The University of Southern Mississippi

The Aquila Digital Community

Dissertations

Fall 12-2017

Teachers Appraisal of Their Relationship with Instructional Coaches and Interpretation of the Instructional Coaches Role

Sandra Lawson Higgins
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations

Part of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

TEACHERS APPRAISAL OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH INSTRUCTIONAL

COACHES AND INTERPRETATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES ROLE

by

Sandra Lawson Higgins

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School,
the College of Education and Psychology,
and the Department of Educational Research and Administration
at The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

December 2017

TEACHERS APPRAISAL OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH INSTRUCTIONAL

COACHES AND INTERPRETATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES ROLE

by Sandra Lawson Higgins

December 2017

Approved by:

_____
Dr. David E. Lee, Committee Chair
Associate Professor, Educational Research and Administration

_____
Dr. Ann E. Blankenship, Committee Member
Assistant Professor, Educational Research and Administration

_____
Dr. Myron B. Labat, Committee Member
Assistant Professor, Educational Research and Administration

_____
Dr. Kyna Shelley, Committee Member
Professor, Educational Research and Administration

_____
Dr. Richard S. Mohn, Committee Member
Associate Professor, Educational Research and Administration

_____
Dr. Lilian Hill
Co-Chair, Department of Educational Research and Administration

_____
Dr. Karen S. Coats
Dean of the Graduate School

COPYRIGHT BY

Sandra Lawson Higgins

2017

ABSTRACT

TEACHERS APPRAISAL OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH INSTRUCTIONAL

COACHES AND INTERPRETATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES ROLE

by Sandra Lawson Higgins

December 2017

The need for high quality teachers has increased over the past years with the new mandates for college and career ready students. School administrators are providing job-embedded professional development to ensure quality teaching is taking place in classrooms. Instructional coaching is a form of job-embedded professional development that is being used to offer an opportunity with support for teachers to implement best learning practices into their classroom teaching.

This quantitative non-experimental research study used survey methodology to collect data from the two districts that participated. This study involved asking teachers to report if the relationship between the coach and the teachers align with the seven principles of the partnership approach and it asked teachers to report if teachers agree that coaches are fulfilling the common roles of instructional coaches.

The results of the study indicate that the majority of teachers reported they have a partnership with their coaches and that theses coaches are fulfilling the common roles of coaching. Although these results were positive the study revealed improvements can be made when developing the partnership principles choice, dialogue, and reflection

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family members who were my support throughout this journey. My husband Kurt and my children Alexis and Marcus were with me every step I took on the road to completion of the dissertation. I appreciate my mother, Verna Lawson, who has always kept me grounded and pushed me to move beyond my comfort zone. I appreciate my father, Odie Lawson, who has always made me feel comfortable about just being myself. My siblings Bobby (Carolyn), Rickey (Pat) and Vicki have believed in me even when I have had trouble believing in myself. Their encouragement and council have given me the confidence to get me through this journey. I thank God for his grace and mercy because without him I would not have been able to take neither my first step nor my last step toward completing my dissertation. He has been my strength when I felt weak; he carried me when I could not move another step alone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

The United States education system is currently experiencing many challenges in an effort to improve student learning. The publication of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) and the adoption of *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB, 2002) have focused on teacher accountability within the schools. Until recently, school administrators have been pressured to make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) to comply with the law. Even though many states were issued waivers for NCLB, these waivers came with the following demanding requirements:

- Be on track to meet current commitments and requirements under ESEA flexibility;

- Have a plan for implementing Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility through the 2015-2016 school year;

- Meet the high bar set to protect all students and support all teachers and principals under ESEA flexibility;

- Identify schools and subgroups in need and ensuring they receive interventions and supports;

- Have resolved any outstanding monitoring findings or compliance issues in ESEA flexibility or related programs. (U.S. Department of Education, 2013)

Teachers were held accountable for each and every student's growth within their classroom and they are now held accountable for this same growth under the most recently adopted Every Student Succeed Act (ESSA, 2015) Although growth is not the only measure used in ESSA, support is required form the district leaders who are in charge of professional development to ensure teachers are prepared to meet the needs of all students. ESSA focuses on students being college and career ready.

District leaders, which includes the superintendent, the central office staff, the building-level administrators, and board members, have the task of ensuring that teachers have the support needed to accomplish the requirements of meeting individualized student growth. One way districts can give this support is through professional development. The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) stated that professional development that meets high standards results in increased teacher knowledge and improved teacher practices, which in turn results in increased student growth (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). These higher expectations require more from our education system. Danielson (2009) maintained,

> Schools themselves are complex systems with many moving parts, such as the richness of the curriculum, the general tone of the school, and the availability of support services and extracurricular activities for students. However, in spite of these factors, the single most important factor under the control of the school influencing the degree of student learning must be equally committed to improving the quality of teaching. (p. 3)

This improved quality of teaching should be emphasized during teacher professional development training in order to improve student learning in the classroom.

Professional development needs have changed over the years due to the need for high quality teachers. Traditionally, professional development has been offered in whole group settings with little to no follow up on the success of the implemented professional development training. This professional development is not considered to be best practice because, in many cases, teachers in these trainings did not have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers after the session to reflect on how the professional

development training related to their existing classroom daily operations. Following the traditional professional development training, teachers were not given the opportunity to implement the training with support from a professional development leader within their class. Traditionally, teachers also were not given the opportunity to discuss with trainers about needed changes that would promote student growth after the implementation of the training in the classroom. (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Knight 2009). Emphasis being placed on accountability and the growing demands of teaching and learning makes it essential for professional development to be more than sessions where teachers sit and receive knowledge on how to acquire skills without being given the opportunity to apply these skills with support and feedback (Vescio, Ross, and Adams, 2008).

One way to provide job-embedded, differentiated support is by using instructional coaches. Coaching allows teachers to gain new knowledge and reflect on their practices using their classroom setting as their training site. Knight (2007) referred to instructional coaches as full time on-site professional development leaders who support research based teaching practices. Hershfeldt, Pell, Sechrest, Pas, and Bradshaw (2012) defined a coach as a person who provides support to teachers as they fulfill their classroom duties which includes student instruction, classroom management, and meeting individualize student academic needs. Denton and Hasbrouck (2009) expressed that the coaches role involves providing guidance and support as the teacher strives to help student reach given academic goals. Teachers are able to make teaching improvements when they have been given solid evidence to help them understand what needs improving and guidance in incorporating this feedback (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012).

3

A goal of instructional coaching is to provide sustained professional development to aid teachers to promote student learning in their classrooms. Instructional coaches form a partnership with teachers to develop effective teaching practices so that the teacher, with the guidance of the coach, will be able to carry out these effective practices to improve student learning in the class (Deerfield Public School District, 2013). Coaching is best when both the teacher and the coach recognize and share responsibility and ownership of the outcomes of student growth, thus coaching is a collaborative partnership between the two (Yopp, Burroughs, Luebeck, Heidma, Mitchell, & Sutton, 2011). Crane (2014) noted,

In a coaching culture, all members of the culture courageously engage in candid, respectful coaching conversations with one another – unrestricted by reporting relationships – about how they can improve their working relationships and individual and collective work performance. All have learned to value and effectively use feedback as a powerful learning tool to produce higher levels of personal accountability, professional development, high –trust working relationship, continually improving job performance (p. 218).

This coaching culture is the foundation for improved individualized learning within the classroom because teachers received individualized support; they are better able to give individualized support to their students. According to Barkley (2005), coaching has the prospect to help teachers achieve goals, learn new methods of teaching, and positively alter the learning path of students. Coaching should provide teachers with the tools needed to face the challenges of presenting high quality teaching practices and the results of these practices should be student growth.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical basis for this study is Knight's (2009) partnership philosophy. Knight (2009) stated that the first step a coach must make before helping others is to self-examine their own principles and the theories that guide their coaching. The partnership approach has seven principles that shape the instructional coaching process. Lee (1998) noted, "The principles you live by create the world you live in; if you change the principles you live by, you will change your world" (p. 1). The principles behind the partnership philosophy include the following seven: equality, choice, voice, dialogue, reflection, praxis, and reciprocity (Knight 2007).

Block (1993) noted that the goal of working together in a partnership is to ensure that there is a balance of power within the coaching relationship. James Flaherty (1999) stated that the job of coaches in a partnership is to first identify how the teacher interprets a given teaching situation and then work in a partnership with that teacher to make necessary changes that will improve learning. This partnership approach allows the teacher and the coach to collaborate and make changes to teaching practices together and allows for the teacher to be the final decision maker in choosing the best practices to implement after collaborating. Knight (1998) studied both partnership learning and a more traditional form of professional learning which consist of primary lectures and found that teachers benefited more from partnership learning. Furthermore, he found teachers were four times more likely to implement the information learned in partnership learning experience than in the traditional training (Knight, 1998).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate whether or not teachers view the relationships that exist between teachers and instructional coaches as a partnership. It will also examine if teachers perceive the roles of instructional coaches as being fulfilled.

This study will explore seven qualities found in the partnership approach to coaching. These qualities include equality, choice, voice, refection, dialogue, praxis and reciprocity. Equality involves partnership relationships between equals. Choice allows everyone involved in the partnership to make their own decisions. Voice allows everyone involved in the partnership an opportunity to be heard. Reflection allows partners to have the freedom to consider ideas before adopting them. Dialogue allows for mutual decision making within the partnership. Praxis allows the teacher to apply what has been learned. Reciprocity requires the instructional coach to learn as they are assisting the teacher (Knight, 2007).

This study will also explore the roles and responsibilities of coaches. The following is a list of common coaching roles that are preformed both formally and informally to ensure success in the schools where coaches provide serves (Harrison & Killion, 2007): curriculum specialist, classroom supporter, learning facilitator, mentor, school leader, research provider, instructional specialist, data coach, catalyst for change, and learner. The purpose of these roles is to support teachers during the coaching process, but implementing the roles also has challenges that can hinder the partnership between the coach and the teacher.

Statement of the Problem

Much of the attention in previous studies on coaching has focused on how student achievement is affected by teachers being coached (Knight, 2009; Neufeld & Roper, 2003). However, there is limited literature that focuses strictly on the relationship that must be developed between the coach and the teacher and the roles coaches play in the school system. The purpose of coaching is to intervene so that student learning within a class improves; but before student learning can begin the coach and the teacher must have positive interactions. Knight (2011) shared, "people will not embrace learning with us unless they're comfortable working with us" (p. 22). The coach and the teacher should start with a trusting and respectful relationship that grows into a partnership in which the coach helps to develop the teacher's ability to reflect on previous knowledge and teaching practices, show the teacher how to incorporate new teaching practices, and create goals that will lead to student achievement. Coaches should concentrate on the teacher when they are in the classroom and make the teacher teaching practices their main commitment (Walker, 2010). This can only be done if there is a positive relationship between the coach and the teacher. James Flaherty (1999) wrote "The basic ingredients for the relationship are mutual trust, respect, and freedom of expression." He further stated, "It's a matter of openness, communication, appreciation, fairness, and shared commitment" (p.39). All of these factors should lead to positive relationship between the coach and the teacher. Knight's (2009) partnership principles describe how relationships should be developed in a coaching partnership.

Limitations of the Study

1.) Due to time restraints the study was limited to a convenience sample which may
   not have accurately represented the population.

2.) Due to the small sample size, results of this study may only be generalized within
   the specifically drawn sample population.

3.) Due to the fact that all sample respondents may not answer with frankness, the
   results from the study may exclude true reflections of the opinions of some
   members of the included population.

4.) Limitations include the fact that the results will not yield a causation conclusion
   but simply report the partnership relationship between the coach and the teacher.

5.) Limitations also include the fact that the results will not yield a causation
   conclusion but simply report whether teachers feel coaches fulfill the given roles.

Delimitations of the Study

1.) The survey instrument will include only multiple –choice questions and no open
   ended questions to warrant manageability of the collected data.

2.) The population in the study will include teachers from South Mississippi whose
   districts are members of the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC)
   and also employ instructional coaches because of the large potential pools of
   participants.

Definition of Terms

   The following definitions of terms are listed to provide consistency and
understanding throughout the study. The terms defined without a citation were developed
by the researcher.

- Instructional Coach: "An instructional coach partners with teachers to help them incorporate research-based instructional practices into their teaching… [Which] help students learn more effectively" (Knight, 2009, p. 30). The following are alternative names that instructional coaches might be labeled in a school setting: math coach, literacy coach, lead teacher, curriculum specialist, academic coach.

- Professional Development is an attempt to provide teachers with the methods to make changes in their educational teaching practices that will have positive effects on student learning (Guskey, 2002).

Research Questions

This study will report whether teachers view the relationship between the coach and the teacher as a partnership as described in Knight's (2009) eight principles of the partnership approach (Knight, 2009). It will also report if teachers agree that the common roles of coaches that Harrison and Killion (2007) describe are the actual roles they observe when working with coaches.

The overarching research objective guiding this study is to relate how teachers report their relationship with instructional coaches and what teachers report as the roles of instructional coaches. The study will include the following research questions:

RQ1: To what degree do teachers report each of the eight partnership principles as being present in the teacher /coach relationship?

RQ2: What do teachers report as the common roles instructional coaches fulfill?

RQ3: Based on the teacher's level of education, and the years of experience, is there a difference in the reporting of teachers regarding the instructional coach partnership with teachers and also the reporting of the roles of the instructional coaches?

Significance of the Study

The current changes in our educational system have put high demands on schools to receive proficient academic results from all students. Educational leaders realize that in order to change student practices, we must first change teaching practices (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). This study will examine the extent to which teachers feel they have the relationship with coaches that is needed to form a partnership of collaboration which leads to a joint effort of improving student learning. Having a partnership with teachers is significant because without a positive relationship the teacher and coach cannot move forward and make progress towards the teacher learning.

The study will also examine whether or not teachers feel coaches are fulfilling the common roles of coaching. If teachers do not understand the role of coaches or if they do not know all of the roles the coaches' play, then they may not take advantage of the service or they have negative feelings toward the coaches because they have limited experiences with the coach. The study will measure what teachers know about the coaches' role and it will also measure to what extent the teacher feels the roles are being fulfilled in their classroom. Understanding the coaches' roles is significant to principals, coaches, and teachers because if the roles of coaches are not clear, then expectations can be misunderstood and academic goals will not be met.

Overview of the Study

Chapter one of this study includes the introduction, the theoretical framework, the purpose of the study, and the statement of the problem. Chapter one also contains the limitations and delimitations, the definition of terms, the research questions, and the significance of the study. Chapter two includes the related literature review of the studied topic. Chapter three gives the details of the methodology used in the study. The findings from the data analyses are reported in Chapter four. The summary of the study, the findings, the conclusions, and future recommendations are found in Chapter five.

CHAPTER II – REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The concern about education reform has prompted both the publication of *A Nation at Risk* and the adoption of No *Child Left Behind* (NCLB). Both have requirements for school improvement that focused on the elevation of student achievement (Seed, 2008). Jim Knight (2007) stated the adoption of *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) has placed a great amount of focus on teaching practices and what students are learning in the classrooms. The goal of achieving Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) has prompted school leaders to find ways of increasing student learning to attain AYP (Knight, 2007). Knight (2007) further stated "with their magnifying glasses focused on instructional practices, many school leaders are discovering that traditional methods simply do not get the job done" (p. 1).

Professional Development

For improvements to be made in education there must be high quality professional development taking place within schools (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). Thomas Guskey (2002) noted "policy makers increasingly recognize that schools can be no better than the teachers and administrators who work within them" (p. 381). Policy makers realized that improvement of student learning could be accomplished by focusing on professional development (Guskey, 2002). This professional development must be meaningful and relevant to benefit teachers and ultimately student learning (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). After conducting hundreds of interviews, Knight (2007) discovered that teachers disapproved of attending traditional one-shot professional development in which an expert lectured on subject matters that were generic and did not cover specific areas of concern. These teachers also stated that training that did not provide follow-up

and opportunities for them to share their expertise discouraged them from embracing new teaching concepts (Knight, 2007). Even though the materials being presented and the reasons for the professional development may differ, the majority of professional development presented has a common goal which is to make schools better academically (Guskey & Yoon, 2009).

<div align="center">Characteristics of Professional Development</div>

Professional development is an attempt to provide teachers with the methods to make changes in their educational teaching practices that will have positive effects on student learning (Guskey, 2002). Professional Development should provide teachers with the opportunity to transfer knowledge that they have learned into practice that increases student learning (Avalos, 2011). Avalos (2011) wrote:

> Teacher professional learning is a complex process, which requires cognitive and emotional involvement of teachers individually and collectively, the capacity and willingness to examine where each one stands in terms of convictions and beliefs and the perusal and enactment of appropriate alternatives for improvement or change. All this occurs in particular educational policy environments or school cultures, some of which are more appropriate and conducive to learning than others (p.10).

Professional development must be meaningful to make a difference in teaching practices. As teachers learn new practices they need to understand why learning these practices are important, the opportunity to put these practices into action in their classrooms, and to receive follow-up on the progress from an observer of the practice (Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987). Meaningful professional development will allow teachers to develop

<div align="center">13</div>

skills that permit them to think deeply about their practice, to make necessary

adjustments, and to enhance classroom instructions (Showers et al., 1987).

In support of professional development, Linda Darling-Hammond and Milbrey

McLaughlin (1995) wrote, "The vision of practice that underlies the nation's reform

agenda requires most teachers to rethink their own practice, to construct new classroom

roles and expectations about student outcomes, and to teach in ways they have never

taught before''(p.1). Professional development that is effective encompasses teachers as

both teachers and learners and permits them to experience the difficulties that go along

with both roles (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002). Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin

(1995) noted that effective professional development has a number of characteristics:

- It must engage teachers in concrete tasks of teaching, assessment, observation,
  and reflection that illuminate the processes of learning and development.

- It must be grounded in inquiry, reflection, and experimentation that are
  participant-driven.

- It must be collaborative, involving a sharing of knowledge among educators and a
  focus on teachers' communities of practice rather than on individual teachers.

- It must be connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students.

- It must be sustained, ongoing, intensive, and supported by modeling, coaching,
  and the collective solving of specific problems of practice.

- It must be connected to other aspects of school change (p.598).

The methods used for professional growth must be understood to support the

implementation of professional development that encourages continuous learning of

teachers (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

14

Effective teacher learning

Professional development that focuses on teachers learning to meet students'

academic needs should begin while student teachers are in college and should continue

throughout their teaching careers (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). Chin-Wen

Chien (2013) stated, "Effective professional development must be comprehensively

designed and systematically delivered by knowledgeable trainers that provide teachers

with ongoing support" (p. 7). Thorough preparation is mandatory for the successful

implementation of professional development. This planning should allocate for well-

organized time that focuses on the best teaching methods for students and job-embedded

assistance that help teachers make adjustments to their classroom practices to increase

student learning (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). In order for professional development to be

successful, it must give the teachers an opportunity to be both the learner who puts effort

into learning and the teacher who is able to relay what has been learned to others

(Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). Showers and Joyce noted "teachers learn

from one another while planning instruction, developing support materials, watching one

another work with students and thinking together about the impact of their behavior on

their students learning" (p.4).

Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin (1995) stated it is essential for teachers to not

only understand the principles behind educating students, but to also have a support

system in place that use inquiry, collaboration, and teaching strategies to provide for

areas in which they need support. Professional development is not carried out

successfully when teachers are asked to integrate teaching practices that do not improve

student learning or if teachers are asked to integrate teaching practices that are impactful,

but do not provide teachers with the opportunity to practice these strategies with support (Knight, 2009). For productive results, teachers must have ongoing opportunities to learn effective teaching practices, see effective teaching practices in action, and with support experience teaching using effective practices. Sparks (1983) stated when teachers are engaged in learning new concepts, they should be given information, and this information should be demonstrated so that they are able to see the new concept in action. Teachers must embrace new visions of learning and stop practicing the traditional learning methods that do not benefit student growth (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). According to Killion and Harrison (2006), "Professional development is the only practical tool at their [the teachers] disposal to increase the instructional effectiveness of current classroom teachers". (p. 8)

Teacher Change

The implementation of professional development is significant in the perception of teacher change as it relates to teaching and learning (Hattie, 2009). Many professional development plans fail because of a lack of knowledge on what motivates teachers to attend training and the change process teacher's experience (Guskey T. , 1986). There are different approaches to teacher training that involve change. Clark & Hollingsworth (2002) listed six perspectives on teacher change:

- Change as training—change is something that is done to teachers; that is, teachers are ''changed''.
- Change as adaptation—teachers ''change'' in response to something; they adapt their practices to changed conditions.

- Change as personal development—teachers ''seek to change'' in an attempt to improve their performance or develop additional skill or strategies.

- Change as local reform—teachers ''change something'' for reasons of personal growth.

- Change as systemic restructuring—teachers enact the ''change policies'' of the system.

- Change as growth or learning—teachers ''change inevitably through professional activity''; teachers are themselves learners who work in a learning community. (p.948)

The concentration of professional development endeavors should be focused on identifying change as learning because it makes change and learning an expected part of professional practices of the school community (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

Teacher Motivation

Professional changes will not take place unless teachers are motivated to make changes (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Michael Fullan (1993) stated that for change to take place in classrooms teachers must have a moral purpose or feel they are making a difference in the classroom. Wagner (2001) wrote that the majority of teachers are concerned about whether or not student learning is taking place inside their classroom and these teachers want their students to grow academically, thus the focus of professional development should be on the classroom best practices. Vincent Angeline (2014) wrote, "understanding the role that motivation plays in seeking out methods for individual enhancement can serve those who seek to design professional development programs that are practical, impactful, and beneficial" (p. 50). Teachers are motivated to

attend professional development when they believe these sessions will increase their

knowledge and skills levels and when the teaching practices learned are realistic and can

be exercised in the daily routines of the classroom (Guskey, 2000). Wagner (2001)

maintained that "the challenge in motivating teachers is to help them understand what

today's students need to know and be able to do for work and for effective citizenship

and to help them learn better strategies for teaching all students" (pp.379-380). Teaching

knowledge is gained when a teacher concentrates on what is most important in education

which is the student and the student work (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995).

<center>Traditional Professional Development</center>

Love, Stiles, Mundry, and DiRanna (2008) wrote, "In the last few years,

educators have been called upon to do work they have never done before and were in

most cases, never prepared to do" (p.3). Teachers have been called upon to:

- work productively in professional learning communities,

- apply principles of cultural proficiency to data use and school
  improvement,

- understand and draw sound inferences form a variety of different kinds of
  data,

- accurately identify root causes of problems the data surface,

- implement researched based instructional improvements linked to goals,

- monitor interim and long term progress toward goals. (Love, Stile,
  Mundry, & DiRanna, 2008, p. 3)

The change in the expectations of our education system has caused a change in what is

needed for teachers regarding professional development. The emphasis that is being

<center>18</center>

placed on accountability and the growing demands on teaching and learning has made it essential for professional development to be more than sessions where teachers sit and receive knowledge on how to acquire skills without being given the opportunity to apply these skills with support and feedback (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). The new standards for professional development restructure the traditional methods of professional development in schools to include the support teachers need to increase student learning in the classroom (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008).

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, dissatisfaction was noted by researchers and educators with the traditional disintegrated workshop form of professional development for teachers. These leaders in education began an action plan that consisted of more long term, job embedded approaches to improve the practices of teachers (Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987). Avalos (2010) argued that if professional development is presented in a workshop or class format, then it should require educators to create curriculum, to evaluate data, and to spend time sharing and collaborating how to deal with certain educational issues (Avalos, 2011).

While examining professional development to find a guide to what leads to positive student learning, Linda Darling-Hammond,Ruth Wei, Alethea Andree, Nikole Richardson, & Stelios Orphanos (2009), found that 9 out of 10 teachers in the United States attended professional development that was mainly workshops and short term conferences which was similar to findings in other countries. It was also found that professional development in the other countries studied provided extra time for collaboration after the initial training, but the United States did not offer this opportunity for learning to be extended (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Teachers in the United

States were not satisfied with the current state of professional development because it did not provide them with time to collaborate with other teachers, and many of the sessions they attended did not relate to what was being taught in their classes. Teachers' opinions about what was presented was also limited, and teachers were not asked to share their knowledge during the sessions (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). Guskey and Yoon (2009) affirmed that teachers were not receiving the professional development that they wanted and needed.

Analysis has shown that even though professional development is common practice for teacher training in education, many professional development programs are in need of need improvements. Even though it is the common practice for improvement in education, analyses of professional development has shown that most professional development programs need major improvements (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). The ineffectiveness found in professional development is caused by many influences, Guskey (1986) suggest there are two important factors that cause the majority of professional development programs to fail: (1) the motivation teachers need to participate in professional development, and (2) the process used to bring about change for teachers. Teachers must feel that they are an active part of the change within the school. Hattie (2009) stated:

> Teachers must enter the classroom with certain conceptions about progress, relationships, and students. It requires them to believe that their role is that of a change agent –that all students can learn and progress, that achievement for all is changeable and not fixed, and that demonstrating to all students they care about their learning is both powerful and effective (p.128).

Murray (2013) noted another concern with professional development programs in America is the typical assumption that all vital teacher understanding and learning must come from external sources. As a result of this assumption, teachers are sent to conferences and workshops or outside speakers are brought to the schools to conduct professional development. These sessions rarely have formal or informal follow-up opportunities for collaboration about what was taught, so these external professional development sessions have little influence on how teachers teach and what students learn (Murray, 2013). According to Knight (2009), teachers need job-embedded professional development that provides follow-up actions and feedback.

The assumption that understanding and learning must derive from external sources discourages teacher collaboration (Murray, 2013). There is a culture of teachers working in isolation in America who are unable to participate and show professional learning and growth through teacher interactions (Murray, 2013).

Even though there may be some form of professional development in existence in schools, traditionally time is not built into the school day for professional development activities that allow teachers to collaborate. This sends a message to teachers that professional learning is not very important to the school (Murray, 2013). Recurrent, job-embedded professional learning must become part of the school's culture to close the gap between current school practices and practices that are best to ensure student growth (Murray, 2013). Professional development is an ongoing process that requires the total education system to examine and make changes to teaching practice so that power is given to the educator to make developmental decisions that might be hard, but allows

them to strive to solve them as a collaborative team (American Federation of Teachers, 2002).

Guskey and Yoon (2009) wrote that of all professional development activities, none has been more disparaged in recent years than workshops, particularly those of short duration. Criticized as the epitome of ineffective practice, many education leaders regard workshops as a waste of both time and money. Guskey and Yoon (2009) further stated that the one shot workshops that offer no genuine follow-up or sustained support are inefficient. Wei et al. (2010) added:

> Professional Development must be intensive; sustained over time; embedded in teachers' day-to-day work in schools; related directly to teachers' work with students; able to engage teachers in active learning of the content to be taught and how to teach that content; coherent with district policies related to curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and structured to regularly engage teachers in local professional-learning communities where problems of practice are solved through collaboration. (p. 38)

Many schools systems have adopted coaching as a means to address the areas of weakness found in traditional professional development because coaching is a more sustained way of building teacher capacity (Killion & Harrison, 2006).

Historical Background of Coaching

Morrison (2010) noted the term coach was used as a slang term for tutor at Oxford University, and the use of the word as it relates to the sports profession started in the later part of the 1800s. Traditionally the sports profession is what is thought of first when coaching is mentioned because the term is well-established in sports. There are

several ways coaching can be defined and this definition varies according to context. According to Dewan (2003), coaching is a non-bias process where an individual is being guided and developed to reach goals. Morrison (2010) stated that coaching is a method that focuses on using guiding instructions in order to aid those being coached to reach their goals. Whitmore (2009) stressed the support that is given in a coaching relationship and the way communication takes place has a great effect on the results. The coach inspires the coachee to find the answers within him or herself.

Coaching in the Business World

Anderson, Frankovelgia, & Hernez-Broome (2009) found that leaders in businesses that creating a coaching culture would bring about more employee engagement, more satisfaction on the job, would increase morale, and improve team collaboration in the workplace. In his book *The Heart of Coaching*, Thomas Cranes (2014) noted that many authors have encouraged managers and leaders in business to use the same motivational approaches to inspire their teams that athletic coaches have used for years.

Increasingly, coaching is being used in business (Dewan, 2003). According to Noble (2012), those who coach must understand what coaching is and why it is done. Coaching is simply giving aid to help increase performance on the job or it could also be assisting employees acquire new skills. Both purposes, if done correctly by the manager coach, will produce high growth and success within the organization (Noble, 2012). In laying out his views on the coaching culture in business, Crane (2014) stated:

In a coaching culture, all members of the culture courageously engage in candid, respectful coaching conversations with one another unrestricted by reporting

relationships about how this can improve their working relationships and

individual and collective work performance. All have learned to value and

effectively use feedback as a powerful accountability, professional development,

high trust working relationships, continually improving job performance and ever

increasing custom satisfaction. (p. 218)

Educators adopted using coaches similarly to businesses - to support effective practices.

Knight (2007), a leader in the world of education found that most of the information on

coaching is found in business literature. These coaches are labeled names such as

transformational coaches, process coaches, and executive coaches. Knight (2007) further

stated "executive coaching is an increasingly popular method for helping people become

more competent in one or more areas of their (usually professional) lives" (p.9). The most

comprehensive literature on coaching comes from the business world, where executive

coaching has become a booming industry. This comprehensive literature from the

business world along with publications from educators provides a clearer picture of just

what coaching is and is not (Knight, 2007).

<div align="center">Coaching in Education</div>

Coaches in education establish a reflective environment that allows teacher choice

through collaboration with the teacher (Knight, 2007). Tomlinson emphasized, "Effective

coaches know that a culture of success is more than a culture of winning" (p.92). Great

coaches provide visions for their teachers and inspire those they coach to apply

themselves to reach their full potential, to persevere even when they make mistakes, and

to grow to love their work (Tomlinson, 2011).

Love, Stile, Mundry, & DiRanna (2008) stated that a coach in education is an onsite leader of professional development who provides on the spot support to teachers as they implement research-based teaching practices. Coaching in education focuses on professional practices, it is job- embedded, it is intensive and ongoing, it is grounded in partnerships, it enables dialogue, it is non-evaluative, it is confidential, and it is facilitated through respectful communication (Knight, 2009). Coaching is a collaborative partnership between the coach and the teacher and is at its best when the teacher and the coach recognize and share responsibility and ownership of the outcomes of student learning within the class (Yopp et al., 2011).

The adoption of instructional coaching as professional development is becoming common in the United States to help support an increase in student achievement (Heineke, 2013). Coaches are experienced teachers who provide instructional support, professional development, feedback, and teaching materials to classroom teachers with the goal of improving student achievement (Poglinco & Bach, 2004). Elmore (2000) noted that the way teachers are prepared to teach and the effectiveness of their teaching practices has a direct connection to how well students achieve. According to Goldstein and Noguera (2006), the challenge schools must tackle determines the method that should be used to improve teacher effectiveness and to make improvements in student achievement. After reviewing research, Goodwin (2011) held that best approach to ensuring the implementation of teaching practices is by providing the assistance of coaches to support teachers. Joyce and Showers (2002) discussion of their research aligned with that of Goodwin (2011) when they wrote:

25

We found that continuing technical assistance, whether provided by an outside

expert or by peer experts, resulted in much greater classroom implementation than

was achieved by teachers who share initial training but did not have the long-term

support of coaching (p. 85).

Vanderburg and Stepens (2010) pointed out that when coaches are effective they (a)

facilitate collaboration between teachers, (b) provide support for classroom instructions,

and (c) use research based practices as a basis for coaching to promote student learning.

Although all of the behaviors listed are important, research conducted by Goldsmith and

Lyons (2005) indicated that the coach is not the most important variable in coaching

success, but rather the person being coached is the key to a successful coaching

relationship.

<div align="center">Building a Coaching Relationship</div>

The success of coaching depends on more than the coach being an excellent

classroom teacher. Even though a teacher may be considered a master teacher, the ability

to teach school age students does not guarantee this person will be a successful

instructional coach who supports teachers (Poglinco & Bach, 2004). An effective coach

has to have the ability to build relationships with the teachers they coach. Teachers will

not accept the help of coaches unless they feel secure (Knight, 2011). Teachers are

vulnerable when outsiders come into their classes to offer assistance with instruction. The

coach and the coachee relationship is fragile in the initial stages and will continue to be

fragile if the coach is not conscious of how the relationship progresses from the initial

meeting (Burns, 2006). The coach must first build a meaningful relationship with each

teacher before trying to make instructional changes in the classroom (Devine,

Houssenmand, & Meyers, 2013). Marilyn Burns noted that coaches need to "Make sure teachers know that you are their advocate, not their evaluator." The most important factor in building a coaching relationship between the coach and coachee is trust.

Trust

It is often stated that trust must be earned. This statement is true in the coach / teacher relationship. Along with having content and curriculum knowledge, Feger, Woleck, and Hickamn (2013) stated that the coach also must have interpersonal skills which allow the coach to establish trusting relationships with open communication between the coach and the coachee. Bryk and Schneider (2002) study of twelve elementary schools found that a school that scored low in the area of trust had a one and seven chance of improving student learning, but half of the schools that scored high in the area of trust showed improvement in student learning. Bryk and Schneider (2002) stated that the most noteworthy information reported was from the most chronically weak schools whose reports showed no improved learning in the major subject areas and extremely low scores in the area of trust.

Crane (2014) agreed, stating that the coach must have the desire to establish rapport and be reliable and trustworthy in order to have a lasting productive coaching relationship. Crane (2002) noted:

> The coach being friendly, approachable and someone the coachee feels they can talk to during any situation. The coachee should feel secure when speaking to the coach and know that the dialogue between the coach and the coachee will be treated in a professional manner and that the coach must also be a good listener who is not only empathic, but also reflective, so that the coachee feels they have

been heard and understood. The coach must be willing to openly share real

learning experiences from their own past that helped the coach to grow as an

educator. Being genuine allows the coachee to view the coach as a teacher who

had to and continues to go through learning processes in order to become better at

educating students. What a coach thinks should be consistent with what is said

and what is done when coaching. (pp. 57-58)

Coaches and coachees share a common focus on student learning and this provides the

foundation for a collaborative relationship, but coaches must let this be a starting point of

growing trust, promoting continuous confidentiality, and successfully communicating

with teachers (Crane, 2014). This successful communication between the coach and the

coachee must include honest feedback.

Honesty

Building a trusting relationship is very important, and along with trust there must

be honesty in the relationship to guarantee student learning is taking place at the level

that it should be within the class. The coachee may trust the coach, but if the coach is not

being honest about negative teaching practices taking place in a teachers class, then

student learning may not be taking place in the classroom. John Gabriel (2005) noted that

when the coach and the coachee focus on building a relationship that is student centered

the two evolve into honest partners with the common goal of student achievement. The

coaching relationship that includes honest feedback is needed in order to make

adjustments in classrooms that bring about student growth.

Effective coaching "depends on building trust around the joint work of improving

instructional practices and not on building trust by avoiding difficult conversations"

(Mangin & Stoelings, 2011, p. 51). Coaches must establish themselves as not only trusted

peers, but also as instructional experts that gives honest feedback to the coachees

(Mangin & Stoelings, 2011). The coachee is "at risk of gaining no insight into practices,

obtaining no results for students" when the coach does not give honest feedback

(Macdonald, 2011).

<div align="center">Current Changes in Evaluation</div>

Education reform initiatives have evolved over the past years and have had a great

impact on how student achievement is measured and on how teachers are held

accountable. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was signed

into a law while President Lyndon Johnson was in office. The funds from this law were

used in both elementary and secondary schools. The goal of the act was to ensure all

students had equal access to education and that accountability and standards were high.

ESEA has had a wide range of influence on education over the years.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB) reauthorization was the next

update of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

goal was to improve our elementary and secondary schools. President George W. Bush

felt that in spite of the large amount of funds that had been spent on ESEA in previous

years, the gaps in education continued to be wide and many of the disadvantaged students

who needed education the most were being left behind. The NCLB Act added greater

accountability for states, districts, and schools. It also brought a greater awareness to

teacher training.

On December 10, 2015, President Obama signed the most recent reauthorization

of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is entitled Every Student

Succeeds Act (ESSA). Under ESSA, states have more flexibility and responsibility. ESSA shifts from the federal the government intense control found in NCLB to each state being responsible for its own accountability system. Another shift that will take place is teacher evaluations. Teacher evaluations under ESSA are no longer required to be based on student outcome as it was with NCLB and ESSA allows states and schools to determine their own criteria for teacher evaluation. NCLB highly qualified teacher requirements were also eliminated, but ESSA requires each state with teachers in Title 1-A funded schools meet state requirements for certifications and licensures. Even though the United States Department of Education has begun working with states and districts to implement the new law, the ESSA will go into effect during the 2017-2018 school year.

Events in U.S. history have brought about the need to change the way professional development is provided for teachers. In 2009, the U.S. Department of Education presented states with the opportunity to receive Race to the Top Funds which consisted of a portion of $4.35 billion dollars stimulus funding for states that aligned their education policies with that of the federal government's educational policies (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). According to Maslow and Kelley (2012), Race to the Top emphasized revising teacher evaluation policies at the state level, and it brought into question the role of evaluation practices and evaluation potential to make improvements within school organizations. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Program was introduced two years after Race to the Top to provide a waiver from provisions of the 2001 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law which required all students have equal access to a quality education and it presented states with the

opportunity to enacted the Reading First initiative which was to ensure all students could read well by the end of third grade.

As one of its exceptions, the ESEA Flexibility Program required states improve the evaluation methods in their district for teachers. (U.S. Department of Education, 2015)

Both of these federal programs had the same requirements for adjustments to teacher evaluations. Before receiving funds, each state's evaluations plan would need the following:

- Be used for continual improvement of instruction;

- Differentiate performance on the basis of at least three levels;

- Use multiple evidence sources to determine performance on the basis of at least three levels including student growth as a significant factor;

- Evaluate teachers and principals regularly;

- Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback for professional development;

- Be used to inform personnel decisions (Popham, 2013, p.20)

Popham (2013) stated, if reviewed closely, this list of requirements would reveal both formative and summative evaluations. Summative evaluations have the purpose of "making consequential decisions" while formative evaluations "enhance the professional skills of teachers" (Danielson & McGreal, 2000, p. 8). The change in expectations for the teacher's evaluation by the federal government has prompted many states to begin using coaches in the classrooms, embracing "an evaluation system that fosters teacher learning" instead of "measuring teacher competence" (Marzano, 2012).

31

Purpose of Evaluations

Maslow and Kelley stated (2012), "evaluation hypothetically serves three distinct purposes: summative judgment regarding individual teachers, formative feedback to support improvements in individual teaching practices, and systemic feedback to inform the management of human resources in the school or district" (p.602).

Summative Evaluations

The purpose of summative evaluation is to make a decision that has consequences and to determine if a quality education is taking place within the classroom (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). They are used to meet the need of accountability for our government, and they are also used for public awareness of the status of teachers who are paid by the public to meet certain standards (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Summative evaluation may be viewed by teachers as highly stressful because it may have direct employment consequences, which makes it harder for teachers to build a positive trusting relationship with the evaluator; even when the evaluator sincerely wants to help the teacher improve, in a summative evaluation system this assistance may be viewed as a threat rather than constructive support (Maslow & Kelley, 2012). These stressful situations and consequences include:

- Teachers who admit having "difficulties" in the classroom fear it will be documented on the final evaluation as "deficiencies"
- Teachers who believe the "evaluation is used to get rid of people"
- Teachers who believe that the evaluator is "bias based on grounds in irrelevant matters fear unfair evaluations." (Maslow & Kelley, 2012, p. 9)

Although summative evaluations are sometimes stressful, they should be used to determine if a quality education is taking place within the classroom (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Formative Evaluation

According to Danielson & McGreal (2000), the purpose of formative evaluation is to enrich teacher practice. Joyce and Showers (2002) stated that coaching can be done successfully if it is done in a formative method, where feedback is based on inquiry instead of evaluation. Coaching, when seen as formative evaluation, provides an opportunity for teachers to grow beyond the pre-determined average and better serve their students (Moran-Tschannen & Moran-Tschannen, 2011).

However, if a coach is placed in the role of a summative evaluator, the role of coaching as a professional developer may be damaged. Moran-Tschannen & Moran-Tschannen (2011) noted the results from evaluations should not be the main reason to provide professional development and professional development should not be the result of just evaluations alone. When the coach is assigned to work with a teacher because of negative evaluation results, the teacher feels coaching is a consequence to that negative evaluation. The possibility of the negative evaluation leading to termination can cause coaching to be seen as failing the person evaluated (Moran-Tschannen & Moran-Tschannen, 2011).

Popham (2003) stated even though there is an important purpose of both formative and summative evaluations, formative evaluations put emphasis on helping a teacher to become effective and summative evaluations put emphasis on choices that have to be made about teacher management which sometimes includes dismissals or the

33

denial of incentives. Teachers realize the only way to attend to teaching deficiencies is to first acknowledge them (Popham, 2013). Teachers are willing to share and work on deficiencies with evaluators who help improve their practices, but these same teachers are reluctant to share when the results may lead to dismissal. It is very important for those who coach teachers and use formative evaluations to put emphasis on the learning and growing of the coachee (Marzano, 2013) because as Piercy (2006) found "when leadership is connected to learning, anxiety regarding accountability is greatly reduced" (p.128). Knight (2009) stated this can be done by forming a partnership between the coach and the coachee.

Partnership Philosophy

This study relies on the theoretical framework of partnership philosophy. Block (1993) noted that the goal of partnerships is to ensure that there is a balance of power in a partnership. The partnership philosophy is based on the concept that people learn and grow best when they work together as partners. According to Knight (2007), the partnership philosophy has seven principles that relate to instructional coaching. These principals include equality, choice, voice, reflection, dialogue, praxis, and reciprocity. The principles include:

- equality because a partnership involves relationships between equals
- choice because everyone should be allowed to make their own decisions
- voice because all individuals in a partnership deserve the opportunity to be heard
- reflection because partners should have the freedom to consider ideas before adopting them
- dialogue because to arrive at mutually decisions partners need to talk

- praxis because learning to apply what is learned make experiences more significant

- reciprocity because instructional coaches should also learn while coaching (Knight, 2007).

All of these principles lead to a partnership between the coach and the teacher that promotes student learning in the classroom.

Equality: Instructional Coaches and Teachers Are Equal Partners

The first principle of the partnership philosophy is equality. Knight (2009) stated teachers may be afraid to be open and honest if they see the coaches as administrators instead of partners. This principle is centered on the idea that all people are created equal and that we share equal rights and responsibilities. Knight (2007) stated that equality does not mean that both the coach and the coachee have the same amount of subject area knowledge on every topic, but it means that the coachee's opinions are just as important as the coaches. Coaching becomes complicated when the coachee feels he or she is not receiving the respectful status they deserve (Knight, 2011). The coachee should leave a coaching session feeling valued and knowing his or opinions matters.

Choice: Teachers Should Have Choice Regarding What and How They Learn

The second principle is choice. Douglas Reeves (2007) explained that the ultimate decision of what is done in the classroom is determined by the teacher's choice and that coaching can only be effective when the coachee "agrees that a change in performance will be useful" (p.90). Peter Block (1993) emphasized that without the ability to choose, there is no possibility for a partnership:

Partners each have a right to say no. Saying no is the fundamental way we have of

differentiating ourselves. To take away my right to say no is to claim sovereignty

over me… If we cannot say no, then saying yes has no meaning. (pp. 30-31)

Even though teachers should have choice, there are occasions when administrators

through internal research discover a need for specific professional development. During

these times, administrators put a limit on the choices teachers make and require that the

need be addressed (Knight, 2007). Knight (2007) further stated it is still possible for the

instructional coach to allow choice in how instruction might be adapted, the structure of

the learning experience, and the type support the coachees receive. The goal is for

teachers to feel like an active participant, not for teachers to feel controlled, so that they

will trust that the coach is working with them to improve learning in the classroom.

Gallwey (2000) wrote, "In the place of manipulation there is choice.

In the place of doubt and over control, there is trust" (p. 30). Permitting

individuals, the ability to choose keeps the feeling of manipulation out of the coaching

partnership.

Voice: Professional Learning Should Empower and Respect the Voice of Teachers

Hargreaves and Shirley (2011) remarked, "teachers are the end-point of

educational reform – the last to hear, the last to know, the last to speak. They are mainly

the objects of reform, not its participants" (p. 1). The third principle stresses the

importance of teachers having a voice. Hargreaves and Shirley (2011), asked the

following question, "How did we get to this position where teachers are always the

objects and never the subjects of change, where leaders say they esteem teachers on the

one hand and then on the other hand assume that teachers know little about how to

36

improve teaching and learning" (p.1)? Knight (2007) emphasized the importance of the coach validating the teacher as being a major part of the improvement of teaching practices by helping them to find their voice.

Devine, Houssenmand, and Meyer (2013) wrote that when teachers have a voice, they believe their shared opinions, perspectives, and points of views are respected and appreciated. Moran-Tschannen and Moran-Tschannen (2011) found that teachers were inspired to work with the coach to achieve common goals when coaches provided a judgement free environment which allowed teachers to freely voice their desire to support student learning and to share their concerns about how this learning should take place. The partnership philosophy provides opportunities for teachers to voice their opinions and for the coaches to value the opinion of those they coach (Knight, 2007).

Dialogue: Professional Learning Should Enable Authentic Dialogue

Aunthetic dialogue is the fourth principle of partnership philosophy that leads to a better relationship. Knight (2007) wrote, "When a conversation between a coach and a teacher comes alive, ideas can bounce around like balls in a pinball machine, and people can start to communicate so well that it becomes difficult to see where one person's thoughts end and another begin" (p. 46). The coach uses dialogue to help the teacher learn best practices within the classroom to increase student achievement (Skiffington, Washburn, & Elliott, 2011).

Crane (2014) defined dialogue as the "respectful, two-way, open-ended flow of communication that balances listening and speaking for the purpose of learning" (p.104). Crane (2014) stated, when a coach tells the coachee information or carries on a one sided conversation, the conversation is controlled by the coach and may cause the coachee to

close up and not talk. A way to avoid controlling coaching conversations is by asking intelligent, effective questions because; when effective questioning techniques are used in the coaching conversations they tend to give the coachee an opportunity to open up (Crane, 2014). John Maxwell (2008) noted that the best moments in mentoring are built from carefully designed questions. The questions asked should foster dialogue between the coach and the coachee. Coaches must remember that coaching is not about the answers, but it is about the questions and how these questions lead to a partnership in learning (Bearwald, 2011).

Reflection: Reflection Is an Integral Part of Professional Learning

The fifth principle in the partnership philosophy is reflection. Reflection is defined as "believing that learning can be enhanced when we have numerous opportunities to consider how what we're learning might impact what we have done in the past, what we are doing now, and what we will be doing in the future" (Knight, 2007, p. 54). A reflective teacher is one who makes decisions from thoughts about his or her own teaching practices in the classroom. Shon (1987) stated that in order to learn, everyone in their profession must reflect because the most important lessons are often not learned unless they are consciously reflected upon. Shon (1987) identified three types of reflections: knowing in action, reflection in action, and reflection on action. "Knowing in action" is the ability to respond mechanically to routine unforeseen occurrences (Schon, 1987). It occurs in the classroom when teachers have to make decisions about the daily routines that take place in their classrooms. Teachers make these decisions automatically without much thinking (Danielson, 2009). Reflection in action is reflecting while in the midst of an action. Teachers use these reflections to make adjustments during the action.

An example of this action would be a teacher who is able to teach a lesson and make positive changes to the lesson while in the midst of teaching (Schon, 1987; Danielson, 2009). Finally, reflecting on the action occurs after the action has taken place, for example, when the lesson is completed, the teacher thinks about what went well during the lesson and what areas of the lesson needed improvement (Schon, 1987; Danielson, 2009).

Knight (2007) stated it is necessity for the coachee to receive assistance from and be encouraged by the coach to reflect on practices. Teachers who are insightful reflect on their practices to ensure the curriculum being taught is aligned to students needs and is implemented in a manner to promote student growth (Allington, 2002). Jaeger (2013) noted that coaches should help teachers analyze lessons to help cultivate the act of reflection. Lana Danielson (2009) stated all teachers have the ability to become reflective teachers, and that it is nurtured when teachers have the opportunity to practice reflecting with a coach.

In order for true partnership to exist, the coach must work with the coachee to use these reflections to take the next steps toward better practices (Knight, 2007). The coach must not dictate to the coachee if a true partnership is to exist (Knight, 2007). There are choices that teachers must be allowed to make that require them to adjust their thinking so that they are able to reflect on their practice (Danielson, 2009). Charlotte Danielson (2000) stated that reflection promotes professional learning and the results of reflections are successful teaching practices.

Praxis: Teachers Should Apply Their Learning to their Real-Life Practice as they are Learning

Knights (2007) sixth principle in the partnership philosophy is "praxis." Praxis is the action that takes place after theory is learned - the application of lessons or skills that takes place in a classroom (Devine, Houssenmand, & Meyers, 2013). Knight (2007) stated:

> Partnership should enable individuals to have more meaningful experiences. In partnership relationships, meaning arises when people reflect on ideas and then put those actions into practice. A requirement for partnership is that each individual is free to reconstruct and use content the way he or she considers it most useful. When this principle is applied to instructional coaching, it means that ICs and collaborating teachers focus their attention on how to use ideas in the classroom. (p. 25)

Jim Knight (2007) noted that when a teacher implements praxis they are revealing that they feel learning is most useful when it has been reflected upon and put into use in their own professional life and teaching practices. Praxis is putting what is learned into action.

Reciprocity: Instructional Coaches Should Expect to Get as Much as They Give

The seventh principle points out that both the coach and the teacher reap the benefits of coaching. Knight (2007) stated that all participants contribute in a positive coaching relationship and all are rewarded by these contributions. The instructional coach should be learning and growing right along with the teacher being coached.

Principal and Coaches Partnership

The Influence of the Principal in Schools

  The principal's leadership role is the key when it comes to reform or change in a school. Karl (2007) wrote that when the principal is engaged in the efforts to reform the culture at a school, the changes that are made within that school are strongly affected in a positive manner. In a study done by the Consortium for Chicago School Reform, it was shown that principals who provided individualized professional development during the academic day led students in their schools who performed well academically (Sebring & Bryk, 2000). Principals must establish conditions that lead to the development of a culture of learning which includes the principal, coach, and teachers (Pankake & Moller, 2007). Karl (2007) shared the following examples as ways principals should demonstrate a real commitment to the coaching partnership:

- Creating school schedules that provide time for teachers to work with the coach;

- Participating in group sessions and professional development sessions facilitated by the coach;

- Encouraging teachers to try new strategies;

- Talking and listening to teachers;

- Continuing to learn themselves;

- Partnering with coaches;

- Making time for everyone to learn and keeping it sacred;

- Starting with a core group, and then planning how to scale up. (pp 1-2)

The principal is the school's instructional leader who guides the vision for student

learning and he or she must promote a trusting coaching culture for coaching to succeed

The Influence Principals have on Coaching

Melinda Mangin (2007) found that the way the principal engages with a coach

and what the principal believes about the coach's role has a great influence on the

implementation of coaching in the school. As Rita Bean (2004) noted, if a coach does not

build a trusting relationship with teachers, then these teachers may feel threatened and

have mixed emotions about a coach visiting their classes. The principal can help alleviate

these negative feelings by working with the coach to establish trust towards coaching and

by helping to build relationships between the coach and the teacher. Schmoker (1997)

cautioned, "Unless the administrator expresses pride and interest in the success of the

project, unless the teacher leader[s are] carefully selected and given supports and

encouragement, the effort will probably die" (p. 128). Matsumura, Sartoris, Bickel, and

Garnier (2009) wrote that the principal can show support for coaching by publicly

acknowledging the coach as an expert in the subject area to be coached. The principal can

also positively support the coach by asking him or her to conduct professional

development and by recommending the coach to the teacher as a helpful resource

(Marsumra et al., 2009). The principal and the coach should collaborate to build an action

plan for the school, to reflect on professional development and to acquire problem

solving skills. (Pankake & Moller, 2007). If the principal does not provide support to the

coaches continuously, improvements in teaching practices cannot be made consistently

(Kral, 2007).

District as Supervisor

It has been noted that when coaches are under the supervision of the district instead of a principal, the instructional roles of the coach are more likely to remain in focus. John Saphier and Lucy West (2009) stated that when principals' experience being short staffed it is tempting to use coaches to complete administrative duties, such as lunch duty or bus duty. These extra duties lead to the coach not having sufficient time to spend working with teachers to improve teaching practices. Pankake and Moller (2007) agreed, when principals allow occasional emergency duties to become routine, the coach's primary responsibilities are neglected. These principals do not have a clear understanding of the best way to use a coach and the coaching resource does not meet the district goals of improved teacher's practices. Douglas Reeves (2007) stated the district must establish that the main location of coaching should take place in the classroom in order for professional development to profoundly alter and improve teaching practices.

District Influence on the Principal and Coach Relationship

The communication between the district and the principal about teacher leadership is also important in improving the knowledge of the principal concerning the coach and their leadership role in the school. Melinda Mangin (2007) listed the following as ways of promoting this knowledge:

- Involving the principals in teacher leadership role design
- Soliciting their input in the hiring process
- Creating opportunities for interaction between principals, supervisors, and teacher leaders
- Clarifying the principals role in implementation

- Offering professional development related to teacher leadership. (p. 351)

In order to have a productive relationship between the coach and the principal that will lead to teacher growth, principals must be a part of the conversation when it involves coaches serving as teacher leaders (Saphier & West, 2009). Kral stated, "An effective principal mutually supports the coach and the teachers as they collaboratively work to improve instructional practices and develop professional learning communities that take on the ownership of improved instruction" (2007, p. 2). In order to provide this support effectively, the district must ensure the principal is informed about and understand the roles and responsibilities of the coach. The lack of knowledge can lead to an ineffective coaching program within the school (Dean et al., 2009).

Common Forms of Coaching

The coaches title may vary according to the district the coach works within or their job description. Regardless of the form of coaching used within a district, the coaches goal is to help teachers improve teaching practices and student achievement. The following are examples of the various forms of coaching and their responsibilities (Harrison & Killion, 2007).

Cognitive Coaching

The cognitive coaching uses conversations to plan, reflect, and problem solve. During cognitive coaching, the coach assists the coachee to self guide his or her next actions by using his or her own views and cognitive processing to reach instructional goals (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Cognitive coaching consists of the following three elements: "(a) a planning conversation, (b) an event, which usually is observed by the cognitive coach, and (c) a reflecting conversation" (Knight, 2007, p. 11). The main

objective in cognitive coaching is for teachers to become self-reliance so they can "self-monitor," "self-analyze," and "self-evaluate" (Gramston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993, p. 58).

Data Coaching

The Data coach uses a data process that focuses both on collecting data for analysis and on building school culture. They use a tool called Data-Driven Dialogue to lead a team that consists of school leadership and teachers to not only evaluate the data, but also to use these evaluations to plan for school improvement (Wellman & Lipton, 2004). The data coach is a key participant on the team who nurtures a positive relationship and cultivates trust and group commitment with the goal of leading the school culture to use data to guide instruction (Love, Stile, Mundry, & DiRanna, 2008).

Literacy / Reading Coach

Literacy coaching is a job-embedded form of ongoing professional development that helps teachers improve classroom literacy instructions (Hanson, 2011). The literacy coach should have strong a foundational knowledge of literacy education and use research-based practices to assist teachers improvement of instruction for the purpose of student achievement (L'Allier, Elish-Piper, & Bean, 2010). Even though it is important for the literacy coach to be knowledgeable in the field of literacy, there may be areas the coach on which the coach may have limited background knowledge. Toll (2005) stated that the coach should acknowledge and use the literacy skills of the coachee as a starting point for them to researching and learning together to reach the coaching goals. Building a trusting relationship in which the coachee feels respected is very important in literacy coaching (Toll, 2005).

45

Math Coaching

There are a variety of titles given to those serving as math coaches a few examples are math specialist, math support teachers, and math resource teacher. Even though the titles are different, mathematical coaching basically has the same common goal of providing aid to teachers of mathematics (Burns, 2006). Mathematic coaches are school leaders who provide professional development in which teachers collaborate about the mathematics curriculum and the best mathematics teaching practices with the goal of increasing student achievement (Campbell & Malkus, 2011).

Peer Assistance and Review

Goldstein and Noguera wrote, "In peer assistance and review, coaches who have been identified for their excellence in teaching and mentoring support new as well as veterans experiencing difficulty in their teaching (p. 32). Peer Assistance and Review is controversial because the results of this process may lead to the termination of the coachee. Many teachers find this evaluation procedure distressing because it goes against the norm of the coach and the coachee being seen as equals (Johnson & Fiarman, 2012). Johnson and Fiarman (2012) found that in order for peer review to be beneficial, the coach must provide the coachee with support that reflects the areas of teaching practices from the evaluation that needs development.

Instructional Coaching

Instructional coaching is a type of professional development that provides ongoing individualized, coaching for teachers to increase teaching knowledge (Teemant, 2014). Jim Knight (2007) noted that instructional coaches are educators who serve as professional developers who work with teachers on-site to promote student learning using

research-based instructional practices to achieve this goal. Instructional coaches can work with a focus content area or they may be generalist that have knowledge and skills in many educational areas (Mangin & Stoelinga, 2008). Instructional coaching uses researched based coaching tools and incorporates many of the same basic qualities of cognitive coaching, emphasizing communication and literacy (Knight, 2007).

Coaches Roles

The role of the coach varies according to the schools being served, the expectations from the schools, and the caseload of the coach at the school which may range from a small number of teachers at one school to several teachers in a school district (Denton & Hasbrouck, 2009). There are common coaching roles that are preformed both formally and informally to ensure success in the schools where coaches provide serves (Harrison & Killion, 2007). The role in which the coach works with teachers using research-based resources to improve student learning is called Research Provider. The coach serves as a Instructional Specialist when he or she supports teachers in learning best practices to use in the classroom. The following are also roles mentioned by Harrison & Killion (2007):

- Curriculum Specialist

  The coach works with teachers to become knowledgeable about the adopted curriculum in the school.

- Classroom Supporter

  The coach supports the implementation of effective teaching practices.

- Learning Facilitator

47

The coach plans professional development opportunities that develop teacher

practices and promote student learning in the classroom.

- Mentor

   The coach provides on-going support to new teachers.

- School Leader

   The coach collaborates with the instructional leaders in the school and district to

   ensure the instructional vision of the district connects with the practices inside the

   classroom (Harrison & Killion, 2007).

The coach who works with teachers to analyze data in order to guide instructions is titled

the Data Coach. The coach also serves in the role of a "Catalyst for Change". The coach

uses research based information to determine when there is a need for changes and makes

action plans that will improve teaching practices (Harrison & Killion, 2007). The coach is

also a life learner that engages in professional development to sharpen his or her own

coaching skills (Harrison & Killion, 2007).

The coach has a large amount of responsibility that requires specific skill sets in

order to perform coaching duties. These roles are effective when the school community

supports them and is committed to coaching practices (Poglinco & Bach, 2004). Harrison

& Killion explained "The job of the school-based coach is both complex and challenging

regardless of which role he or she is playing. Some coaches fill all 10 roles; others, just a

few" (p.29). Nevertheless, the coaches may feel that his/her duties are compromised

when the roles of the coach are not clearly defined (Deerfield Public School District,

2013).

CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY

Research Goals

The methodology chapter described the approach the researcher used to measure the appraisal of instructional coaches by teachers. Chapter three explained who the participants were in the study, the questionnaire instrument that was used in the study, the data collection, and the process that was used to analyze the data. This study goal was to measure whether teachers reported the relationship between the coach and the teachers aligned with Knight's seven principles of the partnership approach (Knight, 2009). It further measured the extent to which the teacher's reports aligned with the common roles of coaches as described by Harrison and Killion (2007).

Research Questions

The overarching research objective guiding this study was to determine how teachers report their relationship with instructional coaches and the roles of instructional coaches. The study included the following specific research questions:

RQ1: To what degree do teachers report each of the seven partnership principles as being present in the teacher /coach relationship?

RQ2: What do teachers report as the common roles instructional coaches fulfill?

RQ3: Is there a difference in the reporting of teachers regarding the instructional coach partnership with teachers and also the reporting of the roles of the instructional coaches based on the teacher's level of education, and the years of experience?

GCEIC Background

This study stemmed from the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium instructional coaches meetings. The instructional coaches meetings came about as a result

of a need for the coaches to collaborate on instructional coaching practices. The instructional coaching program is new to the southern Mississippi region and there has been very limited focus on this teacher leader role. This study was the first of its kind done for schools in the southern region. This study will provide data to improve instructional coaching in the southern region. The existing limited research that has been found is based on instructional coaching programs that are state funded for low performing schools or that are not in the state of Mississippi. These instructional coaches which focus on literacy are hired and supervised by the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE). MDE has implemented this program at a number of targeted schools across Mississippi. The instructional coaches in this study are hired and supervised by district leaders or principals

The information gathered will be the first shared with all of the districts to help improve coaching practices. This information will also be used to guide the needs that are the focus of the monthly instructional coaches regional support meetings.

The instructional coaches serving in our region carry out the same duties as the state hired coaches, but they coach any of the core subject areas. The instructional coaches are expected to have a partnership with the teachers they work with in the schools. They also are expected to incorporate the common roles of instructional coaching into their daily coaching experiences.

Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC)

GCEIC is one of six members of the Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESA). They are as follows:

- Delta Area Association for Improvement of Schools

- East Mississippi Center for Educational Development

- Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium

- North Mississippi Education Consortium

- Southwest Mississippi Education Consortium

- Southern-Regional Educational Service Agency

All of these agencies service the school districts in their region. They provide support to improve the educational programs in these school districts.

There are 25 schools that are members of Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium. GCEIC is a non-profit charitable organization that partners with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and The University of Southern Mississippi (USM) to enhance learning and teaching opportunities for students. GCEIC serves 104,562 students, 10,914 educators who work in and attend 222 schools. Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium is financially supported by the 25 schools membership fees along with donations from business partners, payments from professional development training opportunities for educators, and gifts in kind from The University of Southern Mississippi. GCEIC is administered by a nine member board that makes decisions for the organization. Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium sponsors several regional monthly meetings, which include a superintendent meeting, a curriculum directors meeting, and an instructional coach meeting. The topic discussed is recommended by those involved in each meeting based on current needs. Superintendents from the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC) will be asked if teachers in their respective districts can be asked to participate in the electronic questionnaire.

Participants

Based on the number of schools that are members of GCEIC, there was a

potential of 10,914 educators who possibility could have participated in the questionnaire

in grades pre-kindergarten through 12th grade. The superintendents from the 25 districts

represented in the GCEIC who have instructional coaches were invited to participate in

the study. The superintendents who agreed were emailed to ask for permission to conduct

the study in the district. The principals who agreed were asked to forward the

questionnaire that invited teachers to participate in the questionnaire.

Research Design

This quantitative non-experimental research study used survey methodology to

collect data from the participants. This study involved asking teachers to report if the

relationship between the coach and the teachers aligned with the seven principles of the

partnership approach and it asked teachers to report if teachers agreed that coaches are

fulfilling the common roles of instructional coaches.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire in this study was used to determine what degree teachers report

each of the eight partnership principles proposed by Knight (2009) as being present in the

teacher /coach relationship. The questionnaire was also used to determine whether or not

teachers report that coaches fulfil the common roles of instructional coaching reported by

Harrison & Killion (2007). The instrument used to collect data was Qualtrics. Security

measure were used from the instrument to protect sensitive data as it is transmitted

between the participants 'computer and the Qualtrics servers. The responses collected

were anonymous, but the recipient's tab in Qualtrics was used to track who had or had

not responded to the questionnaire. The survey included a consent form and disclosed privacy practices. Participants were given the option to withdraw any time during the competition of the questionnaire. Teachers reported about coaches they worked with closely, and all were assured that no individual or school results were to be made public. All of the participants remained anonymous.

The questionnaire was created by the researcher because according to the originator of the theoretical framework of this study there was at that time no known instrument that measures all of the research questions using the selected researched information. The survey questionnaire included demographic questions, Likert scale questions, or statements. There had five values used to quantify the responses: 1. Strongly Disagree (SD); 2. Disagree (D); 3. Agree (A); 4. Strongly Agree (SA); and 5. Does not know (DK).

The instrument was first administered to ten educators in the form of a pretest. After making the needed suggested changes, the instrument was then administered to 30 teachers from a school in south Mississippi who had instructional coaching experiences to establish reliability in the form of a pilot test. Modifications were made based upon feedback from the pilot group. The instrument was then sent to each school's principal so teachers could complete the study. The principal forwarded the survey to the teachers in their schools that work with instructional coaches.

<div align="center">Data Collection Procedure</div>

Data was collected during the fall semester of the 2016-2017 school year. Teachers who attended schools that have instructional coaches or teacher leaders who serve in the role of instructional coaches were asked to complete the online questionnaire.

The teachers invited to participate in this study were from the 25 districts that are members of the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC).

After permission was granted from the superintendents and the principals in each participating school district for the teachers to participate in the research, the researcher set a date to forward the both the pilot study. After adjustments were made to the study from the pilot, the researcher sent the final study to the participating principals. The principals then forwarded the questionnaire to the teachers in their schools. Teachers were asked to complete the survey by a given date. Teachers were given two weeks to complete the questionnaire. A reminder e-mail was sent to all teachers at the end of the first week and again a few days before the end of the second week. A third email was sent a week later giving those who had incomplete questionnaires an opportunity to complete them.

<center>Data Analysis</center>

The data source that was analyzed included a questionnaire with a Likert scale. The data was analyzed to develop a profile using the teacher's gender, educational experience, degrees received, and the grade levels taught. This information was used to compare the profiles and make connections where they apply. SPSS was used to interpret all of the data that was uploaded into the program. The data was also used to determine the answers to the research questions.

In order to address RQ1, items one through forty-six were designed to measure each of the seven principles of the partnership approach. These items were combined to calculate a subscale score. Reliability of each of the eight subscales was reported. Descriptive status determined the degree to which teachers reported each of the seven

<center>54</center>

principles as present along with trust. In order to analyze RQ3, multivariate statistics was used to determine if demographic variable made a difference in any of the seven subscales found in Knights (2009) principles.

Similarly, items forty-seven through fifty-nine were used to address RQ2 regarding the common roles of instructional coaches. Descriptive statistics were used to report the degree to which teachers reports aligned with Harrison and Killions (2007) instructional coaches' roles. Further, the teacher's reports of Harrison and Killions (2007) instructional coaching roles were also used to address RQ3 to determine if any of the demographics were related to these reports. The researcher considered using multiple regressions for this part of RQ3.

Summary

This chapter explains the methods used to determine what degree teachers report each of the seven partnership principles as being present in the teacher /coach relationship? It also examines what teachers reported as the common roles instructional coaches fulfill. The research was conducted in schools in South Mississippi. Reliability and validity was established, and data was analyzed upon completion of the questionnaires.

CHAPTER IV – RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative study is to relate how teachers report their

relationship with instructional coaches and what teachers report as the roles of

instructional coaches. Researchers have found that many of the previous studies on

coaching have focused on how student achievement is affected by teachers being coached

(Knight, 2009; Neufeld & Roper, 2003). This study focuses on the relationship that must

be developed between the coach and the teacher and the roles coaches play in the school

system.

Data Collection

Pretest

The instrument was first pretested with twelve educators. The entire process took

two weeks. The researcher sent the initial email asking the participants to complete the

questionnaire. Along with the questionnaire, the researcher sent a comment sheet. The

participants had the option to use the comment sheet or to respond in an email message.

There was a mixture of both type responses sent back to the researcher. Six of the

participants were instructional coaches. The remaining six were principals in the district.

Two out of the twelve educators that were asked to participate in the pretest did not

complete the questionnaire. The educators reviewed the instrument and made

recommendations for improving the instrument which were implemented in finalizing the

instrument prior to administering the survey for the full study.

One consistent concern was the length of the questionnaire. Every participant

asked the researcher to consider shortening the questionnaire. A few of the participants

felt some of the questions were only rephrased which led to them stating there was repetition in the questionnaire. Even though this was stated, the participants did not point out which questions were repeated and needed to be deleted.

Pilot Study

After the recommended changes were made to the instrument, the researcher received permission from the assistant superintendent to conduct the pilot study in a school in South Mississippi. The pilot study was given at an elementary school in one of the same districts in which the study was completed. The study was not repeated in this school when the remainder of the district completed the questionnaire for the actual study. The study was also sent to the strategist at each of the seven schools in this district. These teachers do not have their own classrooms, but they work directly with students, teachers, and coaches. The strategists who completed the pilot did not complete the final study. Of the 39 teachers who were invited to take the online pilot, 32 teachers participated.

The pilot questionnaire was taken using Qualtrics online. The researcher spoke with the principal at the pilot school who agreed to forward the message to teachers. The researcher sent an invitation email message along with an anonymous link that was forwarded to the teachers that were invited to participate. The teachers were given a little over two weeks to participate. The researcher sent a reminder that was forwarded to the teachers at about mid-point. The researcher received comments from teachers that included adding a progress bar to monitor the length of the remaining survey, telling teachers the survey was anonymous in the email as well as directly in the questionnaire, giving the teachers the opportunity to report on specific subject area coaches, and

providing space to elaborate on their answer choice. The two areas that the researcher

could change in this quantitative questionnaire was adding a progress bar and making

sure that it was clearly stated in all email messages and in the online questionnaire that

the information submitted was anonymous.

The results from the pilot study were then downloaded into Statistical Package for

Social Sciences (SPSS). After downloading the results from the study, the researcher

reversed the coded for five questions before testing for reliability. The researcher tested

each subscales and found all to have the expected Cronbach Alpha of .7 or above that

was needed to establish reliability.

Table 1

Pilot Reliability of Data

Sub-Scales	Cronbach's Alpha
1.Equality	.95
2.Choice	.87
3.Voice	.97
4.Dialogue	.91
5.Reflection	.83
6.Praxis	.75
7.Reciprocity	.94
8.Trust	.97

After establishing reliability, the researcher moved forward with the study.

Sample Study Population

The study was conducted in two school districts in South Mississippi. The

research contacted each district's central office to confirm the procedures that were to be

used to distribute the questionnaire and to make sure the timing of the distribution was

acceptable.

Both school districts gave their approval and the researcher, following the superintendent's request, forwarded the questionnaire and a copy of the permission letter the superintendent signed (Appendix D) to each principal in each district that had instructional coaches or teacher leaders serving in that role. The researcher sent an introduction letter (Appendix E) to each principal that was forwarded to each teacher along with the approval letter and the questionnaire.

The electronic questionnaire was then sent to 25 schools principals and forwarded to about 1,000 teachers. A reminder was sent five days later to both districts. A final reminder was sent seven days later to give participants who had incomplete surveys an opportunity to complete the survey. The participants were informed that the survey would close in three days. Within these 25 schools, 309 teachers responded to the questionnaire.

<center>Descriptive Statistics</center>

There were a total of 309 participants that signed into the Qualtrics software to open the questionnaire. After reviewing the data, the researcher deleted questionnaires that were not started or that were not at least 75% completely answered within each of the partnership principles subscales or listed items in the coaches' roles.

There were a total of 197 participants' data that was tested in SPSS after 112 incomplete questionnaires were removed from the data. The majority of the participants were women.

<center>59</center>

The following table reflects those who responded this question in the

questionnaire.

Table 2

Participants Gender

	N	%
Female	177	92.2
Male	15	7.8
Total	192	100

The majority of the teachers which includes 59.6% teach grades Pre-K through 5th

grade. 25.4% teach in 6th through 8th grade. The grade levels with the least responses

were 9th – 12th grade with 15% responses.

Table 3

Grade Levels of Participants

Grade Level	N	%
Pre-K	11	5.9
1st	24	12.8
2nd	21	11.2
3rd	18	9.6
4th	18	9.6
5th	20	10.6
6th	14	7.4
7th	20	10.6
8th	14	7.4
9th	10	5.3
10th	11	5.9
11th	5	2.7
12th	2	1.1
Total	188	100

The level of education of the participants ranged from Bachelor's degree to Doctoral. The majority of the participants which was 48.7% held a master's degree and only 3.6% held a Doctoral degree.

Table 4

Level of Education

Level	N	%
BA/BS	79	40.9
MA	94	48.7
ED.S	13	6.7
ED.D / Ph.D.	7	3.6
Total	193	100

The participants' teaching experience range is from new teacher to teachers with twenty or more years of teaching experience. Teachers who have taught twenty plus years responded at 27.7% which was the highest percentage. The lowest percentage was 7.9% which included teachers who taught less than a year to two years. Three percent of the teachers chose not to respond to this section of the questionnaire.

Table 5

Years of Teaching Experience

Experience	N	%
New to 2yr	15	7.9
3-5 years	36	18.8
6-10 years	33	17.3
11-15 years	30	15.7
16-20 years	24	12.6
21 + years	53	27.7
Total	191	100

Data Analysis

After the data was exported from Qualtics, the quantitative statistical analysis was

conducted using SPSS. After downloading the results from the study into SPSS, the

researcher reversed the code for five items negatively worded so that all questionnaire

items with high value would signify the same type response. Cronbach's alpha was

conducted to test for coefficient of reliability. After accounting for the reverse worded

statements in subscale one and four, each coefficient was above .70. The test measured

strong consistency within the subscales. The study used a four point Likert scale to

analyze the results. The five in the questionnaire was not included in the means because it

represented "don't know."

Table 6

Reliability of Data

Sub-Scales	Cronbach's Alpha
1.Equality	.85
2.Choice	.87
3.Voice	.95
4.Dialogue	.84
5.Reflection	.93
6.Praxis	.90
7.Reciprocity	.96
8.Trust	.98

Statistical Analysis

RQ1: To what degree do teachers report each of the eight partnership principles as being

present in the teacher /coach relationship?

The sample of 197 participants answered questions asking if the eight partnership

principles were present in the teacher /coach relationship. Trust was the highest rated

agreed upon section of the questionnaire that is present in the teacher/coach relationship

with 87.1% of the participants reporting agree or strongly agree.

Table 7

Eight Partnership Principles Present in Teacher /Coach Relationship

Subscales	N	M	SD
8.Trust	197	3.37	.58
3.Voice	197	3.28	.62
6.Praxis	197	3.24	.51
7.Reciprocity	197	3.18	.57
4.Dialogue	197	3.06	.53
1.Equality	197	3.05	.53
5. Reflection	197	3.04	.56
2.Choice	197	2.97	.54

The majority of teachers reported that they agreed or strongly agreed that the

seven of the eight sections of the questionnaire were reported strongly as being present in

the teacher/ coach relationship. One of the seven principles, choice, had a mean below

3.00. Teachers were less likely to agree that choice was present in the teacher/coach

relationship. Using the Likert scale 4-strongly agree, 3-agree, 2-disagree, and 1-strongly

disagree, the data from the subgroup choice shows that 41% of the participants reported

below agree.

The principle, equality, stated that both teachers and instructional coaches are

equal in their relationship. The questionnaire asked eight questions concerning equality.

Question number two has the lowest mean at 2.59. The percentage of teachers who

answered that they strongly agree or agree was 57.9%. So, a little over half the teacher's

felt that the instructional coach tells them what to do. Excluding the 1.5% of missing

answers, the percentage of teachers who answered strongly agree or agree that they are

given the opportunity to make decisions was 84.2%.

Table 8

Equality

	N	M	SD
1. Neither you nor your instructional coach tells the other what to do.	197	2.77	.84
2r. The coach tells you what to do.	197	2.59	.82
3. Both you and the instructional coach share ideas as equals.	197	3.24	.70
4. You are free to share ideas with the instructional coach.	197	3.44	.64
5. You are an equal partner with your coach.	197	3.01	.85
6. Both the instructional coach and you make decisions together.	197	3.10	.76
7r. Only the instructional coach makes decisions.	197	2.96	.74
8. You are given the opportunity to make decisions.	197	3.18	.70

The principle choice states that teachers should have the opportunity to decide how they

learn and what they learn. The questionnaire asked six questions concerning choice. The

percentage of teachers who answered that they have choice in the partnership was 58.9%

and 41% of teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with having choice in the

partnership.

Table 9

Choice

	N	M	SD
9. The instructional coach positions you as the final decision maker.	197	2.64	.79
10. The instructional coach allows you to choose your own coaching goals.	197	2.83	.68
11. You are comfortable telling the coach your coaching goals if they differ from the instructional coach's goals.	197	3.08	.68
12. The instructional coach makes you feel free to decide which shared practices to adopt in your classroom.	197	3.16	.68
13. You decide how student data is used in your classroom.	197	2.94	.69
14. The instructional coach creates an atmosphere where student data is used to guide your teaching.	197	3.22	.56

The principle voice states that teachers are empowered to express their point of view. The questionnaire asked six questions concerning voice. The percentage of teachers who answered that they have voice in the partnership relationship was 83.3% and 16.6% did not feel they have voice.

Table 10

Voice

	N	M	SD
15. You are comfortable expressing your point of view with the coach.	197	3.31	.70
16. You are comfortable expressing your passions with the coach.	197	3.41	.62
17. You are comfortable expressing your disappointments with the coach.	197	3.22	.74
18. You are encouraged to express your opinion about the content being taught.	197	3.23	.71
19. You are free to express your teaching interests.	197	3.31	.64
20. You are free to express your concerns.	197	3.27	.67

The principle dialogue states that teachers are encouraged to engage in conversations about learning. The questionnaire asked six questions concerning dialogue. The percentage of teachers who answered that they have dialogue with their coach is 66% and 34% of the teachers do not agree that they have dialogue with the coaches.

Table 11

Dialogue

	N	M	SD
21. The instructional coach encourages you to engage in conversation.	197	3.31	.64
22. The instructional coach encourages you to engage in a conversation that promotes shared learning about the content being discussed.	197	3.35	.64
23r. The instructional coach imposes, dominates, or controls the conversation.	197	2.95	.82
24. The instructional coach listens more than talks.	197	2.81	.67
25r. The instructional coach uses manipulation to control the coaching conversation.	197	3.13	.74
26r. The instructional coach talks more than listens.	197	2.86	.78

The principle reflection states that teachers consider ideas with the option of adopting or rejecting the ideas. The questionnaire asked seven questions concerning reflection. There is no significant difference in how the teachers report reflection. The percentage of teachers who answered that they reflect with their coach is 68.1% and 31.9 % reported that they do not reflect with their coach.

Table 12

Reflection

	N	M	SD
27. You are encouraged to consider ideas before adopting them.	197	3.01	.67
28. You are given time to think about ideas.	197	3.02	.65
29. You have the freedom to choose ideas.	197	3.02	.69
30. You have the freedom to reject ideas.	197	2.86	.74
31. Your instructional coach encourages you to reflect on teaching ideas after experiencing them with your class.	197	3.14	.61
32. The coach encourages you to use your reflections to improve learning in your classroom.	197	3.20	.60
33. After reflecting on the experience of teaching using certain ideas that may not have been productive, the instructional coach encourages you to change your teaching path.	197	3.03	.62

The principle praxis states that teachers should reflect on what they learn and they should put this learning into action. The questionnaire asked five questions concerning praxis. The percentage of teachers who answered that praxis is performed in the coaching relationship is 84.3% and 15.6% stated that praxis is performed with their coach.

Table 13

Praxis

	N	M	SD
34. You are encouraged to apply new knowledge and skills learned.	197	3.37	.54
35. The instructional coach encourages you to reflect on ideas and then put them into action.	197	3.32	.58
36. The instructional coach encourages you to reconstruct and use content in the manner in which you feel is most useful.	197	3.22	.63
37. The instructional coach focuses his/her own attention on how to use best practices to help increase student learning.	197	3.09	.68
38. The instructional coach helps you focus your attention on how to use best practices to help increase student learning.	197	3.27	.60

The principle reciprocity states that teachers and coaches both learn from each other during the coaching process. The questionnaire asked eight questions concerning reciprocity. The percentage of teachers who answered that they have reciprocity in the coaching relationships 82.6% and 17% did not agree that reciprocity exists between the coach and the teacher.

Table 14

Reciprocity

	N	M	SD
39. Learning is an interactive opportunity for both the coach and teacher.	197	3.19	.67
40. Both the coach and teacher benefit from the success, learning, or experiences of working with each other.	197	3.26	.64
41. The instructional coach evaluates learning along with the collaborating teacher.	197	3.20	.61
42. The instructional coach learns from information discovered about the students in the classroom.	197	3.16	.66
43. The instructional coach learns about the strengths and weaknesses of teaching practices in the classroom.	197	3.15	.67
44. The instructional coach learns about various perspectives of teaching strategies when presented by teachers.	197	3.20	.66
45. The instructional coach learns about various perspectives of teaching strategies when presented by students.	197	3.12	.68
46. The instructional coach and teacher are more involved when both are learning.	197	3.29	.54

Trust was added to the questionnaire to confirm teacher's confidence in the

instructional coach. Even though it was not one of the principles, trust is needed and can

be found within all of the principles. There is no significant difference in how the

teachers report trust. The majority of teachers, 87.17%, stated that they trust their coach

and 12.5% do not trust their coach.

Table 15

Trust

	N	M	SD
47. Your coach is dedicated to helping you become a better teacher.	197	3.38	.61
48. You feel respected by your coach.	197	3.40	.66
49. You respect your coach.	197	3.46	.61
50. Your coach has an authentic respect for your professionalism.	197	3.42	.65
51. You have an authentic respect for your coaches' professionalism.	197	3.41	.66
52. The instructional coach is fair.	197	3.41	.60
53. The instructional coach is honest and truthful.	197	3.44	.58
54. The instructional coach keeps commitments.	197	3.39	.61
55. The instructional coach is loyal.	197	3.40	.61
56. You feel safe to state your thoughts and views with the coach.	197	3.30	.71
57. The coach admits when he/she makes mistakes.	197	3.37	.63
58. The instructional coach is competent.	197	3.45	.58
59. I trust my instructional coach.	197	3.37	.66

RQ2: What do teachers report as the common roles instructional coaches fulfill?

The sample of 176 -195 teachers responded to the questionnaire section

concerning what teachers report as the common roles instructional coaches fulfill. The

majority of teachers reported that they agreed or strongly agreed that teachers fulfill the

common roles of instructional coaches with a mean of 3.10 – 3.35. The lowest mean was

for the role of classroom supporter. The highest mean was for resource provider.

Table 16

Common Roles of Instructional Coaches

Coaches Roles	N	M	SD
Resource Provider	195	3.35	.65
Data Coach	191	3.31	.69
Curriculum Specialist	190	3.29	.68
Learner	181	3.29	.63
Instructional Specialist	192	3.27	.73
Catalyst for Change	191	3.26	.65
Learning Facilitator	188	3.24	.63
Mentor	185	3.24	.70
School Leader	176	3.19	.69
Classroom Supporter	191	3.10	.78

The roles classroom supporter and learner average spread were more than the other roles which convey that the teachers' response range and spread was wider. The standard deviations for the remaining roles were all within .63 to .78. The role learning facilitator average spread was less than the other roles which convey that the teachers' response range and spread was smaller.

RQ3: Based on the teacher's level of education, and the years of experience, is there a difference in the reporting of teachers regarding the instructional coach partnership with teachers and also the reporting of the roles of the instructional coaches?

The researcher looked for an effect of the groups' years of experience on the reporting of the coach partnership with teachers. The multivariate test of Pillai's Trace was not significant $F_{(40,910.000)} = .981$, $p = .505$), so it can be concluded that the groups teaching years of experience do not have an effect on the teachers reporting of the coach partnership with teachers.

The researcher also looked for an effect of the teacher's level of experience on the reporting of the roles of instructional coaches. The multivariate test of Pillai's Trace was not significant F (24,552.000) =1.134, p =.300), so it can be concluded that the groups level of education does not have an effect on the teachers reporting of the coach partnership with teachers

The multivariate test of Pillai's Trace was not significant F (50,725.000) =.938, p =.601), so it can be concluded that the groups teaching years of experience does not have an effect on the teachers reporting of the roles of the instructional coach.

The researcher looked for an effect of the teacher's level of education on the reporting of the roles of instructional coaches. The multivariate test of Pillai's Trace was not significant F (30,441.000) =1.258, p =.167), so it can be concluded that the groups level of education does not have an effect on the teachers reporting of the roles of the instructional coach.

CHAPTER V – DISCUSSIONS

Chapter five of this study will share the summary of the study, findings, limitations, conclusions, and recommendations for future studies. This quantitative study relays how teachers report their relationship with instructional coaches and what teachers report as the roles of instructional coaches. Researchers have found that many of the previous studies on coaching have focused on how student achievement is affected by teachers being coached (Knight, 2009; Neufeld & Roper, 2003). The study was conducted in two school districts in South Mississippi. One of the districts has instructional coaches at the school level and the other district has instructional coaches at the district level. Both schools have at least one instructional coach that works with teachers in all of their Kindergarten through twelfth-grade schools.

This study's theoretical basis is derived from Knight's (2009) partnership philosophy. The partnership approach has seven principles that shape the instructional coaching process. The seven principles included in the partnership philosophy are as follows: equality, choice, voice, dialogue, reflection, praxis, and reciprocity (Knight 2007). This study focuses on the report of the relationship that is developed between the coach and the teacher. The coaching process is best when both the teacher and the coach recognize and share accountability and ownership of the outcomes of student growth. This shared responsibility makes coaching a collaborative partnership between the teacher and the coach (Yopp, Burroughs, Luebeck, Heidma, Mitchell, & Sutton, 2011).

Summary of the Study

The purpose of the study was to report whether or not teachers stated the relationships that exist between teachers and instructional coaches as a partnership. It also was to report if teachers perceived the roles of instructional coaches as being fulfilled.

This study explored seven qualities found in the partnership approach to coaching. These qualities include equality, choice, voice, reflection, dialogue, praxis, and reciprocity. Equality involves partnership relationships between equals. Choice allows everyone involved in the partnership to make their own decisions. Voice allows everyone involved in the partnership an opportunity to be heard. Reflection allows partners to have the freedom to consider ideas before adopting them. Dialogue allows for mutual decision making within the partnership. Praxis allows the teacher to apply what has been learned. Reciprocity requires the instructional coach to learn as they are assisting the teacher (Knight, 2007).

This study also explored how teachers reported the roles and responsibilities of coaches. The following list contains common coaching roles that are performed both formally and informally by coaches (Harrison & Killion, 2007): curriculum specialist, classroom supporter, learning facilitator, mentor, school leader, research provider, instructional specialist, data coach, a catalyst for change, and learner.

Findings

The study research objective was to relay how teachers report their relationship with instructional coaches and to relay what teachers report as the roles of instructional coaches. The study's research questions and findings are as follows:

RQ1: To what degree do teachers report each of the eight partnership principles as being present in the teacher /coach relationship?

There was no significant difference in how teachers reported on if the eight partnership principles were present in the teacher/coach relationship. When the researcher examined the results of the study, the following was found. The majority of the 197 participating teachers reported that trust as the highest rated agreed/ strongly agreed upon part of a partnership between the teachers and coach. Trust is the foundation of all of the principles. These results indicate that most teachers in these two districts trust their instructional coaches. According to the research, gaining trust is one of the first steps that must be taken to have a successful teacher/ coach relationship. Walker states that the teacher and coach should start with a trusting and respectful relationship that grows into a partnership which promotes learning. The initial step to building a relationship is trust because according to Knight (2011), "people will not embrace learning with us unless they're comfortable working with us" (p.22).

The partnership principle choice had the lowest number of teachers who selected "agreed or strongly agreed." This rating revealed that 41 % of teachers surveyed did not feel they made the final decision about the best practices they implement when they work with coaches. This rating should be of concern because research states that the partnership approach should allow for the teacher to be the final decision maker in choosing the best practices to implement after collaborating with the coach (Knight, 1998).

When looking at the individual questions from the principle equality, number two showed a little over half the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the instructional

76

coach told them what to do. The highest rated equality question number eight stated that the teacher is given the opportunity to make decisions. These results showed that even though teachers feel they are told what to do by the coaches, the majority feel they are still able to make decisions. Teachers also reported at 83.3% that they have voice and they are able to express their point of view when being coached. Block (1993) stated the goal of working together in a partnership is to ensure that there is a balance of power within the coaching relationship. These findings reflect this balance.

Slightly over 30% of the teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that the principles dialogue and reflection were present in their coaching relationship. Even though the majority of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that these principles are present, the researcher realizes 30% of the participants disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that dialogue and reflection are present is alarming. Research states that that all members of coaching culture should participate in honest, respectful coaching conversations that put emphasis on using feedback with reflections to make improvements (Crane, 2014).

The principles praxis (84.3%) and reciprocity (82.6%) both received ratings slightly above 80% from teachers. The majority of the teachers reported they have praxis which means they reflect on what they learn and they put this learning into action. The majority also reported reciprocity as being present in the teachers and coaches relationships where both are learning from each other during the coaching process.

RQ2: What do teachers report as the common roles instructional coaches fulfill?

The majority of teachers reported that the coaches are fulfilling the common roles of instructional coaching. The role that received the highest mean was the role of

77

resource provider. The majority of teachers reported that coaches help teachers locate information and materials.

The role of classroom supporter received the lowest mean of 3.10 which is still considered a high rating, but it reflects that the least amount of teachers report the coach model effective instructional strategies, co-plans, or co-teachers lessons, observes teachers, and gives feedback. The remaining roles: data coach, curriculum specialist, learner, instructional specialist, catalyst for change, learning facilitator, mentor, school leader all received a mean between 3.19 -3.31 which indicates that the majority of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the roles are being fulfilled by the instructional coaches.

RQ3: Based on the teacher's level of education, and the years of experience, is there a difference in the reporting of teachers regarding the instructional coach partnership with teachers and also the reporting of the roles of the instructional coaches?

The study found that the groups teaching years of experience did not have an effect on the teachers reporting of the coach partnership with teachers. It was also found that the groups teaching years of experience did not have an effect on the teachers reporting of the roles of the instructional coach.

Limitations of the Study

1.) The study was limited to a convenience sample which may not have accurately represented the population.

2.) Due to the sample size, results of this study may only be generalized within the specifically drawn sample population.

3.) Due to the fact that all sample respondents may not answer with frankness, the results from the study may exclude true reflections of the opinions of some members of the included population.

4.) Limitations include the fact that the design did not allow a causation conclusion but simply reported the partnership relationship between the coach and the teacher.

5.) Limitations also include the fact that the results did not yield a causation conclusion but simply report whether teachers feel coaches fulfill the given roles.

6.) The survey instrument included only multiple-choice questions and no open-ended questions.

7.) The population in the study included teachers from South Mississippi whose districts are members of the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC) and also employ instructional coaches because of the large potential pools of participants. Two of the twenty-five school districts participated in the study.

Conclusions

The purpose of instructional coaching is to intervene so that student learning is improved within a classroom, but before this assistance is accepted, a relationship must be developed between the coach and the classroom teacher (Knight, 2011). The findings from this study guided the researcher to following conclusions regarding the three research questions that report teacher's reactions to research questions on their relationship with coaches and what teachers report as the roles of coaches.

RQ1: To what degree do teachers report each of the eight partnership principles as being present in the teacher /coach relationship? The first conclusion that was drawn

from the survey is that trust is present in a teacher/coaches relationship. The trust section

of the survey had the highest mean in which the majority of the teachers agreed or

strongly agreed that trust was present in their relationship with the coach. These results

add to previous research by showing that trust is the foundation of a partnership between

the coach and the teacher. Teachers have this foundation of trust as they move forward

toward classroom improvements. In order to truly work together as partners, there has to

be a level of trust between the two individuals (Walker, 2010).

Six of the seven principles also had means that reflected that the teachers reported

a relationship had been developed between the teachers who participated and their

coaches. Choice had a mean of 2.97 which was very close to being agree on the Likert

scale, but when the researcher saw 41% percentage of teachers reported below agree, this

knowledge revealed that choice is an area that needs to be addressed as a concern. The

education system has many mandates that must be followed by educators. Teachers do

not have the choice of what can be taught in the classroom. The curriculum is given to

them by district and the district receives the curriculum mandates from the state. The

state prepares a curriculum that fulfills the mandates of ESSA from the federal

government. Teachers who participated from both districts are currently using materials

to teach the curriculum that is scripted and many feel that they cannot leave the script. It

is very important that the instructional coaches of these teachers collaborate with teachers

to help them realize that even though they can't control what is to be taught, they do have

control over how it can be presented in the classroom. The instructional coach and

teacher should work together to develop teaching options that fulfill the curriculum and

meet the needs of the students in the class. The teachers should choose from these options

the next steps to take in the class. Peter Block (1993) states that the final decisions about how to teach must be made by the teacher in order for there to be a possibility of a partnership between the teacher and the coach.

Even though all six of the remaining principles showed positive relationships between the majority of the teachers and the coaches, the researcher found it important to address the principles that had a high, but not the majority, percentage of teachers who disagreed or strongly disagreed that these principle was not present. About 1/3 of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that dialogue and reflection were present in their coaching relationship. Even though 1/3 is not the majority, it is a large amount of teachers and these principles can have a negative effect on the individual relationship between the coaches and teachers involved. When teaching, the goal should be to help 100% of our students grow. The same is true for coaching. Instructional coaches should always strive to form a partnership with every teacher they work with and have the goal of helping all of them grow.

In order for a relationship to grow, the parties involved must be able to have open and honest dialogue in which all participants are actively involved in the conversation. The coach should not take over the conversation with all of the answers. A productive coaching culture offers the coach and the coached an opportunity to have an open dialogue that is done respectfully so that the feedback leads to better performance in the workplace (Crane, 2014). The coach should use effective questioning techniques that will lead the teachers to open up and share possible solutions to classroom issues. John Maxwell (2008) states that when mentoring the emphasis should not be placed on the

answers, but it should be placed on using questions to create growth. In order to improve in teaching, the teacher must reflect on their teaching and make changes.

The teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed at 31% when asked if the principle reflection was present in their relationship with the instructional coach. Coaches should work together with teachers to develop the skills that will allow them to reflect on lessons taught and use these reflections to improve future lessons. While attending one of the coaches meetings in one of the districts that participated in the survey, it was found that this is an area that coaches would like to improve upon. They felt that they needed to allow more time for reflections which would give the teacher an active role in the next steps. Lana Danielson (2009) stated that given the proper encouragement and support by the coach all teachers can become reflective educators. The results of this study substantiate that support continues to be needed from the coach to help teachers in the classrooms and that with this support a partnership is developed.

Instructional coaches must continue to strive to make improvements in all parts of the partnership principles. Past studies have been done on all of the partnership principles, but this study confirms that the partnership between teachers and coaches is an ongoing process that must continue to be studied. This study shows that even though the relationship may be strong in several areas of the partnership there may be areas that need improvement in order for the partnership to grow. The ultimate goal of this growth is to improve the classroom instructions so that there is an improvement in student learning within the classroom.

RQ2: What do teachers report as the common roles instructional coaches fulfill? During the implementation of coaching in one of the districts from the study, teachers

were not formally told the roles of the coach. There were even principals in the district

that did not support the coaches because they also did not know the roles and

responsibilities of the coaches. The coaches realized that this disconnect was limiting the

amount of successful coaching experiences, so they incorporated information that

provided the roles and responsibilities during professional development for the district.

The section of the questionnaire on the instructional coaches' roles was added to

determine if teachers reported that coaches fulfill the common roles. It is important that

teachers realize what to expect from coaches. Teachers cannot ask the coach for

assistance if they don't know what support is available to them by the coach. In order to

have a productive coaching program, the district must ensure that both principals and

teachers are well informed about the coaches' roles (Dean et.al., 2009). The majority of

the participant's responded by agreeing or strongly agreeing that the common roles of

coaching were being fulfilled. This confirms what Harrison & Killion (2007) stated are

the common roles that instructional coaches perform during coaching. Even though the

results are positive in this study, the school districts must with intentional purpose

continue to educate first year teachers and new teachers to the district about the roles of

coaches.

RQ3: Based on the teacher's level of education, and the years of experience, is

there a difference in the reporting of teachers regarding the instructional coach

partnership with teachers and also the reporting of the roles of the instructional coaches?

The findings failed to provide support for a difference found in the level of education and

the years of experience when teachers reported on the instructional teacher partnership

and the reporting of the roles of the instructional coach.

This study results were positive for the two district surveyed. It showed that the majority of teachers reported that they have a partnership with their coaches and that theses coaches are fulfilling the common roles of coaching. Although these results were positive, the reports show partnership principles that can be improved upon in the teacher coach relationship. Coaches in these districts will need to focus on improving coaching that involves the principles choice, dialogue, and reflection.

Recommendations for Future Research

During the process of completing this study, the researcher has discovered that more research can be done to expand the knowledge base on building a partnership between teachers and coaches and defining the roles of coaching. One participant stated that she would have liked to have had an opportunity to express her views about her selection on the Likert scale questionnaire. She felt a need to explain why she made her selections. After the survey was completed and after reviewing the results, the researcher realized that this same quantitative research project can be taken a step further using qualitative questions. This could be done with the questions that did not have a higher mean to gain a better understanding of why this part of the principle or the coaches' role was considered closer to disagree or strongly disagree as being performed. The information found would be used to further improve coaching in these areas.

Another participant suggested that the survey be centered on specific subject area coaches. This questionnaire purpose was a starting point to report the general relationship and role of all instructional coaches. It did not pinpoint specific subject areas coaches. Research should be done in the future to give a more defined reflection of each subject area coach using the partnership principles and the common roles of coaches.

84

The reports given in this study were the results of two school districts from the southern area of the state. Research should be done in other areas in the state to determine the results. The information gained would provide guidance for districts that are developing new coaching programs and reinforcement for districts that are supporting existing coaching programs.

Chapter Summary

Both of the districts that participated in this study have had coaches for several years and both districts have performed well academically over the past years. Both of these factors could lead a district to assume that partnerships exist between the teachers and the coach and that all of the common roles are being fulfilled by the coach. In this study, the teacher reports showed where improvements needed to be made to develop the relationship between the coach and the teacher and it reported the role of the coach as fulfilled. This study gave instructional coaches feedback from teachers on whether or not they report a partnership relationship exists between the coach and the teacher. A teacher and coach partnership leads to working collaboratively to improve student learning. The study also reported feedback on whether or not all of the common roles of coaching were being fulfilled. It is important that teachers are aware of the roles of the coach. Teachers might not receive help if they do not know what support is available to them from the coach. Feedback on the partnership principles and the awareness of the roles of coaches is needed for continuous growth. When coaches help teachers grow, teachers are able to help students grow.

APPENDIX A – Instructional Review Board Approval

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Phone: 601.266.5997 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/research/institutional.review.board

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.
  Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 16100405
PROJECT TITLE: Teachers Appraisal of Their Relationship with Instructional Coaches and Interpretation of the Instructional Coach Role
PROJECT TYPE: New Project
RESEARCHER(S): Sandra Higgins
COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Education and Psychology
DEPARTMENT: Leadership and School Counseling
FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: N/A
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Exempt Review Approval
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 10/5/2016 to 10/04/2017
Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX B – Permission to use Partnership Principles

------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Jim KNIGHT** <jimknight@mac.com>
Date: Mon, Feb 8, 2016 at 10:45 PM
Subject: Re: Dissertation Instrument
To: Sandra Higgins <sandra.higgins@biloxischools.net>

Hi Sandra,

First off, please call me Jim, and I hope you don't mind me referring to you as Sandra.
Second, of course, you have my permission to use the principles in whatever way works
best for you. I would be grateful to hear what you learn.

Jim
On Feb 4, 2016, at 8:47 AM, Sandra Higgins <sandra.higgins@biloxischools.net> wrote:
Dr. Knight,
Happy New Year! My name is Sandra Higgins and I am a doctoral student at the
University of Southern Mississippi. I want to thank you again for personally responding
to the included messages from me.

 I have decided to take your advice and create a questionnaire. My Topic is "TEACHERS
APPRAISAL OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES
AND THEIR INTERPRETATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL COACH ROLE." The
dissertation will be a quantitative research study. I am writing to ask for permission to
include your partnership approach in my questionnaire. I will also include Joellen Killion
and Cindy Harrison roles of coaches in the questionnaire. I have received permission
from Learning Forward to include the roles.

 With your permission, I would like to make slight adaptations to the original wording of
the partnership approach for the questionnaire. I will add the following as choices to
indicate whether or not teachers agree with the questions:

1. Strongly Disagree (SD); 2. Disagree (D); 3. Does not apply (DN); 4.
   Agree (A); and 5.Strongly Agree (SA).

I will cite you as the author of the adapted information. I have attached the questionnaire
for your review.
Dr. Knight, any advice or insight is appreciated. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Sandra Higgins, NBCT

On Mon, Nov 2, 2015 at 7:33 AM, Jim KNIGHT <jimknight@mac.com> wrote:
Hi Sandra,

I just wanted to check and make sure you got my note about this.

Thanks

Jim

I am afraid I don't know of a form like that, but it would be a great dissertation topic to create one.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 28, 2015, at 9:01 AM, Center for Research on Learning <crl@ku.edu> wrote:

From: Sandra Higgins <sandra.higgins@biloxischools.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:45 AM
To: Center for Research on Learning
Subject: Dissertation Instrument

Instructional Coaching Kansas Coaching Project,
My name is Sandra Higgins and I am a doctoral student at the University of Southern Mississippi. I am currently beginning the dissertation process. My Topic is "TEACHERS APPRAISAL OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES AND THEIR INTERPRETATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL COACH ROLE".

I am writing to ask for help. The dissertation will be a quantitative research study. The theoretical framework is based on Jim Knight's partnership approach and Joellen Killion and Cindy Harrison roles for teachers.

I am searching for an instrument that will allow the teacher to state whether they feel they have a partnership with the coach and whether the coaches are fulfilling the roles described by Joellen Killion and Cindy Harrison.

Any information you might have that will assist me in my search will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sandra Higgins

APPENDIX C – Permission to us the Roles of Coaches

From: office@learningforward.org
Date: January 22, 2016 at 1:57:29 PM CST
To: "Sandra Higgins" <sandra.higgins@eagles.usm.edu>
Subject: RE: Request for Permission

Hi Sandra,
Please use this information with your printed copies.
Please ensure that the following citation and credit line appear with your material. Used with permission of Learning Forward, www.learningforward.org. All rights reserved.

Learning Forward
The Professional Learning Association
504 S. Locust Street
Oxford, OH 45056
T 800-727-7288 / F 513-523-0638
www.learningforward.org

-----Original Message-----
From: "Sandra Higgins" <sandra.higgins@eagles.usm.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 1:14pm
To: office@learningforward.org
Subject: Request for Permission

To whom it may concern:

My name is Sandra Higgins and I am a doctoral student at the University of Southern Mississippi.

My dissertation title is "Teachers Appraisal of Their Relationship with Instructional Coaches and Their

Interpretation of the Instructional Coach"
I am writing to receive permission to use a chart found in "Coaching Matter" in my questionnaire. It was taken from Chapter 5: Roles of coaches. It is found under Tool 5.5.

I would like to include it in the questionnaire for my dissertation. I will use the original wording for the roles and functions from Tool 5.5. I will add the following as choices to indicate whether or not the function is being completed by coaches:1. Strongly Disagree (SD); 2. Disagree (D); 3. Does not apply (DN); 4. Agree (A); and 5.Strongly Agree (SA).

I will type on the questionnaire that it was adapted from the following source:
Source: Taking the lead: New roles for teachers and school based coaches,
by Joellen Killion and Cindy Harrison, Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council, 2006

Please indicate agreement by responding to this message. If you do not control these rights, I would greatly appreciate your letting me know to whom I should contact.

 Sincerely,

Sandra Higgins

APPENDIX D – Teacher Questionnaire

Teacher Questionnaire

Part 1: Key: SD = Strongly Disagree   D = Disagree   A = Agree   SA =

Strongly Agree   DK   = Does not Know

Directions: Please select the answer choice that best represents your thinking about each

of the following statements.

When you interact with the coach: Equality	SD	D	A	SA	DK
1. Neither you nor your instructional coach tells the other what to do.					
2. The coach tells you what to do.					
3. Both you and the instructional coach share ideas as equals.					
4. You are free to share ideas with the instructional coach.					
5. You are an equal partner with your coach.					
6. Both the instructional coach and you make decisions together.					
7. Only the instructional coach makes decisions.					
8. You are given the opportunity to make decisions.					

During coaching: Choice	SD	D	A	SA	DK
9. The instructional coach positions you as the final decision maker.					
10. The instructional coach allows you to choose your own coaching goals.					
11. You are comfortable telling the coach your coaching goals if they differ from the instructional coach's goals.					
12. The instructional coach makes you feel free to decide which shared practices to adopt in your classroom.					
13. You decide how student data is used in your classroom.					
14. The instructional coach creates an atmosphere where student data is used to guide your teaching.					

When you interact with the coach:	SD	D	A	SA	DK
15. You are comfortable expressing your point of view with the coach.					
16. You are comfortable expressing your passions with the coach.					
17. You are comfortable expressing your disappointments with the coach.					
18. You are encouraged to express your opinion about the content being taught.					
19. You are free to express your teaching interests.					
20. You are free to express your concerns.					

During coaching:	SD	D	A	SA	DK
21. The instructional coach encourages you to engage in conversation.					
22. The instructional coach encourages you to engage in a conversation that promotes shared learning about the content being discussed.					
23. The instructional coach imposes, dominates, or controls the conversation.					
24. The instructional coach listens more than talks.					
25. The instructional coach uses manipulation to control the coaching conversation.					
26. The instructional coach talks more than listens.					

When you are coached: Reflection	SD	D	A	SA	DK
27. You are encouraged to consider ideas before adopting them.					
28. You are given time to think about ideas.					
29. You have the freedom to choose ideas.					
30. You have the freedom to reject ideas.					

31. Your instructional coach encourages you to reflect on teaching ideas after experiencing them with your class.					
32. The coach encourages you to use your reflections to improve learning in your classroom.					
33. After reflecting on the experience of teaching using certain ideas that may not have been productive, the instructional coach encourages you to change your teaching path.					

When you interact with the coach:	SD	D	A	SA	DK
34. You are encouraged to apply new knowledge and skills learned.					
35. The instructional coach encourages you to reflect on ideas and then put them into action.					
36. The instructional coach encourages you to reconstruct and use content in the manner in which you feel is most useful.					
37. The instructional coach focuses his/her own attention on how to use best practices to help increase student learning.					
38. The instructional coach helps you focus your attention on how to use best practices to help increase student learning.					

During coaching:	SD	D	A	SA	DK
39. Learning is an interactive opportunity for both the coach and teacher.					
40. Both the coach and teacher benefit from the success, learning, or experiences of working with each other.					
41. The instructional coach evaluates learning along with the collaborating teacher.					
42. The instructional coach learns from information discovered about the students in the classroom.					
43. The instructional coach learns about the strengths and weaknesses of teaching practices in the classroom.					
44. The instructional coach learns about various perspectives of teaching strategies when presented by teachers.					

45. The instructional coach learns about various perspectives of teaching strategies when presented by students.					
46. The instructional coach and teacher are more involved when both are learning.					

During your coaching experience:	SD	D	A	SA	DK
47. Your coach is dedicated to helping you become a better teacher.					
48. You feel respected by your coach.					
49. You respect your coach.					
50. Your coach has an authentic respect for your professionalism.					
51. You have an authentic respect for your coaches' professionalism.					
52. The instructional coach is fair.					
53. The instructional coach is honest and truthful.					
54. The instructional coach keeps commitments.					
55. The instructional coach is loyal.					
56. You feel safe to state your thoughts and views with the coach.					
57. The coach admits when he/she makes mistakes.					
58. The instructional coach is competent.					
59. I trust my instructional coach.					

The researcher received permission to use the partnership principles as needed by the originator Jim Knight via e-mail.

Part 2: Source: Taking the lead: New role for teachers and school-based coaches, by Joellen Killion and Cindy Harrison, Oxford, OH: National Staff Development, 2006

Tool 5.5 Coaching Roles

Ten roles The instructional coach / Lead Teacher/ Curriculum Specialist fulfill the following roles:	SD	D	A	SA	DK
Resource provider 60. The instructional coach helps teachers locate information, materials, examples of researched-based practices, and assessments.					
Data coach 61. The instructional coach facilitates conversations with colleagues to analyze many types of data, to identify schoolwide and grade-level or department trends, and to discuss the implications for instruction.					
Curriculum specialist 62. The instructional coach deepens teachers' content knowledge and ensures alignment of the written, taught, and tested curriculum.					
Instructional specialist 63. The instructional coach helps teachers implement effective instructional strategies that respond to diverse learners needs.					
Classroom supporter 64. The instructional coach models effective instructional strategies, co-plans or co-teachers lessons, and observes and gives feedback to teachers.					
Learning facilitator 65. The instructional coach assists with coordination, designing, and delivering professional learning opportunities for all staff, ensuring that a variety of models are used.					
Mentor 66. The instructional coach mentors teachers who are new to the profession and assist teachers who are new to the school.					

School Leader 67. The instructional coach serves on school leadership teams to help coordinate school improvement efforts.					
Catalyst for change 68. The instructional coach encourages teachers to analyze what is working and what is not working, challenges the status quo, and introduces new ideas.					
Learner 69. The instructional coach models continuous learning as adult learners.					

Part 3: Background Information

70.) Choose your gender: male   female

71.) Choose your highest educational degree

BA/BS degree   MA degree   Ed.S degree   Ed.D / Ph.D

72.) Choose the grade level you teach:

(Please choose your primary responsibility)

Pre-K K 1st   2nd   3rd   4th   5th   6th   7th   8th   9th 10th 11th 12

73.) Choose your number of years of teaching experience:

New Teacher   1-2 year   3-5 years   6-10 year   11-15 years 15-20 years   20 years

or more

Thank you for your time and participation.

APPENDIX E – Pretest Letter

June 2, 2016

Dear Participant,

Thank you for agreeing to pre-test the attached questionnaire. The title of my dissertation study is "Teacher's Report of their Relationship with Instructional Coaches and their Report of the Instructional Coaches Role" The portion of the report you will be pre-testing will be the report of teacher's relationship with Instructional Coaches"

Please consider the following as you give your reactions to the questionnaire:
- Is the questionnaire understandable?
- Are the questions necessary?
- Do you feel the timing is appropriate? (Is it too long or too short?)
- Do the questions have a sequential effect? (Consider the order of the questions)
- Are there words that might create language issues? (A slightly different meaning than in the culture that the original questionnaire was designed for)
- Please also check for spelling and other errors.

After you have completed the pre-test, please email me your thoughts. If you prefer, please contact me and we can arrange a time when I can pick up a hard copy of your thoughts. Please feel free to also send the document in the school mail. My mailbox is located in the Dukate building.
The time you are giving to provide your feedback is greatly appreciated. Thank you again.
Sincerely,
Sandra Higgins

APPENDIX F – Pilot Letter

November 12, 2016

Hello Teachers,

My name is Sandra Higgins. I am doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership and School Counseling at the University of Southern Mississippi. I am currently working on my dissertation which will measure whether teachers report the relationship between the instructional coaches/teacher leaders and the classroom teacher as a partnership. The study will also examine if teachers report the roles of instructional coaches/teacher leaders as being fulfilled.

I am writing to ask for your help in collecting pilot data for the study. All teachers who work with instructional coaches, literacy coaches, math coaches, lead teachers or other teacher leaders who serve in this role under a different title are asked to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire will take about 6 minutes to complete.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Southern Mississippi has approved this study. I will not collect personal information during the questionnaire. The data collected will not contain any personal information and all responses will be kept anonymous. All of the data collected will be analyzed at an aggregate level and no individual response will be identified. There are no associated risks in participating in this study. Your participation in this research study is voluntary. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you withdraw from participating at any time, you will not be penalized.

To access the questionnaire please click on the link below or copy and paste it into your web browser:

https://usmep.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2lzY55PFoAMJ0ZD

Your participation is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact me at sandra.higgins@usm.edu or at 228 760-0689.

Sincerely,

Sandra Higgins

Sandra Higgins <sandra.higgins@biloxischools.net>   Sat, Aug 27, 2016 at 5:29 PM
To:

Dear Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium Superintendents,

My name is Sandra Higgins and I am a doctoral student from the University of Southern Mississippi. Mrs. King spoke to you about my dissertation study at the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium Superintendents meeting on Thursday, August 18. I want to thank you for considering allowing your district's teachers to participate in my study entitled "Teachers Report of their Relationship with Instructional Coaches and Report of the Instructional Coaches Role." The term instructional coach in this study is used to include those serving in the role of curriculum specialist, lead teacher, math coach, literacy coach, and academic coach.

The purpose of the study is to investigate whether or not teachers view the relationships that exist between teachers and instructional coaches as a partnership. It will also examine if teachers perceive the roles of instructional coaches as being fulfilled.

I have reattached the letter Mrs. King shared with you and the permission letter that will be sent to the University Institutional Review Board. If you give permission for the study to be done in your district, you will only need to add your letterhead. I ask that the letter then be scanned and emailed back to me.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions by email. I am also available to meet or schedule a conference call about any questions you might have about the study. Thank you again for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Sandra Higgins, NBCT
Biloxi Public Schools
1445 Father Ryan Ave., Biloxi, MS 39533
228-760-0689 - Cell

APPENDIX H – Letter to Superintendent

August 5, 2016

Dear Superintendent,

My name is Sandra Higgins and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership and School Counseling at the University of Southern Mississippi. I am employed as an Instructional Coach for the Biloxi Public School District. I am currently working on my dissertation which will measure whether teachers report the relationship between the instructional coaches/teacher leaders and the classroom teacher as a partnership. The study will also examine if teachers report the roles of instructional coaches/teacher leaders as being fulfilled.

The data for this study will be collected using an online survey software in the form of a questionnaire. I am writing to ask for your help in collecting data for my study. With your permission, I would like to contact the schools in your district to ask teachers to participate in this study. The questionnaires will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

The data collected will not contain any personal information and all responses will be kept anonymous. All of the data collected will be analyzed at an aggregate level and no individual response will be identified. Upon completion of the study, per your request, I would be happy to share the study with you. If you agree, I am asking that you scan me a permission letter on your district's letterhead to my email address. I have included a sample letter that you may choose to use with your district letterhead. I can be contacted at sandra.higgins@biloxischools.net or at 228-760-0689. Thank you for taking time to read my request. I look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Sandra Higgins, NBCT

APPENDIX I – Letter to Principals

From: **Sandra Higgins** <sandra.higgins@biloxischools.net>

Date: Mon, Jan 30, 2017 at 8:03 AM

Subject: Asking For Your Support

To:

Hello,

My name is Sandra Higgins. I am currently working on my dissertation which will measure whether teachers report the relationship between the instructional coaches/teacher leaders and the classroom teacher as a partnership. The study will also examine if teachers report the roles of instructional coaches/teacher leaders as being fulfilled.

Your superintendent has given me approval to conduct my dissertation study in the your School District. The approval letter is attached to this message. I am writing to ask for your support and your help in collecting data for the study. I will be sending an email message and the questionnaire to the district's principals later today. I am asking that you forward the message which has a web-link included that will take the teachers directly to the questionnaire if they click on it. The data collected will not contain any personal information and all responses will be kept anonymous.

Please feel free to contact me if you have questions (228-297-6801). If you would like, I could schedule a time to stop by your school to discuss the study with you. I sincerely thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Sandra Higgins, NBCT

APPENDIX J – Letter to Teachers

January 30, 2017

Greetings Teachers,

      My name is Sandra Higgins. I am doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership and School Counseling at the University of Southern Mississippi. I am currently in the process of completing my dissertation which will measure whether teachers report the relationship between the instructional coaches/teacher leaders and the classroom teacher as a partnership. The study will also examine if teachers report the roles of instructional coaches/teacher leaders as being fulfilled. You District's Superintendent, has given me permission to conduct the online questionnaire in our school district.

      This message is sent to ask for your help in collecting data for the study. All teachers who work with instructional coaches, literacy coaches, math coaches, lead teachers or other teacher leaders who serve in this role under a different title are asked to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire will take about six minutes to complete.

      The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Southern Mississippi has approved this study. The data collected will not contain any personal information and all responses will be kept anonymous. All of the data collected will be analyzed at an aggregate level and no individual response will be identified. There are no associated risks in participating in this study. Your participation in this research study is voluntary. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you withdraw from participating at any time, you will not be penalized.

To access the questionnaire please click on the link below or copy and paste it into your web browser:

https://usmep.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_bPo0Z9Cr9ytCVmJ

      Your participation is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact me at sandra.higgins@usm.edu.

Sincerely,

Sandra Higgins

REFERENCES

Allington, R. (2002). What I've learned about effective reading instruction from a decade

    of studying exemplary elementary classroom teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 22*(1),

    740 -747.

American Federation of Teachers. (2002). *Principles for professional development.*

    Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, M. C., Frankovelgia, C., & Hernez-Broome, G. (2009). In focus/coaching:

    Business leaders reflect on coaching culture. *Leadership In Action,(28)*6, 20-22.

Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher

    Education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education (27)*1, 10-20.

Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2012). Beyond the Scoreboard. *Educational Leadership*, *70*(3),

26-30.

Bean, R. M. (2004). Promoting effective literacy instruction: The challenges for literacy

    coaches. *The California Reader, 37*(3), 58-63.

Bearwald, R. R. (2011). It's about the questions. *Educational Leadership, 69*(2), 74-77.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest.* San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: a core reource for improvement.*

    New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Burns, M. (2006). *The math coach field guide:Charting your course.* Sausalito,CA: Math

    Solutions.

Burns N, Grove SK (2005) *The Practice of Nursing Research: Conduct, Critique, and*

    Utilization (5th Ed.). St. Louis, Elsevier Saunders

Campbell, P. F., & Malkus, N. N. (2011). The impact of elementary mathematics coaches on student achievement. *The Elementary School Journal, 111*(3), 430-454.

Chien, C.W. (2013). Analysis of an instructional coach's role as elementary school language teachers' professional developer. *Current Issues in Education 16(1)*,1-11

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (2002). *Cognitive Coaching A foundation for renaissance schools (2nd ed.).* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Crane, T. G. (2014). *The heart of coaching (4th ed.).* San Diego: FTA Press.

Danielson, C. (2009). *Talk about teaching: Leading professional conversations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Cowin Press.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher Evaluation.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Danielson, L. (2009). Fostering reflections. *Educational Leadership, 66*(5), Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/feb09/vol66/num05/Fostering-Reflection.aspx.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. (1995). Policies That Support Professional Development in an Era of Reform . *Phi Delta Kappan,(76) 8*, 597- 604.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad.* Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council. Retrieved from http://learningforward.org/docs/pdf/nsdcstudytechnicalreport2009.pdf?sfvrsn=0.

Dean, M. J., Dyal, A., Wright, J. V., Carpenter, L. B., & Austin, S. (2012). Principals'
perceptions of the effectiveness and necessity of reading coaches within
elementary schools. *Reading Improvements, 49*(2), 38-51.

Deerfield Public School District. (2013). *Instructional coaching handbook.* Retrieved
from
http://www.dps109.org/Brochure%20Documents/Instructional%20Coaching%20
Handbook%202013-14.pdf.

Denton, C., & Hasbrouck, J. (2009). A Description of Instructional Coaching and its
Relationship to Consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological
Consultation,19(2)*, 150-175.

Devine, M., Houssenmand, C., & Meyers, R. (2013). Instructional coaching for teachers:
A strategy to implement new practices in the classrooms. *Proceida Social and
Behavioral Sciences, 93*, 1126-1130.

Dewan, M. (2003). *Destination MBA: Showing you how to get there.* Okhla Industrial
Area, Phase -II, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership.* Washington DC:
The Albert Shanker Institute.

Feger, S., Woleck, K., & Hickman, P. (2004). How to develop a coaching eye. *National
Staff Development Council, 25*(2), 14 - 18.

Flaherty, F., (2011). *Coaching: Evoking Excellence in Others*. United Kingdom: Taylor
& Francis

Gallwey, W. T. (2000). *The inner game of work.* New York: Random House.

Goldsmith, M., & Lyons, L. S. (2005). *Coaching for Leadership : The practice of leadership coaching from the world's greatest coaches (2nd ed.).* San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Goldstein, J., & Noguera, P. A. (2006). A thoughtful approach to teacher evaluation. *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 63*(6), 31-37.

Goodwin, B. (2011). Implementation counts. *Educational Leadership, 69*(2), 82-83.

Gramston, R., Linder, C., & Whitaker, J. (1993). Reflections on cognitive coaching. *Educational Leadership, 51*(2), 57-61.

Guskey, T. (1986). Staff Development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher, 15*(5), 5-12.

Guskey, T. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 8*(3/4), 381-391.

Guskey, T., & Yoon, K. (2009). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(7), 495-500.

Hanson, L. (2011). The life of a literacy coach. *Educational Leadership, 69*(2), 78-81.

Harrison, C., & Killion, J. (2007). Ten roles for teacher. *Educational Leadership, 65*(1), 74-77.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Heineke, S. F. (2013). Coaching discourse: Supporting teachers' professional learning. *The Elementary School Journal,113*(3), 409-433.

Hershfeldt, P., Pell, K., Sechrest, R., Pas, E., & Bradshaw, C. (2012). Lessons Learned

    Coaching Teachers in Behavior Mangement: The PBISplus coaching Model.

    Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, (22)280-299.

Jaeger, E. L. (2013). Teacher reflection: Support, barriers, and results. *Issue in Teacher*

    Education, 22(1), 89-104.

Johnson, S. M., & Fiarman, S. E. (2012). The potential of peer review. *Educational*

    Leadership, 70(3), 20-25.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development (3rd*

    ed.). Alexandria. VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Knight, J. (1998). *The effectiveness of partnership learning: A dialogical methodology for staff*

    development. Lawrence: University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning.

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving*

    instruction. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press.

Knight, J. (2009). Coaching: The key to translating research into practice lies in

    continuous, job embedded learning wtih ongoing support. *Journal of Staff*

    Development, 30(1), 18-22.

Knight, J. (2011). What good coaches do: When coaches and teachers interact equally as

    partners, good things happen. *Educational Leadership 69(2)*, 18-22

Kral, C. (2007). Principal support for literacy coaching. *Literacy Coaching*

    Clearinghouse, 5(3), 1-4.

L'Allier, S., Elish-Piper, L., & Bean, R. M. (2010). What matters for elementary literacy

    coaching? Guiding principles for instructional improvement and student

    achievement. *Reading Teacher 63*(7), 544-554.

Love, N., Stile, K., Mundry, S., & DiRanna, K. (2008). *The data coach's guide to improving learning for all students.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Lee, B. (1998). *The Power Principle: Influence with Honor.* New York, NY: Free Press; Fireside.

Mangin, M. M. (2007). Facilitating elementary principals' support for instructional teacher leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(3), 319-357.

Mangin, M., & Stoelinga, S. R. (2008). *Effective teacher leadership.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Marzano, R. J. (2013). *Coaching classroom instruction (classroom strategies).* Centennial, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory.

Maslow, V. J., & Kelley, C. J. (2012). Does evaluation advance teaching practice? The effects of performance evaluation on teaching quality and system change in large diverse high schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 22*(3), 600-632.

Matsumura, L. C., Sartoris, M., Bickel, D. D., & Garnier, H. E. (2009). Leadership for literacy coaching: The principal's role in launching a new coaching program. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 655-693.

Maxwell, J. C. (2008). *Leadership gold: Lessons I've learned from a lifetime of leading.* Nashville,TN: Thomas Nelson.

Moran-Tschannen, B., & Moran-Tschannen, M. (2011). The Coach and the Evaluator. *Educational Leadership, 69*(2), 10-16.

Morrision, M. (2010). History of coaching: A true insight into coaching. *Retrieved from https://rapidbi.com/ history-of-coaching-a-true-insight-into-coaching/.*

Murray, J. (2013). Transforming teacher learning in American schools. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice 16*(1), 126 -131.

National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Standards for staff development*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Neufeld, B. & Roper, D. (2003). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity—*

promises & practicalities. Washington, D.C.: Aspen Institute Program on Education and   Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

Noble, M. (2012). Transform managers into coaches: Five steps for coaching success. *T+ D*, *66*(3), 32-33.

Pankake, A., & Moller, G. (2007). What the teacher leader needs from the principal. *Journal of Staff Development, 28*(1), 32-36.

Piercy, T. (2006). *Compelling converstations: Connecting leasership to stduent achievement.* Englewood,CO: Advanced Learning Press.

Poglinco, S., & Bach, A. J. (2004). The Heart of the matter: Coaching as a vechicle for professioanl development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(5), 398-400.

Popham, W. J. (2013). On serving two masters: formative and summative teacher evaluation. *Principal Leadership, 13*(7), 18-22.

Reeves, D. B. (2007). Coaching myths and realities. *Educational Leadership, 65*(2), 89-90.

Saphier, J., & West, L. (2009 -2010). How coaches can maximize student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(4), 46-50.

Schmoker, M. (1997). *Setting goals in turbulent times. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.),*

    Rethinking educational change with heart and mind: 1997 ASCD Yearbook

    (pp.128-148) . Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum

    Development.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.

Sebring, P. B., & Bryk, A. S. (2000). *School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago.*

    Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Seed, A. (2008). Redirecting the teaching profession in the wake of A Nation at Risk and

    NCLB. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(8), 586-589.

Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development:

    A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. *Educational*

    Leadership, 45(3), 77-87.

Sparks, G. (1983). Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching.

    Educational Leadership, 41(3), 65-72.

Teemant, A. (2014). A mixed methods investigation coaching for teachers of diverse

    learners. *Urban Education,49*(5), 574-604.

Toll, C. (2005). *The literacy coach's survival guide: Essential questions and practical*

    answers. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2011). One to grow on/ Every teacher a coach. *Educational*

Leadership   *69(2*), 92-93.

U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *States Granted Waivers From No Child Left*

    Behind Allowed to Reapply for Renewal for 2014 and 2015 School Years.
    Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/states-granted-waivers-no-
    child-left-behind-allowed-reapply-renewal-2014-and-2015-school-years.

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *ESEA Flexibility.* Retrieved from

      http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html.

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Race to the Top Program Executive Summary.*

Retrieved from

      http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf.

Vanderburg, M., & Stephen, D. (2010). The impact of literacy coaches. *Elementary*

      School Journal, 111(1), 141-163.

Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of
professional

learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher*

      Education 24(1), 80-91.

Walker, B. (2010). *Literacy coaching: Learning to collaborate.* Boston: Allyn and
Bacon.

Wellman, B., & Lipton, L. (2004). *Data-driven dialogue: A facilitator's guide to*

      collaborative inquiry. Sherman, CT: Mira Via.

Whitmore, J. (2009). *Coaching for Performance:Growing People, Performance and*

      Purpose, (4th ed.). Norwood, Mass: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Yopp, D., Burroughs, E.A, Luebeck, J., Heidma, C., Mitchell, A., & Sutton, J. (2011).

      How to be a wise consumer of coaching:Strategies teachers can use to maximize

      coaching's benefits. *Journal of Staff Development 32(1)*, 50-53.