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What is Coaching?

Daisy: “The chimney is not drawing properly, the oven is not hot enough”

Mrs Patmore: “It’s a poor workman who blames his tools”
Personal Background of the Problem
What I thought Instructional Coaching was as a first year teacher …
Reserved for poor teachers
Sign of a weak teacher

Isn’t this sometimes how we feel?

Definitions of an Instructional Coach
Disseminator of information
Demonstrates effective practices
Learner
Leader
Curriculum Expert
Mentor
Grant Writer
Visionary
Four aspects of an Instructional Coach

- Agent of Change
- Anchored
- Facilitator
- Not an Administrator

What is Instructional Coaching

Effective coaching is collegial.
Irene Fountas (personal communication, 2013)

Thinking about the Significance of the Problem

Why would the lack of coaching be a problem?

What problems could be avoided with proper coaching?
Significance of the Problem

Many kindergarten students start school without the prerequisite skills need for academic success

4th graders are not meeting basic achievement levels

Scope of the Problem

Summer of 2013 Elimination of Tenure

Teachers are to be ranked in order of student performance and the top 25 per cent would be given a four year contract and yearly bonus

Educators are being judged by student performance … how can one directly measure the impact of an instructional coach?

Research Questions

What is the purpose of a fidelity measure?

What is the nature of instructional coaching and is there a correlation between instructional coaching and implementation fidelity?
Thinking About the Research Questions
What do you expect the findings to be?

What is Implementation Fidelity?
The purpose of implementation or program fidelity is to ensure proper instructional application to provide a consistent practice to ensure student success.

Methods and Data
- Setting, District in Western North Carolina
- Time Interval Study design
- 13 Participants, implemented WRS
- Continuous instructional coaching throughout the school years of 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 respectively
- Three years of fidelity scores and coaching information was analyzed
Implementation

- Sample group consisted of 13 teachers that met the criteria of implementing WRS for three or more years and having existing fidelity data
- Cohort of teachers is consistent over the three years of fidelity data collection

Description and Interpretation of the Data

Number of Years in the Teaching Profession

![Bar chart showing the number of years in the teaching profession for each teacher.

Number of Years: 0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30

Description and Interpretation of the Data

Year Initial Level One Wilson Reading System Training Completed

- 2008-2009
- 2009-2010
- 2011-2012
- 2012-2013
Description and Interpretation of the Data

Number of Years Implementing Wilson

Number of Years

A B C D E F G H I J K L M

Teacher

Description and Interpretation of the Data

Length of Each Coaching Session in 2011-2012

- 30 min
- 1 hr
- 1 hr 30 min
- 2 hrs

Description and Interpretation of the Data

Wilson Reading System Fidelity Score for 2011-2012

Fidelity Score

A B C D E F G H I J K L M

Teacher
Description and Interpretation of the Data

Length of Each Coaching Session in 2012-2013

- 30 min
- 1 hr
- 1 hr 30 min
- 2 hrs

Description and Interpretation of the Data

Wilson Reading System Fidelity Score for 2012-2013

Fidelity Score

- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F
- G
- H
- I
- J
- K
- L
- M

Teacher

Description and Interpretation of the Data

Length of Each Coaching Session in 2013-2014

- 30 min
- 1 hr
- 1 hr 30 min
- 2 hrs
Description and Interpretation of the Data

Wilson Reading System Fidelity Score for 2013-2014

Year to Year Comparison by Teacher

Coaching Session Focus

Number of Teachers Participating in that topic
Description and Interpretation of the Data

Teachers and Grade Level Assignment 2012-2013 and 2013-2014

YES indicates the participant/teacher attended the group coaching session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Participant/Teacher</th>
<th>Fall 2012 Mini Training/Group Coaching Session</th>
<th>Spring 2013 Mini Training/Group Coaching Session</th>
<th>Fall 2013 Mini Training/Group Coaching Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
<td>Did not participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

Review of coaching notes shows:

1. Coach acted as facilitator of learning
2. Length of coaching session and number of coaching sessions were equal for all teachers
Findings

Fidelity scores for those implemented WRS for six years had fidelity scores that were not much different than the teachers that have implemented WRS for fewer years or have less years of experience.

Findings

It appears that length of time in the field of education and the length of time implementing the system of instruction did not demonstrate impact on the fidelity scores.

Findings

There does not appear to be a discernible correlation between coaching and implementation fidelity. To use the fidelity scores as a gauge of a coaches’ impact would not render an accurate reflection of the work of a coach.
Let's Revisit What you expected the findings to be …

As a small group or with the person beside you take a minute to talk about if what you expected was confirmed in this research or did the findings surprise you.

A New Question Raised

“What did teacher D’s student outcomes look like comparative to teacher M?”

• Teacher D had lowest fidelity of the sample

• Teacher M had highest fidelity of the sample

Average Student Scores for Participant D and Participant M for the 2010-2011 School Year

2010-2011 Average Student Outcomes on WADE Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>WADE Reading Pre Test</th>
<th>WADE Reading Post Test</th>
<th>WADE Reading Mastery %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What About the EOG Test Standard Score?

Average End of Grade Standard Score Growth from 2010 to 2011 in Per Cent

- Teacher D
- Teacher M

Growth
Average
Teacher D Teacher M

Limitations

Availability of Data

- Limited sample size
- Limited data years

Given the limitations, there are no generalizations that can be made.

Supports for Effective Coaching

- Agent of Change
- Anchored
- Facilitator
- Not an Administrator
Reading Program Implementation versus Teacher Knowledge and what Role does the Coach Play

• Teacher Knowledge is Paramount
• Differentiation is Key
• A coach fosters flexible thinking

Implications for Future Research

How does the impact of principal support, differentiation, impact of the disability on student achievement have on fidelity and student outcomes?

Implications for Future Research

• What are your thoughts for future research?
Conclusion

Allington (2013) argues that fidelity is not an adequate measure rather teacher knowledge is more powerful than implementation fidelity.
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Abstract
This study investigates the relationship between instructional coaching and Wilson Reading System (WRS) implementation fidelity. As a result of the emphasis that the North Carolina General Assembly has placed on teacher appraisal being pursuant of student test results, I began to question, as an instructional coach for teachers of students with disabilities how will my impact be measured. Consequently, I decided to research teacher fidelity of program implementation to see if any correlation existed between coaching and implementation fidelity. This study follows a quantitative multi-year positivist causal-comparative research study design. There is one cohort of teachers and three years of data being compared. The findings suggest no correlation between coaching and implementation fidelity. The implications of this study suggest the need for further research and suggestions for future study designs are outlined. One caveat to take away from this study is the limitations of the use of fidelity measures. The fidelity measure focuses heavily on lesson procedures as a whole with little emphasis on differentiation of instruction. This study shows fidelity to program may not yield desired student outcomes and fidelity observations have the potential to be contrived since it is based on the lesson procedures and may limit teacher reflection of instructional practices.

Research Question
Does instructional coaching impact teacher implementation fidelity of WRS?

Key Findings in this Study
• Student growth is dependent on the measure used to assess growth
• The study supports instructional coaching as a means for growing teacher expertise
• Quality coaching, as described in the literature, is taking place
• The direct impact of coaching on fidelity is not easily assessed
• There are little differences between teachers that have implemented the program for six years and those in their third year of implementation
• There are no significant differences in the fidelity scores of teachers that have been in the field for 29 years and those that have been in the field for 12 years
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Conclusion

The findings of this study provided interesting information regarding student outcomes when compared to fidelity of program implementation. The implications of the study support instructional coaching as a means for growing teacher expertise. The importance of understanding student instructional needs and having the skills and strategies to address those needs is a teacher’s objective. The coach provides the space to explore what is known about a student and facilitate dialogue to discover instructional strategies to meet the academic and functional needs of a student. It is important to know the student and know the program of instruction in order to make instructional decisions that will yield results.

It is imperative to keep to the framework and integrity of a literacy program, such as Wilson Reading System (WRS), but no literacy program will be as effective as it could be without reflective thinking on the part of the teacher who has his/her students in mind. It is paramount, in other words, to include practices that build student performance based on teacher knowledge and expertise. A reflective teacher armed with student data, strategies and tools, such as WRS has the capacity to build student skills through masterful teaching. It is masterful teaching that is cultivated through a coaching relationship; together, a teacher and a coach have the influence to positively impact student performance.