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Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative study was to investigate the application of Cognitive Coaching as a school-based professional development program to improve instructional thought and decision making as well as to enhance staff perceptions, collegiality and school culture. This topic emerged from personal and professional issues related to the role of the reflective practitioner in improving the quality of education, yet cognizant of the fact that little professional development was available to train teachers to become reflective.

This case study, positioned within the interpretive sciences, focused on three teachers and how their experiences with cognitive coaching affected their teaching practices. Their knowledge, understanding and use of the four stages of instructional thought (preactive, interactive, reflective and projective) were tested before and at the end of eight coaching cycles, and again after two months to determine whether they had continued to use the reflective process. They were also assessed on whether their attitude towards peer coaching had changed, whether their feelings about teaching had become more positive and whether their professional dialogue had increased. Three methods of data collection were selected to assess growth: interviews, observations and journaling.

Analysis primarily consisted of coding and organizing data according to emerging themes. Although the professed aim of cognitive coaching was to teach the process in order that the teachers would become self-analytical and self-modifying, this study found that the value of the coaching, after trust had been established in both the coach and the process, was in the dialoguing and the time set aside to do it. Once the coaching stopped providing the time to dialogue, to examine one’s meanings and beliefs, so did the critical
self-reflection. As a result of the cognitive coaching experience though, all participants grew in their feelings of efficacy, craftsmanship, flexibility, consciousness and interdependence.

The actual and potential significance of this study was discussed according to implications for teacher supervision, professional development, school culture, further areas of research and to my personal growth and development.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

As we move from an industrial to an information based society, the question is, "How do we best prepare students for the increasingly rigorous requirements for life in the 21st century?" The Ontario Curriculum 1997 (Ministry of Education, 1997) states that if we are to address society's needs, as teachers we must move from objective, content based curriculum to an outcomes, higher level thinking skills based curriculum. We must teach students to be active researchers using real life contexts, rather than passive receivers of knowledge. Students need to be encouraged to strive for personal excellence, to reflect on their learning and to set goals for future learnings; in other words to become self-directed lifelong collaborative learners in a global context.

Professional development is critical to any hope of improving instruction and student learning. In order to teach these skills, we as teachers must acquire and model them ourselves. At Teacher's College and during our first years of teaching, we developed and refined basic teaching skills, but the move to improved and more reflective strategies has been very haphazard. As a profession, teachers do not have an enviable
track record in professional growth. Teachers traditionally have worked in loneliness and isolation, which creates problems of morale and professional growth. Professional activity days have been one-shot workshops where teachers have little input, no followup and have resulted in little or no change in instruction. Cognitive coaching is a long-term school based professional development (PD) program to improve instructional thought and decision making as well as to enhance staff perceptions, collegiality and school culture. Indeed Costa and Garmston (1994) call it the foundation for renaissance schools.

Statement of the Problem Situation

It has been suggested that after six to eight Cognitive Coaching episodes a teacher will have internalized the four thought processes of effective teaching (Costa and Garmston, 1994). This basis of teacher cognition is preactive, interactive, reflective and projective thought. The general question then is, “Will the teachers internalize the four thought processes and become self-modifying, self-referencing and self-renewing?” It has also been stated that Cognitive Coaching will promote growth in the five states of mind that promote holonomy, efficacy, flexibility, consciousness, craftsmanship and interdependence.
Purpose of the Study

I engaged three teachers at my school in eight episodes of Cognitive Coaching. I tested their knowledge, understanding and use of the four stages of instructional thought before and at the end of eight coaching cycles. After a period of time had elapsed I returned to determine whether they had continued to use the process in their own teaching and whether they had shared it with others. I also assessed whether:

1. their attitude towards peer coaching had changed;

2. their feelings about teaching had become more positive after the coaching; and

3. their professional dialogue (idea sharing) had increased after the coaching.

Research Questions

The study reported here builds on previous research on the effects of self-analysis on teachers' ability to improve practice (Costa & Garmston, 1994). It also builds on research related to staff development (Showers, Joyce & Bennett, 1987) as well as effective adult education (Candy, 1991). The major questions addressed in the present study are:
1. Do the teachers use the lesson planning and reflective maps as rated on the Level of Use scale more extensively in their teaching than before the coaching took place?

2. Do the teachers exhibit increased collegial activity?

3. Have their positive feelings about teaching increased?

Rationale

As Zahorik (1983) discovered, most teachers plan their lessons around content instead of student learnings. This places the content rather than the student at the centre of the lesson. For example, “the goal of the lesson is to teach latitude and longitude” instead of, “the student will understand what latitude and longitude are and be able to use them to locate places on the globe.” As Candy (1991) states, learning is about process rather than content. A teacher needs to be aware not only of the knowledge and algorithms but of one’s own motives, resources, and contextual restraints, and be able to plan strategically on that knowledge.

We also know that to change teacher behavior we need to have an impact on teacher beliefs, resources and methodologies (Seller, 1984). Research indicates that one of the most effective ways to do this is with peer coaching (Joyce and McKibbin, 1982). From nearly 200 research
studies Showers, Joyce and Bennett (1987) found that what the teacher
thinks about teaching determines what the teacher does when engaged in
teaching, and that teachers are likely to keep and use strategies if they
receive coaching. Also, since reflection is limited in the average school, a
teacher is shaped more by his or her work situation than shaping it (Schön,
1987).

My previous experience with staff development was as a team leader
for the Junior division. Our board was implementing a new math program
and the team leaders participated in four, half-day workshops. Team
leaders were expected to share the material and information given at the
workshops, but I noticed that the teachers were only politely interested.
They were content with doing what they had been doing and were
uncomfortable with the new program’s emphasis on problem solving
instead of computation. As a result, the program was not being
implemented and the PD workshops and inservice had had very little
impact on the majority of teachers.

Cognitive coaching takes the implementation strengths of peer
coaching and adds to it the skills and thought processes for high quality
decision making that will improve instruction. This combination offers a
tremendous potential to transform schools, yet few case studies have been
conducted to investigate actual results. Edwards and Newton (1995) conducted a quantitative study, and collected as well some qualitative data on teacher efficacy. They found that teachers who had engaged in cognitive coaching were more satisfied with their careers and experienced a growth in efficacy as compared to the control group. Foster (1989) investigated teacher perceptions of how cognitive coaching had affected the four areas of teacher thought. Under self-evaluation, the teachers felt that it had an average impact on their thought processes in all areas. The Department of Education for the State of Hawaii (Noda, 1996) stated in a letter that Cognitive Coaching “has proven to be one of our most valuable tools in professional growth and development for our teachers and administrators”. I was interested in seeing whether these results were reproducible and discovering whether cognitive coaching is as effective a staff development strategy as claimed.

Importance of the Study

On the basis of research to date, cognitive coaching appears to be a worthwhile staff development process worthy of study. The model seems to be a worthwhile, practical and feasible strategy for staff development. It uses existing professional resources in a school and the very people who
impact on staff development (the teachers themselves) are empowered to transform their teaching through mutual reflection. It addresses the problem of teacher isolation and strives to increase interaction and cooperation. Successful self-analysis and reflection on teaching practice is a skill that needs to be taught, developed and practised. Coaching by a peer, trained in reflective questioning techniques, stimulates and provides the opportunity for the reflective thought processes to take place. Coaching by colleagues assists in the analysis, and helps to foster an atmosphere of trust, collegiality and professional growth. Cognitive coaching could have a short-term, positive impact on the individuals involved in improving their teaching practice and a long-term impact on the entire educational system by transforming schools into dynamic, continually learning organizations.

Definition of Terms

There are terms used in this study that require definitions to clarify the concepts. Such terms are elaborated below in alphabetical order.

**Cognition** - knowledge from personal view or experience.

**Collegiality** - dialogue with a colleague about pedagogy and a willingness to share resources.
Consciousness - awareness of events, both external and internal to oneself.

Efficacy - a feeling of being in control, and that one’s behavior makes a difference.

Flexibility - the ability to creatively look at things from different perspectives.

Holonomy - from the Greek: *holos* meaning “whole” and *on* meaning “part”. Operating in the best interests of the whole while simultaneously attending to personal goals and needs.

Interactive thought - mental functions performed during the teaching act.

Phenomenography - the attempt to describe the differences in the way that people experience and construct reality.

Preactive thought (planning) - all thought processes that teachers perform prior to the interactive stage of instruction.

Projective thought (application) - teachers take what has been learned through reflection and project those learnings to future lessons.

Reflective thought - teachers look back to compare, analyze and evaluate the decisions made during the planning and teaching stages.
Assumptions and Limitations

I felt that there had to be a more effective form of staff development that would address individual teachers’ needs, be school based and supportive of risk-taking. After a research essay on peer coaching, I discovered that it contains a number of features essential to effective staff development. However, as a teaching professional, my “coaching” experiences have been limited to occasional, casual receiving or giving of information over the staff room table.

The first assumption on which this study is based is that teachers are capable of change and that each possesses untapped potential. Teachers have the potential and desire to learn, and new learnings result in feelings of increased efficacy.

A second assumption is that teaching cannot be reduced to a formula or a recipe. A teacher’s observable classroom behaviors are based on a cognitive map involving four thought processes (preactive, interactive, reflective, projective). While we know what basic teaching skills are, teachers still need to develop and refine what works for them and their students. By engaging in these thought processes, the teacher is constantly improving upon and refining his/her craft.
Another assumption is that learning is a collaborative action and that a skillful colleague can enhance a teacher’s thought processes, thereby improving the teacher’s decisions and teaching behaviors.

This study is limited by the number of individuals involved in the study, the number of contexts studied, the time line, the commitment of the participants, the self-report of reflection, and the flexibility of the timetable.

Preview of Subsequent Chapters

Chapter Two provides the theoretical framework for this study. It presents prominent studies related to teacher cognition/reflection and professional development, preliminary findings on cognitive coaching’s effectiveness, the training context and the foundations of case study. Chapter Three deals with the process of beginning a cognitive coaching cycle. Specifics that relate to the coaching cycle, selection of participants, questions used, pre- and post-conferences and the overall evaluation of the process are discussed.

Chapter Four is a discussion of the training seminar, the major learnings and the overall effectiveness of it. Chapter Five places the coaching in an actual setting, a multiple case study to serve as examples of the effectiveness of Cognitive Coaching in improving teacher reflection.
Chapter Six completes the study with a summary of recommendations and conclusions derived from the results of the case studies.

Summary

Cognitive Coaching, wherein a coach helps to convey a colleague from where he/she is professionally to where he/she would like to be, a process designed by Art Costa and Robert Garmston (1994) holds promise as a viable method of staff development. It can be a natural extension of professional dialogue to assist teachers in becoming more reflective about their practice and to share these new insights with others.

The coaching component can decrease teacher isolation and burnout and increase a sense of efficacy and interdependence. Teachers are hesitant to be observed because of our traditions of judgmental/evaluative feedback. Once teachers trust the process and each other, it opens the door to increased reflection, flexibility and craftsmanship. Thus, cognitive coaching can be an important skill in continuous improvement of instruction.

The strategy also has economic merit as it utilizes trained school personnel to assist each other. It has the potential to transform our teaching, and thereby schools, as it encourages teachers to be self-modifying and self-renewing.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Organization of the Review

This literature review contains a compilation of data related to teacher cognition and peer coaching. It provides the theoretical framework for the training, implementation and use of cognitive coaching. Successful experiences with cognitive coaching are given to illustrate the points made. In total, it is an accumulation of the contexts, investigations, training courses and analyses.

The need for this study is dependent on information gained from previous studies, claims made, appropriate methods used, and generalizations and implications set. The review is presented in five sections:

1. Background to the goals of cognitive coaching;
2. Cognitive coaching, theoretical foundations;
3. Effectiveness;
4. Training; and
5. Case Study.
Background

Cognitive coaching goals are to generate trust, learning and holonomy. Coaching needs to occur where individuals feel safe, have trust, and where both parties have the opportunity to grow and learn. Learning comes as a result of dialogue during the pre- and postconferences. Both teachers engage in reflection, inquiry, analysis and synthesis. Holonomy means that individuals operate in the best interests of the whole while at the same time attending to their own goals and needs (Costa and Garmston, 1994).

In order for this to take place, Costa and Garmston identify five states of mind which the individual teacher possesses: efficacy, flexibility, consciousness, craftsmanship and interdependence. These states of mind are almost identical to the seven habits being promoted as characteristics of highly effective people by Covey (1989). Briefly described, efficacy arises when people believe their efforts make a difference. They believe that they can influence outcomes and are secure in their own coping abilities. Fullan (1982) designates efficacy as a vital factor for the successful implementation of change. Rosenholtz (1989) found that the more certain
teachers are about their technical knowledge, the more students learn.

Laborde and Saunders (1986) found that people governed by an internal locus of control show initiative, control their impulsivity, gather information, are cognitively active, learn eagerly, set challenging goals and persevere in the face of barriers.

Flexibility is the ability to step beyond oneself and look at a situation from a different perspective. Flexible people are empathic. They listen with their ears, eyes, hearts, and minds. They are as Perkins (1983) described creative people, living on the edge, always pushing the frontier. They generate new knowledge, experiment with new ways and constantly stretch to grow in ability. Craftsmanship is taking pride in your work and consistently striving to improve performance. Garfield (1986) found that in schools where teachers are the most successful, they have the highest dissatisfaction with the results of their work. This drives them to deepen and refine their skills.

Consciousness is to be aware of events both external and internal to oneself.

People who enjoy a state of consciousness metacogitate. They monitor their own values, thoughts, behaviors, and progress toward their own goals. They can articulate well-defined value systems,
and they generate and apply internal criteria for decisions they make. They practice mental rehearsal and edit mental pictures as they seek to improve strategies. (Costa and Garmston, 1994, p.138)

This ability enables a teacher, while monitoring student responses, to decide whether to move ahead or remain at the present step and explain further.

Interdependence leads teachers to seek collegiality and they give themselves to group goals and needs as well as drawing on the resources of others. Rosenholtz (1989) found that the single most important characteristic of successful schools was goal consensus. Vygotsky (1978) reports that the human organism grows in reciprocity. First we develop at the social level and later on at the individual level. All the higher functions originate as actual relations between individuals. One gives help, receives help, one influences and is influenced. These are the energy sources that fuel holonomous behaviors. They are also the diagnostic tools through which we can assess the cognitive development of individuals and groups. Refinement of these skills starts with self and emanates to others. The coach’s role is not to teach these behaviors but to provide experiences that will encourage the client to higher states of holonomy.
Peter Senge (1994) in his book *The 5th Discipline* makes a strong case that the most successful corporations create a culture where individuals strive for personal mastery, can translate individual goals to group goals, understand underlying beliefs, dialogue to be open to the flow of collective intelligence and to see the interdependency of individuals in an organization. This supportive culture can be likened to the supportive, collaborative climate created by the process of cognitive coaching, an environment which breaks down teacher isolation (Askins, 1994).

Manning (1988) said,

> One of the major problems that faces teachers is the loneliness of teaching. The fact that teachers have little contact with peers during the work day or the work week creates a problem for morale and a problem for growth. (p. 45)

**Cognitive Coaching**

Peer coaching is a methodology for staff development, *not* evaluation. Its purpose is to improve instruction and for participants to experience professional growth (Pellicer & Anderson, 1995). Baker and Showers (1984) describe peer coaching as “the provision of on site, personal support, companionship and technical assistance for teachers” (Minor &
However, cognitive coaching defers from Baker and Showers' technical model in that the main purpose is not to transfer a particular training or method but to aid the teacher in constructing the method which is right for him/her. The focus is on the teacher as learner, to reflect on practice and to share what one knows. It capitalizes on personal knowledge that comes from experience and the coach understands that personal growth and development come from within (Dyer, 1995). Teachers have always believed that the people most qualified to assist them are other teachers and they resist having others "diagnosing and prescribing for them" (Rodriguez & Johnstone, 1986, p.87). They also feel less threatened working with peers (Minor & Preston, 1991). Administrators are responsible for evaluation, and teachers are reluctant to take a risk with them because of this. In addition, administrators generally do not have enough time for ongoing PD, nor are they always seen by teachers as being "expert" in their particular field. In effect, peer coaching is recognizing and utilizing the natural resources a school already possesses--its teachers (Decker & Dedrick, 1989).

Cognitive coaching is a type of collegial coaching developed by Dr. A. Costa and Dr. R. Garmston. They believe that since teachers' thinking and decision making are influenced by their beliefs, altering behaviors without
affecting the inner thought processes is meaningless. Phenomenography attempts to describe how people conceive, experience or understand different aspects of the world. Different people have different experiences due to their different relations to the world. People then make different analyses and arrive at different knowledge. There is a search to understand what teachers do in their own practice, and an attempt to explore the meaning of variation (Alexandersson, 1994).

Teacher behavior is determined by teacher thought processes (Clark & Peterson, 1986). They state that we should train teachers “to perceive, analyze and transform their perceptions of the classroom” (p.281). Goodman (1988) discovered that teachers were influenced by guiding images from past events that created intuitive screens through which new information was filtered. These beliefs are far more influential than knowledge as predictors of behavior (Nespor, 1987). Cognitive coaching recognizes the teacher as the authority, the essential unit in changing teaching behaviors and beliefs.

Cognitive Coaching is a process during which teachers explore the thinking behind their practices. Each person seems to maintain a cognitive map, only partially conscious. In Cognitive Coaching, questions asked by the coach reveal to the teacher areas of that map
that may not be complete or consciously developed. When teachers talk out loud about their thinking, their decisions become clearer to them, and their awareness increases. (Garmston, 1993, p.57)

Thus the coaching aspect is vital to support this reflection on the teaching act since, as Brown and McIntyre (1986) discovered, if there is conflict between a teacher’s belief and behaviors, teachers will adjust either their belief or behaviors to match the school culture’s. Mezirow (1991) explains that understandings are socially constructed through human interaction. Contradictions generated by change from our formative education give the opportunity for the adult to transform concepts and behavior. The existence of this uncertain, transitional state gives dialogue a powerful role. The ability to name “what is” becomes transformational. Therefore the adult needs to learn to negotiate meanings critically and reflectively, instead of passively accepting the realities defined by others. Thus, acquiring knowledge is no guarantee that one will be able to use it. Teachers need to analyze and apply knowledge that will support problem solving in any domain (Kurfiss, 1988). Learning must be thought of in terms of a qualitative change in the learner’s conceptions rather than a quantitative accretion in his or her store of knowledge (Candy, 1991). Adult learners need to develop the capability to think logically, critically
and analytically, and develop the ability to monitor their own progress. As John Dewey, as cited in Mezirow (1991) stated:

Through reflection we see through the habitual way that we have interpreted the experience of everyday life in order to reassess rationally the implicit claim of validity made by a previously unquestioned meaning scheme or perspective. (p. 102)

Peers assist in analyzing and interpreting observation data, sometimes called the reflective practitioner (LeBlanc & Zide, 1987). Mezirow (1991) describes this reflective practice which in his words is a cognitive revolution. “It is not so much what happens to people but how they interpret and explain what happens to them that determines their actions, their hopes, their contentment and emotional well being, and their performance” (p. xiii). He adds that understandings are socially constructed, validated through communication with another person in order to arrive at an understanding about the meaning of a shared experience. The coach attempts to make explicit and visible the frames of reference through which individual teachers perceive and process information. It is not the peer’s job to “fix” what’s wrong, but to help teachers to reflect on their teaching. Coaches invite teachers to examine
their practice and the effects of their teaching: in other words, to reconstruct their pedagogical knowledge (Keiny, 1994).

The ultimate goal of cognitive coaching is the ability to self-monitor, self-analyze and self-evaluate. The coach acts as a mirror in order that the teacher may see with new eyes. Cognitive coaching supports teachers’ existing strengths while expanding previously unexplored capacities. Schön (1987) refers to this as reflection in action, the ability to bring to the surface one’s beliefs, meaning schemes and perspectives in order to criticize, restructure and use in later actions. He calls the context between the coach and professional a “virtual world” within which one can suspend or control some of the everyday impediments to reflection. In other words, Cognitive coaching is cooperative PD tailored to the specific needs of specific teachers (Glatthorn, 1987).

Indeed, for peer coaching to be effective and sustained over a period of time, it needs a focus that matters to the individuals involved, which is the focal point of Cognitive coaching (Robbins, 1991). Schön (1987) states that one can not use “packaged” educational principles and skills, but one needs to encourage reflection on them every day as teachers in general are not oriented towards specific learnings and rarely focus on means-ends relationships (Alexandersson, 1994).
Van Manen (1977) suggests a hierarchy of reflectivity. This ranges from the practical, concerned mainly with the means rather than ends, to a "best choice" that needs to be made from an abundance of theories, principles and views, and finally to worth of knowledge and social wisdom. The OASCD lists levels of engagement of life occupations which reflects increasingly connected use of the total set of human capabilities plus increasing positive connections with others. These are:

1. using transmitted procedures and attitudes
2. through problem solving, accommodation of transmitted procedures to new/changed situations
3. retrieving/enlarging the working model for processing until it incorporates all personal knowledge
4. inventive/creative restructuring of model elements and relationships

Costa and Garmston (1994) based their model for Cognitive coaching on four thought clusters very similar to the ones mentioned previously. They are:

1. input of data through the senses and from memory
2. processing those data into meaningful relationships
3. output, or application of those relationships in new or novel situations

4. metacognition, or self-monitoring of one's own thoughts, actions, beliefs and emotions

In Cognitive coaching the individual can reflect, dialogue and connect with another professional. This dialogue between professionals about teaching is one of the greatest strengths of coaching (Chrisco, 1989). To ensure this, participation should be voluntary, with staff choosing their own coaches who might or might not be from their own academic area. This can aid in the integration of subjects as well as build new respect for peers. Trust and respect are the operative words in a peer coaching program (Cox, Gabry & Johnson, 1991) and the teacher must be certain that the peer coaching situation is as confidential as the confessional. The entire process should be focused on strengths and infused with a spirit of curiosity about teaching and learning. Each participant must be able to separate practice from competence and be able to dissect practice but leave self-esteem intact (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

The process of cognitive coaching is divided into the clinical supervision model developed by Cogan, Goldhammer and Anderson (Costa & Garmston, 1994) of pre-conference, observation and post-conference.
Glatthorn (1987) reports that four aspects of thinking play an important role in the teacher's classroom performance; planning (preactive thought), interactive thoughts (decisions while teaching), analysis after the lesson (reflection) and future applications (projective thought). Given that Zahorik (1983) discovered that teachers most frequently start with content instead of student learnings in the planning process, at the preconference the coach's role is to facilitate the teacher's thinking about the lesson, a dress rehearsal of the teaching performance. The coach asks probing, clarifying questions to help the teacher fine-tune his/her thinking about the lesson and to clarify for the coach the lesson focus. This brings what teachers do instinctively to the conscious level (Chrisko, 1989). They might even brainstorm to determine a focus if one is not readily apparent. In dialogue people become observers to their own thinking, and develop a sense of trust, so that they can talk about anything (LeBlanc and Zide, 1987). Just as our students who participate in class discussion learn the most, as teachers we also remember best what we hear ourselves say (Sylwester, 1995). Below are topics that should be discussed (Robbins, 1991):

- explain student learnings for the lesson;
- identify what led up to the lesson and what will follow;
The text on this page appears to be a continuation of the previous page, discussing various topics with a focus on the scientific method and experimentation. The paragraphs are well-organized, with clear headings and subheadings that guide the reader through the content. The text is dense and technical, typical of a scholarly or professional context. The page seems to be part of a larger work, possibly a research paper or a textbook on a specific scientific discipline.
- ask for information about class behavior, norms, present capabilities of students, etc.;
- agree upon a signal for the coach to leave if things are not going as planned;
- decide on the purpose of the observation and the data to be collected (teacher is researcher, coach is data collector);
- decide on a method of evaluating/observing whether the desired learnings were achieved.

The coach concludes the preconference by asking for feedback if he/she was effective in stimulating thinking, which generates a sense of reciprocity and trust, and serves to fine-tune coaching skills.

During the observation the data requested by the teacher are collected. The observer can gauge student reactions to the teacher’s desired outcomes discussed in the preconference when the teacher is more focused on his/her own behavior. Data collection should:

- match the teacher’s focus;
- be negotiated in detail;
- reflect the teacher’s style and modality preferences if possible;
At the postconference in collaboration, the teacher and coach discuss which objectives were achieved. The coach asks reflective questions to assist the teacher in analyzing the data. Skillful questioning by the coach helps the teacher to find his/her own answers as to lesson effectiveness. From this debriefing the teacher then can make future teaching and planning decisions based on the postconference analysis.

Effectiveness

Fullan (1990) describe four benefits of coaching: the technical, the reflective, the research and the collaborative.

The mastery of a technical repertoire increases instructional certainty, reflective practice enhances clarity, meaning and coherence; research fosters investigation and exploration; collaboration enables one to receive and give ideas and assistance. (Robbins, 1991, p.14)

Robbins (1991) gives these reasons for implementing peer coaching:

- improved sense of professional skill;
- enhanced ability to analyze one’s own lesson;
- better understanding of teaching and learning;
- wider repertoire of instructional strategies;
- increased sense of efficacy;
- stronger professional ties with colleagues;
- improved teacher performance;
- enhanced student progress;
- better articulated curriculum;
- more cohesive school culture; and
- positive school climate.

Glickman (1993) as well as Little (1982) found in their studies that the most successful schools have a faculty which:

- questions existing practices and constantly strives to improve;
- work and plan together; and
- are involved in decision making
- see educational renewal as a continuing process.

All of these are characteristics of what cognitive coaching strives to foster and promote.

Sparks (1983) determined that effective staff development needs administrative support, an experimental culture, a series of workshops and coaching. Improvement of instruction ultimately belongs to teachers, and peer coaching is a vehicle to break down the classroom doors so that teachers can learn from each other. Several studies by Joyce and Showers reveal that even after high-quality training that integrates theory and
demonstration, classroom application by teachers is only at the 5% level. However, when peer coaching is added, the application level increases to 90% (Costa & Garmston, 1994). Sparks-Langer (1991) found that there was no difference in instruction after training until peer coaching had taken place.

Pellicer & Anderson (1995) state that without a strong foundation in the cognitive aspects of teaching it is difficult for anyone to understand teaching or even to discuss teaching in a meaningful way. Teachers who reported that student behavior was outside their tolerance level but who did not change their behavior (interactive thinking) had students who achieved less (Clark & Peterson, 1986). Effective teachers engage in cognitive processing of information to make sense of the complex classroom environment. Sparks-Langer (1991) found that using reflective-cognitive strategies with teacher candidates moved them from dependence on tradition and authority (using the Reflective Pedagogical Thinking Framework) to the use of appropriate pedagogical principles to explain instructional events. Brooks (1985) states that peer coaching is critical to the implementation and success of the Cognitive Levels Matching Project in Shoreham, New York. The power of cognitive coaching may lie in the fact that most data perceived by our brain are either never entered into
short-term memory or are forgotten within seconds. Therefore much of the daily experience of teaching is forgotten or never explained.

For these reasons, it is the processing of the instructional experience that facilitates construction of new meanings and insights in the teacher. With this model of human intellectual functioning in mind the coach engages and mediates the teacher’s cognition. When cognitive coaching is used, teachers process the same teaching event at least six times. Before the Planning Conference, teachers formulate their objectives and plans. During the Planning Conference, they engage in questions, paraphrases, and clarify in ways that help teachers be more precise in their lesson strategies. Instruction then occurs, with the teacher’s conscious awareness about key elements greatly heightened. The teacher recalls the instructional event before and during the Reflecting Conference. Finally, the teacher continues to reflect and refine after the coaching conference, especially when closure was not reached on a subject or issue. (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 89)

Raney and Robbins (1989) report that cognitive coaching has become part of the school culture where it has been implemented. They call it peer sharing and caring. New teachers get the support that they need and staff
Room conversations are more frequently about the act of teaching. There is an atmosphere of experimentation and openness to new ideas. Teachers consult colleagues for assistance and share ideas. Coaches learn also from the teachers they are observing, thereby opening the doors of communication and understanding (Sparks & Bruder, 1987) “Feelings of isolation and passivity have given way to an environment of collaboration and professional growth.” (p.38, Raney & Robbins, 1986). Bang-Jensen (1986) agrees, stating that peer coaching is an “effective, efficient way to improve instruction and to encourage teacher growth” (p.56).

Edwards et al. (1995) found that Cognitive Coaching improved feelings of efficacy and the longer a person was engaged in coaching, the greater the effect. Foster (1989) investigated teacher thought (planning, teaching, analyzing/evaluating and applying) and how it had been affected by cognitive coaching. She found that teachers with 6 or more years of experience felt that it had an average impact, while teachers with 5 or fewer years of experience felt it had a low impact on their planning and teaching and an average impact on analyzing and applying. Omer Fontaine in Dyer (1995) found that cognitive coaching reduced the stress level on staff, fostered trust and encouraged more experimentation. All of this had a positive effect on student learning.
The process makes you more critical of your teaching techniques and makes you question the clarity of direction you are providing for your students. It prevents you from settling into non-productive patterns. You search for new and better approaches to teaching and handling children. It stimulates improvement and growth of teaching skills. (Dyer, 1995, p.32)

Training

The training process is based on the principles of adult education, the role of reflective questioning to facilitate thinking and neurolinguistic principles. For a detailed report on the training process, please refer to Chapter Four.

In adult education certain guidelines have been articulated over the past several years. Mainly they are that adults need a supportive, trusting environment and should be considered as knowing beings with an internal locus of control who filter their interpretations of reality through past experience (Mezirow, 1991). Factors which shape meaning are:

- developmental stage;
- learning style;
- concrete/abstract thinking;
social/cultural norms;

- psychological perspectives (self-concept, locus of control, needs, etc.).

Reflective action begins with a problem, moves through a series of thought processes and ends with an action. Development in adulthood refers to moving toward more inclusive, discriminating, integrative and permeable (open) meaning perspectives through a critical examination of one’s history, context and consequences of one’s actions. This critical self-reflection enhances awareness of the way one feels, acts and understands (Mezirow, 1991).

Reflective questioning is a technique in which one person asks questions designed to assist the respondent to explore his/her knowledge, skills, experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and values. This encourages the respondent to explore his/her own thinking and is not intended to lead that person to the questioner’s opinion. In a counseling relationship, the learner needs to maintain ownership of the situation (Candy, 1991). If the counselor tells the client what to think or how to behave the client can become dependent, rather than independent.

To be truly reflective, the questioner must respect the respondent’s opinions, suspend judgment, and avoid attempts to manipulate his/her
thinking (Lee & Barnett, 1994). They suggest the guidelines for preparing questions are:

- base questions on the respondent’s own experiences;
- word questions in neutral, nonjudgmental ways;
- keep an overall purpose in mind;
- be prepared to follow up initial questions.

For asking questions they suggest that one use a neutral tone of voice, incorporate active listening skills and refrain from giving advice. They also add that the success of reflective questioning does not depend on asking “just the right question”, but relies much more on creating opportunities for respondents to think aloud and construct meaning for themselves.

One of the greatest challenges in learning reflective questioning is the suspension of judgment (Garmston & Prieskorn, 1990). Teachers have lived so long with the clinical supervision model where the observer’s job is to label, analyze, reinforce and teach the teacher that one finds it difficult to withhold evaluative-type statements. When someone says to a teacher “good job” or “that wasn’t too effective. Here is what you should do,” teacher thinking shuts down, despite the comments being well intentioned. As different people can construct different learnings from the same experience, this type of feedback might be valid for only that observer
Coaching teachers’ thought processes requires letting go of some of these old practices. When focusing on teacher thought, we select the tools that best promote thinking. These tools include gathering and providing data, mediative questions, silence, paraphrasing, probing and summarizing (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

Researchers Bandler and Grinder (1975) conducted a series of investigations to learn why some therapists were almost magically effective in contrast to others who simply did a good job. They discovered whether, consciously or not, the effective therapists were modeling entrainment, being in synchronization with the other person’s posture, gesture, inflection, pitch, volume and rate of speech as well as language choices and breathing. This is a manifestation of rapport between two people (Costa & Garmston, 1994) and greatly increases the effectiveness of the pre- and postconferences.

Case Study

For many years research has been dominated by the quantitative Cartesian model of an outer world which is observable and measurable and an inner world which is difficult to understand. However when researchers use the methods of physical science to examine the social and educational
world, they dehumanize the subjects; for human thought can not be meaningful, separated from feeling and action (Kinchele, 1991).

Recently qualitative research has attempted to address this gap in quantitative research as it is “sustained interaction with the people being studied in their own language and on their own turf” (Kirk & Miller, 1986, p. 12), a sociological and anthropological tradition of inquiry which is naturalistic and participatory. Researchers do not assume that they know what things mean to the people they are studying as there are multiple ways of interpreting events, and through interaction with others a reality is constructed (Bogden & Biklen, 1992). Candy (1991) believes that any learning endeavors should be gauged in qualitative rather than quantitative terms.

However, are these two approaches to research mutually exclusive? Jurgen Habermas with the Frankfurt School (Merzirow, 1991) believes not. He states that there are three kinds of knowledge:

- technical or instrumental learning;
- practical or communicative learning;
- emancipatory or reflective learning.

Instrumental learning is empirical/analytical knowledge, technical rules that attempt to control and manipulate the environment. Communicative
learning attempts to understand others and to be understood, to share ideas through speech, the written word, drama, art and dance. This communication is grounded in social norms. It has been estimated that 65% of communication takes place through nonverbal components (Costa & Garmston, 1994). Most learning involves both instrumental and communicative aspects.

Reflective learning takes place as reflection identifies and challenges distorted meaning perspectives.

Emancipatory knowledge is knowledge gained through critical self-reflection, as distinct from the knowledge gained for our “technical” interest in the objective world or our “practical” interest in social relationships (Mezirow, 1991, p. 87).

Emancipatory knowledge is the culmination of both instrumental and communicative learning. Empirical tests cannot be used to validate how we feel, but dialogue with others can. This then offers the possibility of critical reflection which may lead to diminishing the “prejudgmental power” of our culture and previous meanings and perspectives.

Validity testing then becomes communication with another person in order to arrive at an understanding about the meaning of a shared experience. Rationality is the use of reason, evidence and supporting
arguments rather than appealing to authority or tradition to defend one's perspective.

Kirk and Miller (1986) agree that there are methods of validating qualitative research. They define *objectivity* as the way in which an experience is reported so that it is accessible to others, and *reliability* the extent to which a measurement procedure yields the same answer. Validity is divided into theoretical validity (the extent to which a theoretical paradigm corresponds to observations) and instrumental validity (the extent to which observations match those generated elsewhere).

Miles and Huberman (1994) see analysis of qualitative data flowing from three activities: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification. Data reduction is a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards and organizes data in such a way that conclusions can be drawn. This takes place throughout the data collection period. Data display is an attempt to manage the cumbersome narrative text of qualitative research. The displays may be matrices, graphs, networks and/or charts. All are designed to assemble information in an immediately accessible, compact form. From the beginning of data collection the researcher is noting patterns, possible explanations and propositions.
"Final" conclusions may not appear until the data collection is over but they have often been prefigured from the beginning.

However these meanings have to be tested for their plausibility, their confirmability, their validity. This is sometimes referred to as triangulation (Stake, 1995). Qualitative analysis needs to be documented as a process in order that one can audit the specific analysis, but also for purposes of learning.

As qualitative researchers, we need to understand more clearly just what is going on when we analyze data, so we can develop methods that are more generally reproducible (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p.23).

The purpose of a case study is twofold: to examine a particular case, get to know it well and to illuminate a general problem, to look for regularities in behavior that may transcend the differences among individuals (Stake, 1995). The general can be found in the particular. A case study is justifiable because it is pragmatic, understandable and applicable, a receptacle for putting theories to work (Merriam, 1988).

Case study is also a particularly good means of educational evaluation because it can "explain the causal links in real-life interventions that are too complex for the survey of experimental strategies" (Merriam, 1988, p.29).
Stake (1981) sees the following advantages to case study over other designs:

- more concrete - knowledge resonates with our own experience, thus more vivid, concrete and sensory than abstract research;
- more contextual - experiences are rooted in context as is knowledge in case studies;
- more developed by reader interpretation - readers bring to a case study their own experience and understanding, which lead to generalizations (Merriam, 1988, p.15).

Merriam (1988) adds to this that the purpose of a case study is to establish a framework for discussion and debate, offering insights and expanding readers’ experiences. These insights can aid in the formation of hypotheses that help structure future research. Hence, case study plays an important role in advancing a field’s knowledge base.

Summary

Cognitive coaching, although a practical, applied, professional technique, is grounded in a theoretical framework highly consistent with and relevant to the coaching process. This theoretical framework includes principles from the study of educational change and effective organizations.
The current literature also identifies parallel studies on teacher cognition that analyze its effect on teacher behavior and the role of peer coaching in effecting and supporting professional growth. The most effective staff development strategy is one which enables teachers to critically reflect on their practice, work collegially and constantly strive to improve practice.

Journal articles describe school systems that have implemented peer coaching and/or cognitive coaching with positive results. These programs are based mainly on self-analysis as an evaluation tool. Further longitudinal research on cognitive coaching is needed to measure a teacher’s level of cognitive development and data collection of objective, observable classroom behaviors with respect to this development.

The training is based on the principles of adult education which respect the learner as being capable of reflection and self-modification, the transformational power of reflective dialogue and the use of entrainment to help create rapport.

Case study is seen as an appropriate tool to evaluate and report upon the rich cognitive field of reflective thinking which cognitive coaching seeks to explore.
The information gained through this literature review serves to substantiate the problem stated in this study, the rationale surrounding it, and the overall need for further research into effective programs of staff development.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This multiple case study explored the three participant teachers’ use of the four instructional thought processes before and after eight cycles of cognitive coaching. Chapter Five chronologically describes the research process from selection of the case site and participants, to data collection and recording procedures, through to the analysis methods.

The recounting of my thought processes and actions as researcher serves two central purposes. The information it provides is important to assist in the reader’s analysis of the findings and addresses the issue of generalizability in that it enables others to extend this work (Bogden & Biklen, 1992). In addition, the issue of trustworthiness is addressed by ensuring auditability of the research process (Guba, 1981). This is especially necessary as this is my first case study and formal research. The nature of this case study’s inquiry will be addressed so that it may be positioned according to its appropriate epistemological stance.

The Nature of Inquiry

The ideas of Jurgen Habermas, German philosopher, sociologist and noted critical theorist, serve well as a heuristic device to describe this
study's position on an epistemological framework. As discussed in
Chapter Two, Habermas (cited in Mezirow, 1991) posits that knowledge
is derived from three areas of interests: technical (the need to control our
environment to satisfy such requirements as food and shelter); practical (to
satisfy mutual interests reflected in our use of communication both verbal
and nonverbal); emancipatory (our drive to grow and develop).

Empirical-analytical study is based in the philosophy of positivism. It
produces technically useful knowledge with the focus being on
manipulation and control of the environment, prediction about observable
events, and the generation of technical rules. Interpretive science
(hermeneutic), are the scientific methodologies for generating practical
knowledge. Rooted in phenomenological psychology, it strives to
understand meaning. Emancipatory research is grounded in critical-
reflection theory. It includes two components, enlightenment and
emancipation. Enlightenment happens through a process of self-reflection
that reveals the hidden or distorted meaning schemes that are preventing
achievement of our full potential. Emancipation occurs when theory and
practice join to create praxis. Essentially, the natural and interpretive
sciences aim to understand the world as it is; critical-reflective theory tries
to understand why the social world is the way it is and through that process of reflection, strives to know how it could be through purposeful action.

This case study primarily aimed to document the growth in teacher reflection as the participants progressed through the eight coaching cycles. As the participants' interpretation of events guided the coaching process, the study is firmly based in the interpretive sciences. However, in engaging them in reflective questioning, the coaching process ideally reveals their meaning schemes so that they can move to the emancipatory learnings of enlightenment and praxis.

Research Methods

The selection of the research site and participants was based on convenience and accessibility. However, any act of selection is always an artificial act “for you break off a piece of the world that is normally integrated” (Bogden & Biklen, 1992, p.63). The school in which the study was conducted has a student population of about 550 from Junior Kindergarten to grade 8. It is in a suburban, economically diverse area drawing from subsidized housing units, middle income housing, and one of the more exclusive residential areas of the city as well. The majority of the staff members have been at the school a number of years and many are
nearing retirement. It is also the school at which I teach along with the other participants.

Participants and Researcher

As researcher, I became the primary data-collection tool. This necessitated a transformation in my role as fellow staff-member to that of researcher. I strove to eliminate a teacher’s tendency to give advice and attempted to maintain my role as colearner. This stance was especially difficult to maintain with the beginning teacher who viewed me as the expert. I actively reminded the participants that they had inherent power in the relationship. Meeting times were scheduled at the participants’ convenience, for example, but they also determined what and how much they shared with me. Every participant on at least one occasion questioned if he/she was doing what I expected of them. My response was that I wanted to hear whatever they felt was important for me to hear in order that I might understand their experience with the coaching.

I endeavoured to make the coaching relationship fully cooperative: a colearning approach where knowledge is mutually constructed (Bogden & Biklen, 1992). Throughout the process, I was aware that the primary beneficiary of this research was me. It was through the involvement of these participants that I was able to work toward fulfilling the requirements
for this thesis and, ultimately, my degree. However each participant thanked me for the opportunity to have participated in the study as all of them felt that they had grown professionally because of the cognitive coaching. The method of giving back data and analysis to the participants, as will be described, is usually considered only as a means of improving validity. However I also found it useful in building trust about the process to establish that there were no hidden agendas. Participants also all expressed a desire to see the finished product which I shall distribute to them.

The teachers were selected for coaching because of their openness to new ideas, their interest in improving professionally and the fact that two out of the three had already established a trusting relationship with the researcher. Two of the teachers have been on staff with the researcher for 5 years and they have both been teaching for approximately 10 years. One is a primary teacher (female), the other junior (male). We have a good, professional relationship and discuss pedagogy fairly regularly. The third teacher is new to the staff and in her first year teaching French as a Second Language (FSL) at the Intermediate level. I approached her after her being at the school for only 2 weeks. She took a leap of faith and agreed to participate despite the fact that we had no relationship previous to the
coaching beginning. A more detailed profile of each participant is presented in Chapter Five. Anonymity of participants was protected through the use of alphabet letters instead of names and the school was not named.

Because I was the primary research instrument, the study’s quality was closely connected to my competence as researcher. The qualities of being a “good” qualitative researcher are: creativity and a tolerance for ambiguity; sensitivity to context, variables; a keen sense of timing; sensitivity in “reading” the data; and communication skills such as empathy, establishing rapport, questioning and listening, and ability to foster trust (Merriam, 1988). Many of these skills I had learned and practiced as part of my 5-day training in cognitive coaching described in Chapter Four in detail. I attempted to remain aware of these personal and professional attributes and to build on them through ongoing reflection in order to maximize my abilities as a coach.

Instrumentation

In order to meet the study’s aims I selected methods within the limitations of time and finances. These design decisions were made prior to entry to the field. The data collection methods employed three traditional qualitative approaches appropriate in interpretive research: interview,
observation (data collection) and document review (journal). I assumed the role of observer-participant, recording the teachers’ reactions to the coaching process as well as my own, as these reflections add a further dimension to the data collection.

Interview

Interviews with participants formed the dominant data collection strategy. The first interview aimed to establish a base line before coaching started, the second at the end of eight coaching cycles to discern growth, and the third 2 months later to determine retention. The conversations were structured to ascertain the participants’ knowledge and use of the four stages of instructional thought as well as their level of holonomy.

The questions used for the pre- and posttest knowledge of thought processes were:

1) Describe the process of how you plan a lesson. What things do you consider?

2) Do lessons always go as you planned?

3) After a lesson, what kind of self-assessment do you engage in?

These questions were field-tested beforehand to test their clarity, and revised as needed. Teacher responses are categorized according to the level of use of the planning, strategies, assessment and reflective process
map. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) developed by Loucks at the University of Texas, proposes two continuums along which persons grow as they familiarize themselves with an innovation. These two dimensions are Stages of Concern about the Innovation (SoC) and Levels of Use of the Innovation (LoU). The latter (LoU) describes the behavior of persons as they become increasingly skilled in using an innovation.

There are eight identified levels of use ranging from 0 to VI, and seven categories of use. The levels of use are as follows: nonuse, orientation, preparation, mechanical use, routine, refinement, integration, and renewal. The categories of use are knowledge, acquiring information, sharing, assessing, planning, status reporting, and performing. (see Appendix D). Each level is characteristic of certain behavior expressed by the innovation user.

To measure a person’s LoU, a focused interview using a series of specific questions, was used. This has been found to be an effective data gathering system but, as a 3 day training program is recommended to learn how to administer these questions, I decided to modify the Levels of Use to become growth indicators for the four types of instructional thought. This format best enabled me to reduce the data for easy visual reference and from the responses to questions in the initial interview, observations,
and journal reflections, I could assign a LoU of the planning and reflection map which would be adequate for the purposes of this case study. Interviews were conducted either in the participants’ classrooms or another area of the school where we could talk undisturbed.

The teacher/participants were also asked:

1) How many times during a week would you estimate that you dialogue with another staff member about pedagogy? Give examples if possible.

2) What can you tell me about peer coaching?

3) If someone asked you about pursuing teaching as a career what would you tell them?

4) Complete the Osgood Semantic Differential for Other Teachers (see Appendix D).

As well as these three assessment interviews for the levels of use, there were prelesson interviews and postobservation interviews for each of the eight coaching cycles. The prelesson conference asked the participants what the student learnings/objectives were for the lesson, what strategies would be used to meet those outcomes, what measures of success would be used to ascertain if the learnings were acquired, and what data I (the observer) could collect for them. At the postconference (reflection), the
teachers were asked what their impressions were of how the lesson went, what they had observed that led to that impression, data shared, what they had learned, what they would do differently because of the learning, and what feedback they could offer on the effectiveness of the coaching.

After the fourth coaching cycle with the first participant, all conversations were audio-taped. Tapes were labeled and were of generally good quality; all conversations were audible. Transcripts of participants' comments are reported verbatim in Chapter Five. I attempted to record significant nonverbal behaviour, and writeups of the first or second coaching cycle (including pre-, observation and postconference) were returned to the participants to check for accuracy and to further clarify my purpose. These were returned with no amendments requested but with comments of how interesting they were finding the process which resulted in an increase in trust and commitment to the project.

Observation

Observations occurred for each of the eight coaching cycles with each participant. Each observation was predicated by the preconference and was only discussed at the reflection conference. I thought it might be awkward during the first observations for the participants as observation is so closely linked to evaluation in teaching, but was surprised how
disconcerting all of them found the experience until they fully understood that I was not in any way evaluating them. I had to continually reassure them that I was there as a coresearcher with them, but it wasn’t until they had seen a writeup of a coaching cycle and experienced the nonjudgmental guiding questions of four or five coaching sessions that they felt completely comfortable with the observation. I attempted to give as descriptive an account as possible of the observed lesson as it formed the foundation of our discussions, as well as trying to remain as unobtrusive as possible during the lesson so as not to interfere with the normal operation of the class. Bogden and Biklen (1992) emphasized the point of context well: “To divorce the act, word, or gesture from its context is, for the qualitative researcher, to lose sight of significance” (p. 30).

Document Review (Journal)

The participants’ journals were a relevant data collection strategy to share information that they were reluctant to relate verbally. It also allowed the participants to further reflect on our discussions and record at a later time when I was not available, thoughts that had occurred to them. These journal entries are recorded verbatim at the end of each coaching cycle. However these reflections were not shared with me until the eight cycles were completed, except for the second participant who showed it
half way through the eight cycles, asking if it was what I wanted. As a common starting point I shared with the participants a one-page synopsis of the purpose of journaling from the Cognitive Coaching training manual (see Appendix D).

I also kept a diary to record my reflections after each coaching cycle around growth in the planning, reflective processes map and the coaching process itself. This was recorded at the end of each coaching cycle. As the researcher is present throughout the research process, I experienced growing self-awareness and self-knowledge. The personal reflections served to recognize my presence and personal changes through the research process. It also helped me to refine and improve my coaching skills. Most coaching cycles were written up as soon as possible following the sessions (usually the same evening or within the next 2 to 3 days) in order that the experience was fresh in my mind.

Analysis Procedures

"Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and other materials that you accumulate to increase your own understanding of them and to enable you to present what you have discovered to others" (Bogden & Biklen, 1992, p.153). Separating data analysis from data collection is somewhat artificial
as our minds constantly process and try to make sense out of the deluge of data as we collect them. We move from the field to the concepts. However although collection and analysis were occurring somewhat simultaneously, the formal process was left until data collection had been completed. This was also because the collection of data and the transcribing of interviews consumed all of my time and energy.

The groundwork for the beginning of my analysis had been established by my methodology before the data collection began. A coding system to guide both my and my participants' thinking had been put in place as a result of the Cognitive Coaching training, which proved to be helpful for preliminary analysis. These are the four stages of instructional thought, their level of holonomy and their level of professional dialogue. As Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest, I will define these words used for this coding to ensure that their meaning is precise and shared.

**Preactive Thought:**

*Planning* - the selection of goals, and student learnings for the lesson.

*Strategies* - how to structure the instructional sequence to obtain those student learnings and modify them when necessary so that all students can meet with success.
Assessment - how to evaluate if the learnings were obtained

Interactive thought - mental functions performed during the teaching act.

Reflective thought - teachers look back to compare, analyze and evaluate the decisions made during the planning and teaching stages.

Projective thought - teachers take what has been learned through reflection and project those learnings to future lessons.

These categories guided as well as formed the instructional base for cognitive coaching. They also formed the basis for the data display in the CBAM LoU charts. These charts help to illustrate possible relationships between codes and to promote insights (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Therefore they were extremely useful in both data reduction and data display. Another strategy was ongoing reflection, self-dialogue, especially at the end of each coaching session and in the process of transcribing.

I began analysis by rereading the transcripts of the interviews, observations and journals. This enabled me to pick out recurrent themes from the entire experience. I marked ideas or themes that were either repeated or unique or that had been indicated by the participant as important. These marked areas of text, using the exact words of the participants if possible, were used to cluster ideas and to look for relationships between variables. I then conducted one more coaching cycle
with each of the participants in order to test my emerging hypothesis as I saw that as a gap in my data collection. I had conducted an interview at the end of 2 months but had not made observations myself. I then checked for frequency of these patterns throughout the study. Next I endeavoured to tie my findings to a conceptual, theoretical framework, to account for the “how” and “why” (Miles & Huberman 1994).

I believe my findings to be plausible given the limitations of this case study (one researcher working in one school), as the participants were from three different divisions and at different levels of professional development. My findings were also based on triangulation of self-report, observation and journaling. However I am also aware of being a lone researcher in the field and the inherent dangers in that (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Reflection on the data and findings was discussed with my advisor and other teachers not involved in the study, but for the most part I was on my own.

Dissemination

The results of this study will be shared with both my superintendent and my principal. My superintendent has indicated that she would also like me to share my findings with other team leaders and administrators of my
board. A journal article could be written as well to add to the body of knowledge about the effectiveness of cognitive coaching.

Possible Implications for Practice

The procedures of this study could be used by schools as an ongoing professional development model. This research would benefit teachers by assisting them in breaking down teacher isolation and learning from each other. Team leaders and administrators could be trained in the techniques of cognitive coaching and improve staff development as well as supervision practices. The federation groups might use this information as part of an inservice program for professional development training and teachers' colleges could use the four thought processes as part of their preservice training programs, as the context of student teaching currently does not encourage critical analysis.

Feasibility

This study was straightforward and appropriate to the educational system of today. It addresses the problems of staff development and uses the resources readily available at the school level—its teachers.

The only financial cost of this study was the training course for $280. My board has agreed to cover the cost of this depending on my sharing of results following my study.
The time factor is the far more difficult one to overcome. Each cycle of coaching requires a preconference (10 - 30 minutes), an observation (40 minutes) and a post-conference (40 minutes) for a total of 90 to 110 minutes per cycle, times eight for the eight coaching cycles required. In order to ameliorate this situation I intend to coach only one teacher at a time, at a rate of one cycle per week, complete the eight cycles and then move on to the next teacher. I will also ask my principal to arrange internal coverage for the postconference for the two of us. That would then obligate the coached teacher to donate only 10 - 30 minutes of his/her time for the preconference, times eight as the observation period involves only my giving of my planning time.

Summary

This qualitative case study, positioned within the interpretive sciences, focused on three teachers and how their experiences with cognitive coaching affected their teaching practices. Three methods of data collection were selected to best facilitate the process of assessing their growth in the four instructional thought processes. The coaching cycle interviews were central, but there were also observations and journaling. Some strategies of analysis were employed throughout the time in the field, but the main process followed data collection. The participants'
experiences of cognitive coaching, their journal entries and my reflections during the process are presented in Chapter Five. From the data sorting and coding emerged a series of recurring themes and a discussion of these is presented in Chapter Six.

Procedures

1. Familiarize myself with theory of Cognitive Coaching
2. Taking training
3. Field testing questions
4. Conduct Level of Use evaluation with Teacher A
5. Begin first coaching cycle
6. Shared the first cycle’s notes to check for verification; then I requested that we wait to the end of the block as I didn’t want her reflections to colour mine.
7. Transcribe tapes after each coaching cycle
8. Add reflections from Teacher A’s journal to my descriptions of coaching cycles
9. Retest questions and evaluate Level of Use with Teacher A
10. Conduct Level of Use interview with Teacher B
11. Begin Coaching cycles with Teacher B
12. Retest questions and evaluate Level of Use with Teacher B
13. Conduct Level of Use interview with Teacher A, after 2 months
14. Conduct Level of Use interview with Teacher C
15. Begin Coaching cycles with Teacher C
16. Retest questions and Level of Use for Teacher C
17. Conduct Level of Use with Teacher B after 2 months
18. Conduct Level of Use with Teacher C
19. Begin analysis of data

20. Engage the three teachers in one more coaching cycle each to
    check hypothesis
CHAPTER FOUR: TRAINING

Introduction

After having read extensively about cognitive coaching, the sound theoretical structure that it is based on as well as the early indications of success where it has been used, I was convinced that this was something which I wanted to learn how to do and engage others in. The readings gave some clues as to the principles and foundations of the training but always stated that actual training in conferencing skills was required. I took this training at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) in Toronto. There was also a 2-day follow-up session offered November 15 and 16, which I participated in. This gave me an opportunity to consolidate and extend my coaching skills.

Outline of the Program: Part 1, Coaching skills.

The training seminar was divided into a 3 day format and facilitated by John Dyer. The topics were:

Day One:

1. Principles of Cognitive Coaching;
2. Building trust;


[Text continues on the next page]
3. Introduction of Conferencing Skills; nonverbal communication, wait time, paraphrasing and skillful questioning;


Day Two: 1. Review of Day One;
2. Paraphrase: use and types;
3. Introduction of Holonomy and the five states of mind;
4. Wait time;
5. Questioning; probing for clarity and specificity;
6. Use of inflection in questioning;
7. Map for Reflecting Conference;
8. Keys to effective listening.

Day Three: 1. Review of Day Two;
2. Types of Feedback;
3. Use of syntax and presuppositions in questioning;

Description of the Sessions

John began Day One with a brief description of himself and how he became involved with cognitive coaching. He then proceeded to get a feel
for where the participants were coming from using "Just Like Me. He then engaged a volunteer in a planning conference as a way of demonstrating what cognitive coaching is. The other participants were to observe his questions and the speaker's responses. During the discussion following he brought out that Cognitive Coaching is nonjudgmental, the use of wait time, paraphrase, body language and questioning as conferencing skills, and that the coach does not give advice; her/his purpose is to clarify the speaker's thinking. The analogy of a stagecoach was used for coaching: a way to convey a colleague from where they are, to where they would like to be.

He proceeded to give a lesson on the importance of trust. He stated that research has found that in times of stress the most important factor that contributes to the regeneration and enthusiasm of staff in an organization is trust. Burnout in an organization is either very high or very low, as it is contagious. It is not related to task but to the climate of relations at work. John added that the problem with trust is that it builds slowly over time yet, it can be lost in an instant; and once it's gone, it is very difficult to rebuild. He described the conditions that trust can be built on:

1. Openness, a willingness to share;

2. Ownership, taking responsibility for your actions;
3. Risk taking;

4. Humour.

In schools that show a high level of trust researchers found that the administrator: is a person first and a role second, is nonmanipulative, and takes responsibility for his/her actions. John also suggested that there was a taxonomy of trust beginning with awareness, then understanding, acceptance and finally trust. He emphasized that we must trust ourselves, each other, the process and the environment as no learning can take place until trust is established.

As coaches we need to align ourselves with the speaker’s nonverbal actions using posture, gesture, tonality, language and breathing to create rapport. After an activity to illustrate this point, we debriefed as a group about the power of nonverbal actions on our behavior.

We then developed questions around the three concepts in lesson planning (goals, strategies and measures of success), that could be used in a planning conference, and practised them with a partner.

Day Two started at 8:30 a.m. with a review of the previous day’s activities. Using the conference skills from the day before of matching nonverbal behaviors for rapport, wait time, paraphrasing and probing questioning, we took turns sharing our reflections with a partner.
John then made reference to Mary Bud Rose who found that waiting just 3 seconds, tremendously increases reflection, and thus quality of answers. He also taught a minilesson on the reasons for and importance of paraphrasing. These were listed as: shows and checks understanding, forces listening, paces conversation by giving time to reflect, and is the basis for probing questions.

A paraphrase should be shorter and use different language from the speaker’s. It can be used to label the emotion of the speaker, to restate content or to sum up everything brought forward. Paraphrasing is taking the experience and/or emotions out and labeling them. It is bringing the unconscious to the conscious level for the speaker.

John moved next into the role of a coach as being a mediator to move people from where they are to higher levels of holonomy. On chart paper he pointed out that we want to help people move from powerlessness to efficacy, rigidity to flexibility, adequacy to craftsmanship, unawareness to consciousness, isolation to interdependence. He also pointed out that the states of mind are fairly fluid. Depending on the context you could be at different points on these continuums. You might be at the high end in a school setting and the low end in a hospital operating room.
John introduced us to organizers in order to help us to identify words that need to be questioned for clarity and specificity:

1. universal quantifiers: all, never, always, everyone;
2. modal operators: should, must, can’t, have to;
3. unspecified verbs: think, do, feel, know;
4. unspecified nouns: they, people, students;
5. comparators: better, larger, less useful.

John next taught a minilesson on the power of inflection in questioning. He cited William Condon as saying that 65 percent of what we communicate is done nonverbally; what we’re thinking shows!

John presented us with the outline or map to the reflecting conference. He stressed that this is not a recipe to be followed rigidly but only a guide.

Impressions: How do you feel about the lesson?

Observations: What did you observe that gives you that impression?

Compare: How did it go, compared to how you planned it?

Cause and Effect: What did or didn’t work?

Learnings: What insights have you gained?

Applications: How can you use this in the future?
He asked for a volunteer with whom he could demonstrate a reflecting conference. We observed his conferencing skills of matching for rapport, wait time, paraphrase and skillful questioning to move through the reflecting map. This conference was accomplished in 12 minutes. In the debriefing that followed some participants were concerned that the conference seemed clinical as John had put nothing of himself into the conversation. He spoke only to paraphrase and question for either clarity or to continue to move the volunteer through the reflective map. Others felt that it had been a masterful example of helping someone to mediate their thinking.

John summarized the discussion by saying that the coach is there for the speaker, not to tell his/her story. That is what happens in social conversations all the time. Someone says something which triggers a thought or memory in us which we then can hardly wait to share with them. The coach must suppress those personal thoughts and focus completely on the speaker. The coach is also not there to listen voyeuristically or to give solutions. One does not need to know all the details in a coaching situation but to get at the core of what is being said, paraphrase and deepen their reflection, through skillful questioning. We
were invited to practise this with a partner and to plan a lesson which we would use for a preconference, observation and reflective conference.

Day Three started with a reflective conference on the previous day’s learnings. With a partner, we practiced the skills of matching nonverbal behaviors for rapport, wait time, paraphrase and questioning to guide them through the reflective map. Following this John asked us to observe the lesson which he was about to teach on how stress affects your brain, taking note of how he might improve it. After his 5-minute lesson, he invited feedback and recorded the comments on five different pieces of chart paper using five different colours of magic markers. When there was a fair number of comments on each of the five pieces of chart paper, he invited us to discuss with the person beside us what criteria he was using to classify the feedback. It was agreed that the five types of feedback were:

1. evaluative, judgmental (should have statements);
2. personal response (I liked, I didn’t like);
3. cause and effect (the three positions made it easy to understand);
4. factual, observations (lesson took 5 minutes);
5. reflective questions (how did you feel about the lesson?).
The first three types of feedback have more to do with the observer than with the teacher, and are therefore external. They limit or close down and in no way stretch the teacher’s thinking. The last two types are centered on the teacher, or are internal. They extend thinking and invite the teacher to analyze and make deductions and come to solutions for him/herself.

John talked about how good questions are a result of correct use of syntax. “When? Who? Where? What?” type questions recall data; “What do you think?” requires inference and analysis while, “What if? and how?” type questions require exploring, hypothesizing, etc.; in other words higher level thinking. With our partner we practiced framing good questions that would extend thinking. John suggested that we use two filters for our questions: can they be answered in one word? And try to reframe, rephrase any “why” question as it might imply a negative judgment. John proceeded to warn us about negative presuppositions in our questions. He informed us that in a recent issue of the Journal for Staff Development, Showers and Joyce (1996) had dropped feedback as one of the steps in implementation because without the training to refrain from the judgmental, personal response feedback, it makes no difference or is, in fact, destructive of trust.
We then returned to our home groups for the coaching cycle. With a partner we took turns coaching one another through the preconference for our minilessons on the five states of mind. We taught our lessons, then engaged each other in a reflective conference.

This session was terminated with a decision to have a 2-day follow-up session in November to further refine our coaching skills. Good-byes and thank yous were finished at 1:15 p.m.

**Major Learnings**

The major learnings for me during this training session can be grouped into three general categories: conferencing skills, modifying of established social interactive norms in the coaching situation, and the maps for both the planning and reflective conferences. The conferencing skills of matching nonverbal behaviors for rapport, the use of wait time and paraphrasing, as well as the power of skillful questioning to promote higher level thinking, were both demonstrated and practised.

I also discovered that paraphrase is extremely helpful in clarifying and organizing one’s thinking to get at the core message of what someone is saying, and is something that needs to be practised. I realized that paraphrase gives the time to slow down the flow of information in order to process the information in a more coherent fashion.
With questioning, the flagging of certain words and phrases that need probing and clarifying, I found very useful. It also is important to avoid in the coaching situation tendencies which we have used in our social interactions for probably as long as we can remember. We must suppress our own stories in order to fully focus on what the speaker is saying. Listen to hear, not to speak. We also have tended to want to give solutions to people, to be helpful, calling it constructive criticism. What I realized during this training is that this kind of help is disempowering. It creates dependency as the observer/coach is the problem solver, which sends the hidden message to the teacher that he/she is incapable of doing it him/herself. Even positive evaluative type statements while nice, do not challenge us to grow and improve, and if the receiver of the compliment disagrees with the observer/giver of the compliment, the observer then loses credibility with the person.

It is also difficult to suppress the "I" statements that we are so used to giving when we observe an event. These reactions are similar to the personal stories triggered by dialogue with another person. As a coach we must suppress these as they have more to do with the observer/coach than with the teacher. It takes more effort and control on the part of the coach to ask reflective questions, yet these are the most valuable to the person.
and are the only type of feedback that will extend that person’s thinking for continued professional growth.

Assessment of the Program

I went into the training session feeling extremely unprepared to engage in cognitive coaching despite my reading of and agreement with the theoretical framework for it. I had said that I would engage other teachers in the coaching process, yet felt that I did not have the skills necessary to do that. I was concerned that the 3-day workshop might be a repetition of the background and rationale for cognitive coaching instead of the “how to”.

My fears were unfounded. From the moment John Dyer chose to do a demonstration of cognitive coaching rather than give a lengthy definition, I realized that this was going to be a hands-on, interactive workshop. I found his techniques of making us move around and interact with different participants greatly extended the richness of the experience as we were tapping into the wealth of life-experiences and talents of all with whom we had a chance to interact.

His use of humour and trust-building activities had a profound effect on the participants’ level of openness and comfort level. Indeed the power of effective listening, or conferencing skills if you will, I found to be
profound. As I engaged different people in it, I was amazed at what they were willing to share and how they seemed to welcome the opportunity to speak in depth about something that they were interested in. In debriefing with them afterwards, they all said that it had clarified their thinking and had stimulated other ideas that they might not have otherwise thought of.

As we had so many opportunities to practise the skills that were being presented I felt comfortable and able to undertake cognitive coaching. The training made me aware of the pitfalls of social interactive norms in the coaching setting and I was pleased that I had an emerging set of skills which would help me put theory into practice. As a woman who sat beside me said,

This training gave me a set of skills to deal with new ideas that teachers in my department propose. I found these ideas stressful as I could see problems, yet they were gung-ho to implement. I realize now that I saw myself as the problem solver. I was doing all the thinking. I am now going to engage them in a planning conference and let them do the thinking.

Outline of the Program: Part 2

This follow-up training was divided into a 2-day focus session and was again facilitated by John Dyer, November 15 and 16, 1996.
The topics were:

Day One: 1. Overview of Summer Institute;

2. Demonstrating and Practice of Reflective Conference;

3. Behavioral Manifestations of Internal Response States (BMIRS);

4. Review of the 5 states of mind of Holonomous behaviour.

Day Two: 1. Review of previous day;

2. Demonstrate and practice of Pace and Lead as a way to facilitate problem solving.

Description of the Sessions

John Dyer gave a brief overview of what had been touched on during the summer with the help of chart paper highlighting the key concepts on the wall. He also emphasized that mediation is like helping someone to turn a flashlight on areas of thought of which they were previously unaware.

Following this, John reviewed the steps of the reflection conference: Impressions, Observations, Compare, Cause and Effect, Learnings, Applications. He underlined that we must have a “no fix” attitude, that we must put aside our natural tendency to give advice in
order to coach. He asked for a volunteer to demonstrate a reflection conference with him.

John clarified by explaining that coaching started as an alternative form of supervision. Costa & Garmston (1994) discovered that comparing teachers to best practice and telling them about it didn’t result in any change in practices. They realized that teaching is contextual, therefore the teacher’s decision-making processes before and after the teaching act are critical in changing practice. Professional dialogue can be supportive of the teacher’s thinking, as people don’t change their practices unless they want to.

He also clarified that we can play many different roles as appropriate. We can be a colleague, coach, friend, counselor, evaluator, administrator, expert, consultant or advisor. Evaluator and coach are the only two roles that don’t mix. Ideally you should inform or ask the person’s permission when you want to change your role. As a coach you don’t listen to solution-give, to tell autobiographical information, or voyeuristically. Coaching is about relationships first and thinking second, for if you don’t have trust and rapport no productive thinking can take place.
John opened the afternoon by telling us that we were going to be looking at cognitive shifts: how do you do it? And how do you know that it has occurred? He again asked for a volunteer. What he drew out was that with each shift in type of question there was a corresponding shift in body language. He called these Behavioral Manifestations of Internal Response States or BMIRS (pronounced beémirs). BMIRS can be changes in eye movement, breathing, expression, gesture, verbal cues (i.e., “let me think…”) or a burst of laughter which indicates a rapid cognitive shift.

With our partner we took turns being speaker and coach, with the role of the coach being to structure questions in order to cause and observe BMIRS. We analyzed this activity afterwards, both with our partner and as a group, the consensus being that all were amazed at how obvious BMIRS are once you are aware of them.

John next gave a brief definition for each of the five states of mind for holonomous behaviour. He reminded us that these states of mind are transitory, we continuously are moving up and down the continuum and that they can be changed either externally or internally. They are transforming as they can change our abilities and they are transformable as we can influence each other by our coaching skills.
Day two started with John giving a brief description of pace and lead as assessing where a person is and envisioning where he/she would like to be. Therefore, what are my strategies to help them move through this?

He asked for a volunteer that he could engage in a pace and lead demonstration. The participants were asked to observe BMIRS and how his questions were leading the speaker from the existing to the desired state. This demonstration was then discussed, tying in the relationship between BMIRS and cognitive shifts. John also pointed out how his questions had been related to the five states of mind, trying to move the speaker to higher levels. He drew out that there are four parts to the pace:

1. emotional empathy: label the emotion and match body language
2. restate the content: paraphrase;
3. goal statement: what they want;
4. transition to the lead.

Rapport and paraphrase are the only tools used in this section as the speaker has all the information. He cautioned us that when we get to goal statement we should ensure that it is:

1. Stated in the positive;
2. Broad in perspective;

3. A destination (noun) not a journey (verb);

4. Not a third party goal (needs to be what the speaker has control over);

5. Does not contain a solution.

In other words, the pace describes the existing state and determines what the ideal state is, and the lead, through questioning the use of the five states of mind, assists the speaker in how they are going to move to their ideal state (solve their problem). The participants were then asked to practise pace and lead with a partner.

**Major Learnings**

The major learning for me in this follow-up workshop were that being a highly skilled, effective coach looks easy but there are a multitude of skills and strategies below the surface. Just when I was at the point of being comfortable with the planning and reflection conferences, the review reminded me that there are areas which I need to improve yet and an entirely new skill set (the pace and lead) which I need to implement.

For the reflection conference the review reminded me that I need to probe the teacher further to get more observations from them, rather than
handing mine over. I also realized that I need to include more comparison questions (how did the lesson go compared to how you thought it would?) as well as more cause and effect questions (what did you do that led to...etc.)

I can also see now how Costa & Garmston developed cognitive coaching out of the clinical supervision model. The planning, observation and reflection conference is what is left of that, minus the judgmental summative statements. The pace and lead is a problem-solving strategy that the coach can use in either the planning or the reflection conference as necessary to assist the teacher. It focuses the teacher’s thinking on his/her ability to draw on the five states of mind to solve his/her problems. These states of mind are recognized as characteristics of highly effective people by such business gurus as Steven Covey and Peter Senge, but cognitive coaching is unique in that it is a strategy with which one can increase these states of mind through guided dialogue with a skilled colleague.

Assessment of the Follow-Up Training

The first day, except for the BMIRS, had basically been a review of the material from the summer. The second day however was entirely new and somewhat overwhelming because of information overload. I found
however by the last practice at the end of the day, I felt that I had enough information and practice to start incorporating it in my coaching cycles.
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS

Field Test of Questions

After field testing the proposed Level of Use questions with a teacher not involved in the study, I decided to combine questions #1 and #2 into one question and drop the time element as I deemed this to be irrelevant. It is the quality not the quantity of planning that I am interested in. The assessment question I changed to self-assessment as the teacher assumed as soon as I mentioned assessment that I was referring to student assessment. I also decided not to use the rating scale of rarely, sometimes or frequently for the dialogue with other teachers per week as this might give a negative presupposition. The other questions and Osgood’s Semantic Differential worked about as I had planned so I left them unchanged.

Teacher A

Level of Use Evaluation Before Coaching, Teacher A, Tuesday, September 17, 1996, 8:00 a.m.

This teacher has taught primary for 10 years. She is the Primary Team Leader and is enrolled in a Master’s of Education course. She has also given workshops on professional development days for other teachers in the board for her exemplary practices in language arts.
Questions and Responses

1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson. What things do you consider?

I check the teacher’s manual for strategy and objectives. Then I mentally visualize how the lesson would flow to see students’ reactions and I make adjustments according to how I see it flowing. The objectives and strategies also depend on the amount of time that I have to teach it plus when it is in the day. Primary kids are fresher in the morning. I try to keep instructional time to a minimum so they can explore and discover. If a lesson is rolling on I like to continue with the flow.

2. Do lessons always go as you planned?

No! There might be interruptions such as announcements or visitors. I also gauge the reaction of the kids by the look on their faces, whether they’re with me or not. Another idea might occur to me during the lesson and I’ll change my plans or the kids sometimes come up with a better idea. I go with what’s important to the students.

3. After a lesson what kind of self-assessment do you engage in?

I feel good if the students can follow the directions. I am unhappy if they can’t follow directions. If this is the case, I pitch the lesson
entirely if it is not important. If it is a central concept that I was trying to teach I will come back to it and teach it a different way.

4. How many times a week would you estimate that you dialogue with another staff member about pedagogy?

Once or twice a week formally to plan language arts theme units with other primary team members but almost never informally in the staff room or the hall. I meet a teacher outside of school on our own time who used to be a consultant. She is knowledgeable and I bounce ideas off her. We talk about new programs and courses we’re taking.

5. What can you tell me about peer coaching?

It is a mentoring process where you meet with the coach and work together. It is a collaborative approach and I feel that it is generally a positive approach.

6. If someone asked you about pursuing teaching as a career, what would you tell them?

That it is the best job. Do it, even if there aren’t any jobs now. Do what you love to do.

Evaluation

For the planning model, the teacher appears to be at Level IV B Refinement level of the Level of Use chart for goals and strategies. “I
make adjustments (to the suggested strategies) according to how I see it flowing.” She seems to be in the process of being compelled to move into Level V Integration by circumstances more than by choice as she was assigned three Primary Team Members to work with her class.

However for the indicators of success, she seems to base these on informal observations of whether the students are able to follow directions. When asked how she would know if the goals of the lesson had been met, she looked surprised then replied “If they are able to follow directions.” Therefore I would rate her at Level III Mechanical for this aspect of the planning map.

For the reflective map she is basically unaware, Level 0 Non-use, on the LoU Chart. When asked what self-assessment she engaged in after a lesson she replied that if it had gone well she was happy, if it hadn’t, she pitched it. She has therefore not moved beyond the Impressions level of the Reflection map. She appears from the answers given today, to not be analyzing why something did or did not work and thereby can not apply that learning to future lessons (See appendix A for LoU Chart).

She indicated that she was enthusiastic about the process as she feels that she has had no real feedback about her teaching since
Teacher’s College. She views the supervision process as an evaluation tool (good job/bad job) which has been her experience, not as an opportunity for professional growth. It should also be noted that the quotations from the teacher’s journal were added only after the eight coaching cycles were completed.

Coaching Cycle 1, Wednesday, September 18, 1996

Planning Conference 8:00 - 8:40 a.m.

When asked what she was going to do in this lesson the teacher shared her strategies, then, through the use of clarifying questions, her goals. These were as follows:

Goals: 1. Review of alphabet

2. Letter recognition at the beginning of words

3. Enjoyment of books

Strategy: Create a class alphabet book where the teacher writes the letter and then the words which the children suggest beginning with each letter of the alphabet. Different children are then assigned to draw the word chosen for the different letters.

After some clarifying and probing questions the teacher decided that her measures for success would be:
1. If they have been paying attention students will be able to draw their assigned pictures.

2. They can repeat the word for the letter before they start to draw it.

3. They reach for the class alphabet book to look at during free time.

Data Collection: As the teacher deemed on-task behaviour as central for the learnings to take place I suggested that every 30 seconds I could count students who were not on task. On-task behaviour was described as looking at the teacher and/or volunteering possible words for the letters. The teacher then divulged that this has been a concern for her. Only the second week into Grade 1, another teacher comes into the room every day at language arts time and takes half the class to do another activity in the same room. She confided that she felt the noise level and activity in the other half of the room was distracting for her group and would hinder their on-task behaviour. We concluded by agreeing that I would observe their on-task behaviour every 30 seconds and give her the results at the reflecting conference.
Observation Cycle 1, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.

Every 30 seconds, the number of students not on task was recorded. Over a 30 minute period all students were on task half of the time and averaged only 2.1 children off task the rest of the time. (The detailed description of all lessons observed for Teacher A are found in Appendix A)

Reflection Conference, 2:30-3:05 p.m.

When I asked how she felt, she admitted to finding it stressful being observed even though she knew me and felt comfortable with me. For the lesson, she was not very happy with it because she thought that the noise level from the other group made it difficult to hear although she was pleased with the words that they were able to come up with. She believed this had happened because this group was stronger than the other half of the class and that it was the second time she had taught it. The first time she had assigned the letter immediately after they had come up with a word. Therefore if the child forgot the word the other children working beside him/her could not help as they had not been there to hear the word. The advantage of going through all the letters first was then the students could be a resource for each other.
I then shared the data that I had collected. She was surprised to see that during the time when the noise from the other group was the loudest (and the most distracting to her) the students were almost all on task.

What she felt she learned from this experience was that sharing the classroom with another teacher and the incumbent noise level is a problem more for the teacher than the students. She had worried that the noise level was obstructing the children’s learning and was surprised to find that that was not the case. “I would never have learned that on my own.”

Because of this learning, she is going to try to adjust to the noise level. “This is not the way that I was trained to teach, a fragmented day with four different teachers coming in and out at different times. Maybe it’s a bigger adjustment for me than for the kids.” She has also devised a strategy of a family tree to try to familiarize the students with the five teachers they see every day. She felt that even though the observation had been uncomfortable for her it had been beneficial, believing that one needs to take a risk in order to learn. However she confided that she never would have taken that risk with an administrator, as that is so closely tied to judgment and evaluation. She commented in her journal, “I found this to be a very valuable experience. While I felt anxious being observed, I feel I
grew and learned more about the teaching and learning dynamics in my classroom."

What I neglected to ask her was what she believed that she had done to contribute to students' on-task behaviour despite the noise. I also had not asked her for feedback about my role as coach as she had mentioned after one of my questions how good I was at this and that I was so professional. She also mentioned that the preconference had helped to clarify her thinking about the lesson. I also found it difficult to refrain from advice-giving. I believe that if the two teachers worked more closely together they might be able to eliminate some of their problems. However I remembered that advice-giving, no matter how well intentioned, shuts down thinking instead of stimulating it.

Coaching Cycle 2 Wednesday, September 25

Planning conference, 8:00 - 8:40 a.m.

At this meeting, the teacher was fairly well prepared and was able to list the student goals readily. They were:

1. Visual and pattern clues can be used to decode text
2. Build confidence in their ability to read
3. Build classroom routines
4. Try to reduce teacher talk
This last goal developed out of an experience the teacher had with a science unit. All the evaluation suggested in the unit was observational. From a previous Master’s of Education course, she had started asking students what they had learned instead of focusing only on the activity. She had taught the unit according to the suggested strategies and from her observations felt that they had understood the main concepts. When students were asked individually about what they had learned, she was surprised to discover that some strong students had not acquired any of the key concepts while some weaker students had. She realized that her observations might not be as reliable an indicator as she had believed to evaluate student learning. Consequently she wants to reduce teacher talk so she can listen more to the students. “I’m so busy trying to instill routines that I’m not listening to them enough.”

Strategies: Patterned reading of a poem. Writing in a book with a cloze type activity for the poem about apples, substituting similar words after rote repetition with the teacher. Poem printed on chart paper with substitution words on cards that students can take to desk to copy. Taste test of apples to follow activity to decide which type of apple they like the best.

Success: 1. If the students can read the poem back
2. If they can follow the directions

3. Do they know where to go to get help?

4. Do the students talk more than the teacher?

Data: The teacher had decided before the conference to ask me to observe the ratio of teacher-to-student talk. I suggested that every 15 seconds I check off who is talking.

**Observation, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.**

Every 15 seconds, I checked who was talking, totaling 32 teacher talk to 46 student talk after 30 minutes.

**Reflection Conference, 2:45-3:05 p.m.**

The teacher felt that the lesson had gone well. The students had identified the colour words and the children were helping each other. For the goal of reduced teacher talk I shared the data with her and she felt that was about the ratio she expected for this time of year (September). She expects that as the students become more familiar with the routines she will be able to reduce her talk even more.

When asked what actions or decisions she believed resulted in these desired behaviours she explained that she always encourages participation. She doesn’t like to dampen their enthusiasm and even if a child blurts out an answer she will gently remind them of the routine (raising one’s hand)
but will still accept the idea. She also does not believe in a pin-quiet classroom, but that they need to talk and idea-share, as long as it is on task. She avoids sarcasm and raising her voice as she wants to create a warm, positive classroom environment where ideas are accepted and shared.

She said that she felt comfortable with the observation this time and felt more prepared for it. She knew the routine and what questions to expect and was curious about the ratio of teacher-to-student talk. She recorded in her journal, “I find this process very worthwhile.” I on the other hand felt less effective. I was pleased to discover at the planning conference that she had indeed anticipated my questions and had chosen a focus for observation. However for the reflective conference I was 15 minutes late because of a serious behaviour problem with a student. Because of this I found it difficult to clarify my thoughts and completely focus on her answers or use paraphrasing effectively. I also neglected to probe for applications of her desire to increase student talk. Did she have some strategies in mind to accomplish this?

Coaching Cycle 3, Wednesday, October 3 1996

Planning Conference, 8:00 - 8:40 a.m.

The teacher started this planning conference by stating that she is finding the coaching difficult as she feels somewhat rushed then to start her
day and informed me that she had written that in her journal. She also told me that she had arrived at school at 7:30 a.m. to do some things that needed to be done before she met with me. I paraphrased and empathized with these sentiments. After chatting informally for a few minutes about the pressures of time at work I asked her what she was planning for the lesson I was to observe. Because of a scheduling difficulty I was not going to see a language arts lesson with 16 students as previously, but a religion lesson with the entire group of 33 students at 1:30 p.m.

Author Comment (AC): When this problem originally arose the day before, she asked if I wanted to skip this week’s cycle. I responded that I would prefer not to and she agreed. It should also be noted that we had a staff meeting until 5:00 p.m. the previous day, she had a course that evening and curriculum night is the following evening.

She responded to my question by describing the activity. “They are going to draw their family on a ray of sunshine to make a classroom sun, to represent that we are God’s family.”

AC: This is the third time that the teacher has responded to my question about what she is going to do by describing the activity. Perhaps the phrasing of my question (do) is leading her toward the
activity. Next time I will ask, “What are your goals for this lesson?”

I rephrase the question and ask what the goals are. She replies that the theme is family and the lesson is to foster the idea that they are part of their own family, the school’s family and God’s family.

When I asked how she would know if the lesson was successful, she replied if students can draw pictures of their families and identify them.

AC: I should have probed further as this measure of success measures the success of the strategy, not the goal, “to value that we are part of one family.”

I then asked how she would measure how effective she was in the lesson. She replied that sometimes children in Grade 1 have a difficult time with *immediate* family, especially if their parents are divorced. She instructs them to draw only the people who live in the house with them except, if they have a parent who doesn’t, they can include them. I asked her about what she wanted me to watch for in the lesson. She wanted to know if I had any strategies on how to be a more reflective teacher. She told me of an incident the previous day where she had asked a student to put away her drawing to go to the next activity. The student complained that she never had time to finish anything. This was a red flag for the
teacher that perhaps the students were feeling stressed because of the constant breaks in their day as five teachers float through it. The teacher described it as rotary for Grade 1, too much directed activity and not enough self-directed activity time. She discussed this with the teacher that she shares the classroom with and the reading/writing program. Her partner found the present situation of breaking the class in two stressful as well, and agreed that the students should have more self-directed time. They therefore had decided to start on the following Monday that the class would be divided into three groups, reading, writing and an activity centre related to their language arts theme.

**AC:** I was surprised that she was asking me for a reflective model when in fact she was using the cognitive coaching reflection model intuitively.

**Impressions:** She was unhappy with the way the L.A. program was working because of the way staffing had been arranged (3 different Primary Team Members working with her) but she also realized that she had no control over this.

**Data supporting this impression:** Student expressing frustration at the breaks in the day, teaching partner frustrated as well.
Planned decisions: Had excluded activity time from their busy schedule; maybe they were pushing the students too hard?

Results of this decision: Students who are not as ready for the academic program are feeling frustrated.

Application of learnings: Modify the LA program to include activity time.

I went over this with her: that she was in fact reflecting and self-modifying. This seemed to please her. She added that when she started teaching she used to spend a lot of time making and laminating beautiful activity cards, but now she feels that is a waste of time. Every group of children is different and she does things a little differently each year to meet their individual needs. She also stated that she had taken a course with Dr. John Novak on invitational learning and that it is something which she has an interest in, how to foster a warm and accepting classroom climate.

I suggested that during the religion class I could interview students individually to discover the extent of the frustration level in the class and report back to her at the reflection conference. She felt that was a good idea as she felt if she asked them, they might not be honest with her as they wouldn't want to hurt her feelings.
Observation, 1:30-2:10 p.m.

All 19 students interviewed were enjoying Gr. 1, yet 9 mentioned some level of frustration with directed activities.

Reflection Conference, 2:30 to 3:10 p.m.

When asked what her impressions were of the lesson she felt that it had gone along as she had planned and that students were able to draw their immediate family easily. She also said that they had enjoyed coming over and talking with me as it had made them feel important.

I shared the data that I had collected from the students. She was pleased that out of the 19 children interviewed not one had a negative comment about Grade 1 in general. She also felt that her impressions had been confirmed: 12 out of the 19 listed self-directed time as what they liked best about school. She feels confident now moving ahead with this new plan of action. She stated that she is going to have to team-teach more and is meeting her LA teaching partner to plan the new activity centre. She says that she misses the quiet time to herself with a class when she could go with the flow. With the timetabling structure of the Primary Team Members (PTM) she feels that she’s losing the spontaneity in her teaching which she enjoyed.
When asked about her thoughts on the coaching this time, she said that it honestly was another stress on her. She says that she is finding more and more is being demanded of teachers and her time keeps getting eaten away. She said this while rushing back to her classroom to dismiss her class as the bell was ringing.

AC: Next week I need to ensure that we conclude the reflection conference 5 minutes before the end of school to give her time to dismiss her class comfortably. Is coaching fatigue setting in? I also plan to give her a copy of the reflection conference questions so she can follow the format with me as we go through it. I will also use the format terms with her at the planning conference of goals, strategies, success and data collection.

Coaching Cycle 4, Thursday, October 10, 1996.

Planning Conference, 8:15 a.m.

We had had to change our coaching day from Wednesday to Thursday because of a field trip the teacher was taking on the Wednesday to the pumpkin patch. It had been miserable weather, she arrived late, forgetting that we had planned to meet. She was fighting a cold and admitted that if it had not been the last school day before the Thanksgiving weekend she would have called a supply (the Friday was a system-wide PD Day).
I asked her what her goals were for the lesson and she again started by reporting the strategy. One of her Primary Team Members (a half time teacher) was going to teach an introductory 10-minute lesson from the All Star Reading program which she explained was an early intervention program. Then the PTM would take a group and work with them while she supervised a book exchange with the rest and then would conclude with a story about Thanksgiving.

AC: Are teachers used to talking only at the strategy level? Is that why she has responded each time to my question about goals with strategy?

When I probed to ask her for the purpose of this activity she explained that the All Star Reading Program teaches them different strategies that can aid in the decoding of words. For example, today’s story was about using visual cues as well as phonetic ones. She explained that the small group the PTM would be taking, she had identified as high-risk students from observing their journal writing, the ability to identify parts of a book, etc. The PTM then would be able to reinforce with them the targeted strategies for the lesson to encourage them to internalize them.

The purpose of the book exchange was to take a book home and read it every night with their parents. It’s called their snuggle up and read
books. She explained to the parents on curriculum night that research shows that any effective reading program has a home link. She has both the parent and child sign a letter committing to reading a book every night, and if she gets resistance she then asks the parents, whether they are willing to help their child learn how to read. She related that she has had lots of positive feedback about this "quality time" and has ever only had one parent who refused to do it. The books are numerically coded for difficulty, and once they have completed 17 books they receive a certificate which she added serves as an incentive.

The purpose of the Thanksgiving story was to give the students practice in identifying the "problem" in the story as a listening focus and to reinforce the concept that every story has a problem and a resolution. At this point I recalled that last week she had asked me about a reflective model for teachers. I decided to share that the planning conference consisted of goals, strategies and measures of success. Therefore I asked her what her measures of success were going to be for her goals of using visual and phonetic cues as a reading strategy, that books are being read at home and that the students can identify a problem in a story? She replied that for the reading strategies she would observe them in the students' transference of these strategies to their reading in whole or small groups,
for the book exchange the filling up of their recording sheets and their enthusiasm to pick a book, and an observation of their ability to be able to identify the problem in the story.

When asked what data I should collect, she responded that she hadn’t really thought about it. I asked if there was something I should watch related to her measures for success. She said yes, that I could observe for their level of participation and interest as this was a new teaching format. As discussed at last week’s conference, she had changed her way of working with the three PTMs. They now are jointly planning and teaching all the subjects together so that the day is more seamless for the students. She added that she didn’t know what had gone on with the PTM’s teaching of the All Star Reading program before as she had not been there so this was going to be new for her today also. The planning conference finished at 8:35 a.m. with the teacher beginning to cut out construction paper feathers for the turkey activity and saying see you at 11:10 a.m.

An interesting aside: At the morning recess the PTM who is usually in the class when I do my observation at 9:00 a.m. said that she was disappointed that I had missed her turkey story and activity as it is one of her personal favorites. The teacher that I am coaching confided that this PTM had been rather intimidated and nervous about my presence in the
room at first, but that she had been sharing our reflections and insights with her obviously to the point of her now welcoming my presence.

Observation, 11:10 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.

The P.T.M told them about reading strategies and explained to them that it’s like clues to help them to read. She read a book to them and they were to guess the strategy. At 11:25 the P.T.M. finished the book and called her group for the reinforcement activity. The rest of the class stayed on the carpet with the teacher as she released them by groups to select a book. She then read a story and directed them to listen for the problem. As the teacher started the story all eyes of the children on the carpet were on the book, intently focused on listening carefully. After, the problem and solution to the story were identified following a couple of clarifying questions.

I conferenced with the PTM and shared the data with her on the level of participation and interest of the class.

Reflection Conference, 12:25-12:45 p.m.

Before we started I asked for clarification of why the two students (other than the girl with the stomach ache) had been drawing at their desks during story time and why the two others who browsed through the book selection had not participated in the story. She said that as it is at the end
of the morning before lunch she realizes that they are getting tired and some can just not concentrate any more. She prefers that they do something quietly at their desks, or browse through books rather than force them to participate where one then runs the danger of their disturbing others. She added that this is also a strategy to teach self-monitoring, “Do you need to go and sit at your desk?” as well as a way of identifying students who have problems focusing. “I want the learning environment to be relaxed.”

AC: I teach a group of very immature and weak Grade 6 students Math from 1:30 to 2:10 p.m. each day. I’ve noticed three students have a very difficult time focusing. Could I modify this strategy to work effectively with them?

I then asked her how she felt the lesson had gone and she replied very well. She was pleased to see the students clueing into the picture and phonetic strategies and she was also able to observe that she had indeed selected the students for extra work with the PTM from those who were not participating in the whole group lesson. So, she was pleased that these students would be getting the reinforcement after the lesson with the PTM.

She also shared with me how pleased she is with their new teaching strategy. She stated that the dividing and scheduling of the day into
different teacher blocks had been stressful for the children, as their activities were constantly being interrupted, “time to go here, time to do this”, stressful for the teachers, as they weren’t teaching using the strategies of long uninterrupted periods of hands-on activities, and she felt the content was suffering as well. She now believes that they have more time to cover the skills. With the inclusion of the activity centre into their LA cycle, she added the children don’t realize they’re still doing reading and writing as they have one hour now of uninterrupted time. Even if there might be slightly less teacher-directed time, they are getting more covered and the children love it. “When is it going to be activity time?” She said that she is now able to teach more the way she would if it was just her in the classroom. She realized that she had been presented with this situation of working with three PTM’s and that she had to find a way to make it work. She now feels that she has found it.

She added that the other teachers are more relaxed with the new format as well and she felt fortunate that they all have a similar hands-on, activity-based philosophy. The only problem she could see with this new approach is that as they all plan together, and teach different parts of the same lesson, (AC: I suppose it could be likened to different parts of the same body), she hopes that at report card time they can agree upon the evaluation.
The conference ended before I had a chance to ask her if I had been effective, as the end of noon hour was drawing nigh. However, she mentioned as we were collecting our things that she felt that it was fortunate that I was doing this with her at this point of the year as this was a real problem that she needed to work through and not just something trivial. She recorded in her journal, "the reflective process is a valuable experience".

For my own reflections on the process, I felt that I had been helpful in confirming the teacher's observations about the students' interest and participation and had definitely affirmed the PTM whose first year it is teaching primary. After, I realized that I had not shared the reflection questions with her and shall do so next time. I also have decided to tape-record the reflection conference with the teacher's permission for two reasons. I feel that I might be missing important points since I only take minimal notes during the conference as I do not want to break rapport with her nor stop the flow of the conversation. On top of that I believe that it might be a useful strategy for me to improve my questioning skills.

At the halfway point through this coaching block of 8 cycles, I am happy with the planning conference as I feel comfortable with the questions and with probing the teacher in order that she articulates her goals,
strategies and measures of success. With the reflecting conference though, beyond the first questions of how do you feel about the lesson and what did you observe that makes you feel that way, the teacher takes it from there. She talks about what she has observed, finds an explanation related to her decision for what she observed, and comes up with a solution. Should I be asking more probing questions or is she at the self-modifying stage now? Or had she been using this reflective process before but the coaching process has brought it to the surface so that she can use it purposefully instead of intuitively?

Coaching Cycle 5, Wednesday, October 16, 1996

Planning Conference, 8:15 - 8:25 a.m.

I entered the classroom and the teacher was ready. We sat down to get started right away. When I asked what her goals for the lesson were the teacher responded that they were finishing pattern books. I asked what the purpose of the activity was and she replied that it was to reinforce vocabulary from the apple, farm and Thanksgiving poems and also to build confidence in their writing ability.

They would print on four pages, Thank you for .... and draw pictures to accompany the sentence. When asked how they would spell the words
that weren’t patterned the teacher said that they were to invent spelling by using phonetic cues.

Asked for her measures of success she answered if the students could read the book back to her which would also serve as an assessment of their reading level, and if they could remember what they were doing from yesterday. For data collection the teacher asked me to check their comfort level. How many were finished the task by 9:30? Were any frustrated or not on task?

**Observation, 9:00 - 9:30**

All students were interested in and completed the activity to the best of their ability except one boy who sat and stared into space for the entire 30 minutes.

**Reflection Conference 2:30 - 2:55**

I asked the teacher if I could tape-record the conference and she agreed. When asked what her impressions of the lesson were she replied that she felt it went well, “They had finished up and it had worked well”.

When I asked her to clarify “worked well” she replied that she was pleased to see the students were using different strategies to ensure that the picture matched the text such as asking the teacher or another adult in the room
(the observer included) what the sentence said so they could draw the picture.

I then shared the data that I had collected with her. She immediately picked up on the one student who had done nothing. She explained that unless someone is right beside him directing him, he doesn’t work. He is an ESL student (Polish first language) and is getting resource help even though he speaks English.

I next reviewed the reflection steps with her of impressions, then observations that support those impressions, and asked what action or decisions she had made that impacted on those observations. She responded that the task was definitely at their ability level with 13 out of 14 either finished or working. With the one student it seems to be more a work habit problem as she had sat beside him the day before to get him started. She recounted that she had even said to him to just do the pictures in an attempt to modify, but he still hadn’t done anything. She explained that she couldn’t sit with him today as she wanted to hear the other students read.

I paraphrased that the activity was appropriate and when she had sat with the one, nonworking student previously he was able to do the activity. Therefore it must be a work habit problem. She agreed and added that she
had had to direct him step by step to get him to write. "Write T, then H etc." In a large group, he looks at you and seems attentive but has difficulty with seat work and staying focused. I paraphrased that now she is beginning to wonder if he is actually processing what he is hearing in the large group.

"So what have you learned from today’s cycle?" moving into the learning stage of the reflection conference. "That my gut instincts were right. In September I spoke to the kindergarten teacher and she felt that he was fine as he was beginning to talk." However she still decided to ask the ESL teacher to work with him more as a buddy for another Polish boy in the other class whose English is still limited, and at least build his self-esteem. "However with after what you observed today and what I observed yesterday, there may be an attention problem there that goes beyond language. It was also the morning, when he should have been on task....If I’m going to have his attention anytime, I should have it at 9 o’clock in the morning!"

As she finished I asked if she had any strategies in mind to apply this new learning. She replied that she is going to buddy him up with a strong student who is always clear on the directions, to help. In fact she already had a student in mind.
"Any reflections on the coaching cycle today?" "The observation was really valuable because it reinforced my intuition that there might be a problem beyond language. The coaching is also starting to become second nature. I can anticipate your questions and clarify what I mean."

I also found this coaching cycle satisfying. We seem to be falling into a comfortable format. At the planning conference, we both now know what information needs to be shared and are accomplishing this in 10-15 minutes, something that was not possible when we began. I also was extremely pleased with tape-recording the reflection conference. This allowed me to give my undivided attention to the speaker, paraphrasing and gently moving her through the reflection map. It also reassured me in my questioning techniques that I was indeed paraphrasing and guiding her reflection. However, instead of asking if she had any strategies in mind, which might have a negative presupposition, I should have asked what strategies she had in mind to apply this new learning. The tape recorder became my observation tool for the reflection conference while I was more focused on paraphrasing and questioning.
null
Coaching Cycle 6, Wednesday October 23, 1996

Planning Conference, 8:15 - 8:25 a.m.

When asked what her goals were for this lesson, the teacher replied that they were going to read *Where the Wild Things Are* with the students following along in their own books and chiming in when possible. Then they are going to colour and cut out their own Wild Thing which will be used in a future writing activity. She said the first time that she reads the story she wants them listening for the problem in the story and tracking the reading, following along, moving their finger from left to right. She also wants them looking at the pictures to use the visual cues, something that they have been practising from the All Star Reading Program. The second time through she will encourage the students to chime in, especially in the patterned, repeated parts of the story.

When asked for her measures of success she stated that she would like to see them be able to track as she reads the story the first time and track and chime in the second time through, also if they can use, the picture cues to identify the problem as it is at the very beginning of the story. For data collection she asked me to observe how well they can track the reading.
Observation, 9:05 - 9:30 a.m.

The students were seated in roughly two rows of four in front of the teacher with a third row of two. Showing the book cover, the teacher asked who could tell her the title. The teacher reminded them of the reading strategy of previewing the book. One student had to check by watching others to make sure he was at the front and moving in the right direction. As the teacher started to read (from a student’s book on the floor in the first row) this student continued to check with other students to ensure that he was on the right page. Three other students sitting in the second and third row as the story progressed were having trouble tracking (on the wrong page, flipping back and forth). A boy in the third row about half way through the story asked “Is this the right page?” At this point six were on the wrong page. After the teacher recapped, all were again on the right page. Two pages after the teacher started reading again seven were on the wrong page, only the three immediately in front of the teacher were on the right page.

Reflection Conference, 2:30 - 2:50 p.m.

When asked for her impressions the teacher felt that the lesson had gone well since the students were familiar with the story, that they were able to stay focused despite the noise from the other groups, that the
students were able to chime in and with some prompting identify the problem. She was especially pleased that the student who identified the problem had used the picture cues to do so and she felt that about two thirds of the group had been able to track the reading. She was very encouraged to see a student who, at the beginning of September didn’t even know to turn the page at the sound of the bell with the listening centre books, at least was trying to stay on the right page with the others and was aware of the different strategies.

I then shared my observations with the teacher at how carefully the students had previewed the book. They weren’t just flipping pages but purposefully going through it. She added that the previous lesson of the All Star Program had encouraged them to look for picture and phonetic cues and to try to guess words before the teacher read it to them.

The teacher was surprised at the number of students who were having trouble tracking and the fact that it had been basically the four in the first row who were able to track with her.

When asked what she had learned from today’s cycle she responded that rather than have them sit randomly it might be better to have them sit in a circle in order that she can monitor them more closely and keep a better handle on who is with her and who is having difficulty. She also
decided to have the five students who were having trouble tracking sit closer to her and the better readers a little further out. She wrote in her journal, "I learned to go back to reading in a circle and keep the weaker ones close to me."

She felt pleased with this coaching cycle and didn’t have any comments to make. However as we were walking out she related how relaxed the class is now with the three groups (2 directed and 1 self-directed activity). She has observed that the students are on task and keen about the activities and the teachers are happy. She said that research shows that language instruction should be in groups of no more than eight, "Well 10 or 11 is the closest I can get this year but with this format it’s manageable now".

I too was pleased with this cycle. We have become very comfortable and there is almost a sense of routine. I was also pleased that I had been able to be "another set of eyes" in the classroom to aid in her observations of the students.

Coaching Cycle 7, Wednesday, October 30, 1996

Planning Conference, 8:15 - 8:25 a.m.

Asked for the goals of her lesson, the teacher replied that she was carving a pumpkin with a rotation group of 10 children. The purpose of
this was to encourage oral language and the use of descriptive vocabulary and terms.

Her strategy was to have them participate in the carving of the pumpkin, feeling it and describing the experience. She said that the group the day before had gone off on, what was made from pumpkins (soup, muffins etc.) but she would flow with whatever topic this group brings up. Next week she plans to have the students do a follow-up writing exercise to describe this experience.

When asked for measures of success she indicated that participation and vocabulary generated were important. I suggested that I could make a list of words concerning the pumpkin and she agreed that that would be useful.

Observation, 9:05 - 9:30 a.m.

There were 10 students sitting around a table with the pumpkin in front of the teacher. As the teacher pulled up a handful of seeds, she asked what it was called. Students were encouraged to use descriptive adjectives and to make comparisons to other objects that they were familiar with. This continued throughout the carving activity.
Reflection Conference, 2:30 - 2:45 p.m.

The teacher was pleased with the lesson but was surprised by how differently it had gone from the previous day’s group. She felt that today’s group had been really focused and were willing to get into it and touch it. Their ideas for carving were also more original and creative.

When asked if she had noticed any difference in the language used between the two groups, she replied that this group spent more time examining it and because of this they were able to move beyond using descriptive words to the ability to make comparisons. I then shared my observations with her and the language used as well as pointing out how she was encouraging the expansion of the vocabulary and comparisons made with her comments and questions.

After I had paraphrased that she was more pleased with today’s lesson than yesterday’s as the children were more into it and as a result the language and thinking skills of the students had been elevated, I asked what actions she might take with the third group the next day to replicate today’s level of success. She replied that she thought today she had slowed them down so that they could really focus on the experience and that she had kept pushing and encouraging their oral language. AC: Was this because I was there? With yesterday’s group when they didn’t want to
touch it she had allowed them to pass, but she now sees that that had diminished the experience for them. So for the next group if they are reluctant she is going to push them to touch it, don’t worry about getting dirty, explore it! She felt that next time she won’t accept that reluctance first time; she responded, “I can see now at the end of coaching session how you framed and modeled (paraphrased) the questions, yes, this is what I’ve learned, this is my reflection time. Last week I wrote (in her journal) that I learned to keep the weaker students closer to me for oral reading so now I am consciously doing that. This time I’ve learned the importance of slowing them down and pushing for participation. I find that it is easy now to write in my journal about what I learned from my teaching.”

When asked if she saw a pattern in my questions she replied that she did, and that she was clear in her mind what she was to do but that she couldn’t replicate or take over my role with another teacher. I then asked her if she knew what question I always start with. She stated that you always ask me how I think the lesson went and then you share what you observed. I notice that you always just state what you observe. You don’t make a value judgment on it. Then you ask me why the observations were that way and after that you restate what I’ve said. It’s like a verification which clarifies the learning for me. I then asked if she could go through the
process herself and she replied that she definitely could but that she
couldn’t guide someone else.

I am very pleased with how my coaching skills have improved. As I
listen to the tape of the reflection conference I can hear my use of
paraphrase and how it focuses the teacher’s thinking. I am also very
pleased that the teacher now appears to see the value of the coaching cycle.
I no longer have the impression that she sees the coaching as a burden but
that she rather looks forward to it. When I came into the planning
conference a little later than usual this morning she told me that she was
afraid that I had forgotten.

I am also feeling an increased level of collegiality because of the
coaching. With her lesson on the importance of oral language, I shared
with her after the reflection conference the similarities with the teaching of
French as a second language (my field): how an FSL teacher always builds
the oral language before moving to reading and writing. I am also
beginning to feel far more comfortable in a primary classroom because of
the coaching experience. I have no formal training for the primary division,
yet I can now see the similarities with what I do at a different level in the
Junior and Intermediate divisions.
Coaching Cycle 8, Wednesday, November 6, 1996

Planning Conference, 8:15 - 8:30 a.m.

As asked for her goals, the teacher responded that they were going to be reading a poem that they had heard four or five times orally from Halloween and placing it in their poetry books.

The purpose of this activity was to apply the strategies that they have been working on in the All Star Reading Program (picture clues, previewing, reading it again), to build confidence in their ability to read, to expose them to another literary form (the rhythm of poetry) and to continue to compile a record of their reading learning for the year. They are to read the story once to themselves, then to read it again chorally with the teacher.

For her measures of success, she hoped that they would be able to recall the poem, applying the strategies, and be enthusiastic and confident in the activity. The teacher asked me to watch the 4 weakest students in this group of 10 (Alissa, Gabriella, Steven, and Peter). Referring back to her goals I wondered how I could observe if they were using the reading strategies. I suggested that if she asked them to point to the words they recognized I could observe that as well as a global assessment of their level
of involvement and enjoyment in the activity. The teacher agreed that that would be helpful in assessing all the students’ reading levels.

As we were finishing the teacher commented on how this experience has made her more reflective about her program. She also shared how she is using it naturally in other aspects of her program and even as a tool to problem solve in her Master’s of Education course.

**Observation, 9:05 - 9:30 a.m.**

The teacher sat with her group on the floor, keeping the weak students close to her. She reminded them of the All Star Reading strategies, then asked them to read a poem. Of the four students I was asked to observe, three were trying and meeting with varying degrees of success but one boy appeared frustrated and not engaged in the reading activity.

**Reflection Conference, 3:30 - 3:45**

The teacher said that she had been pleased with the lesson and she felt that the students were applying the strategies. I shared with her my observations of the four students she had asked me to focus on. When she realized that Steven was doing quite well, she commented that he had been in the group getting extra help with the PTM as he was one of the weakest readers at the first of the year. She now feels that he is ready to maybe move out of that group and put Peter in as he seems to be falling behind.
When asked what she had learned from today's cycle, she said that from the observations, she feels the students are using the strategies successfully except for Peter. She stated that she has been amazed by the growth in the reading ability of all the students except for a few like Peter. She added that she will talk to the PTM about who is the strongest in the extra-help group that they could move out in order to make room for Peter.

Level of Use Evaluation at the End of the Coaching Teacher A

November 6, 3:45 - 4:10 p.m.

Questions and Responses

1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson. Has it changed?

   I still plan in the same way with regards to my objectives. My strategies have changed more as I reflected on them. I'm more conscious of the changes. I'm conscious of the effect of the strategies. In the process we've focused on the effects of my strategies and how to be the most effective. My goals and objectives have remained the same though. I always knew where I was going but my strategies on how to get them there has been modified.

2. What about your measures of success?
I am more conscious of evaluation and probably do it more frequently. I always measured my success by how many students came to me reading compared to those who are reading when they leave Grade 1: their growth over the year’s time. Now I’m doing it more frequently. Before it was always a gut reaction of how the lesson went—they were really with me or not. I used to think, where did I go wrong or ask the students that think they understand to start the activity at their desks while I would continue to work with the ones who were still having trouble. Now I reflect in more detail rather than an overall impression. I go through in my mind, “What did I do?” “What did they do as a result?” “How would I change that next time?” Before it was instinct. I always reflected but now I feel that I have a more structured process for reflecting.

I didn’t ask her if lessons always go as planned as she had replied so emphatically no the first time. I also didn’t ask her what kind of self-assessment she engages in after a lesson as she had answered this with her measures of success.

3. Has the number of times a week that you engage in professional dialogue changed?

A little. I continue to meet with the other teacher outside of school and perhaps talks more with the other two classroom teachers I work with
directly. I feel that a lot of dialogue between staff members is griping—sharing the frustrations over lack of resources. I feel that I am working more effectively with the PTMs because of the change in lesson planning strategies however.

4. What can you now tell me about peer coaching?

I think it’s a very valuable process. I think the coach’s role is to provide a framework to guide the teacher through their own reflective process - like a scaffold. Pedgoski the Russian child development psychologist, said that your role as a teacher is to help them build scaffolds for their learning. The only difficult part of the process was the sacrifice of the time. What I had to do was come in at 7:30 the day of the coaching or stay 30 minutes later the day before to keep up with everything. With primary you have to have everything set up for them. There are so many demands on our time. I asked if she felt that it was good PD and she replied “Definitely!”

I didn’t ask her the final question about teaching as a career, since it had been glowing the first time around.

Evaluation

For the planning model, the teacher has moved from Level IVB Refinement level of the Level of Use chart for goals and strategies to Level
V Integration for goals. She is coordinating her activities with colleagues to achieve a collective impact on their students (see coaching cycle 3). For strategies however she has moved to Level VI Renewal. She is evaluating the quality of her strategies and seeks to modify them to have an increased impact on her students. “My strategies have changed more as I reflected on them. I’m more conscious of the changes and how to be the most effective”.

With measures of success she is more conscious of it and is doing it more frequently. She also has started to question the validity of relying solely on observations as a measure of learning (see coaching cycle 2), and has implemented the use of learning logs. Therefore I would rate her at Level IVB Refinement. She is varying the use of her measures of success by changing both the means and the frequency of use to increase the impact on her students.

For the reflective map she is now using it at the Level IVA Routine. She has used the map to reflect on her teaching and in her own learning (see coaching cycle 8). “I go through in my mind, what did I do? (causes), what did they do? (observations), how would I change that next time?” (learnings, application). It should be pointed out here that in the journal the teacher kept at the end of each reflection conference she wrote what
she had learned and what she was going to do as a result of that learning. However as this is a newly acquired skill she is not giving any thought to how to improve the process (see Appendix A for LoU chart).

I am very pleased with the results of this first coaching session. The teacher, despite being an extremely competent professional, still benefited and found value in the process. I therefore am looking forward to trying this with the next teacher, who might not be as receptive.

Level of Use Evaluation, 2 months after Cognitive Coaching. Teacher A

Thursday, January 16, 1997, 3:30 - 3:45 p.m.

Questions and Responses

1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson.

   Oh, it’s 3:30 on a Thursday! OK. You decide on the objectives, you come up with a strategy, you decide on the activity and how you will evaluate.

2. Do lessons always go as you planned them?

   No.

3. After a lesson, what kind of self-assessment do you engage in?

   I usually think back and go over the lesson in my mind how were the students?, were they with me? On task? Did they complete the activity?
Vera (another grade 1 teacher) and I will talk about why things did or did not go well and ways to improve the lesson when necessary.

4. How many times during a week do you engage in dialogue with other staff members about pedagogy?

   I’d probably say just the planning session once a week that I have with the other three grade 1 teachers.

For the questions about peer coaching and pursuing teaching as a career, she said had not changed from before. I then asked, “Do you find that you have carried over some of the things that we talked about and were consolidated during the coaching process?”

   Probably subconsciously I do, but I’m not consciously aware of it.

   The reflection steps?

   Because, I always reflected on the lesson, maybe not in that detail. I was in the habit of doing it anyhow, so I may go back through, O.K. is this done, that done and go over it in my head in a little more detail but I’m not consciously aware, oh, I’m reflecting, I’m not consciously guiding myself through the steps.

   Can you still remember the steps?

   Yes...however I honestly find the instructional day is so hectic that unless I have that preset time, like when I was working with you, to sit
down and go over it in my mind and write it in a book, I don’t have that
time to sit down and consciously think about it unless the lesson hasn’t
gone well; I talk to my teaching partner, ‘how can we do it differently?’ but
it’s at an oral level and more informal form of reflection…the day is just so
busy, I don’t take that reflection time unless I see the need to. When I was
working with you, I took the time, it was more conscious and deliberate.
Now my planning time is back to, I’ve got to do this, this and this and
because it isn’t on my to do list—journal for Jennifer, it doesn’t get done.

Did you continue to use the learning logs?

No, I don’t have the time.

You were questioning observation as a valid measure of success,

have you changed your use of observation?

In language arts I’m using more one on one evaluation. I’ve come
to believe that they can look like they know but they don’t when
questioned individually.

Evaluation

For reflection, since November 6 she appears to have dropped back from
Level IVA Routine level of use to Level 0 NonUse: “I don’t take that
reflection time unless I see the need to… I don’t have the time”. As well
she has dropped the use of the learning logs with the children. For
measures of success she mentioned that as part of how she plans a lesson, which she had not done on Sept. 17. She also has modified her use of observation as an evaluation tool. Therefore I believe that she has stayed at Level IVB Refinement. She continues to plan jointly with the other team members so is still at Level V Integration. Her search for new strategies and criticism of ones she presently uses seem to have suffered because of her lack of reflection time. Now only when things go wrong does she think about what she's doing, not on an ongoing basis to continually improve. Therefore I believe she has returned to Level IVB Refinement (see Appendix A for LoU chart).

It appears that Teacher A had internalized the steps in planning effectively and reflection, but unless actual time is set aside for it, it is not engaged in on a regular basis. Is the strength of cognitive coaching the setting aside of time in hectic lives to reflect on what we’re doing and the collegiality this inspires rather than the acquisition of the process?

Coaching Cycle 9, Teacher A, Tuesday, May 27, 1997

Followup cycle to verify analysis.

Planning Conference, 8:20 - 8:30 a.m.

When asked for the student learnings for the lesson, she responded with the strategy. With her reading group of 15, they were going to reread a
story, she would ask comprehension questions, they would do a pronoun recognition activity and then start a new story. I asked for clarification on the learnings for these activities and she readily replied, to practise their reading skills: recognizing sight words, tracking etc., to develop recognition of pronouns and to check reading comprehension.

Next I asked for her assessment to evaluate if they had obtained these learnings. She replied immediately, observation. Can they answer comprehension questions, are they tracking and reading? When asked what data I could collect that would be helpful to her, she asked me to help in the observation of their reading skills.

Observation, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.

During the reading activity two students did not participate. The rest were attempting to stay with the teacher but there was a feeling of hesitancy and uncertainty about their reading. The teacher appeared to be aware that she did not have their attention and cut the pronoun activity short.

Reflection Conference, 12:20 - 12:50 p.m.

What are your impressions of how the lesson went?

I thought that it went pretty well.

What did you observe that makes you feel that way?
I observed some of the children were reading on their own, some were tracking and the two beside me needed help but they were trying.

At this point I realized that my impressions of how the lesson had gone and how the students were responding were different from hers so I tried to ask a question to force her thinking about some whom I had seen definitely in difficulty. I asked, “What about Marek?”

I noticed that he is starting to track a little bit but I didn’t actually hear him read. However he is beginning to track and the understanding is there.

I paraphrased that she was pleased because most of them were able to track and follow along with her. She added, “Even with the chart they were able to read the simple sentences and follow along.”

What did you do that caused this lesson to be successful?

The culmination of the year’s work at this point, all the reading strategies that we have been working on. You’re starting to see the application now.

What did you notice about their attention?

I noticed that for the most part it was fairly good. Some of the boys have very short attention spans.

What did you learn from today’s lesson?
Uhm... I got a good impression of where quite a few of them are in their reading. I'm seeing some that are at grade level and others that are still below grade level. This will be helpful as I will need to do report cards soon.

What applications are you going to take forth from this lesson?

I’ll continue to follow the same format, as I can see that I am getting results with this approach. The research shows that you should always start the lesson with a review of a previously read story to consolidate and as a confidence booster before you go on with the new lesson.

As she had still not asked for my observations, I asked, “Do you have any questions for me?”

What did you observe?

I proceeded to read to her what is printed in the observation section of this report (see Appendix A). She listened intently until the part where I had commented that the teacher appeared to be aware of their inattention at the pronoun activity. I asked if that was correct.

Yes. I could see that so I didn’t continue with it as long as I had planned. This is my weak reading group. The other group is at or above grade level, this group is at the primer or below. Their attention span is extremely short and they are easily distracted. I sense when they’ve had
enough and move on. They are going to continue to need extra help next year.

I continued with reading my observations with her interjecting occasionally, concurring with what I had observed. I then asked, “Do you notice a difference in your thinking about planning from what you do normally and when we engage in coaching.”

No, not really because I really think through my lessons. When I come in I visualize how the lesson will flow and have everything set up. I think through it.

Any difference from what you do while teaching every day and when I’m observing?

No. Until the kids went over to you at the end of the lesson, I’d forgotten that you were there.

What about when you reflect after, do you notice a difference?

Yes, I don’t spend the time in reflecting. I do all my thinking in preparation for the lesson. I honestly don’t reflect unless it was a total flop. If it was a routine lesson, I just move on.

Do you learn something when we engage in this reflection?

I do. Just discussing things and discussing the students consolidates things for me. It verifies and confirms my observations and assessment.
If it was available, would you engage in cognitive coaching for one lesson a month?

Yes, I would because I find it beneficial, especially the reflection. It forces you to take time to reflect that you don’t usually take.

I had decided to ask this question specifically for this teacher as she had always identified time as a problem with regards to coaching so I knew that if she was willing to give it time voluntarily, then she must indeed find it useful. This cycle again underlined for me the power of perceptions and how not knowing all the facts can affect your impression of what is going on. Once she had explained that this was her low reading group I understood that she had been pleased with their progress, however small.

Teacher B

Level of Use Evaluation before Coaching Teacher B, Monday, November 11, 3:20 - 3:50 p.m.

This teacher has taught in the junior and intermediate divisions for 10 years. He hasn’t taken an educational course since graduating from teacher’s college. He says that he would rather learn on his own. He is currently teaching a grade 5/6 class.
1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson. What things do you consider?

I first of all consider where the students are and what they can handle—especially this year. I consider the content, the skills that I have to teach in the program and consider the materials needed, mainly what do I have? The problem with this group is social skills. They are so immature.” When questioned about measures of success he answered “Hopefully application in their work.

2. Do lessons always go as you planned them?

No! Rarely actually. I find it difficult to gauge how much to give them. If I give them too much they’re frustrated, if too little then they’re off task. Their skills are so low I try to find something that they can do.

3. After the lesson what kind of self-assessment do you engage in?

“Very little. Over several lessons I’ll wait to see a pattern. Right now time is a problem with coaching volleyball. I really would like to sit down and reflect on Wednesday and Friday to think about how it’s gone over the past 2 days and make changes as needed.”

4. How many times during a week would you estimate that you dialogue with another staff member about pedagogy?

I’m not in the staff room a lot, with you a couple of times a week.
AC: It should be noted that I have shared a class in the afternoon with this teacher for the past 3 years. Over this time period I have shared a number of strategies and activities that I have picked up from my Master’s of Education courses and he has shared strategies that have worked for him from different workshops.

5. What can you tell me about peer coaching?

Nothing much, I’ve never done it.

6. If someone asked you about pursuing teaching as a career, what would you tell them?

Don’t! I love teaching but we are so maligned by society and more over, there are lots of other things you could do.

Evaluation

For the planning model the teacher appears to be at Level IVB Refinement Level of Use. For goals and strategies with his comment “where the students are and what they can handle” he is a Level IVB Refinement as well. For measures of success the teacher appears to be at Level IVA Routine. He appears to give this little thought when he replied “application” (of skills taught in their work). With the reflective map the teacher appears to be at Level 1 Orientation. He is aware that reflection would improve his teaching: “I really would like to sit down on
Wednesday and Friday to think about how it's gone over the past 2 days."

AC: The teacher attended my workshop on the previous PA Day, November 1, concerning Reflection Journals and self-evaluation. (see Appendix B for LoU chart).

Coaching Cycle 1 Teacher B


When asked for the goals of his lesson he replied after probing and paraphrasing:

1. To teach the definitions of five words from their novel: strayed, scabbard, varmints, depredations, and plunder. (He is then planning a vocabulary activity to rearrange the letters of the word depredation, to form new words.)

2. To check comprehension of the chapter they were assigned to read for homework.

3. To create a character web for the main character.

Strategies:

1. To teach definitions: - ask them what they think it means, check in dictionary, letter activity.

2. To check reading comprehension: - how they answer questions in their notebook and discuss their answers orally.
3. To create a character web: -Homework assignment was to jot down characteristics of the main character as they read the story. They are to fill in a sheet with details on how the main character looks, acts and feels with examples from the book.

Measures of Success:

1. Vocabulary: if they can spell them and give definitions on weekly test.

2. Comprehension: will collect notebooks to check answers to questions as well as impressions from discussion.

3. Character web: observe if they can fill in the chart.

When asked what data I could collect that would be useful for him, he replied whether they are paying attention or not. I suggested that every 30 seconds I could record how many were not on task. It was agreed that on-task behaviour would mean participation, looking at the speaker and accomplishing the assigned tasks. I asked if my questions had clarified the lesson. He answered “It did actually!”

Observations, 9:00-9:30 a.m.

Five students were chronically non-attentive. These students continually attempted to draw other students off-task as well. The other students worked fairly well but at the slightest distraction, lost focus as
well. (For a detailed description of all observed lessons for Teacher B, see Appendix B).

Reflection Conference, Tuesday, November 12, 1:40-2:05 p.m.

What were your impressions of the lesson?

"O.K. No major problems, just regular things went on. It wasn’t the most inspiring lesson. It’s the first time I’ve done something whole class.

(AC instead of teaching the 5s and 6s separately). It went better than what it usually does because they were more focused.”

What did you mean by “it wasn’t the most inspiring lesson?”

"Things today are supposed to be hands-on group-work instead of a formal lesson. Before I’ve gone a long time with self-directional activities but this year I find I’m doing more directed lessons because they can’t handle the group work.”

I then shared the observational data with the teacher. The teacher responded, “That is why I wanted you to see them during a whole-class lesson because the slightest little distraction will set them off. Then you can imagine when I try to teach the 5s only the 6s will be listening to me or what’s going on with the 5’s instead of doing their work. That’s why I’ve gone to more formal lessons because they need straightforward, clear
directions and they need it quiet in the room for them to focus. The slightest noise or distraction and you’ve lost them. It escalates very quickly. The smallest distraction will cause a major rift. They all have to know what they’re doing and it has to be fairly quiet for them to do it. It’s not just noise though. If they don’t understand what they are supposed to do they get frustrated very easily and give up.”

What do you feel that you’ve learned from this process?

“Last night when I was talking to you about the lesson (the planing conference) it made me realize how much we do in a lesson. I’ve done this so many times that I guess you forget the reasons behind why we do this and you rethink about why you’re doing some of them. Your observations also confirmed what I had been noticing, one little thing can so easily take them off task.”

Is there anything from this learning today that you plan on applying or changing?

“Actually I saw you using a check list.”

AC: When I come into this classroom to teach the grade 6s only Math, they are coming back from French which is on the other side of the school. I find that they are noisy and hyper by the time they get back to the classroom. My expectations are that they come in, get their math books
out and are seated quietly, ready to start. If they can do this they get a
check mark and I told them that this is what I count for effort on their
monthly report for Math.

“I’ve been thinking about doing something like that because I was using
Bell work but after 2 ½ months I feel they are still taking too long to settle
down. Maybe something like that would work. I want to get them seated
faster so we can get more work done.

Also I’d like to do activities to increase their attending, but a lot of
it is maturity too. A lot of them have such poor self-esteem, poor social
skills that the slightest thing sets them off and the rest have been with them
in the class so long that they’re used to feeding off that.”

AC: These 5s and 6s are the students who did not go into French
Immersion (FI) so they will be a class more or less the same until grade 8.
They are also generally the low achievers as two thirds of the grade 4
students go into FI in grade 5.

“I want to make sure that I maintain as much of a consistent work
environment as I can. We have the homework books and with the novel
study I told them the routine is the same every day--read the chapter, do
the chart, a little bit of vocabulary, a little discussion, comprehension
questions. So hopefully they’ll fall into that routine.”
Any other ideas?

"Beyond that you’ve only got a handful that need more, and them I keep in at last recess, check their homework books, check their logs. I talked a bit to Paula (Child Youth Councilor) about their social skills and she said that she would get back to me. I gave the monthly newsletter to parents to make sure that they are aware and try to get that support at home, and of course for Wayne and Ed (two identified attention deficit students) there is the check list. (Every 40 minute period on task and work completed they get a check which they cash in for computer time on Friday afternoon).

"I’m starting to see some improvement in most of them except for Elisabeth so I’ve moved her closer."

Any reflections on the coaching?

"Things like this make you think and actually I’m feeling guilty because of the way I’m teaching. You’re supposed to be teaching cooperative group-work style."

Supposed to? Who’s telling you this?

"Every thing in the world says you’re supposed to be doing it a different way."
I responded “You’re clearly defining the needs of your students, they need routine, a quiet atmosphere, know what’s expected of them and you have to keep them extremely organized otherwise; they can not focus. What are you not doing that you’re supposed to be doing?”

(Long pause) “Every thing I’ve read about teaching is that it is supposed to be group work and a noisy atmosphere, or that’s the impression I get. Even if I had normal kids I wouldn’t want that much and with this group I wouldn’t want that at all. There’s always a present style of teaching that’s supposed to be the best and right now that’s it.”

You’re not doing what’s trendy because of what you see as the needs of your students. So why are you feeling guilty? What I think I hear you saying is that you would like to teach in a cooperative, group-work style from time to time but it isn’t possible with the students you have this year as they do not have the skills for it. Therefore you’re meeting the needs of your students.

“I don’t know!” (laughter)

Well if you were teaching in a group setting would you be meeting the needs of your students?

“No, they’d be lost.”

Did my feedback and questions help you?
“They made me think a lot. You get so busy doing things that you don’t sit back and think why you’re doing them, so I found that very helpful. Your observations were very on the ball so they were helpful. It’s good to make people think. That’s what I liked about it.”

Did the reflections now help you?

“Yes because it makes me realize that I’m trying to meet the needs of my students.”

I found this coaching cycle more difficult than the last couple with Teacher A. The process had become very easy and comfortable with her. I feel like I’ve started back at square one again, as I have. When listening to the tape of the reflection conference I was pleased with my paraphrasing; however I neglected to ask how it went compared to how he had planned it, and what he had done to cause the success of the lesson. I also had the impression even though we have worked together well for the last 4 years that he was somewhat nervous about the process—that I would somehow pass judgment on him for not using group work. Hopefully those fears were laid to rest. I will try to ensure that I ask him all the questions next time and also get more observational data from him.

Coaching Cycle 2, Tuesday, November 19, 1996

Planning Conference, 8:35 - 8:40 a.m.
The teacher had been caught in traffic and I suggested coaching another day but he wanted to proceed. Despite my skepticism about being able to have a planning conference in the time available we in fact were able to finish.

I asked for the student learnings (a strategy suggested by John Dyer) but he still responded with the activities. He replied that they were going to study the spelling and meanings of list words in pairs in preparation for a test and then answer comprehension questions on the novel. By paraphrasing and redirecting a few times he explained that the goals were that the students:

1. Learn the spelling and meaning of the list words;
2. Practice a studying strategy;
3. Check their reading comprehension;
4. Develop their analytical thinking skills.

The measures of success were:

1. The test on spelling and meaning;
2. Observation--can they successfully use the strategy of working with a partner and not wander off task?
3. Are the answers to the questions accurate, and do they contain detail and insight?
When asked what data I could collect that would be helpful to him, he asked me to watch Elisabeth for behaviour, effort and attitude.

Observation, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.

The teacher went over the instructions for the first activity. Elisabeth rarely looked at the person talking whether it was the teacher or a student. She was sitting at the middle front of the room. She spent the entire observation period attempting to tidy her desk and find her work. After about 20 minutes, while the other students worked independently, the teacher went over and assisted her in organizing her desk.

Reflection Conference, 1:30 - 2:05 p.m.

When asked for his impressions of how the lesson went he replied, “Not very good at all.” I asked what he had observed that made him feel that way. He responded that Wayne (one of the ADD students) had come in hyper and both Elisabeth and Elisha were not in good moods. I then asked him how the lesson went compared to how he had planned it. He was disappointed that they had not gotten as much done as he had hoped; he rushed with the comprehension questions at the end of the lesson and therefore had to assign the rest for homework. He then was concerned that they wouldn’t be completed. He also was disappointed that he didn’t have
a chance to observe how the studying in pairs went as he was stuck with Elisabeth. "Just things like that detract from what I wanted to do."

I then asked him if he could pinpoint what caused his lesson to go off track and he repeated how the behaviour problems snowball and cause frustration. I realized after the weekend's training session that we were now into problem solving and I initiated pace-and-lead questioning. I asked him how he would have liked to see the lesson go ideally and he stated, the students listening attentively to instructions, to be able to answer questions to clarify, to separate them physically enough so that they could concentrate on studying with their partner, to give them adequate time to study, and to be able to walk around and observe how the strategy was working.

I paraphrased and then asked what strategies he had in mind to move them towards this ideal. He observed that after the test most of them had the spelling of the words but not the meanings. He reviewed with them that in the use of their study time they would have to put more emphasis on studying the definitions, something that they are not used to, that they felt they had not had enough time and that a lot of them find memorizing difficult. He reviewed studying strategies with them and they were to practise at home for a retest the next day.
I then asked if there was something that the other teachers who interact with the class could do to reinforce his strategies to improve study and organizational skills. He felt that the students who have the biggest problems with these have so many other problems that it is difficult to know what to do. “I’ve tried homework books (as well as other strategies) and have seen some progress with everyone but Elisabeth. My problem is setting my expectations at a low enough level that they can experience some success. I suppose my biggest frustration is with Elisabeth because I have seen no improvement. I’ve talked to the mother a number of times and she doesn’t want to have anything to do with a reward system. Elisabeth sits in my class and complains about everything. She is so negative! If I come in with some positive reinforcement then she just says that’s stupid! I also have a gut feeling that she has a problem dealing with me because I am a man. She wants my attention but she has no idea how to get it.” He feels that her disorganization is a way of getting attention. At this point he seemed genuinely stuck. He stated that everything he could think of he had tried with her and that he could absolutely not think of another thing to try. At this point I used a strategy that John Dyer had suggested in the training that a coach can use at times like this. I gave ideas by saying “I’ve seen some teachers do this.” After exploring several
possibilities the teacher said that he was thinking about giving her time to draw as a reward system.

I then asked about his reflections on the coaching cycle and he replied that he never would have come up with the drawing idea if we hadn’t talked.

I originally had been quite unhappy with this coaching cycle. The planning conference had been rushed and I felt that my effectiveness had dropped due to my inexperience with the pace-and-lead questioning techniques. However as I listened to the tape I could hear that despite my perceived clumsy questioning skills, through paraphrase I was useful in guiding his reflections to the point where he had an idea to try where he had been stymied before.

I also am going to review the suggested questions in the training booklet for the pace and lead as this teacher is in more of a problem-solving mode than teacher A. I also have a sense that the teacher is feeling a sense of powerlessness in this situation so I will direct my questions to increasing his sense of efficacy.

It also was interesting that the teacher never asked for the data that I collected. I didn’t offer it, following John Dyer’s advice from the second training workshop, to get the teacher to give the observations.
Coaching Cycle 3, Tuesday November 26

Planning Conference

I asked the teacher what the student learnings for the lesson were and he responded with his strategies. He is starting with a grammar activity sheet followed by comprehension questions on the novel and a chart on character and plot development. I asked clarifying questions about why he was doing these activities and he established that the grammar activity was to practise differentiating between common and proper nouns and that the chart was to help them to analyze the character and plot development in the chapters that they have read.

He mentioned that two students (one functioning at the grade 3 level [Ed] and one ADD student [Wayne] he had switched from the novel study to Focus on Reading because of their inability to focus long enough to read a chapter. When asked for his measures of success he replied that they were to hand in the grammar sheets and there would be a follow-up activity on Thursday with a test on Friday. He is also planning to check the charts to observe if they have included enough detail. He wanted me to watch if Ed and Wayne are frustrated and whether Elisha (another identified student) is focused.

Observation, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.
The teacher began the lesson by reviewing what a noun is. Both Wayne and Ed attended to the lesson and worked well completing their assignments. Elisha took some time to settle down to work but also eventually completed the assignment.

Reflection Conference, 1:35 - 2:00 p.m.

I started by asking the teacher how he felt the lesson went and he responded, “Much better than I expected.” I then asked him what he had done to cause that to happen (stressing efficacy). He seemed surprised and said, “What I did? I think the kids were better behaved. I don’t think that I did anything to cause that.” I redirected, asking him what he did that contributed to their positive attitude. He again replied that they had come in with a better attitude today, maybe a halo effect from the report cards going home the day before. He said that the reports had been fairly positive. Then he added, “I don’t know, they just came in ready to work.”

I then asked for his observations, what had he noticed that led him to believe the lesson had gone well? “Most of them were very much on task. They worked through that grammar fairly well, the concept was pretty straightforward so they didn’t have that much frustration with it.” I responded, “So you structured the lesson so that it was easy for them to
understand, simplifying the task so that they would work at their comfort level."

I then asked how things had gone with the chart. He stated that it had taken longer than he had hoped to get to it but he had been pleased with the responses he had been getting and that they were able to identify how the character was changing. He hopes that he will see those reflections recorded in a written form in the chart.

I then reminded him that he had asked me to observe three students in particular and I asked him what observations he had made. He explained that Elisha had come in all upset as her “friends” were angry with her for different things that she had been doing before the bell rang. “I got her settled down. Ed worked as well as Ed works. Wayne was pretty much on task.” I followed up by asking him what he had done to settle Elisha down. “I separated her from the other girls and just set her down and said whatever it is can’t be dealt with right now. She needs to get herself ready for the day. I just diverted her attention and tried to get her to focus.”

I returned to his goals for the lesson stating that he was pleased because he had accomplished what he had set out to do. “Yes, we got almost everything done, they have more homework to finish than I would have liked, but yeah, we pretty well covered everything.”
The next question was about how they are doing in completing homework (returning to the previous two cycles with their poor organizational skills). He replied that he has initiated a new system of checks for work completed and handed in (or lack thereof) and the tally will go home to the parents in the monthly report so they are aware. He feels that the students perceive there is now a consequence for not completing work.

I then paraphrased that his strategies are working and overall he is seeing gradual improvement (returning to efficacy). He agreed that, yes, overall they are improving. They have their peaks and valleys but generally he can see that progress is being made. I asked how Ed and Wayne had reacted to the modified program. He said that Ed was unhappy about not doing the same as the others and only did about half of what he should have, so he was kept in at recess to finish. I asked if the strategy of keeping him in at recess is effective. He replied, "Well, then it's just me and him. I can give him the individual help he needs and he gets the work done. This helps with his frustration level as he gets frustrated very easily and gives up. At recess I can ask him questions so that he can see the answers. Wayne was working well. He would stop and look around and then continue." I paraphrased that the teacher had successfully modified
the program to meet Wayne’s short attention span (focusing on efficacy and craftsmanship) and the teacher agreed.

I asked about Elisha and he said that she had been very angry, “ready to explode” and removed herself from the room (what I had observed). She returned but again had to leave the room before she was finally calm enough to work. I asked if she had completed her work and he responded, “yes, she had it handed in before recess.

I then summarized by saying that he is generally pleased with the lesson as the modifications he had made for Ed and Wayne were working, he is allowing Elisha to be self-modifying to manage her anger, he had made the lesson simple and direct so all the students could experience success and he has a follow-up strategy in place to ensure that they complete their assignments.

When asked for reflections on the coaching cycle, he replied that it was helpful because it just made him think a bit more. I asked him if he had started a journal. (I had asked him to do this after the first cycle and I had a feeling that he hadn’t started.) He confirmed my suspicion and asked me what I wanted him to do. Respecting his field independence I gave him a copy from the Cognitive Coaching booklet on journaling, why it is important, and some suggestions on how to do it.
(text content is not legible due to image quality)
I also told him that I would bring in the writeup of the first coaching cycle so he could have a better understanding of what I’m doing. He then asked me if he should do it daily, or whenever the mood strikes him? I suggested whenever the mood strikes, being conscious of the fact that I am already taking up one of his planning periods and I didn’t want to make this too onerous.

He then asked me if this was for a course and I replied that it is part of my research for my thesis. (I had explained this before we started the coaching process.) We proceeded to chat informally about pedagogy for the next 5 minutes. He also shared with me that he has a hearing problem and if there is a lot of background noise he finds it difficult to listen. He explained that that is why he likes a classroom environment that is fairly quiet.

I was generally pleased with this coaching cycle. The planning conference was somewhat rushed again in the morning. We had met with the principal for about 45 minutes after school concerning another matter when we had intended to do the planning conference. Hopefully next week we can do it at a bit slower pace after school, the day before observation. However the teacher seemed overall more relaxed and at ease with the process. The reflection conference went well. The teacher started out
feeling the lesson had gone well but that he had done nothing to contribute
to that (low efficacy). I finished up on that and kept rephrasing and
questioning him to draw out the fact that he had indeed done many things
to contribute to the success of the lesson. I feel that by the end of the
conference he had responded to that and learned that he was indeed making
a difference in the classroom.

Again I did not provide any data as it was not requested by the
teacher, despite my subtle reminder. I found it interesting though that my
observations were basically the same as his so I didn’t pursue it.

I hope that he will start his journal as I would like to probe further
what he means by “you made me think more.” Next time if he says this
again I will ask him to explain what he means by that.

Coaching Cycle 4, Wednesday, December 4

Planning Conference, 3:30 - 3:45 p.m.

As we had to change the observation period, this time I would be
observing an environmental studies lesson. When asked for his goals he
again gave me the strategies.

AC: I am wrestling with this problem of how to get teachers to
think about their goals first, instead of their activities.
He told me that they were going to make a chart listing similarities and differences between reptiles and amphibians. They had viewed a film the day before and had been instructed to take notes on the characteristics of these two groups of animals. When asked for the purpose of this activity he replied that it was to teach them how to compare, collect appropriate information (neither too general nor too specific) and to teach them the strategy of using a chart to organize information.

When asked for his measures of success, he said that he hoped that they would be able to come up with two similarities and differences besides his examples. I asked what data I could collect for him and he asked me to watch if Elisha and Elisabeth are on task.

He had shared with me what he had written in his journal from last week and asked me if that was what I wanted and how often he should do it. I told him that his reflections on the process and how it had impacted on his thinking were exactly what I was looking for and that he could decide for himself how often he wanted to do it.

Journal Entry of Teacher B

I have been asked to keep a journal throughout this process. I am reluctant to do so; however, I see the purpose, so I will try to be honest and forthright.
I am coming to this class after several years of chaotic and, in many ways, poor years of teaching. Serving under a domineering principal, then teaching in a hectic intermediate schedule reduced me in many ways, and in longer term ways than I had first imagined.

Coming back to teaching “a class” is what I have wanted for a long time. I am enjoying the challenge of this class, though I am very much aware that this challenge is ongoing.

This coaching has been insightful. I was very reluctant at first because of my now ingrained sense of hesitation and fear of criticism. But overall, I find this useful.

The sessions have forced me to look at what I am doing and have started me in “tightening” up my thoughts about what I am doing.

I was concerned that the rather “teacher-directed” method I am using this year would be perceived negatively, but has not been.

The talks we have ahead of time are useful because I think just a little more than I normally do. This is good because, quite frankly, I can get into real ruts without the pressure to think about what and why I am doing something.
Observation, Thursday December 5, 1996 10:35 - 11:05

Elisabeth was absent. Elisha continued to be off task for the majority of the time but did manage to copy the information from the blackboard into her notebook. Other than move around a lot however, she was not disturbing others.

Reflection Conference, 1:35- 1:55 p.m.

I started by asking him for his impressions of how the lesson went and he was fairly happy with the lesson. He felt that the students had an understanding of how to pick out similarities and differences despite some of them having not taken very good notes during the film. I asked him how it had gone compared to how he had planned it and he replied that it had proceeded about the way he had hoped. I then asked him what he had done that had caused the lesson to go so well and he replied (long pause) “I’m never quiet sure, I don’t know, I just explained it clearly what they were to do, gave them good examples and then while they were doing it I went around and pointed out what they were doing well. While I was going around I noticed that a lot of them were putting down colours as differences so I went back and reexplained that they have to filter out what is too specific and what is too broad. They still have a lot of difficulty with that concept at this age.”
I then paraphrased that he has observed that they need more practice making comparisons, picking out relevant information by avoiding what is too specific or too general. I asked what plans or activities he had in mind to do this.

"Next week we’re going to do one or two more activities like this, comparing two animals together, and then I’m going to give them an independent research project where they select two animals, research the habitat, etc. and put the information on a chart like this listing similarities and differences."

He also continued that he would guide them in their selection of two animals to ensure that they would be able to find enough similarities and differences to make the project worthwhile.

I reminded him that he had asked me to watch Elisha and I asked him for his observations. He replied that she had been better than before recess and that she hadn’t been disruptive. When I asked for his reflections on the coaching cycle this time he asked me for my observations of Elisha. I shared the data with him that I had collected. When I got to the part where Chantel was moved away and she was staring into the hall, he commented that she was being obstinate: “make me work.” He added that this is what she does but he ignores this behaviour as long as she is not
bothering anyone else as she does finish her work since she knows that she will have to stay in otherwise to finish it. “Also if you go at her too much she just gets worse. I had all the work written out for her to work in the library if her behaviour did not improve and I told her that before recess.”

I commented that the strategy appears to be working as she was not being disruptive, she had gotten her work done and she appears to understand the concept.

I asked about whether he had a preconceived list of similarities and differences and he answered that he hadn’t written it down but he knew generally what information they should have gotten out of the film.

I returned to if he had any reflections to share on the process, any pattern? He responded “Well yes, but it basically depends on the kids, whether they are on task or not. If they are on task then we can talk about the lesson but if they’re not then it’s just so basic.”

I asked if he sees a pattern in my questions and he said that he hadn’t really thought about it. He assumed that I was asking questions concerning what he was doing. Other than the fact that there is “less of you and more of me. You’re expecting me to give my two cents worth and less of your input. You’re making me self-aware I guess, which I’m very resistant to.” (Laughter)
I reiterated that I am really looking forward to his feedback about my role as a coach, and the process, whether he sees it as being useful to him. He said that he thinks that it is a good thing but that the two people have to \textit{want} to do it. It could not be forced.

AC: Next time I will have to explore with him what he means by “a good thing.”

Concerning the planning conference my concerns about his lack of stating the goals for the lesson were clarified in the reflection conference. He had in fact a very clear plan of teaching them how to make comparisons, using a chart to organize information. I am coming to the realization that school culture and teacher talk are so centered on activities that goals or outcomes to the lesson are almost an afterthought. This emphasis on activity however makes it difficult to measure the success of the lesson. Is the lesson successful if the students simply complete the activity?

The coaching cycle for me again underlined the value of taping the reflection conference. I had been somewhat discouraged after the reflection conference because of his lack of giving me feedback and I was questioning whether he was finding the process valuable. However on listening to the conversation I could hear engagement in what we were
discussing and how he had asked for my observations. It also occurred to me that he is so involved in what he is doing and problem-solving on a day-to-day basis that he has not been able to think about the process.

I was encouraged that he articulated that the process was forcing him to think and that I am not the solution-giver. By pointing out that there is a pattern to my questions, hopefully he will be more aware and start to observe the steps in the thought processes that I am leading him through.

I will continue to stress his sense of efficacy in our conferences as he is still feeling on external locus of control, “it basically depends on the kids, whether they are on task or not.”

Coaching Cycle 5, Monday, December 9, 1996, 3:30-3:45p.m.

Planning Conference

Asked what the student learnings were for the lesson the teacher responded that the students were going to proofread their stories. He added that he wanted them to check for capitalization and paragraphing as they have been working on this.

His strategy was to review the rules of capitalization and paragraphing with them, then to have them individually read their stories,
checking for those two points in particular. After that he will assign them a
partner to proofread for spelling.

For his measures of success, he is hoping that at least half of the
capitalization errors will have been corrected and the paragraphing correct
when he collects the stories to read them. Data collection focus is
requested and the teacher pauses to think. He finally asks me to watch
Marcus, to see who is initiating the exchanges between him and Elisha.

**Observation, Tuesday, December 10, 1996, 9:05-9:35**

The teacher explained that they were going to be proofreading their
stories individually. Marcus and Elisha were on-task most of the time.
The two conversations that they had during the observation were initiated
by Marcus.

**Reflection Conference, Tuesday, December 10, 1996, 3:30 - 4:00p.m.**

The teacher was generally pleased with the lesson when asked for
his impressions and he readily gave specific observations which led to this
impression. When I asked him what he had done to cause the lesson to go
so well, this time there was no hesitation. He replied, “Well as always
break it down into little chunks, making sure that they can stay focused, for
example proofreading by themselves. This is something that I’ve never
done before but with this group it’s the only thing they can do. It’s just a
matter of keeping my mind completely at their level, and making sure that everything is in small chunks, very clear, very functional so that there is nothing abstract that would require them to take an extra step because some of them would just get too frustrated.”

After paraphrasing this I asked him what he had learned from this reflection. He replied, “When I plan my lesson, I can’t assume anything and everything has to be planned down to the smallest detail which is a change from what I’ve been used to in grade 8. I find with this class they can only go for very short periods without my direction which is an adjustment for me--a total change of mind, to keep the class totally directed...When I go through it step by step by step, they are quite happy to do the work and are pleased with the results.”

I paraphrased that the students are meeting with success with this step-by-step approach. He came back with more examples of how this same approach has been successful in their environmental studies project and their art lessons, qualifying this with the fact that at grades 5 and 6 he normally would expect to give them more independence. “Their academic and social skills are just so weak, they can’t handle anything that isn’t clearly defined.”
I reminded him that he had asked me to watch Marcus. I asked him for his observations and he replied that he felt that they had worked fairly well. I then shared my observations which basically reinforced what he had observed.

I then recapped that he has observed that he needs to guide them through step by step in order that they can meet success and reduce their frustration. He again jumped in and added, “It’s not just the 6s you know, even the 5s when I’m teaching them math, they need the same type of approach which surprises me because they’re academically stronger. It’s like they have picked up the bad habits of the 6s.”

I again summed up by saying that the students are happier with his approach, he is happier because they are on task and for each lesson therefore he is going to lead them through step by step. He jumped in again, “That just drives me nuts!”

I asked “So this is not your preferred teaching style?”

“To be organized? No. But they are so lacking in organizing skills that I have to be.”

I then asked for his reflections on my role as coach and the process in general. He answered that it’s getting easier and faster because he is
null
more prepared as he knows what to expect now and he is seeing that there is a pattern. He again repeated that it is helpful because it makes him think.

I asked him to clarify what he means by "it makes me think."

"Well just the fact that you are going to be here it makes me reflect more about what I’m doing. I’m not doing anything different than I would have done but the fact that I’m taking that extra time to think, it focuses me to think how I can do other things better."

I asked him to articulate what the pattern is in my questions. He said that for the planning conference it is pretty straightforward: goals, strategies, success and data collection. For the reflection conference he found it more difficult as he said, "I’m so busy thinking, I’m not taking in what you’re doing." However he said, "You always start by asking how I think it went and then what I did to bring about that. After that I’m not sure. The idea being, though, not what the kids have done but what I have done."

I shared with him again that the whole purpose of this coaching is to teach him the process so that he will become self-coaching. He added, "That’s interesting, when I started teaching I used to journal a lot but I stopped about the time that I came to this school (5 years ago). The advantage to journaling is that you have a record of your thinking. If
you’re complaining about something and that carries on for several days, you can look back, see a pattern and say, “I’d better do something about this.” But if you’re just doing it in your head you might forget and never see the pattern and deal with it.”

I am very pleased with this coaching cycle. For the first time the teacher appears to have an internal locus of control. He had read my writeup of Coaching Cycle 1 and had started his journal. This seems to have been a catharsis for him. He stated in his journal that problems that he had had with a previous administrator had shaken his self-confidence in his teaching, which he had not realized previously.

He also seems genuinely surprised that he is meeting such success with his class by this step-by-step approach. I even overheard him telling another teacher in the staff room how, by breaking it down into tiny chunks, the students are eagerly following along.

I also was pleased that he has picked up that I have been focusing on his sense of efficacy. “The idea being, not what the kids have done but what I have done.” This is a complete turnaround. Up to this point he had always answered that whether the lesson did or did not go well depended on the students. He seems overall more confident with his teaching and his
ability to deal with the students in his class. Would this sense of control and problem-solving have taken place without the coaching?

Journal Entry of Teacher B

Tuesday, December 10, 1996:

It amazes me how well the simplest lessons work with this class. Fully directed, small-step increments are the only way they can deal with work. Any activity which lasts more than 10 min. is in jeopardy of falling apart, so it always needs to be broken down into the tiniest of activities which last 5 min. They must then be stopped, refocused and redirected. It is amazing to me.

Wednesday, December 11, 1996:

This morning with the grade 5 students was great. It was relaxed but focused (until I had to deal with an Elisha problem).

After recess, it returned to the same intense way it normally is. We were in the library, with most students working. Then, another class came in and we had to move back to class. That change was a major disruption and the students were not able to recover from it.

Friday December 13, 1996:
This morning went perfectly. The art lesson was step by step and left little room for individuality. It was very low level. But they loved it, and worked hard on it. It was at a grade 3 level, but all were successful.

After recess went the same way. But this tiny-step approach just drives me nuts. It continually amazes me.

**Coaching Cycle 6, Monday, December 16, 3:20 - 3:30**

**Planning Conference**

The teacher appears very comfortable and prepared for my questions. He states that his goals for the novel lesson are:

1. to formulate a spelling list for the novel;
2. to check reading comprehension;
3. to publish a good copy of creative writing;
4. to continue to emphasize good work habits.

For his strategies, he said that he would ask them to gather all the words that they have been looking at and put them into one list. They are then to answer comprehension questions from Chapters 15 and 16 and finally they are to write the good copy of their creative writing.

For his measures of success he stated: If the students can stay focused and use their time wisely, the comprehension questions will be collected and marked, as well as their creative writing stories. When asked what I
could look for that would be beneficial, he responded immediately, “Could you watch for how long they can stay focused without me redirecting them.”

Observation, Tuesday, December 17, 9:15 - 9:50

There was a busy chatter as students worked. However about every 7 - 10 minutes the noise level would get quite high and one would start to hear conversations that were not work related. At that point, the teacher would refocus them and ask them to get back to work while he continued to help individual students.

Reflection Conference, Tuesday, December 17, 1:30 - 1:50 p.m.

When asked for his impressions of how the lesson went he said “Much better than I expected, considering the length of time that they were working individually and the amount of work that they got completed.”

I paraphrased and then asked about what length of time he expected them to be able to work and he said, “about 10 minutes which was maybe about what it was, other than a few individuals that I had to remind but a couple of times I think it was more like 15 minutes.”

I asked what he had done that caused them to be able to focus for this longer period of time.
"I don't know, just things that we've been working on all along, making sure the tasks are straightforward, step by step was written on the board and I had written in their books what they needed to catch up on."

After paraphrasing I shared my observation data with him which basically confirmed his observations. He also added that it is very difficult to give individual attention in this class because as soon as they know that the teacher is not watching them directly, they get off task very easily.

I then asked what he had learned from this cycle that he could apply to future lessons.

"Now that I know that I can keep most of them for 7 minutes straight, I can do that a little more regularly and try to keep lengthening the time. They need to learn that, especially the 6s who are going to have higher expectations placed on them next year."

After paraphrasing what we had discussed this cycle, as well as his plan to try to keep lengthening the amount of self-directed time, he added, "The greatest problem is their lack of maturity and weak skills. They also perhaps have been allowed to be unfocused in class and to not get their work completed within a certain time frame."

I asked what his reflections on this cycle were and whether he had been keeping his journal. He answered that he had been keeping his journal
and that the clarification (paraphrasing) helps as he had not had it that clear in his head.

"A lot of this stuff I have been doing kind of instinctively, like increasing the amount of self-directed time. Now that I am aware of it consciously, I can plan it out a bit better."

I felt that this was an appropriate time to underline his efficacy by reminding him that when we started 6 weeks earlier he had said that he could only keep them focused for 5 minutes at a time and now it had increased to around the 10 minute range. Therefore his strategies were obviously being effective. He responded to this with,

"Yeah, it's just so contrary to me, it's just such an effort every day. I'd gotten so used to those high level grade 8s (AC: He taught the English section for the previous 3 years of the French Immersion classes). You could be very vague and they would work for 40 minutes. This group has no expectations on them, a lot of them, at home, they have no concept of the future or actually planning something. They live right now and that's it. The idea that school is to improve yourself is completely foreign to them. I'm the one that is imposing the organization and desire to improve. Your pointing these things out makes it conscious to me, therefore I can plan better."
I replied that the power of discussing forces us to focus and he said, "and I'm not one to do that." I asked him what he noticed about my role as I didn’t want him to have the impression that I was pointing things out to him but in fact that he is doing it himself.

He replied, "It's me mostly thinking about it rather than you."

I was pleased with this coaching cycle and feel that there is now a sense of routine between the teacher and me. I believe that the teacher now anticipates my questions and that this is in fact focusing his thinking, which he is beginning to appreciate.

I found his comment interesting that the paraphrasing and articulating of his thoughts was clarifying his thinking and that he is "not one to do that." He has made similar comments throughout the six coaching cycles which probably come from his tendency to field independence. It will be interesting to see, now that he is beginning to see the value of peer dialogue, whether he will engage in this activity more often. Will he engage other teachers than me in professional dialogue?

Coaching Cycle 7, Monday, January 6, 1997, 3:25 - 3:35 p.m.

Planning Conference

The teacher started by telling me that he was beginning a new novel study and this time the grade 5s and 6s are studying different novels. He
had assigned both grades to read the first chapter that night as his goal for the next day’s lesson was to introduce the novel and characters, pointing out how it is written in the first person which limits perception for the grade 6 novel, and to provoke empathy for the main character in the grade 5 novel. He also wanted to check reading comprehension and teach what an apostrophe is and how to use it.

His strategy for the grade 6s was to lead them in a discussion about the first chapter and the use of first-person narrative, to be followed by comprehension questions. The grade 5s were to start the comprehension questions, while asking the 6s questions orally about their views on friendship. Both groups would be assigned an activity sheet to practise apostrophe usage.

When asked for his measures of success, he replied: whether they had the chapter read, their answers to the comprehension questions and their verbal responses in class to gauge their understanding of the limited viewpoint of first-person narratives, and their views of friendship.

For data collection, he requested that I observe if the half of the class with whom he is not working remains focused and stays on task.
Observation, Tuesday, January 7, 1997, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.

During the observation both the grade 5s and 6s did indeed work independently and stayed focused as the teacher worked with the other group.

Reflection Conference, Tuesday, January 7, 1997, 3:25 - 3:40 p.m.

The conference started with the teacher stating that he felt the lesson had gone very well. He stated that most of the grade 6s had read the chapter and had understood what had gone on. However when he came to the first person narrative limiting the perspective he had to feed it to them, but with their answers to the comprehension questions he saw that they had understood what he was saying. He also felt that the 5s had worked well and were quieter than he had anticipated when he was working with the 6s.

“They worked well. I was glad to see that.”

When asked what he had done to create this successful lesson he answered:

“Everything was clearly written on the board. They knew where to find the information, one tricky activity for the 5s, I went over it quickly before I started with the 6s. I’m doing this differently from the other novel study. Instead of writing in their notebooks they are using loose-leaf paper
and every day they have to hand it in. Before I would wait 2 - 3 days before collecting their work and a lot of them couldn’t keep track of it for that length of time. That, knowing that it’s due every day, is one reason that the majority of them read their chapter last night... I also found that the homework books weren’t working that well so I’ve come up with a calendar for the whole month which they will hand me every day filled out with their homework. Everything they have completed gets a check mark, anything incomplete gets an X. They and their parents can see what’s going on.”

After paraphrasing this, the teacher replied, “It (all the organizational strategies) really limits things. You can’t really do anything extended, since they can’t handle it. Everything is broken down into tiny little bits. It’s kind of boring.”

I then asked if he has seen progress in their organizational skills since the beginning of the year, knowing that he had, which would stress his efficacy and sense of craftsmanship.

“I’ve been really happy with them all day, they are really coming along.”

When asked for his reflections on this coaching cycle he remarked that it has become very comfortable and relaxed. He had just met with the
principal earlier in the day to start his evaluation; he commented that he wished that this (all the coaching) could be his evaluation. He also repeated that he is happy to see the class improving. "It's small steps but we're getting there."

I asked whether the coaching had helped to clarify his thinking through this period.

"Yes, definitely, the other pair of eyes not only gives you another opinion but keeps you more aware of what you're doing. In this job you do so much by yourself; the extra pair of eyes helps you to focus and it's not like a principal when you feel threatened."

When I asked if he thought he could do the process by himself now, he answered, "Now that I've started doing my journal again, yes, I can see myself doing this." I also feel very relaxed and comfortable with the coaching with this teacher now. In fact I felt rather superfluous this cycle. He had his lesson very well planned, his observations of the class were in total alignment with mine and he knew exactly what he had done to achieve this successful lesson.

I found it interesting however when he heard the strategies that he is using listed, his natural tendency to rebel at such organization came
through: "it's kind of boring." However when brought back to think about the progress being made using these methods, he was pleased.

I have found it gratifying working with this teacher as I believe that he might very well have never implemented these organizational strategies without the cognitive coaching since it is contrary to his preferred teaching style. I have also noticed an improvement in his sense of efficacy and he has started to keep a journal again regularly. It will be interesting to see if the evaluation at the end of cycle 8 supports these impressions.

**Coaching Cycle 8, Monday, January 13, 1997, 3:25 p.m. - 3:35 p.m.**

**Planning Conference**

When asked for the student learnings for the lesson the teacher replied with the strategies or activities. The grade 5s were to do a character comparison by using a chart as well as comprehension questions on their novel after a brief discussion about the characters. The grade 6s were doing comprehension questions as well, plus a decision-making grid to record the pros and cons of a decision that the main character made, following a discussion and examples with the teacher. They also must decide which decision they personally would have made and why. Both groups were also doing a grammar sheet on the correct use of apostrophes.
After paraphrasing I again asked for what learnings he expected from these activities and he stated: to clarify apostrophe use, to check reading comprehension, to teach the grade 5s a strategy for character analysis and that the grade 6s understand that every decision has both pros and cons.

When asked for measures of success he replied, "their participation in and responses to the discussion questions, the completeness of the grade 5 chart which is to be collected and the ability of the grade 6s to explain their choice, which will also be collected."

I then asked what data I could collect for him and he asked me to watch the interplay in class between Amy and Elisha as they have been having problems getting along at recess. I noted that they are seated in diagonally opposite sides of the classroom but the teacher confided that he had had a visit from Amy’s father complaining that Elisha was swearing at her during class.

Observation, Tuesday, January 14, 1997, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.

During the observation the entire class was working quietly and on task. The observer saw no interactions verbal or non between Elisha and Amy.

Reflection Conference, Tuesday, January 15, 1997, 1:30-1:45 p.m.

As asked for his impressions of how the lesson went the teacher replied,
“Well, I had their attention, their confidence level was up, the discussion went well, they worked well and accomplished their work quickly and when I walked and saw it was done fairly well.”

After paraphrasing I asked him what he had done that had caused all this success; he answered:

“I’ve been tracking them very stringently since the beginning of January; the new calendar system seems to be working very well. They’re getting their homework done so are therefore not lagging behind. They can now keep up with their work and everybody is working on the same thing so they are not distracted as easily and are on task. Therefore they are not frustrated because they are not lagging behind and just going through things step by step, the same as always.”

I again paraphrased and then asked him what he has learned about his teaching strategies with this class.

“Everything has to be very small pieces, they have to be constantly and closely monitored and it’s all very basic organizational things... I’m going to keep up these things and look for other ways of helping them stay organized. I’m hoping that at least by March, well I’m already seeing it, that I can let them work independently for longer periods of time. So I’m hoping that by March I can give one group an assignment and have them
work and remain focused for half an hour while I work with another group. That’s what I’m working towards.”

I paraphrased and asked him where he was planning on finding other ways of keeping them organized. He answered, “Other teachers and looking back over things I might have used in the past.” I then asked how long different groups had remained on task for this lesson. He thought for a moment and replied, “about 20 minutes.” I asked this question for two reasons, to increase his sense of efficacy since at the beginning of the coaching process he was talking about their ability to focus for only 5 minutes at a time and also to point out that his goal was attainable. He continued, “for them that was a big step... I was telling them before lunch that the quality of their work has really improved; the only thing they need to work on is getting their reading done when I ask them to, because most of them are getting their homework done, even Wayne and Marcus. It’s just the things that they think they can get away with because it’s harder to check like, did you read this? But most of them are getting all their work done on time.”

I underlined his efficacy in my paraphrasing by pointing out that these organizational strategies are obviously working because of the improvement he has seen.
I was happy with this coaching cycle. It is now very routine as the teacher anticipates the flow of my questions. I wonder though if I had not pushed for the students’ learnings whether the teacher would have even formulated them as he seemed to be forming them as we spoke--especially the one for the grade 6s realizing that every decision has its pros and cons. I noticed a look of discovery as he said it to me and that he used almost the exact same words when he was leading the discussion with the grade 6s.

I also have the impression, because in our reflection conferences he has restated so many times the need to monitor and organize them, that he has internalized this strategy despite his natural dislike of it. In addition I believe his sense of efficacy and craftsmanship has improved as I never judged him nor gave him solutions. The mere articulation of his thoughts seemed to focus and refine them. My role was simply to facilitate his reflections.

**Journal Entries of Teacher B**

Monday, January 13, 1997:

The first week back went very well. I have started a new organizing structure, using a monthly calendar, to ensure student organization. This seems to be working very well. The majority of the students seem to be working well with it and the completion rate is
improving daily. We are spending quite a lot of time just organizing, and
the need to keep their work organized myself remains. But I am starting to
see real improvement. The rate of improvement seems to be increasing. I
am very pleased so far.

Thursday, January 16, 1997:

The improvements continue. The LA class is now running very
well. The students seem to be able to stay focused and are producing much
better work. The grade 5 work is progressing at a great pace, but even the
grade 6s have made great progress. I’ve started my evaluation process
with David. (AC the principal). It is very different from my previous
experience. He seems much more relaxed about the whole thing. It
certainly doesn’t seem to involve mental torture and manipulation.

Level of Use Evaluation at the End of the Coaching, Teacher B, January
14, 1:45 - 2:00 p.m.

Questions and Responses

1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson. Has it changed?

   I guess, more clearly I’m thinking, why am I doing this? I’ve
always tended to figure out what I’ve wanted to do, and still that’s the first
thing I think about but now I think a little bit more about purpose. I go
back to why am I doing this and try to think more clearly, clarify the what more closely with the why.

What about measures of success?

The way I decide about whether they are progressing or not is basically the same; with this class it’s more a question of keeping them organized so they can progress.

2. Do lessons always go as you planned?

No

3. What kind of self-assessment do you engage in?

I’ve started doing the journal more and I’m thinking more positively about ways of looking for them to improve if the lesson hasn’t gone well rather than just complaining about it or letting it slide.

4. How many times during a week would you estimate that you dialogue with another staff member about pedagogy?

Once

With me? (laughter)

Yeah, well that’s not really true. I don’t really talk that often with a lot of staff members but I do two or three times with Kevin or Paul or you or Marg or Gwyn (AC all intermediate staff members). With Marg I find
out what she’s doing with her grade 7 art program to try to plan lessons that will lay the groundwork for next year for my students.

5. What can you tell me about peer coaching?

I have a better attitude towards it, well maybe more a trepidation I guess to begin with. I think it has a lot of benefits. I had a positive experience with it. I think that it depends on the individuals and their reaction to it but I would recommend it.

6. If someone asked you about pursuing teaching as a career what would you tell them?

I would still say no. It has nothing to do with teaching but all the politics around teaching right now. It’s just in general a negative attitude towards teachers.

Any final comments about myself as a coach, the coaching experience?

I think that it was very clear and very well done, like I said when we started I was very hesitant because I thought it was going to be, telling me what to do, but there was none of that, so it was very good that way.

Evaluation

For the Level of Use of goals, I believe that he has moved from Level IVB (Refinement) to level V, Integration, as he’s talking to the
intermediate teachers to integrate his program with theirs. "I find out what’s she’s doing...to lay the groundwork for next year.” With strategies I believe he is still at Level IVB Refinement as he is continually trying to refine his strategies to best meet their needs. “I’m going to keep up these things and look for other ways of helping them stay organized.” For measures of success I also believe that they have remained unchanged at Level IVA Routine: “The way I decide about whether they are progressing or not is basically the same.”

However with reflection I believe that he has moved from Level 1 Orientation to Level III Mechanical Use. “I’m thinking...about ways of looking for them to improve...rather than just complaining about it or letting it slide.” He also has continued journaling. It was interesting when I asked if I could have his journal in order to record his reflections in my writeup; he told me that he would photocopy it in order that he could continue to use it (see Appendix B for LoU chart).

Overall I feel that cognitive coaching was very beneficial to this teacher. It supported him through a difficult transition from teaching high-achieving grade 8 French Immersion students to extremely low-achieving grade 5 and 6s. I believe that the coaching helped to: reinforce his thinking to modify his strategies, clarify his goals for the lessons, increase
his sense of efficacy and craftsmanship, improve his sense of
interdependence and bring to the conscious level a lot of things that he was
doing intuitively but had not clearly articulated. In other words, he has
become more "holonomous" as a result of the coaching.

However I am somewhat left with the impression that the teacher
feels he basically accomplished these improvements by himself, that I was a
mere observer of the process. Therefore I am left wondering, would he
have engaged in these modifications himself or is this another sign of the
success of the process that he feels that he did it himself?

**Level of Use Evaluation, Two months after Cognitive Coaching, Teacher B**

**Thursday, March 20, 1997, 1:45 - 2:05 p.m.**

**Questions and Responses**

1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson.

   I look at what my objectives are going to be, what resources are
available, figure out where the kids are and take it from there.

   Has how you plan a lesson changed as a result of the coaching?

   Yes, I'm thinking things through more carefully, I'm making sure what
I do fits the students...because I'm more aware, I'm a little more critical
and proactive than what I was before. Rather than saying, oh that didn’t
work and leaving it, I think about why it didn’t work and how I could do it better next time.

2. Do lessons always go as planned?
   No

3. After a lesson, what kind of self-assessment do you engage in?
   I’m still doing the journal and I have a portion on my weekly planner for self-evaluation that I hadn’t been using. I’m using it now, just jotting down what I’m thinking about, otherwise I forget about it.

4. How many times during a week do you engage in dialogue with other staff members about pedagogy?
   About four or five times. You are very good about sharing articles, Kevin, Marg (Intermediate teachers), they’re so good about sharing their expertise.

5. What can you tell me about peer coaching?
   I like it. It’s good and nonthreatening. It was good that I did it before my evaluation with the principal. I was thinking the whole time rather than just a routine. It was a spring cleaning of the mind! The biggest problem in teaching is ruts and if you’re not self-aware nothing ever changes.”

Do you have trouble finding the time for reflection?
   Not the time, the energy.
Did you find it easier when we had the time scheduled for reflection?

Yes, if you force yourself, then you do it. It’s like exercise, it’s good for you but it’s hard to find the time and the energy. When things are not going well there is a tendency to blame the students. When you reflect you think about instead what you can do differently in order to help them more.

6. If someone asked you about pursuing teaching as a career what would you tell them?

Still no, not because of teaching, I love it but because of everything else that’s going on right now in education.

Evaluation

For planning, he appears to continue to be at Level V Integration as he continues to dialogue frequently with the Intermediate teachers plus he and I are working on a joint music project with our classes. With strategies, he also appears to continue to be at Level IVB Refinement: “I’m making sure what I do fits the students.” He perhaps has moved from Level IVA Routine to Level IVB Refinement for measures of success as he stated, “Rather than saying, oh that didn’t work and leaving it, I think about why it didn’t work and how I could do it better.” For reflection, I believe that he has moved from Level III Mechanical to Level IVA Routine. “I’m still
doing the journal and I have a portion on my weekly planner for self-evaluation” (see Appendix B for LoU chart).

Coaching Cycle 9, Teacher B, Wednesday, May 28, 1997

Followup cycle to verify analysis.

Planning Conference, 8:30 - 8:35 a.m.

When asked for the student learnings for the lesson, he started by saying that he was doing a demonstration of a black hole, then caught himself and said, “I want the students to understand what a black hole is and how it works”. He added that he also wanted them to understand what a star is and to stimulate their thinking and interest so that they start to ask questions.

Next I inquired after his strategies to obtain these learnings, to which he replied that he is using a demonstration of a black hole using a black sheet and a ring clamp. After that they will answer questions on a sheet with information about stars with a partner and throughout he will encourage the active participation of the students.

For his assessment he answered that he will know if he has been successful if he gets spontaneous questions from the students and if they can answer the questions posed from the material. Just generally, also, if they are engaged and participating. When asked what data I could collect
for him, he asked me to help in assessing the involvement of the students and to watch two students in particular as they have tended to be off task lately.

**Observation, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.**

The students’ attention was riveted during the demonstration. Even after, the students posed thoughtful questions and were very engaged in completing the extending activity.

**Reflection Conference, 12:25 - 12:50 p.m.**

When asked for his impressions of how the lesson went, he replied, “I was worried at first because before you came in, I had to talk to some of them who wanted to climb on their desks to see and also I wasn’t pleased with their questions, but after a while they got into it.”

What did you do that stimulated their interest?

I think the demonstration made it clear to them and I asked a few questions that grabbed their attention. I also made statements that would provoke them. [ AC: like mentioning that a galaxy might disappear into a black hole.] I also related some questions back to what we had talked about before, so I knew that someone would know the answer.

After paraphrasing, I asked what he had learned from today’s lesson.
That they are interested. I was worried that they might not be interested in this unit, although I have always had great success with it before. I noticed that after the demonstration and discussion they were completely into the questions which, when we started yesterday, they couldn’t focus on at all.

After underlining that the concrete visual aids served to pique their interest to even carry over that enthusiasm to the abstract (the questions), I asked what applications he was going to make to future lessons.

I want to do something visual like that to begin each lesson with but sometimes it’s hard to come up with the ideas.

I asked if he wanted to hear my observations. He said that he did. When I reported that both students he had asked me to watch were on task and participating, he commented that he had noticed that too. Since efficacy had been a problem in our earlier coaching episodes and as he had not been overly enthusiastic with praise for his lesson, I underlined how all the students had been enthralled with the demonstration, and that they could work for 10 minutes independently. He agreed with all the observations but made no comments. I asked if he notices a difference in the way he thinks about planning a lesson regularly and when we engage in coaching.
Yes, it’s like when you’re cooking for your family every day and when you’re having company. You make sure that you make a balanced nutritional meal every day but for company you make sure that everything is just right. You just do everything a little more neatly. Having another pair of eyes in the room just makes you more self-aware.

Do you find that you teach differently?

No, it’s more a heightened awareness.

What about the way that you reflect about your lessons, do you notice a difference?

Oh yeah, there can be weeks go by where you don’t reflect. You just plough unto the next thing, but this forces you to take the time. I was writing in my journal last week and I hadn’t written in it for a month so it just shows you the difference.

Finally, if cognitive coaching were available to you for one lesson a month, would you participate?

Yes, definitely.

Why?

Because I see the benefit of it. One of the most dangerous things in teaching is that you fall into routines and you don’t think about things.
Even once a month, it forces you to do that because if you don’t reflect, you’re not going to grow professionally.

Teacher B had answered the question about student learnings with learnings instead of strategies. This shows that he had continued to grow in this area as, at the last coaching cycle in January, he had still answered that question with strategies. In March at the 2-month interview, he answered when asked how he plans a lesson that he looks at the objectives and then plans around that. He was also continuing to reflect in his journal and on his monthly planner. Since that interview, we had a system-wide PA day which focused on how the Board wants us to do long-range plans using the Common Curriculum outcomes which will also tie into the new Provincial Report Card. We had talked about this and a few days previous to Coaching Cycle 9, he told me how he was now planning his units for next year based on the model and student learnings.

Teacher C

Level of Use Evaluation Before Coaching Cycle, Teacher C, Wednesday.

January 22, 1997, 8:15 a.m.

This teacher graduated from Teacher’s College only last spring. She had a short-term contract teaching FSL full time in another school from September to December. She now has a contract in my school from
January until June of this year. This teacher was approached, as the 
intermediate teacher that I had hoped to work with refused. He originally 
agreed, then 2 days later rescinded, stating that he was busy coaching 
basketball and that he had a large class with a lot of behaviour problems. I 
tried to reassure him that this was not about evaluation but to no avail. 
The FSL teacher has classes from grades 2-8, the same grade 8 class the 
intermediate teacher who was not willing to work with me. The FSL 
teacher agreed readily. In fact she suggested that she would like me to 
observe the grade 7 and 8 classes, her two largest and most difficult ones. 
I knew nothing about this teacher, other than what is mentioned above, 
having met her for the first time 3 weeks previously when she came on 
staff. In fact when I asked her to participate in my study it was probably 
only the second or third time that I had spoken to her.

Questions and Responses

1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson.

   I look at what material I have, then I write down what I want to do. 
I usually follow the lesson plan that I was taught: instructional objective, 
anticipatory set, the lesson, evaluation, closure. Then I’ll bring in other 
resources if I think that the lesson is kind of dull... I list out step by step 
what I’m gong to do, maybe hand out a sheet that I might collect for
evaluation or whatever. Sometimes I don’t have time for closure: did you like what you did? But I try.

2. Do lessons always go as you planned?

   No, not always. Sometimes it bombs. When that happens I think about it later, maybe this would have worked better. Right now, I’m just trying to get to know the kids, see how they work...Sometimes I change things midstream.

3. After the lesson, what kind of self-assessment do you engage in?

   Self-assessment? Uhm... I don’t know if I really do that. I have all these classes one after another. End of the day I think, oh that could have been better or this was really good. Sometimes I have good days, sometimes I have bad. I don’t really have time to think after the lesson. Sometimes if I’ve had a bad day, I’ll just go home and do exercises. Other times I’ll talk to my Mom, just to tell her how it went.

4. How many times a week would you estimate that you dialogue with another staff member about pedagogy?

   At my other school, I did that every day as the four FSL teachers were in one office. We talked all the time about what worked best. Here, I would say maybe two or three times a week.”

5. What can you tell me about peer coaching?
...
Peer coaching, I’ve never heard of it.

6. If someone asked you about pursuing teaching as a career, what would you tell them?

I would say that it is very rewarding, it has its benefits and drawbacks. Right now, since I’m young, I know a lot of people who can’t get jobs. I love teaching and am fortunate enough to have a specialty. I can get these short-term contracts but it’s discouraging for my friends who can’t.

Evaluation

For the planning model, the teacher appears to be at Level III Mechanical. She appeared to recite by rote as she answered, “I usually follow the lesson plan that I was taught...” and “I list out step by step what I’m going to do.” However during our first planning conference, it was obvious that she had not internalized this process as she was not aware of what her goals were for the lesson, only the strategy. I therefore changed her rating to Level 1 Orientation.

With strategies she seems to already be at Level IVB Refinement:

“I’ll bring in other resources, if I think the lesson is kind of dull.”

Measures of success appears to be the weakest link in her planning. She listed it when reciting how she had been taught to plan a lesson, but
appeared to give it little thought: “maybe hand out a sheet that I might collect.” Therefore I placed her at Level 1 Orientation.

For reflection, she seems to be at Level 0 NonUse, stuck at the impressions level. “End of the day I think, oh that could have been better or this was really good” and “Sometimes I have good days sometimes I have bad. I don’t really have time to think after the lesson.” (See Appendix C for LoU chart)

Coaching Cycle 1, Wednesday, January 22, 1997

Planning Conference, 8:25 - 8:35 a.m.

When asked what the student learnings were for the lesson that I would be observing she responded with the activities. She told me that she was going to start with a colour game and then practise a dialogue in groups of five which they are to present the next day. I paraphrased, then asked why she was engaging them in these activities. She replied: to reinforce the vocabulary for colours, to practise pronunciation from a written text, to follow teacher modeling, to take the risk and feel comfortable speaking French in front of their peers, and to work cooperatively in groups. These goals seemed to evolve as we spoke. I had the impression that she had not clearly formulated them prior to our conversation.
Asked for her measures of success she answered: observation, are they actually practising? She also planned to evaluate the dialogue when presented for enthusiasm and pronunciation and participation in the colour game. I then inquired what data I might collect for her. She paused for a minute and asked if I could watch the back row, whether they were attending during the game and to assist in observing whether the groups were practising the dialogue during the time given for that purpose.

**Observation, 2:35 - 3:05 p.m.**

During the warm-up, most students were attending but during the time to practise the dialogue about half of the groups were not focused on the task at hand. She raised her voice to ask them to be quiet. All students were listening. When she asked them to sit quietly in a normal voice, no difference in the noise level was noticed. (For a detailed description of all Teacher C’s observed lessons, please refer to Appendix C.)

**Reflection Conference, 3:25 - 4:00 p.m.**

I began by asking her how she thought the lesson went.

Well, I think they liked the game, a lot of them were participating. I should have continued with that a bit longer, maybe I should have closed with that too. When I got them into groups, I let them pick their own groups and I noticed that a lot of them were talking, but when I would
null
come around, then they’d start talking in French. So I can see that I should have cut that down a bit, not given them as much time. I think for the most part though, the groups are going to do O.K. when they present tomorrow. Some of the stronger kids were helping out the weaker ones which was good.

After I paraphrased she added that next time she will choose the groups to try to cut down on the off-task chat. She added that she had listened in with all the groups and they were all able to pronounce the dialogue fairly well. I then asked her what she had done to cause the game to be so successful.

I think first of all, because I modeled it, they understood what was going on. I think with this class, playing games to get their attention is something that I am going to have to look at and projects, hands-on kinds of things because I know it’s too hard to try to do work from the book with them.

Returning to her observation that the groups tended to wander off task, I asked what she plans to do next time. She replied:

I will makeup the groups, now that I know the kids, put in a high achiever, a low achiever and average students in each group. I would even
tell them, show me that you can work well and next time you can pick your own groups and have them work towards that.

I reminded her that she had asked me to observe the back row. I reinforced her observation that there was a high level of engagement during the game. I also shared with her what I had observed during the group work. I then summarized that she noticed games go well. I asked her what she thought it was about the game that they liked.

Well it was about them, the sentences to be used were on the board so it was structured. I might use it again tomorrow, add a few more things, make it more complicated.

I also summed up that next time she would make up the groups to try to balance the groups to keep them on task. She added that, “I noticed it went on for too long, maybe I should have gotten a couple of groups to come over to present it.”

I followed by asking her what she felt that she had learned from this lesson.

I learned that I can have fun with them, they like games and next time I’ll cut down the time for dialogues, so they don’t get off task and I think also that I’m going to have to make myself more strict. The classroom teacher told me that this group only responds if you yell. So I
got to do that to get them to listen, but it’s something that I don’t like to do.

I paraphrased and then asked what other strategies she has thought of using other than raising her voice to get their attention.

Well at my previous school I used three warnings. After the third warning a note goes home to the parent with the reason and the consequence for the misbehavior. I sign it and the parent signs it. If they get three notes then they have to make an appointment with the principal to discuss it. I noticed it worked because they didn’t want to have an appointment with the principal. However some of the kids here would probably have three in a row right away.

I paraphrased and she then responded:

I think I might try it. See if it works. I’m not too sure. I’m just starting, I need to keep my sanity.

I asked who she might talk to about different strategies to increase her sense of interdependency.

The classroom teacher told me it took her 2 months to figure this class out and they only respond to raising your voice. I noticed that even today when I did that they settled down a bit...but I’m a quiet person so I
don’t like to yell. Another intermediate teacher said, get in contact with the parents right away because most of them are supportive.

I realized that we were into a pace-and-lead situation so I asked her, ideally, how would she like to handle discipline problems?

I never liked when a teacher would isolate a person by yelling at them to stop what they were doing. So I think if I did this three warnings they would know without drawing attention to them and I can talk to them one on one after class or walk over quietly and say this to them.

So you think that you’re going to try this system before looking at something else?

Yes, I think that I will, and I’m going to keep close contact with the parents.

I summarized, stressing her efficacy by stating that she can motivate them to speak French through the use of games and dialogues, they can work in groups as long as it is very defined and for a limited period of time and that for discipline she is planning on implementing a system that has worked before. I then asked for feedback from her on my role and the coaching process.

At first I felt like I was back in Teacher’s College when the professor would come in to evaluate you. Afterwards I got into it and I
didn't care that you were there. I like talking about it afterwards, talking to someone else instead of thinking in your mind by yourself.

What struck me most, about working with this teacher for the first time, is how vulnerable beginning teachers are to school culture. She appeared ready to accept a way of disciplining that she personally disliked even before trying something else that had worked for her previously.

I was also impressed how, using the reflective process, she herself came up with the suggestions that I would have given her to improve the lesson. This did not put me in the position of solution-giver and her being dependent on my words of wisdom, but instead gave her the respect of a capable professional able to analyze and self-modify her performance. I also believe that the articulation and clarifying of what make the game successful enabled her to transfer those successful strategies to other lessons and other classes. Would she have pinpointed why it had worked without my questioning? Would she have even taken the time to think about it?

AC: These journal entries were entered after the eight coaching cycles had been completed.
Journal entry:

When Jennifer first asked me to participate in her project I did not know what to expect. I thought, "Oh great! I've just started to work here and already I am being observed." I am not quite sure what her project is about. She explained it to me but I am still not clear and I am quite confused.

I did notice that when she came in the students were taken aback because they too wanted to know what she was doing. To be truthfully honest, I felt quite uncomfortable with her being in the classroom because I feel that she is somehow evaluating me. I am a new teacher and having someone with experience in your classroom can be very intimidating. Well, I hope as time progresses that I will figure out exactly what she is doing because as of now I really do not have a clue.

Coaching Cycle 2, Tuesday, January 28, 1997

Planning Conference, 8:30 - 8:40 a.m.

Asked for the student learnings for the lesson she responded with the activities/strategies. She will introduce the new words, have them repeat the words after her, practise them with a partner, copy the words in their booklets, draw a picture to illustrate each word and finish their title pages. Asked for the central learnings for these activities she replied that
they understand and can pronounce the vocabulary words for the space unit.

For measures of success she stated: observation of their pronunciation with a partner and observation of the illustrations, if they were appropriate for the word. She asked me to watch Bartek, Brad and Aaron for on-task behaviour.

**Observation, 1:35 - 2:10 p.m. (a class of 18, Gr.4 students)**

Brad, Aaron and Bartek worked well for the first 10 minutes of the lesson but then started to lose focus. The teacher approached the group and noticed that Aaron had copied only one word. She moved him to a desk by himself. After that Bartek and Brad continued to work well for the rest of the class.

**Reflection Conference, 3:35 - 4:00 p.m.**

What were your impressions of how the lesson went?

“Well, I did the lesson before with the other grade 4 class and I found that even though there are more kids, it went more smoothly than this one. The other class actually did practise the vocabulary together. This class strayed. They always want to be with their friends and if I try to put them with somebody else they back away. I think for the most part they wanted to rush through the vocabulary work to get back to the title
page because they like that. I was impressed with Bartek today, he finished his work so maybe he’s interested in space. And Aaron and Brad weren’t bad.”

When I paraphrased that the work with the partner had not gone well she added, “yeah, there was even tension, who am I going to work with? or their refusal to work with their assigned partner.”

I added that their poor social skills had deterred the effectiveness of this strategy and she agreed despite the fact that it had worked well with the other grade 4 class. I therefore asked her what she would do differently next time to avoid this problem of choosing a partner.

“I think I’d pair them with somebody I know that they can work with because I want them to speak with one another, not just me speaking. They also have to learn to work with anybody because that is what the real world is like.”

“What might you do another time to encourage this ability to be able to work with anybody?”

“They like hands-on things, so maybe next time they could have the pictures and match the words to the pictures and say it as they put them together.”
After paraphrasing this I continued by asking her what she might do to improve the social skills, of working with somebody they might not like.

“That’s kind of hard, I’m really not sure, I don’t know what I could do.”

I replied as she seemed genuinely stuck, “Something I’ve seen done is that you pair everybody in the class randomly, one, two, one, two or I’ve also seen it done, find a person who is wearing the same colour as you.”

I then returned to her observation that they had rushed through or not finished the vocabulary activity to return to colouring the title page. What would she do differently next time to prevent this?

“Next time, I won’t even mention that that activity is to follow, and that they have to show me the completed vocabulary activity before going on.”

Returning to her goals for the lesson and her measures of success, I asked her how successful the students had been in meeting those goals.

“When I went around to the pairs, most were good and they were helping one another, what’s a meteor? and someone would know. That was good.”

I summarized all the things that she was pleased with about the lesson and the one thing that she wasn’t pleased with, how they had
worked with their partner, that she is thinking about pairing them differently. I then asked what she has learned from this coaching cycle.

"I’m a bit clearer on what you’re doing. I like talking about what’s going on. I’m actually thinking out what I’m doing. I still find it weird because when you come in I think that I’m being evaluated, there’s somebody else in the classroom. But I realize you’re here to help and guide me through the process of teaching."

I paraphrased then asked, “Feedback for me, any way that I could be more effective?”

“You could give suggestions because you’ve been teaching longer than me. So any suggestions that you can give, especially with the grade 8’s.”

I felt at this point that the coaching had ended as we were no longer talking about the lesson that I had observed. I felt that I had switched roles from coach to information-provider. Therefore I asked, “Was there anything in particular that you wanted to know today?”

“I’m getting a lot of attitude from the grade 8s; any advice on that I’d take.”

I asked her what she has observed. I found that she did not have a specific question but instead I was again paraphrasing and guiding her
reflections through this problem. As she talked and I paraphrased and probed, she actually was coming up with her own ideas to try. My role was placing her observations and ideas in a pedagogical context through paraphrasing which reinforced sound pedagogical practices.

She said that she has also started her journal and we agreed that next week I would observe the grade 8 class on Thursday.

I found this cycle the most difficult to not give advice. Having taught FSL for 10 years, I know exactly how I would have taught that lesson. But she is not me. Even when she asked for advice, what she wanted to do was verbalize and process what she had been thinking about. This emphasized for me that coaching is about the person being coached, not the coach. For idea-gathering I believe it would be more effective to have a teacher observe another teacher and take the ideas that fit. This leaves the locus of control and sense of efficacy with the teacher rather than taking it away through advice-giving. However when she was genuinely stuck on how to get around the partnering problem, I used John Dyer’s advice and gave some ideas by saying, “something I’ve seen done is...”

I also believe that the planning conference is clarifying her goals and strategies. Again she appeared to have not given the goals for the
lesson much thought, only the activities. She also is feeling a lack of control, especially with the grade 8’s. I intend to emphasize her sense of efficacy and craftsmanship in the next cycle.

**Journal Entry:**

This was the second time that Jennifer came into my class. I am still a bit nervous having her in the class but once I got into the lesson I really did not notice her being there. I am still not quite sure what she is doing. She has explained it to me but it still somewhat boggles the mind. I am sure that once we start talking about it, I will get a clearer picture.

I do like how we talk at the end of the day about how the lesson went. I find it very helpful. In the back of my mind I still keep on wondering if she thinks I am doing a good job. Being a new teacher, I am very conscious of this because I know that I am doing my best but I wonder if I am doing the right things. This is what makes me very nervous.

I noticed today that the students were nervous about her being in the class. They are still unsure as to what to make of her. They are actually quite funny about it.
Coaching Cycle 3, Thursday, February 6, 1997

Planning Conference, 8:30 - 8:40 a.m.

As asked for the student learnings, the teacher responded with the strategy. The grade 8, FSL class are continuing an activity that they had started the previous day. They are making a brochure with a schedule of activities for an event of their choice. I paraphrased and redirected my question to have her articulate the purpose for the activity. She replied that she wanted them to be creative, and expand their vocabulary, from the model she had given them the day before. She then added that they didn't know how to use an English/French dictionary and she wanted them to look up words that they didn't know. I paraphrased that the purpose of the lesson was to apply previously taught vocabulary and structures and to learn how to use an English/French dictionary.

For her measures of success she replied that they would be evaluated on their product: grammar out of 10, creativity out of 10, neatness out of 5 and good use of class time out of 5.

I asked her what data I could collect for her and she asked me to watch for on-task behavior, especially the back row, Todd and Colin.
Observation, 12:55 p.m. - 1:30 p.m. (Gr.8 class, 37 students, 8 identified)

Students started to work noisily on the previous day’s work. The teacher moved some students who were having difficulty focusing. This appeared to work for about 15 minutes. The teacher again refocused those needing it and again most returned to the task at hand.

Reflection Conference, 3:25 - 4:00 p.m.

I began by asking her how she felt the class had gone.

I find this class really hard to deal with. There are a few of them that will get down to work and a few of them that won’t. I’ve tried changing the seats and it doesn’t matter...whatever I do doesn’t work. I don’t know what to do with this class. I’m at my wit’s end. There are about seven that cause the most difficulty. They just don’t understand that I’m the teacher and they are there to do their work. There are some of them that are working...I explained to them yesterday how to do it but I found some of them still confused as to how to approach it...I don’t know, I’m having problems with this class.

I paraphrased that she is unhappy because of the behaviour of a few, yet she is pleased to see other students putting forth an effort. She added, “Yeah there are students that are trying but they are being
influenced by the others...I've been told that I don't have to complete the entire program. I've noticed that if they can actually do something with their hands, it's better...I'm trying to deal with Colin [AC: Colin's father passed away just 2 weeks ago.] I don't know if he is just like this with me or the other teachers as well."

At this point I shared my observations with her which confirmed many of her own. I asked her what strategies she has in mind to deal with Colin.

I don't want to take him away from his friends because of what he's going through; on the other hand, I want his friends to do their work. He's trying to act cool. I'm thinking about talking to Carol (the VP) about how he is acting, maybe I could send him down there to work. I'm afraid that if I just place him in the hall he might run away.

I replied, "What I've seen done is quietly ask him to go into the hall and when he feels that he can work without disturbing others he can come back in."

I don't know, I feel like they are taking advantage of me because I'm young and because I think they know that I don't like to shout and they want to see how far they can get.

What makes you say that they are taking advantage of you?
When I tell them to be quiet and they ignore me. It’s their attitude towards French. I’m just finding it really hard.

I decided that I needed at this point to underline her sense of efficacy and craftsmanship. I replied,

You’ve tried ignoring inappropriate behaviour, you’ve been in contact with the parents, you’ve been talking to the classroom teacher and you’ve talked to Carol and David (the VP and Principal). You’ve tried some different strategies and you’re modifying the program to make it more hands-on and interesting for them.” I also pointed out that after she had moved Todd, he had worked for 15 minutes and that at different points in the lesson the majority, if not all, the students were on task until about 1:25 when they seemed to need a break and then 2 minutes later were back to work.

Teacher C responded, “I find they are a very social group.”

I paraphrased that they like to talk as they find reading and writing difficult. She continued, “Yeah, even in English they can barely write a sentence, yet alone in French.”

I reiterated that they like to talk and do things with their hands and that she is modifying the program to allow for this.

And they like doing their own thing too, being creative.
I restated again that they find reading and writing difficult, and have difficulty staying on task, so what ideas does she have to further modify the program to fit their needs?

With the elements that they do have to know, I’ll have to cut down and make it short, like 10 minutes then give them a break and come back, maybe that will work.

I paraphrased then asked, considering their verbal and social tendencies, had she considered using structured games?

Oh yeah, they love that game 7-up

What is it about the game that they like?

It’s simple sentences, and they get to pick their friends. They love playing Scrabble in French too. Even the ones that are behaviour problems will play the game. They like it.

I paraphrased that game-playing seems to be enough of a motivation to keep them on task. “The challenge then is to modify the program so that there is enough modeling and structure to guide them yet give them some choice to personalize it, keep the activity short and include some kind of game component.”

Yes, because they can’t read and are frustrated with any writing...another good thing would be skits, to get them moving.
I restated, “keep the activity short, structured and the learnings boiled down to the minimum.”

Yes because this program is way too difficult for them, all the verbs and the tenses... They don’t have a clue.

I then asked her, to allay any qualms she might have about not following the program faithfully: “For a group of students such as this, what is the most important thing that you would like them to take away from your French class?”

I would like them to leave, going to high school, knowing that French can be fun. That it’s not all grammar. I’d like to see some of them taking the risk to speak French. Also to know enough French to be able to get by in a French environment.

After paraphrasing I asked “Given that this is your overall goal, how is that going to effect your modification?”

I’m going to modify and make up a lot of games...Even get them to make up the games as long as I guide and structure it for them.

You’ve got a plan in mind: modify the program to keep it simple, structure activities around what they like so that they have a positive attitude and create situations to encourage them to take the risk and speak French through the use of games and skits etc...
I then underlined her efficacy that she has already seen successes when she has modified the program and that it continues to be only two or three that are disruptive. However she has a plan to further modify to draw them all in and keep them on task, stressing her craftsmanship.

Yeah, I want to have fun with them because I like them.

What do you think you learned from this cycle?

I like talking about it, talking out my ideas, so it’s clear in my mind. I’m more at ease now. Before I thought, ‘Oh no, she’s going to see there’s no control and everything like that, but no it’s not like that. I like you being in the class and to be able to share ideas after.

After paraphrasing I asked if she had any other comments.

I have my journal at home and I write in it. I wish you were in the class all the time!

This coaching cycle emphasized for me how destructive teacher isolation is. She started the reflection conference completely discouraged and at a loss of what she should do. By the end of the conference she had a plan of action and was totally reenergized to the point where she was saying that she liked the class! I believe that professional dialogue needs to be increased and is extremely valuable to all teachers but I can see now
how it is essential to beginning teachers to give them the emotional support that they need.

**Journal entry:**

What a day! I really did not want Jennifer to come into my class today. My day was not going so great and I thought that my lesson would be a disaster. Actually, it turned out to be quite okay and I was pleased.

I am becoming more comfortable with her being in the room. I am looking forward to our discussion at the end of the day as to how the lesson went. I really like this because I find it easier to talk ideas out if someone is there to guide you along. It is better to let your ideas flow instead of keeping them locked up in your head.

I am now beginning to see more clearly Jennifer’s role when she is in my class. I find her project very interesting and it is something that I would recommend everyone to participate in. I especially find it extremely useful for beginning teachers.

**Coaching Cycle 4, February 13, 1997**

**Planning Conference, 8:30 - 8:40 a.m.**

When asked for the student learnings for the lesson the teacher responded immediately that she was going to assess their reading ability in French. (AC: I had given her a copy of Coaching Cycle 3 to read the day
before so she could see how I was writing up what we were doing. She told me that she thought it was very good. I had the impression that she had noted when asked for her learnings, that she had given her strategies in that cycle.)

I then asked what her strategy would be. She replied that the students would listen to the dialogue on tape, practise in groups for 5 minutes, then present it to the class. Asked for her measures of success she said that she was evaluating the oral presentation out of 5. I inquired what criteria she was using for the evaluation. She thought for a minute and answered: speak loudly and clearly, be expressive, and correct pronunciation of words that they should know. I asked how the students would know which words she considers essential. After a pause she said, "I could make a list on the board." I then asked how the students would know, when they got their mark, which of the three criteria they need to improve. Another pause, then, "I suppose that I could evaluate each criteria out of 5 and make it totally out of 15."

I then asked her what data I could collect for her. She asked me to watch to see if they are attentive during the presentations, as it is important that they are a polite audience and listen politely. Knowing this class's behaviour problems, I inquired if she wanted to make being a polite
audience part of the evaluation. She readily agreed and said, “That would make the dialogue out of 20.” She also asked me to watch how they use their 5 minutes of practising time.

**Observation 12:55 - 1:30 p.m.**

The groups except one, practised the dialogues making good use of the time given to practice. During the presentations the class was generally attentive although was starting to get restless by the last presentation. The students then were finishing quietly either a card activity or playing Scrabble.

**Reflection Conference, 2:10 - 2:25 p.m.**

Asked how she felt the lesson went she replied, "Well, they’re really frustrating me, even when I explained how they could get easy marks, they didn’t care...however some of them really tried hard, one group even memorized theirs. I thought it would go longer so I let them play Scrabble. They like playing that and they’re calm playing that. I go around and encourage them to use French words but some of them won’t even try. Some of them try but they’re very low. I’m getting those tapes on positive discipline...I don’t know, maybe it’s me, like I’m failing in some way.”
I paraphrased that what she was pleased with was that some students are trying; however what she finds frustrating is that a few are not on task, some of the time but yet they were quiet and calm today.

More so than usual today...I think it’s that they love to play games. I’m thinking of putting a word list of easy words in the boxes for them to refer to.

I paraphrased that they like games and that it helps to keep them calm and focused; however it’s too easy for them to lapse into English so she’s thinking of giving them a list of French words to help them.

I’ve been looking through the program for things that could be made into games, even make mobiles out of vocabulary words, because some of them are very artistic I’ve noticed, and I think that they would like that.

I paraphrased and added that they seemed to have done a good job with the cards and that she is going to continue to investigate different ways of modifying the program. I then asked her if she was pleased with the assessment of their reading ability.

Some of them aren’t too bad, some are bad but I don’t know if I’m expecting too much, this is my first year teaching...it’s mainly their attitude towards French. They just don’t care.
I paraphrased that the biggest problem is getting them motivated and that she is modifying the program by using games, dialogues, creative projects and deemphasizing the reading and writing components which they find difficult. I then reminded her that she had asked me to watch how they had used their 5 minutes of practising time. I reported most had stayed on task for almost the entire 5-6 minutes. When I reported that two students had even come up and asked me for help in pronouncing certain words, the teacher interjected, “because they wanted the marks.” I paraphrased, so the marks are motivating for some students. “Yes but they definitely do not like paper and pencil type activities, they’re very low but you can have fun with them. Josh has settled down a bit. He’s trying now.”

I paraphrased, then added that she has noticed some improvement in their attitude since the beginning of January.

Oh yeah, I think they’re finally getting used to me being here.

I paraphrased that she has a plan, she’s going to go with their interests to motivate them, to keep them on task since as she again observed today, you go with what they like and they are calm and focused. Give them short tasks, explain clearly how they can get good marks for the ones that are motivated by marks, and use creative and game activities for others that are motivated by that. So you plan to modify the program to incorporate those
strategies and stay away from pencil and paper type activities as much as possible. What did you learn from this coaching cycle?

As I said before I like talking about it, especially this morning. You know how I said maybe evaluating it out of 5? Well it was better doing it this way. You get better ideas talking to someone. I felt when you left after the lesson that the lesson was bad! But then talking about it after is fine.

Unfortunately the conference ended abruptly there as I was called away. However this cycle again pointed out to me the importance of giving nonjudgmental support. With her final remarks, she revealed that she was worried that I would somehow evaluate her badly on how the lesson had gone but then realized that I was there to be not judgmental, but supportive.

I also believe that as we talked I was able to emphasize her sense of efficacy and craftsmanship to move her from a feeling of failure at the end of the lesson to a plan and sense of direction to carry on. I also believe that through this coaching she has a sense that she is not in this alone and a sense of hope that things can improve.
Journal entry:

I am really beat. The kids really drove me nuts today. They were loud and they wouldn’t settle down. This all happened in the morning. I have such a headache and I still have one.

Well, when Jennifer came in, I thought things went well. The students seemed to stay on task and were involved in what they were doing. There were of course a few that were fooling around, but for the most part they were doing what they were supposed to be doing.

I really enjoyed our discussion after school today. I find it very helpful to talk to a colleague to get feedback as to how the class went. I am also seeing a pattern of coaching emerge. There are certain questions that we follow which enables us to have very good discussions. I am really enjoying being part of Jennifer’s study. I feel that I am learning and gaining a lot!

AC: The reflection conference seems to have completely changed her impression of how the lesson went. She started out in the reflection conference feeling that she was failing in some way, to writing in her journal after the conference that she thought things had gone well.
Coaching Cycle 5, Wednesday, February 19, 1997

Planning Conference, 8:30 - 8:40 a.m.

Asked for the learnings for the lesson, she responded with her strategy.

(AC: We had to change our coaching time at the last minute so she had not had time to prepare for our planning conference). She stated that the grade 7 students were making a poster in groups (four maximum) with a team logo and slogan in French. I paraphrased and probed for the purpose of the activity. She said that this activity was an application of the vocabulary for colours, an opportunity to use French creatively, to practice using the English/French dictionary and to work cooperatively.

For her measures of success, she is evaluating the posters out of 20: 10 for creativity/effort, 5 for correct French and 5 for cooperation during the work period. With data collection she asked me to watch whether the students are on task and do they stay focused, especially Mike and Shannon.

Observation, 2:35 - 3:05 p.m.

All groups were very animated and involved in completing the assigned project. Students were still discussing what they were doing as they were leaving the classroom. However because of the large number of students in
the classroom and the group work, the noise level was quite high. This appeared to bother the teacher.

**Reflection Conference, 4:00 - 4:25 p.m.**

AC: An unexpected staff meeting had been called after school. The teacher came to me quite concerned about when we would meet. I asked if we could still meet after the meeting and she agreed.

When I asked her how she felt the lesson went, she replied,

“There were a few who got to work, some took awhile to settle down to their work and some of them are still not clear as to where they are going with the assignment and I had to help them...I think for the most part they are using the dictionaries, so for that part I was pleased; however there are some that just can’t control themselves.”

I paraphrased and asked what she had observed that she wasn’t happy with.

I know that if they’re working in groups, they’re going to be loud, but even when I said “if you don’t start working now, it’s going to be for homework,” that doesn’t deter them. I don’t know what’s going to make them get down to work, and I don’t want to be shouting all the time.

I paraphrased that she didn’t like their being loud. She interjected, “I don’t mind if they start talking amongst themselves and I know that it’s
going to be in English if they’re doing their work. It’s when they start
talking about last night or what’s going to happen tonight that is
unacceptable."

Did you observe them talking about that?

Some of them, and I tell them, get to work!"

I felt at this point that it was important for me to share my observations
with her, to give her a different perspective. I underlined that all
conversations were work related despite being loud and they appeared to
be very motivated by the activity. I then restated that she had observed
students’ conversations off topic. She replied,

Yes, Steven and Chuba, they were just chatting for some time.

There were no more examples. I then asked her what she had done to
keep them on-task.

I think they like using their hands. It’s not, oh I have to think really
hard about these verb tenses, just keep it simple. You have to keep it
simple for them. Some of them are very creative and they want to do well.

I added at this point that two students had been so caught up in the
activity, that they were still talking about it as the class was leaving.
One of those students, I called his Mom so he’s been trying lately. Actually, all the boys that are usually goofing off have been really into this activity.

I underlined her craftsmanship by paraphrasing that they’re enjoying the activity because it’s motivating, creative, simple and self-directed. She is noticing that the students are responding positively to her program modifications.

Oh yeah, you should see June’s poster! She took it home to finish it. It’s beautiful! I’m going to put them up in the hall.

I paraphrased that she was pleased with the effort some students are putting into the activity and that she is working on their self-esteem by displaying their work in the hall. I again restated that by keeping the program simple, hands-on, and self-directed she is seeing improvements in their motivation.

Yes, some of them are making improvements. I got this neat video with French commercials. I’m going to show it and then let them make their own commercials. Some of them are hams.

So, you’re building on their interests, something to hook them in.
Yeah, that’s what Nicole (the French Consultant) said, don’t worry about finishing the program. Just find something that’s going to motivate them.

What did you learn from this cycle?

I like talking about it. I’m more comfortable with you in the room and I think the kids are more comfortable. It’s easier to talk out your lesson with someone because I don’t see all the things that you see because I’m with the other kids. I think, oh they’re so loud, they’re fooling around! So it’s good to hear that they were actually working...they’re just loud.

The teacher had been quite upset by how she had perceived that the lesson had gone. She made comments to me on the way to the staff meeting “That was so awful! etc.” I didn’t want to talk about it until we were actually in the reflection conference so I simply commented, “Don’t worry about it.” It also demonstrated vividly the power of negative assumptions. She had extrapolated from one off- topic conversation and the noise level, that they couldn’t be working. It also pointed out that at times another pair of eyes can be very beneficial for data collection. In this case it underscored for the teacher that she is indeed on the right path and to continue her modifications.
This cycle I felt somewhat rushed because of the schedule changes. I neglected to ask her for feedback on my coaching and whether she is keeping her journal.

Journal entry:

I had a good day. The kids for the most part did what they were told and I was very pleased. I was a bit concerned as to how Jennifer thought today’s class went. My main concern was they could not be doing what they were told to do because they were loud and talking. They were very chatty. I find this to be a huge problem with this class because they are a very social group.

It was funny today because many of the kids came to my defense as to why Jennifer was in the class. They did not like that someone else was in their class and they thought that she was judging me. Some of them were also nervous because they thought they were being watched. They really do make me laugh.

I enjoy talking my ideas out at the beginning of the day and my feelings and opinions at the end of the day. So far, I am understanding Jennifer’s purpose and motivation of her project.
Coaching Cycle 6. Thursday, February 27, 1997

Planning Conference, 8:30 - 8:40 a.m.

As asked for her learning objectives the teacher replied with her strategies. She said that they were going to practise a dialogue for 5 minutes in groups that they had been assigned the day before. They will then present their dialogues to the class.

After paraphrasing, I probed for the purpose of this activity and she responded; to practise speaking in French, to practise reading in French and applying the target vocabulary for the unit. She added that following the dialogue there will be words and sentences to decode on the board that different individuals in the class have composed. This is also to practise the vocabulary and their reading in French.

I asked for her measures of success and she said that the evaluation procedure would be on the board. She also would like to see them attending during the dialogues and that they participate in the decoding activity. I inquired as to what data I could collect for her and she responded to just generally observe their behaviour.

Observation, 12:55 - 1:30 (Grade 8 class of 35)

The teacher explained the activity with the evaluation clearly outlined on the board. Students generally used the time to practise well and listen
to the first presentations but were getting restless towards the end. During the decoding activity all students were completely engrossed in it and stay on-task until the end of the class.

**Reflection Conference, 3:30 - 4:00 p.m.**

When asked for her impressions of how the lesson went, the teacher responded,

“I know there are a few who can not handle themselves listening to other people, or they act stupid while presenting....Some of them were fine. The second part of the lesson, the decoding of the messages, they like that. I noticed that there was a lull and they were all doing it. They like puzzles, figuring things out.”

I paraphrased that she liked the game because it kept them quiet, motivated and on-task; however for the dialogue presentation some of them had trouble sitting and listening. Others, because of their lack of confidence, were intentionally trying to be silly while presenting.

Yes, they really like games. I’ve started the Preferred Activity Time where if they work well, they earn time to play games. They also keep asking to do another project because they like that. I’ve noticed that they don’t have the vocabulary skills to compose their own dialogue. I had to
help them a lot with the few simple words or phrases on their posters that they did.

I paraphrased that the class has a great deal of difficulty with dialogues as they don’t have the vocabulary skills, yet during the decoding activity they were reading and manipulating the French words to solve the puzzle. I then asked her what was it about the decoding activity that made it so successful.

I think it’s the challenge. They want to figure it out. I noticed that some kids in the class had been using codes that they were making up to write notes so I thought, “Heh, I can use that to practice their French!”

After paraphrasing I asked how she was going to continue to use their interest in games.

I’m definitely going to plan more creative, hands-on activities...maybe even clay or plasticine, anything to keep them occupied because they go crazy if they have to do pencil and paper exercises. I don’t know what they’re like in other classes, maybe it’s just French.

I reiterated that she was going to continue to look for ways to modify the program to keep it simple and hands-on. She added, “Yeah, they really like seeing the posters that they had done in the hall. A lot of them have such low self-esteem.”
I paraphrased that by modifying the program she is setting it up so that they can succeed and feel good about what they’re doing. Also using things that they are interested in, motivates them to stay on task. I summed up by saying that she is going to continue to keep it simple, guide them through step by step, find hands-on activities and set it up so that they can meet with success and build up their self-esteem. I then asked for her comments on the coaching cycle.

I like it you know because you can talk things out, talk your ideas through.

I asked her if she sees any pattern to my questions.

Yes, you ask how did you find your lesson, did you meet your objectives, the observations, what could I do differently....

I added and in the planning conference, learnings, strategies, measures of success and data collection. I told her that the reason I was asking is that this is cycle 6 and the goal of the coaching was for her to learn to do this herself. Next, I asked her for comments on my role as coach.

It’s still weird for me because I’m new to have someone come into class. She’s going to see that I have no control. Sometimes I’m ready to pull out my hair. And then I think, well she knows what they’re like. I
also worry that the VP's office is next door and she hears how noisy they are by the end of the day.

I replied that the grade 7 and 8 classes are extremely large (35 and 37 respectively). The grade 8s have French the first period after lunch and the grade 7's the last period of the day. On top of this roughly one third of each class is extremely low functioning. She has strategies in place to manage and cope with this situation by keeping the program simple, hands-on, and setting it up so that her long-term goals for the class were that students would have a positive attitude towards French and take the risk to speak it. Think of the class today, did they have a positive attitude?

Yes, as long as it's a game.

And the risk to speak French, they all did that today. Have you seen improvement from when you came in January?

Oh yeah, the modifications have really helped.

I then asked her if she is continuing to keep her journal.

Yes, at home, I like to write.

Despite the fact that I have been stressing her efficacy and craftsmanship each coaching cycle she appears to still believe that it is because she is young and inexperienced that she is having trouble with these classes. I also find it discouraging that after 6 cycles she is still
somewhat uncomfortable with my being in the class. There also is not that sense of routine I experienced with the previous two teachers. Perhaps this is because she is so involved in problem-solving with the behaviour of these two classes.

Journal entry:

Well, I feel like I am right in the swing of things as far as the project that I am participating in is going. I find it very interesting and I would like to see the final result.

I feel that as time progresses, I am developing a better rapport with the students. I notice a big difference from when I started to the present time. The kids are getting to know me better and they know what to expect. I feel that they are trusting me more. I am beginning to like them a lot better than when I first started. I have found with the grade 8 class that it is much easier to grab their attention and get them involved if they have a project to do. It is amazing to see how settled down they can get once they are involved and interested with the task on hand.

I felt that today's lesson went well because they seemed to be involved and they met my objectives. I really like talking out my ideas at the end of the day with Jennifer.
Coaching Cycle 7, Wednesday March 5, 1997

Planning Conference, 8:25 - 8:35 a.m.

Asked for the learning objectives (I decided to change my terminology in the hope of getting that instead of the strategy), the teacher responded with the strategy. The students are to choose a product, describe it and create a logo for it, individually or in a group of two or three. She said that she was going to have the instructions and an example on the board. After they have completed this they will then present it to the class. Pressed for the learning focused in this activity she replied that she would like them to apply an ir verb in a meaningful situation.

For measures of success she will be watching for how many can understand the instructions and stay on task; also which students can accomplish the task with little assistance. She also wants to see them working cooperatively. After reviewing her learning focus I asked how she was going to evaluate the activity. She replied (AC: I had the impression that she was formulating this as we spoke) that the French would be marked out of 10 and presentation and creativity/effort at 5 marks each. I then asked what data I could collect for her and she asked me simply to help her in observing how well they work.
Observation, 2:25 - 3:05 p.m. (Grade 7)

The students again were very engaged in the hands-on activity. Only 2 out of the 8 groups had difficulty staying focused.

Reflection Conference, 4:15 - 4:45 p.m.

When asked for her impressions of how the lesson went she replied, “I think they’re enthused for the most part. They got into it right away. But I also noticed that there were eight away today. What a difference! I didn’t notice a lot of off-task behaviour. Did you?”

I paraphrased and then confirmed her observations, underlining her craftsmanship by pointing out that a lot of students are now comfortable using the English/French dictionary, which skill she has been targeting. I also pointed out that the students were motivated enough in the activity that two times I overheard students say to another student, “Turn around and stop bothering me.” I then shared my observation that some students were really struggling in choosing a product. I asked her what ideas she had to alleviate that. She replied,

“I thought about it when I was going around. I should have put ideas up on the board to choose from because some of them just can’t think. So tomorrow I’ll have some ideas on the board for anyone that is still stuck. Then I’ll give them 5 minutes and they’ll have to get started after that.”
I paraphrased that when the activity is simplified and hands-on the students are motivated. I then asked if she was pleased with her targeted learning of using an ir verb; had that been achieved?

Some of them tried but I think a lot of them didn’t even realize that I had said that.

I then asked her what strategy she would use next time to make that goal clearer for the students.

I could have given them more examples...or even made an activity out of it, here are different ir verbs, here are some slogans.

After paraphrasing I asked her what she had learned from this coaching cycle?

With this class, I have to make things interesting, they like working in groups even if they do get noisy, for the most part they stay on task. I’m getting to know them better and they’re more comfortable with me. They even told me that they like doing these activities because before they said they were doing a lot of things that they didn’t really understand. “We’re liking French a bit more now.” I also completely modify their tests. They also like to see their projects displayed that they’ve been working on.

I paraphrased, stressing her efficacy and craftsmanship and pointing out that she is beginning to see positive results because of her modifications. I
then asked her if she thought that she could do this (the coaching) by herself?

Yes, I think so. I’d ask myself, did I meet the learnings? How did it go? But I like talking to someone, to talk it out. It’s easier and the time is set aside.

I then asked her if she was comfortable with me in the classroom today.

Yes, there were less of them there, so there was less stress on me. I wasn’t so worried about losing control of the class.

I then asked her if there was any way that I could be more effective as a coach.

No, not really, talking about it is good. I understand what you’re doing now.

I was pleased with this coaching cycle as well. She no longer sees me as the solution-giver as she did when we started the coaching process. She also seems to understand what the reflection process is and it is finally getting a feeling of routine.

I also am coming to believe that the real strength of the coaching is the dialoguing with a colleague and the time set aside to reflect. I felt that by paraphrasing and affirming her attempts at modifications it gave her the confidence to persevere and carry on. I am also looking forward to reading
her journal as her answers to my questions are usually brief on what she thinks about the coaching process. Does she see it as helpful?

Journal entry:

I am really enjoying the coaching session that I have with Jennifer at the end of the day. I think that I am better able to express my ideas and how the lesson went when I can talk it over with someone else. It is very helpful.

I think that for the most part the students met with success in today’s lesson which makes me feel good and I hope that it lifts the students’ self-esteem. This is a big issue in this class. They are afraid to take risks in French and I try to make it possible for them to try. Therefore when they are successful, they feel good. If I reach this goal, I feel that what I am doing with them is very worthwhile.

I now completely understand the process of coaching that Jennifer is doing. I find it great and very useful. I wish that she could come in every week!

Coaching Cycle 8, Thursday, March 20, 1997

Planning Conference, 8:20 - 8:30 a.m.

Asked for the student learnings for the grade 8 FSL lesson the teacher explains that they are making their own miniature villages to teach them the
vocabulary for the parts of a town. She also wants them to understand that learning French can be fun.

To explain her strategy more fully after some probing and clarifying questions she explained that she will review the vocabulary words with them for 5 minutes at the beginning of the lesson, and she will give them three or four 40-minute classes to colour, cut and paste together the buildings. The group will then present their village to the class using the appropriate vocabulary.

For her evaluation, she will observe the level of student engagement in the activity and their presentation at the end of the activity. I asked her what strategies she had in mind to ensure that they were practising and learning the vocabulary as they are constructing their villages over the course of the three to four lessons. She paused for a minute then replied, “I could tell them that I will be walking around asking them the names of different buildings while they are working and they will be evaluated on their ability to answer.”

After paraphrasing, I then ask her what data I can collect for her. She requests that I assist her in observing how engaged they are in the activity, and whether the review at the beginning of the lesson and the oral test strategy stimulates them to practise the words while working.
Observation, 1:00 - 1:30 p.m.

All students were very engaged in the activity. Even the students that usually had difficulty focusing were able to name the buildings that they were working on in French

Reflection Conference, 4:00 - 4:15 p.m.

When asked how she felt the lesson went she replied,

I think it went fairly well. I explained that I was going to go around and ask them the different words. I then reviewed them on the board and when I asked them most of them did a fairly good job giving me the words....Most of them were pretty engaged, they were chatting a little but most of it was on topic. I noticed toward the end a few started to lose concentration but for the most part they were enjoying it.

After paraphrasing I shared my observations with her which reinforced her own observations. What have you learned from this lesson?

With this class if they can do something with their hands and work in groups, they’re fine. They were so quiet I was shocked. It has to be simple. The program is way too difficult for them. Nicole (the French consultant) told me that’s fine, just get their interest in something.
I paraphrased that she has to modify the program to keep it simple, hands-on, enjoyable, in order that they can meet with some success and not be frustrated.

Yes, I want them to be comfortable.

So as long as you can give them something that they can meet success with, they’re not frustrated, they’re comfortable and they’re not a discipline problem.

Yes, I was so impressed. Even the ones that are usually problems were really working hard.

So you have to continue to find activities that are kinesthetic, modifying the program to meet their needs.

Yes and I’ve noticed that they’re trusting me more now. I have a better rapport with them.

I felt good about this coaching cycle. I feel that I assisted her in thinking her way through a difficult situation. By gently guiding her with my questions and supporting through paraphrase sound pedagogical practices I was able to point her in the right direction without creating dependence (being the solution-giver) nor by criticism which would have eroded the already fragile self-confidence of a beginning teacher.
Journal entry:

I cannot believe that the coaching session is over! I found it to be very helpful and it made me really think about my lessons and my teaching. I now think more ahead of time how my lesson is going to go and afterwards, at the end of the day I think about what I could have done or what I should not have done.

This process that I went through with Jennifer was excellent. Since I am a new teacher, I thought it was extremely helpful because I was able to talk to a colleague which proved to be very beneficial. I think that it would be great if every new teacher went through this process because I feel that teacher’s college really does not prepare you for the actual classroom setting. To be truthfully honest, when I first started, it was like being thrown right into a fire pit and you have to adjust in order to survive. By being able to talk to someone showed me that the things I was doing were meeting with success and gave me a feeling of accomplishment.

I strongly recommend that all teachers, both new and old, go through this process. It can be very rewarding.
Level of Use Evaluation at the End of Coaching, Teacher C

Thursday, March 20, 4:15 - 4:30 p.m.

Questions and Responses

1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson

   Since I’ve started this with you, I think to myself, what do I want to accomplish in this lesson? What are the students going to get from this lesson? I’m looking at things more carefully trying to focus in on certain things. I also plan my lessons more around the students’ abilities, more modifications. I like to think about it more...even when I’m doing the lesson I’m thinking maybe I should do it this way, especially if I see that they’re not getting it.

2. Do lessons always go as you planned them?

   No, if I see that the students are interested in something, now I think, O.K., let’s run with it.

3. After the lesson what kind of self-assessment do you engage in?

   I find it hard right after the lesson because I have another class coming in so it’s usually at the end of the day, sometimes at lunch time. I jot down ideas if I were to teach this lesson again, what I would do differently.

   Have you found the journal helpful?
Oh yes, I write down how I felt, just to think it out. It was like when I had a journal in school, it helps you to think.

4. How many times during a week would you estimate that you dialogue with another staff member about pedagogy?

   Usually at lunch time. I talk with the classroom teachers if I’m having trouble with certain students.

5. What can you tell me about peer coaching?

   It’s very good, especially being a new teacher. I think that it would be good for every new teacher. You can talk your ideas out and having someone else in the room it helps to have that other set of eyes observing the students and you, giving you that feedback, because you can’t see everything.

6. If someone asked you about pursuing teaching as a career, what would you tell them?

   Teaching is very rewarding but unless you have a specialty you don’t have much of a chance of getting a job.

**Evaluation**

   For the planning model, I believe that she has moved from Level III Mechanical to Level IVB Refinement. “I plan my lessons more around the students’ abilities.”
For strategies, she is continuing to look for new ways to modify the program to make it more hands on. Therefore I would continue to place her at Level IVB Refinement.

With measures of success, I was gently guiding her, suggesting different possibilities which I observed that she was incorporating and continuing to explore. I would place her therefore at Level III Mechanical.

She appears to be routinely engaging in self-reflection now. “At the end of the day I jot down ideas...just to think it out.” Thus I would place her at Level IVA Routine for reflection. (See Appendix C for LoU chart)

Level of Use Evaluation, Two months after Cognitive Coaching, Teacher C

Wednesday, May 21, 1997, 3:25 - 3:45 p.m.

Questions and Responses

1. Describe the process of how you plan a lesson.

I think about, what do I really want the students to achieve?, what’s my main goal? I’ll then jot down different ideas for strategy, something to hook their interest. Then I’ll think about the assessment, whether written or some type of visual or oral presentation, how they work in their groups, etc.

2. Do lessons always go as planned?
No. Then I’ll think about it after, what I could have done differently, or sometimes right then I decide to do something different. I find now that if they are interested in something, then I’ll just go with it.

3. After a lesson, what kind of self-assessment do you engage in?

I’ll think, that went O.K. or that didn’t. Sometimes I’ll ask the students if they liked that activity. I talk to my family and friends about how things are going as well. However there isn’t really anybody here that I can talk about it with, everybody is busy with their own things. I miss you coming into the classroom. I’d really like to have a mentor.

4. How many times during a week do you engage in dialogue with other staff members about pedagogy?

In the staff room sometimes but I don’t find that I am a lot. I’ve tried to with the other FSL teacher but he seems very introverted and I get the impression that he doesn’t want to. At the other school we were all in the same office, so we had a lot of opportunities to talk. Basically I feel like I’m on my own.

5. What can you tell me about peer coaching?

From what I experienced with you, I think it’s a very good idea for all teachers, but especially new teachers. Teacher’s College doesn’t really prepare you and talking to someone helps you out, having another person
in the class too. At first you think, oh no they’re evaluating me but it helps you to understand what’s going on. When I talk with my family or friends after I just talk about how I’m feeling, but you had certain questions that helped me to focus my thinking, I miss the serious conversations that helped me to think. I would really like to be paired with another teacher.

6. If someone asked you about pursuing teaching as a career what would you tell them?

I would say that it’s very challenging but it’s also very rewarding. I’m really proud of the progress that some of the students have made.

Evaluation

For the planning and strategies, I believe that she has remained at Level IV Refinement, “I think about what do I really want the students to achieve... and a strategy to hook their interest.” For measures of success, I feel that she has advanced to Level IV A Routine, “I’ll think about the assessment, whether written or some type of visual or oral presentation, how they work in groups, etc.” She offered this readily and in a very matter-of-fact manner.

However, for reflection, she appears to have dropped back to Level 0 NonUse. She seems to be functioning at the impressions level, “I think that went O.K. or that didn’t” and later on she added “When I talk with my
family or friends after I just talk about how I’m feeling, but you had certain questions that helped me to focus my thinking.” (See Appendix C for LoU chart)

Coaching Cycle 9, Teacher C, Thursday, May 29, 1997

Followup cycle to verify analysis.

Planning Conference, 8:15 - 8:22 a.m.

When asked for the student learnings for the lesson (grade 8 FSL) despite the fact that she had answered in her interview that she thinks more about what she really wants them to get out of the lesson, she still gave me the strategies. She said that they were making a poster for a festival, including all components necessary for a poster and one or two sentences in French describing the festival. They would be doing this with a partner. After some clarifying and probing questions she responded that the student learnings were: to know what components are necessary on a poster, the ability to express that in French and to give them a creative application for the unit they have been studying on festivals.

As asked for her assessment strategy for the lesson, she replied that they would be evaluated out of 10 for the grammar and components, out of 10 for wise use of class time, out of 5 for creativity and out of 5 for neatness.
When I asked what data I could collect for her she asked me to help assess how on task they were.

**Observation, 12:55 - 1:30 p.m.**

The atmosphere was calm and relaxed as students worked quietly in groups on their project. The evaluation scheme was clearly evident on the board and almost all students were busily engaged in the activity.

**Reflection Conference, 2:10 - 2:25 p.m.**

When asked for impressions of how the lesson went, she replied, “When I told them that today they were going to do a poster they were happy. Most of them listened carefully to the instructions and even one of the students who can be a behaviour problem got right into it and asked for my help right away to put some of the words he was having difficulty with in French. I was so pleased the way that they were working, quietly and calmly and getting the assignment done.”

After paraphrasing I asked what she had done to make it a successful lesson.

“I let some of them work in the hall so that helped to keep the noise level down, so that they didn’t have to shout to be heard. I also let them know that I would help them with the sentences so that they didn’t have to panic
about that. So that put them at ease so that they could meet with success.

I also went around to check on them and help where needed.”

After a paraphrase I asked her what she had learned from this lesson.

Especially with this group, anything creative that gets their hands going
works with them. We struggled through the festival booklet which was
reading and some writing, so this activity gave them a break from that, yet
still was an application of the theme. It was more relaxing for them as well
as for me. They also remember how well they had done on the previous
project so they know that they can do a good job and succeed at this. AC:
They had done a poster for a museum exhibition which is displayed outside
the classroom and which really is very visually stunning.

Again paraphrasing, I asked her what applications she was going to take
forth from this lesson.

I will know that even next year I will assess what their abilities are and
modify the program to build on what their strengths are and structure the
activities to how they learn best.

She asked me what I had observed and I told her my observations
which were basically the same as hers. I then asked her if her thinking
about her planning was different when we engage in coaching compared to
what she does normally.
...
Yes, I think about it more clearly when you ask me the questions. When I just think myself I’m not as clear. Talking about it helps.

What about when you’re teaching?

No, not really. When we first started, I’d think oh no she’s in here!... Actually I find that after talking about it beforehand, I am really clear on what I want to do. So other than that, I don’t really even think about you being in the classroom.”

What about your reflection after, is that different?

Oh yeah. I like talking to a peer better. Like I said before, I talk to my parents but they don’t understand what it’s actually like. This is much better.”

If it were available would you engage in cognitive coaching once a month?

Yes, because it’s very helpful. You get to think out your lesson and process your ideas. I was kind of thrown into the fire with this assignment. I had to figure out how to get their attention and by talking about it I was able to figure out what their strengths were. I really modified the program and that made both them and me more at ease.

What I noticed about going through this 9th coaching with all three teachers was how easy it was. They all knew the routine. The planning
conferences were down to 5 to 10 minutes and the reflection conferences around 15 - 20 minutes. This makes for a far more feasible proposition to implement in a school. However the teachers were so used to me and my presence was so nonthreatening that they barely took note of my being in the classroom, quite a contrast from when I started with each of them.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of the findings that have emerged from my perspectives as researcher in the study of cognitive coaching. It begins with a summarizing discussion of the participants' experiences. The focus is on the participants' growth in instructional thought and their feelings of collegiality. The chapter next turns to a critical interpretation of these experiences from the perspective of cognitive coaching, and finally the implications of this study.

Discussion of Participant Experiences

My study set out to discover whether after eight Cognitive Coaching episodes the teacher participants would internalize and retain the four thought processes of proactive, interactive, reflective and projective thought to become self-modifying and self-renewing. I also wanted to discover whether their experiences with cognitive coaching would change their attitude toward peer coaching, would improve their feelings about teaching, would increase their professional dialoguing and would affect their feelings of holonomy. I will therefore discuss my findings with
reference to each participant’s growth in these areas and whether it was sustained over a period of time with no coaching taking place.

**Teacher A**

**Instructional Thought**

*Preactive thought:* This teacher puts a lot of thought and energy into her lesson planning for strategies and student learning. It was evident from the very first interview.

“I check the teacher’s manual for strategy and objectives. Then I mentally visualize how the lesson would flow to see students’ reactions and I make adjustments according to how I see it flowing.” However by the end of the eight coaching cycles, she realized that she was modifying her strategies even more because of increased reflection on them.

My strategies have changed more as I reflected on them. I’m more conscious of the changes. I’m conscious of the effect of the strategies. In the process we’ve focused on the effects of my strategies and how to be the most effective. My goals and objectives have remained the same though. I always knew where I was going but my strategies on how to get them there have been modified.”
It was interesting to note that only once during our nine cycles did she answer the question for lesson goals with the actual objectives. The other eight times she always responded with the strategies first but when probed she could readily give the goals. I kept changing my phrasing of the questions from goals to objectives to outcomes, finally deciding on student learnings in an attempt to remedy this situation, but to no avail. However it was quite clear with each lesson that she knew exactly where she was going and why.

Her measures of success or assessment for her lessons did not change either. She primarily relies on observation as this is grade 1, despite being somewhat shaken by its reliability in Cycle 2. She wanted to take time to get more verbal confirmation and said during our interview after 2 months that she tries to get that one on one in language arts. However she had started a learning log with them but did not continue after the coaching stopped, citing time restrictions.

She confirmed all of the above in Cycle 9. When asked if her planning was different from what she does normally and when we engage in coaching, she replied, “No, not really, because I really think through my lessons. When I come in I visualize how the lesson will flow and have everything set up.” This is almost verbatim what she said when we started.
Interactive thought: Teacher A also showed no change in this area as she was already very receptive to changing plans as needed. She started in September by saying, "I gauge the reaction of the kids, by the look on their faces, whether they're with me or not....I'll change my plans." By the 9th cycle in May she was continuing to modify as needed. "I could see that (they weren't paying attention), so I didn't continue with it as long as I had planned."

Reflective thought: This is the area where Teacher A demonstrated a definite change in her thinking and teaching because of the coaching. She started out by saying that if she was unhappy with a lesson she simply would "pitch it" unless it was a key concept which she would approach in a different way. After providing her with information which resulted in a key learning for her, by Cycle 2 she had already been thinking prior to our meeting about what data she wanted me to collect. The coaching perhaps most closely resembled action-based research as I collected data for different instructional problems that she had been thinking about. The majority of the time my observations confirmed her thinking, but the few times that it did not she began immediately to start to think about making changes in her instructional approach to align with my observations.
In Cycle 1 she started the reflection conference by stating that she had not been very happy with the lesson because the noise level from the other group in the classroom made it difficult to hear. She was surprised to see that during the time when the noise level was loudest from the other group, the students were all on task. My data collection and sharing it with her totally changed her perception. She stated, “This is not the way that I was trained to teach, a fragmented day with four different teachers coming in at different times. Maybe it’s a bigger adjustment for me than for the kids.”

In Cycle 2 my observations confirmed for her that she is meeting with success in her attempts to reduce teacher talk. Cycle 3, I collected data for her which confirmed her impressions that the students needed more self-directed time and underlined her efficacy that none of the children had a negative comment about grade 1. This was a continuation of the problem situation from Cycle 1: having to work with three other teachers (PTMs) and how to work most effectively together to meet the needs of her students. This was a new experience for her and she was finding the changes in her instructional approach which this situation necessitated, stressful. My data made her confident to move ahead with her new plan of action that she had been thinking about. “She stated that she is going to have to team teach more.”
In Cycle 4 she reported that she and the three PTMs were now jointly planning and teaching all the subjects together so that the day is more seamless for the students. As a result of this change in Cycle 4, half of my observation time was spent observing one of the PTM’s lesson. I shared my data that I had collected with her, showing high student participation and interest. This served to underline her efficacy. She commented, “When I’m teaching, I’m always concerned that it’s more than a few who are not paying attention. This is great!” Teacher A also found that the data had confirmed her impressions that the new approach was working better.

In Cycle 5, the teacher picked up from my data collection that one student had done nothing. It again confirmed for her what she had begun to suspect, that there might be a processing problem for this student. “After what you observed today and what I observed yesterday, there may be an attention problem there that goes beyond language.” She also stated, “The observation was really valuable because it reinforced my intuition...I can anticipate your questions and clarify what I mean.”

In Cycle 6 my data collection did not serve to confirm her impressions but to contradict them as in Cycle 1. She had been pleased with the lesson and felt that the students were with her. “The teacher was surprised at the
number of students who were having trouble tracking and the fact that it had been basically the four in the first row who were able to track with her.” As a result of this information she decided to again use a circle formation for group reading activities in order that she can better monitor them and to keep the weaker ones right beside her. She wrote in her journal, “I learned to go back to reading in a circle and keep the weaker ones close to me.”

In Cycle 7 I felt because of the clarification and articulation of her goals at the planning conference, combined with her heightened awareness that the data I was going to be collecting were vocabulary generated, she had pushed the group I observed through questioning further than the first group she had worked with. She noticed that “today she had slowed them down so that they could really focus on the experience and that she had kept pushing and encouraging their oral language.” This resulted in more and better vocabulary and thinking skills being pushed to the comparison level which had not happened the day before. She also recognized by this point that the reflection conference always starts with her impressions of how the lesson went, what both she and I observed, what she had done to create this situation and finally what she had learned and how she was
going to apply that learning. She said about the coaching, "It's like a verification which clarifies the learning for me".

Cycle 8 observations confirmed again for her what she had been noticing, that one student in the extra-help group was doing very well while another who was not receiving that help was not progressing. She had specifically asked me for that information to aid her assessment and, once she had the confirmation, was ready to act on it. She also stated at the planning conference that "this experience has made her more reflective about her program. She also shared how she is using it naturally in other aspects of her program and even as a tool to problem solve in her Masters of Education course."

After the eight coaching cycles at our interview on November 6, 1996 she said,

"Now I reflect in more detail rather than an overall impression. I go through in my mind "What did I do?" "What did they do as a result?" "How would I change that next time?" Before it was instinct. I always reflected but now I feel that I have a more structured process for reflecting."

However this reflection did not continue. By Cycle 9 in May when I asked her if there was a difference in her reflection from when we're
cognitive coaching and what she does normally, she replied very candidly, “Yes, I don’t spend the time in reflecting...if it was a routine lesson, I just move on.” Yet she recognizes the value of reflection: “Just discussing things and discussing the students consolidates things for me.” She, who also found time constraints on her teaching a major irritant, would take time to engage in coaching once a month because, “It forces you to take time to reflect that you don’t usually take.”

**Projective thought:** In Cycle 1 as a result of my observations she concluded that the noise level with the other PTM in the classroom was more a problem for her than for the kids. She also decided to make a family tree, to help the students get to know all the teachers.

After Cycle 2 she decided to encourage participation and try to reduce teacher talk even more. Cycle 3, a decision was made to give the students more self-directed time which would necessitate a different instructional approach which in Cycle 4 she confirmed was working, so would continue with it.

Cycle 5, she resolved to buddy a weak student up with a stronger student and, after Cycle 6, to put students in a circle to read, keeping the weaker ones near her. In Cycle 7 she determined not to accept reluctance from students the first time. “Slow them down and push for participation.”
After Cycle 8 she moved a student who has shown good progress out of the extra help group and place one who was not progressing into it, while in Cycle 9 she would continue to use her structured approach in reading as all students are making progress.

Therefore cognitive coaching had not affected her instructional thought processes permanently. Her preactive and interactive thinking had remained basically unchanged after the coaching and her reflection and projective thinking were effected only during the coaching. Once the coaching stopped providing the time and data collection for reflection, it stopped. Only when there is a disaster does she think through the problem and try to resolve it.

**Peer Coaching**

She started out knowing that it was a collaborative approach where two teachers meet and work together, which she thought was a good idea, but had no personal experience with it. What emerged from our engagement in peer coaching (the first time for both of us) is that trust and a nonjudgmental atmosphere are key. Observation is so linked to evaluation, as this is almost exclusively the only time that it takes place in teaching.

In Cycle 1, she admitted to how stressful it had been to be observed even though she knew what I was doing and felt comfortable with me. She
also said that she would never have taken the risk of asking an administrator to watch for on-task behaviour as that is so closely tied to judgment and evaluation. After this first experience she realized that I was not there to judge her but to assist her in thinking and collecting data. As she had such a positive experience the first time, learning something that she wouldn’t have on her own, she never again mentioned any anxiety about my being in the room. In Cycle 7 she stated, “I notice that you always just state what you observe. You don’t make a value judgment on it.” By Cycle 9 she even said that she forgot that I was in the room.

Confirming this unease about having another teacher in the classroom, the PTM who was working with the other half of the class admitted to Teacher A how uncomfortable she was with me being in the classroom. However as Teacher A shared with her what we were doing and the data that I was collecting which was helping them in their decisions on instructional modifications, by Cycle 4 she expressed her disappointment to me at recess that we had changed the observation time as I had missed her turkey story and activity which is one of her personal favorites. The other PTM whom I had observed that day (but whom both Teacher A and I had neglected to tell what we were doing), whispered to me as she walked past me while I was busy writing notes, “Note, I’ve had no experience at the
primary level.” However after sharing my observations with her, she was pleased and happy that I had affirmed her teaching.

At the end of 8 coaching cycles when asked about peer coaching she said, “I think it’s a very valuable process. I think the coach’s role is to provide a framework to guide the teacher through their own reflective process--like a scaffold”. Asked 2 months later, she said that she had nothing to add.

Feelings About Teaching (holonomy)

Teacher A believes that teaching is an extremely rewarding and fulfilling career. When asked at the initial interview about what she would tell them about teaching she replied,

“That it is the best job. Do it, even if there aren’t any jobs now.

Do what you love to do.”

She reiterated at our last interview that she still feels the same way.

Teacher A appears to be acting in a very holonomous way professionally. She was always confident and knew that her decisions determined what went on in the classroom. She demonstrated flexibility by devising a new way of working with the PTMs to work most effectively when presented with the situation. She was conscious of how her actions affected what learning was taking place and overall displayed a sense of
craftsmanship of wanting to refine and hone her skills. This sense of consciousness and craftsmanship increased during the coaching as result of increased reflection time and data collection. Unfortunately it declined after the coaching stopped due to the reduced professional dialogue and reflection time. She also has a developed sense of interdependence, joint planning with the other primary teachers but even meeting with another teacher she considers expert on her own time.

By Cycle 7 after the reflection conference I was sharing the similarities that I had observed from teaching FSL and what she was doing in grade 1 to assist in first language acquisition using very similar strategies. I, who have no experience in primary, after observing eight lessons felt very comfortable in the classroom. As a result of this increased comfort and level of familiarity on a professional level, when she wanted a gifted student in her class to work on a self-directed research project she approached me to ask if one of my grade 6 students would like to be his mentor. This project was so successful that we planned another joint project, this time including both entire classes, the grade 6s acting as peer tutors to the grade 1’s. We were both extremely pleased with the results of this collaboration and resolved to do it again. The librarian, as she watched the two classes work together, remarked on what a terrific idea it was, as both groups
were totally engaged, yet it was the first time in her 15 years of teaching that she had seen it.

**Professional Dialogue**

The professional dialogue that cognitive coaching initiated had immediate effects on Teacher A’s reflections. However once the coaching and professional dialogue stopped on an ongoing basis, so did the reflection.

She began the process talking professionally with a teacher not at the school and with the other primary department members about planning. Throughout the process and beyond she has also included me in this circle. During Cycle 1’s reflection conference she stated, about the on-task behaviour not being affected by the noise, “I would never have learned that on my own.” In Cycle 3 she related how she had noticed that the students were feeling pressured to finish things at a specific time and did not have enough play time. She discussed this with a PTM and she found it stressful as well believing also that the students weren’t getting enough self-directed time. After processing this and collecting more data from me, she revamped their LA program. She also was confirmed in this new approach by feedback from the other teachers involved and again by my data collection.
Teacher A would also immediately pick up on any discrepancy between what she and I had observed as in Cycles 1, 5, 6 and 8 and suggest a plan of action immediately to remedy the discrepancy. She seems to use professional dialogue to problem solve. At the interview after 2 months, she was quite candid about not reflecting as much about her teaching since the coaching stopped but, when necessary to work a problem out, would talk with one of her teaching partners.

Therefore the advantage of the cognitive coaching for Teacher A was the setting aside of time for professional dialogue which stimulated reflection on her teaching practices.

“When I was working with you, I took the time... Now my planning time is back to, I’ve got to do this, this and this and because it isn’t on my to-do list--it doesn’t get done.”

Professional dialogue which she sees the value of yet doesn’t take time for in a hectic day.

**Teacher B**

Instructional Thought

**Preactive thought:** As with Teacher A, when I asked for the student learnings for the lesson he would respond with the strategies. After
some probing and clarifying questions, he could come up with the objectives but it was never the first thing that came to mind. The only exceptions were Cycles 6, 7 and 9. By Cycle 6 and 7 he had anticipated my questions and responded with the goals. However in Cycle 8 he was feeling rushed and relapsed into giving me the strategies, which necessitated my probing for the learnings. In Cycle 9 when he started to answer with the strategies, he caught himself and gave the student learnings. This was a definite effect of the cognitive coaching. Right from the first cycle he said, “Your questions made me think a lot. You get so busy doing things that you don’t sit back and think why you’re doing them”. However he was always aware of having to modify his strategies to meet the needs of the students and continued to struggle with how best to do that throughout our coaching. This attention to and thinking out of his goals and strategies appeared to be one of the biggest benefits of the coaching for him.

“T’m more clearly thinking, why am I doing this? I’ve always tended to figure out what I’ve wanted to do, and still that’s the first thing I think about but now I think a little bit more about purpose. I go back to why am I doing this and try to think more clearly, clarify the what more closely with the why.”
He also said, "I'm making sure what I do fits the students."

His measures of success remained unchanged throughout the coaching cycles. Basically if the students were on task and were attempting to complete the activities successfully, he was pleased. He confirmed this with the interview at the end of the eight coaching cycles. "The way I decide about whether they are progressing or not is basically the same; with this class it's more a question of keeping them organized so they can progress".

Interactive thought: Teacher B was very attuned to whether his students were with him or not and his need to modify his approaches to engage them. He stated at the first interview, "If I give them too much they're frustrated, if too little then they're off task". He was always aware of when he needed to redirect them and when he had their attention. This skill remained constant throughout the coaching and appeared unchanged by it.

Reflective thought: This was an area that was affected by cognitive coaching for Teacher B. He started off by telling me that he waits to see a pattern over several lessons but time was always a problem. At the end of the coaching cycles he was writing in his journal almost on a daily basis. He also added a portion to his weekly planner for self-reflection so that he
could jot down ideas in order not to forget about them. Two months after the coaching ended he still stated,

"I'm more aware, I'm a little more critical and proactive than what I was before. Rather than saying, oh that didn't work and leaving it, I think about why it didn't work and how I could do it better next time."

However by Cycle 9, over 4 months after the coaching had ended, he said that it had been over a month since he had written in his journal.

This reflection did not come spontaneously once we started the coaching but evolved over the 8 weeks. We spent Cycle 1 reflecting about why he was using a more directed instructional approach than what he was used to, and my observations confirmed the need for this to keep students on-task. He stated that the reflection conference was useful as "it made me realize that I'm trying to meet the needs of my students." By using the pace-and-lead problem-solving strategy in Cycle 2, I was able to lead Teacher B through his thinking so that, where he had been very discouraged and frustrated at the beginning of the reflection conference, by the end he had a sense of where he was headed and a plan of action. In Cycle 3 he was pleased with the lesson but was unable to tell me at the beginning of the reflection conference what he had done to make it successful; by the end of the conference he could. In Cycle 4, again he
was happy with the lesson but, when asked what he had done to make it successful, he replied, “I’m never quiet sure.” He then proceeded to list exactly what he had done that worked. He also started his journal only after this cycle.

That seemed to be the turning point in his reflecting. In Cycle 5 when asked what he had done to make the lesson successful, he showed no hesitation and listed off what he had done. As we talked he continued to bring up other observations which supported the use of his new step-by-step strategy and how it was working. These appeared to occur to him as we talked and he even said at the end of the conference, “If you’re just doing it in your head you might forget and never see the pattern and deal with it.” Cycle 6 underlined this importance of articulating to bring to the conscious level his modifications and strategies: “A lot of this stuff I have been doing kind of instinctively.. now that I am aware of it consciously, I can plan it out a bit better.” By Cycles 7 and 8 he had internalized the reflection process to the point where he was basically going through the steps himself. In Cycle 9 though, he realized that he had not been taking as much time to reflect as previously, even though he values that reflection highly.
“One of the most dangerous things in teaching is that you fall into routines and you don’t think about things...if you don’t reflect, you’re not going to grow professionally.”

However he also was having trouble finding the time. He told me at our 2-month interview after coaching that “reflection is like exercise, it’s good for you but it’s hard to find the time and the energy”.

Projective thought: As a result of the learning that was taking place because of the reflection Teacher B was engaging in during cognitive coaching, there was also a lot of projective thought taking place.

In Cycle 1 he realized that he was going to have to impose structure on the class as they have no self-discipline, in order for them to learn and progress. In Cycle 2 he understood that he was going to have to structure the lesson in order that all the students could meet with success, and by Cycles 3 and 4 was beginning to understand that decisions he was making were creating a successful lesson. In Cycle 5, when asked what he had learned, he replied,

“I can’t assume anything and everything has to be planned down to the smallest detail...When I go through it step by step by step, they are quite happy to do the work and are pleased with the results.”
The rest of the cycles were a refinement of this learning. In Cycle 6 he became aware of the fact that he would like to increase the length of time that students can stay self-directed to eventually lead to the possibility of a less directed teaching style. By Cycles 7 and 8, he was beginning to see an improvement in student organization because of his strategies and planned to continue them even though this was not his preferred teaching style. However he would endeavor to continue nudging them towards more independence in their learning.

**Peer Coaching**

Teacher B started out knowing nothing about peer coaching. He wasn’t even quite sure what this research project was about but had enough trust in our professional relationship over the past 3 years that he agreed to participate. Nonetheless he was very nervous the first few cycles that I would somehow pass judgment on him and tell him what to do. He stated in his journal, “I was very reluctant at first because of my now ingrained sense of hesitation and fear of criticism.” Again he had had a bad experience with a supervisor using observation in a judgmental evaluative way, and he had been cautious that peer coaching might be similar. He said, “I was very hesitant because I thought it was going to be telling me
what to do, but there was none of that." By the end of the coaching he could see the advantages of it. He stated,

"Just the fact that you’re going to be here, it makes me reflect more about what I’m doing...I’m taking that extra time to think, it focuses me to think how I can do other things better."

He also said in Cycle 7,

"The other pair of eyes not only gives you another opinion but keeps you more aware of what you’re doing. In this job you do so much by yourself, the extra pair of eyes helps you to focus and it’s not like a principal when you feel threatened."

Following the eighth coaching cycle Teacher B went into his supervision cycle with the principal. He commented at the interview after 2 months and when the supervision was over,

"Peer coaching is good and nonthreatening. It was good that I did it before my evaluation with the principal. I was thinking the whole time rather than just a routine. It was a spring cleaning of the mind!"

Feelings about Teaching (holonomy)

Teacher B started the coaching with a fairly negative attitude towards teaching and a low level of holonomy. At the first interview when asked about what he would say to someone who was considering teaching as a
career he replied "Don't! I love teaching but we are so maligned by society and moreover there are lots of other things you could do." After coaching this answer had softened to "I would still say no. It has nothing to do with teaching but all the politics around teaching right now."

He also started out with a fairly low sense of efficacy. When I asked him what he had done to make the lesson successful he couldn't tell me.

“What I did? I think the kids were better behaved. I don’t think that I did anything to cause that.”

As I recognized this to be a problem, it was something that I guided him through questioning to be more aware of. After Cycle 4 he wrote in his journal,

“I am coming to this class after several years of chaotic and, in many ways, poor years of teaching. Serving under a domineering principal, then teaching in a hectic intermediate schedule, reduced me in many ways, and in longer term ways than I had first imagined.”

By Cycle 5 he was aware of this and was able to tell me without hesitation what he had done to make the lesson successful. When I asked if he saw a pattern to my questions at the reflection conference he answered,
"You always start by asking how I think it went and then what I did to bring about that.... The idea being, not what the kids have done but what I have done."

With flexibility he had worried at the first cycle that I would pass a value judgment on him for using a teacher directed approach with his class. He started off the reflection conference by saying that it had not been the most inspiring lesson because it was not hands-on, group work. He wanted me to see that the slightest distraction or noise causes them to be off task. Yet he said,

"I'm feeling guilty because of the way I'm teaching. You're supposed to be teaching cooperative, group-work style."

After further questions and discussion, I had paraphrased that he would like to be able to teach in this manner but the students in his class didn’t have the skills necessary for this. Therefore he was meeting the needs of his students by giving them the structure and organization they needed in order to learn. So, why was he feeling guilty? This was a BMIR moment. He had been very serious up to that point but in response to that question he laughed and answered, "Because I'm Catholic!" From that point on he was never again concerned about trying something that might go against the accepted norm.
The coaching process also helped him to be more conscious. From the first cycle he said,

“When I was talking to you about the lesson, it made me realize how much we do in a lesson. I’ve done this so many times that I guess you forget the reasons why we do this and you rethink about why you’re doing some of them.”

Basically every time when I asked him what comments he had about coaching he would reply that he liked it because it made him “think”. By Cycle 4 he laughed and said, “You’re making me self-aware, which I’m very resistant to.”

This raised awareness and increased sense of efficacy greatly contributed to his sense of craftsmanship as well. By paraphrasing and stressing in our reflection conferences what strategies he was implementing to meet the needs of his students, by Cycle 5 he could easily say what he had done to make the lesson successful and explored different possibilities of how he could refine and build on his successes in successive cycles. He wrote in his journal, “The sessions have forced me to look at what I am doing and have started me in “tightening” up my thoughts about what I am doing.”
As Teacher B tends to be “field independent” (he answered the cognitive style assessment, Appendix M, checking off that he likes to work alone and figure things out for himself), I was not surprised at our first interview that the question about dialoguing with other staff members about pedagogy elicited a pause, then “with you a couple of times a week.” This sense of interdependence showed a marked improvement as a result of the coaching.

Even in Cycle 1, he mentioned that he had seen me using a checklist to get them seated faster and thought he might try that. By the end of the eight cycles he answered the question about professional dialogue with,

“I do two or three times a week with the four intermediate staff members or you. With Marg (the art teacher), I find out what she’s doing with her grade 7 art program to try to plan lessons that will lay the groundwork for next year for my students.”

He continued to build on this, for after we had finished coaching, when it came time to practise for the school musical, he approached me about our two classes doing something together. This we did and it turned out to be a pleasant and successful experience for all involved. At the interview, 2 months after coaching had stopped, he answered the question about professional dialogue with,
"About four or five times a week. You are very good about sharing articles, and the intermediate teachers are so good about sharing their expertise."

As a result of Teacher B’s involvement with cognitive coaching I believe that he has became a more self-confident and fulfilled teacher.

Professional Dialogue

Before cognitive coaching, Teacher B engaged in very little professional dialogue. However by the end of the eight coaching cycles he began to value the support which it provides and continued to build on it.

In Cycle 1, my observations confirmed for him what he had noticed about the class’s need for a structured approach. However, because of his perception that he wasn’t doing what he was “supposed” to be doing (group activities), he needed to talk out with a peer that he was indeed trying to meet the needs of his students. In Cycle 3 he couldn’t tell me what he had done to make the lesson successful but through my questioning and paraphrasing by the end of the reflection conference he was listing off what he had done to achieve this success. This dialogue also brought to the fore how his self-confidence in his teaching had been shaken by a previous principal.
The articulation of his thoughts and my paraphrasing of them forced him to focus and clarify them. He said, “Your pointing these things out makes it conscious to me, therefore I can plan better”. The articulation of the student learnings for Cycle 8 forced him to clarify and define exactly what he wanted the students to understand. There was a look of discovery on his face as he spoke to me and I noticed that he used almost the exact same words when he was speaking to the students.

Professional dialogue appeared to be key for Teacher B to clarify his thinking for both his preactive and reflective thinking, to provide the time and discipline for reflection, and to increase his feelings of efficacy, flexibility, consciousness, craftsmanship and interdependence.

Teacher C

Instructional Thought

Preactive thought: When asked at the initial interview how she plans a lesson, she recited from memory what she had been taught at Teacher’s College: instructional objective, anticipatory set, the lesson, evaluation, closure. However she had not internalized this process, for at our first planning conference when I asked for the student learnings, she gave me activities. Indeed only once did she respond to the question for
student learnings with the actual objective, in Cycle 4. This was after having read my write up of Cycle 3 where she noticed, I’m sure, how I had underlined that she gave me strategies instead of learnings. After that the answer was always first the strategy/activity then after probing and clarifying questions, the learning. However as the coaching cycles progressed she appeared to be more aware of them as she was able to more readily and more easily articulate them. In her two interviews after the coaching, she stated that she was now thinking in terms of

“What do I really want the students to achieve?, what’s my main goal?, something to hook their interest.”

For measures of success, she was continuing to develop in this area over the eight coaching cycles. She started out by saying “maybe hand out a sheet that I might collect for evaluation or whatever.” Through the use of questioning I guided her to a type of assessment rubric which would be clearly laid out before an activity started and designed in a way that all students could meet with success, as well as emphasizing good work habits. At the end of the coaching she said,

“I’m looking at things more carefully, trying to focus in on certain things. I also plan my lessons more around the students’ abilities, more modifications...Then I’ll think about the assessment, whether written or
some type of visual or oral presentation, how they work in their
groups, etc."

Therefore as a beginning teacher, she is beginning to acquire the skills of
preactive thought but still needs more practice to consolidate and refine
them.

Interactive thought: At the first interview, Teacher C showed a
developing sense of interactive thought. She knew that sometimes lessons
don’t go as planned, but was unsure as to why. “I’m just trying to get to
know the kids.” After the eight coaching cycles she replied,

“If I see that the students are interested in something, now I think,
O.K., let’s run with it...or I’ll think about it after, what I could have done
differently, or sometimes right then I decide to do something
different.” This appears to show a greater degree of confidence and
flexibility in her teaching practices.

Reflective thought: Teacher C started coaching basically unsure as
how to reflect about her teaching.

“End of the day I think, oh that could have been better or this was
really good. Sometimes I have good days, sometimes I have bad. I don’t
really have time to think after the lesson. Sometimes if I’ve had a bad
day, I’ll just go home and do exercises.”
By the end of the eight coaching cycles she was saying, “I jot down ideas if I were to teach this lesson again, what I would do differently... or I write down how I felt, just to think it out.” This reflection grew gradually as the coaching progressed. During the reflection conferences, with probing and clarifying questions guiding her within a pedagogical framework, she was able to identify and articulate what had worked and what had not. It also enabled her to process problems that she was having with the class attending and a general dislike of French as a subject. At other times as well I was able to provide her with data which altered her perceptions of how the lesson had gone.

In Cycle 1, through the reflection, she worked through that games worked as a motivator with the class and, through questioning, what it was about the game that they liked. She also noted that the practice time needed to be reduced to keep them on task. With pace-and-lead questioning, she also devised a plan of action for when students are noncompliant. By Cycle 2 she said, “I like talking about what’s going on. I’m actually thinking out what I’m doing.”

However this was the teacher I found it most difficult not to give solutions to, having taught FSL for 10 years and she saw me as “expert”. Despite this, even in Cycle 2 when she asked me for suggestions about help
with the intermediate classes, what she really wanted was an opportunity to talk through the problem. We were in another pace-and-lead questioning sequence and my role was placing her observations and ideas in a pedagogical context. At the end of the conversation she had come up with the same ideas that I would have suggested anyway but left her in control. This continued in Cycles 3 and 4. She had started the reflection conferences completely discouraged but after she had thought through the problem and developed a plan of action, she was totally reenergized to the point where she was saying that she liked the class! She stated, "I like you being in the class and to be able to share ideas after."

In Cycle 5, I was able to provide data which changed her perception of how the lesson had gone. She had been unhappy with the lesson as the noise level had been quite high with 36 students in the room working on a group project. She had assumed that they must not have been working. She was surprised and pleased to discover otherwise when I shared my data with her which proved the contrary. She was then able to articulate that she had noticed improvements as she modified the program to make it more simple, hands on and self-directed. She stated,
"I don't see all the things that you see because I'm with the other kids. I think, oh they're so loud, they're fooling around! So it's good to hear that they were actually working."

Through paraphrasing and emphasizing her sense of craftsmanship and efficacy, she went away from each reflection conference happier and more confident with her teaching. By Cycle 6, I was getting discouraged as she seemed so frustrated at the beginning of the conference yet would say very little to me at the end about how she was thinking about the coaching. I also felt that there wasn't that sense of routine that I had experienced with the other two teachers by this point. However after this cycle she went home and wrote in her journal,

"Well, I feel like I am right in the swing of things as far as the project that I am participating in is going. I find it very interesting and I would like to see the final result."

"I feel that as time progresses, I am developing a better rapport with the students. I notice a big difference from when I started to present time. The kids are getting to know me better and they know what to expect. I feel that they are trusting me more. I am beginning to like them a lot better than when I first started. I have found with the Gr. 8 class that it is much easier to grab their attention and get them involved if they have a
project to do. It is amazing to see how settled down they can get once they are involved and interested with the task on hand."

"I felt that today's lesson went well because they seemed to be involved and they met my objectives. I really like talking out my ideas at the end of the day with Jennifer."

The above is basically a repetition of what we had talked about in the conference.

This seemed to be the turning point in the coaching. By Cycle 7 she was pleased with the lesson, meeting with success with her program modifications and we finally had that sense of ease with the coaching. This confidence and success continued in Cycle 8. By gently guiding her with my questions, I was able to assist her in working through this very difficult teaching assignment without creating dependence by being the solution-giver. In her journal she wrote,

"I found it (the coaching) to be very helpful and it made me really think about my lessons and my teaching. I now think more ahead of time how my lesson is going to go and afterwards, at the end of the day I think about what I could have done or what I should not have done."
However once again, once the coaching stopped so did the reflection. She did not continue with her journal and 2 months after coaching stopped she told me,

“There isn’t really anybody here that I can talk about it with, everybody is busy with their own things. I miss you coming into the classroom. I’d really like to have a mentor.”

Projective thought: As a result of this structured reflection time during the coaching, Teacher C was able to problem-solve and modify her teaching practices. In Cycle 1 she learned to use games to hook students’ interest, keep self-directed time structured and to implement a system of three warnings for noncompliance. For Cycles 2 - 6, she continued to work through this problem of motivating and keeping these large classes of grade 7 and 8, 35 and 37 respectively, on task at the end of the instructional day. Throughout this process she continued to modify and try different approaches to build on their strengths and self-esteem which was quite low as almost one third of each class is identified and has difficulty with language. By Cycles 7,8 and 9, she was seeing the rewards of her efforts and was simply continuing to refine them. In Cycle 8, she observed, “Even the ones that are usually problems were really working hard” and in Cycle 9,
"Even next year, I will assess what their abilities are and modify the program to build on what their strengths are and structure the activities to how they learn best."

Cognitive coaching had a positive effect on Teacher C’s preactive, interactive, reflective and projective thought during the coaching, but once the coaching stopped providing the time and pedagogical context for it, the growth stopped as well. When I engaged Teacher C in Cycle 9, it felt like we had just finished Cycle 8, despite the fact that 2 months had passed.

**Peer Coaching**

Teacher C started out by saying that she had never heard of peer coaching. However she new what evaluation was and was worried that I would be judging her. She wrote in her journal,

"I felt quite uncomfortable with her being in the classroom because I feel that she is somehow evaluating me. I am a new teacher and having someone with experience in your classroom can be very intimidating."

This unease continued until Cycle 3 when she began to realize that I was not there to judge her and, after she read my writeup for the coaching cycle, she was clearer as to what my project was about. A level of trust was being established where none had existed before as we did not know each other. However these fears were not completely laid to rest until the
end of Cycle 6 when she finally wrote in her journal, "I feel like I am right in the swing of things as far as the project that I am participating in is going.”  By Cycle 9 she stated, "I don’t really even think about you being in the classroom."

By the end of the eight coaching cycles, Teacher C had a very positive opinion about peer coaching. She said,

"It’s very good, especially being a new teacher. I think that it would be good for every new teacher. You can talk your ideas out and having someone else in the room it helps to have that other set of eyes observing the students and you, giving you that feedback, because you can’t see everything.”

Feelings about Teaching (holonomy)

Teacher C started out the process with a fairly positive attitude towards teaching, calling it rewarding and counting herself lucky that she had a specialty which had enabled her to obtain a position, whereas many of her friends have not. This attitude basically remained constant and appeared unaffected by the coaching process. However her sense of holonomy appeared to change and grow over the weeks.
She started out with a fairly low sense of efficacy, worried that I was going to judge her teaching and looking to me to be the solution-giver for her problems. She wrote in her journal,

“I still keep on wondering if she thinks I am doing a good job.

Being a new teacher, I am very conscious of this because I know that I am doing my best but I wonder if I am doing the right things. This is what makes me very nervous.”

For the first six cycles she was very discouraged at the beginning of the reflection conferences. Remarks such as “whatever I do, doesn’t work”, “they’re really frustrating me” or “maybe it’s me, like I’m failing in some way” were typical comments. However by the end of the conference, once she had worked out a plan of action, remarks such as “I want to have fun with them because I like them” or “for the most part they were doing what they were supposed to be doing” were common. Finally after the six cycles she had a sense of control and craftsmanship as she could see the difference that her modifications were making. She wrote in her journal, “It is amazing to see how settled down they can get once they are involved and interested with the task on hand.”

After Cycle 7 she recorded in her journal,
"I think that for the most part the students met with success in today's lesson which makes me feel good... when they are successful, they feel good. If I reach this goal, I feel that what I am doing with them is very worthwhile."

After Cycle 8 she wrote,

"By being able to talk to someone showed me that the things I was doing were meeting with success and gave me a feeling of accomplishment."

Through the process of working through her instructional challenges, she realized that she had to be flexible and devise different approaches to reach these classes. In her journal she wrote,

"I feel that teacher's college really does not prepare you for the actual classroom setting. When I first started, it was like being thrown right into a fire pit and you have to adjust in order to survive."

Teacher C was always conscious of what was going on in the classroom and, other than a few occasions, had basically the same observations and drew the same conclusions as the observer. However she appreciated the verification and support that the "extra pair of eyes" gave. This contributed to a sense of interdependence especially with the coach.
Whenever she needed supplies or had a question about school procedures, she would come to me.

Therefore cognitive coaching had a positive effect overall on Teacher C’s sense of holonomy. She was more self-confident in her teaching abilities and felt supported by her peer. However 8 weeks was not enough time for these feelings to be consolidated and she missed the support and camaraderie that, at the coaching engendered when it stopped.

Professional Dialogue

Teacher C started the coaching by saying that the school she was at in the fall, she would talk every day about what worked and what didn’t as the four FSL teachers were all in one office. At this school she said it happened maybe two or three times a week. Throughout the coaching experience, this teacher appeared to benefit greatly from dialoguing with a peer. It clarified her thinking and helped her to problem-solve.

At the first planning conference, her goals seemed to evolve as we spoke. The articulation and clarifying of what had made the game successful enabled her to transfer those strategies to other lessons. “You get better ideas talking to someone.” She was also very vulnerable to accepting any suggestions as she appeared to be ready to take the advice of the classroom teacher to yell at the class to maintain control, even though
she had a personal dislike for that form of discipline. When I asked what other ideas she had, she related what she had done at her previous school and after articulating that, she decided to try that approach instead. Without the dialogue however, I believe that she would have followed the advice of the classroom teacher.

The clarifying and probing questions throughout the coaching forced her to fully define her thinking, to bring it to the conscious level, while the paraphrase served to underline her sense of efficacy and craftsmanship by putting these reflections in a pedagogically sound context. She started the first six reflection conferences very discouraged with her teaching but by the end of each was positive and upbeat. Even by Cycle 2 she was recognizing the value of this: “I’m actually thinking out what I’m doing... talking out my ideas, so it’s clear in my mind.”

In Cycle 3, she clearly demonstrated how destructive teacher isolation is. She started the reflection conference completely discouraged and at a loss as to what she should do. By the end of the conference she had a plan of action and was totally reenergized. She wrote in her journal,

“I am looking forward to our discussion at the end of the day as to how the lesson went. I really like this because I find it easier to talk ideas
out if someone is there to guide you along. It is better to let your ideas flow instead of keeping them locked up in your head.”

The other advantage of the coaching for Teacher C was the nonjudgmental feedback which assisted her in her pedagogical decisions. “I find it very helpful to talk to a colleague to get feedback as to how the class went.” This was especially beneficial during Cycle 5. My observations that the class may have been noisy but were on task and very engaged in the activity changed her assumption that the noise meant otherwise. “It’s easier to talk out your lesson with someone because I don’t see all the things that you see because I’m with the other kids.” Without this feedback she might have decided that her modification strategy was not working, and returned to a more formal, directed approach.

By Cycles 7 and 8, she was familiar with the questions and thought that she could do it herself but prefers to dialogue,

“It’s easier and the time is set aside... I am better able to express my ideas and how the lesson went when I can talk it over with someone else... By being able to talk to someone showed me that the things I was doing were meeting with success and gave me a feeling of accomplishment.”
However once the coaching stopped the professional dialogue stopped as well, not by choice but by lack of opportunity. At the interview 2 months after coaching she said,

“...I’ve tried to dialogue with the other FSL teacher but he seems very introverted and I get the impression that he doesn’t want to...

Basically I feel like I’m on my own... When I talk with my family or friends after I just talk about how I’m feeling but you had certain questions that helped me to focus my thinking. I miss the serious conversations that helped me to think”.

She also demonstrated a need for continued professional dialogue, being a beginning teacher and still consolidating her practices. In Cycle 9 she said that “...I think about it (the lesson) more clearly when you ask me the questions. When I just think myself I’m not as clear. Talking about it helps.”

Professional dialogue forced her to clarify her thinking, helped her to problem-solve, put her reflections in a pedagogical framework and underlined her sense of efficacy and craftsmanship; she was in control and was capable of working out her own problems.
Participants' Experiences Compared

Instructional Thought

Preactive: For goals and objectives, Teacher A was always aware and very clear about what she wanted to accomplish in her lesson, despite the fact that she would give the strategies first. Therefore this area was unaffected by the coaching. Teachers B and C however would also give the strategy first but were less conscious of why they were engaging in those activities for the lesson. The coaching process had a lasting effect on the way that they looked at their lesson planning. Teacher B began to actually give the student learnings when asked for them at the planning conference and Teacher C, although she still gave the strategies first, was more aware of her goals and could articulate them readily when probed, something that she could not do when we started.

All teachers were aware of the need to modify strategies to meet the needs of their students but Teachers B and C were less sure about how to best do that. Teacher A was very confident in her teaching and as soon as she had feedback from the observer that students were not meeting her expectations, she would immediately decide to try a different strategy. However, once the coaching stopped providing the extra observations, she returned to relying on her own observations to assess the need for
modifications. Teacher B, after a negative experience with a supervisor who had shaken his confidence in his teaching, worried that by not using the “current style” of teaching, he was doing something wrong, despite the fact that his students lacked the skills to work effectively in that style. The coaching gave him the confidence and confirmation that his modified approach was meeting with success, despite his personal dislike of this extremely directed style and the encouragement to continue, while building the students’ skills to enable them to move toward more independent learning. Teacher C also struggled with modifying strategies, due to her lack of experience and feeling that she should be teaching the program as it was laid out. She was aware that the students were struggling and frustrated but was unsure as to how to reach them. The coaching guided her observations and reflections to try different strategies that were more visual, creative and structured and which enabled the students to meet with success.

Teachers A and B’s measures of success for a lesson were unchanged by the coaching process. Both continued to use the same criteria and assessment as before the coaching started. Teacher C however became much more aware of how to assess student achievement and also recognized how it could be used as a motivational strategy with some
intermediate students. She became more aware of exactly what she wanted to evaluate and clearly laid it out for the students in order that they knew before the activity started exactly what they had to do to meet with success. The coaching guided her through this in the planning conference by asking her to clarify and explain how she was going to measure the success of the lesson.

**Interactive thought:** All three teachers were very aware of when a lesson was going well and when they did not have the students with them. Both Teachers A and B would change lessons midstream if need be, while Teacher C gained the confidence to do that over the coaching period.

**Reflective thought:** All three teachers changed significantly in this area. They all moved from a general impressions level (pleased or discouraged with the lesson) to using a guided format of observations, comparisons to how the lesson was planned, what caused the lesson to succeed or fail, learnings from the lesson and applications to future lessons. However Teachers A and C being more field dependent (see Appendixes E and U) needing concrete experiences and guidance; once the coaching stopped, so did the reflecting. Even Teacher B, who is more field independent, did not need my observations to continue his reflections which he did in his journal and a self-reflection portion on his weekly
planner, but the frequency of his reflections decreased as the time was not set aside for it as during the coaching.

**Projective thought:** Teacher A’s projective thought was affected as long as the coaching was providing new data. Once that stopped she returned to relying on her observations for the need to make adjustments. Teachers B and C’s projective thinking was mainly influenced by the pace-and-lead questioning during the reflection conferences to assist them in problem solving. This enabled each of them to work through some very challenging instructional problems and to formulate plans of action to meet those challenges. Teacher B continued after the coaching to write down ideas in his journal and Teacher C said that she jots down different ideas as to what she would do differently if she taught that lesson again, but both appeared to basically not have changed their thinking nor approach in Cycle 9, since we had stopped the coaching.

**Peer Coaching**

None of the teachers had any experience with peer coaching and only Teacher A had somewhat of an idea of what it was about. Teachers A and B knew and had worked with me for a few years, Teacher A even having taken a Masters of Education course with me, while Teacher C, being a new teacher, was too naive to refuse to participate. What was very evident
from the outset was that observation is so linked with evaluation that all teachers experienced anxiety by the very fact of another teacher being in the classroom and until the teacher has a firm understanding that the coach is there not to judge but to assist in their thinking and collecting data, no progress can be made. The length of time for this to take place depends on the level of trust between the coach and the teacher but also the trust in the process itself. With Teacher A, after one cycle she was confident and at ease with both me and the process. Teacher B, because of his negative experience with observation, had enough trust in me to agree to participate, but took four coaching cycles before he trusted the process. With Teacher C it took six coaching cycles as she needed to develop a sense of trust with me as well as with the process. However, once that trust had been established, all the teachers valued the feedback and the heightened awareness about their teaching practices which the coaching provides, as they all enthusiastically said that they would like to continue with cognitive coaching at least once a month if it were available to them.

Feelings about Teaching

All three teachers enjoy teaching, Teacher A saying that it is the best job, Teacher B saying that he likes teaching but feels maligned by the public at present, while Teacher C counts herself lucky to have a job.
None of these feelings changed as a result of the coaching, yet their sense of holonomy did.

Teacher A ended the coaching as she had started, highly confident, feeling in control of her teaching, flexible in her approaches, conscious of the effects of her teaching and with a high degree of craftsmanship and interdependence. The only noticeable change was in her level of consciousness and flexibility during the coaching as it provided new data.

Teacher B had grown in all areas of holonomy through the coaching process. He started out with a fairly low sense of efficacy, not even able to tell me what he had done to make the lesson successful. By the end he was able to list off readily the strategies that had worked and seemed much more confident in his decisions. He was no longer afraid to use a more directed style to meet the needs of his students, seeing flexibility as a good thing. He became more aware of why he was doing certain things and this enabled him to do them more purposefully, which improved his sense of craftsmanship. He also increased his sense of interdependence, going from talking to me maybe once or twice a week, to four or five times a week with five different teachers, seeking their expertise.

Teacher C increased her sense of efficacy over the coaching period, which gave her a sense of control and success, which increased her sense of
craftsmanship as well. She improved her flexibility, using different approaches to reach the students, and became aware of her goals and measures of success for her lessons. Her sense of interdependence increased with me but when she approached other teachers in the school, found them uninterested in discussing things with her. She found this disappointing and wished that this had not been the case.

Professional Dialogue

With all three teachers, dialoguing with a peer seemed to be the essential element of cognitive coaching. It forced them to articulate clearly exactly what their goals, strategies and measures of success were, thereby making them more conscious and/or aware of them. It also placed their reflections in a nonjudgmental, pedagogical framework which facilitated problem solving, providing data as needed. This dialoguing with a peer also gave, especially Teachers B and C, the emotional support needed when dealing with difficult classes, which served to increase their sense of efficacy, craftsmanship and interdependence. Teacher A already had a strong network for professional dialogue before the coaching started, meeting regularly with a teacher outside of the school on her own time as well as the team of teachers that she plans and works with every day. She simply has now included me in this circle of dialogue which is ongoing.
Teachers B and C also continue this dialoguing, approaching me to talk about new problems that have arisen or sharing successes.

Interpretation of Experiences According to Cognitive Coaching Theory

My discussion now shifts to an exploration of the findings from cognitive coaching’s perspective. Cognitive Coaching is described as a school-based professional development program to improve instructional thought and decision-making, as well as enhancing staff perceptions, collegiality and school culture. It also has been suggested that after six to eight cognitive coaching episodes a teacher will have internalized the four thought processes of effective teaching (Costa & Garmston, 1994) and promote growth in the five states of mind that promote holonomy. This case study respected ethnographic techniques of data collecting by interviewing, observing and using journals, and was an application of cognitive coaching theory.

The three goals of cognitive coaching are trust, learning and holonomy. However trust is not a goal but a foundation for coaching, and learning is a product. Therefore the only real goal is improving the five states of mind: efficacy, flexibility, consciousness, craftsmanship and interdependence.
The concept of sustainable development involves balancing economic growth, social welfare, and environmental protection. In the context of renewable energy, innovations such as solar and wind power are key elements. By harnessing these natural resources, we can reduce our dependence on fossil fuels and mitigate the effects of climate change.

Moreover, the development of energy storage technologies is crucial for the integration of intermittent renewable sources into the grid. Advances in battery technology, for instance, are enabling the storage of excess energy generated during periods of high production, which can then be used during low production times. This approach not only enhances the reliability of the power supply system but also supports the transition to a more sustainable energy landscape.

The challenge, however, lies in achieving the necessary infrastructure and policies to facilitate widespread adoption of these technologies. It requires international cooperation, investment in research and development, and a commitment to green initiatives by governments and businesses alike. The ultimate goal is to create a resilient and sustainable energy system that benefits all stakeholders while preserving the planet's resources for future generations.
Merriam (1988) states that a good interviewer remains neutral, nonjudgmental, paraphrases and is respectful. These are all essential in building a relationship of trust and were stressed in the training for cognitive coaching. Showers and Joyce (1996) stated that judgmental feedback is destructive of building a trusting environment, and indeed John Dyer emphasized during the training that no learning can take place until trust is established.

My findings support these statements, as all three teachers were initially anxious that I was going to somehow evaluate their teaching and it wasn’t until they trusted both me and the process that they relaxed and started to focus on their own teaching practices and learning. By using the conferencing skills obtained during the training, the teachers valued the neutral observational feedback that either confirmed or challenged their own observations. The few times when the observations were in opposition to theirs, they accepted them willingly and never challenged their validity nor felt threatened by them. The use of paraphrase also helped them to clarify and place their thinking within a pedagogical framework which served to affirm and highlight their craftsmanship. All of these teachers took a chance with me and shared very personal reflections.
about their teaching. This bond of trust has brought us closer together as coworkers and we continue to approach each other for mutual support.

As Candy (1991) states, learning is rarely solitary; we do it in a context. This context is critical since as Habermas believes (Mezirow, 1991) we need to communicate with another person in order to arrive at an understanding about the meaning of a shared experience. We develop at the social level, then at the individual (Vygotsky, 1978). Our understandings are socially constructed through the ability to name “what is” in dialogue. The observations and dialoguing lead to critical self-reflection; as Mezirow believes, is not so much what happens to people but how they interpret and explain it that determines their actions and emotional well being. Schön (1987) also states that dialogue brings to the surface one’s beliefs, meanings and perspectives in order to criticize and restructure. We also remember best what we hear ourselves say (Sylwester, 1995). However despite the importance of this dialogue, teachers are preoccupied with daily survival, and time for reflection and analysis seem remote (Kincheloe, 1991).

All of these theories were borne out in my case study. Despite cognitive coaching’s professed goal of teaching the teachers the planning and reflection maps to become self-modifying, none of the teachers
continued to use these maps in the same way after coaching stopped. Teachers A and C maintained growth only in planning and assessment, while Teacher B maintained growth in all areas (Appendixes A,B,C). In fact, however, none of the teachers felt that they had mastered it to the point where they would be able to coach another teacher and lead them through the process. Teacher A during coaching was modifying her strategies and beginning to question her assessment procedures, but after coaching stopped providing the data, this stopped, as did the reflection, citing that she had no time during a busy day. Teacher B became more aware of his goals and the "permission" to modify his strategies to fit the needs of his students. For reflection he continued to use his journal after the coaching ended, but the frequency declined as the length of time increased from the end of the coaching. Coaching Cycle 9 stimulated him to look at his journal and he hadn't written in it for a month. Teacher C also became more aware of her goals and the need to modify strategies plus the advantages of having a clearly defined assessment strategy. However once the coaching stopped, growth in these areas appeared to stop as well and she did not continue her reflections, saying that she had no one to talk to. In other words, as soon as the coaching stopped providing the time to dialogue to examine one's meanings and beliefs, so did the critical self-
reflection. Indeed their reflection dropped in direct relationship to the amount of professional dialogue engaged in after the coaching. Only Teacher B increased his amount of professional dialogue after the coaching ended, and even he barely maintained his level of reflection. He admitted that without the coaching he did not engage in reflection as frequently. Teachers A and C’s level of dialogue dropped after the coaching stopped and so did their reflection. Teacher B summed it up best when he said, “It (the reflection) is like exercise, you know it’s good for you but it’s hard to find the time.” The value then of cognitive coaching is not in the teaching of the planning and reflection map, although that is important in the improvement of teaching practice, but the time set aside to dialogue with a peer, to name “what is” and to critically reflect on our teaching, challenging our beliefs and perspectives. This was where the teachers’ learning took place, in the nonjudgmental feedback for Teacher A and the pace-and-lead problem solving for Teachers B and C.

The characteristics of holonomy are recognized as being key to being a successful and happy person by people such as Covey (1989), Senge (1994), all the way back to Maslow who recognized that esteem needs had to be met before one could move on to developing one’s talents and potential. Edwards and Newton (1995) discovered that teachers trained in
cognitive coaching showed increased efficacy, empowerment, engaged in more professional dialogue, attended more training sessions and implemented more new teaching practices.

My findings tend to support this. All the teachers could not focus on improving practice until they felt a sense of trust in the process and believed that they had control over what takes place in the classroom. Once they felt empowered, their flexibility, consciousness, craftsmanship and sense of interdependence all increased. They then could critically reflect on what practices were working and what needed changing. Finally they had to know what a learning is, as this drives the rest of the instructional sequence. Teacher A was aware of her learnings before the coaching started, although school culture has taught her to discuss strategies first. Teacher B learned this over the course of the coaching and continued after. In Cycle 9 he started to give me the strategy, then caught himself and gave me the learning. He shared with me that he has already started writing his long-range plans for next year using the format of learnings, strategies and assessment. Teacher C is developing her sense of what a learning is saying, "What do I really want the students to achieve?"

All thus continue to be interested in improving their craft. Teacher A is continuing with her Masters of Education courses, Teacher C wants to find
a mentor at her new school (the responses on her Osgood’s Differential for Other Teachers increased in almost all categories, Appendix C) and Teacher B has even signed up for two conferences, something he had not been interested in before as he dismissed them as a waste of time. However all of these depend on peer dialogue with a skilled colleague for continued development. These teachers were not trained in cognitive coaching, yet benefited and grew in holonomy from examining and reflecting on their teaching practices with a trained coach. As they reflected on and improved these practices with a peer, their feelings of efficacy, craftsmanship, flexibility, and interdependence all grew as they became more “aware” of what they were doing. All teachers continued to dialogue with me after the coaching was over to discuss problems and successes. As Kincheloe (1991) states, a good work environment is a self-directed place of learning with work-mate cooperation.

Implications

The significance of this study lies in the implications that it raises for practice, among both teachers and administrators, in creating a school culture that is a place of learning and support of each other in order that all may continue to develop professionally. What has come to the fore over
the course of this study is that reflection is key to professional growth, but it can not flourish unless it is supported by a sense of trust and the time to dialogue with other teachers. The discussion now turns to how both teachers and administrators may contribute to this process.

Teachers first of all must be willing to share, take risks, laugh with their colleagues and most of all learn to be nonjudgmental with their peers. Teachers are so used to evaluating and passing judgments on students, and so conditioned that the only reason another teacher is in your classroom is to evaluate your teaching, that we isolate ourselves and cut ourselves off from the richness of experiences and perceptions that each of us possesses. When we open our doors, visit each other’s classrooms without making value judgments, we build a sense of trust and feeling of interdependence. This supports us through difficult times and builds team. None of us has all the answers; we’re all in this together! Teachers can begin by dialoguing with each other about pedagogy, what we’re doing and why, and engage in action-based-research which would stimulate reflection, dialogue and perhaps even observation by peers to assist in data collection.

Teachers also need to focus on learnings instead of activities. This also is continually reinforced by teacher dialogue, as teachers talk about what they are “doing” in their classroom, but rarely why. We must force
ourselves to write the learnings for each lesson in order that we can adequately assess whether we have met them. This focuses the lesson, increases the teacher’s sense of efficacy and craftsmanship, and increases the impact on the students.

Teachers can also use the same reflection map as in cognitive coaching to guide their students through self-analysis of their own work. I experimented with this myself this year with my grade 6 class and found it to be a very useful tool. The students kept a learning log and recorded at the end of each day what they had learned. This was difficult at first as they were not used to “thinking” about what they had learned and found it hard work. However with practice and feedback from me they moved away from simply listing activities to actually recording what they had gained from the day’s lessons. This proved insightful for me at times, as they recorded learnings that I would not have been aware of if I hadn’t asked, and were usually more important to their overall learning than a recitation of facts. After any project or presentation to the class, I would ask them first to write in their learning logs if they were pleased with their project or presentation, why, what had they observed, what had they done that caused this, what had they learned, and what they would do differently next time. As a result of this strategy, they became very self-critical and
would invariably make the same comments as I would have, some even more so. This allowed me to write my evaluation after theirs and became simply a verification of their own reflections. I saw real progress over the course of the year in their presentation skills as they were setting their own goals and striving to achieve them. This also served to give them a sense of efficacy and control over their own learning.

For administrators, they also need to build a sense of trust, as no learning can take place without it. The extremely judgmental feedback that Teacher B had experienced at the hands of a previous principal had shaken his confidence in his teaching and had made him hesitant to dialogue with others for fear of criticism. Cognitive coaching helped to restore his sense of efficacy and trust. His positive experience of supervision with the present principal after the coaching, consolidated this for him. Even though principals are responsible for the evaluation of teachers, if they used a coaching model the teacher would still feel in control of the process and maintain self-esteem. Flores (1991) as reported in Edwards & al (1995) found that a teacher on the verge of termination during the cognitive coaching process improved her self-confidence, her classroom management skills, decreased behavior referrals and improved student-teacher relationships. As a result of coaching, she was able to continue in her job.
If all administrators were trained in cognitive coaching, it would allow them to coach all staff, developing trust, learning and holonomy, and they could continue with teachers that need ongoing support such as beginning teachers and teachers experiencing difficulty.

Administrators also need to facilitate opportunities which allow teachers to plan together, to dialogue about pedagogy and to visit each other’s classrooms. They also need to ask teachers to write long-range plans centered around learnings.

Questions for Further Study

This study served to deepen the understanding of how cognitive coaching affected the teaching of three particular teachers over a period of time. They were at different points in their professional growth and taught in different divisions. All were willing participants, or at least willing to take a chance. All had a beneficial experience with it and all would like to continue with it if available, as it sets the time aside to reflect on their practices with a trained colleague.

Despite having answered some questions, this study raises others. Would these teachers continue to grow and develop with further cognitive coaching? With all the teachers during Coaching Cycle 9, I felt that the
coaching was very routine and that it was basically a continuation and consolidation of our discussions from the last coaching cycle. Being near the end of the school year, were the teachers just tired or did they need the challenge of a new class to stimulate further learning?

I also, wonder if I approached the teacher who had refused to participate and got him to agree to engage in cognitive coaching, would he benefit in the same way as the teachers who had willingly participated? Could trust be established? This would be especially interesting for administrators, as few teachers would dare to refuse a request from a vice-principal or principal; yet could trust be established so that learning could take place?

As teachers find observation so threatening, would the coaching be as effective without the observation? Only two times with Teacher A, once with Teacher C and never with Teacher B did my observations differ from theirs. Is the observation an essential component? Would trust still be established without it?

As the three participants, especially Teachers B and C, grew so much in their feelings of holonomy to the benefit of their students, what would be the impact if implemented on a school-wide basis? Would an administrator
formally scheduling in time for conferencing between teachers increase reflection and professional growth?

Summary

I started out my study looking for a way to help teachers to continue to grow and develop professionally. I believe that I have found it. Cognitive coaching does not give answers nor prescribe certain strategies. It respects and recognizes the abilities of teachers as professionals to reflect on and improve their own practice in dialoguing with a trained coach, as each teacher is an expert on his/her own teaching and class.

It assists teachers to become active researchers in the real context of their classrooms, rather than passive receivers of knowledge. It encourages growth in instructional thought in order that they may improve decision-making in their daily teaching. Teachers are encouraged to strive for personal excellence, to reflect on their learning and to set new goals. It breaks down teacher isolation and encourages peer sharing and dialogue. It supports teachers and gives them a framework in which to problem-solve during difficult times.

However the goal of cognitive coaching should not be that teachers simply master the four processes of instructional thought, but that they
continue to refine and perfect them through ongoing professional dialogue and interaction. As Teacher B said, “It’s like exercise, it’s good for you but it’s hard to find the time;” having a buddy makes it easier to do.
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Appendix A

Classroom Observations, Teacher A

Cycle 1

Number 1 represents the first observation, number 2 the second, 30 seconds after, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Students not on task</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>teacher “Eyes this way, hands in your lap”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>teacher moved to chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>all standing hands together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>silent actions, following teacher’s lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>names called for group to leave circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:14</td>
<td>2 lesson started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:15</td>
<td>4 teacher showing alphabet book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:16</td>
<td>4 alphabet song</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:21</td>
<td>1 teacher reading alphabet book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24</td>
<td>0 teacher reading alphabet book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:31</td>
<td>1 Other teacher passing papers to her group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33 1
34 2
35 0
36 0
37 0
38 1
39 0
40 1  teacher "Speak up, I can't hear you"
41 0
42 3
43 0  "What word starts with Z?"
44 2
45 1
46 1  teacher assigning letters
47 2  a lot of background noise from other
        group
48 0  noise level continues at fairly high
        level
49 1  noise level remains constant for rest
        of time
Cycle 2

I entered the classroom and sat down to start my recording. This time only a couple of students even looked as I walked in. Every 15 seconds, I checked who was talking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Directed part of the lesson with the rote reading and review of words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Start of cloze activity at seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher  Student
Total    32      46

**Cycle 3**

Alexander  How do you like grade 1? A lot
Why? We play outside.

Anything you don’t like? When it’s noisy, when my teacher’s gone.

Justine How do you like grade 1? A little.

What do you like? Recess and activity time.

Anything you don’t like? French and Gym.

Observer Comment (OC): French and Gym are taught in a highly directed manner by the same teacher (not their classroom teacher).

Chelesy How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? My friends, making stuff.

Anything you don’t like? No.

Kevin How do you like grade 1? Friends, colouring and drawing.

Anything you don’t like? Going to the carpet, calendar, poems,…

Jessica How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Friends, drawing, activity time.

Anything you don’t like? Some work is hard, poems.

Kenneth How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Mass (matter experiments they had done in class), craft stuff.
Anything you don’t like? French.

**Mitchell**

How do you like grade 1? Fine.

What do you like? Recess, all the stuff to play with but I don’t get to play with it a lot.

Anything you don’t like? Paper work. We do a lot of paper work.

**Alexandra**

How do you like grade 1? I like it!

What do you like? Doing the work, reading, paper work.

Anything you don’t like? No.

**Dani**

How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Painting, activity time and play time.

Anything you don’t like? Teacher stuff, cleaning up, work sheets.

**James Allen**

How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Math, religion (writing).

Anything you don’t like? No.

**Tammy**

How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Recess, crafts, making booklets, calendar.

Anything you don’t like? French.
Alissa

How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Crafts, painting, making stories (drawing pictures at this point).

Anything you don’t like? French.

Austin

How do you like grade 1? Recess, French, gym, play time.

Anything you don’t like? Getting up in the morning.

Adam T.

How do you like grade 1? I like it a lot.

What do you like? Listening centre, paints.

Anything you don’t like? Lunch time, I don’t get to eat all my lunch.

Rachel

How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Writing, reading, colouring.

Anything you don’t like? No.

Alicia

How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Read the books and write the stories, do math.

Anything you don’t like? French.

Kathryn

How do you like grade 1? I don’t like French and Gym.

What do you like? Play time, crafts.
Anything you don’t like? No.
Sarah

How do you like grade 1? Make new friends, math, trace letters.

Anything you don’t like? French.
Gabriella

How do you like grade 1? Good.

What do you like? Activities, painting.

Anything you don’t like? Nothing.

Cycle 4

As I walk in the children are just settling down on the carpeted area in front of the teacher. Almost half the class is either looking at me sitting down or looking around the classroom. However as soon as the teacher started awarding the certificates to those students who had read 17 books all eyes were on the teacher. The teacher then invited the PTM to start the reading strategies lesson and took a seat on the carpet at the back of the class.

The PTM tells them they are going to be learning reading strategies and explains to them that it's like clues to help them to read. She then explains that she will be reading a book to them and they are to see if they can guess the strategy. It is a large alphabet book with pictures illustrating each letter. After the first page almost every hand is up. The PTM points out
that the picture represents the word. Then by the time she gets to D she adds that the letter is also a clue: "D is for Dog." It is difficult for the students to control their enthusiasm. They are speaking out the answers and waving their hands in the air accompanied by "ah, ah." At the letter I, all hands are up except for 5 out of 31. For J, a student answered "jacket" (the picture had a boy putting on a bright red jacket). The PTM asked "Why didn’t you say coat?" Student: "It starts with J". For L (a picture of a tree on the ground) the PTM points out that "it can’t be tree, we’re not on the T page, so what could it be? O (picture of boy with oars): The PTM prompts them, "What do you use to row a boat?" Students answers: "paddles"; another student answers, "no, that starts with P"; another student, "Oars". R - only 3 students not attending or hands not up. S (picture of a sand castle): PTM reminds them about the letter cue, so it can’t be castle. Student answers "It’s a sand castle!" X (picture of an X in the sand for X-ing): PTM says "If I walk, I’m walking, if I skate, I’m skating, if I make an X," Student shouts out "I’m X-ing!"

At 11:25 the PTM finishes the book and calls her group for the reinforcement activity. As she walks past me, she whispers, "Make a note, I’ve had no experience at the primary level."
OC: I then realized that neither the teacher nor I had informed the PTM of what I was doing in the classroom. Nor had I asked her permission to be there. I could imagine how a stranger entering the room and taking copious notes might be a little unnerving. I resolved to speak to her after class and share the data that I had collected with her if she wished.

The rest of the class stayed on the carpet with the teacher as she released them by groups to select a book. One girl was more interested in the turkey on the wall and she was gently reminded to choose a book and put it in her bag. As they finished, they returned to the carpet for the story. Comments overheard while students were choosing books: “How many books have you read?” “This is a good book.” “I can read this one!” (said with confidence in her ability to do so). One girl put her book down on the table and started to look at it before putting it in her bag.

There are four students still choosing books, two in the process of putting them in school bags as the teacher shows the cover of the book and asks the students on the carpet to try to guess the title using the picture cues. Someone answers “Thanksgiving” and the teacher answers “yes, it’s Mousekin’s Thanksgiving.” She then directs them to listen for the problem in the story as she reads it. Student: “I have a stomach ache!” Teacher:
“Do you need to sit down at your desk?” Student: “Yes”. She goes and puts her head on her desk. Two other students have been given permission to sit at their desks and draw.

OC: Ask the teacher at reflection conference why these other two students opted out of the story time.

As the teacher starts the story all eyes of the children on the carpet are on the book, intently focused on listening carefully. The three students at their desks turn from time to time to look at the book as the action in the story mount. Student speaks out, “That turkey is kind of like that one!” (pointing to turkey on the wall). A few moments later to a different student the teacher comments, “Great listening Justine.” Three students look momentarily as the PTM and her group move to the book centre. Teacher asks, “What was the problem?” 8 hands raised out of 22. Problem is correctly identified after a couple of clarifying questions. “How was the problem solved?” Five hands up and correct answer given. The lesson ended at 11:45 with the class starting lunch.

Both the teacher and I then spoke to the PTM to apologize for our oversight. The teacher explained to her what we were engaged in and I offered to share my observations with her. She eagerly agreed, so from 11:50 -12:00, I conferenced with the PTM. I asked her how she felt the
lesson went and she responded that she felt it had gone well, but that she was going to have to make sure that her group chooses a book at their appropriate reading level so that she can reinforce these reading strategies after with them using these books. I then shared the data with her on the level of participation and interest of the class. She thanked me profusely for sharing this with her and said that I had made her day. “When I’m teaching, I’m always concerned that it’s more than a few who are not paying attention. This is great!” (to see the high level of participation and interest).

OC: I didn’t take the time to go through the other questions with her as I was meeting with the teacher at noon hour for her reflective conference.

Cycle 5

As I entered the room the class was being divided into two groups, one staying with the PTM and one moving with the teacher to their desks. The teacher asked if there was someone who could explain the activity that they were finishing from yesterday? Six out of 14 hands went up. After the boy had explained the activity the teacher asked, “Who thinks that they can get started?” All hands were raised. As they started to work I noticed four boys who were colouring a picture not in their pattern book. When asked
why, they replied that they had finished yesterday and when asked to, pulled out their Thank you books, and read them easily. One boy was colouring the turkey on the front cover. When I asked him he read the two pages he had finished but did not start the two uncompleted pages. Instead he returned to his colouring. One girl that the teacher had identified at the planning conference was intently drawing pictures only, as the teacher had diagnosed her at the preword stage. Another boy had sentences but no pictures and could not read it back to me. Still another boy had pictures but few words. The teacher meanwhile was calling them over individually and reading their booklets with them. By 9:30 the boy who had been colouring the front cover had started to work on finishing the booklet but another boy was still sitting, his book opened at the blank page doing nothing but staring into space. At the end of the observation period, there were eight students who had finished, five who were actively working at finishing the assignment and one not working.

**Cycle 6**

As I enter the classroom all 32 children are seated on the floor in front of the teacher. The PTM enters after me and the teacher reviews where the groups are on the rotation. One group stays seated with the PTM and two groups move to the back with the teacher. One group lines up to get their
self-directed activity while the third group of 10 stays on the floor in front of the teacher for the Wild Things activity. The students are seated in roughly two rows of four in front of the teacher with a third row of two. Showing the book cover, the teacher asks who can tell her the title. A boy answers *Where the Wild Things Are*, “I have that book at home!” The teacher reminds them of the reading strategy of previewing the book. All the students start looking at the book *carefully* starting from the front pages and moving to the last page. One student has to check by watching others to make sure he is at the front and moving in the right direction. As the teacher starts to read (from a student’s book on the floor in the first row) this student continues to check with other students to ensure that he is on the right page. Three other students sitting in the second and third row as the story progresses are having trouble tracking (on the wrong page, flipping back and forth). A boy in the third row about halfway through the story asks, “Is this the right page?” At this point six are on the wrong page. After the teacher recaps, all are again on the right page. Two pages after the teacher starts reading again seven are on the wrong page, only the three immediately in front of the teacher are on the right page. When asked what the problem is two students answer before the third boy answers using the picture cue, that he was chasing the dog with a fork,
being a "Wild Thing." All students are attending to the discussion about the story, eyes on the teacher and most hands up for questions. The teacher then invites the students to read the book again with her, this time holding the book in front of her and showing it (which she hadn't done the first time).

Seven students continue to have difficulty tracking as they are flipping pages back and forth, unsure of where they should be. After a few pages, five continue to read the story (the four in the front row and one in the second) in their book as the teacher reads; the other five are looking at the teacher's book. The observer can hear some chiming in and notices a high degree of interest as all students are laughing and looking at the pictures.

When the second reading is completed the teacher gives them the instructions for the activity of colour the Wild Thing, cut it out and glue it on the construction paper. The students repeat colour, cut, glue. Observer leaves.

**Cycle 7**

There are 10 students sitting around a table with the pumpkin in front of the teacher. She passes it to her left and asks the students to feel the outside of it. The first student says, "It's scary, hard, smooth, cold". Another student asks what happened to the pumpkins that they had
collected from the pumpkin patch visit. The teacher answers that they had rotted and this was a new one she had acquired free of charge that morning from a local store. Different students remark, “It’s bumpy, dirty, rubbery, crunchy, rough”.

After all students have had an opportunity to feel its outside, the teacher cuts the lid. A student asks if they will be doing some cutting and the teacher confirms that. Another student remarks, “I never get to carve at home.” As the teacher pulls up a handful of seeds, she asks what it’s called. Comments of “guts, roots, seeds” are heard. She calls it pulp. As the pumpkin is again passed, with each student pulling out a handful of seeds, they are encouraged to describe it. “It feels gross, slimy, yukky, cold, sticky. I love pumpkin seeds”. The teacher continues to press them for adjectives; students respond, “gukky, squishy, my hands are cold like when you’re sick or winter, slippery, sticky.” The teacher reminds them of their matter unit, does it feel like a solid or a liquid? Response: “It’s a solid and a liquid as you squeeze it.” “It feels disgusting, stringy.” “The pulp looks a bit like frost.” Teacher: “It does look like frost crystals, it was cold out last night and the pumpkin was outside. Let’s look at the pulp with the magnifying glass.” As one student uses the magnifying glass another comments, “It smells!” To another student who is feeling what he
has pulled out, the teacher says, "Run the pulp through your hands; does it break easily?" Student: "It is almost elastic!" This student continues to explore and examine this for another 5 minutes.

The teacher then passes the bowl that contains what they have pulled out of the pumpkin, again asking, "How does it feel?" "Juicy, gooey, it looks like orange juice. It feels like old spaghetti!" Teacher: "like old pasta?" Student: "This piece of pulp isn’t as strong." Teacher: "It came from the top of the pumpkin. Let’s pass the top around." Another student with the bowl: "It gets juicy as you squeeze. The crystals are disappearing with the squeezing!" Teacher: "Look at the colour of the pulp that has been squeezed (dark) and what hasn’t been squeezed." Teacher pulls out another handful. "This is a really interesting texture." Student: "It looks like worms!" "It feels like pasta, soft and gooey." Teacher: "Look how stringy this piece is." Another student: "Juice comes out when you squeeze it!" Researcher leaves.

**Cycle 8**

As I enter the room all children are seated on the carpet in front of the teacher. The teacher is reviewing the reading strategies with them with a poem on the board. OC: This is not the one they will be reading in the small reading group.
The teacher asks them to remember to read from left to right, tracking with their eyes. “I will read, you listen. Now read with me.” Choral reading of the poem follows.

The Blue group of 10 students then moves to the back of the room with the teacher while the PTM keeps one group and the third group has activities. The teacher sits with them in a circle on the floor and purposefully keeps the weak students close to her. She tells them that she is going to give them a poem to read that they will put in their poetry books. She then asks them for the All Star Strategies they will use to read. One of the identified weak students (Steven) answers “Think.” Another one of the four (Gabriella) says, “Look at the pictures”, and another student adds, “Sound out some of the letters.” The teacher then adds that when they are previewing she wants them to touch every word that they know.

The teacher starts distributing the poem and some students immediately read the title, “Five Cat Caper”. The teacher reminds them that they are to read to themselves. One of the girls I have been asked to observe, Alissa, comments, “I can read this!” Gabriella doesn’t touch any words the first time through but after the teacher reminds the group to touch the words they recognize, she touches cat. Of the two boys I am to watch, Steven is
tracking with his finger and appears to be mouthing the words. Peter however is not touching any words and is in fact watching the boy beside him read.

The teacher asks Gabriella how she knew that it was Five Cat Caper. She replied, “I looked at the picture.” Peter? “I looked at the picture.” Steven? “I used the words.” Alissa? “I looked at the words.” The teacher then asks the students to read the poem aloud with her. Teacher: “I can see Steven is ready.”

OC: Steven has his finger on the first word.

As the reading starts, the four students I am watching are all tracking (moving their fingers along the words). After they finish and the teacher is distributing the poetry books, I ask Peter to read the poem to me. He moves his finger along the words but is reciting from memory as he is not pointing at the word he is saying. Steven reads the poem to me and points out where the teacher had made a mistake (changed a word) in line four from what they had memorized. After Alissa puts her poem in, she said, “Now, let me read!” She turns to the beginning of the book. She is reciting the poems from memory (she is pointing at the wrong words) and sings the alphabet song when she gets to that poem. When she gets to the Wild Things she says, “I can’t do this!”
OC: This was a very long poem with several paragraphs.

Gabriella hears Alissa sing the alphabet song and she also turns to that page. Steven turns to Leaves are Falling. “I just read this one by myself!” Peter is sitting with the book closed looking slightly uncomfortable.

Cycle 9

As the observer enters the classroom, the teacher is making a list of words that start with long and short vowel sound e. Students are seated at their desks. She then asks the students to go to the carpet. She invites one student to read his “news” (clues that other students have to guess what it is. The PTM enters classroom to start work with her half of the class and Teacher A asks her reading group to move to the back of the room.

Students sit in a circle on the floor. When the teacher asks who can remember the story 4 out of the 15 students raise their hands. She then distributes the readers. Once the students have their books they start to read aloud. The teacher moves around the circle assisting as needed.

Marek appears not to be reading (looking around, opening and closing the book). After about 2 minutes, she stops them and invites them to choral-read the story. Marek and Tammy are not participating. The rest are attempting to stay with the teacher but there is a feeling of hesitancy and uncertainty about their reading.
She starts the comprehension questions. Two or three students ask extending questions about the story commenting on how the characters behaved. She asks Marek a question. He is unsure of his answer but with teacher prompting, gets the answer. The pronoun activity is next. On chart paper she has printed sentences in pairs where the second sentence uses a pronoun to replace a word in the first sentence. For her questions there are on average three hands raised. The teacher also seems to be aware that she doesn't have their attention. She sits down and moves to the new story. She asks them to read it by themselves. After a couple of minutes she asks them to read it chorally. About four students appear to be participating, the others are not. When the teacher asks a comprehension question, six hands go up. The teacher asks them to close their books and does a finger game with them. She gathers the readers and the observer leaves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level VI</th>
<th>Level V</th>
<th>Level IVB</th>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Non-Use</th>
<th>Level 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Levels of Use

- **Planning**: 1 - Goals, 2 - Strategies, 3 - Success Reflection
- **Acquiring**: 1 - Knowledge
- **Sharing**: A
- **Assessing**: 1
- **Reporting**: 1

**Appendix A**

**Thursday, September 17, 1996**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level V</th>
<th>Level VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Assessing</td>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Level I: Renewal
- Level II: Integration
- Level III: Refinement
- Level IV: Routine
- Level V: Mechanical Use
- Level VI: Preparation

Levels of Use: I - Goals, 2 - Strategies, 3 - Success, 4 - Reflection

Appendix A

Thursday, January 16, 1997, Teacher A

Lou Chair 3, Teacher A
In the space provided, rank each of the following statements from 1 (most important) to 5 (least important) according to your personal priorities and belief systems.

My priority ranking of the main proposes of education is as follows:

1. To develop students' ability to think clearly, to use intellectual reasoning to solve problems and to make rational decisions.

2. To nurture the individual student's unique potential to allow full development of his/her creativity and sensitivity; talents and abilities; and, to encourage personal integrity, love of learning, and self fulfilment.

3. To diagnose the learner's needs and abilities; to design instructional strategies which develop skills and competencies, and to produce trained people who are able to function efficiently in our changing, complex, technological society.

4. To transmit to young people the basic knowledge, skills, traditions, academic concepts, and values necessary to interpret, participate in, and further the heritage and traditions of our country.

5. To create a future world condition of peace, harmony, equality and love: and, to foster a new society with humans who can live together in balance with their environment and with each other.
timely      /\         /\       /\  untimely
strong      /\         /\       /\  weak
good        /\         /\       /\  poor
optimistic  /\         /\       /\  pessim
warm        /\         /\       /\  cold
sharp       /\         /\       /\  dull
effective   /\         /\       /\  ineffe
clear       /\         /\       /\  confu
valuable    /\         /\       /\  worth
essential  /\         /\       /\  unimi
active      /\         /\       /\  passi
kind        /\         /\       /\  cruell
liked       /\         /\       /\  hate:
sharp       /\         /\       /\  dull
bright      /\         /\       /\  dark
Appendix A

OTHER TEACHERS, Teacher A

November 6, 1996

timely ✔
strong ✔
good ✔
optimistic ✔
warm ✔
sharp ✔
effective ✔
clear ✔
valuable ✔
esential ✔
active ✔
kind ✔
liked ✔
sharp ✔
bright ✔
untimely
weak
poor
pessim
cold
dull
ineffec
confus
worthi
unimpor
passiv
cruel
hated
dull
dark.
Appendix A
OTHER TEACHERS, Teacher A
January 22, 1997

- timely
  - untimely
- strong
  - weak
- good
  - poor
- optimistic
  - pessimistic
- warm
  - cold
- sharp
  - dull
- effective
  - ineffect
- clear
  - confusing
- valuable
  - worthless
- essential
  - unimportant
- active
  - passive
- kind
  - cruel
- liked
  - hated
- sharp
  - dull
- bright
  - dark.
Appendix B

Classroom Observations, Teacher B

Cycle 1

Nonattentive students. Recorded every 30 seconds.

1. Teacher checking homework - rest doing bell work.

2. Quickly get these words copied down. 4 talking: Marcus, Angela, Sara, Elisabeth.

3. Elisabeth.

4. Elisha- came to see me - told to sit down.

5. Elisabeth, Ed.

6. All attentive.

7. Ed.

8. Ed, Jenna.

9. Ed.

10. Ed.

11. All attentive.

12. All attentive.


14. Jenna, Jennifer (watching Lindsay come in late).

15. Jenna, Jennifer.
16. All attentive.

17. Ed copying words instead of listening to teacher.

18. Lindsay - getting out book.

19. All attentive.

20. Jenna.


22. All attentive.

23. All attentive.

24. All attentive.

25. All attentive.

26. All attentive.

27. All attentive.

28. All attentive.

29. All attentive.

30. All attentive.

31. All attentive.

32. All attentive.

33. All attentive.

34. All attentive.

35. All attentive.
36. All attentive.

37. All attentive.

38. Angela M - combing hair, Elisabeth colouring.

39. All attentive.

40. All attentive.

41. Lara - talking to Angela as she takes off her sweater.

42. All attentive.

43. Craig looks at Michelle coming in.

44. Elisabeth, Lara, Angela M. out of chair (Elisabeth has not copied anything down; she has been colouring).

45. Michelle, Elisabeth.

46. Michelle, Elisabeth, Jenna, Tammy talking about ballet.

47. Michelle, Jenna, Elisabeth.

48. Michelle, Jenna, Elisabeth.

49. Michelle, Tammy, Elisabeth.

50. Elisha, Elisabeth.

51. Michelle, Jenna, Tammy.

**Cycle 2**

As I walk into the room, the teacher is going over instructions for the first activity. Elisabeth rarely looks at the person talking whether it’s the
teacher or a student. She is seated at the middle front of the room. Five
minutes later her desk is surrounded by books and papers on the floor.
Another 5 minutes pass and she starts to organize the mess. As the teacher
is reviewing the meaning of the words Elisabeth raises her hand to answer
once, then goes back to tidying. At 9:15 she has finished tidying and asks
the teacher a question (all other students are now studying in pairs). She
returns to her desk and starts searching in it. At 9:20 teacher starts to help
her organize her desk. “What goes in here first?” “Which is the smallest?”
“What’s the biggest thing in this pile?” He then starts to show her how to
classify a mass of loose paper. She walks to where I am sitting to hand in
an assignment (found in the mass of paper). She comments, “I know what
the problem is, I don’t hand in work that I’ve finished. I’m disorganized.
My Dad is really organized. I don’t know what happened to me.” I reply,
“You can learn how to be organized.”

Cycle 3

As the observer enters the classroom, the students are doing
Bellwork (computation questions) as the teacher collects assignments.
When he has finished, he begins the lesson by asking, “What is a noun?”
One student answers “an action word?” Elisabeth answers “a person, place
or thing.” The teacher then gives the example that a common noun is boy,
a proper noun is Ed, a common noun is girl, a proper noun is Vanessa.
The teacher moves to the overhead and starts the activity sheet, asking them to identify whether they are common or proper nouns and what’s the difference?

9:05: Elisabeth is talking, Wayne and Ed are attending. Morghan answers that proper nouns are capitalized and common nouns aren’t.

9:10: Ed identifies a noun correctly, Elisha puts up her hand to draw attention to herself. Wayne is attending. The activity sheet is distributed and the teacher explains the activity (a list of words where the students have to write common or proper noun beside it) The teacher then explains all the tasks that have to be accomplished before recess (listed on the board). Students start to work.

9:15: Wayne and Ed are working. Elisha has removed herself to the hall voluntarily to work. The classroom is quiet as all students are working. The teacher is checking work and collecting from those who have not yet handed in work.

9:20: Ed is checking what Marcus (sitting beside him) has done, Wayne is over half done and Elisha has only four questions done.
9:25: Wayne approaches the teacher, he has finished, Ed is continuing to work and Elisha is sitting in the hall on the floor. She has made no progress.

9:27: The teacher asks then to put the grammar sheet aside while he explains the character and plot chart. Wayne and Ed are continuing to look at or work on their sheet and Elisha is still in the hall.

9:30: Elisha reenters the class of her own accord, her sheet still unfinished. The observer leaves.

Cycle 4

10:35  -Teacher making chart on board.
        -Elisha rummaging in desk, Elisabeth is absent.
        -students answering teacher’s questions to fill in chart.
        -teacher explained similarities and asks for an example.

10:40  -Elisha starts copying information from chart on board onto her chart.
        -Teacher defines cold-blooded by directing questions.
        -teacher asks for an example of a difference.
        -teacher directs them to fill in the chart by adding 2-3 more pieces of information (at least) about each animal.
-students busy completing chart, talking with their partner about the
assignment (3 minutes pass).

10:45 - Chantel moves over to work with Elisha.

-teacher starts collecting information from them as he notices a lot
of them don’t have a lot of notes copied down from the film.

-Elisha stands, walks over and looks into hall.

-teacher redirecting them (to ignore information that could apply to
many types of animals, also to look for information, not just a list of
names).

-Elisha again walks to the door and looks out, returns to her desk
and sits with arms folded (rest of class on task).

-Elisha starts to wander, looking at what others are writing, then
asks teacher to go to the washroom.

10:51 - students talking about assignment and completing chart.

10:55 - Teacher asks for information to put on chart on board.

10:56 - Elisha talking to a student in the hall as she reenters.

-she sits down and starts copying from the board “Frogs make
noise” Teacher: “Not specific enough, lots of animals make noises.”
- he accepts information that is general enough to describe all the animals in the group and rejects other information that is not specific enough.

11:00 - Elisha stands to sharpen her pencil, walks over and talks to Wayne, she walks to door and looks out before returning to her desk.

11:02 - She resumes copying notes.

- after teacher has collected a half dozen points for each group he asks them to pick out similarities.

11:05 - all students’ eyes on board or teacher, copying information or answering questions.

- when teacher senses that they have exhausted the list he starts asking them for differences.

OC: Ask him at conference if he had a specific list of similarities and differences that he was looking for?

11:07 - noise in hall, Elisha walks to door, takes a look and closes door.

Observer leaves.

**Cycle 5**

Teacher is checking to see if students have their stories with them as I enter the room.
Teacher explains that they are going to be proofreading their stories individually. He then reviews the capitalization rules with them from three sentences on the board:

1. Beginning of a sentence;
2. Proper name;
3. Name of a place;
4. Beginning a quotation.

He reminds them that there are seven or eight rules and he asks them to take out their grammar sheets that talk about capitalization.

9:12 - The students are sitting in a double row by the window, a single row in the centre and another double row against the wall. He asks them to separate their desks into all single rows.

The teacher explains specifically what he expects them to do. He tells them that he wants them to find at least half the capitals and to be careful not to just put capitals anywhere. He wants them to write why they added or deleted capitals.

9:16 - Students start to work. Marcus asks Elisha if she is in trouble. She walks over to his desk to talk to him.

OC: Elisha had been called to the office by the principal after announcements. She returned at 9:10.
The teacher tells Elisha to sit, and start checking her story for capitals. She asks if she can work in the library; teacher says “No.” Ed walks back to visit Marcus, teacher tells him to sit down. Elisha puts a candy in her mouth, notices that I have seen her and takes it out; Marcus chuckles.

9:20 - All students reading quietly, checking their work. As they are working the teacher is circulating, checking on their progress. Wayne appears to be tired (head on arms, eyes closed).

9:25 - Teacher directs their attention to the board and again repeats what he expects from them with capitalization. He then asks them for rules about paragraphs. He writes on board from their answers.

1. A new topic.

2. After a direct quote. Mary said “Hello.”

A student asks for clarification and teacher underlines that every time a different person speaks, it’s a different paragraph.

3. After 4 or 5 sentences. He explains that this isn’t a grammar rule but a guideline.

9:30 - Students start reading stories again, looking for paragraphs. Marcus and Elisha are working. Marcus asks Elisha a question. Teacher tells Marcus to work. Elisha looking around at other students for a couple of minutes, then starts to work.
9:35 - Elisha walks over to talk to Wayne, then sits down and looks around. Observer leaves.

Cycle 6

9:15 - Elisha is turned around bothering Angela for answers.

9:20 - Vanessa, Amy, Elisabeth not working and Michelle, Ed staring into space.

-teacher reinforces that they are to be working, asks to keep noise level down. There is a busy chatter, all that I can hear is work related.

9:25 - Amy asks for help in finding a word in a dictionary.

-the teacher walks over and helps Ed get back to work.

-Elisabeth walks over to teacher to check a definition.

9:27 - Noise level is quite high and some students appear to be off topic.

Teacher asks them to get back to work.

9:30 - There is a busy hum, all conversations I can hear are work related except Elisha and Chantel.

9:31 - Teacher redirects by reminding them about what is acceptable talk: only if you have a problem or question.

9:35 - There is a mild hum of students working. All the observer can hear is work talk except for Elisha. The teacher asks her to come to him where he asks her to talk about work only. He then asks the class who has
finished. Most of the class raise their hands. He directs them to the list on board of tasks to be accomplished before recess. Any questions? He instructs them to get to work and to use their time wisely.

9:37 - Amy asks to go to washroom. Elisabeth stands to talk to teacher. Elisha asks for direction from the teacher. He answers and she appears receptive.

9:40 - All students busy working on assignment. The teacher is circulating, checking on their progress. Elisabeth asks for help in finding a word in the dictionary.

9:44 - Amy returns from washroom. Ed walks over to Wayne’s desk. Teacher asks him to sit down; he replies, “I don’t want to do this stupid thing.” Elisabeth follows teacher to front of room, then gets a note out of her bag.

9:45 - Teacher is helping Ed at his desk. Elisha, Chantel, Amy and Elisabeth are chatting, or spinning their paper. Nick joins them. Teacher reminds them to get to work.

9:50 - Students working quietly except Chantel, Elizabeth and Amy. Observer leaves the classroom.

Cycle 7
Students finishing Bellwork as observer enters the class. Teacher asks the students to put that work away and explains to them the procedure of how he plans to divide the class for the novel study (dividing the 5s and 6s) and what will be expected each day. He asks them to get their novels out; a general hum erupts as students take out their books. After 2 minutes students are busy copying their comprehension questions from the board. 9:05 - The teacher asks the grade 5s to listen for a moment while he goes over the vocabulary activity with them. The grade 6s are to continue copying questions. Amy is talking to Chantel or looking at teacher as she sporadically copies the questions.

OC: Amy is the only grade 6 seated beside another student. 9:10 - The teacher finishes with 5s and proceeds to ask the 6s individually whether they have read the chapter or not, which he records. He then asks them for a summary of what happened in Chapter 1. One grade 5 is listening to 6s instead of copying questions for 1 minute then returns to work. Two grade 5 girls near the front start looking at what the 6s are doing and/or listening to the teacher. They start whispering to one another. After about 3 minutes they return to work. All other 5s are copying and writing answers to the questions.
9:15 - The teacher is checking comprehension with the 6s by reading certain paragraphs and through his questions purposefully points out that the story is written from the main character’s perspective. All the 5s are working (copying from board and writing on paper).

9:20 - Jenna and friend (grade 5 girls) start chatting and looking around. This lasts about 1 minute.

9:25 - Teacher explains to the 6s what they are to have completed by the next day, assigning chapters to be read and questions to be answered. He then asks the 5s to stop what they are doing and records whether they have read the first chapter. Amy and Chantel (6s) are talking as are Angela P and Lara. The other 6s are either reading or copying from the board.

9:30 - Elisabeth is talking to herself that she can’t see the board or makes comments to herself on what the teacher is talking about with the 5s. This is only sporadic though and the rest of the time she is copying from the board. The other 6s are copying or reading quietly.

**Cycle 8**

9:00 - As the observer enters the classroom the teacher is calling out their names to check if they have their work to hand in while they copy the comprehension questions from the board. There is a busy buzz as students are getting their work out and/or chatting with the person next to them.
9:05 - The class is working quietly as they copy the questions. Elisabeth is upset because she does not have her work completed. She grumbles and complains to herself. The teacher asks her to be quiet. He asks two students to return the apostrophe activity sheet.

9:10 - Elisabeth continues to complain as she didn’t get her sheet back. The teacher proceeds to correct the sheet with the class by asking them for the answers. All students are quiet and busy correcting their work.

Elisabeth is copying comprehension questions. The teacher had told her to look on her neighbour’s sheet for the corrections. Amy and Elisha are working quietly correcting their work and answering questions. Elisabeth starts to pull her desk apart looking for the apostrophe sheet mumbling that he (the teacher) doesn’t care that she can’t find it.

9:15 - The entire contents of Elisabeth’s desk are on the floor. She decides to continue copying the questions from the board. The teacher tells them to put the sheet in their language arts folder, asks the grade 5s to start their questions while he works with the 6s. He then proceeds to ask the 6s if they had read the two assigned chapters. One third have not. However all the 5s had done their reading. He asks them why and they agreed that they had been busy finishing their work to be handed in as they had talked too much yesterday in class.
9:20 - The teacher leads the grade 6s in a discussion about what happened in the two chapters that they were to have read for today. The grade 5s are all working quietly. The teacher distributes the decision-making grid (a sheet to list the pros and cons of the decision that the main character made in these two chapters). The teacher then explains what pros and cons mean and asks for an example of each, which he writes on the board.

9:25 - All the grade 6 students are either copying these examples from the board or giving other examples. All the grade 5s are continuing to work quietly. The teacher assigns the 6s to find one more pro and con for the decision, then explains how they are to take one or more reasons from the pro or con list.

(OC: I have observed no interaction between Amy and Elisha.) He explains that there are very few decisions in life that do not have a con side to them.

"Any questions? I want it very quiet." There is no student talking.

9:30 - The teacher begins to check the grade 5 work as the observer leaves.

Cycle 9

As I enter the classroom, the teacher is at the front of the class with five students assisting in the demonstration. All students’ attention is riveted on the demonstration. As he asks questions four - five students
raise their hands to answer. The list of what’s going to happen for the morning is on the board.

During the 10 minutes of the demonstration, there is not a sound as the teacher explains what’s happening. After the demonstration all students return to their desks. All students continue to focus on the teacher as he asks for questions. About 5-7 students have their hands raised at a time to ask questions. One of the students I have been asked to watch is listening attentively and the other is raising her hand, asking questions. The questions continue for over 5 minutes.

Next the teacher asks the students to complete the questions with a partner. Students immediately move to their partner and start work. After 5 minutes all students are still working and all talk that can be heard is work related. There is a quiet hum of students engaged and working together. As students start to finish he asks them to work on finishing another assignment. After 10 minutes, he asks who has not yet finished; a few raise their hands.

Five or six students who have finished start to congregate and he asks them to sit down. After the redirection all students are either finishing the assignment or completing the other activity. I leave the classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performs</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Assessing</th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>Information Acquiring</th>
<th>Knowledge Levels of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Renewal**

**Integration**

**Preparation**

**Orientation**

**Non-Use**

---

Monday, November 11, 1996, Teacher B

Appendix B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Use</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Acquiring</th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>Assessing</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Performing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 - Goals, 2 - Strategies, 3 - Success, Reflection.
In the space provided, rank each of the following statements from 1 (most important to 5 (least important) according to your personal priorities and belief systems.

My priority ranking of the main proposes of education is as follows:

1. To develop students' ability to think clearly, to use intellectual reasoning to solve problems and to make rational decisions.

2. To nurture the individual student's unique potential to allow full development of his/her creativity and sensitivity; talents and abilities; and, to encourage personal integrity, love of learning, and self fulfilment.

3. To diagnose the learner's needs and abilities; to design instructional strategies which develop skills and competencies, and to produce trained people who are able to function efficiently in our changing, complex, technological society.

4. To transmit to young people the basic knowledge, skills, traditions, academic concepts, and values necessary to interpret, participate in, and further the heritage and traditions of our country.

5. To create a future world condition of peace, harmony, equality and love: and, to foster a new society with humans who can live together in balance with their environment and with each other.
### Appendix B

**OTHER TEACHERS, Teacher B**

November 11, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>mornings</th>
<th>afternoons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>X Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untimely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineffect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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timely      timely
strong     weak
good      poor
optimistic   pessimist
warm    cold
sharp      dull
effective    ineffectiv
clear    confusing
valuable   worthless
essential   unimporta
active    passive
kind      cruel
liked    hated
sharp      dull
bright    dark
Appendix C

Classroom Observations, Teacher C

Cycle 1

Grade 7 - Class of 34, core French (11 identified students).

2:35 - The teacher starts with a prayer, after which she starts the game with
the beginning of the sentences on the board (describing a student in the
class).

- Some students shout out the answer. She asks them three questions then
asks for a volunteer to ask the questions.

- Many students with hands up. Some students talking as student is asking
the question. A different student is chosen after each question. About 7 or
8 students with hands up to answer. Students ask and answer the
questions using French.

2:42 - The teacher asks them to take out textbooks. A mild groan. The
teacher explains her expectations. She begins to read the dialogue. Except
for two or three students who are whispering, the class is listening.

2:45 - The teacher explains first in French then again in English that she
expects them to practise the dialogue in groups of 5 and that they will be
evaluated. She then announces that they may work in a group of their
choice. Students move quickly into groups.
2:50 - One group of boys at back are not practising, one is writing a note (to another student); when I returned they were again chatting.

-Nathan swore.

-Robin at washroom.

-Dave got a drink.

There are 7 groups.

2:55 - 2 groups in the hall are practicing. Brad’s group is not practising as I approach. Nathan’s group is not practising. When I return to Brad’s group they are singing a song. Shannon leaves to talk to two grade 8 students. Paul Vetrone’s group is practising.

Natalia’s group is practising. The teacher is distributing Timbits. Groups in the hall are still practising.

3:00 - Nathan’s group is practising.

Sean’s group is practising.

Paul’s group is not

Beth’s group is not practising.

Brad’s group is not practising.

Two groups in the hall are still practising.

3:05 - Lyndsay in Brad’s group is practicing, nobody else is. Teacher asks all students to return to desks. Closes door, shuts off lights and asks them
to be quiet. Shannon burps loudly and laughs. She raises her voice to ask them to be quiet. All students are listening. As the teacher asks for the books to be collected, general talking erupts. She asks them to sit quietly; no difference in the noise level is noticed. When students realize that when their row is sitting quietly they will be dismissed, they sit quietly until they start to stand up and move noisily to the door. The observer leaves.

**Cycle 2**

1:35: As the observer enters the classroom the students are chorally repeating the vocabulary after the teacher. After going through the list words once she asks the students to practise the words. The students spend the next minute choosing a partner and clarifying what they are to do. The teacher walks around the classroom to clear up any questions. Four groups (out of 8) can be heard saying the words, the other 4 appear frustrated.

After 5 minutes the teacher asks them to return to their desk and to copy down the vocabulary words from the board. Students quickly get their booklets and are chatting about their work as they copy the words. There is a busy hum in the classroom as they continue to copy. Brad, Aaron and Bartek are busy working. Brad and Aaron (sitting beside one
another) also practised saying the words before. Bartek however had made no effort to practise saying the words.

Brad turns around to talk to Bartek about his pencil sharpener. Bartek goes to sharpen his. Students chat about their work: "Do you draw a picture beside it?" "What's a meteorite?" What's a comet?" Two boys at the back of the class have stopped working and are chatting about their friends. As the teacher approaches (she has been circulating in the classroom constantly) they return to work. Ten minutes after the activity has begun, all students are busy copying the words or drawing a picture.

The few that have finished have started to finish the title page on their booklet. The teacher approaches Aaron and Brad, and notices that Aaron has copied only one word. She moves him to a desk by himself.

Fifteen minutes into the activity, the two boys at the back have seven words copied and no pictures. Bartek and Brad continue to work copying the words. A girl walks over to the teacher to show her words. The teacher asks her to draw a picture beside them. The teacher is sitting, helping a student who is having trouble copying the words.

After another 5 minutes the teacher shuts off the lights to get their attention, asks the girls to hand in their booklets, then the boys. The students then line up at the door to return to their classroom. She asks
them to be quiet but there is still talking. She calls “James!” three times before she gets his attention to hand in his booklet. Despite asking them to be quiet in the hall, she leads them off as they were still talking.

Cycle 3

12:55 - Observer enters the classroom as students are being seated. After a brief prayer, all students are quiet and the teacher asks them to continue the activity that they started yesterday.

Students start to work noisily. Two minutes later the teacher reminds them to get to work. Todd, Steven and Colin are not working. They are also talking loudly and trying to disturb others. Maria asks me where to find the words. Elizabeth doesn’t know what she is to do.

1:05 - Todd, Steven, Mallory, Colin are still not working, June is writing a note.

The teacher moves Todd so he is isolated and he starts to work.

She continues to circulate, helping individual students.

1:10 - All students are working except for Steven and Colin who are looking around, trying to find someone to talk to. Failing in their attempts they start to work.

1:15 - All students are working quietly. Then Matt takes Colin’s paper and places it on the other side of the room. Colin yells out, “Give me my
paper!” Colin then stands up and retrieves it. When he returns to his seat he starts talking to Steven who is seated in front of him. The teacher comes over and starts assisting Steven. Colin continues to look around for someone to talk to.

1:20 - Todd has now stopped working and moves his chair back to the group to start talking. The teacher is busy helping a group of students and does not see this. The back row of students have worked almost consistently from the beginning of the class. Colin has moved to another desk beside a student that he is talking to.

1:25 - 13 students continue their work. The rest are chatting. The teacher tells Todd to turn around and get to work. Two boys stand up and pretend that they are falling, hitting each other. Comment heard across the class, “I’m picking my nose”; response, “You’re sick!” No reaction from teacher. Some students are close to finishing the activity.

1:30 - All but 3 or 4 students are back to work as the observer leaves.

**Cycle 4**

As the observer enters the classroom the students are practising the dialogue. The teacher has listed the key vocabulary words on the board for each dialogue, as well as the marking scheme. Randy and Todd are not
practising. All other groups are very focused and practicing. Two groups even approached me to check pronunciation of certain words.

1:00: Colin’s group is arguing about who is reading what part. Todd and Randy have started to practise. The teacher is circulating, helping individual groups. She takes two small toys away from one student. The students are starting to lose focus. The teacher calls the class back to order. When they are seated Matt (in Colin’s group) complains that his group still hasn’t chosen their roles. She reminds them that they will receive 5 marks for listening quietly.

1:05: The first group presents. The class is quiet. After the brief presentation some comments are heard. The teacher reminds them that the 5 marks are also for sitting quietly between the presentations.

1:10: The class is quiet during presentations. Two students at the back are making a Valentine (for the French teacher). The rest of the students are looking at either their book or the presenters.

1:15: By the last presentation Todd and three students around him are looking around, making faces. The presentations finished, the teacher asks three students to collect the textbooks. She then instructs the class to finish their card for the teacher on maternity leave (OC: She just had her baby). When they finish their card they are to play Scrabble in French.
1:20: All students are busy either finishing the card or playing Scrabble. At the five Scrabble boards all students are quiet and involved in the game, but all words are in English. The cards are all written in French.

1:25: Three students who have finished their cards are sitting quietly, watching the other groups. The Scrabble groups continue to play quietly.

1:28: The teacher asks the class to put away the Scrabble games and tidy their desks. Students do so in a fairly orderly fashion. The teacher asks the students to line up at the door and then leads them back to class.

**Cycle 5**

As the observer enters the classroom the students are listening quietly as the teacher reviews what they are to accomplish. She underlines that part of their mark is for cooperating in the group and how they use class time. She then starts to distribute the papers that they were working on the day before. Matt and his partner started with one idea yesterday but are now changing it. All groups are working loudly but all talk that I can hear is work related. The teacher reminds them to use the time wisely. Mike and Shannon are having some trouble getting started, sharpening pencils, chatting with others but finally settle down to work. Caitlin and Melanie weren’t sure if the teacher was checking off the ones that were or were not cooperating. The teacher is circulating, taking notes.
2:50: The noise level has subsided to a busy hum as all the students appear to be focused and talking about the activity. The teacher warns them that if they don’t use the time wisely, the activity will be assigned for homework. Two students are using English/French dictionaries. Brad is looking in a book for picture ideas.

3:00: Students are focused on activity, noise level is normal conversation level. All talk that the observer can hear is work related. Students, when asked what their slogan meant in English, were able to say and when asked where they found the words, they replied, “in the dictionary.”

3:05: Matt and his partner have drawn a few sketches in rough but still have no slogan. The teacher asks them to tidy and tells them that they will have time tomorrow to finish. Mike and Shannon worked well for the entire time given.

Cycle 6

After a brief greeting in French, the teacher explains that they will have 5 minutes to practise before presenting. The students open their books and noisily start to practise. Mallory is laughing loudly. June is flipping through the pages in her book. Steven, Aaron and Cole are practising. Cole asks how to pronounce two different words. Chris, Jayden and Colin go into the hall to practise. After about 3 minutes the class is fairly settled
and the only speaking that I can hear is French reading. Matt and Steven are making silly noises and Hayley tells them to stop.

1:00: The teacher reviews the evaluation on the board: speaking loudly and clearly /5, be expressive /5, correct pronunciation /5, be a good listener /5. Steven, Hayley and Chris volunteer to be first. The class is quiet and remains so despite Steven’s attempt at intentionally mispronouncing words. The following groups do not wait until the class is quiet before starting. However once they start, the students are listening except for Todd. By the fifth presentation Steven and Matt have trouble listening, they are making comments to each other. At the beginning of the sixth presentation the majority of students are not listening. The teacher stops the presentation until the class is quiet. When Colin, Jayden and Chris are called on to present Colin asks, “Which one do you want us to do?” The teacher shows them and they start. Steven and Matt are chatting.

1:15: The teacher explains the next activity, saying that they are to decode the messages on the board. As the teacher is passing the paper Matt turns to Jayden and Jayden swears. After everyone has a paper the students start to try to decode the words. All students are engaged in the activity except Matt and Steven. The teacher walks over and stands beside them and they quiet down somewhat.
1:20: All students are working on the decoding activity, even Steven and Matt. Todd tries to disturb the students beside him and they tell him to be quiet. The teacher is circulating and helping students as needed. June is copying down what’s on the board, but has not started to decode. Steven and Matt are still talking but it is about the activity. The students that are talking are helping each other. Todd continues to try to disturb Rosie. She tells him to leave her alone.

1:25: All students are busily engaged in the activity and the only talking is work related. The students can be heard speaking French as they are reading the encoded messages trying to figure them out.

1:29: Students that have finished are handing their sheets in. The teacher asks them in French to hand in their books and line up at the door. There is no response from the students. She waits a minute, then repeats in English. They all begin to move.

**Cycle 7**

The teacher tells the class about what they will be doing, going through the example, and the evaluation in French, then repeating in English. She begins to distribute the paper for the rough copy. The students start to talk and what I can hear is discussion about what product to choose.
2:40: One student gets a dictionary to look up a word. Two students are finishing their activity from the day before. Shannon is eating a sandwich, Sean and Matt are watching her. As she finishes they start discussing a possible product. The rest of the groups are discussing product choices.

2:45: Two other students are looking up words in the dictionary. Brad and his partner still have a blank page. All other students are starting to draw or continue to discuss possibilities. Sean is using a dictionary.

2:50: Two groups still do not have a product chosen; they continue to search for one. The rest of the groups are busy drawing logos for their products.

2:55: Shannon, Matt and Sean have trouble staying focused on the task. Lawrence still has not started; he is the only one who does not have a product chosen. The classroom has a busy hum as students discuss their products’ logos. Three students have asked me for words in French, numerous students are using English/French dictionaries.

3:05: Matt, Sean, Shannon have spent the majority of time talking off topic. Lawrence has no product chosen and nothing on his sheet. The observer leaves.
Cycle 8

As I enter the room 5 minutes after the class has started, the class is busy constructing their buildings. All students are busy colouring, cutting and/or pasting. The teacher is circulating in the classroom, helping students and taking notes. All talk I can hear is work related.

I approached three groups to ask them about their work. They are all clear on the task to be completed (make a community) and that they will be responsible for knowing the words in French. There is a list of the words on the board and when asked to read them they can do so with varying degrees of success.

1:15: All students continue to be engaged. Even students that usually have difficulty attending are totally engrossed in the activity. When questioned all students are able to find the name of the building in French on the page that they are working on.

1:25: Roger has lost interest in the activity and says that he is finished. The group starts talking about bikes. However two out of the five continue to work. Another group of girls has finished and is sitting quietly.

1:26: The teacher asks them to tidy. A student that is usually a serious discipline problem is noticeably pleased and proud of the building that he
has constructed. The students tidy and put away their buildings for
tomorrow.

1:30: The class lines up at the door and the teacher leads them off. A

group of girls tell me as they’re leaving that they’re going to use their
community in geography for an earthquake after their French presentation.

**Cycle 9**

As I enter the classroom the students are already in groups working.
The desks are arranged in groups of six. All groups appear to be
discussing a choice of festival. The teacher moves from group to group
assisting as needed. There is a quiet hum of students chatting about their
work. Two boys appear uninterested and are not talking about the project.
After redirection by the teacher, they get started. The evaluation scheme is
evident on the board. There are 10 girls working in the hall and they are
basically quiet and focused on the task at hand. This serves to relieve the
pressure of too many students talking in the classroom which improves the
noise level. The atmosphere is fairly calm and relaxed. All students except
six or seven are engaged. At the end of this class all students except the
group of five boys are totally engaged in the activity. I leave the classroom
as they start to tidy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level VI</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Level V</th>
<th>Level IVB</th>
<th>Level IV A</th>
<th>Routine</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Non - Use</th>
<th>Level 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'2'2'2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1'2'2'2</td>
<td>1'2'2'2</td>
<td>1'2'2'2</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performing</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Assessing</th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>Acquiring Information</th>
<th>Acquiring e Knowledge</th>
<th>Levels of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - goals, 2 - strategies, 3 - success, Reflection,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, March 20, 1997, Teacher C
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level IIA</th>
<th>Level IIB</th>
<th>Level IIC</th>
<th>Level IVD</th>
<th>Level IVB</th>
<th>Level VIA</th>
<th>Level VII</th>
<th>Level VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Level IIA</td>
<td>Level IIB</td>
<td>Level IIC</td>
<td>Level IVD</td>
<td>Level IVB</td>
<td>Level VIA</td>
<td>Level VII</td>
<td>Level VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Level IIA</td>
<td>Level IIB</td>
<td>Level IIC</td>
<td>Level IVD</td>
<td>Level IVB</td>
<td>Level VIA</td>
<td>Level VII</td>
<td>Level VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Level IIA</td>
<td>Level IIB</td>
<td>Level IIC</td>
<td>Level IVD</td>
<td>Level IVB</td>
<td>Level VIA</td>
<td>Level VII</td>
<td>Level VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>Level IIA</td>
<td>Level IIB</td>
<td>Level IIC</td>
<td>Level IVD</td>
<td>Level IVB</td>
<td>Level VIA</td>
<td>Level VII</td>
<td>Level VIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Levels of Use**
- Performing
- Reporting
- Status
- Planning
- Assessing
- Sharing
- Acquiring
- Knowledge

**Levels**
- I
- Goals
- Strategies
- Success
- Reflection

*Wednesday, May 21, 1997, Teacher C*

*Appendix C*
Appendix C

GOALS OF EDUCATION

In the space provided, rank each of the following statements from 1 (most important) to 5 (least important) according to your personal priorities and belief systems.

My priority ranking of the main proposes of education is as follows:

1. To develop students' ability to think clearly, to use intellectual reasoning to solve problems and to make rational decisions.

2. To nurture the individual student's unique potential to allow full development of his/her creativity and sensitivity; talents and abilities; and, to encourage personal integrity, love of learning, and self fulfilment.

3. To diagnose the learner's needs and abilities; to design instructional strategies which develop skills and competencies, and to produce trained people who are able to function efficiently in our changing, complex, technological society.

4. To transmit to young people the basic knowledge, skills, traditions, academic concepts, and values necessary to interpret, participate in, and further the heritage and traditions of our country.

5. To create a future world condition of peace, harmony, equality and love; and, to foster a new society with humans who can live together in balance with their environment and with each other.
Appendix C
OTHER TEACHERS, Teacher C
January 22, 1997

timely ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ untimely
strong ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ weak
good ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ poor
optimistic ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ pessimist
warm ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ cold
sharp ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ dull
effective ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ineffectiv
clear ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ confusing
valuable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ worthles:
etable ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ unimport:
active ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ passive
kind ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ cruel
liked ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ hated
sharp ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ dull
bright ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ dark.
**Appendix C**

**OTHER TEACHERS, Teacher C**

March 24, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liked</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>untimely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineffecti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confusing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthles:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimport:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
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timely ✓ [...]
strong ✓ [...]
good ✓ [...]
optimistic ✓ [...]
warm ✓ [...]
sharp ✓ [...]
effective ✓ [...]
clear ✓ [...]
valuable ✓ [...]
esential ✓ [...]
active ✓ [...]
kind ✓ [...]
liked ✓ [...]
sharp ✓ [...]
bright ✓ [...]
untimely [...]
weak [...]
poor [...]
pessimistic [...]
cold [...]
dull [...]
ineffective [...]
confused [...]
worthless [...]
unimportant [...]
passive [...]
cruel [...]
hated [...]
dull [...]
dark [...]

Appendix D

WHAT IS A JOURNAL?

This Journal is a place where you can record your reflections, connections, observations, and questions. A journal is an ongoing record of your progress and consists of frequent, unpolished writings.

Journals are encouraged because they fit the principles and purposes of COGNITIVE COACHING. Journal writing engages such intellectual skills as fluency of thought, precision of language, formulation of theories, sequencing of tasks, analysis of concepts, synthesis of skills, inducing from experiences, deducing from generalizations, and creating metaphorical and personal analogies. As Flower and Hayes (1981) have asserted:

"Writing is among the most complex of all human mental activities. Essentially, it is a form of problem solving because the writer must produce an organized set of ideas for a paper by selecting, sequencing and synthesizing a manageable number of concepts and relations from a vast body of knowledge, and fit what they know to the needs of a reader and to the constraints of formal prose".1

You are encouraged to:

- record questions about puzzling passages in articles read or in presentations heard;
- make predictions about what comes next;
- respond with meaning and insight to ideas presented;
- think about your own level of performance;
- compare new ideas with previously held ideas;
- assign tasks and actions to yourself when you return from this workshop;
- jot down ideas you wish to remember and ponder in the future.

You may be asked to start a session with a journal entry, to end a session with another entry, or to begin a workshop by sharing ideas from your journal. You are encouraged to write in your journal daily (JOUR means DAY - like in Soup du Jour). As you begin working more closely with teachers, you will want to record your insights about your and their styles, to keep track of the strategies you employed to make observations of indicators that the goals of COGNITIVE COACHING - TRUST, LEARNING AND AUTONOMY - are being achieved.

All entries will be kept confidential, and you will not need to show or share your writing with anyone if you do not wish to. From time to time you will want to return to your initial entries, to compare first impressions with later insights to determine how you have grown in complexity of thought, how you have become

more precise in your language, and how COGNITIVE COACHING is being diffused throughout your encounters in life beyond this workshop and your employment setting.

Some participants have divided their journal page with a vertical line in order to record ideas on one side and questions on the other. Some participants have appreciated a blank space to freely record ideas that come to mind, make mind maps or other visual cues. Still other participants enjoy starter questions or stems to stimulate their flow of ideas.

Some sentence stems to "jump-start" your thinking might be:

What puzzles me is .....        The big ideas seem to be .......
I'd like to talk more about...... A questions I have is ........
I'm confused about............ The way to use this idea is ..........
This is similar to what I know in that.......... Another point of view is ........
When I get home I'm going to...... I've got it. It means .........
8

LEVELS OF USE

SCALE POINT DEFINITIONS OF THE LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION

Levels of Use are distinct states that represent observable different types of behavior and patterns of innovation use as exhibited by individuals and groups. These levels characterize a user's development in acquiring new skills and varying use of the innovation. Each level encompasses a range of behaviors, but is limited by a set of identifiable Decision Points. For descriptive purposes, each level is defined by seven categories.

LEVEL 0

NON-USE: State in which the user has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with the innovation, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.

DECISION POINT A

LEVEL I

ORIENTATION: State in which the user has acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and/or has explored or is exploring its value orientation and its demands upon user and user system.

DECISION POINT B

LEVEL II

PREPARATION: State in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation.

DECISION POINT C

LEVEL III

PRACTICAL USE: State in which the user is using the most effort on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than client needs. The user is primarily engaged in a stepwise attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use.

DECISION POINT D-1

LEVEL IV A

ROUTINE: Use of the innovation is stabilized. Few if any changes are being made in ongoing use. Little preparation or thought is being given to improving innovation use or its consequences.

DECISION POINT D-2

LEVEL IV B

REFINEMENT: State in which the user varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients within immediate sphere of influence. Variations are based on knowledge of both short- and long-term consequences for clients.

DECISION POINT E

LEVEL V

INTEGRATION: State in which the user is combining own efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact on clients within their common sphere of influence.

DECISION POINT F

LEVEL VI

RENEWAL: State in which the user reevaluates the quality of use of the innovation, seeks major modifications of the innovation to provide an alternative to present innovation use, and explores new goals for self and the system.

CATEGORIES

KNOWLEDGE

That which the user knows about characteristics of the innovation, how to use it, and consequences of its use. This is cognitive knowledge related to using the innovation, not feelings or attitudes.

ACQUIRING INFORMATION

Solicits information about the innovation in a variety of ways, including questioning resource persons, corresponding with resource agencies, reviewing printed materials, and making visits.

SHARING

Discusses the innovation with colleagues, ideas, resources, and problems related to the innovation.
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### CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSING</th>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>STATUS REPORTING</th>
<th>PERFORMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examines the potential or actual use of the innovation or some aspect of it. This can be a mutual assessment or can involve actual collection and analysis of data.</td>
<td>Designs and outlines short- and/or long-range steps to be taken during process of innovation adoption, i.e., aligns resources, schedules activities, meets with others to organize and/or coordinate use of the innovation,</td>
<td>Describes personal stand at the present time in relation to use of the innovation,</td>
<td>Carries out the actions and is involved in operationalizing the innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Takes no action to analyze the innovation, its characteristics, possible use, or consequences of use. | Schedules no time and specifies no steps for the study or use of the innovation. | Reports little or no personal involvement with the innovation. | Takes no discernible action learning about or using the innovation. The innovation and/or its accoun are not present or in use. |

Analyzes and compares materials, content, requirements for use, evaluation reports, potential outcomes, strengths and weaknesses for purpose of making a decision about use of the innovation. | Plans to gather necessary information and resources as needed to make a decision for or against use of the innovation. | Reports presently orienting self to what the innovation is and is not. | Explores the innovation and methods for its use by talking to about it, reviewing descriptive information and sample materials, at orientation sessions, and other sessions. |

Analyses detailed requirements and available resources for initial use of the innovation. | Identifies steps and procedures entailed in obtaining resources and organizing activities and events for initial use of the innovation. | Reports preparing self for initial use of the innovation. | Studies reference materials in schedules and receives skill trial preparation for initial use. |

Examines own use of the innovation with respect to problems of logistics, management, time, schedules, resources, and general reactions of clients. | Plans for organizing and managing resources, activities, and events related primarily to immediate ongoing use of the innovation. Planned-for changes address managerial or logistical issues with a short-term perspective. | Reports that logistics, time, management, resource organization, etc. are the focus of most personal efforts to use the innovation. | Manages innovation with varying degrees of efficiency. Often lacks attention to immediate consequence; flow of actions on the user and is often disjointed, uneven and tenuous. When changes are made, they primarily in response to logistics or organizational problems. |

Limits evaluation activities to those administratively required, with little attention paid to findings for the purpose of changing use. | Plans intermediate and long-range actions with little projected variation in how the innovation will be used. Planning focuses on routine use of resources, personnel, etc. | Reports that personal use of the innovation is going along satisfactorily with few if any problems. | Uses the innovation smoothly with minimal management problems; over time is little variation in pattern of use. |

Assesses use of the innovation for the purpose of changing current practices to improve client outcomes. | Develops intermediate and long-range plans that anticipate possible and needed steps, resources, and events designed to enhance client outcomes. | Reports varying use of the innovation in order to change client outcomes. | Explores and experiments with alternative combinations of the innovation existing practices to maximize involvement and to optimize client outcomes. |

Applies collaborative use of the innovation in terms of client outcomes and strengths and weaknesses of the integrated effort. | Plans specific actions to coordinate own use of the innovation with others to achieve increased impact on clients. | Reports spending time and energy collaborating with others about integrating own use of the innovation. | Collaborates with others in use of innovation as a means for expediting the innovation's impact on all clients. Changes in use are made in concert with others. |

Analyzes advantages and disadvantages of major modifications or alternatives to the present innovation. | Plans activities that involve pursuit of alternatives to enhance or replace the innovation. | Reports considering major modifications of or alternatives to present use of the innovation. | Explores other innovations that could be used in combination with or in place of the present innovation in an effort to develop more effective means achieving client outcomes. |

| LOU: A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING INNOVATION ADOPTION |
### Appendix D

**OTHER TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>untimely</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>pessimist</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>effective</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>ineffecti</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>worthies</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essential</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liked</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>sharp</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
<td>dull</td>
<td>●●●●●●●●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>