7-1-2015

THE DIFFERENCE A COACH CAN MAKE: Supporting New Teachers in the Classroom

Mary Beth Kueny-Runge
University of Nebraska at Omaha

THE DIFFERENCE A COACH CAN MAKE:

Supporting New Teachers in the Classroom

by

Mary Beth Kueny-Runge

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College of the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Dr. Kay A. Keiser

Omaha, Nebraska

July, 2015

Supervisory Committee:

Dr. Peter J. Smith

Dr. Jeanne L. Surface

Dr. Karen L. Hayes

Dr. C. Elliott Ostler

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Abstract

The Difference a Coach can Make: Supporting New Teachers in the Classroom

Mary Beth Kueny-Runge, M.Ed., Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 2015

Advisor: Dr. Kay A. Keiser

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the body of literature around supporting new teachers, instructional coaching, and teacher self-efficacy.

The study consists of a survey to determine the overall self-efficacy of both new and veteran teachers as well as teachers who have worked with an instructional coach twenty (20) hours or more and those that have not. Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs were measured using a survey. The survey itself is based on a larger self-efficacy scale for teachers created by Bandura (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy was also measured in three subcategories: instruction, discipline, and the ability to create a positive climate/culture. The study is of significant interest to schools or districts planning to implement or currently implementing an instructional coaching model and any district interested in retaining new teachers. The aim of this research is to determine why new teachers are leaving the profession at such alarming rates and what we can do to help them succeed and remain in the teaching profession. By measuring a new teacher's self-efficacy some predictive value regarding his/her success and retention may be gained. New teachers need assistance, support, and encouragement. Approximately 50% of new teachers leave the teaching profession within the first five years. Instructional coaches can assist new teachers develop a strong sense of self-efficacy. With increased self-efficacy, maybe the

retention rate will go up. Student achievement is also impacted negatively by high teacher turnover. Additionally, research on the use and helpfulness of instructional coaches is sorely needed. While the use of instructional coaching has gained acceptance, the way in which instructional coaches are used varies widely. This study will help target the use of instructional coaches to where they can make the greatest impact.

Acknowledgements

Many people have supported and encouraged me as I worked through the course work and dissertation process. Thank you Dr. Kay Keiser, my advisor and committee chairperson, who encouraged and supported me every step of the way. She is a respected mentor and guidepost. Her sound advice from beginning to end was invaluable. Dr. Peter Smith made it possible for me to understand and interpret statistics in a meaningful way. Additionally, thank you to Dr. Martha Bruckner, who allowed me to run with this survey knowing how helpful it would be to have the data when I was ready for Chapter 4. A very special thank you to all the new and veteran teachers who allowed instructional coaches into their classrooms, and took the time to help with my research.

To my parents, thank you for all of the love, support, encouragement, and dedication. You both saw this for me before I could see it for myself. Your absence impacts me profoundly every day. To my older sister, Barbara Kueny, for helping me to see that anything is possible with God. I miss you. You would have loved this! To my siblings, relatives, and friends who tolerated every update and vague response to, "When are you done?" A special thank you to Talik & Trenel, my sons. You provided the motivation for me to finish this project. To my husband, my "perfect Patrick," who has been there for me every step of the way and who has the patience of a saint. Thank you for all of your love, support, help, encouragement, and dedication. Words cannot express how much I love you all.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Tables

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The indoctrination of new teachers into a school's culture is a fascinating area of research and a critical component to successful systems. A strong mentoring program, an instructional coach to work with new teachers, and a building principal interested in supporting new teachers are all great ways to help mold and retain new teachers.

Previous research on new teacher socialization has focused on both formal and informal agents. Several studies have focused on formal agents of socialization, such as, supervising teachers from the college of education, the cooperating teacher during student teaching, and a mentor assigned to work with the new teacher (Ashford & Black, 1996; Weiss, 1999; Brown & Wynn, 2007). Other studies have focused on informal socialization agents: family and friends of the prospective teacher; pre-service classmates; previous teachers; teachers hired at the same time as the new teacher (new hire cohort); and even who teaches in the room next door to the new teacher (Hertzog, 2002). Educational leaders are looking for the reasons why new teachers do not stay in the teaching profession, and what can be done to keep them.

Coaches, mentors, and building principals all play a pivotal role when working with new teachers. They can all provide the new teacher with feedback. Feedback is critical (Knight, 2008; Sweeney, 2011). New teachers not only need specific feedback on what they are doing, but crave it. They need to know how they are doing. This feedback can be formal, from their building principal, but it must also be informal. It is this informal feedback that allows the new teacher to learn, risk, and reflect. Coaches, because they are not formal evaluators, are the optimal person to help with these informal

observations and provide feedback (Knight, 2008; Sweeney, 2011). These opportunities help create professional dialogue as well. The coach or mentor can use this opportunity to model self-reflection techniques to the beginning teacher. The coach or mentor would hopefully also be open to allowing the new teacher to observe them or other model teachers as they teach. Of course, they would be able to witness effective teaching strategies through this process.

Coaches, administrators, and mentors are attempting to maximize new teachers' chances for success and minimize their chances of failure (Feldman, 1984). An instructional coach can suggest various instructional strategies, opening up a whole world the new teacher may have lost sight of in the excitement of beginning a new job. These types of supportive working conditions are more likely to enhance beginning teachers' morale and retention (Weiss, 1999). While supporting and understanding the new teacher, the coach, mentor, and building principal must also challenge the new teacher to strive for excellence in his/her teaching and increase their self-efficacy. They can support the new teacher as they assess student performance as well as analyze and reflect on their own teaching and self-efficacy.

Theoretical or Conceptual Framework

Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy is, "…based on the assumption that psychological processes serve as a means of creating and strengthening expectations of personal efficacy. An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required necessary to produce the outcomes" (p.192). In the Rand Corporation's research on school effectiveness, Berman and McLaughlin (1975) found that teacher self-efficacy was the single most consistent variable related to school success (Costa & Garmston, 1994). Self-efficacy is grounded in the theoretical framework of

social cognitive theory, which emphasizes the evolution and exercise of human agency – it is the idea that people can exercise some influence over what they do (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 2006). Effective teachers are those that experiment with new ideas in an ongoing quest for improvement (Costa & Garmston, 1994). When a teacher has a peer or coach to collaborate with, work with, confide in, plan with, and "pick the brain" of, they are much more likely to feel and be productive and effective, to experiment and take risks, and to therefore be happy and satisfied with their jobs. Happy teachers are teachers who continue to teach.

When new teachers have not had the chance to practice newly formed skills, they have a lot of self-doubt and worry that they may not be capable of meeting all the expectations of the teaching profession. As Bandura (1977) explains, risk avoidance and even a person's mental approach and the role they play in initial and developing self-efficacy,

> …individuals can believe that a particular course of action will produce certain outcomes, but if they entertain serious doubts about whether they can perform the necessary activities such information does not influence their behavior. Therefore, expectations of personal mastery affect both initiation and persistence of coping behavior. The strength of people's convictions in their own effectiveness is likely to affect whether they will even try to cope with given situations. At this initial level, perceived self-efficacy influences choice of behavioral settings. People fear and tend to avoid threatening situations they

> believe exceed their coping skills, whereas they get involved in activities and behave assuredly when they judge themselves capable of handling situations that would otherwise be intimidating (p.193-4).

New teachers will divulge their fears and worries that maybe they cannot do this job. They feel overwhelmed and worry they may have jumped into the deep end of the pool. As Bandura (1977) again asserts, "Not only can perceived self-efficacy have directive influence on choice of activities and settings, but, through expectations of eventual success, it can affect coping efforts once they are initiated" (Bandura, 1977, p.194). Efficacy expectations determine how much effort people will expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences. Preparation and confidence are key. If new teachers do not feel prepared, or even feel they are not equipped for teaching, how long will they persist?

One way new teachers could persist longer is to work with an instructional coach. These coaches are assigned to help teachers (especially new teachers) develop unit and lesson plans, engage in best practice, collect and reflect on data, institute strong procedures and routines and help them develop positive relationships with students (Schein, 2011). Additionally, a coach may be asked to help teachers refine their questioning skills, differentiate their instruction, increase their repertoire of instructional strategies, test new technological sites or apps, and review student performance data (Sweeney, 2011). When these things are happening in a classroom, a teacher can be incredibly effective and have a heightened sense of self-efficacy. Coaches can help new teachers make these things happen in a classroom.

Another source of support for new teachers is the building principal. The leadership style of the building principal plays a large part in the culture and climate of a school. If principals have a proactive versus reactive approach to supporting new teachers, and have a keen awareness of issues affecting new teachers, they are more likely to retain new teachers (Brown & Wynn, 2007). When a new teacher has an instructional coach and/or supportive administrator or principal, they are supported more than if they did not have either. Through these two formal and informal socialization agents, prospective teachers begin to learn what the expectations are for their role. These agents will shape the new teacher. The foundation is then laid for the norms that are likely to be enforced regarding their behavior in this role (Feldman, 1984).

Problem Statement

Teachers are regularly overwhelmed. Job satisfaction can suffer. A truly happy and satisfied teacher is a productive, effective teacher who collaborates regularly with others (DuFour & Eaker, 2008). For new teachers, the expectations, planning, and putting into practice what has only been theory up to this point, can be especially challenging. In addition, new teachers often feel the isolation of the classroom. No other profession faces this unique isolation (Muhammad, 2009). For most of their professional lives, teachers will be the only adult in their immediate area of practice. This can be hard for veterans, and it can be fatal for new teachers. One new teacher stated that, "...beyond problem solving, and professional development, new teachers' experiences can be enhanced simply by being connected to a friend" (Christensen, Horn, & Johnson, 2008, p.1). In order to be effective, confident and own a sense of self-efficacy, teachers need more than just content and pedagogical knowledge.

According to The Teaching Commission (2004), two million new teachers (more than 700,000 in urban areas alone) must be hired over the next decade to accommodate the aging teaching population. The goals of recruiting and retaining effective teachers are difficult to attain. The teaching profession is not an easy career. Nearly one-third of new teachers leave the field within the first three years, and one half depart after five years (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Hanushek, 2007; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Unless this trend is reversed, the need for new teachers will continue indefinitely.

The indoctrination of new teachers into a school's culture is a pivotal time in laying the foundation for their career in education. As Robbins (2003) states, "…the most critical socialization stage is at the time of entry into the organization. This is when the organization seeks to mold the outsider…" (p.236). The process of a new teacher's socialization, both by the building principal and an instructional coach (both formal and informal), plays a large role in new teacher retention from day one.

Purpose of the Study

Effective mentoring programs take advantage of this excitement and anticipation during the early phase of teaching for the novice teacher. This aspect of teaching is something new teachers look forward to and a good mentor will get out of the way of an excited novice teacher and simply assist with the more mundane aspects like where to get things printed or how to set up their grade book or take attendance. Some districts employ official mentors. The Council Bluffs, Iowa district, along with a handful of other districts, supplies an instructional coach who serves as a mentor as well as an instructional leader and resource. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine the

impact of instructional coaches on teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy, and specifically on new teachers' self-efficacy perceptions.

Research Questions

This cross-sectional survey research study seeks to understand the impact on teacher self-efficacy if a teacher utilizes an instructional coach. Specifically, the impact on new teachers' self-efficacy is most important.

1) What is the self-efficacy of new teachers?
2) What is the difference between the self-efficacy of new teachers and the self-efficacy of veteran teachers?
3) What is the difference between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and new teachers who work with an instructional coach 19 hours or less?
4) What is the difference in the area of Instruction between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and those who do not?
5) What is the difference in the area of Discipline between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and those who do not?
6) What is the difference in the area of Creating a Positive School Climate between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and those who do not?

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, the following terms were used:

Coach. For the purposes of this study, an experienced teacher or administrator who is working with new teachers as a resource. Three different types of coaches are discussed in this study.

Cognitive coaching. A process through which teachers explore the thinking behind their practices (Alseike, 1997).

Instructional coach. An experienced teacher working with all teachers on instructional strategies, best practice, data analysis, and student achievement; some formal training and release time is provided.

Job satisfaction. A positive reaction or feeling about how a person is functioning in their position.

Mentor. A person working with, and guiding, a new teacher (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Elliot, Isaacs, & Chugani, 2010). Some formal training and release time is provided.

New teachers. Teachers employed for the first time as a teacher. Any full time teacher in the first five years of teaching is considered a new teacher.

Peer coach. A fellow teacher working together with other teachers on instructional strategies, best practice, data analysis, and student achievement; no formal training or release time is provided.

Self-efficacy. A person's beliefs about their capabilities to produce effects (Bandura, 1977).

Supervisory/Administrative coach. An administrator working with teachers on instructional strategies, best practice and student achievement.

Teacher retention. The decision to remain in the teaching profession and/or educational setting (Brown & Wynn, 2007; Weiss, 1999).

Assumptions

It is being assumed that when new teachers have access to and utilize instructional coaches to enhance their teaching abilities, they increase their self-efficacy and gain more job satisfaction. Increased self-efficacy leads to increased job satisfaction and teacher retention. It is also assumed that new teachers need support. Both formal and informal socialization agents are important to study to gain an understanding of the needs of the new teacher.

Study participants completed the survey voluntarily. No incentive was given for participation. Surveys were completed anonymously, so it can be assumed study participants supplied candid, honest responses.

Limitations

This survey was given to approximately 300 teachers in grades 6-12 in one urban district that had an instructional coach as a resource. Many of the 300 teachers had never worked with a coach. The return rate was low, 23.6%. Seventy (70) surveys were completed and returned. Eighteen of the participants are teachers new to the profession with five years or less of teaching experience. Twenty-three of the participants are teachers either new to the profession or new to the district in the last five or fewer years. Limited research has been conducted regarding the role of instructional coaches and administrators working with new teachers. Respondents may not be representative of the overall population of teachers. The low response rate in this study may limit valid inferences from the sample to the population (Cresswell, 2012). When this district

surveys teachers, the response rate is similar to the response rate in this study. Additionally, a low response rate in and of itself is not an indication of meaningless information (Cresswell, 2012). Even though the overall low response rate is a limitation in this study, the questions posed were clustered around themes. Research has shown that when clusters of items are analyzed, versus individual items themselves, reliability increases (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006).

Delimitations

This study was limited to 70 completed responses from teachers in one urban district that employ instructional coaches. This study focuses on teachers of students in grades 6-12 in four public schools (two middle schools and two high schools). The results will not be generalizable.

Significance of Study

This study contributes to research, practice, and policy. The study is of significant interest to schools or districts planning to implement or currently implementing an instructional coaching model and any district interested in retaining new teachers. The aim of this research is to determine why new teachers are leaving the profession at such alarming rates and what we can do to help them succeed and remain in the teaching profession. By measuring a new teacher's self-efficacy we can gain some predictive value regarding his/her success and retention. We need to be able to assist, support, and encourage new teachers. This is the only way we will stem the tide of losing approximately 50% of new teachers within the first five years. If we can help new teachers develop a strong sense of self-efficacy, we can keep them longer. More importantly, we can help them be as effective as possible in helping to raise student

achievement. Moreover, we can transfer precious resources away from the hiring process and into the classroom. Additionally, research on the use and helpfulness of instructional coaches is sorely needed. While the use of instructional coaching has gained acceptance, the way in which instructional coaches are used varies widely. This study will help target the use of instructional coaches to where they can make the greatest impact.

Outline of the Study

The literature review relevant to this research study is presented in Chapter 2. This chapter reviews the professional literature related to instructional coaching, teacher self-efficacy, and new teacher socialization. Chapter 3 describes the research design, methodology, independent variables, dependent variables, and procedures that are used to gather and analyze the data of the study. Chapter 4 displays the study results and a detailed analysis of the data. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of findings, and conclusions related to the research questions and related literature. The final chapter includes implications of the findings for practice and research.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

This study builds upon and adds to the existing knowledge base in three primary areas of research – instructional coaching, teacher efficacy, and new teacher socialization. This literature review describes literature on the topics that are pertinent to this research topic. It is organized around three bodies of literature: (1) that relating to instructional coaching (2) that relating to teacher self efficacy, and (3) that relating to organizational socialization (especially of new teachers).

Instructional Coaching

People have been seeking support, guidance, and coaching throughout time. Coaching pervades society, most notably in sports, but also in fields such as business and psychology (Knight, 2008). K-12 education has seen coaching become increasingly popular as a way to help teachers increase their knowledge and skill. While educational coaches fill a variety of roles and perform various functions, the primary purpose of an educational coach should be to help teachers increase their effectiveness. To do this, coaches must help teachers identify areas for potential growth, practice new strategies, and adjust their performance in response to feedback. Instructional coaches work to help teachers implement and practice strategies in response to their students' needs, and thereby becoming more effective overall (Sweeney, 2014). Instructional coaching involves sharing knowledge and expertise, while working alongside a classroom teacher to transfer what they learn in professional development sessions and other experiences into classroom practice. Teachers' needs often stem not from a lack of knowledge, but from a failure to operationalize their knowledge (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Knight, 2008).

Operationalizing their knowledge is key to professional development and growth. To assist with this growth, instructional coaches became more commonplace in the late 1990's. To meet goals set by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, schools realized they needed help in building the skills of teachers so that all students could learn at high levels. Mass professional development workshops or sessions were not changing or improving the practice of educators (Joyce & Showers, 2002). All learning is about relationships. As Comer (2001) states, "No significant learning occurs without a significant relationship" (p.30). Strong educators know this and form lasting relationships with their students. What holds true for students also holds true for everyone else, including teachers. One-on-one learning, with whom someone has a relationship with, is the best way to help not only students but teachers learn. This relationship also allows teachers to better understand and change their practice so that all students can and do learn at high levels (Joyce & Showers, 2002).

Thus, instructional coaching started becoming popular. Instructional coaches are on-site professional developers who teach educators how to use evidence-based teaching practices and to support them in learning and applying these practices in a variety of educational settings (Knight, 2008). An instructional coach helps teachers understand what best practice looks like, analyze their own practice, reflect on their current practice, and supplies tips, strategies, and support as needed – all through a safe and supportive relationship. Coaching is a process of engaging, enhancing, and mediating the intellectual functions of teaching (Sweeney, 2011). Instructional coaching delivers professional development individually. This individual focus allows for professional development that is tailored to each teacher's unique style and growth.

In the Council Bluffs Community School District, instructional coaches were assigned to specific buildings (usually just one). They were available to coach any teacher in the building, even though they may have a content specialty. During the 2013-14 school year, there were ten coaches working with teachers in the Council Bluffs Community School District: two in each core content area (English/language arts, math, science, and social studies), one 6-12 special education coach, and one 6-12 technology coach. There were two coaches at each high school, two coaches at each middle school, and the special education and technology coaches floated between all secondary buildings. Coaches were asked to document their work with teachers by using the 1-1 Coaching Cycle Data Collection Tool Form from Sweeney (2011 p.186). **See Appendix B.**

There are a variety of different ways coaching can be implemented in schools. The various approaches do have some things in common; respect for the professionalism of teachers, a partnership approach, listening more than talking, emphasis on conversations, and a focus on the importance of student learning (Knight, 2008; Sweeney, 2011; Sweeney, 2014; Costa & Garmston, 1994; Grant, Green, & Rynsaardt 2010; Krpan, 1997; Schein, 2011; Smith, 1997). However, there are also differences between the various approaches. As Jim Knight (2008) explains,

> Cognitive coaching puts thinking at the heart of the coaching relationship. Content coaching emphasizes lesson design and empowering teachers, largely through questioning, to attain a deep, rich understanding of the content they teach. Instructional coaching focuses on providing appropriate, sufficient supports to

> teachers so that they are able to implement scientifically proven teaching practices. Literacy coaching emphasizes the development of students' reading and writing abilities. Each of these approaches may be more or less appropriate in various scenarios, but clearly they are not synonymous (p.193).

An additional type of coaching from Sweeney (2011) is identified as student-centered coaching. In student-centered coaching the emphasis is on helping the teacher close the gap between where students are currently achieving or performing and where they need to be achieving and performing. The coach and teacher use student work to identify this gap. This type of coaching seems much less threatening to a teacher, as the emphasis is on the students, not on "fixing" the teacher (Sweeney, 2011).

School districts develop coaching programs because they assume that high quality professional development will improve instructional practices, which in turn will improve student achievement. Two major reports suggest that there is a clear link between teacher quality and student achievement.

Wenglinsky's (2000) analysis of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data provides evidence of the importance of professional development for teachers. Wenglinsky's (2000) study uncovered that professional development is an important factor in predicting higher student achievement. He claims, "...changing the nature of teaching and learning in the classroom may be the most direct way to improve student outcomes" (p.11).

Further evidence supporting the link between instructional effectiveness and student achievement is provided by Sanders and Rivers' (1996) landmark study of two

major Tennessee school districts. Researchers determined that teacher quality accounted for a 50% spread on student achievement. Differences reported were highly significant (Sanders & Rivers, 1996). Commenting on the implications of these findings, the authors conclude, "... the single most dominating factor affecting student academic gain is teacher effect" (Sanders & Rivers, 1996, p.6).

Bush (1984) examined whether peer coaching, the precursor to instructional coaching, increased teachers' implementation of new skills. The research team found that when teachers were given only a description of new instructional skills, only 10% used the skill in the classroom. When each of the next three components of peer coaching - modeling, practice, and feedback were added to the training, teachers' implementation of the teaching skill increased by 2% to 3% each time a new component was added to the training process. Description, modeling, practice, and feedback resulted in a 16% to 19% transfer of skill to classroom use. However when coaching was added to the staff development, approximately 95% of the teachers implemented the new skills in their classrooms.

The efficacy of coaching can be supported from a number of perspectives. Joyce and Showers (2002) provided their perspective on coaching as it relates to educators:

> We found that continuing technical assistance, whether provided by an outside expert or by peer experts, resulted in much greater classroom implementation than was achieved by teachers who shared initial training but did not have the long-term support of coaching. (p.85)

In their 2002 research, Joyce and Showers found that even when training included demonstrations, practice sessions, and feedback, it did not noticeably affect teachers' transfer of their learning to the classroom. However, they did find that "a large and dramatic increase in the transfer of training occurs when coaching is added to an initial training experience" (p.77). In other words, coaching provided the most effective means of helping teachers transfer newly acquired knowledge and skills to their regular classroom practice.

Joyce and Showers (2002) found that coaching helped teachers transfer their training to the classroom in five ways: by practicing new strategies more frequently and developing greater skill in these new teaching strategies; using their newly-learned strategies more appropriately; exhibiting greater long-term retention of knowledge about and skill with strategies in general; explaining new models of teaching to their students, ensuring that students understood the purpose of the strategy and the behaviors expected of them when utilizing these strategies; and exhibiting clearer understanding with regard to the purposes and uses of the new strategies.

Bush (1984) showed that traditional professional development usually leads to about a 10% implementation rate. In response, Knight (2008) stated that, "Our experience has shown that when teachers receive an appropriate amount of support for professional learning, more than 90% of them embrace and implement programs that improve students' experiences in the classroom" (pp.3-4). In addition to increased implementation of professional development, Grant, et al. (2010) reported that coached teachers developed, "... enhanced self-reported leadership and communication styles... reduced stress, increased resilience, and improved workplace well-being" (p.162).

Overall, teachers who were coached became more effective at teaching, and in turn, increased their self-efficacy.

Taken together, the Wenglinsky (2000), Sanders and Rivers (1996), Bush (1984) and Joyce and Showers (2002) studies suggest that improving teaching practice is an important way to improve student achievement. And when instructional coaches are there to describe, model, and provide feedback, the likelihood of implementation of best practice are a way to improve teaching practice and student achievement, one teacher at a time. Additionally, researchers (Alseike, 1997; Edwards & Newton, 1995; Hull, Edwards, Rogers, & Swords, 1998; Krpan, 1997; Smith, 1997) examining the impact of Cognitive Coaching have reported increases in teacher efficacy as a result of coaching, being coached, and reciprocal coaching.

The research linking coaching and changes in teacher behavior is strong. Vanderberg and Stephens (2010) reported the positive effects of coaching on teacher knowledge finding, "…the beliefs and practices of coached teachers became more consistent with best practices as defined by state and national standards" (p.143). Finally, Kinnucan-Welsch, Rosemary, and Grogan (2006) reported that coaching helped teachers gain familiarity with the concepts they were teaching, and Cantrell and Hughes (2008) found that coaching increased teachers' efficacy. In light of all this research, it is apparent that coaching has a positive impact on teachers and can improve their self-efficacy.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

Social learning theory (Bandura, 1986) explains that individuals possess a self-evaluation system that allows them to exercise some control over their thoughts, feelings,

and actions. These self-evaluations help determine how much effort individuals will exert on any activity, how long they will persevere when confronting challenges, and how resilient they will be in difficult situations. "People process, weigh, and integrate diverse sources of information concerning their capability, and they regulate their choice behavior and effort expenditure accordingly" (Bandura, 1977, p.212). According to Bandura (1986), self-efficacy beliefs may be strong predictors of related performance. In other words, the confidence people bring to specific tasks plays an important role in their success or failure to complete those tasks. Bandura also emphasized increases in self-efficacy as a function of repeated observations of successful modeling. He explains that limited time working with someone results in very limited behavioral change (Bandura, 1977).

This type of limited, brief exposure would correspond with large group weekly or monthly professional development. In contrast, "... repeated observation of successful performances increased by a substantial amount the level and strength of self-efficacy which, in turn, was accompanied by similarly large increments in performance" (Bandura, 1977, p.208). This repeated observation would be something a teacher working with an instructional coach would be doing regularly. To see a master teacher, an instructional coach, teach and then to have that instructional coach observe lessons and provide immediate success and intervention feedback could obviously impact teacher self-efficacy. McDonnough and Matkins (2010) suggest that increased efficacy beliefs may be due to the increased opportunities to practice specific techniques, receive feedback from supervisors, and the development of a sense of accomplishment through having real world performance experiences. When an instructional coach works one-on-

one with a teacher, new or otherwise, to practice new skills or strategies, a teacher's self-efficacy is bound to increase.

Improving the self-efficacy of established or veteran teachers might be an altogether different thing. As Bandura (1977) notes, "... even success experiences do not necessarily create strong generalized expectation of personal efficacy. Expectations that have served self-protective functions for years are not quickly discarded. When experience contradicts firmly established expectations of self-efficacy, they may undergo little change if the conditions of performance are such as to lead one to discount the import of the experience" (p.200). While new teachers are usually eager for any assistance or resource, veteran teachers are typically leery of working with an instructional coach. They might view instructional coaches as a crutch or a resource for new teachers or teachers who are struggling.

Unfortunately, some veteran teachers may have a false sense of self-efficacy through lack of sufficient and appropriate feedback and support at the school and classroom level (Elliot, et al., 2010). Kruger and Dunning (1999) developed a theory that might explain why experienced and some new teachers may have a false sense of self-efficacy and do not seek help from an instructional coach. They propose that, for a given skill, incompetent people tend to overestimate their own level of skill; fail to recognize genuine skill in others; fail to recognize the extremity of their inadequacy; and recognize and acknowledge their own previous lack of skill only *if* they are exposed to training for that skill. If a veteran teacher has not had sufficient feedback, they may not feel the need to seek out an instructional coach. They may feel as though this is not a necessary resource for them to access or learn from. This aligns with Bandura's (1977) assertion

that a person would generally avoid tasks where self-efficacy is low, but undertake tasks where self-efficacy is high. When self-efficacy is significantly beyond actual ability, it leads to an overestimation of the ability to complete tasks.

If self-efficacy beliefs impact the teacher effectiveness most during the first three years of teaching, there is a natural intersection with teacher induction research. The concepts of teacher induction activities and individual teacher self-efficacy are critical at the individual school level, especially in schools that need highly qualified teachers the most. These schools typically have bigger classrooms, lower overall achievement levels, fewer resources, and more diverse students. However, new teachers are most often assigned to the lowest achieving schools, which have the greatest need for highly qualified and experienced teachers. The Catch-22 is devastating. Understanding the connection between self-efficacy beliefs, how to help teachers build these beliefs, and teacher retention might provide information to enhance retention rates or retain qualified teachers in the schools that need them the most.

The development and progression of early career teachers into truly skilled professionals requires continued support and supervision over time. This continued support and supervision cannot come from large group professional development alone. Attention to young teachers' perceived competence (self-efficacy beliefs) for teaching must be provided. An instructional coach is the perfect person to provide such continued support without formal evaluation attached, like that of an administrator.

How can new teachers improve their self-efficacy, quality of teaching, and remain in education? Elliot, et al. (2010) provides some suggestions that align well with the role of an instructional coach: "Set a good example by providing individualized attention,

have ‘quick srategies’ available, and conduct targeted observation and provide timely feedback” (p.135). Otherwise, beginning teachers may feel isolated and unsupported with a growing dissatisfaction for teaching as a career (Benson, 2008).

Organizational Socialization

So, how do new teachers (and new hires) transform into fully functioning members? They do this through organizational socialization (Feldman, 1976). It is through socialization that an individual learns the norms, values, expected behaviors necessary to assume a role and successfully function within an organization (Louis, 1980). Organizational socialization can be formal and informal. If an instructional coach is a formal resource, yet an informal evaluator, they could provide the new teacher with ways to navigate the organization in which they have found themselves. Learning the culture of a school is challenging. An instructional coach is a member of that school and district. Navigating this new culture side-by-side with a new teacher steers that new teacher away from negative experiences or agents and toward a clear focus for success and retention.

By gaining an understanding of their new work environment, through stated and unstated expectations, the new teacher can make sense of his/her work world. Organizational socialization involves just this transmission of knowledge about the organization’s culture (Robbins, 2003; Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983). Culture includes the subconscious assumptions, shared meanings, and ways of interpreting things that pervade an entire organization (Reichers & Schneider, 1990). Culture is what allows us to understand the hidden and complex aspects of organizational life. It helps establish

identity, community, and group members. Schein (1992) offers this description of culture:

> The concept of culture helps explain all phenomena (of differences) and "normalizes" them. If we understand the dynamics of culture we will be less likely to be puzzled, irritated, and anxious when we encounter the unfamiliar and seemingly irrational behavior in organizations, and we will have a deeper understanding, not only of why various groups of people or organizations can be so different but also why it is so hard to change them. (p.5)

Members of a group or organization share general assumptions. Schein (1992) further defines culture as the norms, values, behavior patterns, rituals, and traditions bound together into a coherent whole that reflects the groups learning. He defines the culture of a group as a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.

Learning the culture of an organization alongside a coach helps new teachers to embrace the group. Seeing the school or district as their own, or where they belong, as they transition from newcomer to insider is very important for retention.

Pre-service Teachers' Informal Socialization (Agents)

Pre-service teachers begin informal socialization while in elementary school. This is what Lortie (1975) called 'apprentice-by-observation.' According to this model, the students in the process of observing their teachers, learn and internalize to some

degree the values and beliefs of their teachers (Lortie, 1975). Pataniczek & Isaacson (1981) confirmed this finding noting, "The experience as a student is crucial in terms of the informal socialization into the profession." However, in Su's study (1992), data revealed that students' prior socialization experiences in K-12 schools was considered as having only moderate power of influence over their current beliefs and practices. Other studies have found that new teacher candidates tend to be influenced positively by good teachers they had earlier in grade school (Crow, 1987).

Good teachers are not the only source of socialization for pre-service teachers. Many students are influenced by family and friends when thinking about a career in teaching (Su, 1992). Findings by Karmos & Jacko (1977) also concluded that family and friends contributed greatly, supplying pre-service teachers with sources of inspiration. They were also identified in Su's research (1992) as having powerful influence on the formation and development of basic educational and professional values and beliefs. A longitudinal study conducted by Flores (2001) involving in depth interviews with fourteen new teachers in Portugal, found that for most participants (10 out of 14) the influence of significant others (relatives or former teachers) was one of the most common reasons for joining the teaching profession.

College classroom peers (other prospective teachers). There is conflicting evidence regarding the role of classroom peers or other prospective teachers for the informal socialization of pre-service teachers. Most students in Su's (1992) study did not identify pre-service peers as having much influence on their socialization into education. Some exceptions were students in subcategories, peers interested in elementary education, or peers with the same content focus, might develop strong interpersonal

relationships, therefore impacting their informal socialization. However, Flores (2001) finds evidence that is contrary to Su's (1992) findings, discovering that new teachers rely heavily upon the advice and interactions with their peers during the preparation or pre-arrival phase of teaching. Additionally, there are other related studies on trainees in professional schools where peer group function has been found to be a crucial variable in the socialization of trainees (Becker cited in Su, 1992).

As Britzman (cited in Johnston, 1994, p.80) states, "Learning to teach is always the process of becoming…a time of formation and transformation, of scrutiny into what one is doing and who one becomes." As pre-service teachers complete their curriculum requirements and move into their first teaching assignment, they begin to encounter the field of teaching. They will now be faced with socialization agents that are imbedded in the organizational structure. These agents will be both formal and informal and will continue to refine and shape the new teacher's values, beliefs, and attitudes.

Pre-service Teachers' Formal Socialization (Agents)

Education college professors & supervising teacher. Pre-service teachers begin formal socialization while in college. Prior to becoming a new teacher, students must complete core education requirements at an accredited university. During this coursework, pre-service teachers are experiencing the pre-arrival stage. The pre-arrival stage is a time when all the technical learning necessary for the new member is experienced, as characterized by Robbins (2003). Typically, the pre-service teacher is completing coursework in the areas of educational foundations, educational psychology, and methodology. They would also be immersed in a thorough study of their curriculum content. Thus, the pre-service teacher begins her formal indoctrination into the set of

values, attitudes, and beliefs associated with educators by her college professors. Professors within either the college of education or a content area can also be influential socialization agents during this time period for a pre-service teacher (Su, 1992).

However, Su (1992) found that typically pre-service teachers saw the faculty's influence as very mild, except for those cases where a special bond was developed between the faculty member and the pre-service teacher. In these cases, the research showed a very strong relationship and influence on the pre-service teacher's socialization (Su, 1992). The same is true for the university's supervising teacher regarding influence on the development of the pre-service teacher. "It was clear from the interview data that the students… believed that the faculty had certain influence on the development of their educational beliefs and values, and on their growth as becoming teachers" (Su, 1992, p.244).

Interestingly, there is conflicting research in this area. Flores (2001) found many subjects in her research on new teachers referring to the gap between theory and practice. There is no doubt the potential for influence is there, but whether or not a relationship is developed would seem to be dependent on extraneous factors. Again, Comer's quote, (2001) regarding learning through relationships, comes to mind.

Cooperating teacher. Not surprising, when pre-service teachers were asked to identify the single most important source of influence, they identified their student teaching experience and specifically their cooperating teachers (Su, 1992). For some pre-service teachers, this may be their first experience teaching. For many pre-service teachers, there is no doubt this is a watershed event that begins their immersion into a school culture, now as a teacher. Hamman, et al. (2006) studied the interaction between

cooperating teacher and student teachers in relation to student teacher self-efficacy. These authors found that amount of guidance received from a cooperating teacher was related to the level of student teachers' self-efficacy. Other findings (Lortie, 1975) support the identification of student teaching as the most important phase in teacher preparation. The benefits to a new teacher when the instructional coach perpetuates that safe, learning relationship could be innumerable.

Interestingly though, Su (1990) found, the culture of teaching overall to be strongly resistant to change. Some cooperating teachers openly showed contempt for change and experimentation by their student teachers and discouraged such methodologies that might be characterized that way (Su, 1992). If pre-service teachers are initially exposed to liberal, experimental methodologies while undergoing the educational preparation at college, then socialized quite strongly in the other direction, there is obviously a disconnect between theory and practice (Su, 1992). "Once they begin student teaching, they are likely to be re-socialized into the existing culture of teaching (Su, 1992 p.247)."

Apparently, the problems for the student teacher are buried deep in the organizational structure of the public schools (Calderhead, 1988). Student teaching exposes these problems as well as the organizational structure for the first time to pre-service teachers.

New Teachers' Informal Socialization

Next door neighbors. Where a new teacher's room is located within a school building itself can have a tremendous impact on his/her informal socialization. Physical proximity appears to facilitate the choice of who a new teacher seeks out for assistance

(Hertzog, 2002). "If a new teacher is entering a school in a low-performing urban area, they will face many problems associated with power and group politics and a culture characterized by norms of uncertainty, isolation and individualism" (Hertzog, 2002 p.26). New teachers will need assistance. Naturally, the most convenient person is the person next door. The administration may even be purposefully positioning a new teacher so they will develop ties with their neighbor in an effort to manipulate his/her exposure to the organization's norms.

While a new teacher may seek assistance and guidance from a teacher nearby, isolation in the classroom is and always has been an organizational problem for schools. As Su (1992) notes, "Clearly, the existing pattern of socialization in the practice school encourages a conception of teaching as an individualistic rather than a collegial enterprise, and creates special problems for socializing teacher candidates into the profession as members of an intellectual community" (p.249).

Other new teachers. Given that new teachers will be struggling to overcome the overwhelming demands placed on them their first year teaching, it is no surprise they will not only seek out informal mentors and teachers next door, but other new teachers. There is strength in commiserating. New teachers are being exposed to the same demands, time adjustments, culture shock, and other novelties. These common experiences during the first years can bind them together.

While, technically, formal mentors are in place to assist new teachers, formal mentors are not the first choice of most of the new teachers for seeking information (Hertzog, 2002). Instead, mentors were only sought out after the new teacher had had a chance to rehearse a problem situation with another new teacher. Hertzog, (2002)

interviewed twelve novice teachers over the course of their first year teaching and found that new teachers most frequently sought out initial advice from another new teacher. These cadres of new teachers are important touchstones for each other during the socialization process.

Students in the classroom. Some previous studies of teacher socialization discovered that school students can serve as major socializing agents for teachers (Su, 1992). Obviously, it is this group teachers spend the most time with. When teachers are given evaluations by their students, they tend to become more like the 'ideal' teacher (Su, 1992). Lortie (1975) also noted that the rewards of teaching largely come from a teacher's students, not from those that have evaluative power over the teacher.

Su's study (1992) also supported this notion. Su found that, in general, influence from students is more significant than that from their teacher education faculty, from other teachers in the school, from their peers, and from their family and friends. Obviously, this is the intended audience for all the preparation a new teacher has endured. In fact this group may be the most important socialization agent for new teachers.

New Teachers' Formal Socialization (Agents)

Administration. Obviously, the administration can have a huge impact on a school's organizational culture and the associated norms. As a new teacher hired in a school district, many times they will have already met the administration through the formal interview process. The new teachers will have been exposed to statements about a school and about the expectations made by the administration. As Feldman (1984) notes, "…norms set explicitly by the supervisor frequently express the central values of the group" (p.51). So the socialization of the new teacher, in a formal sense, begins.

The administration can impact what classes new teachers will be teaching, what their room assignment is, who will be their mentor, what their daily schedule will be, and a host of additional items that will impact new teachers' experiences that first year teaching. Basically, this is how the administration sets the tone for the culture in a school and for new teachers. Data from Flores' (2001) study indicates that when there is a supportive climate and an effective leader, this has a great impact on a new teacher's professional learning at work and how they perceive the school culture. Supportive working conditions are more likely to enhance beginning teachers' morale and retention (Weiss, 1999).

Mentoring programs. Many districts now have in place a mentoring program for new teachers and teachers with experience that are new to the district. In an effort to clarify the norms for these new members, they set out to clarify the expectations. As Feldman explained (1984), they are attempting to maximize their chances for success and minimize their chances of failure. There is a difference, though, between formal mentor programs and informal mentoring. Formal mentor programs are sanctioned by the organization. They are set up as a way for new members to attain information, not only technical information, but also cultural information regarding the school's norms and political environment.

However, Flores (2001) points out that many new teachers perceive a gap within the school between the newcomers (younger teachers) and those with more experience. In an effort to overcome this gap, new employees also seek out relationships with others in the organization who act as informal mentors (Chao, et al., 1992). These informal mentors play a key role in the indoctrination of the new teachers. Empirical research has

indicated that newcomers' effort to build relationships with both peers and supervisors is important to the socialization process (Ashford & Black, 1996). These relationships can serve as a means of providing support, advice, assistance, stress reduction, and technical information.

In the Council Bluffs Community School District, instructional coaches serve new teachers (both to the profession and the district) for their first two years. Each new teacher was assigned an instructional coach to work with. The instructional coach would not always be working in the same building as their new teacher. So, it is likely these new teachers sought out informal assistance.

Conclusion

A wide range of variables impact new teachers and their retention. Central to these issues are 1) instructional coaching, 2) teacher efficacy, and 3) new teacher socialization. All over the country, schools are struggling to retain their new teachers, not just in their own school, but in the profession.

Between students and all other socialization agents, new teachers will be interacting with a variety of audiences and people in their new position. An instructional coach can smooth the way for them to learn the culture, understand how to help their students succeed, and reflect in a way that leads to greater self-efficacy. The purpose of this study will be to determine if there is a relationship between the amount of time spent working with an instructional coach and teacher self-efficacy. The specific methodologies associated with this study will be addressed in Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This study examines the relationship between hours spent working with an instructional coach and the level of self-efficacy for teachers. Of particular interest is the relationship between hours spent working with an instructional coach and the level of self-efficacy for initially licensed teachers. The primary purpose of this study is to determine if working with an instructional coach positively impacted beginning teachers' level of self-efficacy, and therefore increases the likelihood that they would remain working in education. The data gathered adds to the knowledge base of the current method of instructional coaching used by the district in which this study occurred. The summary of the information may be used to inform and possibly modify the existing program to be even more beneficial to new teachers and ultimately retain quality teachers with high self-efficacy that will positively impact student learning and achievement. Self-efficacy also impacts teacher retention. When teachers feel more efficacious, perhaps they are more likely to remain in teaching. In this chapter, details and descriptions are given of the research design, participants, instrumentation, variables, research questions, data analysis, and procedures utilized in this study.

Design

This study, collecting descriptive data, consisted of a self-administered survey to determine the self-efficacy of teachers who worked with an instructional coach. This survey was conducted between April 14, 2014, and May 2, 2014 (18 days). The survey itself is based on a larger self-efficacy scale for teachers created by Bandura (2006). The survey included both closed- and opened-ended questions. The survey was cross-

sectional, comparing two educational groups. One group is teachers with less than five years experience who have worked with an instructional coach 20 hours or more. The other group is teachers with less than five years experience who have not worked with an instructional coach 20 hours or more. Additional teachers with more than five years experience will also provide comparison data. While the low response rate in this study may limit valid inferences from the sample to the population, even a small return rate may not be biased and be acceptable in survey research (Cresswell, 2012).

A survey was placed in each secondary teacher's mailbox in six different buildings. Teachers at two middle schools, two high schools, one alternative center, and one career and technical center were the subjects for this research study. There were approximately 300 potential subjects that were given the survey to complete.

Research Questions

1) What is the self-efficacy of new teachers?
2) What is the difference between the self-efficacy of new teachers and the self-efficacy of veteran teachers?
3) What is the difference between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?
4) What is the difference in the area of Instruction between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and those who do not?

5) What is the difference in the area of Discipline between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and those who do not?
6) What is the difference in the area of Creating a Positive School Climate between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and those who do not?

Subjects

There were 70 teachers that completed this survey and participated in this study. Not all of the participants completed coaching cycles with an instructional coach. Twenty six of the participants had worked with an instructional coach by completing at least one six-week student-centered instructional coaching cycle (Sweeney, prezi - July, 2014 http://prezi.com/krx2kzqlh6qj/intro-to-scc/).

The teachers were all from the same school district that offered instructional coaching to all teachers and required newly-hired teachers to work with an instructional coach their first two years in the district. Participating teachers were from a moderately sized school district in Western Iowa. This district serves approximately 9,000 students PreK - twelfth grade. This district met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as defined by NCLB (2001) for participation, attendance, and graduation rates, but did not meet AYP in reading and mathematics. All four secondary schools did not meet AYP in reading and mathematics.

Data Collection

Surveys were distributed to every teacher of grades 6-12 in this district. This totaled approximately 300 teachers. Completing the self-administered surveys was

voluntary and no incentive was given for participating. Surveys were completed anonymously with results tabulated and formatted into a spreadsheet for analysis using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software.

Instruments

An anonymous and confidential survey, the modified Bandura Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (Appendix A) was administered in late April, early May, 2014. The Bandura Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale was used by Bandura in his work on teacher self-efficacy. Bandura pointed out that teachers' sense of efficacy is not uniform across the many different types of duties teachers are asked to perform, or across different subject matter (Hoy, 2007). In response, he constructed a thirty-item instrument with seven subscales: efficacy to influence decision making, efficacy to influence school resources, instructional efficacy, disciplinary efficacy, efficacy to enlist parental involvement, efficacy to enlist community involvement, and efficacy to create a positive school climate. Bandura's scale attempts to provide a multi-faceted picture of teachers' efficacy perceptions without being too narrow. Bandura's Self Efficacy scale has been used in dozens of studies with thousands of participants. For example, Schwarzer and Hallum, (2008) utilized Bandura's self-efficacy scale in their research on teacher stress and burnout. However, very little additional research could be located to support the validity and reliability of this tool.

For the purposes of this study, Bandura's scale was modified to include only three subscales, 1) instructional efficacy (specifically the district identified instructional framework - the gradual release of responsibility), 2) disciplinary efficacy, and 3) efficacy to create a positive school climate. The survey consisted of 37 total questions:

fifteen questions (#s 1-15) addressing a teacher's instructional self-efficacy; six questions (#s 16-21) addressing discipline self-efficacy; six questions (#s 22-27) regarding self-efficacy to create a positive school climate; four open-ended questions (#s 28-31) about instructional coaching; and a few demographic questions. Responses were on a Likert scale with a score: one equals "Strongly Disagree," two equals "Disagree," three equals "Neutral," four equals "Agree," and five equals "Strongly Agree." These three subscales were identified as the focus for this study as the three areas most likely to be impacted by working with an instructional coach.

Data Analysis

Research questions 1 and 2 were tested using descriptive statistical measures. Means and standard deviations were reported for 27 survey items, individually and by factor. Research questions 3 through 6 were tested using independent two tailed *t*-tests with a significance level of .05. This helped determine if the differences among the means represent true, significant differences or chance differences due to Type I errors (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). Independent variables include survey participants who have not worked with an instructional coach, survey participants who have worked with an instructional coach 1-19 hours, and survey participants who have worked with an instructional coach 20 hours or more. An overall self-efficacy score was determined for each participant. Items were clustered by subscales for three additional self-efficacy scores for each participant (1) instructional efficacy, 2) disciplinary efficacy, and 3) efficacy to create a positive school climate.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

The purpose of this research is to explore the impact of instructional coaching on teacher self-efficacy. An additional focus of this study was to determine if working with an instructional coach positively impacted beginning teachers' level of self-efficacy, and therefore increases the likelihood that they would remain working in education. The survey instrument used was based on a larger self-efficacy scale for teachers created by Bandura (2006). For the purposes of this study, Bandura's scale was modified to include only three of his original seven subscales, 1) instructional efficacy (specifically the district identified instructional framework - the gradual release of responsibility), 2) disciplinary efficacy, and 3) efficacy to create a positive school climate.

The number of study participants was 70. All of the participants were teachers of grades 6-12. The teachers were all from the same school district that offered instructional coaching to all teachers and required newly-hired teachers to work with an instructional coach their first two years in the district.

Research Question #1

What is the self-efficacy of new teachers?

Total (overall) scores and subscale scores for new and veteran teachers are shown in Table 1. A teacher's total (overall) self-efficacy score (TSE) was calculated by finding the average of their responses to questions 1-27. Among study participants, (n = 18) the overall TSE of teachers with five or less years experience was surprisingly high, with a mean score of 4.22 on a 5 point Likert scale. The minimum overall TSE score for new

teachers was 3.63 with the maximum overall TSE score of 4.93. Table 1 displays this data.

The data for the first subscale, dealing with instructional self-efficacy of new teachers (n = 17), show the mean was 4.28. The minimum instructional self-efficacy subscale score was 3.87 and the maximum instructional self-efficacy subscale score was 5.0. Table 1 displays this data.

The data for the second subscale, dealing with discipline self-efficacy of new teachers (n = 18), show the mean was 4.13. The minimum discipline self-efficacy of new teachers was 3.0 and the maximum discipline self-efficacy of new teachers was 5.0. Table 1 displays this data.

The data for the third subscale, dealing with creating a positive school climate self-efficacy of new teachers (n = 17), show the mean was 4.11. The minimum creating a positive school climate self-efficacy of new teachers was 3.5 and the maximum creating a positive school climate self-efficacy of new teachers was 5.0. Table 1 displays this data.

Additionally, data displayed in Table 1 includes descriptive statistical information relating to the same data for all teachers and veteran teachers, as well as new teachers.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics All, New, & Veteran Teachers' Self-Efficacy

	All Teachers		New Teachers		Veteran Teachers	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Overall TSE	4.21	0.34	4.22	0.37	4.24	0.32
Instructional SE	4.26	0.36	4.28	0.33	4.27	0.38
Discipline SE	4.18	0.45	4.13	0.53	4.22	0.39
Creating Positive Climate SE	4.12	0.45	4.11	0.45	4.15	0.43

Overarching Research Question #2

Is there a significant difference between the self-efficacy of new teachers and the self-efficacy of veteran teachers?

Research Sub Question #2a

Is there a significant difference between the total (overall) self-efficacy of new teachers and the total (overall) self-efficacy of veteran teachers?

Analysis

The total (overall) TSE score was also calculated for veteran teachers ($n = 49$), those teachers with more than five years of experience. Among study participants the overall TSE of teachers with five or more years of experience, was also high, with a mean score of 4.24 on a five-point Likert scale. The minimum overall self-efficacy score for veteran teachers was 3.59 with the maximum overall self-efficacy score of 5.0. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference between new teachers ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.37$) and veteran teachers ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.32$), $t = 0.23$, $p = 0.82$, $d = 0.07$. This data is displayed in Table 2.

Research Sub Question #2b

Is there a significant difference between the instructional self-efficacy of new teachers and the instructional self-efficacy of veteran teachers?

Analysis

The data for this subscale, dealing with instructional self-efficacy of veteran teachers ($n = 46$), show the mean was 4.27. The minimum instructional self-efficacy subscale score was 3.20 and the maximum instructional self-efficacy subscale score was 5.0. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference between new teachers (*M*

= 4.28, *SD* = 0.33) and veteran teachers (*M* = 4.27, *SD* = 0.38), *t* = 0.04, *p* = 0.97, *d* = 0.01. This data is displayed in Table 2.

Research Sub Question #2c

Is there a significant difference between the discipline self-efficacy of new teachers and the discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers?

Analysis

The data for this subscale, dealing with discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers (*n* = 46), show the mean was 4.22. The minimum instructional self-efficacy subscale score was 3.20 and the maximum instructional self-efficacy subscale score was 5.0. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference between new teachers (*M* = 4.13, *SD* = 0.53) and veteran teachers (*M* = 4.22, *SD* = 0.39), *t* = 0.73, *p* = 0.47, *d* = 0.19. This data is displayed in Table 2.

Research Sub Question #2d

Is there a significant difference between the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of new teachers and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of veteran teachers?

Analysis

The data for this subscale, dealing with the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of veteran teachers (*n* = 46), show the mean was 4.16. The minimum self-efficacy subscale score was 3.20 and the maximum self-efficacy subscale score was 5.0. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference between new teachers (*M* = 4.11, *SD* = 0.45) and veteran teachers (*M* = 4.16, *SD* = 0.43), *t* = 0.45, *p* = 0.65, *d* = 0.13. This data is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2

Comparison between New and Veteran Teachers' Self-Efficacy

	New Teachers		Veteran Teachers					
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*P*	*d*
Overall TSE	4.22	0.37	4.24	0.32	0.23	59	0.82	0.07
Instructional SE	4.28	0.33	4.27	0.38	0.04	61	0.97	0.01
Discipline SE	4.13	0.53	4.22	0.39	0.73	63	0.47	0.19
Creating Pos Climate SE	4.11	0.45	4.16	0.43	0.45	64	0.65	0.13

Overarching Research Question #3

What is the difference between the self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Research Sub Question #3a

Is there a significant difference between the total (overall) self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The overall TSE score was calculated for teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours is again, very similar. Among study participants the overall TSE of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.12 on a five-point Likert scale. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference between teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.35$) and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.33$), $t = 1.31$, $p = 0.19$, $d = 0.36$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 3.

Research Sub Question #3b

Is there a significant difference between instructional self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and instructional self-efficacy of teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The instructional self-efficacy score was calculated for teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours. Among study participants the instructional self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.20 on a five-point Likert scale. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in instructional self-efficacy between teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours (M = 4.20, SD = 0.32) and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours (M = 4.27, SD = 0.38), t = 0.67, p = 0.50, d = 0.19. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 3.

Research Sub Question #3c

Is there a significant difference between discipline self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and discipline self-efficacy of teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The discipline self-efficacy score was calculated for teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours. Among study participants the discipline self-efficacy of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.04 on a five-point Likert scale. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in discipline self-efficacy between teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours (M = 4.04, SD = 0.43) and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours (M = 4.24, SD = 0.45), t = 1.59, p = 0.12, d = 0.43. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 3.

Research Sub Question #3d

Is there a significant difference between the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The self-efficacy to create a positive climate score was calculated for teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours. Among study participants the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.04 on a five-point Likert scale. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the self-efficacy to create a positive climate between teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.45$) and teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20hours ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.42$), $t = 1.78$, $p = 0.08$, $d = 0.47$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Time spent working with an instructional coach and impact on self-efficacy (all teachers)

	Less than 20 Hours		20 Hours or More					
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*P*	*D*
Overall TSE	4.24	0.33	4.12	0.35	1.31	61	0.19	0.36
Instructional SE	4.27	0.38	4.20	0.32	.67	63	0.50	0.19
Discipline SE	4.24	0.45	4.04	0.43	1.59	65	0.12	0.43
Creating Pos Climate SE	4.17	0.42	3.97	0.45	1.78	66	0.08	0.47

Overarching Research Question #4

Is there a difference in the self-efficacy of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Research Sub Question #4a

Is there a difference in the total (overall) self-efficacy of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the total (overall) self-efficacy of new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The overall TSE score calculated for new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach and the total (overall) self-efficacy of new teachers work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours is again very similar. Among study participants the overall TSE of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.19 on a five-point Likert scale. The overall TSE of new teachers who work less than 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.25. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the overall self-efficacy of new teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.36$) and new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.41$), $t = 0.31$, $p = 0.76$, $d = 0.15$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 4.

Research Sub Question #4b

Is there a difference in instructional self-efficacy of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the instructional self-efficacy of new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The instructional self-efficacy score calculated for new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach and the instructional self-efficacy of new teachers work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours is again very similar. Among study participants the instructional self-efficacy of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.25 on a five-point Likert scale. The discipline self-efficacy of new teachers who work less than 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.31. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the instructional self-efficacy of new teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours (M = 4.25, SD = 0.32) and new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours (M = 4.31, SD = 0.35), t = 0.35, p = 0.73, d = 0.17. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 4.

Research Sub Question #4c

Is there a difference in discipline self-efficacy of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the discipline self-efficacy of new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The discipline self-efficacy score calculated for new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach and the discipline self-efficacy of new teachers work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours is again very similar. Among study participants the discipline self-efficacy of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.15 on a five-point Likert scale. The discipline self-efficacy of new teachers who work less than 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.11.

Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the discipline self-efficacy of new teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 0.46$) and new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.62$), $t = 0.14$, $p = 0.89$, $d = 0.07$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 4.

Research Sub Question #4d

Is there a difference in self-efficacy to create a positive climate of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The self-efficacy to create a positive climate score calculated for new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of new teachers work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours is again very similar. Among study participants the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of new teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.07 on a five-point Likert scale. The self-efficacy to create a positive climate of new teachers who work less than 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.15. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of new teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 0.48$) and new teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 0.45$), $t = 0.32$, $p = 0.76$, $d = 0.15$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 4.

Table 4

Time spent working with an instructional coach and impact on TSE (New Teachers)

	Less than 20 Hours		20 Hours or More					
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*D*
Overall TSE	4.25	0.41	4.19	0.36	0.31	14	0.76	0.15
Instructional SE	4.31	0.35	4.25	0.32	0.35	15	0.73	0.17
Discipline SE	4.11	0.62	4.15	0.46	0.14	16	0.89	0.07
Creating Pos Climate SE	4.15	0.45	4.07	0.48	0.32	15	0.76	0.15

Overarching Research Question #5

Is there a difference in the self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Research Sub Question #5a

Is there a difference in the total (overall) self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the total (overall) self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The overall TSE score calculated for veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach and the total (overall) self-efficacy of veteran teachers work with an instructional coach less than twenty 20 hours is again very similar. Among study participants the overall TSE of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.16 on a five-point Likert scale. The overall TSE of veteran teachers who work less than 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.24. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the overall self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.31$) and veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.33$), $t = 0.60$, $p = 0.55$, $d = 0.25$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 5.

Research Sub Question #5b

Is there a difference in instructional self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the instructional self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The instructional self-efficacy score calculated for veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach and the instructional self-efficacy of veteran teachers work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours is again very similar. Among study participants the instructional self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.24 on a five-point Likert scale. The discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work less than 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.27. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the instructional self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.32$) and veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.40$), $t = 0.22$, $p = 0.83$, $d = 0.09$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 5.

Research Sub Question #5c

Is there a difference in discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The discipline self-efficacy score calculated for veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach and the discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours is again very similar. Among study participants the discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.08 on a five-point Likert scale. The discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work less than 20 hours with an

instructional coach is 4.25. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the discipline self-efficacy of veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.31$) and veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.40$), $t = 1.10$, $p = 0.28$, $d = 0.47$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 5.

Research Sub Question #5d

Is there a difference in self-efficacy to create a positive climate of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours?

Analysis

The self-efficacy to create a positive climate score calculated for veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of veteran teachers work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours is again very similar. Among study participants the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of veteran teachers who work at least 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.00 on a five-point Likert scale. The self-efficacy to create a positive climate of veteran teachers who work less than 20 hours with an instructional coach is 4.18. Independent *t*-test results indicate no significant difference in the self-efficacy to create a positive climate of veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach at least 20 hours ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.36$) and veteran teachers who work with an instructional coach less than 20 hours ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.42$), $t = 1.18$, $p = 0.25$, $d = 0.46$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

Time spent working with an instructional coach and impact on TSE (Veteran Teachers)

	Less than 20 Hours		20 Hours or More					
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*d*
Overall TSE	4.24	0.33	4.16	0.31	0.60	42	0.55	0.25
Instructional SE	4.27	0.40	4.24	0.32	0.22	43	0.83	0.09
Discipline SE	4.25	0.40	4.08	0.31	1.10	44	0.28	0.47
Creating Pos Climate SE	4.18	0.42	4.00	0.36	1.18	46	0.25	0.46

Research Question #6

Is there a significant difference by question between any of the self-efficacy scores of new teachers and any of the self-efficacy scores of veteran teachers?

Analysis

The self-efficacy score for each question was calculated for both new and veteran teachers. Data indicates self-efficacy scores on only three of the 27 questions are significantly different between new and veteran teachers.

Survey question number 1, "I promote learning even when there is a lack of support from the students' home," has a mean of 4.89 for new teachers and a mean of 4.73 for veteran teachers. This survey question deals with instructional self-efficacy. Independent *t*-test results indicate a significant difference between new teachers (M = 4.89, SD = 0.32) and veteran teachers (M = 4.73, SD = 0.45) in their responses to survey question number one (1), t = 1.34, p = 0.19, d = 0.40. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 6.

Survey question number 14, "I help other teachers with their teaching skills," has a mean of 3.44 for new teachers and a mean of 3.98 for veteran teachers. This survey question deals with instructional self-efficacy. Independent *t*-test results indicate a significant difference between new (M = 3.44, SD = 0.92) and veteran teachers (M = 3.98, SD = 0.83) in their responses to survey question number 14, t = 2.27, p = 0.26, d = 0.61. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 6.

Survey question number 22, "I make my school a safe place," has a mean of 4.17 for new teachers and a mean of 4.60 for veteran teachers. This survey question deals with the self-efficacy to create a positive school climate. Independent *t*-test results

indicate a significant difference between new teachers ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.71$) and veteran teachers ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.54$) in their responses to survey question number 22, $t = 2.63$, $p = 0.01$, $d = 0.68$. Data for this comparison is displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Item analysis – Where it DOES matter.

	New		Veteran				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*P*	*d*
Survey Q#1 – I promote learning even when there is a lack of support from the students' home. (Instructional SE)	4.89	0.32	4.73	0.45	1.34	0.19	0.40
Survey Q#14 – I help other teachers with their teaching skills. (Instructional SE)	3.44	0.92	3.98	0.83	2.27	0.26	0.61
Survey Q#22 – I make my school a safe place. (Create Positive School Climate SE)	4.17	0.71	4.60	0.54	2.63	0.01	0.68

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Discussion

The purpose of this research is to explore the impact of instructional coaching on teacher self-efficacy. An additional focus of this study was to determine if working with an instructional coach positively impacted beginning teachers' level of self-efficacy, and therefore increases the likelihood that they would remain working in education. The survey instrument used was based on a larger self-efficacy scale for teachers created by Bandura (2006).

For the purposes of this study, Bandura's scale was modified to include only three of his original seven subscales, 1) instructional efficacy (specifically the district identified instructional framework - the gradual release of responsibility), 2) disciplinary efficacy, and 3) efficacy to create a positive school climate. These three subscales were identified as the focus for this study as the three areas most likely to be impacted by working with an instructional coach. The number of study participants was seventy. All of the participants were teachers of grades 6-12 and all were from the same school district that offered instructional coaching, beginning in 2009, to all teachers but required newly-hired teachers to work with an instructional coach their first two years in the district.

Conclusions

Research Question #1 was used to determine the self-efficacy of new teachers. In general, the self-efficacy of new teachers was incredibly similar to the self-efficacy of veteran teachers. The mean for the total (overall) self-efficacy for new teachers was 4.22 and the mean for the total (overall) self-efficacy for veteran teachers was 4.24. This is a little surprising given that new teachers have not had nearly the experience as veteran

teachers. The average number of years experience for new teachers (n = 18) was 2.83, while the average number of years experience for veteran teachers (n = 49) was 18.94.

For new teachers to perceive their self-efficacy as high as veteran teachers, teachers that have been practicing their craft for fifteen years longer on average, is really surprising. Since new teachers were required to work with an instructional coach, it seems possible that working with an instructional coach may have helped these new teachers accelerate their confidence and self-efficacy in the classroom.

Interestingly, while there is no significant difference statistically between the subscale means by category, there is a statistically significant difference between new and veteran teachers in some of the individual survey questions. The self-efficacy mean of each question was calculated for both new and veteran teachers. In the subscale category of instructional self-efficacy, there is a statistically significant difference between new and veteran teachers on two survey questions, numbers 1 and 14. In the subscale category of self-efficacy to create a positive climate, there is a statistically significant difference between new and veteran teachers on one survey question number 22.

Survey question number 1, "I promote learning even when there is a lack of support from the students' home," has a mean of 4.89 for new teachers and a mean of 4.73 for veteran teachers. It is interesting that the mean for new teachers is actually higher than the mean for veteran teachers. Maybe this difference is an indication of the positivity each new teacher brings to the field. New teachers come prepared to make a difference in the lives of each and every one of their students. Maybe the shine on that idea has dulled for veteran teachers. As one veteran teacher noted on their survey, "The

instructional coach is a tool to help teachers better their classroom interactions. I've been teaching a long time, I don't really need help any more." While that is not the attitude of every veteran teacher, it seems to be the prevailing sentiment among some veteran teachers.

Survey question number 14, "I help other teachers with their teaching skills," has a mean of 3.44 for new teachers and a mean of 3.98 for veteran teachers. This seems to make sense. Veteran teachers see new teachers as additional students sometimes. They are typically open and willing to assist new teachers in any way they can. Additionally, teaching is a very demanding job. Working together and collaborating with each other to help students achieve is the direction education is going (DuFour & Eaker, 2008).

In the subscale category of the self-efficacy to create a positive school climate, there is a statistically significant difference between new and veteran teachers on one survey question, number 22. Survey question number 22, states "I make my school a safe place," has a mean of 4.17 for new teachers and a mean of 4.60 for veteran teachers. This difference between new and veteran teachers may have to do with the fact that veteran teachers have been there and done that. They know how to de-escalate conflicts between students and have experience doing just that. New teachers are still developing these mediation and conflict resolution skills.

Research Question #2 was used to determine if there was a significant statistical difference between the self-efficacy of new teachers and the self-efficacy of veteran teachers. The self-efficacy means of new teachers and veteran teachers overall (total self-efficacy score), their instructional self-efficacy, discipline self-efficacy, and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate were all calculated and compared. There were no

significant statistical differences between the self-efficacy of new teachers and the self-efficacy of veteran teachers in any of the compared means. This is a little surprising. But, not really unexpected, as new teachers have quite a bit of support starting out.

Research Question #3 was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the self-efficacy of teachers who worked at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and teachers who worked with an instructional coach less than 20 hours. The self-efficacy mean of teachers who worked with an instructional coach at least 20 hours and the self-efficacy mean of teachers who worked with an instructional coach less than 20 hours were compared in the following categories: overall (total self-efficacy score); their instructional self-efficacy; discipline self-efficacy; and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate. These means were calculated and compared. There were no significant statistical differences between the self-efficacy of teachers who worked with an instructional coach at least 20 hours and the self-efficacy of teachers who worked with an instructional coach less than 20 hours in overall (total) self-efficacy or in any of the subscales.

This is disappointing, but not really unexpected. Instructional coaches are stretched and pulled in so many different directions, they struggle to assist teachers day to day.

Research Question #4 was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the self-efficacy of new teachers who worked at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and new teachers who worked with an instructional coach less than 20 hours. The self-efficacy mean of new teachers who worked with an instructional coach at least 20 hours and the self-efficacy mean of new teachers who worked with an

instructional coach less than 20 hours were compared in the following categories: overall (total self-efficacy score); their instructional self-efficacy; discipline self-efficacy; and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate. These means were calculated and compared. There were no significant statistical differences between the self-efficacy of new teachers who worked with an instructional coach at least 20 hours and the self-efficacy of new teachers who worked with an instructional coach less than 20 hours in any of the categories.

While 20 hours was an arbitrary delineation for the purposes of this study, the quantity or amount of time does not seem to matter nearly as much as the quality of the interactions between coach and teacher. This quality of this relationship seems to be much more important than the amount of time spent working together.

Research Question #5 was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the self-efficacy of veteran teachers who worked at least 20 hours with an instructional coach, and the self-efficacy of veteran teachers who worked with an instructional coach less than 20 hours. The self-efficacy mean of veteran teachers who worked with an instructional coach at least 20 hours and the self-efficacy mean of veteran teachers who worked with an instructional coach less than 20 hours were compared in the following categories: overall (total self-efficacy score); their instructional self-efficacy; discipline self-efficacy; and the self-efficacy to create a positive climate. These means were calculated and compared. There were no significant statistical differences between the self-efficacy of veteran teachers who worked with an instructional coach at least 20 hours and the self-efficacy of veteran teachers who worked with an instructional coach less than 20 hours in overall (total) self-efficacy or in any of the subscales.

Discussion

How is it that new teachers in this study have incredibly similar self-efficacy perceptions as veteran teachers? There are a number of possibilities. It is possible new teachers are simply better prepared by their university education courses and pre-service experiences. Many education students are student teaching for a full year before seeking their first teaching job. Additionally, because of the cost and the challenge of retaining new teachers, many districts are utilizing mentors and coaches alike to support new teachers as they move into the classroom. Because of this, many new teachers are hitting the ground running.

When this research is added to the existing body of knowledge regarding instructional coaching, a few pieces of evidence stand out. It would seem instructional coaching and self-efficacy may not be related. Given that, how will coaching be different moving forward? Secondly, it is likely that the quality of interactions and relationships are more important than the amount of time spent working together. Effective instructional coaching seems to hinge upon the relationship between the coach and the teacher. The time spent together is only productive in a trusting context. Thirdly, teaching is a very collaborative career, much more so now, than even ten or twenty years ago (DuFour & Eaker, 2008). Layers of support are necessary for all teachers, let alone new teachers, to be successful and make a difference in student achievement.

The Transformation of Coaching

The participants in this study teach in a progressive district that sensed the need to modify the role of their instructional coaches. When this study was conducted, there were eight (8) total instructional coaches for four (4) secondary buildings. These coaches

were participating in a number of initiatives. They were planning and presenting weekly professional development for each secondary building as well as large groups of job-alike teachers monthly. Additionally, they were mentoring new teachers, engaging in assigned coaching with struggling teachers, developing curriculum for each core subject area, and creating common district assessments for each course in all four core content areas. They were mentors, instructional coaches and curriculum specialists all at the same time. This was not a targeted approach to using coaches. As one veteran teacher summarized, "Most of the coaches are great! The district has asked so much of them that they can't do what they're supposed to do, work with teachers!"

In August 2015, this district recognized the issue of coaches' roles being too broad and made some sweeping changes to their coaching model. They doubled the number of instructional coaches at the secondary level to 16, four instructional coaches for each secondary building. Coaches would no longer be responsible for professional development in the buildings. The district also added a mentor for each secondary building. These mentors would work with all teachers new to the profession as well as those new to the district. Instructional coaches would no longer be working with any new teachers. To further refine the use of teacher leaders in the district, the district identified four new curriculum specialists, one for each of the core subject areas. These curriculum specialists are now responsible for all curriculum modifications as well as common district assessments and monthly professional development. Now, instructional coaches would really be focused on coaching teachers in the area of instruction. Because of all these changes, the instructional coaches' job will now look significantly different. The transformation of instructional coaches in this district has been remarkable. This study

will help to serve as baseline data to assess the effectiveness and impact of instructional coaching moving forward.

Trust and Relationships with Coaches

While the role of an instructional coach is transforming and shifting, the context of that work remains the same. Again, as Comer (2001) states, "No significant learning occurs without a significant relationship" (p.30). Not all instructional coaches are considered equal. If an instructional coach has the reputation of being trusting and respectful, teachers will seek them out. But, once approached, the instructional coach rarely gets a second chance to make a great impression. They must be able to supply the teacher with ideas, strategies, and/or techniques that help students learn, are practical, and help the teacher. If the coach does not deliver, it is not likely the teacher will grow, reflect or seek the help of a coach again. Teachers are simply too busy to add one more commitment to their already incredibly busy days.

Speaking of time, the amount of time spent working with an instructional coach did not seem to matter for either new or veteran teachers. While 20 hours was the cut off for what was deemed a significant amount of time spent working with a coach for this study, it is likely not really about the hours spent working together. For most teachers in this study, it seems the relationship they had with the coach was more important than the amount of time they spent working with one. For example, as one veteran teacher put it, "I've had both positive and negative experiences with our instructional coaches. A trusting relationship needs to be formed for it to work." A new teacher echoes this idea, "When the right person is in the job, it makes all the difference." Additionally, a new teacher views his or her coach this way, "My coach provided excellent

emotional/personal support as well as instructional support." Clearly, it is not about the time spent together, but the actions and interactions between a coach and teacher.

If a teacher can count on an instructional coach to provide meaningful assistance, insights, resources and information, they are likely to view that instructional coach as effective and valuable. Unfortunately, throughout the past five years, coaches have sometimes been assigned to work with struggling teachers. But, if a coach can develop a relationship with a teacher, even then, the work together can be productive. For example, a veteran teacher remarked, "My coach helped me think of several things I already knew, but for some reason stopped doing. We shared ideas about how to best work with students. I didn't think I would like working with her, but it was surprisingly, a good experience. As one new teacher confirmed, "I asked for help amending a project. The coach made a point to understand the goals and limitations. He researched and brainstormed with me, identifying resources and following up often during implementation." Coaching is a game changer for teachers and ultimately students. When coaches can commit fully to teachers and assist them, teachers will seek them out.

The Role of Collaboration

Not only do coaches need to be the "right person" for the job, they need to help teachers develop the skills to collaborate with each other. Teaching has become a very collaborative profession (DuFour, 2008). Now, teaching has more of a team mentality, not solo superstars getting amazing results on their own. Gone are the days of a teacher being an independent contractor, shutting their doors and teaching. Instructional assistance is where most teachers view a coach as a resource. As one veteran teacher stated, "My coach is a great sounding board for when I want to try a new strategy."

To assist and help all teachers layers of support have been set up. Administrators are seen as instructional leaders in their buildings and are urged to "coach" their struggling teachers. Professional learning communities (PLCs) are the norm. Teams access interventionists and specialists to help them collect and reflect on data. Coaches and mentors are also available. These are all layers of support for all teachers. Mentors are especially crucial for new teachers. They help new teachers navigate the terrain with skill and confidence. New research even points out that teachers without mentors leave the profession much faster (Gray & Tale, 2015).

It is clear to anyone that works with new teachers that they feel their biggest deficit is in the area of instruction. They simply don't have a full tool box that they can reach into and pull out a strategy tailored to specific content or a specific skill. As one new teacher said, "We all grow through collaboration." This is something veteran teachers probably had to learn on their own. Another new teacher emphasizes this point by stating, "This year, my third, was the first year I really felt the benefits of a supportive instructional coach in the building. I had a great experience co-planning and assistance with implementation with my coach." Another new teacher stated, "Working with a coach was very positive for me. She made me feel more comfortable with my teaching." That's the confidence new teachers need to try different strategies out and continue to refine their craft.

The role of teaching has become incredibly collaborative over the past years. The role is so demanding that it is almost impossible to do in isolation. As one veteran teacher remarked, "Well, it's always beneficial to have additional support." Another teacher described working with a coach as, "A wonderful experience and my coach was

extremely positive! I have learned a lot and grown as a professional." The role of coach is to not only help teachers instructionally, but also build their skills to reflect on teaching and learning, and most importantly learn from each other. The goal for instructional coaches is to support teachers by building their effectiveness to increase student achievement and building their confidence to take risks. All of this is accomplished while stretching the teacher at the same time. As one new teacher revealed, "Overall, working with an instructional coach was a good experience that challenged, but strengthened me."

Implications for further research

While it does not seem instructional coaching impacts the perception of self-efficacy in those that work with a coach versus those that do not, what if no coaching would have been offered to the new teachers in this study? Would their self-efficacy perceptions be as high as they are? It is hard to say. But, since the role of an instructional coach has been modified in this district and is now more focused on assisting teachers, will the self-efficacy of teachers who work with an instructional coach shift? What role can veteran teachers play in the development and growth of new teachers? What should coaches and now mentors in this district do to help new teachers and veteran teachers alike? Now that new teachers have mentors and will then work with coaches after their first two years in the district, maybe the expectations will be set early and then simply continued throughout their career. They will need to collaborate with others to meet the ever increasing demands of the teaching profession. Teachers, especially new teachers, will need every layer of support they can get, be it mentors,

instructional coaches, curriculum specialists, administrators and colleagues, as they master the skills and art of teaching.

References

Alseike, B.U. (1997). Cognitive Coaching: Its influence on teachers. *Dissertations Abstracts International,* 58(8), 2911. (University Microfilms No. 9804083).

Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: A role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81(2),* 199-214.

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide to the construction of self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.). *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents.* (Vol. 5., pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*. 84(2), 191-215.

Benson, M. A. (2008). Effective mentoring for new music teachers: An analysis of the mentoring programs for new music teachers as described in the literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education,* 26(2), 42-49.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1975). Federal programs supporting educational change. *Volume III: The process of change*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Brown, K., & Wynn, S. (2007). Teacher retention issues: How some principals are supporting and keeping new teachers. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17, 664 – 697.

Bush, R. N. (1984). *Effective staff development. In making our schools more effective: Proceedings of three state conferences.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratories.

Calderhead, J. (1988). The development of knowledge structures in learning to teach. In Calderhead, J., (Ed.) *Teachers' Professional Learning.* London: Falmer Press.

Cantrell, S. C., & Hughes, H. K. (2008). Teacher efficacy and content literacy implementation: An exploration of the effects of extended professional development with coaching. *Journal of Literacy Research,* 40(1), 95-127.

Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparision on mentoring functions and contrast with non-mentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, *45(2)*, 619-636.

Christensen, C. M., Horn, M. B., & Johnson, C. W. (2008). *Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Comer, J. P. (2001). Schools that develop children. *The American Prospect,* 12(7), 30-35.

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (1994). *Cognitive coaching: a foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Cresswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Crow, N.A. (1987). Socialization within a teacher ed program: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8). 6-13.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Edwards, J. L., & Newton, R. R. (1995, April). *The effect of Cognitive Coaching on teacher efficacy and empowerment.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Elliot, E. M., Isaacs, M. L., & Chugani, C. D. (2010). Promoting self-efficacy in early career teachers: A principal's guide for differentiated mentoring and supervision. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 4(1), 131-146.

Feldman, D. C. (1984). The development and enforcement of group norms. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(1), 47-53.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21: 433-452.

Flores, M. A. (2001). Person and context in becoming a new teacher. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *27*(2), 135-148.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Grant, A. M., Green, L. S., & Rynsaardt, J. (2010). Developmental coaching for high school teachers: Executive coaching goes to school. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research,* 62(3), 151-168.

Gray, L., & Tale, S. (2015, April 1). Public School Teacher Attrition and Mobility in the First Five Years: Results From the First Through Fifth Waves of the 2007–08 Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved June 1, 2015.

Hamman, D., Olivarez Jr., A., Lesley M., Button, K., Chan, Y., Griffith, R., & Elliot, S. (2006). Pedagogical influence of interaction with cooperating teachers on the

efficacy beliefs of student teachers. *The Teacher Educator*, 42(1), 15-29.

Hanushek, E. A. (2007). The single salary schedule and other issues of teacher pay. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4), 574-586.

Hertzog, H. S. (2002). "When, How, and Who Do I Ask for Help?": Novices' perceptions of problems and assistance. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(3), 25-41.

Hoy, A. W. (2007). The Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy. Retrieved August 10, 2014, from http://people.ehe.osu.edu/ahoy/research/instruments/#Sense.

Hull, J., Edwards, J. L., Rogers, M. S., & Swords, M. E. (1998). *The Pleasant View experience.* Golden, CO: Jefferson County Schools.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30-33.

Johnston, S. (1994). Conversations with student teachers: enhancing the dialogue of learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education Quarterly,* 28(3), 25-41.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development* (3rd ed.)Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Karmos, A., & Jacko, C. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *11(28)*, 51-55.

Kinnucan-Welsch, K., Rosemary, C., & Grogan, P. (2006). Accountability by design in Literacy professional development. *Reading Teacher*, 59(5), 426-435.

Knight, J. (2008). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Krpan, M. M. (1997). Cognitive Coaching and efficacy, growth, and change for second-, third- and fourth-year elementary school educators. *Dissertation Abstracts*

international, 35(4), 93. (University Microfilms No. 1384152).

Kruger, J., & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: how difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, (77). 1121–34.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making : What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 226-251.

Louis, M. R. , Posner, B. Z., & Powell, G. N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. *Personnel Psychology*, (36). 857-866.

McDonnough, J. T., & Matkins, J. J. (2010). The role of field experience in elementary preservice teachers' self-efficacy and ability to connect research to practice. *School Science and Mathematics,* 110(1), 13-23.

Muhammad, A. (2009). *Transforming school culture: How to overcome staff division.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319, (2008).

Pataniczek, D. D., & Isaacson, N. S. (1981). The relationship of socialization and the concerns of beginning teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 32(3), 14-17.*

Reichers, A. E., & Schneider, B. (1990). Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture*, 5-39. SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Robbins, S. (2003). *Essentials of organizational behavior.* 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement.* Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee.

Schein, E. (2011). *Helping: How to offer, give and receive help.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* Special Issue: Health and Well-Being (57), 152-171.

Smith, M. C. (1997). Self-reflection as a means of increasing teacher efficacy through Cognitive Coaching. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 35*(4), 935. (University Microfilms No. 1384304).

Su, Z. (1990). The function of the peer group in teacher socialization. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(9), 723-727.

Su, Z. (1992). Sources of influence in preservice teacher socialization. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18(3), 239-259.

Sweeney, D. (2014, July 28). Introduction to Student Centered Coaching. Retrieved February 9, 2015, from https://prezi.com/krx2kzqlh6qj/intro-to-scc/

Sweeney, D. (2011). *Student-centered coaching: A guide for K-8 coaches and principals.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

The Teaching Commission. (2004). *Teaching at risk: A call to action.* Washington, D. C.

Vanderburg, M., & Stephens, D. (2010). The impact of literacy coaches. *Elementary School Journal,* 111(1), 141-163.

Weiss, E. M. (1999). Perceived workplace conditions and first-year teachers' morale, career choice commitment, and planned retention: a secondary analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15(8), 861-879.

Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality.* Princeton, NJ: Policy Information Center.

Appendix A

COACHING & TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY

Please indicate your perceptions about each of the statements below by circling the appropriate number. 1 = you strongly disagree with the statement, 2 = you disagree with the statement, 3 = you neither agree or disagree with the statement, 4 = you agree with the statement, 5 = you strongly agree with the statement. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and will not be identified by name.

	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. I promote learning even when there is lack of support from the students' home.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I utilize a variety of teaching strategies to help students learn.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I effectively prepare my students for district assessments.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I understand the standards identified in the district curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I teach the standards identified in the district curriculum	1	2	3	4	5
6. I reflect on my teaching daily.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I reflect on my students' learning daily.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I keep students on task on difficult assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I feel comfortable planning for and implementing differentiated instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I implement the elements of GRR (Gradual Release of Responsibility) on a regular basis.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I encourage students to work together productively.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I can overcome the influence of adverse community conditions on student learning.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I help other teachers with their teaching skills.	1	2	3	4	5

15. I engage in collaboration with teachers to make the school run effectively.			1	2	3	4	5
16. I am able to connect with even the most difficult students.			1	2	3	4	5
17. I encourage students to do their homework.	1	2	3	4	5		
18. I require students to follow classroom rules.	1	2	3	4	5		
19. I establish classroom procedures and routines to promote learning.			1	2	3	4	5
20. I have fewer than five (5) discipline referrals every year.	1	2	3	4	5		
21. I control disruptive behavior in the classroom.			1	2	3	4	5
22. I make my school a safe place.			1	2	3	4	5
23. I make students enjoy coming to school.			1	2	3	4	5
24. I encourage students to trust me and other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5		
25. I can help reduce school dropout.	1	2	3	4	5		
26. I can help reduce school absenteeism.			1	2	3	4	5
27. I help students develop a belief that they can do well in school.			1	2	3	4	5

28. What, in your opinion, is the role of an instructional coach?

29. List any topics or skills you (have) would go to a coach for information about.

30. If you have worked with a coach, how would you summarize the experience? *(skip this question if it is not applicable)*

31. Any additional comments, reflections or recommendations about instructional coaching in the district:

Demographic Data

32) Gender M F

33) Total number of years teaching _____

34) Total number of years teaching in **Council Bluffs Community School District** _____

35) Department/Content area that **BEST** describes your current assignment: *(circle only one)*

a) English/Language Arts
b) Math
c) Science
d) Social Studies
e) Special Education
f) World Languages
g) Physical Education
h) Career/Technical
i) Other _____

36) Have you worked with an instructional coach on a coaching cycle in the past five years? (Typically, this is working together for six weeks, meeting 2-3 hours each week.)

Yes _____ No _____

37) Approximately how many hours have you worked with an instructional coach one-on-one during the **PAST FIVE YEARS**? Exclude large group professional development and job alikes. One six week coaching cycle, where you meet 2-3 hours each week, equals approximately 18 hours. Please include all one-on-one time you have spent working with a coach the past five years.

a) 0 hours over the past five years
b) 1-19 hours over the past five years
c) 20 - 39 hours over the past five years
d) 40 - 59 hours over the past five years
e) 60+ hours over the past five years

Appendix B

1-1 Coaching Cycle Data Collection Tool

Teacher's Name:	**Coach's Name:**
Coaching Cycle Focus:	**Dates of Coaching Cycle:** **beginning date** **ending date**

What is the student learning goal for this coaching cycle? What data is this goal based on?	**What instructional practices were determined by the coach and teacher to most likely produce the desired student learning goal?**	**What coaching practices were implemented during this coaching cycle? (check all that apply)**	**As a result of the coaching cycle, what instructional practices is the teacher now using on a consistent basis?**	**What is the evidence that students accomplished the desired learning goal?**
Student Learning Goal: **Baseline Data:** **_____ % of students were able to do_____ as determined by the _____ assessment.**		Demonstration Teaching with a prebrief, lesson and debrief Co-Teaching with a prebrief, lesson and debrief Collaborative Planning Analysis of student work Teacher Observation with a prebrief, lesson and debrief Study group to discuss professional text that aligns to the student learning goal Critical Friends Group that aligns to the student learning goal Other:_____		**Post Assessment Data:** _____ % of students were able to do_____ _____ as determined by the _____ assessment.

Adapted from PEBC Coaching Initiative & Diane Sweeney