Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts

Volume 62 | Issue 2 Article 5

9-2023

Coaching High School English Teachers in Guided Reading for Struggling Readers

Tiffany L. Gallagher
Brock University, tiffany.gallagher@brocku.ca

Arlene Grierson
Brock University, arlenegrierson@gmail.com

Catherine Susin
Brock University, csusin@brocku.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons

Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Language and Literacy Education Commons, Secondary Education Commons, Special Education and Teaching Commons, and the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Recommended Citation

Gallagher, T. L., Grierson, A., & Susin, C. (2023). Coaching High School English Teachers in Guided Reading for Struggling Readers. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts, 62* (2). Retrieved from https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol62/iss2/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Education and Literacy Studies at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.

Western Michigan University
Dorothy J. McGinnis Reading Center and Clinic

READING HORIZONS

Coaching High School English Teachers in Guided Reading for Struggling Readers

Tiffany L. Gallagher, *Brock University*
Arlene L. Grierson, *Brock University*
Catherine A. Susin, *Brock University*

Abstract

Although small-group guided reading is traditionally an elementary school instructional practice, this study details how high school English teachers perceived its implementation in high school classrooms. As part of a larger, multiyear research project, this 2-year study examined a dual-level coaching professional learning program that included two school district literacy coaches, eight provincial literacy facilitators, and 21 high school teachers. Teachers were coached in the implementation of guided reading and small-group instruction to support students in Grades 9–10 who were struggling with reading. Qualitative methods were used to gather data including observations of the professional learning meetings and teachers' instruction; interviews with literacy coaches, professional literacy facilitators, and teachers; and artifact collection. Data were analyzed using the qualitative software program NVivo. The findings suggest that teacher coaching, modeling, co-planning, discussion, and reflection enhanced teachers' abilities to support students in their use of metacognitive skills and comprehension strategies during guided reading. Teachers noted some insightful instructional considerations for implementation of elementary instructional practices in their high school English classrooms. Overall, these results have practical implications for teachers seeking to help struggling high school readers.

Keywords: ***literacy coaching, secondary education, struggling readers, guided reading***

There has been much documentation about how teacher professional learning can support professional growth and foster educational improvement (Grierson et al., 2022; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2020) as well as enhance student learning and achievement (Elish-Piper & L'Allier, 2011; Ontario College of Teachers, 2016). There are myriad contexts for teacher professional learning including the school, community, district/system, province/state, and higher education, and

within them many opportunities for teachers to self-direct or interact with colleagues and facilitators (Ontario College of Teachers, 2016). Coaching among teachers (as peers) or within the school district is one of the often-cited forms of effective professional learning in these contexts (Kise, 2006; Knight, 2017). Yet even though few studies have explored coaching (and professional learning facilitation) in Canada (Bengo, 2016; Grierson et al., 2022; Hardy, 2009; Lynch & Ferguson, 2010), research in other jurisdictions has documented the importance of building on teachers' existing professional knowledge and working collaboratively to support their self-directed professional growth (Gutierez, 2015; Kuh, 2015; Stover et al., 2011).

Over the course of two years, this study documented the professional learning of high school English teachers who were coached by two district literacy coaches from their own southern Ontario school board and eight provincial literacy facilitators (i.e., Ministry of Education coach leaders). The focus of the professional learning was to provide high school English teachers with strategies to enact elementary reading pedagogies to support their struggling readers. Although little research has been conducted on how coaches can support high school English teachers (Davis et al., 2018), abundant research on coaches supporting elementary teachers has yielded positive results for both teachers and students (e.g., Al Otaiba et al., 2016; Sailors & Price, 2015; Weiser et al., 2019), with a qualifier that implementing district-wide instructional coaching is complex to enact on both theoretical and practical levels (Atteberry & Bryk, 2011; Snyder et al., 2015).

Among the many commonly used elementary reading instructional practices are running records to assess reading fluency and comprehension, guided reading with leveled texts, and word study. Guided reading involves a teacher working with a small group of students who have similar reading interests, needs, and levels, carefully supporting and assisting them in improving their literacy practices as they work with more challenging texts (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012). Using differentiated instruction and leveled books just beyond students' independent reading levels, teachers scaffold readers to engage with texts at their instructional reading levels (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012). Guided reading and small-group instruction are typically elementary reading instructional practices (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001, 2017); however, this study reveals how their implementation in high school classrooms may be able to support struggling readers. This articles details the experiences of high school English teachers who engaged in dual-level coaching (i.e., district literacy coaches and provincial literacy facilitators working collaboratively to support participants) and participants' perceptions of implementing such strategies in high school classrooms.

Review of Research on Professional Development at the Secondary Level

For late middle and high school teachers, the value of collaborating to support the needs of their struggling readers is well established (e.g., Okkinga et al., 2018; Schnellert et al., 2008). Collegial collaboration (Stephens & Mills, 2014) can enhance teachers' pedagogical knowledge through engaging in critical reflection and goal-directed, self-regulated learning (Toll, 2007; Walpole & McKenna, 2012). The English language arts Common Core State Standards specify that all students are to achieve language proficiency by the end of high school (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010); however, there is little to guide teachers on how to ensure that they meet the diverse needs of all language learners.

Teachers are advised to use their professional judgment to assist struggling learners to reach the standards (International Literacy Association [ILA], 2012); however, teachers require ongoing professional learning and collegial support to do so.

Professional development for high school literacy teachers is crucial, as students need to acquire a broad range of skills from all six dimensions of the English language in addition to effectively using technology in socially responsible ways (Baye et al., 2019). For decades, there has been documented concern that "high school students who read at low levels often have difficulty understanding the increasingly complex narrative and expository texts that they encounter in high school and beyond" (Slavin et al., 2008, p. 291). Yet high school teachers in subjects other than English often are unprepared, are untrained, and lack the time to support students with literacy (Davis et al., 2018). It is now widely accepted that teachers require intense and dedicated professional development to enhance their practices, which supports the role of professional learning facilitators and coaches in districts and school boards (Troyer, 2017). Ironically, despite the importance of high school students' literacy, there has been little documentation in the literature of the effects of coaching on high school teachers' literacy practices, as the majority of the research has focused on elementary teachers (Davis et al., 2018).

Recently, Davis and colleagues (2018) conducted a study to garner which ways high school literacy teachers could be supported to "implement recommended literacy approaches, with quantitative outcome measures" (p. 265). Among these literacy approaches were read-alouds, guided reading, literature circles, and independent reading. Teachers were randomly assigned to one of three professional development conditions: workshops; workshops and materials; and workshops, materials, and coaching. Davis and colleagues found that the condition that included coach support had positive effects including increased frequency of use of the recommended literacy practices, increased quality of the practices, and increased student engagement (Davis et al., 2018). Furthermore, Meyers et al. (2015) found that collaborative professional development among middle school teachers and faculty coaches resulted in increased implementation of effective practices by the teachers and increased student reading comprehension.

Literacy coaches are in the position to facilitate reflective practice in teachers to enhance their literacy instruction (Meyers et al., 2015; Mraz et al., 2016). Further, Lovett et al. (2008) added that a reflective teaching style as well as "metacognitive teacher training, instructional coaching, long-term mentorship, and collaborative learning have been proposed as important features of effective professional development" (p. 1094). Development of students' metacognitive thinking skills is an area in which literacy coaches (Fenwick, 2018) can support teachers in addition to assessment and evaluation (Kennedy & Shiel, 2022). Literacy coaches have many strengths and can support teachers and students in multiple ways, but ultimately effective literacy coaching is a collaborative relationship between teacher and coach (Toll, 2007).

In the province of Ontario, where this study took place, the goal of the literacy coach "is to improve literacy achievement; they accomplish this by working collaboratively with teachers and principals to deepen their understanding of the reading and writing process and to extend their repertoire of teaching and learning strategies" (Lynch & Alsop, 2007, p. 1). Literacy coaches were found to be effective in a study that evaluated

eight school boards in Ontario (Campbell et al., 2006). At the time of this study prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Ontario Ministry of Education espoused different types of literacy coach programming at both the provincial and school district levels, but primarily targeting elementary (K–8) teachers. In the present study, data were gathered during a focused case study of a school district that opted to provide coaching support to high school English teachers. Accordingly, this study was grounded in this question: What are the impacts of dual-level models of literacy coaching on the professional learning of high school English teachers of struggling readers?

Theoretical Framework

Consistent with social constructivist learning theories (Vygotsky, 1978), leadership through coaching and mentoring is collaborative and knowledge is constructed through dialogue and social interaction with others (Walpole & McKenna, 2012). Previous research documented how collegial collaboration (Stephens & Heidi, 2014) can support teachers' abilities to enhance their knowledge through engaging in coaching that includes critical reflection and goal-directed, self-regulated learning (Walpole & McKenna, 2012). Collegial collaboration is at the heart of Wenger's (1998) concept of a community of practice, within which individuals learn together as they seek to solve common problems of practice in a structured framework of situated co-participation. Essential dimensions of such a community of practice include building relationships through sustained, focused interactions, as individuals work on joint activities collaboratively seeking to improve their practices, learning from, learning with, and seeking to help one another (Wenger, 1998). Although this requires commitment, coordination, and synergy, communities of practice can provide participants with the support required to modify their practices (Wenger et al., 2002).

The conceptual perspective that a socially constructed professional learning approach builds a synergistic relationship among facilitators and teachers in a community of practice (Wenger, 1998) was applied to this study. This was the model of coaching that evolved in a school district and provincial education governing body. It is worth noting that the teacher participants in this study were aware of the two tiers or dual levels within and between the coaching communities, but they were not aware that their school district literacy coaches were being coached by provincial facilitators.

Project Description

This school district project was among a number across the province of Ontario that were supported with short-term funding by the Ontario Ministry of Education with the goal to address literacy gaps in adolescent learners. The Ministry focus was the provision of provincial literacy facilitators who were seconded to the Ministry of Education for limited terms (i.e., 2016–2017 and/or 2017–2018) to provide school district literacy coaches with the guidance that they needed to engage high school teachers in professional learning in reading instructional methods. The provincial literacy facilitators were exemplary literacy educators in their own right and were deployed to several school districts that self-determined their program of professional learning in accordance with their systems' needs. The specific focus of the professional learning in each school district was collaboratively determined by the provincial literacy facilitators and school district

coaches. Essentially, the provincial literacy facilitators coached the literacy coaches and consultants, modeling effective practices as together they worked with high school teachers in their classrooms and facilitated associated whole-group professional development sessions.

Based in one medium-sized publicly funded school district in southern Ontario, participants in this study included high school English teachers, school district literacy coaches, and provincial literacy facilitators, as they were engaged in this two-year professional learning project. The high school English teachers were coached in the implementation of reading assessment strategies, guided reading methods, and small-group reading strategy instruction in order to support their ninth- and tenth-grade students who were struggling with reading. The chosen high schools had teachers who were willing to explore such changes to their practice. The teacher participants worked in pairs, each pair from one of the three participating high schools. With the support of the literacy coaches at their school sites, teachers co-planned and co-taught lessons focused on small-group guided reading including fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, and metacognitive thinking. These coaching sessions took place at the request of the teachers and according to their availability. All teachers were provided with release time for their participation and professional learning books and resources. In addition, there were regular professional learning meetings and webinars co-facilitated by the literacy coaches and provincial literacy facilitators, which were opportunities for all participants to come together to share new strategies, reflect, and discuss their practices. As part of the group sessions, teachers shared samples of their students' work and their lessons along with their successes and challenges implementing them. Through introducing and exploring the targeted practices of small-group guided reading lessons, reading comprehension strategy instruction, fluency, and metacognitive thinking in a wide variety of professional learning contexts (i.e., individualized coaching, group sessions, webinars, professional learning resources and materials), teacher participants were provided with opportunities for collaborative differentiated professional learning.

Methods

This project employed a generic qualitative research methodology (Kahlke, 2014; Percy et al., 2015) to gather data through artifacts, field noted observations, and one-on-one interviews with participants as they engaged in the professional learning. Generic qualitative research methods do not adhere to a specific, established methodology and liberally assume viewpoints and employ data collection from several methodologies (Kahlke, 2014). Further, generic qualitative research "investigates people's reports of their subjective opinions, attitudes, beliefs, or reflections on their experiences" (Percy et al., 2015, p. 78). Such was the case in this study, as data were gathered from all three types of participants on their varied experiences in the coaching project.

As part of a five-year federally funded research project examining different coaching models in Ontario, this study received ethics clearance from our university and the participating school district. Our role in this study was that of external researchers who sought to understand the participants' experiences through collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data and disseminating the findings. Over the previous decade, as external university researchers, the first two authors had engaged in several research projects with

the participating school board.

Participants

This study was conducted over two academic years (2016–2017 and 2017–2018), with no change in the literacy coaches and minimal change in the provincial literacy facilitators and high school English teacher participants year over year. Pseudonyms for all of the participants are employed.

Literacy Coaches

The two school district literacy coaches, Roger and Katie, were consistent throughout the project. They were both itinerant educators and responsible for supporting K–12 teachers throughout the whole school district. Roger had been a high school English teacher (Grades 9–12) for five years before he held the dual roles of literacy coach (30% of his time) and consultant (70% of his time). As a literacy coach and consultant, he was assigned to assist K–12 teachers and was responsible for supporting teachers in the curricular areas of social sciences and ESL instruction.

Katie had over six years of teaching experience in middle and high school and then took on various roles in the school district that related to curriculum development and professional development for teachers. She provided curricular expertise in literacy, science, social sciences, geography, history, and Indigenous education. Katie provided coaching for K–12 teachers in special education, math, and literacy.

Provincial Literacy Facilitators (Coach Leaders)

From the Ministry of Education, eight provincial literacy facilitators (Jessica, Ashley, Hannah, Joy, Blake, Kiley, Donna, Beth) had various roles in the facilitation process. Jessica participated in both Years 1 and 2; the others participated in Year 1 only, with the exception of Beth, who joined in Year 2. As these individuals were seconded by the Ministry of Education for defined limited terms, attrition in this participant pool was expected. All of these facilitators assisted to some extent with the content creation and facilitation of the whole-group sessions, webinars, and conferences. Some of the facilitators (Ashley, Joy, Blake, Jessica) were more actively involved in the interactions with the high school teachers. Most importantly, they also guided and mentored the school district literacy coaches' work as a form of professional learning for them.

High school English teachers

In Year 1, there were six participating high school teachers from two high schools; three of them continued into Year 2 and were joined by an additional 15 high school teachers (Year 2 total was 18) from three other high schools. All of the teachers were actively teaching struggling high school students in their English classes (Grades 9–10) and all of these teachers were open to learn about how to enhance their practices to assist these learners. Participation in the professional learning project and in the associated research was voluntary.

Data Collection and Analyses

We gathered field notes and artifacts while we observed during the professional learning meetings, webinars, and classroom coaching and instruction; we also interviewed subsets of the participants.

Field notes

In Year 1, there were a total of 10 observations. Five of these observations were made during whole-group sessions that were co-facilitated by the literacy coaches and provincial literacy facilitators. There was one session in which the teacher participants worked together with the provincial literacy facilitators, who in turn coached the literacy coaches. There was one session that the teachers and literacy coaches all attended together, which was facilitated by the Ministry of Education to support the work of all educators and coaches. There were two observations of literacy coaches providing one-on-one classroom coaching. Finally, there was a conference hosted by the provincial chapter of the ILA that all the Year 1 participants attended together. Field notes were taken during their debriefings about the conference sessions.

In Year 2, 11 observations were field noted. Two of these observations were made during whole-group (in-person) sessions and five webinar-type sessions with the teachers as co-facilitated by the literacy coaches and provincial literacy facilitators. During one session, all of the provincial literacy facilitators attended a whole provincial session facilitated by the Ministry of Education to support the work of all coaches, consultants, resource teachers, and curriculum leaders. There were two observations of literacy coaches providing one-on-one classroom coaching. Again, the same provincial chapter ILA conference was attended by the participants.

Artifacts were gathered during both years of the study. These included items such as handouts and slide decks from the meetings and exemplars of the teachers' work such as instructional resources and links to shared reflections on a Google Doc.

Interviews

Both of the literacy coaches were interviewed three times over the course of the two years. They were asked to discuss their practice and professional learning as coaches with the provincial literacy facilitators. Two of the provincial literacy facilitators volunteered to be interviewed over the course of the project; they were asked about their background, their role and interactions with teachers, resources they use in their practice, and their coaching approaches. A subset of teacher participants from both years of the project ($N = 11$; $n = 5$ from Year 1 and $n = 6$ from Year 2) were interviewed to garner their impressions of how to differentiate instruction and scaffold struggling readers using the gradual release of responsibility and guided reading. Teacher participants were selected for interviews on the basis of their availability and that of substitute teachers at their school sites who were available to teach the interviewees' classes during the school day when the interviews took place. Teacher participants were asked to comment on their impressions of the professional learning project and perceptions of any changes in their practice as a function of the coaching as well as their perceptions of their students'

experiences engaging in guided reading. Questions were open-ended and probed teachers' perceptions of the strengths and challenges of participating in this project; they also asked teachers to share any insightful, profound, or revealing moments throughout the project, describe their interactions with the project facilitators, and share any changes in their practices that they attributed to the project.

Data analyses involved using the qualitative software NVivo to import all raw data (field notes, interview transcripts, and artifacts). After these data were read, open-ended coding was used by a research assistant to create nodes. Together the first two authors (researchers) and the research assistant used an axial coding process to create meaningful categories from the open-ended codes to illustrate the findings from the data set (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). The researchers met to cross-confirm the categories (Saldana, 2013), which were then clustered into four larger themes. Quotes were then extracted from the raw data; these are presented next in the thematic findings.

Findings

The four thematic findings reflect the professional learning that ensued as high school English teachers came to appreciate *what guided reading looks like in high school English* as they were engaged in *coaching high school English teachers by modeling* and enhancing their practice of *fostering students' metacognition within guided reading.* Notably, as an outcome of the dual levels of coaching, the teacher participants recognized that there were *unanticipated instructional considerations for guided reading.* Each of the four themes is presented next together with representative data excerpts.

What Guided Reading Looks Like in High School English

The high school English teachers were introduced to the small-group, guided reading instructional approach by their literacy coaches (LCs) and then further discussed it in the first professional learning meetings with the provincial literacy facilitators (PLFs). They were tasked with piloting the instructional approach with a few groups of struggling readers in their classes and then anecdotally reporting on its initial impact. These teachers noted some early positive outcomes:

> The small-group instruction is invaluable when it comes to evaluating their reading comprehension and use of reading strategies. It is very easy to provide them with positive feedback and help them use a variety of strategies.… Most importantly, one of the students really shone in this type of learning environment. His responses were on point and he was focused for most of the activity. (Inez, teacher)

As the teachers became skilled at grouping students with similar reading interests and needs, they began to see additional affordances of guided reading groups: "Small-group instruction has value because it offers students to take a leadership role in their understanding and breeds greater engagement and enjoyment" (Antionette, teacher). In keeping with guided reading instructional practices, these high school English teachers encouraged their students to support their peers and to reflect on their own reading skills. In some cases, guided rather than independent reading time became the preferred class-

room practice: "Students were able to self-assess their needs and determine which small group to join with effectiveness. Those who chose the guided reading groups stated that they much prefer working in small groups with the teacher than in an independent group" (Aarti, teacher). It was inferred that large-group, independent instruction was more typical in this classroom.

At the beginning of the group professional learning meetings, the LCs and PLFs asked the teachers to share the challenges and successes that they had seen related to their guided reading instruction and to pose any queries that they had related to their struggling readers. These opening discussions evolved, and the LCs and PLFs then asked questions such as these: "How do you lead students without directing them to activate their own thinking? What is the limit or extent of scaffolding during guided reading? When should you step in to aid students to activate their thinking process" (Field notes). It took some time over the course of the multiple professional learning meetings, but the high school teachers started to recognize their opportunity to elicit meaning-making during guided reading. This is represented in field notes that were taken during a discussion among three teachers:

> Marsha (Teacher): Asking students good questions is more important than telling them the answer.
>
> Ella (Teacher): It is helpful to guide students to differentiate between why and how as often they confuse the two. The conversation with carefully placed provocation by the teacher gets the student to first question their surface understanding and then take it deeper. The nudging pushes the student to do the thinking. There was no correcting by the teacher, just nudging to think about what the student had concluded.
>
> Erika (Teacher): When you prompt with questions and challenge the student's understanding of the text, the student rereads and deeper meaning comes from the second reading.

During the professional learning meetings, the school district LCs and PLFs explicitly shared with teacher participants what they were seeing in terms of changes in teachers' reading instructional practices and shifts in their beliefs.

> The coach noted that a big revelation is that teachers' beliefs have shifted from seeing the students as struggling to now being resilient. They are now focusing on not just comprehension strategies but also why the strategy works and when it works.… Then the provincial literacy facilitator goes on to discuss teachers' feelings and reports that teachers are more confident in their ability to support struggling readers through guided reading strategies and expecting higher order thinking from students and seeing more engagement. (Field notes)

From the beginning of the professional learning project, guided reading was indeed functional in these high school English classrooms and the teachers were attuned to the key features of the reading instructional approach and recognizing the potential effectiveness

to encourage perseverance in their struggling readers.

Coaching High School English Teachers by Modeling

Unique to this professional learning project were the dual levels of coaching offered by the district LCs in their typical role supporting teachers and the PLFs supporting both the LCs and the teachers in this district. The high school teachers availed themselves of their LCs, Roger and Katie, to work in traditional one-on-one interactions co-planning, co-teaching, and reflecting:

> The best day [Roger] and I had was after I did all their [students'] assessments. We went to the competent readers chart [Ministry of Education skills continuum with reading levels] and we placed specific kids. Then we targeted based on what [Ashley, the provincial learning facilitator] gave us in those sessions with different parts of the competent readers chart. (Inez, teacher)

> [Katie] came in my class two or three times and we worked on repeated readings. She came in and I sat; I was the helper. She has a wealth of knowledge about teaching reading. That was incredibly helpful to me. Lots of [reading] needs in the class. (Tammy, teacher)

Over the course of the project, some teachers noted that the LCs provided them with a balance of guidance and autonomy, allowing teachers to manage their guided reading programming; they saw this as an effective approach. The teachers shared that the LCs were flexible with their scheduling, and "if [teachers] needed support, they were there to come in [and] model approaches" (Tia, teacher).

Ashley, a PLF, was especially known to push teachers' thinking and avoid simply providing them with directives; she was also perceived to be very knowledgeable, practical, genuine, and a positive role model. Josiah, a teacher, noted that she supported his conceptual thinking: "It's still a struggle differentiating between reading and writing [assessment and instruction]. Ashley's taught me that, which has been a huge awakening experience for me and Tia and Daria [teachers], who have been part of the project." Ashley consistently encouraged teachers to think critically in order to develop their own conceptualizations. This approach was beneficial to teachers' learning, with Inez noting, "She doesn't really tell you what to do. She just makes you think about things and so that might be a little frustrating at first, but then you realize that she's just being a good teacher." In this way, teachers were placed in a productive struggle when thinking about the answer to a question or problem—something they were working on fostering among their students.

This instructional approach was explicitly acknowledged by both Blake, a PLF, and Roger, an LC, who practiced modeling how to guide students' thinking when coaching teachers. For example, during a group session Blake reinforced the use of comprehension prompts in guided reading, stating to a teacher, "I think you are getting to some helpful prompts. I try not to lead students too much, work with what they have. I'm trying not to deliver the 'answer.' I think your prompts after students talk are helpful for that." Still, the LCs noted that some of the high school English teachers were inadvertent-

ly overscaffolding for their students: "There seems to be some teacher confusion over the key messages here—how much scaffolding to provide and when to do so" (Katie, LC). During a group meeting, Roger added to this discussion during an exchange with Inez:

> Roger (LC): It is difficult to get kids to persevere when things are challenging. How do we help kids build prior knowledge in the process of problem solving? Research now shows that a lot of scaffolding creates overdependence on teachers. How do we engage kids in a struggle that is productive? They need to be a little uncomfortable because that is when learning happens.
>
> Inez (Teacher): It is hard, though. I see that with the quote activity that we worked on. I want to jump in and help them [students].
>
> Roger (LC): You want them to do this because you feel like you have to move on. They aren't ready and it will take time to get them there. Time struggling can be productive for learning.… Keep guiding them forward to a point where we have complex thinking and complex text in the same task. (Field notes)

Given the experience these LCs and PLFs had from working in the classroom, teachers saw them as relatable, valuable, and meaningful partners: "Authenticity is key.… Ashley [PLF] taught for a long while [before becoming a PLF] and that's essentially what speaks to teachers" (Tia, teacher). With this background experience, coaches were cognizant of the time they spent with each teacher, ensuring that their time was used meaningfully. As Tammy, a teacher, shared, "Teacher[s] complain all the time about wasted professional development, and I felt every time that I met with Ashley, I was not wasting my time, that I was learning something and I wish we could do more of this." In addition to using time meaningfully and being cognizant of everyone's busy schedules, the fact that the LCs approached consultations and professional learning sessions with a sharing-of-ideas approach fostered this feeling of relatability and value: "No one is coming in and saying this is the be all, end all. It's key, I tried this" (Aarti, teacher). Teachers found the approach coaches used during their sessions to be very invitational and student centered. As Tammy, a teacher, shared, "I think the approach is inspiring because you have choice and you have agency and you also have the opportunity to try, fail, succeed, do both. There is authenticity in that experience as well." It is symbiotic that this approach is exactly what struggling readers also require of their educators.

Fostering Students' Metacognition Within Guided Reading

A key concept that the LCs and PLFs interrogated with the high school teachers was the fostering of students' metacognitive thinking within guided reading lessons. For many of these teachers, instruction in metacognition with struggling readers had not previously been a part of their practice and certainly not within guided reading lessons. Coaching, co-planning, reflection, and discussion about metacognition prompted the high school teachers to help their students use metacognitive strategies in their small-group guided reading discussions. Students used active listening strategies while engaging with their peers and reflecting on their learning. Students were supported to evaluate and analyze the reading strategies they were using, which their teachers perceived to subsequently contribute to students' enhanced comprehension. For example, teacher Clarissa shared

how to get her students to think about their reading: They needed explicit instruction and modeling to evaluate "what [to] do when they don't get it" (Field notes). The students of these teacher participants began to talk meaningfully about their understanding during guided reading instruction as well as ask questions demonstrating their ability to think about their reading strategies.

> Ella [teacher] is more comfortable with metacognition and how to get students to reflect on their learning. They are asking questions when they are reading with her that demonstrate whether they are inferring or making connections. Ella is more aware of how to teach it explicitly now and she really has slowed her teaching down. (Field notes)

As the professional learning project progressed, the high school English teachers perceived that their guided reading instruction was making a positive impact on their struggling readers' metacognitive skills.

After the first year of professional learning, the teachers' perceptions of their students' growth was validated by the LCs and PLFs who saw shifts in the teachers' confidence and guided reading instruction, including increased metacognitive language used by the teachers during debriefing opportunities in the professional learning sessions:

> [The literacy coach] notes that their big revelation is that teachers' beliefs have shifted from seeing the students as struggling to now being resilient. They are now focusing on not just comprehension strategies but also why the strategy works and when it works. (Field notes)

The teachers were surprised at their own ability to promote metacognition in guided reading lessons as well as their students' abilities to incorporate metacognitive strategies. This skill development supported students in becoming resilient readers, as they were better prepared to select the strategies they needed to solve problems and persevere during more challenging reading tasks.

During the debrief after observing some guided reading lessons, the LCs and PLFs prompted the teachers to consider students' responses to the question: "What are you learning about being a problem solver as you read?" They noted that during the observed lessons, the high school students were "not identifying a wide range of strategies" and instead relying on what was familiar to them (field notes). Indeed, some teachers recognized that metacognition did not come naturally to their struggling readers, and they were encouraging their students to observe metacognitive thinking while teachers "provided examples to explain [their] thinking… [and] identify the strategies [they] are using during reading" (field notes). To further address this lack of strategy identification among students, PLF Blake suggested that teachers consider other ways to interpret the student success criteria outlined, with some noting an addition to the success criteria specific to what was missing regarding strategy evaluation and application (field notes). Specifically, teachers should create success criteria that students could individually reference and also ensure that they were working toward a whole-class goal. During an observed lesson, it was noted that some of the success criteria that aimed to foster metacognitive thinking included "I can… recognize when I am disengaged. Apply self-regulation strategies to

re-engage (e.g., movement break). Describe ways to advocate for myself when things aren't working/beyond productive struggle" (field notes).

In the second and final year of the project, the LCs and PLFs began to prompt a conceptual shift in instructional approaches such that teachers might focus on supporting self-determined, student-directed thinking instead of teacher-directed instruction. The premise here was to support students to explore their own cognition and allow them ample time for problem solving while in small-group guided reading lessons. As observed in two classrooms, some teachers approached this with "the goal to have their students explain their metacognitive thinking as readers so that we can think about how to apply our skills and build understanding" (field notes). In other classrooms, it was observed that when selecting strategies during guided reading, teachers were encouraging students to solve for the answer instead of simply providing them with it. As students learned to use their problem-solving skills, they were encouraged to persevere during reading when they faced challenges. We contend that this was the goal of the project: to create resilient readers such that students were explicitly thinking about what they were reading and, as they were reading, still experiencing challenges but possessing strategies to correct themselves, and in doing so building confidence and changing their attitudes toward reading.

Unanticipated Instructional Considerations for Guided Reading

The teacher participants adopted the guided reading pedagogies in their high school English classrooms but quickly recognized a number of instructional considerations such as access to texts and the need to preteach vocabulary and text features as well as background knowledge for content area reading. The teachers became acutely aware that they must consider whether the leveled texts are representative of their students' culture, language, interests, and so on. They recognized that selecting texts that their struggling readers connected with increased students' engagement with reading. "Some kids think reading sucks," and teachers need to recognize that "they need text that they want to read" (field notes). The search for appealing texts was a challenge, but the goal was to "get them to see that reading is not a drag" (field notes). In particular, many teachers were guided by PLFs to "develop reading lists that interest [their] adolescent students" (Clarissa, teacher) at their early literacy levels.

Teachers also needed to be more flexible and offer students choice over text genres, which, as PLF Ashley noted, is challenging, especially when teachers believe that they "need to be in control and the knowledge keepers." Ashley encouraged the teacher participants to offer texts that question students' biases so that they might see "that persons in marginalized populations are not seen as individuals, they are seen as a collective with common characteristics" (field notes). Covering this issue in the professional learning group meetings highlighted the importance of not only ensuring teachers are encouraging social justice awareness and being culturally responsive in their classroom, but also acknowledging how texts "need to be examined for how people are positioned and who is privileged" (field notes).

Both the LCs and PLFs also emphasized that teachers need to consider the role of vocabulary as part of guided reading instruction. They encouraged teachers to take an asset-based approach with explicit vocabulary instruction focused on the word meanings that their students know, not the vocabulary that their students do not know. It was further

noted that readers who struggle become overwhelmed when texts become inaccessible given their limited vocabulary. As PLF Jessica pointed out, "Asking kids to circle words they don't know is playing to their deficits and highlight[s] them. Instead [we] want them to underline the words that they do know" (field notes). The premise here is that teachers are then able to begin with students' foundational understandings before they begin to explore what students do not understand. However, with this approach, there are concerns of whether students "just focus on comprehension based on the highlight[ed words] and … ignore the difficult words" (field notes). PLF Jessica and LC Roger guided this discussion, and it was decided that this approach should be used with certain students who require an asset-based stance.

The LCs and PLFs picked up on this discussion related to building readers' resilience across the curriculum and cited a practitioner text (Barnhouse & Vinton, 2012) that discussed how important it is to "build a sense of agency in readers, regardless of their discipline" as this sense of agency "is needed to read literature in humanities and in STEM" (field notes). Previously, LC Roger noted that, as educators, "we really want to push how every discipline has its own set of literacy skills and ways to approach literacy in that discipline" (field notes). When teachers approach vocabulary in texts with a focus on students' assets, PLF Donna noted that all high school teachers could "access informational texts from their various disciplines" and "change the way content area teachers teach" (field notes). However, determining "which words in the text students must have [an] understanding of to derive meaning from" is a continuous debate among teachers (field notes) and raises the question of "how much preteaching is required and how much scaffolding is too much" even in guided reading instruction (field notes).

In addition to expanding students' vocabulary, coaches highlighted the importance of questioning text features during guided reading instruction. As LC Roger noted, "Carefully crafted questions may be used to scaffold students' comprehension of the text" (field notes). For example, PLF Blake suggested asking students "what is salient and why some text features are helpful to them to understand the text" (field notes). With this approach, teachers are able to encourage students to engage in this reading transaction and "consider what stands out to them… and allow students to pull from [the] text what they can" (field notes), instead of relying on the literal comprehension questions that teachers often use to guide students toward the answers they want. These collegial discussions among the LCs, PLFs, and teachers were thought-provoking and elevated teachers' conceptions of the utility of the skills and concepts taught during guided reading instruction.

Another professional learning meeting discussion focused on supporting students to make inferences from different types of texts. Questions teachers posed after reading a text sample included "What does the writer want us to understand? What do we need to infer? And what are we paying attention to in order to make this inference?" (field notes). LCs encouraged teachers to support their students in understanding "how facts are connected or related (e.g., cause and effect, ideas, and examples), [w]hat the facts might imply (conclusions, generalizations), [and] [h]ow and why a phenomenon or process even works" (field notes). Instead of using the phrase "read between the lines" to approach inferring, LCs encouraged teachers to use a more intellectual query, suggesting that they use questions such as "What are the demands of the text? What does the author want us to know?" (field notes). Teachers suggested that students need to develop an understanding of author bias within text and "establish the credibility of sources and how that is related

to inferring" (field notes).

Clearly, there were unanticipated instructional considerations that the LCs and PLFs needed to address in their sessions with the high school English teachers to set up the conditions for effective guided reading instruction. Teachers discussed how to ensure students are represented in culturally responsive texts, have opportunities to further develop their vocabulary and disciplinary literacy skills, and build comprehension skills through questioning text features, making connections, and inferring. Inez, a teacher, stated, "I think how she connects to the text is really important. She says how it makes her feel—that is key. I think my kids did well with this because they had prior knowledge and can then connect." As these considerations became assimilated into their practice, the high school English teachers began to note positive changes in their students' reading skills.

Discussion

Overall, the findings from this coaching project extend previous studies related to the importance of building on teachers' existing professional knowledge and coaches at different levels working collaboratively to support change in their practice (Penuel et al., 2014; Stover et al., 2011). This has been documented with Canadian high school teachers in mathematics (e.g., Bengo, 2016), where effective coaching was differentiated and offered teachers both resources and time to assimilate new practices. Specifically, this research has demonstrated the perceived positive impact of incorporating an elementary reading pedagogy such as guided reading into high school English teachers' practices to address the learning needs of struggling readers. The literacy coaching at the school district level was typical, including co-planning, co-teaching, and reflection; however, the focus of the coaching on small-group guided reading in the high school English class was novel. Only Davis and colleagues (2018) conducted a similar study in which high school literacy teachers used a variety of literacy strategies (among them guided reading), but their focus was on the efficacy of types of professional development (among them coaching).

In the present study, the dual levels of coaching support from the PLCs who supported the high school teachers and coached the LCs was also atypical. Here, there was a synergistic effect of this multilevel coaching, which widened the boundaries of this community of practice. Significantly, consistent with the assertion of Wenger and colleagues (2002), the commitment, coordination, and synergy in this community of practice appeared to provide teacher participants with the support required to modify their practices, which teachers perceived to better support their struggling students. Importantly, integral to the outcomes here were teacher participants' positive, respectful, collaborative relationships with both the LCs and PLFs, supporting Toll's (2007) assertion. These relationships were central to and appeared to foster teacher participants' continued commitment to addressing their problems of practice in this community of learners (Wenger at al., 2002).

The outcomes were such that the high school English teachers acquired skills to practice guided reading instruction in their classrooms through modeling and dual levels of coaching. They became more confident using guided reading methods in small groups to assist their struggling readers' with fluency and metacognition. They perceived that

their students were actively listening, reflecting on their learning, asking questions, and using comprehension reading strategies. As outlined in our project description, the high school English teacher participants in this study volunteered for this initiative and were interested in exploring the implementation of these practices. Accordingly, their receptivity to coaching and implementing these practices may have presented a participant bias. Nonetheless, the findings here support those of others (e.g., McMullan & Sutherland, 2020) who have documented the accrued benefits of struggling readers' motivation, peer communications, and metacognitive strategy use as a function of working in small groups in high school English. In the current study, LCs recognized increased metacognitive language use by teachers and that their instruction had become more explicit, especially in comprehension. The high school English teachers recognized that they needed to include in their planning text choices that were respectful of students' cultures and interests and engendered skill development in vocabulary, disciplinary literacy, and inferring. It has been validated that in high school English classrooms where teachers focus on individualizing instruction and disciplinary literacy with their struggling readers these learners develop a positive literacy identity (Learned, 2018).

The coaching that these high school English teachers participated in offered them both individual and group opportunities to professionally learn, practice, and hone their pedagogical knowledge and skills related to guided reading. This is consistent with Stephens and Mills's (2014) statement that "literacy coaching is not about moving another person in a particular direction, but instead literacy coaching was a collaborative inquiry into literacy theory, research, practice, and learning" (p. 190). In the current project, inclusion of the Ministry of Education's literacy coaches, the PLFs, was likely an additional enhancement to the potential professional learning capacity. Similar to other documented research, the presence of external facilitators is beneficial to all: "As members of the teaching team, our primary responsibility was to help coaches learn to coach and teachers improve their practices via inquiry, thus providing all participants the opportunity to 'outgrow their former selves'" (Stephens & Mills, 2014, p. 190).

Implications and Future Research

There are implications for practice for school district literacy coaches and consultants to consider and also for classroom teachers. In particular, for literacy coaches there remain varied challenges related to the time dedicated to do their work with teachers and their own professional learning (Toll, 2007). Literacy coaches should consider expanding their professional knowledge and skills with respect to elementary reading pedagogies. They might actively recommend to their school district administrators that they would benefit from coaching (from external experts) and professional learning so that, in turn, they can support teachers in the transfer of elementary reading pedagogies to high school English classes.

Small-group teacher-guided reading instruction that includes teachers scaffolding students' progressive independent use of strategies such as activating prior knowledge, inferring, making connections, and questioning is typically an elementary education practice (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001, 2017). As documented here, middle and high school teachers can benefit from implementing these pedagogies in their teaching practice to further prepare students to be self-determined, metacognitively aware learners. It is insightful to recall that middle and high school students may have familiarity with these

methods from their prior elementary schooling experience. Furthermore, teachers might use these findings to target struggling readers through practices with which their students are already familiar. In addition to the efficacy of these practices, teacher participants' experiences in this study revealed the need for access to lists of culturally responsive texts at various reading levels in order to support the implementation of these methods in high school English. For other jurisdictions contemplating implementing these methods, this is a consideration to bear in mind. Furthermore, with teacher support, metacognitive strategies such as activating prior knowledge, questioning, inferring, and building vocabulary that were reinforced in small-group instruction here might also be integrated into other high school courses where disciplinary literacy skills are needed, such as history, geography and science.

The type of literacy coaching described here takes time, and school districts should be prepared to support both literacy coaches and teachers with release time and resources. Literacy coaches need to plan for the longitudinal professional learning program that is necessary to introduce, engage, practice, reflect and refine new pedagogies with their teacher partners. They need to be ready to engage teachers in productive struggle through unfamiliar instructional approaches and scaffold teachers who are not as willing to persevere with the discomfort of change. Simply put, coaches need their own supports and professional learning in terms of how to coach in addition to the content of what to coach (Chaparro et al., 2021). Future research into the perspectives of the students who are receiving the instructional approaches would be insightful. Both qualitative accounts of their experience and articulation of their learning and quantitative data on their reading achievement also might be insightful.

Similar to others over the past decade or so (e.g., Elish-Piper & L'Allier, 2011), we view coaching as an opportunity to further enhance teachers' instructional practices, build their repertoire of skills, and offer practical solutions that foster effective student learning. As documented here, high school English teachers benefit from the provision of literacy coaches (Davis et al., 2018). An important implication of this study is that it would be prudent for school districts seeking to support the needs of struggling readers in high school to provide teachers with support through literacy coaching.

There is no doubt that additional reading instructional approaches hold potential applicability across K–12 classrooms; literacy coaching is an optimal support for teachers to adopt these practices. This research has demonstrated the positive impact of literacy coaching on incorporating elementary reading pedagogies into high school English teachers' practices to support the learning needs of struggling readers—this is an important area and there is opportunity for future work to be done.

Acknowledgments

This project was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC IG Grant #435-2016-0401).

About the Authors

Tiffany L. Gallagher, PhD, is recognized for her research that aims to enhance

the learning of students with literacy difficulties and learning challenges. Supporting the professional learning of teachers through literacy, technology, and inclusion coaching is also a focus of her work. Longitudinal, multivaried participant perspectives are the cornerstone of Tiffany's research projects. Her work seeks to inform targeted audiences such as students, teachers, administrators, and policy makers. Tiffany is also the director of the Brock Learning Lab, which offers community-based tutoring for K–12 students and mentors undergraduate volunteer tutors. orcid.org/0000-0003-3006-9773

Arlene L. Grierson, PhD, has been recognized for her research investigating many forms of professional learning, with attention to the factors that affect educators'

change processes. She is particularly interested in exploring the processes through which educators change their beliefs and associated practices, and how participation in different models and systems of professional learning (e.g., coaching, focus groups, field experiences) affect educators' diverse change processes. Her work seeks to inform educators and policy makers, with the ultimate goal of understanding how to support teacher change that will positively impact student learning. orcid.org/0000-0002-6298-3992

Catherine A. Susin is a sessional course instructor in the Department of Education Studies at Brock University, in Canada. Her teaching has focused on mathematics education for junior/intermediate preservice teachers, supporting students studying curriculum, literacy, and reading development and incorporating video games in the classroom. Catherine is the administrative coordinator at the Brock Learning Lab, which mentors undergraduate tutors in teacher education programs. orcid.org/0000-0002-3202-052X

References

Al Otaiba, S., Folsom, J. S., Wanzek, J., Greulich, L., Waesche, J., Schatschneider, C., & Connor, C. M. (2016). Professional development to differentiate kindergarten Tier 1 instruction: Can already effective teachers improve student outcomes by differentiating Tier 1 instruction? *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 32*(5), 454–476. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2015.1021060

Atteberry, A., & Bryk, A. (2011). Analyzing teacher participation in literacy coaching activities. *Elementary School Journal, 112*(2), 356–382. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/661994

Barnhouse, D., & Vinton, V. (2012). *What readers really do: Teaching the process of meaning making*. Heinemann.

Baye, A., Inns, A., Lake, C., & Slavin, R. E. (2019). A synthesis of quantitative research on reading programs for secondary students. *Reading Research Quarterly, 54*(2), 133–166. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.229

Bengo, P. (2016, November). Secondary mathematics coaching: The components of effective mathematics coaching and implications. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 60*, pp. 88–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.027

Campbell, C., Fullan, M., & Glaze, E. (2006). *Unlocking potential for learning: Effective district-wide strategies to raise student achievement in literacy and numeracy.* Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat.

Chaparro, E. A., Massar, M. M., & Blakely, A. W. (2021). Exploring the knowledge and skills of systems-level coaches within elementary schools implementing multi-tiered systems of support. *Elementary School Journal, 122*(2), 191–207. https://doi.org/10.1086/716909

Davis, M. H., McPartland, J. M., Pryseski, C., & Kim, E. (2018). The effects of coaching on English teachers' reading instruction practices and adolescent students' read-

ing comprehension. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 57*(3), 255–275. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2018.1453897

Elish-Piper, L., & L'Allier, S. K. (2011). Examining the relationship between literacy coaching and student reading gains in grades K–3. *Elementary School Journal, 112*(1), 83–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2018.1453897

Fenwick, L. (2018). Standards-based reform to senior-secondary curriculum and metacognition in the literacy domain. *Curriculum Journal, 29*(3), 338–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2018.1424643

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers, grades 3–6: Teaching comprehension, genre, and content literacy*. Heinemann.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2012). Guided reading: The romance and the reality. *The Reading Teacher, 66*(4), 268–284. https://doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.01123

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2017). *Guided readers: Responsive teaching across the grades*. Heinemann.

Grierson, A., Gallagher, T. L., & St. Hilaire, R. (2022). Forging the role of the digital learning coach: Flexibility, responsiveness, and resourcefulness in supporting teacher professional learning. *Professional Development in Education.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2022.2038657

Gutierez, S. (2015). Teachers' reflective practice in lesson study: A tool for improving instructional practice. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 61*(3), 314–328. https://doi.org/10.11575/ajer.v61i3.56087

Hardy, I. (2009). Teacher professional development: A sociological study of senior educators' PD priorities in Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Education, 32*(3), 509–532. https://www.jstor.org/stable/canajeducrevucan.32.3.509

International Reading Association, Common Core State Standards Committee. (2012). *Literacy implementation guidance for the ELA Common Core State Standards*. https://www.literacyworldwide.org/docs/default-source/where-we-stand/ela-common-core-state-standards-guidance.pdf?sfvrsn=b1a4af8e_8

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Kahlke, R. (2014). Generic qualitative approaches: Pitfalls and benefits of methodological mixology. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 13*(1), 37–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691401300119

Kennedy, E., & Shiel, G. (2022). Writing assessment for communities of writers: Rubric validation to support formative assessment of writing in Pre-K to grade 2. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 29*(2), 127–149. https://

doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2022.2047608

Kise, J. A. (2006). *Differentiating coaching: A framework for helping teachers change.* Corwin.

Knight, J. (2017). *The impact cycle: what instructional coaches should do to foster powerful improvement in teaching.* Corwin.

Kuh, L. (2015). Teachers talking about teaching and school: Collaboration and reflective practice via critical friends groups. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 22*(3), 293–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1058589

Learned, J. (2018). Classroom contexts and the construction of struggling high school readers. *Teachers College Record, 120*(8), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811812000802

Lovett, M. W., Lacerenza, L., De Palma, M., Benson, N. J., Steinbach, K. A., & Frijters, J. C. (2008). Preparing teachers to remediate reading disabilities in high school: What is needed for effective professional development? *Teaching & Teacher Education, 2*4(4), 1083–1097. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.10.005

Lynch, J., & Alsop, S. (2007). *The effectiveness of literacy coaches*. Ontario Ministry of Education.

Lynch, J., & Ferguson, K. (2010). Reflections of elementary school literacy coaches on practice: Roles and perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Education, 33*(1), 199–227. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285968572_Reflections_of_elementary_school_literacy_coaches_on_practice_Roles_and_perspectives#fullTextFileContent

McMullan, T., & Sutherland, J. (2020). Developing motivated adolescent readers and enhancing student voice, using action research in disadvantaged contexts. *London Review of Education, 18*(3), 495–510. https://doi.org/10.14324/LRE.18.3.12

Meyers, S., Cydis, S., & Haria, P. (2015). A partnership between professors and middle school teachers to improve literacy skills of adolescents: A pilot study. *Reading Improvement, 52*(4), 147–158. https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&u=google-scholar&id=GALE|A438562109&v=2.1&it=r&sid=AONE&asid=c94af09d

Mraz, M., Salas, S., Mercado, L., & Dikotla, M. (2016). Teaching better, together: Literacy coaching as collaborative professional development. *English Teaching Forum, 54*(4), 24–31. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1123196.pdf

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy.* http://www.corestandards.org/read-the-standards/

Okkinga, M., van Steensel, R., van Gelderen A. J. S., & Sleegers, P. J. C. (2018). Effects

of reciprocal teaching on reading comprehension of low-achieving adolescents. The importance of specific teacher skills. *Journal of Research in Reading, 41*(1), 20–41. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12082

Ontario College of Teachers. (2016). *The professional learning framework for the teaching profession.* https://www.oct.ca/-/media/PDF/Professional%20Learning%20Framework/framework_e.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Professional growth in times of change: Supporting teachers' continuing professional learning and collaboration.* (OECD Education Policy Perspectives No. 10). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/753eaa89-en

Penuel, W. R., Phillips, R. S., & Harris, C. J. (2014). Analysing teachers' curriculum implementation from integrity and actor-oriented perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 46*(6), 751–777. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2014.921841

Percy, W. H., Kostere, K., & Kostere, S. (2015). Generic qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative Report, 20*(2), 76–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2015.2097

Sailors, M., & Price, L. (2015). Support for the improvement of practices through intensive coaching (SIPIC): A model of coaching for improving reading instruction and reading achievement. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 45,* 115–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.09.008

Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Sage.

Schnellert, L. M., Butler, D. L., & Higginson, S. K. (2008). Co-constructors of data, co-constructors of meaning: Teacher professional development in an age of accountability. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24,* 725–750. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.04.001

Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Groff, C., & Lake, C. (2008). Effective reading programs for middle and high schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*(3), 290–322. http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.3.4

Snyder, P. A., Hemmeter, M. L., & Fox, L. (2015). Supporting implementation of evidence-based practices through practice-based coaching. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education,35*(3), 133–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121415594925

Stephens, D., & Mills, H. (2014). Coaching as inquiry: The South Carolina Reading Initiative. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 30*(3), 190–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2014.907714

Stover, K., Kissel, B., Haag, K., & Shoniker, R. (2011). Differentiated coaching: Fostering reflection with teachers. *Reading Teacher, 64*(7), 498–509. http://dx.doi.

org/10.1598/RT.64.7.3

Toll, C. A. (2007). *Lenses on literacy coaching: Conceptualizations, functions and outcomes.* Christopher-Gordon.

Troyer, M. (2017). Teacher implementation of an adolescent reading intervention. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 65,* 21–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.005

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society.* Harvard University Press.

Walpole, S., & McKenna, M. C. (2012). *The literacy coach's handbook: A guide to research-based practice.* Guilford Press.

Weiser, B., Buss, C., Sheils, A. P., Gallegos, E., & Murray, L. R. (2019). Expert reading coaching via technology: Investigating the reading, writing, and spelling outcomes of students in grades K–8 experiencing significant reading learning disabilities. *Annals of Dyslexia, 69*(1), 54–79. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-018-00175-1

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge.* Harvard Business School Press.