? If not, why?
2-d. What other programs/innovations were being implemented simultaneously?
2-e. What other changes occurred during the implementation of the coaching process?
3. What do teachers perceive as contributors to the implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process?
3-a. How have coaching conversations changed you as a teacher?
3-b. What do you think contributes to the continued use of the coaching process?

Additional questions that evolved out of the interviews
Open/willing to work with the coach
• You referred to an openness to learn and work with the coach (share lines where that was said) Talk about what you think creates that openness to be willing learn and change…..
• You referred to the lack of trust. Clarify what you would have needed to build a trusting relationship with a coach. (#8)
• You talked about the importance of building trust and rapport—how did you go about establishing that trust? If you were unable to build trust, why? (#7)
Awareness of the process
• Give them the examples of questions and ask them to identify the questions that they recognize C used during coaching conversations or planning meetings.
Continue to probe the contributors
• You have talked about what has contributed to the continued use of the coach. I would like you to identify 3 factors that you think contributed to the continued use of that process here at Fitzmorris. What would you say was the #1 factor?

APPENDIX B

ISSUE-BASED OBSERVATION FORM FOR

COGNITIVE COACHING IMPLEMENTATION

Observer:	School:	Date:	Time: to	
Teacher(s):	Age: 25 35 50 65	Assignment:	Gr/Role	
Tchr. Experience: 0---M	Assignment:	Site of conf:	Time of write-up:	
Level of Training:		Type of Conv:	Plan ProSol Ref Obs Conf	
Content of the Conversation:		Patterns evident in the conversation:		
Evidence of knowledge and skills	Evidence of the language of CC	School as a Learning Organization	Evidence of change in attitude (values)	
	Pauses	Change agent		
	Paraphrasing			
	Question stems			

APPENDIX C

SUBJECT SELECTION MATRIX

Name	Prin/Asst Prin	District Adm.	Single Training	Multiple Trainings	Single Training	Yrs of Experience	Support Role	Resistance	Consistent use	Ethnicity

APPENDIX D

PROTOCOL AND REFLECTION QUESTIONS

Planning meetings

Begin with asking you to clarify goals
Ex: What do you mean when you say, "learn _____?"
        What might be some of the connections of this goal to the standards?

Specify success indicators and plan for collecting evidence

      Ex.   How might you know when you have reached the goal?
              What might be some of the evidence you can collect?

Anticipate strategies, approaches, decisions, and how to monitor them.

Ex: What might be some strategies you have used before that were effective?
        What are some of your predictions about how this lesson will go?
        What might be some strategies you considered before deciding on these?
        What will guide your decisions about this objective/lesson?
        What criteria might you use to decide when to use another strategy?
        How long do you think this lesson will take?
        What kind of help might be useful to you with this lesson?

Identify personal learning—focus on process for self-assessment

Ex: What do you want to be sure you do well?
        What skill is or processes might you want to perfect in this lesson?
        …How might you know that you did that?

Reflect on the coaching process

Ex: How has our conversation been helpful to your or supported your thinking?

Reflecting conversations: (most of your conversations revolved around specific lessons or looking at student data, charting and identifying their growth, and what students still need to learn.

What are some things you did to make _____ happen?

What might be some alternatives to _____?

How does this compare to what you thought would happen?

How might you account for this (whatever happened in the lesson)?

What kind of help might have been useful to you?

What are you noticing (during this lesson) ?

What are some specific patterns or trends that seem to be emerging?

How is this similar to/different from _____?

APPENDIX E

PLANNING CONFERENCE INNOVATION CONFIGURATION MAP

Use of an Innovation Configuration Map (Hall and Hord, 2001)

1. An Innovation Configuration Map is a diagnostic tool to use for planning and implementation assessment. It provides a schema of the components of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process. It identifies the various levels of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process and describes how the process looks at a high of implementation as well as an understanding of how the process appears prior to implementation.

2. Level 1 is little or no implementation while Level 5 describes the highest level of implementation.

3. The highlighted areas (blue) indicate the higher levels of implementation.

4. Each table contains varied components critical to implementation of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

5. The IC Map describes in detail the behaviors consistent with the components of the Cognitive Coaching^{SM} process.

Topic: Planning Conference

Component 1: Planning

1	2	3	4	5
Teachers follow previous lesson plans or textbooks with no regard to goals or standards. Teaching focuses on the content with little regard to how it fits into the overall context of standards and goals.	Instructional coach operates in a consulting model to develop a level of understanding to establish goals and help clarify understanding of standards..	There is a team effort (teachers, instructional coach, principal) to understand and set goals to guide the instructional process. The following questions might guide this understanding: • What might be some of the connections of this goal to the standards? • Specifically, what might you mean to say, "learn___?"	Teaching teams throughout the campus know the instructional goals in relation to identified state standards. These goals are used to guide instruction. The following questions might guide this understanding: • How might this objective relate to the objectives of your team members?	Throughout the campus teaching teams utilize internalized instructional goals as they relate to standards to guide instruction.

Component 2: Specify success indicators and a plan for collecting evidence

1	2	3	4	5
Limited understanding and ability to evaluate for success and gather data to support evidence of student learning. Lack of general understanding and knowledge of what success will look like.	Teachers and the instructional coach recognize a need to identify indicators for student success. The following question might guide this understanding: How might you know when you have reached the goal?	Teachers work with the instructional coach and others to identify how to organize and gather data to evaluate for student success. The following question might guide this understanding: What might be some of the evidence that you can collect?	Teachers and the extended support team (instructional coach, principal) have a better understanding and ability to evaluate for success and gather data to provide evidence of those indicators of success.	Teachers and the extended support team (instructional coach, principal, and support staff) have a high level of understanding and ability to evaluate for success and gather data to provide evidence of those indicators of success.

Component 3: Anticipate approaches, strategies, decisions, and how to monitor them

1	2	3	4	5
Teachers have limited knowledge and skills of instructional strategies to use to meet students' needs. They use strategies from their prior experience and make few adjustments even when students' needs are not met. Teachers are more focused on changing the students rather than adapting their own instructional strategies.	Instructional coach operates in a consulting model to develop a level of understanding of instructional strategies and approaches to use to meet students' needs. Various ways to monitor instructional practice are presented to the teaching staff.	A limited number of teachers work closely with the instructional coach and together with their teaching team to develop skills, knowledge of instructional strategies, and flexibility to look for alternatives to meet the needs of students. Teachers identify as a group when to make adjustments and monitor the instructional process.	Teaching teams work together along with the instructional coach and/or the principal to develop skills, knowledge of instructional strategies, and flexibility to look for alternatives to meet the needs of students. Grade level teams identify how to make adjustments and monitor the instructional process.	Across the teaching staff and campus personnel there is a high level of skills, knowledge of instructional strategies, and flexibility to internally look for alternatives to meet the needs of students; individuals are consciously aware of when to make adjustments and monitor the instructional process.
The following questions might guide this understanding: What might be some strategies you have used before that were effective? What factors are most under your control?	The following questions might guide this understanding: What might be some strategies you considered before deciding on these? What will guide your decisions about _____?	The following questions might guide this understanding: As you rehearse this lesson in your mind, what does it look/sound like? What kind of help might be useful to you with this lesson? What are some of your predictions about how this lesson will go?	The following questions might guide this understanding: What criteria might you use to determine when to use another strategy? What might be the long and short-term effects of _____?	The following questions might guide this understanding: What might be the primary value of this lesson/strategy to your students? How might some of your team members support you with this lesson?

Component 4: Identify personal learning focus and processes for self-assessment

1	2	3	4	5
A limited number of staff members identify areas for personal learning. These staff members do not include the principal. The staff has limited self-assessment skills. The following questions might guide this understanding: What do you want to be sure you do well?	A limited number of staff members including at least the principal and instructional coach identify areas of personal learning through self-assessment. The following questions might guide this understanding: What might the group/class feel is most important for you to focus on in yourself? What might it be important for you to pay attention to in yourself?	Key members (principal, instructional coach, or teacher leaders) identify areas of personal learning through self-assessment The following questions might guide this understanding: If you could videotape this lesson, what would you want to see/hear in yourself when it was replayed? What skills or processes might you want to perfect in this session?	All members of the teaching staff including principal and instructional coach consistently identify areas for personal learning through self-assessment. The following questions might guide this understanding: How will you know when you have perfected a process or skill?	Consistently across the campus staff members identify areas for personal learning through self-assessment. The following questions might guide this understanding: What might you learn from this group? How might you know you've learned this?

Component 5: Reflect on the coaching process and explore refinements

1	2	3	4	5
Teachers and staff show no interest in reflection and looking for ways to refine their instruction.	Members of the staff begin to recognize that reflection helps refine individual instruction. Few teachers identify the instructional coach as a resource to refine instruction. The following questions might guide this understanding: How has our conversation supported your thinking? How has our conversations been helpful to you?	Members of the staff utilize reflection to help refine individual instruction. Key members of the staff model the use of reflection in faculty meetings. Staff members utilize coaching conversations as requested by the instructional coach. The following questions might guide this understanding: What key indicators might be most critical to your goals as a professional?	Consistent use of reflection to refine individual instruction by teacher leaders, principal, and instructional coach. Staff members seek coaching opportunities in order to refine their instruction. The following questions might guide this understanding: What might be some of the specific things about this conversation that were helpful?	Consistently staff members initiate and demonstrate interdependence through reflection with others. Staff members consistently engage in coaching conversations to refine their instruction. The following questions might guide this understanding: In what other ways might I continue to support you?

Based on information from Costa and Garmston (2002b, pp. 54-55).

APPENDIX F

RELATIONAL TRUST INNOVATION CONFIGURATION MAP

Use of an Innovation Configuration Map (Hall and Hord, 2001)

1. An Innovation Configuration Map is a diagnostic tool to use for planning and implementation assessment. It provides a schema of the components of the developing relational trust. It identifies the various levels of the process and describes how the process looks at a high of implementation as well as an understanding of how the process appears prior to implementation.

2. Level 1 describes little or no implementation of the process while Level 5 is the highest level of implementation.

3. The highlighted areas (blue) indicate the higher levels of implementation.

4. Each table contains varied components critical to implementation of relational trust.

5. The IC Map describes in detail the behaviors consistent with the characteristics relational trust.

Topic: Relational Trust

Component 1: Respect

1	2	3	4	5
Principal, instructional coach and teachers do not listen to each other nor do they value or accept varied opinions. There is a sense of mistrust as people engage in social discourse and dialogue.	Some members of the identified school staff are approachable and listen to each other as they engage in social discourse, coaching, and dialogue. This behavior is limited to a small group of individuals and does not include key staff members (i.e., principal).	The principal, instructional coach and key teacher leaders are approachable and listen to each other while engaged in dialogue, coaching, or social exchanges. Some people within the school recognize and value differences of opinion and take those into account as they interact with each other in future dialogue or social exchanges.	The principal, instructional coach and majority of the teaching staff are approachable and listen to each other while engaged in dialogue, coaching, or social exchanges. There is a sense of interpersonal respect and openness among those engaged in dialogue and social discourse. As these individuals engage in discussion and dialogue people believe that each person will be treated with respect and valued for their opinion regardless of their role within the school community. Consistently key individuals demonstrate a sense of interpersonal respect.	School community members are approachable and genuinely listen to each other while engaged in dialogue, coaching, or social exchanges. This behavior is pervasive throughout the school community. There is a sense of interpersonal respect and openness among those engaged in social discourse and dialogue. People believe that each person will be treated with respect and valued for their opinion. Consistently people take into account varied perspectives in future dialogue and social exchanges and value differences of opinion. People feel equal during discussions and dialogue regardless of their role within the school community.

Component 2: Competence

1	2	3	4	5
School community members do not perceive competence among identified school community members (teachers, instructional coach, and principal/administrators).	Individual pockets of competence are perceived throughout the school community. However, key individuals (i.e., principal, instructional coach and teacher leaders) are not among those competent individuals.	Key school community members demonstrate competence (principal, instructional coach, teacher leaders) in identified roles. They are perceived as a resource to others within the school community. This competency is conducive for establishing a positive work environment for the teaching staff. However, this behavior is not pervasive among all members of the staff and does not result in the desired outcomes for student expectations.	School community members demonstrate competence in identified job roles. Competence results in the ability to achieve desired outcomes. These desired outcomes result in not only learning objectives for students but also effective work conditions for teachers, and the administrators' ability to maintain positive school-community relations.	Competence in identified job roles is pervasive across the school community which results in achievement of desired outcomes. People have a high level of respect for individual's instructional skills. These desired outcomes impact not only student learning but also creates a culture and climate where all individuals exhibit high levels of success.

Component 3: Personal Regard

1	2	3	4	5
School community members fulfill their identified job descriptions but there is little display of personal regard for each other beyond those identified boundaries. (Teachers fulfill their contract to teach students but there is little regard for individual needs; principals or administrators fulfill their job role but have little regard for staff members' individual needs).	Small groups of individuals extend themselves beyond their formal job roles. However, this behavior is not pervasive among key school community groups (administrators, teachers).	Members of the school community perceive that specific school community members care about them as individuals and extend themselves beyond formal job roles. (Ex: Principal who creates opportunity for teachers' career development; instructional coach who demonstrates an understanding of personal concern; teachers who exhibit caring commitment to other staff members or students and internalize a commitment beyond required job descriptions)	Key members of the school community (principals, instructional coach, and key teacher leaders) are perceived by others as individuals who care about others and extend themselves beyond their formal job description. These key members of the staff engage in discourse and dialogue on a personal level.	Total school community members sense a culture in which others care about each other beyond their prescribed job description. Individuals are perceived as those who take on responsibility beyond their identified job role. This perception is pervasive among many members of the school community. School community members express a high level of relational trust among and between all the constituents of the school community (teachers, instructional coach, and administrators).

Component 4: Personal Integrity

1	2	3	4	5
There is little integrity or consistency between what an individual says or does across the school community. Members of the school community profess certain beliefs but little trust can be built that they will follow-through with the stated belief in their daily actions. Individuals are more the focus of the school community rather than the students.	Some individuals demonstrate integrity and consistency between what they say and do but it is limited to a few staff members within the school community. Individuals state that the students are the focus of the school community even though their actions are not consistent with this belief.	Key individuals (principal, teacher leaders) within the school community demonstrate integrity between what they say and do. Individuals within the community maintain honesty and confidentiality. However, this behavior is not pervasive across the school community. Individuals maintain students as the focus of the school community even though competing conflicts among staff members sometimes interfere with this focus.	Individuals within the school community have integrity and consistency between what they say and do. Individuals are guided by a moral and ethical perspective and are perceived as honest Therefore, they maintain confidentiality as needed. Students remain the focus throughout the school community regardless of competing conflicts between and among various individuals and groups.	There is a pervasive belief that there is consistency and integrity between what individuals say and do among the whole school community. Students are consistently the focus of the school community in spite of differences among individuals and groups. The school community as a whole is guided by moral and ethical perspectives. Individuals are perceived as honest in their interactions with each other and maintain confidentiality as needed.

Based on Bryk and Schneider (2002).

APPENDIX G

OUTLINE OF IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS BASED ON COMPILATION

OF TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Coaching Process (CC) is described simultaneously with the process of the implementation of the coaching personnel:

- The actual understanding of the Cognitive Coaching process or skills varies
- Few staff members were able to use specific terminology
- Often if they used the terminology, paraphrasing, pausing—they had learned the terms and process in another setting

Yr 1 – 2000-2001

2 part-time coaches on the campus –

1 for math, part time, 1 for literacy, part-time

Placed on the campus to work with 3rd and 4th grade CSAP—identified schools where improvement would make the greatest change
- Rolling Ridge was one of those identified schools

- Mil [sic] levy—It was passed by the taxpayers to give the school district additional monies—they had to show and improvement in test scores for a 3 year period
  (Performance Promise)

A grant Read to Achieve was written to impacted 2nd and 3rd grade

Yr 2 – 2001-2002

3rd and 4th grade were the focus
- Working with the coach seemed to be optional
- Focus more on working with new teachers
Grades 2 and 3
- Read to Achieve Grant

Working with the coach was optional

- Focused on 2 and 3rd
- Sp. Ed.

1 part-time person that did both math and literacy

Yr 3 – 2002-2003

Full-time coach for math/literacy

Worked with grades 2 and 3
- Perception was that working with the coach was optional

Focus was on the Read to Achieve Grant and 3rd state test scores

Yr 4 – 2003-2004

Worked with grades 2 and 3 through Read to Achieve Grant

Focus was on 4th grade state test scores

Yrs 5 – 2004-2005

Works with all grade levels
- Majority of teachers perceive that she is functioning more in a coaching role
- Majority feel that the expectation of the coaching job is clearly by the principal

The principal purposely does not have her working with discipline or managerial roles

APPENDIX H

RESPONSE PROTOCOL

1. Everyone is given an article to read and a 3 x 5 card.
2. Go through the article and pick out one sentence that catches your eye.
3. Divide staff into groups of 4 or into two groups (dependent on the size of the group).
4. Everyone in the group has a minute to respond to the phrase that each individual chooses.

Reflecting Conversation Protocol

Summarize Impressions

General Impressions (Whip around—1 minute per teacher)
What did you hear in the students' responses that were interesting and/or surprising?
(Whip around—1 minute per teacher)

Recall Supporting Information

Are there patterns in what students knew and were able to do

Compare, Analyze, Infer, Determine, Cause and Effect

Are there patterns in what students knew and were able to do?
What do you think caused this?

Construct New Learnings and Applications

What questions about teaching and assessing did today's work raise for you?
What ideas would you like to try I your classroom as a result of today's assessments and conversation?

Reflection on Process

What do you feel you learned from this process?
How did you feel as we went through the process?
How will this process influence your teaching?

VITA

Linda A. Reed
11 Brookwood Court
Montgomery, TX 77356
reedlar@consolidated.net

EDUCATION

B.A., Education, Stephen F. Austin University, 1967

M.Ed., Educational Administration, University of Houston, 1976

Ed.D., Texas A&M University, 2006

EXPERIENCE

August 2002 - June 2004	Assistant Superintendent
January 2002 - August 2002	Interim Superintendent
1999-2002	Area Superintendent, Northbrook Learning Community
1988-1999	Principal, Spring Shadows Elementary
1983-1988	Instructional Coordinator
1981-1982	Special Education Teacher All experience in Spring Branch ISD, Houston, Texas
1967-1981	Regular Classroom Teacher, Special Education Teacher