



1992

## Peer Coaching: A Study of Teacher Involvement and Motivation

Christine A. Jakicic  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Jakicic, Christine A., "Peer Coaching: A Study of Teacher Involvement and Motivation" (1992).  
*Dissertations*. 3195.  
[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/3195](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3195)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1992 Christine A. Jakicic

PEER COACHING: A STUDY OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT AND  
MOTIVATION

by

Christine A. Jakicic

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the  
School of Education of Loyola University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree  
of Doctor of Education

May

1992

Copyright by Christine A. Jakicic, 1992  
All Rights Reserved

Christine A. Jakicic

Loyola University of Chicago

PEER COACHING: A STUDY OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT AND  
MOTIVATION

The purpose of this study was to examine, through an ethnographic case study approach, a successful peer coaching program for teachers. A qualitative design was used which incorporated data collected through semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document analysis. This particular site was chosen because their peer coaching program had been in place for over eight years and received support from both the teachers and administrators. Eighteen interviews were conducted including six administrators and twelve teachers. These people were chosen as being representative of the entire group. All teachers new to the program during the 1991-92 school year were included in the sample as well as all of the team leaders. Participant observation took place during the summer training workshop and during one full observation cycle. Documents reviewed included recruitment materials, training materials, and completed teacher worksheets produced during an observation cycle.

The results were presented in a narrative style. Findings included information about what motivates teachers to participate, what are the characteristics of a good training program, what characteristics must such a program have from a teacher's perspective, and why administrators support the program.

Some conclusions were reached about why this particular program works. Administrative support is vital to peer coaching program, however, the role of administrators within the program is unclear. Teachers join for a variety of reasons but primarily because they are open to trying new strategies and value the opportunity to learn from each other. Peer coaching does not need to be tightly tied to a staff development program. Teachers will use a variety of resources for ideas to improve instruction. Teachers value collaboration and are willing to give up the time needed to participate to work with each other. A strong training program is critical for success. Teachers need to be taught how to observe and what to observe. School climate is vital to a program's success. An atmosphere that values the improvement of instruction is valuable. Critical components of such a program are trust, confidentiality, and a voluntary participation policy.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The power of collaboration between professionals was established in many ways during this research. Without a doubt, this dissertation would not be the same without the collaboration of many people.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Philip Carlin, director of this dissertation committee, for his support and advice throughout this study. He was always available to answer a question, and often, to ask a question when so needed. I also want to thank Dr. Max Bailey and Dr. Edward Rancic for their help and encouragement as members of this dissertation committee.

I am grateful to the teachers and administrators who were involved as part of this case study. They exemplify the nature of collaboration, and their willingness to share their thoughts and experiences was invaluable to the completion of this research.

My thanks also to Peggy Primosch who faithfully transcribed interviews made under less than perfect conditions. Her sense of humor was much appreciated. The editing and proofreading done by a wonderful colleague, Joanne Trahanas, cannot go unnoticed. Her help "got" me through the hard times. Finally, the collaboration of a group of Loyola colleagues, who studied together for comprehensives and stayed together during the research process, provided support and advice vital to the completion of this study.

For his understanding and patience, I thank my husband, John. He was beginning to believe that all families used their dining room tables for computers and research.

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother, Helen Ayd, and to the memory of my father, George Ayd. They taught me that knowledge is something to be pursued and that learning is something to be enjoyed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
COPYRIGHT PAGE . . . . .	.ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	.iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	.v
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	.vii
CHAPTER	
I. Introduction . . . . .	.1
Purpose . . . . .	.5
Problem Statement and Research Question . . . . .	.6
Significance of Study . . . . .	.7
Limitations of This Study . . . . .	.8
Definitions . . . . .	.8
Overview of the Following Chapters . . . . .	.9
II. Review of the Related Literature . . . . .	10
Benefits of Collaboration/Collegiality . . . . .	10
Conditions for Collaboration . . . . .	15
Resource Sharing . . . . .	.16
Cooperative Professional Development . . . . .	.18
Transfer of Training. . . . .	.20
Peer Coaching Models . . . . .	27
Training for Coaching. . . . .	.34
Implementation of Coaching. . . . .	36
The Role of the Principal . . . . .	40
Benefits of Peer Coaching . . . . .	41
The Relationship to Evaluation . . . . .	44
Teacher Job Satisfaction . . . . .	.45
Motivation . . . . .	.47
Chapter Summary . . . . .	.50
III. Methodology . . . . .	.51
The Research Site . . . . .	.52
A Brief Description of the Program . . . . .	.53
Entry . . . . .	.55
Subjects . . . . .	.56

Data Collection . . . . .	57
Data Reduction and Analysis . . . . .	63
Limitations of the Methodology . . . . .	66
IV. Presentation and Analysis of the Data. . . . .	68
Administrator Interviews . . . . .	69
Summary of Administrative Interviews . . . . .	83
Teacher Interviews . . . . .	91
Summary of Teacher Interviews. . . . .	119
The Observation Cycle . . . . .	125
History of the Program and Development of Roles . . . . .	128
Recruitment and the Training Process . . . . .	132
Reflections About the Training Process . . . . .	144
V. Conclusions and Recommendations. . . . .	146
Research Questions. . . . .	146
Conclusions. . . . .	149
Recommendations . . . . .	154
Suggestions for Further Study . . . . .	156
Reflections About the Research . . . . .	156
APPENDICES. . . . .	158
REFERENCES. . . . .	182

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1	Type of Teachers Who Benefit From Peer Coaching . . . . .85
2	General Benefits . . . . .86
3	Benefits Related to Collaboration . . . . .86
4	Benefits Related to Improved Instruction . . . . . 87
5	Teacher Interviews . . . . .92
6	Reasons for Joining the Collegial Consultation Program .120
7	What Makes Teaching Satisfying .. . . . .123
8	Most Dissatisfying Things About Teaching . . . . .123
9	Teaching Behaviors Resulting From Participating . . . . . 124
10	Critical Components That Make This Program Successful .126

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Throughout the last decade significant attention has been given to the need for staff development as a way to improve instruction (Sparks, 1983b). Research conducted in the late 1960's and early 1970's suggested that the individual teacher should be the focus for improvement (Nevi, 1988). An effort was made to provide inservice opportunities to meet the needs of adult learners. During this time staff development activities changed their emphasis from the content of teaching to the process of teaching. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) have suggested that, "Teaching skills have much more often been the objectives of training than have academic content and its role as a component of teaching competence" (p. 84). This has led to two major concerns for staff developers. One, that too much emphasis is being placed on the strategies of teaching and not enough on the content, and two, that programs may not be comprehensive enough to make change.

During this last decade another phenomenon that has affected education is the concept of teacher empowerment. Making teachers a part of the decision-making process must also include being involved in staff development decisions (Glickman, 1988; Maeroff, 1988; Sparks, Nowakowski, Hall, Alec, & Imrick, 1985). Maeroff suggests that staff development is the key to teacher empowerment as it can help reduce isolation, increase self-confidence, make teachers more enthusiastic and knowledgeable about various skills

and strategies, and involve teachers in the decision-making process (1988).

More recently, the focus has changed from the individual to the organization, or to what Nevi terms "cultural development" (1988, p. 61). Often an attempt to affect change of some sort is made by developing new ideas among the entire staff. This idea is supported by Joyce and Showers (1988) saying that climate can be changed only "through collective action" (p. 8). This focus of change has become known as school improvement and is explained by Joyce and Showers (1988) in their work on staff development:

A teacher who works alone to impose standards not promoted by the faculty as a whole is in for a very frustrating and largely ineffectual experience. The second purpose of a comprehensive system is to unite the staffs of schools in studying ways of improving the school and engagement in continuous programs to make it better. Schools become outstanding when school improvement is prominent among their features. Schools whose programs are neglected become less effective quite rapidly (p. 6).

Teachers must become more involved in decisions about staff development activities, and those in charge must recognize what conditions are necessary for school improvement to take place. This is particularly true in light of the wave of school reform and its impact on school improvement (Wildman & Niles, 1987a).

A recent shift has occurred from single inservice meetings to other kinds of staff development opportunities which provide for what Glatthorn describes as "cooperative professional development" (1987, p. 31). Included are opportunities for professional dialogue, collaboration about curriculum development, peer supervision, peer

coaching, and action research (Glatthorn, 1987). Thus, the focus of many current staff development programs has become some type of cooperative or collaborative activity involving teachers.

In their book The Structure of School Improvement, Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin (1983) describe the four conditions that must exist for change and improvement to take place: "instruction-related executive functions, collegial teaching units, continuous staff development, and continuous community involvement (education about education)" (p.80). They go on to describe their concept of collegial teaching units by describing the beginnings of team teaching that occurred in the late 1950's and early 1960's. The purpose of team teaching was to have teachers participate collaboratively on curricular and instructional decisions. They believe that it is through this collaboration process that change in attitude and behavior will take place.

Team teaching has often been described as the beginning of the peer coaching model. The term peer coaching has been used to describe a variety of activities during which teachers are helped by other teachers or professionals in a clinical setting. The focus of this improvement is a specific teaching or instructional strategy. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) describe the objectives of training as "the understanding of any given practice, the skill required to generate the interactive moves necessary to employ that practice, and the cognitions necessary for appropriate and integrated use. . ." (p.85).

Wildman and Niles (1987a) suggest that there are three conditions which are essential for professional growth to occur. They are autonomy, collaboration, and time. By autonomy they mean the freedom to explore new techniques and ideas. In conjunction with this they suggest that when teachers collaborate they can share new information and ideas. Finally, they suggest that time is, and will continue to be, a factor for teachers.

Research has been conducted about the transfer of training from an inservice activity into classroom practice. Since the purpose of any staff development inservice or training is to provide new skills or ideas for teachers to use in their classrooms, an important component of any program must be the likelihood of teachers bringing back to their classrooms what they have learned. A meta-analysis by Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) provided some conclusions about what types of things should be done to promote effective staff development activities. They suggest that teachers should be involved in the decision-making process, that the design of the training be considered as it will have a great impact on its effectiveness, and that support by the organization also be considered as it will have an impact. On the other hand, they found that who does the training or where/when it is done will have little impact.

In studying how the design of the training program affected how the participants acquired knowledge, they found that when the training involves dispensing information only, very little change occurs. With the addition of demonstrations, practice and feedback,

there is a substantial increase in the amount of knowledge acquired. Thus, the addition of further levels of training will increase the acquisition of knowledge.

Acquiring knowledge is not, however, sufficient to ensure that the new skill will be transferred to use in the classroom. In looking more specifically at how the use of new skills can be transferred into classroom use, they found that unless a coaching component was included, the skill would not likely be transferred to use in the classroom.

### Purpose

Recognizing the need for a comprehensive plan that involves multiple opportunities to try new skills and strategies, collaboration between teachers, a coaching component, and focus on both the content and process of teaching, many schools are looking at peer coaching models as a component of staff development. If school improvement continues to be a focus for staff development, and if staff developers want to use training as a means to affect change, then the coaching component so necessary to transfer training from inservice to practice must be added to staff development plans.

This study examines a peer coaching program that has been in place for eight years. Using a qualitative case study approach, information is gathered about why teachers participate and why administrators support the program. This information is gathered

through semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document review.

While much has been written recently about various peer coaching programs, their purposes, their models and how they were begun; little has been written about how these programs function over a period of time. The concept of peer coaching is a relatively new one, therefore, few long term studies have been conducted. A careful examination will be made of the model used by this program in comparison to the models reported in the literature, to determine the effect that this plays on the program's success.

For the purposes of this study, this program will be deemed successful for two reasons. The first is that the program has been in place for over eight years and continues to attract new members. The second reason is that the program receives support from the administration as well as from the teachers. Thus, programs will be considered successful if participation is ongoing and if support comes from both teachers and administrators.

### Problem Statement and Research Questions

Peer coaching programs have been written about extensively in the literature, however, they have not found their way into actual practice in a majority of schools. In looking for a site for this research, it was found that many schools who had begun peer coaching programs had discontinued them. What, then, makes this program successful? Why do teachers continue to participate and

administrators continue to support it? The following questions are addressed through this study:

1. What motivates teachers to become involved and to stay involved in this program?
2. What are the teachers' perceptions about how the program affects collegiality?
3. According to the teachers, how does the program affect instruction and resource sharing?
4. What are the benefits reported by administrators?
5. What are the characteristics of a successful training component?

### Significance of Study

While the literature describes many peer coaching programs and their models, a review of the literature failed to find an analysis of why some programs are successful over a period of years and why others fail. In fact, the majority described programs which had been in place for two years or less. Perhaps this is because peer coaching is a relatively new concept, or perhaps no study has followed a program for any length of time. The questions addressed through this study should provide information to those people who are interested in starting such a program in their own school or district, and who would like to plan a program based on a successful model. It should also provide clues as to why some programs fail so that these problems can be avoided in the future.

### Limitations of This Study

Inherent in the nature of any case study is the limit on the generalizability of the results. No other site can be expected to have exactly the same characteristics. One of the features of any school is that it has its own culture. While this study examines a program shared between two schools, the demographics of the two schools are very similar. Schools and districts whose teaching and administrative staff are unlike those in this program may find the results to be less applicable. However, these same limitations may provide an opportunity for additional research.

### Definitions

Several words will be used throughout this study which may have varying definitions. As they will be used in this paper:

Peer coaching - a process in which teachers are helped by other teachers or professionals in a clinical setting to transfer newly acquired skills or strategies.

Resource sharing - teachers sharing ideas, experiences, and/or examples of strategies.

Feedback - the verbal information that is given to the teacher about the observation that has taken place.

Strategy session - a part of the peer coaching process during which the observers discuss the feedback that they wish to provide the observed teacher.

Process observer - person responsible for providing feedback about how the group functioned during the peer coaching process.

Pre-observation conference - the conference that is held prior to the observation during which the teacher clarifies to the observing teacher(s) what feedback is desired.

Post-observation conference - the conference held after the observation during which one of the observers discusses the feedback with the teacher to reinforce what has occurred and to clarify any questions.

### Overview of the Following Chapters

Chapter II includes a review of the related literature in the areas of collaboration/collegiality, models of peer coaching, benefits of peer coaching, transfer of training, and teacher satisfaction and motivation. Chapter III describes the study, including entry into the site, subjects, interviews, participant observations, document reviews, and data analysis. Chapter IV provides the details of the data and an analysis of the findings. Chapter V summarizes the findings, draws conclusions from the data, and makes recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### Review of Related Literature

Staff developers have long been aware of the fact that teaching tends to be done in isolation from one's peers. This isolation begins in teacher training programs and continues inside the school building (Lortie, 1975). New teachers tend to rely on a few trusted colleagues for the information they need (Pataniczek & Isaacson, 1981). In fact, all teachers bring with them their own experiences as students, experiences most likely to reinforce the isolation of the classroom. These conceptions are hard to change (Buchmann & Schwille, 1983). The structure of schools also limits collegial interaction; school schedules, expectations of administrators, and the nature of the teaching task itself tend to promote isolation (Copeland & Jamgochian, 1985). Smith (1986) concurs and adds to this list the way evaluations are conducted, and the typical decision-making practices that are unlikely to involve teachers. Leggett and Hoyle (1987a) call for a "break in the isolation that impedes the improvement of instructional skills, and hence student learning" (p. 17).

#### Benefits of Collaboration/Collegiality

Research suggests that developing collaborative models for supporting school improvement will have a positive impact on instruction (Leggett & Hoyle, 1987a; Little, 1982; Smith, 1986; Smith, 1987). In a study conducted by Little (1982) of six schools, 105 teachers, and 14 administrators, it was found that the more

successful schools were more likely to be those where teachers were frequently involved in talk about teaching. Schools were characterized as being either high success and high involvement, high success and low involvement, or low success and high involvement. In this study the designation of low or high success was made based on standardized test scores. The designation of low or high involvement reflected an examination of the staff development programs. There were two schools, one elementary and one secondary, in each category. Interviews were conducted with central office and building administrators, and teachers. Observations were made in both classrooms and less formal settings such as hallways, faculty meetings, and lounges.

Based on the data, Little identified four critical practices of successful schools: teachers are frequently engaged in talk about teaching, teachers were regularly observed and critiqued each other, teachers worked together to develop curricular materials, and they taught each other pedagogy. This study found that in successful schools all four of the critical practices occurred frequently. In the less successful schools the talk was not frequently of this nature. The frequency of the interactions assured that they would become habit.

In investigating the location of critical practice interactions, she found that rather than limiting the interactions to one particular location, they took place in many different locations. "Collegial experimentation is a way of life; it pervades the school" (p.332) is the way successful schools were described.

Describing the types of interactions that occurred in successful schools she explained,

Interactions pursued routinely in one school are considered out of line in another; interactions thought useful by one group of teachers may be dismissed as a waste of time by another; and involvements that receive official sanction and support in one school may go unrewarded in another (p.331).

She suggests that schools can be distinguished from one another by the types of interactions that occur and are encouraged, and concludes that the interactions classified as "critical" are those that are concrete and relate to teaching. However, this doesn't eliminate talk that is philosophical or theoretical as long as it relates to classroom practice.

Zahorik (1987) studied teacher interactions and compared the collegial behavior of teachers in six schools. He found that, on the average, teachers spent approximately 63 minutes per day conversing with other teachers. Of that time, 41 minutes or 63% related to teaching or other topics related to education.

Johnson and Johnson (1987) looked at the relative effectiveness of cooperative, competitive, and individual learning styles among adults. They defined the three situations that could occur among teachers. In a competitive situation one teacher is working against the other members for his/her own benefit. In an individualistic situation each member works as an individual and is rewarded as an individual. In a cooperative situation joint goals are established and members work together to reach them.

A meta-analysis of 133 studies with adult samples found that cooperative learning achieved better results than either competitive or individualistic learning. In disaggregating the data for achievement only, the cooperative situation provided higher achievement than either the competitive situation or the individual situation.

When required to produce a group product, the benefits of cooperative situations increased the results. Also, when asked to participate in activities requiring more than just rote decoding or correcting, the benefits of cooperation increased (Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, & Skon, 1981).

Johnson and Johnson (1987) also found that, in general, cooperative learning increased the relationships among adults and also increased the sense of support they felt. Self-esteem was found to be higher when learning occurred in cooperative situations rather than in competitive ones.

One of the outcomes of a peer coaching program is increased collaboration between teachers. For example, in a study by Sparks and Bruder (1987), an increase from 25% to 40% of the teachers indicated that they frequently discussed teaching with a colleague after they became a part of a peer coaching program. This was not always the case, however, as evidenced by the research conducted by McFaul and Cooper (1983) in an urban elementary setting. In this study teachers were trained in peer clinical supervision methods. Even after implementation, isolation and fragmentation of the teaching staff was still reported. The authors suggest that the

failure of teachers to become more collegial could have been based on the poor environment and the conditions of the school climate at that time.

In their study in Forest View High School in Illinois, Munro and Elliott (1987) also examined the change in the norms of collegiality after teachers were involved in a peer coaching program. They reported that in their evaluation of this program, 93% of the teachers who were interviewed said they had had more of an opportunity to talk about instructional methods with their colleagues. They cited several examples of inter-departmental team members working together to develop new instructional materials. These authors also addressed the feeling of reduced isolation. Teachers reported that their classrooms were wide open to other observers. One of their teachers reported that "my classroom had a revolving door, teachers were coming in and out of the classroom all the time and I wouldn't think twice about it" (p.27). In addition, teachers who were interviewed indicated that they found out that other teachers faced the same problems as they did and that other teachers had difficult students to deal with. Teachers felt that the coaching process they had participated in helped them to realize that they were good teachers and confirmed that the things they were doing in their classrooms were right.

Other benefits of increased collaboration and collegiality have been reported. They include staff harmony, increased respect between teachers and administrators, and an improved environment of professionalism for teachers (Smith, 1987). It has also been

reported that in collaborative schools new teachers are more easily assimilated into the teaching staff (Leggett & Hoyle, 1987b; Rosenholtz & Kyle, 1984). Johnson and Johnson (1987) reported that teachers who are involved in a collaborative process will have higher self-esteem, greater productivity, and will demonstrate more expertise. Finally, Rosenholtz and Kyle (1984) report that collaborative schools encourage greater experimentation, lower absenteeism and less teacher attrition, and a feeling of renewal.

### Conditions for Collaboration

Several researchers have investigated the conditions that are required to establish a collaborative environment. Prefacing discussions on conditions for collaboration is usually a reminder that schools by their very structure are not set up to make collaboration easy (Kent, 1987). All of the reported conditions have to do with the people involved rather than the facility or school structure. For example, it was found that collaborative schools involve teachers who feel a responsibility for the quality of education in their school, and who believe that improvement is always a goal, that teachers should be accountable for instructional outcomes, that a wide variety of teaching practices are valuable, and that teachers should be involved in decision-making. Collaborative schools are also places where there is a positive relationship between teachers and administrators. In addition, these schools must have a strong leader, someone who will help

establish a cooperative atmosphere, and someone who values teacher input in a variety of decisions (Smith, 1987).

Kent (1987) breaks the conditions needed for collaboration into two categories. The first he calls technical skills. These include using a shared common language, developing a focus for one or two issues or problems, demonstrating a willingness to rely on real evidence in decision-making, and working together to gather this evidence. The other category he terms social principles. These include being willing to be involved in two way communication, being aware of the intentions of the other person, and being sensitive to the knowledge and expertise of the other person. Finally, Johnson and Johnson (1987) suggest that results can be expected "only when groups have carefully structured positive interdependence, face-to-face interaction, personal responsibility, and periodic group processing" (p. 30).

### Resource Sharing

Teachers share ideas, experiences, and materials as a part of the collaborative process. The giving of ideas by one teacher to another is also known as resource sharing. In a study conducted in six elementary schools chosen to reflect a diversity in SES and school structure, Zahorik (1987), found that resource sharing differed among schools based on these two factors. Data were gathered through the use of semi-structured interviews and field notes. Teachers reported that they received help from other teachers an average of 266 times per year or approximately eight

times per week, and that they gave help 345 times per year or approximately ten times per week. In general, teachers felt that they gave more help than they received.

In reviewing the ways that teachers received help, they reported being helped with: materials, discipline, learning activities, individualization, evaluation, methods, objectives, reinforcing behavior, lecturing, questioning, and room organization. These responses are listed by frequency of response. The first four listed, materials, discipline, learning activities, and individualization, account for 70% of the help received by teachers. Each of these four are directly related to student actions, while the others on the list are related to teacher actions. Zahorik concludes that teachers are more willing to ask for help in changing student behavior than help in changing their own behavior.

Some of the reasons identified by teachers for the primary focus being the student were: "teacher behavior is comparatively unimportant, teacher behavior is personal and private, teacher behavior is idiosyncratic, teacher behavior is intuitive, and time and opportunity prevent exchange concerning teacher behavior" (Zahorik, 1987, p.390).

In this same study it was found that teachers tended to seek out teachers at the same grade level to go to for help. In fact, 75% of the time this was so. Teachers whose classrooms were located in close proximity were sought out 15% of the time, and teachers who were available at that particular time were sought out 13% of the time. The location of the interactions tended to be varied: in

formal meetings, at lunch, before and after classes, and on the playground.

In examining how SES relates to resource sharing, Zahorik looked at the effect of SES on the types of help sought by teachers and found that teachers in schools with a low SES tended to ask for more help with discipline. Teachers in schools with a high SES tended to ask for more help with individualization.

The data was also disaggregated for school structure. In schools that were considered traditional in structure, teachers more often received help with discipline, and in schools that had a team structure, teachers received more help with materials. In schools with a traditional structure, teachers more often gave help with materials. Teachers in schools with a team structure gave more help with individualization.

### Cooperative Professional Development

Thus, in an effort to reduce teacher isolation and improve the collaborative nature of the teaching profession, a trend toward cooperative professional development has recently occurred. One of the broadest explorations of the idea of teachers working together for improvement of teaching was described by Glatthorn (1987). He looks at the overall task of staff development and suggests five areas that can be performed cooperatively. He calls the first one professional dialogue. Teachers have guided discussions about an area of interest in the teaching field. The group meets once to decide when and where to meet and to plan an agenda of topics. The

meetings follow a specific order; the leader first summarizes research data and information, then the group analyzes the information and discusses how this fits in with their interpretation of the research. The last step in the process is for the group to look at the future and determine how this new information affects their current teaching practice.

A second type of cooperative professional development according to Glatthorn is used in curriculum development. He feels that the process of developing curriculum should be collaborative. A team of teachers should be involved when curriculum is being written. A third type of collaboration is peer supervision. This process involves observations by peers, collection of data during the observation, an interpretation of the collected data, and reciprocity between teachers. Another type of collaboration is peer coaching. This differs from peer supervision, according to Glatthorn, in that the training component is much more extensive. In peer coaching, teachers are trained in a new teaching technique. They then practice implementing that technique with another teacher observing them. The observing teacher provides feedback to help the classroom teacher be more effective.

The last type of collaboration discussed by Glatthorn is action research. In this process teachers define a problem, research the problem, and make decisions as a group about how to implement the applicable intervention in their own setting.

## Transfer of Training

As staff developers become more familiar with the characteristics of adult learning, they also must consider the importance of encouraging teachers to use the training they have received through inservice in their classrooms. As reported by Joyce and Showers (1981), "Transfer of training to the learning environment requires skillful decision making by the classroom teacher and redirection of behavior until the new skill is operating comfortably within the classroom" (p. 167).

Joyce and Showers (1980) analyzed over 200 studies about the training methods used for adults to determine which ones were most effective in transferring the training back to the classroom. They looked at two levels of training, fine-tuning skills that were already in use, and acquiring and understanding new skills. They found that being able to fine-tune a skill required less training than did the mastery of a new skill or teaching strategy.

Another of the areas that they studied was the difference between vertical and lateral transfer of skills. Lateral transfer occurs when the knowledge that has been acquired is used in a similar fashion but is applied in a new area. For example, teachers may learn how to use cooperative groups in reading and may then design similar lessons to teach mathematics. Vertical transfer occurs when new knowledge is sufficiently internalized so that it can be used in a different way in an new area. In this case the teacher may have been taught the concept of cooperative learning and may design an entirely new program for using the skills taught.

Joyce and Showers (1981) suggest that this vertical transfer of training is not likely to take place after inservice training for teachers unless a combination of training opportunities are offered.

In their research, Joyce and Showers (1980) have found that there are a variety of "levels of impact" (p.380), that training can have on teachers. The first of these is awareness of the new skill or information. This is followed by knowing concepts and organizing knowledge or by knowing the theory behind the idea or skill. The next level is acquiring the skill itself. This is followed by application and problem solving. Once this last level has been achieved, the teacher can effectively use the skill and knows when best to use it.

The components of training that Joyce and Showers (1980) have identified include presentation of theory, modeling or demonstration, practice under simulated conditions, feedback, and coaching. The first component, which includes becoming familiar with the theory behind the skill or strategy, is useful for either fine-tuning a skill or as a part of the process of mastering a new one.

Modeling or demonstrating can be conducted in a variety of ways, either in a simulated situation or through the use of video or television. This component helps the teacher to understand the theory that has been previously taught. Again, this component will help in fine-tuning a skill but is not sufficient itself in causing teacher to change behavior in the classroom.

Practicing a new skill under simulated conditions involves the teacher attempting to use the new skill. This component is effective for some people in allowing them to add the new skill to their teaching repertoire, but it is not sufficient for many other people.

The fourth component, providing feedback, can be broken down into two areas. The first is structured feedback. This component seems to be particularly effective when fine-tuning skills even in new situations. However, the feedback must be continued if the behavior is to continue. The other type of feedback that can be given is open-ended feedback. This is feedback which is not structured but that may occur in an informal discussion following a classroom observation.

The final component of the training process is coaching for application. Coaches can be other teachers or a variety of trained personnel who provide feedback and help the teacher to analyze this feedback. Joyce and Showers (1980) feel that it is this component that has the most impact on the transfer of new skills into a teacher's repertoire.

The data that is provided by the coach for the teacher can be the basis for analysis. The teacher can then reflect on his/her own teaching practices and make decisions about change. By having another person observe what is happening in the classroom, the teacher has a different view from an unbiased perspective. The observation process can be beneficial to both participants, the coach as well as the teacher. The observer can benefit from watching the

teacher and from the discussion of the feedback. Finally, once a teacher has been successful at implementing a change, the likelihood is that the teacher will continue to implement change in the classroom (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989).

Sparks (1983b) interprets the steps in training a little differently as: "diagnosing and prescribing, giving information and demonstrating, discussing application, practicing and giving feedback, and coaching" (p.67).

Research has been conducted to determine the effect of each of the components of training on its impact on teachers. Joyce and Showers (1988) divided the results of teacher training into three categories: knowledge, skill, and transfer of training. They include the following as training components: information, theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching. They found that, in general, the acquisition of a skill increases with the addition of more training components. For example, with the use of theory, demonstration, practice, and feedback, skill acquisition is more than double of what it is with providing theory alone. In addition they looked at how well teachers were able to use the skills in the classroom. That is, how often, how appropriately, and how well integrated. They found that the addition of theory, demonstration, and practice have no real impact on whether the skill is transferred into the teacher's repertoire. In fact there is only minimal transfer with the addition of feedback. It is not until the coaching component is added that real transfer occurs. They hypothesize that "fully elaborated training systems develop a 'learning to learn'

aptitude; that, in fact, individuals learn more efficiently over the long term by developing the metacognitions that enable self-teaching in settings where essential training elements are missing" (p.72).

In a model of coaching developed by Joyce and Showers (1982), teachers should be exposed to at least twenty to thirty hours of training which incorporates the theory. After this, the teachers should have the opportunity to observe demonstrations of this new technique at least fifteen to twenty times. Finally, teams should be formed to begin the process of coaching. This process allows teachers to try out the new technique and receive feedback from an observer. These monitored trials should take place ten to fifteen times before the teacher feels that this technique is a part of his/her repertoire.

In a study designed to examine the question of whether coaching increases the likelihood of transfer of training, Showers (1984) looked at a coaching program involving 21 teachers and six peer coaches over a five month period. Training results were based on a composite score that included ability to use the skill taught in training, appropriateness of selection of a skill, student comfort with the skill, and amount of practice. The first three were ranked on a scale of one to five and the last on a scale of one to three. Out of the possible eighteen points, coached teachers averaged 12.74 points, and uncoached teachers averaged 9.56 points. In addition, on tests of students for application of the skill, students in coached teachers' classes scored higher than those in uncoached teachers'

classes. This study also found that if the teachers had transferred the skill, then students were more likely to be able to use it. It also found that even if teachers used the skill frequently in class, if they hadn't transferred it to their own repertoire, then students didn't use it as well. It is important to note that the transfer process involves a cognitive transfer as well as a willingness to use the skill (Showers, 1984; Showers, 1987).

Teachers in Stokes County Schools became involved in a peer coaching program whose initial focus was to facilitate the transfer of training in the use of manipulatives in mathematics. They used the coaching process in conjunction with the necessary training in using manipulatives in the classroom. Using a questionnaire and pre- and post-tests to measure how well teachers understood the use of manipulatives and their level of concern in using them, a positive result was found. Coached teachers understood the use of the manipulatives, used them more often, and expressed less concern about their use than uncoached teachers. In addition, teachers involved in the program also had a better understanding of the goals they were to accomplish and felt more comfortable with not finishing the book (Williamson & Russell, 1990).

Madeline Hunter's teacher decision-making model was the focus for follow up peer coaching sessions in Sulphur Springs Elementary School District in Canyon Country, California. In addition to increasing the transfer of training, this district hoped to improve the collegial and professional discussion by their teachers and to improve instruction in the classroom. During the second year

of implementation of this training, a coaching program involving the assistant superintendent was begun. The third year of implementation was the beginning of the peer coaching program. The district reports that the peer coaching was implemented and has kept the use of Hunter's model alive in the district (Desrochers & Klein, 1990).

Using a slightly different slant, teachers in Fort Worth, Texas, used peer coaching as a follow up to training beginning in 1984. Unlike other peer coaching projects whose training was devoted to one specific skill, teachers involved in this project received training in a variety of areas. They included: planning, writing objectives, task analysis, and developing formative and summative tests. Teachers could also elect to take training in classroom management, motivating students, student participation, and Bloom's taxonomy (Leggett & Hoyle, 1987a).

Showers (1985) also describes the effects of training: teachers practice the new skill more frequently, they use it more appropriately, they are able to retain the information for a longer period of time, and they are better able to teach it to their students. They "exhibit clearer cognitions with regard to purposes and uses of the new strategy" (p. 42).

Other things that contribute to the transfer of training include: discussing the transfer problem during training, becoming as skillful as possible during training, and developing "executive control, that is a 'meta-understanding' about how the model works,

how it can be fitted into the instructional repertoire, and how it can be adapted to students" (Joyce & Showers, 1982, p.6).

### Peer Coaching Models

Many different models have been suggested for implementing peer coaching programs. Each model has been developed to facilitate a specific purpose. Some models suggest that the coach should have more expertise than the observed teacher; others are designed so that the two are very much peers. Some peer coaching models are strongly linked to training in a new method or skill; others are flexible about the content of the coached material.

Bruce Joyce suggests that the peer model is more effective because teachers actually practice new skills, unlike the experts who don't have a regular classroom to do so (Brandt, 1987). Similarly, Russell and Spafford (1986), suggest that, "It is the experience of teaching that permits the sharing of meaning in analyzing and interpreting classroom events and in developing new possibilities for action" (p. 5).

Joyce and Showers (1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1987, 1988) are known for a specific model of peer coaching. According to Joyce and Showers, the main purpose of coaching is to transfer the skills that are acquired during staff development training. Using this model teachers are grouped into teams and work in a cyclical process to observe and give feedback to each other. The process is linked to training in a particular skill or strategy. In many cases a clinical

assessment form is developed and used to record data during the observation. The observer records the behavior observed and makes a determination regarding the extent to which it occurs. As the team works together for a period of time they will begin to discuss the appropriateness of the use of a particular strategy.

Garmston (1987) describes three different models which can be used for peer coaching, each with a different purpose. The first is called technical coaching. This type is similar to the Joyce and Showers peer coaching model in that it requires extensive training in a new technique or methodology. Here again, the purpose is to help teachers transfer a new technique into their repertoire. Unlike the Joyce and Showers model, technical coaching requires more value judgement by the observing teacher. The feedback is more evaluative in nature since the observer records not only the presence of a characteristic but also a determination of to what degree it is present. The model itself involves a pre- and post-conference along with the observation, also similar to the Joyce and Showers model. This model is most likely to help transfer the skills learned through training.

The second model defined by Garmston is collegial coaching. Teachers participate in a pre- and post-conference along with each observation. Instead of linking coaching to training in a particular skill, the observed teacher chooses the technique to be practiced. The coach provides feedback to the observed teacher, and the observed teacher determines whether the goals have been met. Thus, the observer makes no value judgments. One of the benefits of

this model is increased collegiality and is, therefore, recommended if school culture is to be changed.

The third model defined by Garmston is challenge coaching. In this model a problem is defined by the participating teachers. After conducting action research, a solution is identified and defined. The group then implements the solution to the problem. In this case the purpose is to use groups to solve pervasive problems.

Barnes and Murphy (1987) describe a model for high school teachers that can be used to replace the formal evaluation process. Teams are developed with three or four teachers from different departments. The teachers are trained over a ten day summer session. During the year substitutes are hired so that team members can observe each other. Since its inception over 90% of the teachers have participated in the program.

Some of the suggestions given for a successful program are to make sure that the process is not judgmental, to have the teams agree to work together, to have a certified administrator on each team, to diversify the team's academic background, to allow teams to work together for a two year period, to strive for six observations a semester (two per teacher), to conduct pre-observation conferences, to select one person as chairperson, to allow teams to determine their own procedures, and to have all of the teams from the same school select a common focus or theme (Barnes & Murphy, 1987).

Interesting results occurred in a study about the relative benefits of expert and peer coaches where teachers were divided

into three groups: control group, a group observed by peers, and a group coached by trainers. The results showed that peer observation is more effective than either being coached by a trainer or being in the control group. Additional factors that may have impacted the results included the fact that under normal circumstances, teachers rarely have an opportunity to observe another teacher, that during this study the peer observers were involved in analyzing and coding feedback, and that the peer groups seemed to have a higher morale and a greater sense of trust and self-esteem (Sparks, 1986).

In studying the benefits of an expert coach compared to a peer coach, in Oroville, California, the decision was made to use one of their own teachers. This teacher was given a year's training before coaching. They made this decision after looking at the benefits of using a teacher; the person has more credibility and there is less likelihood that the program will be linked to evaluation. They also realized that experts were more costly to the district. Thus, one of their own teachers was given a paid one year leave of absence to be trained in teaching and coaching strategies. The training consisted of working with a regional professional development center, first as an observer and then as a trainer. After the year of training this person was assigned to work with seven new teachers. New teachers were given three days of training prior to the beginning of the school year, and the mentor helped coach the teachers throughout the year.

Kent (1985) describes a program where teachers take two different roles, one is a teacher advisor and the other is a peer

facilitator. The teacher advisor is a full- or half-time position paid at the regular teacher's salary. The peer facilitator position is a stipended position for regular teachers. In this case the model was developed on the concept that there are two kinds of collaboration that they wished to encourage. The first kind of collaboration involved developing a technical language. The second type of collaboration was of a social nature involving the development of a trust relationship. The purpose of these two new roles was to link resources, to facilitate curriculum and instruction planning and implementation, to help train teachers, to act as a colleague/coach, and to supervise teachers.

An attempt was made in California to link staff development and coaching in a model similar to the Joyce and Shower's model. A training/coaching program was developed that was cyclical. That is, the teachers prepared for and discussed observations in their training workshops. Pre- and post-observation conference training was conducted after teachers had had an opportunity to observe in each other's classrooms. Instruments for collecting data during observations were explained in the workshops prior to the observation. It was thought that this helped to alleviate the anxiety of getting and giving feedback (Mohlman, Kierstead, & Gundlach, 1982).

New teacher training was the focus for a coaching program in one model. This school district had year-round schooling so teachers are either on-track or off-track. Trained coaches were assigned two new teachers to coach during their first year of

teaching. The new teachers were given a full week of training prior to the opening of school. The coach observed each new teacher two times per month. Benefits of this model included increased collegiality for new teachers and improved instruction (Moffett, St. John, & Isken, 1987).

Knowing that there are benefits to using peers as coaches, a California district decided to train selected teachers as coaches. The criteria for selection included: observation skills, analytical ability, self-confidence, creativity, flexibility, interpersonal relations, and responsibility. Seven teacher advisors were selected. These advisors were then available to any teacher who went through a district training program and wished to have a coach for follow-up. The coaches worked with the newly trained teachers to help them implement the skills correctly and consistently. Several other factors were noted as having an impact on the process. The first was accountability; teachers who were working with advisors were more likely to practice the newly acquired skills. The second was the support and companionship the coach provided. The last factor was the impact of specific feedback that teachers were given when implementing the skill (Servatius & Young, 1985).

A model using support groups for teaching teams was developed by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory. Teachers were assigned to teams of two or three teachers. Support groups consisted of three to four teaching teams. They met on a regular basis every two to four weeks. Their purpose was to provide support, professional guidance, and practical help. During the

meetings they discussed observations that have taken place since the last meeting and determined the focus for future observations (Hutchins et al, 1984-85).

McFaul and Cooper (1984) describe a collaborative process that did not prove to be successful. Twelve teachers were involved in a clinical supervision model as a part of a semester long graduate course. As a part of their training teachers learned how to develop instruments for data collection, conduct conferences, use videotape equipment, and analyze data. The researchers found, however, that the application of the model was superficial, and in-depth analysis only occurred 20% of the time. They suggested that the teachers "appeared to honor an unwritten agreement that no one would be made uncomfortable in the process" (p.7).

A variety of other models are reported in the literature. In one case a district decided to use a coaching model for formative evaluation and to have administrators conduct the summative evaluation. Separate instruments were developed which could be used to report information (Christen & Murphy, 1987).

In another district's model, the coach acted as a team teacher, actually helping teach the class. The two teachers planned, taught, and evaluated the lesson together. In this study several characteristics of successful coaches were reported. They found that the coach should be more knowledgeable about the topic than the teacher. This model used specialists in the subject area as coaches. They also felt that coaches should be credible, that they must be good teachers themselves. They felt that while the coach

should support and facilitate the lesson, the teacher must continue to be in control of the classroom. Finally, coaches must be accessible and available to the classroom teachers (Neubert & Bratton, 1987).

One of the concerns of schools that have begun coaching programs is releasing teachers from class to observe other teachers. There is, of course, a financial impact in having to hire substitutes and many teachers don't like to leave their classrooms. One district overcame this problem by purchasing videotape equipment. Teachers videotaped each other and then met to review the tapes (Rogers, 1987).

Another unique model was developed by a school district where there were great distances between schools. Teachers used tele-conferences to follow-up their observations (Hauwiller, 1986).

### Training for Coaching

When implementing a peer coaching program, most districts train the teachers who participate in the coaching process. Showers (1985) feels that the coaching component of training should occur simultaneously with the other skill training. Thus, as a skill is taught, it is also demonstrated and modeled in the workshop. Participating teachers then have an opportunity to try the skill, give, and receive feedback from other teachers. A second level of training occurs as teachers work together in follow-up sessions several weeks after the initial training. Again, the focus is on implementing the skills taught in previous training with the

workshop leaders modeling how to facilitate collegial discussions regarding the skills being discussed. Thus, the focus is on modeling the appropriate coaching behavior in a specific situation rather than on being trained in the coaching process.

In the research she conducted about transfer of training, Showers (1984) reported the need for additional time dedicated to role playing in the training process for coaching. While this was originally identified by teachers as the least valuable part of the training, they changed their minds after being involved in the coaching process.

Servatius and Young (1985) explore this type of process training more thoroughly. During the first phase of process training, theory is presented. The group learns how to have a pre-observation conference, how to take notes and make an observation, how to give feedback during the post-observation conference, and how to facilitate collegiality. This initial training is followed by a second phase during which each of these skills is practiced. Trainers then observe the teachers going through each of the steps in the process and provide feedback to the involved teachers. Finally, teachers are paired with trainers to do more practice with volunteer teachers.

In the Sulphur Springs elementary district, teachers were trained in a four day period in the Cogan-Goldhammer clinical supervision model. They were also trained in script-taping, labeling, and conferencing skills (Desrochers & Klein, 1990).

In the program described by Leggett and Hoyle (1987a), teachers were given six hours of training in coaching after twelve

hours of core training in instructional strategies. This training included information on the reasons for coaching and provided the opportunity for teachers to practice observation skills, script-taping, and giving feedback. In addition the teachers viewed videotaped lessons and critiqued them for the skills they had learned in their previous training. The workshop itself provided an opportunity for teachers to try out some of these coaching skills on each other.

Raney and Robbins (1989) developed a seven day workshop in training for coaching. The workshop covered theory about coaching, a description of models, observation instruments, relationships, conferencing skills, communication skills, and change theory. Teachers were given released time to participate in the training program.

One of the biggest hurdles faced in the training process in Richmond County, Georgia, was that teachers found it difficult to believe that their students were capable of learning more than had been previously expected of them. The researchers felt that one of the benefits of the collaborative process was recognition that students are capable of more than is expected and that they can be taught to be better learners (Murphy, Murphy, Joyce, & Showers, 1988).

### Implementation of Coaching

When a school or district decides to begin a peer coaching program, planning is essential. Glatthorn (1987) suggests that

planning be started at the district level with a planning team of district administrators, supervisors, principals, and teachers. This team should develop the guidelines for use, including deciding what training to offer, which teachers will participate, how to provide time, how the program will be evaluated, and who will coordinate and administer the program. Each school should then decide how and when to start the new program in their building. This proposal then goes back to the district committee for revision and modification, and it is then that implementation begins.

According to Glatthorn, there are several things that successful programs have in common. Leadership must be strong at both the district and the building level. There must be a trust established between teachers and administrators, and there should be no link between coaching and evaluation. It is important that necessary resources be provided. The focus should be on teaching. School structure may have to be adapted, such as rewriting the school schedule, or relocating some classrooms.

Another implementation plan is described by Paquette (1987) about the formation of the Effective Schools/Professional Development Committee in Calgary, Canada. This committee was responsible for the professional development of 93 teachers responsible for 1,700 high school students. The nine people comprising the committee decided that planning was important in arranging for professional development as was collegial support.

They began with a pilot program in 1986 by asking for a maximum of thirty volunteers who would be divided into groups of

eight to ten teachers. The groups would meet regularly to discuss issues of importance to group members.

The first step in implementing the program was to establish groups and begin to develop skills that would be used in the group process. Phase one included discussion of process skills, self-assessment, and planning for improvement. During phase two, each group met on a monthly basis for at least three hours. During this time a new idea or strategy was introduced and time was spent in discussing on how to most effectively use that strategy in the individual classrooms. The last phase was a wrap-up time for teacher to explore how the groups impacted their teaching. The overall feedback from the teachers about this new program was very positive.

Another peer coaching project began in New York in 1984. Four experienced teachers implemented what they called the Collegial Interaction Process. This program involved allowing time to discuss background research about a specific topic in education. The discussion was followed by a pre-conference, during which teachers discussed the purpose of the the lesson they were about to observe. Then, a videotape of the lesson was made while one teacher also script tapes a written record. Afterwards, the teacher who has been observed views the tape for the purpose of self-evaluation. The team then reassembles to critique the lesson. During the critique, teachers emphasize the positive things that happened and give suggestions to the observed teacher. The entire team then practices this new technique (Anastos & Ancowitz, 1987).

Desrochers and Klein (1990) provide a number of suggestions for implementation based on their experiences. They suggest that the program be run by the teachers and that teachers be responsible for planning and implementation. Mentor teachers were used to coordinate all activities related to coaching in their program. The mentor teacher also held bimonthly meetings for teachers who participated in the program. Desrochers and Klein also felt that the principal is important to the success of the program and should help with the financial and organizational problems and should lend support by modeling desired behaviors.

Teacher participation can be encouraged and rewarded. Newsletters, collegial support meetings, and professional contact are several rewards that peer coaching programs can offer. Teachers should select with whom they work as this increases the likelihood that there will be trust relationships established. Some teams may choose to stay together for an extended period of time, others may switch more regularly.

Teachers should be trained in a variety of data collection techniques so that they can choose the one that best meets their needs. The teacher who is being observed should be the one who brings up problems in the post-conference. There must be complete confidentiality throughout the process (Desrochers & Klein, 1990).

Munro and Elliott (1987) make the following recommendations based on their experience. They suggest that participants should be aware of the purposes of the program, administrators should support the program with careful planning, participation should be

voluntary, some kind of incentive should be offered for participation, the teachers should determine the instructional goals for the program, training for providing feedback should be offered, a structure for observations and feedback conferences should be developed, participants from all teams should meet to discuss the program, teams should change over time to vary the feedback, and someone should be responsible for coordinating the teams, schedule, and classroom coverage.

### The Role of the Principal

Since this is a teacher oriented process, the question about the role of administrators is a natural one. The principal can be responsible for helping in the planning of the program and establishing priorities. Other administrative duties can also be done by the principal such as assisting in finding resources for training and implementation, and helping with the overall administration of the program. For example, the principal may need to help by hiring substitutes and changing schedules (Garmston, 1987; Leggett & Hoyle, 1987a; Showers, 1985). In addition, the principal should recognize and reward teacher participation by public discussion of the importance and value of the process (Garmston, 1987; Showers, 1985). Finally, the principal should help form the teams of teachers, and should organize and support meetings (Showers, 1985).

The principal can also help by creating a climate which will nurture the coaching process, a climate where collegiality and

experimentation are the norm, not the exception. This involves modeling and describing expected behaviors. An attitude of high expectations and constant improvement should be created (Brandt, 1987; Hutchins, et al., 1983; Leggett & Hoyle, 1987a). Principals should also be available to discuss problems as they occur (Raney & Robbins, 1989).

When principals are involved in the process, teachers report that more interest is shown in the program and that teacher morale is higher. In addition, the quality of suggestions made during feedback has reportedly been higher (Williams, 1986).

By participating in a similar collegial program, the principal should also model desired behavior (Garmston, 1987). For example, a similar program for principals is reported by Gibble and Lawrence (1987). Principals are teamed together to observe each other. During the evaluation process for teachers, they both observe the teacher and plan for feedback. Only one principal, however, holds the post-observation conference with the teacher. Principals who have participated in this program report reduced isolation and increased expertise in providing feedback to teachers. In another similar program, Barnett (1985) suggests that principals can become more reflective and analytical when working with a peer.

### Benefits of Peer Coaching

In addition to the increase in collaboration and transfer of training, other benefits have been attributed to peer coaching programs. Using the Paragraph Completion Method to assess the

conceptual level of teachers, Phillips and Glickman (1991) found that coaching increased the conceptual level of teachers from 1.89 to 2.033,  $p < .05$ . In the same study an increase in conceptual level was also found in three of five teacher teams on the Reflective Teaching Index, however, the difference was not at a significant level. Teachers reported a slight increase in the number of interactions they had with other teachers, excluding peer coaching interactions. They also reported a slight increase in the number of instances where they gave and received help, and a decrease in the average number of minutes involved in interactions.

Thies-Sprinthall (1984) also studied the increase in the developmental level of teachers when involved in a coaching process. The conditions found to promote psychological growth included experiencing a different role, guided reflection, a balance between the experience itself and the reflection about it, and making coaching a continuous process.

Coaches benefit from the process as well. The opportunity to observe colleagues has proven valuable (Roper, Deal & Dornbusch, 1976; Rorschach & Whitney, 1986; Smith, 1986). Showers (1984) reports, "Peer coaches uniformly believed they had learned more and grown more than their trainees as a result of the coaching experience. Four of the peer coaches also believed they had achieved greater collegiality with their peers because the coaching conferences had established new norms for what they discussed with their peers" (pp. 24-25). Anastos and Ancowitz (1987) found

that by observing other teachers, coaches added new techniques to their repertoire.

In studying the effect of coaching on teachers, Freiberg, Waxman, and Houston (1987) found that coaching was relatively effective for experienced teachers in improving instruction.

Leggett and Hoyle (1987b) attribute an improvement in school climate to the collegial nature of coaching. They also suggest that new teachers find it easier to teach in buildings with coaching programs. Finally, they feel that instruction improves when coaching programs are introduced. "Teachers' increased sense of efficacy has helped them to overcome their isolation and open their classroom to the potential of professional sharing" (p.63).

In studying the allocation of class time, Showers (1984) found that coaching changed the way teachers used their class time. Significantly less time was spent in structuring behavior; a change from 37% to 21-29% was recorded. Also, an increase was noted in the amount of time spent processing information and the number of higher order tasks, from 49% to 59-64%.

Increased use of innovations was reported in a study by Sparks and Bruder (1987). Teachers were asked to estimate how often they tried something new before they participated in a peer coaching program, and again, after participation. They reportedly went from 54% to 70% as a result of participation. They also reported increased confidence in trying new strategies, from 35% to 67%, and an increased chance that they would try something a second time if it didn't work the first time, from 13% to 59%.

An evaluation of the peer coaching program implemented in Arlington Heights, Illinois, found that 97% of the teachers who had participated in their program reported that they had accomplished the instructional goals they had set, and that 88% felt that peer coaching made a significant difference in their instruction from the previous year. Also, 94% reported that peer coaching had been more helpful to them than classroom supervision (Munro & Elliott, 1987).

### The Relationship to Evaluation

Showers (1985) has written about the relationship of coaching and evaluating. While the coaching model is by its structure similar to the supervision process, she believes that the two must be kept separate. One of the purposes of coaching is to provide a support base for teachers as they experiment with new strategies in their classrooms. It is important that the coaching process be far removed from the traditional concept of teacher evaluation if teachers are to feel comfortable about experimentation. For coaching to be successful and to flourish, the environment must be safe for teachers to experiment.

Contradictory examples have been found in the literature. For example, Barnes and Murphy (1987) suggest that the coaching model replace the formal evaluation process. In their model, Christen and Murphy (1987) suggest that peer coaching replace the formative evaluation component. Glatthorn (1987) disagrees and feels that it is important to keep the two processes separate.

### Teacher Job Satisfaction

When asked why they stay in the teaching profession, teachers most often cite intrinsic rewards as the reasons. These rewards include student achievement, the student-teacher relationship, the satisfaction of providing public service, and the collegial interactions and professional growth (Zahorik, 1987). Similar intrinsic factors are described by Rosenholtz and Smylie (1984) as being identified as reasons people select teaching as a career. These factors include the importance of helping children learn and the desire to work with others.

Several studies have examined the reasons why some teachers leave the teaching profession and why other teachers stay. These reasons can be clustered into two similar categories, extrinsic and intrinsic. Extrinsic factors included financial rewards, lack of time, low status of the teaching profession, poor opportunities for advancement (Litt & Turk, 1985), the fact that earning potential peaks early, and lack of upward mobility in career stages (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984). Intrinsic factors included a sense of efficacy about one's ability to help students (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984), job challenge or lack of it, and recognition by others (Chapman & Lowther, 1982).

Rosenholtz and Smylie (1984) found that teachers who left the profession felt that they lacked support from the administration and that they were unable to deal with poor student behavior. Rates of attrition were highest in inner-city schools which were deemed to be ineffective as evidenced by student achievement measures. They

also found that attrition was highest in the first few years and attributed this to the lack of collegial help for new teachers.

Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) found that those leaving the profession placed a higher value on autonomy and salary while those who stayed did not feel that these factors were as important. People who stayed rated recognition by others as more important. Teachers who stayed in the profession seemed to have better organizational skills while those who left had better analytical skills. They also found that high school teachers who left felt that they had the ability to work with others in a cooperative situation and tended to go into careers which involved this type of work.

Chapman and Lowther (1982) have suggested that "what initially appears as autonomy is felt by many teachers as isolation" (p.242). Several factors that Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) found to impact isolation were the fact that most teachers felt that they were bound to a particular curriculum and that they must use a specific textbook. They also found that throughout a teacher's career daily activities remained the same. Finally, they found that teachers were influenced by the perception that student performance as measured by standardized tests was the way that their own performance was judged.

Chapman and Lowther's (1982) study of teacher satisfaction found that it was influenced by teachers' personal characteristics, their abilities, what criteria they use to judge their own success, and their professional accomplishments. They emphasize the importance of job challenge and the recognition given by others.

They further recommend that teachers be given increased leadership opportunities and be encouraged to continue their own scholarly work to increase satisfaction.

Wildman and Niles (1987b) found that when decisions are made for teachers regarding materials, content, and method, that the teaching process was unstimulating. This sometimes caused teachers to leave the profession. They found that collaboration improved the opportunity for teachers to reflect on their teaching practices but that the conditions that currently exist in most schools do not encourage teacher reflection. Roseholtz and Smylie (1984) agree. They suggest that in schools where collegiality is the norm, teachers own sense of efficacy can contribute to their desire to remain in teaching.

### Motivation

Based on data gathered in a study of what motivated engineers and accountants, updated with research involving a variety of other types of workers, and an extensive review of similar studies, Frederick Herzberg developed his motivation-hygiene theory about motivating workers (Herzberg,1976; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957). Prior to this time, most theories on the subject assumed a hierarchical nature to the kinds of things that motivated workers. For example, Maslow grouped human needs into the following categories: physiological needs, safety needs, need to belong, need for esteem, and the need for self-actualization. He

believed that once a lower order need was satisfied it would no longer act as a motivator of behavior (Maslow, 1954).

While Herzberg recognized similar needs acted as motivators, he didn't believe in the same hierarchical framework. His theory is based on the assumption that "biological and psychological needs of man are parallel systems, rather than either one assuming initial importance" (Herzberg, 1976, p. 48).

Based on his research, Herzberg believed that the factors that made workers satisfied with their job were very different than those that would produce dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1976). He said,

When our respondents reported feeling happy with their jobs, they most frequently described factors related to their tasks, to events that indicated to them that they were successful in the performance of their work, and to the possibility of professional growth. Conversely, when feelings of unhappiness were reported, they were not associated with the job itself but with conditions that surround the doing of the job (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959, p. 113).

Thus, he tried to classify the environmental conditions that could lead to worker dissatisfaction. These he called hygiene factors, and they included: supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies and administrative practices, benefits and job security. All of these factors could lead to worker dissatisfaction if they were not satisfactorily available. On the other hand, these factors could not be used to motivate workers (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

Factors that could be used to motivate workers were called motivators, and they included: growth, advancement, responsibility, work itself, recognition for achievement, and achievement. These are intrinsic to the job. He found that the most important motivators were found the least often. On the other hand, he found that each of the hygiene factors was equally important to workers (Herzberg, 1976).

The importance of this research is the change in perspective on how employees are motivated. Rather than putting the emphasis on extrinsic motivators such as salary and benefits, employers should be looking at the intrinsic factors of a job. Only performance itself can bring rewards (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

In further differentiating hygiene factors from motivating factors, Herzberg notes that improvements in the area of hygiene are short term and motivating improvements are long term. He also explains that there are an infinite number of things that can be related to hygiene but only a small number of sources of motivation. Hygiene needs are cyclical and motivating factors are additive (Herzberg, 1976).

In a study on motivation related specifically to teachers, Rosenholtz and Smylie (1984) found that effective teachers were most often motivated by leadership opportunities and opportunities for recognition and approval. They also found that the following things motivated teachers to improve: a collegial setting, a professional culture, and support from other teachers. Ponzio

(1987) also found that teacher partnerships increased teacher motivation to investigate and improve classroom activities.

### Chapter Summary

This review of the literature establishes a reason for developing a collaborative school culture by identifying the benefits to instruction and student performance. Additionally, the conditions needed to establish such a culture are examined.

Several examples of professional development based on a collaborative model are examined including the peer coaching model. The impact of peer coaching on professional development is explored and benefits for participation are identified. In particular, studies that relate to the increase in transfer of training are presented.

The process of peer coaching is also examined with an emphasis on the factors necessary to establish and implement such a program. Various models, the necessary training, the role of the administration, and the relationship to evaluation are all factors that must be considered by schools or districts who intend to begin such a program.

Finally, research on teacher satisfaction and motivation is explored. If, in fact, such a program increases satisfaction and/or motivation, it would be important to know why. Also, one of the components of this study is to examine what motivates teachers to participate in such a program. Research on motivation is examined in this light.

## CHAPTER III

### Methodology

The purpose of this study was to investigate through an ethnographic approach a successful peer coaching program for teachers. In determining the best method to use in investigating this problem, a number of factors were considered. If successful programs were numerous, it would be natural to do a comparative analysis. However, this is not the case. In fact, when first developing a research question and hypothesis, several sites were investigated. Each of these five sites had been previously identified as having a peer coaching program in place. When contacted about their programs, four of the five were no longer being implemented. Therefore, a case study approach was used to investigate one particular program which had been in place for a period of eight years. This program has been deemed "successful" because of its longevity and also because it was supported by both administrators and teachers in the district. Data about this peer coaching program were gathered through the use of participant observation, interviews, and document review. Specific attention was paid to the model used and the training program in an effort to "capture" the essence of the collegial relationship. The research questions which guided this investigation were:

1. What motivates teachers to become involved and to stay involved in this program?

2. What are the teachers' perceptions about how the program affects collegiality?
3. According to the teachers, how does the program affect instruction and resource sharing?
4. What are the benefits reported by administrators?
5. What are the characteristics of a successful training component?

This chapter describes the investigative process from entry into the site through the data collection. Further, a description of the process used to analyze the acquired data is explained. The names of the schools and participants are fictitious to provide anonymity.

### The Research Site

This investigation was conducted in a large suburban high school district in northern Illinois. Two high schools make up the district and serve 2,780 students. Xavier High School serves 1,560 students whose ethnic background include 87.8% white, 4.5% black, 4.7% Hispanic, 2.9% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 0.1% Native American. It has an enrollment of 3.7% low-income students and 2.1% limited-English proficient students. York High School serves 1,220 students whose ethnic background include 94.8% white, 0.5% black, 4.0% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 0.1% Native American. It has an enrollment of 0.3% low-income students and 0.0% limited-English proficient students.

The district employs 201 teachers, with an average level of experience of 19.1 years. Teachers who hold a Master's degree or above compose 87.5% of the staff. Further demographic information is found in Appendix A.

Prior to the start of this study, multiple sites were considered. Each site had been considered because of its involvement in a peer coaching program, however, when the time came to begin data collection, the programs had been discontinued for one reason or another. This research, therefore, took on a different focus than originally expected. The problem was changed to investigate the specific reasons this peer coaching program has continued to be supported by teachers and administrators for eight years.

This site was not chosen because it was typical, but because of its unique feature of having had a successful peer coaching program in existence for eight years. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) discuss the ramifications of choosing an unusual situation rather than a typical case for a case study investigation. While the generalizability of the results may suffer, this is not always the case. It was the nature of the problem that led to the decision to choose a less than typical site to study.

### A Brief Description of the Program

While Chapter IV will include details about the history of the program and the model used, certain information is important to understanding the choice of methodology. Therefore, a brief

description of the program is included for clarity. This program was developed by a group of teachers in an effort to share experiences, problems, and successes in their teaching and is open to anyone who wishes to participate. A recruitment drive is held each spring. Teachers call the program Collegial Consultation. Participation is strictly voluntary and it is estimated that approximately 40% of the district's teachers have participated at some time.

In this program teams of teachers work together in the collegial process. One teacher acts as team leader and this person helps with the administrative duties and facilitates the process. Three other teachers comprise the rest of the team. All team members are involved in each cycle, that is, three teachers observe one teacher. The process consists of six steps: the pre-observation conference, the observation, the strategy session, the feedback conference, the process conference, and the post-observation conference. During each cycle a team member is assigned to be the process observer, another to be the feedback coordinator, and a third to conduct the post-observation conference. This cycle is built on a variety of models but represents a model that this district developed to meet the needs of this particular program.

Administrative support is given in many forms including helping with training and facilitating the process. This is done by both administrators and by releasing a teacher from part of his teaching load to have the time to do the variety of tasks involved. Again, this will be discussed in depth in Chapter IV.

## Entry

Both Bogdan and Biklen (1982) and Schatzman and Strauss (1973) suggest that careful consideration be given to entry into the site, beginning with making the initial contact to receive permission to conduct research. They suggest making informal inquiries to discover who the "gatekeeper" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 121) is, that is the person who ultimately has the ability to grant permission for the investigation.

After making informal inquiries, it became apparent that in this case the person whose permission was needed was the Executive Director for Instruction. A simple phone call was all it took to receive both permission and support in obtaining access to the desired information and subjects. It is suspected that the people involved in this program in this district are proud of their accomplishments and are not only interested in sharing their results but also in becoming recognized for their program. This became even more evident in viewing a recently made videotape about the program in which one of the topics discussed was the fact that this program was currently being studied as a part of a doctoral dissertation. In addition to permission to interview teachers and administrators, an invitation was extended to observe the summer training workshop and collegial cycles in the upcoming school year.

Once permission for the research had been granted, contact was made with the person who serves as the district coordinator for the program. This person supplied needed information about the participants, the summer workshop, and general documents about

the program itself. This person became an important liaison. His initial letter is found in Appendix B.

The summer workshop provided an ideal opportunity to meet many of the participants on an informal basis. This workshop is attended by all new participants and by the five team leaders for the collegial teams. As will be described in Chapter IV, this workshop is the beginning of the establishment of a trust relationship among the participants. By being there as an observer, this researcher was able to meet and establish a relationship that would make the interviews that followed much easier.

### Subjects

For the 1991-92 school year there are seventeen teachers who are returning participants and four teachers new to the program. They represent both schools and a variety of departments within each school.

In addition, there are a number of key people who are involved in the program. They include the Executive Director for Instruction, the District Coordinator, and a resource person. The resource person is the person who originally brought the idea of this program to her colleagues and to the administration. Since then, she has taken a position in administration as a Department Chairperson and is no longer an actual participant. However, she continues to be a part of the summer training program and the semi-yearly inservices for participants.

The Executive Director for Instruction acts as the administrative liaison for the program. He conducts part of the summer training program and participates as an observer of the program. Since staff development is a part of his job, he is a key person in terms of training and support.

The District Coordinator is a teacher who has been involved in the program from the beginning. When it became apparent that someone needed to be responsible for the administration of the program, he was given the job. In this role, he recruits participants, is the primary trainer during the summer workshop, takes care of the paperwork and materials involved, coordinates substitutes, and conducts the evaluation of the program. In addition, he participates as an observer and helps solve any problems that arise as a part of the program.

## Data Collection

### Interviews

Interviews with administrators and participating teachers make up the majority of data for this study. Interviews were semi-structured so that data could be compared across subjects, but leeway was allowed so that subjects could discuss issues of importance to them. Examples of questions are found in Appendix C.

Teacher interviews were conducted early in the 1991-92 school year. Initial contact was made by way of a letter of introduction (see Appendix D). A follow-up phone call was made to determine willingness to be interviewed and an appropriate time and

place. Interviews were scheduled either before or after school, or during a planning period. Therefore, in many cases, a time limit was imposed on the interview. An attempt was made to interview each of the new participants, each of the team leaders, and a number of other teachers who represented a cross section of participants. For example, an effort was made to interview a teacher from each department from each of the two schools. Subjects were selected based on these criteria and on willingness to be interviewed.

Interviews covered four areas: decision to become involved in the program, effect of the program on collegiality, teacher satisfaction/motivation, and effect of the program on instruction. These topics were selected based on the research questions originally posed. Questions varied as multiple interviews were conducted and as theories evolved.

Administrative interviews were conducted during the summer of 1991 and the beginning of the 1991-92 school year. The District Coordinator represented both an administrative perspective and a teacher perspective. Therefore, his interview data was categorized in two different ways.

In selecting subjects for administrator interviews, two factors were considered. The first was to choose administrators who had had enough contact with the program to provide a personal perspective. The second was to choose a diverse enough selection to be representative of the administrative staff in the district. Therefore, three key people were selected. The first was the District Coordinator since he supplied information that was

unavailable from any other source. The second was the resource person who had begun the program as a teacher. Her perspective as administrator was valuable as was her information about the history of the program. Finally, the Executive Director for Instruction was targeted as having key information about staff development. In addition, one of the two principals was interviewed along with two additional department chairpeople.

One of the questions addressed in the review of the literature is the role of the administrator in such a program. By interviewing key administrators it was hoped that some analogies could be made to some of the models in the literature. It is interesting to note that this was a concern that came to light during the training process and thus pursued during the administrative interviews. It will be discussed more thoroughly in Chapter IV.

Each of these interviews was somewhat unique in an attempt to gather information about the role played by the person being interviewed. However, each of these interviews attempted to explore the same four areas already targeted in teacher interviews: personal involvement, collegiality, satisfaction/motivation, and change in instruction.

Interviews were tape recorded with the permission of the people being interviewed. These interviews were then transcribed for data analysis.

In addition to the formal interviews, many informal interviews were conducted, particularly during the summer workshop training. Unfortunately, it wasn't possible to tape record

these interviews. In many cases, however, they provided invaluable information. Field notes were recorded as soon as possible in order to preserve the information gathered.

### Participant Observation

A second source of information came in the form of participant observations. A summer training workshop was conducted in June, 1991, for four days, five hours each day. All new participants were obligated to attend all four days. Team leaders were expected to attend the last three days of training. Observing the summer training workshop provided information about the model and the training conducted. Unexpectedly, it also provided an opportunity for invaluable insight into how relationships are developed and nurtured as a part of this program.

Initially, the observation opportunity provided what seemed to be an overwhelming amount of material making it impossible to collect everything. Both Bogdan and Biklen (1982) and Schatzman and Strauss (1973) describe this problem. They suggest narrowing the focus after spending some time trying to put together a picture of what is happening.

Once general information about the program was gathered, it was then possible to focus on the relationships developing among the participants through a variety of activities incorporated into the training. This became an interesting piece of the picture in that it was unexpected yet, once discovered, deemed important. As the collegial nature of the program is explored in Chapter IV, some

attention will be paid to the evolution of relationships during this time.

Notetaking proved difficult in certain circumstances and easier in others. For example, having been invited to participate in certain activities, notes had to be made unobtrusively, or not at all, so that participants weren't uncomfortable about what was being recorded. On the other hand, there were many other times when participants were taking notes themselves about information being given. During this time it was possible to write freely. As soon as possible after each session additional notes were added.

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) discuss the problems encountered in trying to be both an observer and a participant. They suggest that if one is trying to gather data from the perspective of the participant, it is often more valuable to participate in the program. In this case, many insights were gathered by being a part of the group. In addition, participants seemed to forget that they were being observed and did not seem awkward with an observer in their midst. As suggested above, this opportunity also made teacher interviews much easier and more worthwhile.

An opportunity to observe a collegial cycle was also offered. This included observing the pre-observation, observation, strategy session, feedback, and process sessions. The post-observation is conducted several days after this and, therefore, was not a part of the observation. During this entire time it was not possible to gather field notes as this would be distracting to the participants. Therefore, field notes were made only during the observation,

strategy session, and process session. Other notes were made as soon as possible after the observation.

### Document Review

Throughout this study a variety of documents were reviewed for various reasons. For example, one of the questions asked is why do teachers become involved in this program. Recruitment documents provide information about what teachers are "promised" when they decide to participate. These pieces of information were compared to the reasons teachers themselves provided in the data analysis in Chapter IV.

Additional training materials were gathered during the summer workshop. These documents helped to understand the purposes of the program and the model being used by the district. Having this information proved valuable during the interview process as teachers felt that they could use a common language when they explained their perceptions.

A variety of forms were collected and appear in Appendix E. These forms include the worksheets used for the pre-observation conference, the observation data sheet, the strategy session worksheet, and the post-conference form.

These documents provided a structure to the collection of further information about the program and provided written information regarding the initial knowledge base of teachers in the district. In many cases, these documents were used to support information gathered by other means.

### Data Reduction and Analysis

Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest three stages in analyzing qualitative data: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. They suggest that none of these is a discrete step and that they each occur throughout the data collection process.

The grounded theory approach (Strauss and Corbin, 1990) was used so that theories evolved during the data collection process. This is based on the idea that theories should be arrived at inductively rather than deductively. Theories are based on the data collected, rather than established prior to the investigation.

#### Data Reduction

Even while using the grounded theory approach, it is necessary to establish certain limits to the data collection. Throughout the collection process, limits were placed on what data would be collected. For example, while observing the training workshop, data could have been collected in any number of areas. After several hours of participation it became obvious that one of the major goals of this workshop was to begin to develop trusting relationship among the team members. Therefore, information about relationships was included in field notes.

In addition, interview questions were drafted to produce information to answer the research questions established at the beginning of this study. These questions were designed to be open-ended and unstructured to produce a variety of ideas for the people being interviewed. Many times during the interviews teachers and

administrators brought up unexpected information. Because of the limited structure placed on the interview, they were encouraged to elaborate on these new ideas. This information often enriched the final theories.

Transcribed interviews and field notes were coded based on both preliminary codes and a number of codes added as the data was gathered. Throughout the data collection process, themes emerged and were considered for their importance to the problem being considered.

### Data Display

Interviews were transcribed verbatim using Microsoft Word 4.0. This provided the opportunity to manipulate the data in a variety of ways. Using the "find" function, certain words could be searched to pull out similar ideas and concepts. For example, the word "trust" could be easily located in any or all interviews without having to go through the material manually. This function helped to identify data for coding as well as in trying to see patterns and themes.

Once the data were gathered, individual comments and sections of the data were coded by theme. Thus, if the interviewee discussed trust relationships, the information would be coded R/TM/TR to indicate that it described a relationship with a team member regarding trust.

### Conclusion Drawing/Verification

All of the coded data were then sorted into file folders with data about similar themes. While the process of developing theories occurred throughout the process of data collection and analysis, the categorized data provided the actual proof to verify an existing theory.

During this process one of the considerations was the difference in perceptions of administrators and teachers. This prompted an examination of the data across these categories. In addition, data was examined to determine the difference in perception between new and experienced teachers.

It was feasible to use triangulation to verify final conclusions because there were three sources of data: participant observation, interviews, and document review.

Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest twelve ways of working with data to generate meaning, including: counting, looking for themes and patterns, seeing plausibility, clustering, creating metaphors, splitting variables or taking some data apart, putting data together, factoring, looking for relationships between variables, finding intervening variables, creating a chain of evidence, and making conceptual/theoretical coherence. Each of these processes was considered in manipulating the data to draw conclusions.

Conclusions were confirmed using several techniques. For example, discrepant cases were sought out. Representativeness of

specific examples was examined. Consideration was also given to researcher effects.

### Limitations of the Methodology

From the beginning it was deemed necessary to use a qualitative approach in order to investigate the kinds of questions being attempted. By looking at reasons why teachers become involved and stay involved in a program, for example, one is investigating more than just a list of predetermined reasons. Rather, the list is very personal to each teacher and must be open ended. Thus, a quantitative approach may have yielded some very superficial data confirming, or disagreeing with, the current literature. It is unlikely that a quantitative research design would have yielded the kind of results a qualitative approach would have.

Even while recognizing the value of a qualitative approach, the drawbacks of such a design must still be considered. As previously referenced, this site was selected because of its unique feature of being involved in a successful peer coaching program rather than being representative of school districts involved in peer coaching programs. It may or may not have been representative; this question was not addressed. However, this must be considered when trying to generalize the data.

All of the participants who were interviewed were interviewed because they were participants in this program. Thus, there was a bias on their part regarding peer coaching and this particular peer coaching program. While it wasn't important to this

study to examine the reasons why people don't participate, those observed and interviewed were only one section of the teaching population.

Finally, this program has many unique features. Consideration must be given to the fact that it may be because of, rather than in spite of, these unique features that this program is has continued to work for over eight years. For someone who is starting a peer coaching program and who is desirous of making it work over a period of time, strong consideration must be given to the features of this program.

## CHAPTER IV

### Presentation and Analysis of the Data

The data gathered during this research project came from three sources. The first source was teacher and administrator interviews. The second was participant observation of the summer training workshop and observation of a Collegial cycle. Finally, relevant documents were gathered and examined to confirm or dispute information gathered through other sources. The data will be presented first in narrative form as a summary of interviews and observations. In addition, it will be analyzed to explore themes and trends. Discrepant cases will be noted. The purpose of this chapter is to capture the nature of the collegial process used in this district by describing it from an outsider's perspective. The opportunity to talk to the people involved, observe aspects of the program and the training, and satisfy the curiosity developed while reading the literature about peer coaching, has helped to develop a "picture" of this program. Perhaps this chapter will provide an opportunity for the reader to share this experience.

This discussion begins with the perspectives of teachers and administrators as gathered from interviews. Fictitious names have been used for the teachers, administrators, and schools to assure anonymity. It is followed by a description of the history of the program as related by various constituencies and a discussion of the recruitment procedure and the training process.

### Administrator Interviews

Six administrators were interviewed as a part of the data collection process. Their roles included teacher/coordinator, the Executive Director for Instruction, a department chairperson who initiated the program when she was a teacher, the principal of one of the two schools, and a department chairperson from each of the two schools. Together their input represented a range of perspectives from staff developer to supervisor and included historical information and personal reminiscences.

The purpose of these interviews was to determine the extent of administrative support, to determine what impact the collegial process had on teacher behavior related to instruction, to find whether administrators encouraged certain types of teachers to participate, and to determine how administrators viewed peer coaching as a part of the supervisory process. Therefore, the questions were designed to collect information in these areas. The nature of the semi-structured interview also allowed flexibility in the areas explored.

#### Mr. Adams

While Mr. Adams is not an administrator in the district, his role in this program is, in fact, an administrative one. That is, he coordinates the program, recruits the participants, observes many of the coaching cycles, and trains the teacher-participants. Mr. Adams was one of the original teachers who began the program, so

he was able to contribute to the historical information about the program.

Mr. Adams explained that any certified staff member was welcome to join the program, including counselors, special education teachers, and psychologists. One of the issues explored was whether or not department chairpeople could and should be involved in the program. He explained that technically they could, but that, in reality, they were not encouraged to do so. In fact, one applied but was unable to be available for the summer training. Since all new people must be available at that time, this person was not able to be included in the program. The one exception to this is Ms. Brown who was the originator of the program as a teacher and who has since moved into a department chairperson position.

Mr. Adams went on to explain the role of the administrator for the program. He explained that the administration provided financial support so that the program could exist. This support included substitute time, compensation for summer workshop participants and teachers, and graduate credit on the salary schedule. The other area in which administrators support the program is by providing support to the teachers who do participate. Principals send letters to department chairpeople in their buildings asking them to encourage teachers to join. This support also comes from the Superintendent who acknowledges the value of the program.

Mr. Adams went on to discuss the importance of the program being voluntary. He stressed that it was not a program for teachers who needed remediation. He stated

It is not a remedial program in any way, shape, or form. It's not for people who are having tremendous types of trouble, etc. If you got someone in there who even needed help, that's not the avenue for giving them help unless that's the way they want to get their help. If you have a person on a team of four who doesn't want to be there, the trust and the camaraderie will be destroyed in five seconds. We have to run a thin line between encouraging people but never making it seem like you have to.

He also discussed the role of the team leader. They are expected to attend three days of the summer workshop in order to become familiar with the new teachers and develop a rapport with them. During this time they decide the composition of the teams for the upcoming school year. The other part of their job is to facilitate the collegial observations. They order the substitutes, reserve the rooms for meetings, and they are the initial problem-solvers.

In their role as problem-solvers, a team leader might have to deal with a team member who is not getting along with the rest of the team. If the team leader feels unable to deal with the problem, or in need of advice, Mr. Adams becomes involved. He may or may not involve the Executive Director for Instruction depending on the severity of the problem.

Mr. Adams also discussed the level of commitment of the teachers who participate. He explained that by only being involved in the program for one year, a teacher is unlikely to get as much out of the program as if they stayed for an extended period. After two years a teacher might want to take a year off in order to try out some of the ideas acquired. After that they may want to come back into the program.

As compensation, the team leaders are often released from a part of the supervisory "duty" that all teachers in the district are given. For example they may only have duty three days a week instead of five, or for one semester instead of all year. Team leaders are encouraged to stay for extended periods of time. As a form of recognition a letter is sent to the department chairperson when a person is made team leader.

When asked to reflect on his experiences as a teacher in the program, Mr. Adams discussed the two-pronged benefit of the observation cycle. The first benefit comes from being observed twice a year and having feedback from those observations. The second is the opportunity to observe other teachers. He said:

But I've learned this through the years, I state it all the time and I've never had anyone disagree with me yet; you will learn more from watching the six times, just as a watcher, than you will from the in-depth analysis you're getting twice. You will pick up tricks, and you will see things and you're going to say, "My God, why didn't I ever do that? That's the exact problem. . . ." I always say, by the time the fourth person in the team gets to go on stage, he's probably learned 75% of the things that he was hoping to learn by watching him when he hasn't even been watched yet. That's really, I think, the success of the program.

Mr. Adams also discussed the problem of teacher isolation. He explained that when the program started, one of the first things that they learned about in the summer workshop was isolation. They started asking themselves how many had ever had the opportunity to observe another teacher teach. Most of the teachers had not done so. On the other hand, he believes that it is important that when teachers visit each other's classrooms they must know what to look

for, and the teacher who is being observed must know what they are observing.

### Ms. Brown

Ms. Brown is currently a department chairperson at Xavier High School. She was a teacher there nine years ago and was instrumental in developing the Collegial Consultation program. This role is explained further in the section of this chapter on the history of the program.

Ms. Brown described the types of teachers who benefit most from this program, "they have to be people who are basically receptive, who are not highly defensive people, any more so than any normal person is. They have to be people who have a strong sense of self. . . ." People who are in need of remediation or who "have an ax to grind" usually do not do well in the program.

In reflecting on the things that were done in putting the program together that have led to its ultimate success, Ms. Brown talked about the outside consultant help, the staff development, the recognition that the teaching process is an emotional as well as an intellectual process. She remembered:

When we first started out, for instance, one of the the mistakes we made, we used to tell people all the things that we thought were strengths an all the things we thought were weaknesses. it was so stupid! It sounds so asinine to be saying it now. Now, one of the reasons for the strategy session is to say, let's think of a piece of feedback where we're going to get the biggest bang for our thought.

She also recognized the importance of administrative and board support, pointing out that Mr. Adams teaches only 80% F.T.E., and the rest of his time is spent coordinating the peer coaching program.

She also discussed the changes in people over the time period the program has been in effect. She explained that some people stick with the program as team leaders because they feel that they can mentor other teachers in this manner. About two teams leaders in particular she said, "It's not for their own personal growth. It's that they feel that they're giving something back, and that element has to be there." She also described a personality change that has occurred with Mr. Harris as he participated in the program, and eventually became a team leader in the program. Surprisingly, this change was discussed in interviews with other participants as well. "When (Mr. Harris) first started in Collegial he would never shut up. He would take over a group. So to see him emerge as someone who's more interested in bringing other people out. . ."

Ms. Brown said that three-fourths of her department has participated in the program with an average stay of two years. She encourages people to join, and she explained that teachers who are not on the formal observation cycle must choose between the Collegial program, a self-evaluation program, or the regular clinical supervision process.

In discussing the types of feedback that teachers ask for from their colleagues, Ms. Brown worried that it was "very safe." She suggested that the program was not strongly linked to the staff

development program, and that teachers often used ideas they learned in outside workshops for their goals.

The issue of collaborative talk among teachers was also discussed. Being a department chairperson, her experience has been that teachers who have participated can analyze a lesson on a more sophisticated level than teachers who have not been in the program. She also believes that these people believe the research on supervision and understand the importance of getting feedback. Sharing strategies becomes a focus for these teachers, and whether it's a teaching strategy or a management strategy, they like to talk about what they're doing.

### Mr. Carlson

Mr. Carlson is the Executive Director for Instruction for the district. He came to the district a year after the program began and has become instrumental in its training and structure since then. His role in the training is described in that section of this chapter. During this interview the relationship between the district's staff development program and the Collegial program was also discussed. He explained that the two mandatory Saturday inservices for new participants are conducted every year are planned as a result of the evaluations conducted regarding the summer workshop.

He explained that he sees the Collegial program more strongly tied to the district's supervision model than to the staff development program. He further explained the choices that teachers are given in the "off-year" of the clinical supervision cycle.

He also discussed how beneficial this program has been for various teachers. Mr. Harris was again used as an example. He explained that Mr. Harris was a "nasty, nasty adult" in the beginning. "And, he is such a pleasant, mellow person to be around now."

The types of people who do well in a program like this were then discussed. He related his amusement with the fact that the recruitment literature states that teachers will be notified if they are accepted into the program when, in fact, it is very rare that anyone was turned down. The one teacher he did remember being counselled out of the program was someone who was headed toward remediation.

In discussing the relationship of the program to changing school culture, Mr. Carlson discussed the importance of interpersonal relationships and camaraderie as they develop during the year. He explained that teams only stay together one year. He went on further to say:

You notice during the training we spend almost all of our time on how to talk to each other. That's where the cultural change comes as much as possible, because they just don't know how, without being insulting, not only in the observing and the relaying as far as instruction is concerned, but just day-to-day operations. It has made a very big difference.

The next part of the interview focused on the improvement of instruction. Mr. Carlson strongly believes that the teachers learn more while they are observing other teachers than they do when they are being observed. He suggested that the Collegial program recognizes the need for teachers to experiment and to take risks.

He also believes that the time that is set aside for reflection after the observation is the key to improvement of instruction for the observed teacher.

When asked what happens when a team doesn't work well together, he replied:

The team leader, I, and (Mr. Adams) usually meet and say, "O.K., can we define the problem; what is the difficulty? What is keeping the team from functioning? If it's one person, what is it that that one person is doing?" Let me give you a specific case. We had one who was just simply caustic. He wouldn't play the game at all. Where we said in pre-observation specifically what we want to watch, he would never pay any attention to that. And if he had feedback, he would start in with something like, "Your voice was fine", it was like he was reading off the University scale or something. Sometimes he would be late, and we just had a little bit of a problem with him. So we had to say this guy is not vested in the program, really. So we would work out a script and send the team leader saying you'll have to go and talk to him and say, "I notice this, this, and this. And it's really having a negative effect on the other members of the team. Could you, would you, and if you can't, we may have to ask you to leave." In the seven years I've been associated with the program, we've had two teachers drop out, and one we asked to leave. It's a pretty good record.

In describing the two situations where the teachers dropped out of the program, he explained that during one session feedback was given to a teacher about her voice. Even though the team tried to make amends when they realized that the feedback was inappropriate, the teacher was too insulted to continue. This particular example was brought up in several other interviews as an example of a poorly conducted feedback conference.

The other person who dropped out of the program was a teacher who left after her first observation. There was no inappropriate feedback given, and the rest of the team felt that things had gone well. The teacher just felt that she couldn't handle the process.

Mr. Carlson summarized the benefits of the program as personal and professional growth and a way to learn from peers. He discussed his involvement in the program as being an important part of this job, particularly his role in the training process. He also referred to the fact that he observes many of the cycles. Some problems related to the fact he acts as an observer are explored more thoroughly later in the summary section of this chapter.

### Ms. Davis

Ms. Davis is the principal of York High School. She was a department chairperson for five years before becoming an Assistant Principal, a position she held for two years. During the 1990-91 school year she was appointed acting principal and was officially given the title of principal at the end of the school year. When this interview took place she had been in this position for a few weeks.

Ms. Davis explained that she was a department chairperson when the Collegial program was first implemented. She encouraged, and continues to encourage teachers to participate in either this program or a "mini-collegial" program that has developed in response to the original program. She suggested, however, that

encouragement isn't usually needed because the program has such a good reputation and teachers are very interested in it.

The mini-collegial program was developed by Ms. Davis in response to the teachers at York High School being interested but unwilling to make the commitment of the regular program. This program remains an option in this high school.

In describing the kind of teacher who benefits from a peer coaching program, Ms. Davis described them as "people who are introspective and self-aware and try to solve problems." She felt that anyone who is receptive to the process would benefit. Further, she said:

That receptiveness, that willingness to do it means they're going to be open to the criticism. What we found is that there are many teachers that will go through this process and will say, "I'll be darn, my department chair has been telling me that for the last five years." It didn't have an impact until now, when they hear it from their colleagues. What we found is that good, to very good teachers, just get even better. They just go "great guns." Those who are average to above average--I don't like to put those labels on, but have some room for growth--really benefit as well. The ones who are really struggling, probably get the least benefit because they have such a deficit of skills to start with. But they do make a change in attitude toward their growth. A willingness to think about things that they had never thought about before, and we consider that that attitude shift is well worth anything.

Ms. Davis talked about teachers sharing ideas and strategies with each other. She explained that even though the teams were cross-disciplinary, the teachers still shared information about teaching strategies. She thought that the Collegial program helped teachers share because there was more openness among the teachers

involved. In addition, she discussed the common language that exists among teachers in the program, and she felt that this helped in the resource sharing.

Teachers have also willingly talked to her about what they had learned from other teachers. They expressed their pleasure to her about the opportunity to share ideas. For example, one teacher said, "It's so nice to talk to each other, talk about teaching, it renews me." The connections that they made with other teachers provided more satisfaction with teaching.

Ms. Davis also explained the importance of this program's role in the supervision model used in the district. She felt that the opportunity to do this instead of the clinical process every other year was an advantage to both teachers and administrators.

### Mr. Evans

Mr. Evans is a department chairperson at Xavier High School. He was involved in a peer coaching program as a teacher in another district prior to coming to this high school. He has been a department chairperson for eleven years.

In discussing whether or not he encourages teachers to join the program, Mr. Evans replied:

Yes, but I wouldn't say that that was the critical variable to their joining. I think that, certainly I always encourage people toward Collegial. I think one of the reasons that this Collegial program works is that it has some of the strongest teachers in the school participating. Therefore, a lot of people are eager to be part of the program because, we all know in observation, it's not when you're observed when you learn, it's when you

observe that you learn. The observation you do gives you really the value of something. It's not being observed that necessarily gives you a lot.

He also discussed the problem of having a teacher in the program who needs remediation. He called the results of such a situation "shared ignorance." On the other hand, he believes that the teachers from his department who participate are generally the best teachers.

In describing the types of teachers who benefit from this program he claimed openness as a "critical variable." Other than that he felt that all teachers could benefit from the program. He estimated that a little over half the teachers in his department had participated at one time or another in the program.

Once again, Mr. Evans explained the supervision process of the district and related that the Collegial program can be used every other year to fulfil the supervision requirement. Each year he has goal setting conferences with every teacher, however. Through this process he felt he sometimes influences the Collegial goals.

In discussing the relationship between the district staff development program and the Collegial program he explained:

I would say; I'm thinking about a couple of specific instances, I know several people in the Foreign Language department played around with several cooperative learning techniques this year with a staff development focus. They used Collegial as kind of a sounding board for that idea. I think if the staff development idea, the staff development concept, is going on, it piques the curiosity of people. Then they will use Collegial as a sounding board to validate, or mess around with it, or experiment with it. I think that if it's something that they have not interest in at all, they'd probably just dismiss it.

In describing the effect of participation in the program on teachers, he talked about the importance of a common language in teaching. He also said that teachers who participate are more aware of what they are doing. "They are far more attuned to the science of teaching . . ." He also stated that the opportunity to observe others teach meant that teachers became better at what they were doing. They are more willing to try something new after seeing another teacher do it.

### Ms. Fine

Ms. Fine is a department chairperson at York High School where she has worked for fourteen years. This is her third year as chairperson of this department, and she followed Ms. Davis into the position when Ms. Davis became an Assistant Principal. She participated as a teacher in the mini-collegial program.

Ms. Fine discussed the "affective" benefits to teachers of participating in the program. In addition, she felt that the opportunity to discuss teaching methodologies was beneficial. This happens, she believes, because the groups are interdepartmental so course content is not a factor. "I think for a teacher's own need to sometimes look at the process of teaching as well as the content; having had that experience and seeing those similarities is a benefit to that already strong, confident, caring teacher."

In responding to the question about whether she encourages teachers to participate she explained that she does, but not everyone. She singled out the characteristics of reflective and self-

directed as being important qualities for teachers in this program. She also mentioned the importance of the program being voluntary in nature.

She also discussed the drawbacks of the program. Teachers who participate in an alternate supervision model write their own evaluation, rather than the administrator writing it. She felt that this places an unfair burden on the teacher. In addition, she said that she felt that teachers liked receiving the final written evaluation at the end of the year. Finally, she said that having to have a substitute take over their class is viewed as a burden to teachers.

When asked about collaboration, Ms. Fine said that she sets aside time in department meetings to talk about teaching. Teachers who have attended an outside workshop bring back information to the rest of the department.

Teachers rarely observe each other outside the Collegial program. Such observations do occur in some instances. For example, if a teacher is taking a graduate class which requires data collection from a colleague's classroom, an observation might take place. Also, she remembered times when teachers were being reassigned to a new department. These teachers might observe experienced teachers under these circumstances.

## Summary of Administrative Interviews

In an effort to more thoroughly understand the information gathered through administrator interviews, further analysis of the data was conducted.

### Benefits

In order to gain insight about the type of teachers who might benefit from this type of program, administrators were asked whether they encouraged certain teachers to participate in the program. This also led to discussion about what types of teachers benefit from the program. These benefits are listed in Table 1.

Administrators were also asked to discuss the benefits to the teachers who participate. These benefits are grouped into three categories: 1. general, 2. those of a collaborative nature, and 3. those related to instruction. In Tables 2-4 for each benefit described, the administrator or administrators who mentioned it are listed.

### Administrator/Teacher Relationships

Since this program was conceived by teachers and is run for and by teachers, the relationship of various administrators was naturally area for exploration. For example, Mr. Carlson and Mr. Adams act as observers/resource people for each collegial cycle. While Mr. Adams is still a teacher, Mr. Carlson is not. Mr. Carlson explained that he recognized this problem early on and worked to

Table 1

Type of Teachers Who Benefit From Peer Coaching

ADMINISTRATOR	CHARACTERISTIC
Mr. Adams	Not in need of remediation
Ms. Brown	Not in need of remediation Receptive Not highly defensive
Mr. Carlson	Not in need of remediation
Ms. Davis	Receptive Introspective Self-aware Problem solver Open
Mr. Evans	Not in need of remediation
Ms. Fine	Reflective Open Self-directed

Table 2

General Benefits

BENEFIT	ADMINISTRATOR
"E" credit on salary schedule	Mr. Adams
Recognition by administrators	Mr. Adams
Personal growth	Ms. Brown Mr. Carlson
Replaces clinical supervision	Ms. Brown Mr. Carlson Ms. Davis Mr. Evans

Table 3

Benefits Related to Collaboration

BENEFIT	ADMINISTRATOR
Reduced isolation	Mr. Adams
Mentor other teachers	Ms. Brown
Opportunity to talk about teaching	Ms. Brown Ms. Davis
Knowing how to talk to each other	Mr. Carlson
Camaraderie	Mr. Carlson
Learn from peers	Mr. Carlson
Common language	Ms. Davis Mr. Evans
Resource sharing	Ms. Davis

Table 4

Benefits Related to Improvement of Instruction

BENEFIT	ADMINISTRATOR
Feedback from peers	Mr. Adams Ms. Brown
Opportunity to observe others	Mr. Adams Mr. Carlson Mr. Evans
Share teaching/management strategies	Ms. Brown Ms. Davis Ms. Fine
Experiment and take risks	Mr. Carlson Mr. Evans
Reflective time	Mr. Carlson
Know the "science of teaching"	Mr. Evans

develop the rapport and comfort needed in such a program. He described times that he had to leave an observation because he felt that the teacher was uncomfortable with him there. He also described times that teachers specifically asked for him to be the resource person because they wanted to try something new, and they felt he had the expertise to help them.

For some teachers there was still a level of discomfort in having an administrator observe teachers during this process. Several teachers mentioned this discomfort at various times during the data collection process, suggesting that it was something that they lived with in order to have the support and expertise of the administration. This discomfort was not, however, universal.

Although Ms. Brown has moved into an administrative position from a teaching position, she is still widely accepted by the teachers in the program. The only person who reported any concern about her being in the program was one team leader who was leery, because she viewed Ms. Brown as being so skilled in the process that the team leader felt intimidated in her role as team leader.

Teachers, on the other hand, when it came up during interviews, did not feel any sense of unease in having her in the program or on their team. She would not, of course, be on a team with teachers from her own department.

Ms. Brown, herself, reported that she was particularly looking forward to the feedback this year because she was teaching a new class and was concerned about how well she would do in this new situation.

Mr. Adams concurs that teachers feel comfortable with Ms. Brown. On the other hand, he has tried to discourage other department chairpeople from joining. One person did apply but was unable to attend the summer workshop. Since the summer workshop is required, it was easy to say no to this applicant.

Another area explored with administrators was the Board of Education's view of the program. The support by the Board of Education was described as important. According to the Executive Director of Instruction, Mr. Carlson:

It has never been questioned as an expense item. In fact, most of the Board members love it. We don't report every year on it. I, in my report, will allude to it because it's part of our supervisory program and I will talk about, we have 28; of these we have "x" number of veterans, and so on. Kind of a statistical. . . and they keep their thumb on it in that regard.

He also stated that he did not believe that this program would be one that would be cut if cuts had to be made in the budget. He feels this because of the importance he the Board attached to it.

#### Relationship to the Staff Development Program

Teachers who are new to the program are committed to two additional days of inservice training as a part of their requirements for credit. These workshops are held on Saturdays and respond to the areas of concern indicated in the evaluation of the summer workshop. They can be related to the peer coaching process itself, or they may be related to instruction. For example, last year one of the days was dedicated to cooperative learning.

Regarding the relationship between the program and other staff development programs, Mr. Carlson explained that the people in Collegial tended to be the "forerunners of the staff development program." They tend to become involved with something and then share it with the staff. He goes on to say that "that the Collegial has done more to develop individual staff members than any other program formal or informal. It is just really amazing to me how we have not only increased their effectiveness as instructors, but as people."

The supervision process for this district was explained and the relationship of this program to it. According to state law and district policy, teachers must go through the clinical supervision process every other year. This process culminates with a written evaluation by the administrator. On alternate years teachers can elect to participate in either the peer coaching program or in a self-evaluation program in lieu of clinical supervision. Many of the teachers who continue with the program over a number of years do it in addition to the clinical supervision process.

### Cost of the Program

In an effort to determine the cost of the program, different administrators were questioned about this area. Mr. Carlson explained that there was not a line item in the budget for this but that the costs were absorbed in several areas. Cost included substitute costs, stipends for team leaders, less teaching periods

for the coordinator, summer workshop expenses, and the cost of allowing teachers to earn credit on the salary schedule.

For example, Mr. Adams teaches one less class than the rest of the teachers to compensate for his duties as program coordinator. Team leaders receive a stipend for attending the workshops, and they usually are released from part of their supervisory duties for their participation. Teachers new to the program receive one credit for the summer workshop and one credit for their participation during the year. For each observation cycle, four substitutes are brought in for at least a half a day. Each teacher in the program is observed twice. With twenty-five members this would mean 200 half-day subs during the year.

### Teacher Interviews

Data was gathered and analyzed from twelve teacher interviews conducted during the 1991-92 school year. Each of the four teachers new to the program were included, all five team leaders were interviewed, and three other teachers representing other departments were selected. Table 5 indicates the department and high school each of these interviews represents.

The purpose of these interviews was to explore the reasons that teachers became involved in the Collegial Program, to discuss the relationship of the program and the nature of collegiality, and to find out how teachers feel the program has improved instruction.

Table 5

Teachers Who Were Interviewed

NAME	SCHOOL	DEPARTMENT	NEW/RETURNING
Mr. Grant	York	Science	Team Leader
Mr. Harris	York	English	Team Leader
Ms. Jones	York	Special Education	Team Leader
Ms. Kahn	Xavier	Mathematics	Team Leader
Mr. Larson	Xavier	Social Studies	Team Leader
Mr. Morris	York	Physical Education	New
Ms. Nathan	Xavier	Foreign Language	New
Ms. O'Toole	Xavier	Special Education	New
Ms. Price	Xavier	Foreign Language	New
Mr. Rand	York	Science	Returning
Ms. Smith	Xavier	Fine Arts	Returning
Mr. Thomas	York	English	Returning

Mr. Grant

Mr. Grant is a science teacher at York High School. He has been teaching there for 21 years and has been a member of the Collegial group for eight years. Along with Mr. Adams, Mr. Grant is considered one of the original teacher participants in the program. Because during the first year of the programs inception only teachers from Xavier High School participated, Mr. Grant began in the second year. When asked to reflect on why he became involved, he talked about the fact that he was teaching "Level 3" classes and felt frustrated. He explained that at that time there was a hierarchy among teachers; the better, more experienced teachers were given the better students.

He wanted "companionship", to be able to talk to other Level 3 teachers in an effort to share experiences and solve problems. At that time, the students in these classes included those who had all kinds of problems including things that might now qualify as learning disabilities. Teachers had little or no training in working with these special needs. He was looking for "a support group" who would be able to help him with this situation.

When asked why he has continued to participate, Mr. Grant explained that this was the one process that he had found to be successful in teaching him something new. He described going to workshops or classes and not really concentrating on the material. He would leave without really having internalized anything.

He mentioned that the opportunity to observe other teachers' classrooms provided him the opportunity to see some of these new

teaching strategies that he had been hearing about. After seeing them, he was able to include them in his own repertoire. He feels that this is a very non-threatening way to learn something new.

He also discussed the value of diplomacy and training in giving feedback. He explained that there is usually someone in the summer training session who says that colleagues should just "tell it like it is" when they observe each other. This, in fact, did occur during the summer workshop. These teachers feel that their colleagues shouldn't try to be diplomatic but should simply say what's wrong and tell the teacher how to fix it. Mr. Grant said that he believes these people are really the most vulnerable to criticism.

When asked if he had ever had his own feeling hurt in a collegial cycle, he said that while it has never happened to him, he has participated in groups where it has happened. His experience has improved his ability to read situations and body language, however. He described a cycle, during which he was the team leader. He didn't really know anything about the team member but he clearly felt that something was wrong. The team was split on what kind of feedback to give the teacher. He used his prerogative as team leader to simply provide positives to the teacher during feedback. It turned out that the teacher had been approached by the administration the day before to consider early retirement. In reflection he feels that this was "one of my finest successes and I feel really good about that."

On the other hand, he also described a time when he and his team gave a teacher feedback about her voice. This caused the teacher to drop out of the program. He said:

We just totally blew it. It was totally inappropriate. . . In our own defense, we apologized as best we could, and the woman wouldn't forgive us. So, that's all I can do. I don't carry any emotional baggage from it. I made a mistake; I said I was sorry. I had hoped that the woman would accept the apology and she wouldn't.

Human interaction and the relationships with students are the most satisfying things about teaching for Mr. Grant. He feels that the Collegial Program provides an opportunity for contact with adults. He enjoys that opportunity to talk, discuss strategies, listen, and compromise. He described the discussions as more than just conversations. When asked about opportunities to discuss lessons with other science teachers he explained that the busy day of teachers does not provide time or opportunities for discussions with colleagues.

This program has changed the way Mr. Grant feels about the teaching profession. The Collegial program has contributed to the excitement he still feels. "I can't put a percent on it. Normally I'm me and I don't think any one program is going to make me a different person, but it has helped."

In sharing an example of something that he has changed because of his experience with this program, Mr. Grant talked about how his need to be in complete control in his classroom has diminished. He described seeing other teachers who were more

relaxed in their classrooms. This led him to realize that he didn't have to be as "intensely organized" or to have absolute control.

When asked if there is one thing that makes this program work he replied, ". . . absolute confidentiality. That's one thing you can't overstress." Nothing within the group is ever shared outside of the the group.

### Mr. Harris

Having taught for 25 years, Mr. Harris has been in the Collegial program for five or six years. He is a team leader and a member of the English department at York High School.

He recalled becoming involved mostly because of the recommendation of some of his friends. He also said that teaching had become "mechanical" and that he no longer felt any challenge. He had become stagnant as a teacher. He described wanting to become rejuvenated and refreshed and heard that this program would help him with this. There was one other person in his department in Collegial at the time he joined; people have dropped out and in over the years, and there is currently one other person in it.

He stated that there are three reasons that people drop out of the program. The first is that the "hassle" may become greater than the rewards, the second, that there might be bad "chemistry" among the team members, and the third, that people only want to be reaffirmed in what they are doing and are not open to suggestions.

He believes that the program is most valuable for teachers with several years experience because they need to feel secure with

people coming in to observe them. New teachers have too many other things to worry about. He believes that teachers have to overcome the "initial experience with administrators and the sort of comments they make, 'That was nice. . .but', stuff." He went on to add, "Everybody waits for the ax to fall. And, one thing Collegial does is you set your own agenda. This is what I want you to look at." He believes that this control over what the team looks at is what makes the program so valuable.

In recalling how he picked his goal for the year, he said that he just chose something very generic. He then narrowed the goal after he had a chance to get to know his class better. For example, he might want to be observed in a particular class which has five Hispanic students to make sure that he is involving them in the lesson. He wouldn't know this until he became familiar with his class.

His philosophy of teaching is "the lower the profile you keep, the less you will be hassled." Therefore, he doesn't really want to make a big deal out of being team leader. He doesn't mind doing it, but if they asked someone else to do it, he wouldn't really care.

He believes that the Collegial program has improved his opportunities to talk to other teachers. He said that he now knows some of the Xavier High School teachers that he did not know before and that that gives him an opportunity to find out what kinds of things they're doing. He said, however, that he never is on a team with another English teacher so that he doesn't work with the English curriculum.

When talking to other teachers, he said that the program gives him the opportunity to share strategies in a less threatening way. He can mention something he saw in another teacher's classroom. This way the person he is advising doesn't have to take his advice, because it is not something he is personally doing. He also mentioned that the program has provided relationships with teachers that continue even when they are no longer together on a team.

The most satisfying thing about teaching for him is "seeing light bulbs go on in kids' heads." He particularly enjoys having students come back years later to let him know how he helped them.

He said he believed that Collegial has helped his teaching. He is:

more aware of when something is going right and when something is going badly. It gives you enough strategies so that you can make adaptations. But, I also think it gives you the confidence to say this isn't going well, we're going someplace else.

When asked if he had ever had a bad experience in Collegial, he recalled observing a teacher who was really a bad teacher. The teacher had no control over the students. The team didn't know how to give the teacher feedback because there were so many things wrong. After the first observation the teacher said, "This is the best class I've ever had." Also, he didn't seem to really want any advice from the team. He did, however, become aware of how bad things were and dropped out of the program at the end of the year.

When asked if he had ever received any feedback that changed his teaching, he said that he had been able to refine his teaching in

many ways. He also mentioned that the Collegial program allowed him to focus on what had gone right rather than only on what had gone wrong with a lesson. He added that the program opened him up to seeking other resources such as the aid of counselors. Sometimes he will go to other Collegial members when he is having trouble with a particular student to ask for some information from them about how the student behaves in other classes.

He added that this is a good program for a teacher who needs some help but isn't really sure what is wrong. It is less threatening to receive help from colleagues than from a department chairperson. He added, "It's a tremendous program if you and your department chair philosophically are at odds." The team provides support. Teachers in this school know which teachers are considered weak by their department chairpeople. The Collegial Program, however, is confidential, and no information gets out about how teachers are doing.

He is not particularly concerned about the time away from his classroom because he feels its pretty easy to have a substitute in English. He has students in his classes who take the lead when he is gone. He does, however, recognize that it is easier in some subjects than in others.

In describing why the program is successful, he commented that its voluntary, people who stay in it believe in it, and its not political. By political he meant that the program wasn't going to be used by an administrator to try to look good and further his/her career.

He would like to see department chairpeople become involved because "it would do them good." He doesn't think that they have enough confidence to listen to feedback from teachers, however. He did not include Ms. Brown in this belief because she's "on a different wavelength than 99% of administrators."

### Ms. Jones

This is the fourth year Ms. Jones has been a part of the Collegial program. She has been teaching special education for 19 years, all of them at York High School, and she is currently a team leader in the Collegial program.

When asked why she became involved with the program, she remembered that it was because she wanted to see regular classrooms in operation and keep aware about what regular expectations for students are. She believes that she gets more more from observing other teachers than having them observe her. She could not recall any instances when teachers observed her prior to joining this program, except perhaps, a friend who had a special education child.

Ms. Jones is a half time EMH and half time BD teacher in the district. Because she's the only EMH teacher in the district she doesn't have anyone to talk to or work with regarding these students. On the other hand, she says that the BD teachers are very supportive of each other and meet regularly to talk.

The Collegial team builds "a relationship quickly." This year she was the first one observed so that it relieved the anxiety of the

other members. Friendships often come out of the teams. She explained that she sometimes sees team members socially as well as professionally.

By the time of this interview, Ms. Jones had been through the first collegial cycle during which she was observed. Her team watched her teach her BD class. She recalled of the feedback:

What I asked them to look for specifically was student involvement and behavior management kinds of things, and they were terrific. I came out of that session feeling on top of the world because they really complimented me and encouraged me, and gave me a couple of suggestions: to try not to burn myself out because I lecture a lot, to keep it flowing, to let my aide do more, and let the kids do more cooperative learning things.

"To encourage openness and honesty and yet tact," was the goal Ms. Jones picked as a team leader. The purpose of the process, she feels, is to tell your colleagues something about their teaching but to target strengths not weaknesses.

The teams are picked during the summer workshop. They try out different combinations of teachers as the various activities are conducted. They try not to put two people on the same team who are rigid. "The more intimidated, vulnerable people we try to put with team leaders that can encourage them and bring out strengths."

The most satisfying thing about her job is helping a student with special needs make progress. The least satisfying thing is bringing the job home.

She reported that this program has made her a better teacher. She feels that observing other teachers has confirmed to her that everyone is different and that that's okay.

The one thing that she highlighted as being an important component of the program is the confidentiality. She wishes there was a way to involve the administration in a non-threatening way.

### Ms. Kahn

Ms. Kahn is a team leader and has been a math teacher at Xavier High School for four years with a total of 13 years teaching experience. She has been in the Collegial program for three years, this year being her second year as team leader.

The influence of a personal friend who was very involved with Collegial Consultation led Ms. Kahn to join. She used to teach at York High School and felt that the experiences she had there with the supervision process were not very positive. Her department chairperson here at Xavier was a member of the Collegial program himself when he was a teacher. She felt that the supervision here at Xavier was very different as a result of his participation. She decided that if her experiences with the clinical supervision model were as positive as they were as a result of the Collegial program, that she wanted to be a part of it.

According to Ms. Kahn, the value of participation is that it forces teachers to focus in advance on their lesson plan for the day. The process requires the teacher to decide on the one thing they want feedback about. Ms. Kahn also admitted that she doesn't select

something for feedback that is a weak area for her; she requests feedback on something that she's pretty confident about.

She described an experience that she had the day before the interview when she was observed by her team. They observed her teaching a large class with many special education students and students with behavior problems. She decided to take a risk by having them observe this class because she wanted some help with these students. Their feedback to her was that she really needed to ask the special education department for an aide to help her with this class. The group brainstormed some ways that she could use the aide while she was teaching. In addition, they helped her design an evaluation process that might be more successful to use with these students.

She has stayed with the program because it has allowed her to continue to grow as a teacher. It has helped her to keep up with new ideas and with the research. She has continually tried new things in response to what she learned, and her team has provided her with information about whether or not it has worked. She believes she will probably stay in the program for a long time.

When asked to indicate what, in particular, has made this a successful program she suggested two reasons. The first was that the program is voluntary, and the second was that the program replaces the clinical supervision process on alternate years.

Mr. Larson

A social studies teacher for eight years at Xavier High School, Mr. Larson has been a member of the Collegial program for six years and is currently a team leader. He has a total of 24 years of teaching experience.

Reading research and journal articles about teacher isolation led Mr. Larson to participation in this program. He remembered a few times when he had observed other teachers in the past but recognized that these opportunities were rare. He recalled a time when he specifically wanted to observe one teacher who was a friend and who was well respected but could not ask to be released to visit this person. He did not recall anyone other than a supervisor observing him teach.

While he does not change what he is doing for the team observations, Mr. Larson did say, "It gives you an opportunity to display your wares." This statement caused him to recall the observation he had experienced a few days prior to the interview. He said that he got some ideas from his team and that he tried them out the subsequent class period. He went on to say:

The fact they were able to say this looked good, and this looked good, and one guy mentioned to me that I have a very, almost overpowering voice. Using that terminology is not necessarily positive. A strong voice in a classroom situation may not be essential but its certainly better than the alternative. . .He, I could tell, felt that sometimes it was too much so. That's fine. I don't happen to agree with him, but both of us were veteran teachers. He's not going to hurt my ego by mentioning that. If I were a second or third year

teacher I would hope that he wouldn't have said it that way. That could damage a person's confidence.

He went on to say that it surprised him that someone would say this during the first observation of the year. He would have tried to temper the remarks by asking whether anyone had commented on his voice before and let the teacher lead the discussion.

One of the teachers on his team is someone he perceives as a fragile person. He feels that they will have to be very careful with the feedback they give to her; she wouldn't be able to handle feedback like he had just gotten. He believes this because it was something he sensed and also because it was something he had heard. The Collegial program taught him "how to approach that fragility."

When asked to provide an example of feedback which he has gotten that has been valuable, he described a refinement of a game that he uses with his students. He felt that this "subtle" change improved his lesson 20%.

If he wanted to try something new with his team, he would let them know during the pre-observation conference that it was something new. It wouldn't bother him to open himself up this way because he would be receiving ideas for improvement.

Last year his collegial goal was to improve the closures he used in his classes. Until last year he used the last two minutes of the period to review the day's lesson. His team recommended that instead of always doing this orally, he might want to try having each student write down what they remembered. This year his goal is to improve the way he keeps track of students who "cut" his class. He

realizes that this is not something they're going to be able to come in and see during an observation. He also fears that they might not have any better ideas themselves.

His goal as a team leader is to contact the group before each cycle to make sure everyone is aware of the pertinent information. He picked this goal because there is one member of his team who has a reputation for forgetting about Collegial.

When asked what he finds most satisfying about teaching, he responded that it was the relationships he has developed with students. He develops a feeling of trust with them. He also finds teaching satisfying because it is something he is good at doing. He said that students enjoy what he is doing with them. He wondered if he would be able to keep up his enthusiasm level when he is 60. The hardest thing about teaching is trying to be "up" some many times day after day. But, he added that this program helps to keep up the enthusiasm level. Having observed another teacher earlier in the day will change the last few periods for him. Helping the team work together also brings him satisfaction.

Mr. Larson related that he expects to continue with the program unless something were to happen with the leadership. He said that if Mr. Adams were no longer the district coordinator for the program he might not continue to participate.

When asked what makes this program work, he explained that administrative support, including financial, is vital to the program. The support of the Superintendent and the Executive Director of Instruction are also important; he wondered what would happen to

the program if one or the other left the district or retired. He also feels that the voluntary nature of the program is critical because the program takes time. He did mention, however, that he doesn't feel it takes as much time as some people seem to feel it does.

### Mr. Morris

Mr. Morris is new to the Collegial program and has been teaching physical education at York High School for 20 years. He joined the program because his wife is involved and also because he has some philosophical differences with his department chairperson and this allows him to replace clinical supervision every other year.

He described some changes that the new department chairperson has tried to make with the curriculum. The changes were forced on the department with no input from the teachers. Even after they went to the curriculum committee, the new idea was still implemented.

In describing how he picked his goal for the Collegial program he mentioned that this program is separate from the evaluation process. He had a difficult time choosing a goal, because it was the middle of the summer.

The most satisfying thing about teaching for him is watching his students grow from the ninth grade through graduation. He also said he likes it when students come back to him for advice later on. The most dissatisfying thing is that there is no curriculum and that it is hard to get things that need to be done done. He described a maintenance problem that has existed for a long period of time that

he has been unable to get fixed. He also mentioned all of the special education paper work that has to be completed and how little time there is to do it.

He is looking forward to the Collegial program because "the openness you get, you don't get in a department chair/staff meeting." He believes that teachers help each other out at York High School.

### Ms. Nathan

Ms. Nathan is a foreign language teacher who currently teaches at Xavier High School; she also worked at York High School for a period of time. She has been in this district for fifteen years, and this is her first year in the Collegial program.

When asked why she decided to join the program she said that she wanted the chance to observe other teachers. She had talked to other teachers in the program in her department about it. She knows that teachers are working on things like cooperative learning and this is something she is also working on. She hopes to be provided some new ideas for her classes from her team.

When asked whether she had ever been observed by another teacher before this, she remembered a time when she first started teaching. Her department chairperson required everyone to observe someone else. There was no training for this and no formal process for feedback. She suspected that most people gave their partner some informal feedback.

When asked about the goal she chose for the program this year she said it was related to cooperative learning because this is

something she has been working on. She described the goal as "not the most risky kind of thing." Two or three years ago she had gone to a workshop on cooperative learning but hadn't tried many new ideas with it. The following year (last year) her job was cut because of decreased enrollment. So, this year she wants to pursue cooperative learning. She also mentioned that the school district provides teachers many opportunities to learn about new teaching strategies.

She misses the common planning period she had at York High School with the other French teachers. Right now there are three French teachers at Xavier. One teacher is full time, the other is part time in the afternoon, and Ms. Nathan is part time in the morning. This makes sharing ideas and resources difficult.

She went on to discuss the composition of her team, two teachers from each of the high schools, one a special education teacher, one a physical education teacher, and one a science teacher. She likes the idea of various departments being represented.

She related the most satisfying thing about teaching as being also the most frustrating thing about teaching, that is, "the kids." She explained that when a student understands something it is such a good feeling, but when a student is having a difficult time understanding something it can be very frustrating.

Because she hasn't yet been through an observation cycle, she wasn't sure if she would continue to feel the same way about her answer to the question what makes the program successful. At this

time she said that it was the summer workshop because the workshop provided the chance for learning and practicing skills.

She is not nervous about her upcoming observation. She has thought about the lesson because she knows which class it will be with, but she does not yet know what she will be teaching. Her concern is that the class is a large one and that the four observers will take up a lot of room.

### Ms. O'Toole

Ms. O'Toole is a special education teacher who has been at Xavier High School for eight years. She has been teaching since 1961. This is her first year in the Collegial program.

By the time of this interview, Ms. O'Toole had attended her first collegial cycle. She observed Mr. Grant teaching a science lesson to 12 non-English speaking students. She explained that during the feedback session, Mr. Grant talked almost the whole time; he explained why he did what he did in lesson. She took the role of the Process Observer. She explained:

I knew I had to take a role, and I wasn't sure what I was going to do and they just said, "Do it and we'll talk about it. If you're uncomfortable or unsure. . ." But you know, it just fell in to place. Everything just seemed to be right.

Ms. O'Toole decided to join the program after she heard a great deal of positive feedback about it. She noticed that people were staying in the program for year after year. While she was concerned about the amount of time it would take away from the classroom and

about the amount of paperwork involved, she'd also heard many positive things from the people who had participated. She heard that you would learn a lot from watching other teachers, and that the program was nurturing and supportive.

In addition she had also tried the other supervision alternatives. She had videotaped herself teaching and had shared the tape with someone. She had also had someone from outside her department come in to observe her teach. This program, however, is the only program where she is allowed to observe someone else teach to learn from them.

She recalled particularly the influence of her department chairperson on her decision to join. She had been recommending it to Ms. O'Toole for several years. This year she explained that the time away from the classroom was less than it had been.

The satisfaction she feels from teaching comes from working with young people. She relayed the feeling of satisfaction she has when working with special education students. The least satisfying part of teaching comes from all the paperwork and from the lack of time.

Because she was interested in cooperative learning and wanted to develop social skills in the special education students with whom she works, Ms. O'Toole chose a goal for Collegial to teach the social skills needed to work in a group. She plans to have her class in cooperative groups at least twice a week and to measure a specific skill each time.

She believes this program is valuable because of the feedback from practicing teachers. She explained that the feedback from administrators may not be as worthwhile because many of them have not been in the classroom for a long time.

Her first observation is scheduled for the middle of October, and she is looking forward to it. She is not wary of the upcoming observation because of the summer workshop which "wiped away" all the myths she had about Collegial. She elaborated explaining that the teacher who is being observed remains the focus of the feedback. The other team members don't share how they do things.

Ms. O'Toole said that she would probably stay with the program for a while. She had to be out of her classroom for two days prior to the Collegial cycle and this bothered her. She hopes that she can get over this concern.

### Ms. Price

Ms. Price has been teaching foreign language for four years at Xavier High School. This is her first year in the Collegial program. She wanted to join the program because she felt that it would help her to grow as a teacher. She had done her student teaching at Xavier High School and had observed many teachers during that time. She wanted to observe teachers as well as to have them observe her. She described informal opportunities for her department to collaborate including talking about teaching strategies and observing each other.

Ms. Price had just completed the first Collegial cycle when this interview took place. She found it to be an intense experience. While she believed the summer workshop had prepared her to work with the people in the summer workshop, she did not feel this was the case with her team. She felt that there should have been trust building activities within the team prior to the first cycle.

Complicating these feelings was the fact that the observation she had done was with Mr. Larson. She felt that the feedback they had given him, and that he had described during his interview as being "not necessarily positive," was in fact, threatening to him. She is now responsible for conducting the post-observation and is concerned how this will go.

The most satisfying thing about teaching for Ms. Price is working with young people and seeing them learn and grow. The paperwork is the least satisfying.

Her goal for this year is to include more visuals. This is something she has been working on so it is not particularly threatening. When she signed up for this program she felt that she would likely continue with it over a number of years. Now she is not so sure. Her doubts are brought on by the amount of time she is required to be out of the classroom. She wondered if she would always feel so drained after a cycle or if she just felt that way this time because it was her first experience.

Mr. Rand

Mr. Rand has been a science teacher at York High School for 32 years. He has been in the Collegial program for three or four years. The reason that he joined was to try to improve himself and to show the administration that even after all the years he has been teaching, he is still trying to improve. He perceives that the administration feels that this program is important.

He discussed the fact that Mr. Carlson, as an administrator, observes teachers in the program. While this worries him, he does not believe that this is a problem because the program would not exist if he abused the opportunity to observe.

He feels that the program has helped him as a teacher both because of the suggestions he has received and from watching other teachers. He explained that one of the suggestions he had gotten concerned the way he reviewed tests with his class. He said that he is open to new ideas. He has begun having students work together in groups after observing other teachers using cooperative groups.

The most satisfying thing about teaching for him includes the people he works with. He also discussed the climate of the school which allows teachers to try different ideas. In fact, they allow the teachers a great deal of freedom and encourage them to try new things. They have a sufficient budget for materials. The most dissatisfying thing for him are the students who don't care. He mentioned that sometimes a student will wear a T-shirt to his class with four letter words on it. It bothers him that no one has noticed or asked for it to be removed.

The Biology teachers in this school do meet to share ideas but there isn't a chance for any kind of team teaching. He feels that there is collaboration going on between the Biology teachers and has been for a long time.

One of the things that he doesn't like about the program is that the teams are from both schools. He feels that this is a waste of time since there needs to be travel time built in. He does like the fact that different departments are included on the teams. He feels that time is a factor in the program and that the teams shouldn't meet too often.

### Ms. Smith

Ms. Smith teaches dance and physical education at Xavier High School. She has been teaching for 13 years and this is her third year in the Collegial program.

Prior to joining the program she had thought about it for several years. What concerned her was having to get a substitute for her classes, and there is no qualified substitute for teaching dance. She was encouraged by a colleague to join. This encouragement was the main reason she finally decided to become involved.

As the only dance teacher, she has not really had anyone she could talk to about teaching. This year she is teaching some physical education classes and she often talks to the other teachers about what they are doing. The department was recently

consolidated into one big office instead of three, and this has helped in teachers talking to each other.

She believes that "seeing other teachers in action is probably the best part" of the Collegial program. She feels strongly that the interdisciplinary nature of the program is valuable. She might see something in an English class and "the wheels start turning" about how she could use it in her dance class.

She also believes the feedback she is given after being observed is valuable. Having someone come in to her classroom makes her think about what she is doing and why she is doing it. Teaching is no longer mechanical. "It renews you."

She had a hard time choosing a goal this year. It was the middle of the summer and she really wasn't thinking about teaching. So, she came in and looked at her Collegial file to see what recommendations her team had made last year. One of the suggestions they had made was to videotape students and allow them to self-critique. This was a response to her own concern about how her students take criticism. Up until now, she has felt that it would be too much of a hassle to drag the equipment up to her dance studio, however, she is going to try it this year as a goal. Her evaluation will be to determine whether the good that comes of it is worth the hassle of dealing with the equipment.

She's not sure that she will stay with the program after this year. Last year she was on a team with all York High School teachers so she had to travel much of the time. Compounding this was the problem of trying to get a substitute teacher for her area.

She didn't want to quit at the end of last year because she didn't want to leave on a bad note. She would really like to see the program be contained in separate schools. She believes there is a value to having teachers who have the same children on a team.

The most satisfying thing about teaching for her is "when a student goes, 'I got it!'" The least satisfying thing is when students don't want to be there. She said that she has been spoiled by teaching dance for so many years because it's an elective. Now that she is teaching physical education; she often has reluctant students.

The only negative experience she recalled with Collegial happened last year when one of her team members was really frustrated with her situation. She said the team got away from the Collegial format and really became a support group for her.

The one thing that makes this program successful is the support of the teachers. Teachers who are willing to become involved are risk takers themselves and are "willing to put themselves on the line." She is glad the program is not mandatory for this reason. The teachers who participate are good teachers and she often has a difficult time trying to find things that she can help them improve.

### Mr. Thomas

Mr. Thomas has been teaching English for eight years at York High School, with 11 years experience previously. It is his second year in the Collegial program. He became involved in the program

because he had heard from other department members that they had received a lot of good feedback as a result of participation.

When asked to relate something positive he had gotten from his team last year, Mr. Thomas explained that his team suggested he use a clipboard for recording participation rather than his grade book on the podium because then he could walk around the room during the discussion. He also mentioned that he now puts the student desks in semi-circles rather than in rows to facilitate discussions. This year he chose a goal related to cooperative education.

The team he worked with last year included a physical education teacher, a home economics teacher, and a special education teacher. He felt that he needed more academic teachers to make this worthwhile. He mentioned this on the end of the year evaluation for the program. This year his team has more academic teachers.

He does not know if he will continue with the program for much longer. He thought that you received graduate credit on the salary schedule for every year you participated but found out that you only get one the first year. The other thing that concerns him is the amount of time it takes. He is involved in many other activities and coaches several sports, so it is difficult for him to make the time.

The most satisfying thing about teaching is the fact that the school encourages innovative approaches to teaching. They support things like the Collegial program and allow teachers to go to

workshops and professional activities. The least satisfying thing is the amount of paperwork. Sometimes he would just like to close his classroom door and teach and not have to do all of the other things.

There is a group within his department who share ideas and work together. His prior experience with observing teachers was only on the rare occasion when he combined his class with someone else. This occurred only a couple of times a year.

He was encouraged by his department chairperson to join Collegial. He also believes that they are better at recruiting teachers than a lot of the other activities. He credited the brochure describing the program and the positive statements from teachers who had experienced the program.

He believes the program works because of the planning and the summer workshop. The simulations are helpful as a part of the training.

### Summary of Teacher Interviews

In an effort to more thoroughly understand the beliefs held by teachers about this program, further analysis of some of the areas explored through interviews was conducted.

#### Why Teachers Join

Teacher reported joining the program for a variety of reasons. Table 6 lists the reasons cited by teachers for joining.

Several teachers also discussed why they have stayed with the program. These reasons include things such as this program has

Table 6

Reasons for Joining Collegial Consultation Program

Teacher	Reason For Joining
Mr. Grant	Needed help with Level 3 classes Reduced Isolation
Mr. Harris	Encouraged by a friend Teaching had become mechanical
Ms. Jones	See Regular Education class; expectations
Ms. Kahn	Encouraged by a friend
Mr. Larson	Reduced isolation Chance to see other teachers teach
Mr. Morris	Wife was a part of the program Replaced clinical supervision
Ms. Nathan	Chance to watch other teachers Heard good things from participants
Ms. O'Toole	Positive feedback from participants People keep coming back Alternate supervision model Encouraged by department chairperson
Ms. Price	Best way to grow as a teacher Other department members encouraged her
Mr. Rand	To help himself grow Want administration to perceive him as growing
Ms. Smith	Encouraged by a friend
Mr. Thomas	Encouraged by department chairperson Heard positives things from participants

forced a reluctant teacher to grow in teaching, observing other teachers is a good way to learn, the program encourages growth as a teacher, this program replaces clinical supervision on alternate years, and you get more from observing than being observed.

Some teachers talked about whether they would continue to participate over a number of years. Most of those who have been in it for several years intend to stay. One teacher said that if Mr. Adams no longer coordinated the program he wasn't sure he would stay. Two teachers new to the program were worried about the time commitment. One teacher in his second year is not sure he will continue. He has a variety of other commitments which take his time, and he didn't realize you only get credit on the salary schedule for the first year of participation. Another teacher would like to work with teachers in her own building to reduce the time from the classroom.

### Goal Setting

Each teacher writes a goal for the Collegial program. In addition, each team leader writes a goal for themselves as team leader. Most of these goals related to instruction: better closings, cooperative learning, teaching social skills, and using more visuals with Level 3 students. Most were things that the teachers really wanted to work on; some teachers reported having worked on them for a while so they are not as risky as some other goal. One teacher used the feedback she had gotten from last year as this year's goal.

Team leader goals related directly to team needs. One team leader intended to call all team members before each cycle because he had heard that someone on his team had a tendency to forget to come to sessions. Another wanted to encourage openness on her team, yet to make sure feedback was tactful.

### Negatives

Seven teachers reported concerns or negative aspects of the Collegial Program. These included the amount of time it takes away from teaching; this was specifically mentioned as a negative twice. Other teachers also expressed concern but didn't specifically list it as a problem. One teacher was concerned that there were no trust building activities as a team before the first cycle. Another expressed concern over the composition of the team. Finally, one teacher thought that the district should give teachers credit on the salary schedule for each year in the program. Two teachers mentioned the problems that teachers in their team had had, not with Collegial, but with other teaching related situations. They described their experiences with these situations as negative.

### Teacher Satisfaction

When asked what is most satisfying thing about teaching the teachers responded as follows.

Table 7

What Makes Teaching Satisfying

Teacher	Reported Satisfier
Mr. Grant	The human interaction with the kids
Mr. Harris	Seeing students understand new concepts
Mr. Larson	Rapport with students
Mr. Morris	Watching students grow
Ms. Nathan	The kids
Ms. O'Toole	Working with young people
Ms. Jones	Successes with children (academic and behavioral)
Ms. Price	Working with young people; seeing them grow
Mr. Rand	The people I work with
Ms. Smith	When suddenly students understand something
Mr. Thomas	Willing to take a chance on innovative approaches

Table 8

Most Dissatisfying Things About Teaching

Teacher	Reported Dissatisfier
Ms. Jones	Can't turn it off when she gets home
Mr. Morris	No curriculum; special education paperwork
Ms. O'Toole	Not enough time; all the paperwork
Ms. Price	Paperwork
Mr. Rand	Kids that don't care
Ms. Smith	Having kids who don't want to be there
Mr. Thomas	Paperwork; all the extra commitments

## Changing Teacher Behaviors

Most teachers were able to describe instances where the feedback they had received through this process had changed their own teaching behaviors. Their responses are listed in Table 9.

Table 9

### Teaching Behaviors Resulting From Participation

Teacher	Behavior
Mr. Grant	Less need for control; more relaxed
Mr. Harris	Less critical, refined teaching strategies
Ms. Kahn	Focuses in advance what is going to happen in class
Mr. Larson	Changed the way he played "Jeopardy"
Ms. Jones	Less teacher centered
Mr. Rand	Changed how he goes over exams Allows groups to turn in one assignment
Ms. Smith	Use videotape for feedback
Mr. Thomas	Uses a clipboard for recording participation Puts student desks in semi-circle

## Resource Sharing and Collegiality

Many teachers talked about how the Collegial program provides them an opportunity to share ideas and information with their teams. In addition, many teachers talked about the opportunities they had throughout the school day to share with their colleagues.

In looking specifically at things resulting from the Collegial program, teachers reported acquiring ideas about how to use an aide and better ways to set up a management system.

Many teachers reported not having time, other than the Collegial program to share ideas. Most reported that they had never, or rarely, been observed by another teacher, or observed another teacher themselves. One teacher reported maintaining friendships with team members outside of school. One teacher felt that this program has changed the way he feels about teaching.

### "Absolutes" For The Program

Teachers were asked to identify one critical component of this program that makes it successful. Their answers are identified in Table 10.

### The Observation Cycle

As part of the data collection process notes were recorded upon conducting an observation of a Collegial cycle. The cycle includes the pre-observation, the observation, the strategy session, the feedback session, the process conference, and the post-observation. All of these were observed with the exception of the post-observation conference because this takes place at a later time and is between the observed teacher and one team member. The team which was observed included Mr. Thomas, who was the observed teacher, Ms. Kahn, the team leader, Mr. Rand, and Ms. Smith.

Table 10

Critical Components That Make This Program Successful

Teacher	Factor
Mr. Grant	Absolute confidentiality
Mr. Harris	Its voluntary, people believe in it, not political
Ms. Kahn	It's voluntary
Mr. Larson	The support of the administration
Ms. Nathan	The training in the summer workshop
Ms. O'Toole	Collaboration with other teachers
Ms. Jones	Confidentiality
Ms. Price	Teams must trust one another
Mr. Rand	Don't meet too often; don't take away time in class
Ms. Smith	The supportive teachers, its voluntary
Mr. Thomas	The training in the summer workshop

The pre-observation began with various team members asking Mr. Thomas clarifying questions about his completed worksheet and his lesson plan. His collegial goal was to try cooperative groups with his class, and this particular lesson reflected this goal. Mr. Thomas explained that while this is considered a Level 2 class, the students are all low readers. There are usually seven students in the class, but he knows one will be absent today. The team discussed the problems with class size and the relationship to the Level of the class. They reflected on their previous observation of Ms. Kahn where she had a large Level 3 class. Since then she has requested, and been assigned an aide. Mr. Adams remarked, "Collegial strikes again." This in reference to the fact that they had recommended that she ask for an aide after their observation.

Before the observation team members were assigned roles. A teacher from the same building as Mr. Thomas offered to do the post conference; another teacher who had just been observed offered to be the process observer. The last teacher took the job as feedback coordinator. There seemed to be no difficulty in assigning roles. Mr. Adams also attended the session to act as a resource person.

During the observation, the team was careful not to overwhelm the small class. Two of the team members moved close to the student groups to collect data, the others did not move from their original seats. This decision was made during the pre-observation conference.

During the strategy session, the team talked about how to conduct the feedback session. Because the class had gone so well,

the team decided to concentrate on letting Mr. Thomas direct the feedback. They did want, however, to make sure they relayed how important they felt it would be for him to give the class positive feedback. He had been concerned that they might not have been prepared with their homework, and this was not the case. The team hoped to indicate that the class members themselves could analyze why it went so well. They might be able to come up with the fact that their own preparedness helped the class to work.

The feedback conference began with the coordinator asking Mr. Thomas how he felt the class went. He indicated he was pleased. He mentioned right away that he wanted to give the class positive feedback. The coordinator tried to give him some suggestions about allowing the class to become involved in the analysis. Mr. Thomas did not seem to pick up on this suggestion.

The process conference was short with plans made for the post-observation. Everyone agreed that the cycle had gone well. The group talked about the subtlety of the advice they had given.

During this observation things went well. The entire cycle seemed to come off as it had been explained in the summer training workshop.

### History of the Program and Development of Roles

A number of people who were involved with the program from the beginning are still involved with it. In some cases their roles in the district or in the program have changed. For example, one of the teachers originally involved has become the district coordinator,

and another teacher whose idea the program was originally, is now a department chairperson.

The idea for a peer coaching program originated when Ms. Brown, who was then one of the district's teachers, returned from an ASCD convention having heard about clinical supervision and its impact on teaching. She recalls the time frame as being in 1981 or 1982. Ms. Brown was teaching part-time at this time and was taking graduate classes. While she doesn't recall the reason for attendance at the ASCD convention that year, she does recall feeling that the concept of clinical supervision, while new to the teachers, was something that she perceived could become very valuable. She recalls feeling, "I think that this could be applied to staff working together. The tricky part would be is that it would have to be totally separate from the real supervision model so that it doesn't get into any kind of summative evaluation."

The program was originally designed for teachers to collaborate about "at risk" students. Therefore, original participants were all teachers who taught these students. Having surveyed the faculty members in her building who taught "Level 3" classes, she found a number of teachers who were interested in becoming involved. Level 3 classes are described as classes taught to the lower achieving students. The Superintendent was interested in the program from its inception and agreed to support the concept with the restriction that teachers from the other high school in the district had to be included. While this was not very popular with the

originators of the program at the beginning, it is now considered one of the advantages of the program.

There were 12 members during the first year, 1983-84, all of whom were teachers who taught students in the lowest track. They represented a variety of departments, however. The original summer workshop was conducted by Ms. Brown and an outside consultant from the University of Chicago. During the first year the district School Psychologist/Social Worker also attended the summer workshop. Many of the training techniques that were used during that original workshop are still being used. Training was provided on how to talk to each other and how to discuss issues. Role-playing was, and still is, a large part of the summer training.

Ms. Brown recalls of the initial experience:

Anyway, what happened is, we all had a wonderful time. It was immediately beneficial. We made mistakes, and when we made mistakes, they were big time. We really felt that it was really a good program, and we realized the people we could help and those people we couldn't help. There were lots of teachers signing up for this as the years progressed who really were not able to use the program. It's a certain type of person, a certain profile of person that should be involved in a peer supervision program.

The program has, of course, evolved over the years, the biggest change being that teachers of all levels of students are involved. In addition, the summer training is now conducted entirely by district staff.

Mr. Carlson, the Executive Director of Instruction joined the district during the program's second year of implementation. His role has evolved over the last several years. He is responsible for

staff development and teacher training for the district and, therefore, has become involved in the training component for the Collegial Consultation program.

A variety of roles have evolved as the program has become operational. As Ms. Brown has moved from a teaching position to Department Chairperson, her responsibilities within the program have changed. She continues to act as a resource person but is no longer directly involved as a participant.

Mr. Adams now acts as coordinator of the program and is responsible for all of the administrative duties related to organization and program development. Mr. Adams was one of the teachers originally involved in the development of the program and has been involved ever since its inception. For the last three or four years, he's not sure how long, he has been responsible for the daily operations of the program. He works with the team leaders to make sure that everyone knows the dates and their responsibilities for each observation cycle, he coordinates substitutes, he is responsible for paperwork, recruitment, and for training.

Mr. Adams reports that there has always been a teacher in charge of the program and that in the beginning there was a teacher at each school. This model became expensive and also became cumbersome for coordinating information. Eventually, there was one person responsible for the entire district.

Compensation for these responsibilities is to have one release period during the school year. In addition, a stipend is paid for

teaching the summer workshop class just as a stipend is paid for teaching any class during the summer.

The role of resource person has been retained by Ms. Brown. She acts as the "expert" when questions arise, and she participates in the summer workshop program.

Each team is assigned a team leader. This person is someone who has been in the program before. They tend to be people who are very interested in the program and stay for a number of years in this role. Their responsibilities are described by Mr. Adams:

The team leader, basically, has two roles. During the summer workshop they are to attend three of four days, or four of the five days, add their expertise, help the brand new people feel comfortable in their diagnostic-analysis role playing. These are people that are going to end up being on their team, some of them, not all of them, so they get to know these people, feel a camaraderie with them; and help select the teams by the end of the workshop for next fall. With the input with the people they know already from the past, who are continuing with the new people that they're seeing work now. I certainly cannot tell every single person, I may have seen them once or twice; whereas the team leader has seen them six times in just one year. Now during the year their job is really just to facilitate things. They'll make sure that there is a room for the pre-observation and post-observation conference. They will let me know if there is any kind of problem, from having to reschedule due to an emergency that day. Teachers have been sick on the day they were supposed to be observed. They're kind of just another liaison-type person.

### Recruitment and the Training Process

Each year the responsibility for recruiting new participants falls to the District Coordinator. In April an introductory letter is

sent to all teachers about the program. (See Appendix F). The letter highlights the benefits of the program to the teacher and suggests that people should look for further information in their mailbox or should call for further information. This letter is followed by a brochure about the program. The theme "Teachers Helping Teachers Grow" is stressed throughout the literature. Time requirements are explained; the summer workshop, the consultation time, and the inservice meeting are described. In addition, benefits such as professional growth are explained. Many department chairpeople will become involved during the recruitment process to encourage teachers to participate. It is interesting to note that applicants are told that they will be notified if they are accepted into the program, and yet, everyone who applies and commits to requirements is accepted.

Informal methods of recruitment are also used. People who are already participating in the program, department chairpeople, and other administrators will provide the names of people who they think will be good candidates for the program. These people receive a letter which suggests that they have been "recommended" as someone who would be a positive addition to the collegial group. This individual attention often brings results.

Word of mouth is also a reliable technique. Some departments are more highly represented than others. In some cases this is because of word of mouth, and in others it is a reflection on the type of needs the department has. For example, it was reported that special education teachers are becoming more involved as the

Regular Education Initiative has come about, and it has become more important to know how regular education classrooms function.

Recently a videotape was put together which describes the program and its benefits. This video is available for interested teachers as well as for other districts expressing an interest in the program.

The training process has evolved over the nine years that the program has been in effect. During the summer of 1991, training occurred over four days in June and involved all new participants, team leaders, and several administrators. The total training time was 20 hours, five hours each day for four days. During this time new participants were trained in the process, relationships were initiated and developed among old and new members, teams were selected, and good communication and positive interactions were modeled.

Training began on a Tuesday morning the week after the school year ended. All new participants were required to attend all sessions; team leaders attended only the last three days. Training was conducted by three people who had been involved in the process since the beginning: Mr. Adams, the district coordinator, Ms. Brown, the teacher turned department chairperson whose idea the program was initially, and Mr. Carlson, the Executive Director of Instruction. The training included a variety of activities including lectures, group discussions, writing assignments, videotapes, and role-playing.

There were three goals for the summer workshop. The handout describing them appears in Appendix G. They include developing trusting relationships among the participants, learning the process used for collegial consultation, and improving diagnostic skills related to the teaching process.

The first goal is that participants will have "established a climate of trust, confidence, respect, and rapport for one another." This is accomplished in several ways. Participants work in groups throughout the workshop completing trust building activities together. Involving all participants in introductions is one way that the development of relationships was targeted. Each person interviewed another participant and then introduced that person to the group. One team leader commented that a "major part of the summer workshop is to build up trust with one another."

Another of the group activities completed early in the training was to complete a worksheet listing what trust looks like and what it sounds like. For this activity participants chose the group to join although most simply moved closer to the people they were sitting close to. The groups then chose one word using each letter from the word TRUST to describe it. These choices were shared with the large group. This activity was led by Mr. Carlson.

During each of the last three days a writing activity was conducted. Each participant was to write a response to a prompt given. The three prompts were:

1. Remember a time in the recent or remote past when you had trouble learning something. Try to recall as vividly as you can

the details of the experience and the emotions you felt. Write about it below.

2. Recall one successful experience you had as a teacher. Try to recapture the details of the experience. Write all that you can remember.

3. Pretend that you are nearing the end of your career. A younger colleague who has been teaching for only a few years asks you, "After all these years, what have you really learned about teaching--what do you know that could help me?" What would you say?

The writing assignments were designed to involve more risk taking early and to become less risky by the end. The first asks to describe a personal negative experience, the second to describe a less personal positive experience, and the last to share advice. Each writing experience involved a request by Mr. Adams to share responses with the group. As a way to make people feel more comfortable during the first experience, he read his own response first. The team leaders were also very willing to share during this time and a few new participants did as well. By the last day participants were much more willing to read their own responses aloud to the class. There was one participant who seemed to be very insecure about his involvement in the process and was very reluctant to participate in any of the role-playing. By the last day even he shared his writing assignment with the group.

Role-playing was a technique used frequently throughout the four days. Videotaped lessons were used rather than having someone

teach a lesson during the workshop. For the first explanation of the process, the pre-observation conference, strategy session, and feedback session were also videotaped for the participants to view. After that, the entire process, except the lesson itself, was role-played. The level of risk was increased throughout the training for involvement in role-playing. The first time through everyone simply observed the videotaped sample. During subsequent situations the team leaders and the two facilitators modeled the process. By the end of the third day and during the fourth day new participants also took an active role.

Team leaders were instrumental in the process of developing relationships. If someone was reluctant to participate in the role-playing, the team leader would assign him/her a role. For example, one participant was reluctant to take the role of the feedback coordinator because he said he was afraid of saying the wrong thing. The team leader advised him that this was a role that he would be taking on during the year and suggested that it was better to practice it now than to make mistakes in a real situation.

The fear of saying the wrong thing or hurting someone's feelings were discussed throughout the workshop but more often toward the end. Whether this was due to participants becoming more aware of their own fears or because they felt more comfortable in discussing their fears with the group, was difficult to determine.

The team leaders work with Mr. Adams during the summer workshop to help to develop the teams for the following school year.

Teams of four teachers are chosen based on three criteria. The first is that there be a combination of new people to collegial and experienced people. The second is that there be a mix of people from the two high schools. The last criteria is that there be people from diverse content areas. The team leaders meet after the workshops on each of the three days they attend to discuss how the group is developing and to determine how they will help this process. At the same time they also discuss the composition of the teams for the following year.

Integrated throughout all of the activities conducted during training is information about the process of collegial consultation. The participants are given materials describing each of the steps of the process, and they spend time learning about and practicing each of the steps.

During the first day of training the pre-observation conference was introduced. New participants viewed a videotape of a lesson after they have seen the pre-observation conference modeled by the trainers. They learned that this conference is scheduled for one class period immediately prior to the observation. It was explained that the pre-observation worksheet is to be prepared in advance by the observed teacher and given to the team the day before the observation. During the conference the teacher explains the purpose of the lesson and describes the feedback he/she is requesting from the team. The role of the other team members in the pre-observation conference is to ask clarifying questions so that they are clear about the kind of feedback the teacher is requesting.

Examples of ways to gather the right information in a pre-observation conference were given. For example, team members might want to ask "What kind of information do you want on student involvement?", "What should we look for to give you that information?", "How will you be checking for understanding?", and "Are there problems with certain kids?" Participants were cautioned that the pre-observation conference is not the time to suggest that a teacher's idea might not be a good one or to give the teacher examples of how the lesson might be better conducted. This information can be exchanged after the lesson if, in fact, the lesson does not go well.

The pre-observation conference was discussed several times during the workshop, and on three of the days a pre-observation conference was modeled or role-played as a part of the entire process. After the initial experience by videotape, the trainers showed how to conduct a conference. The last time groups of participants worked together to plan the conference and then conducted it with the rest of the group watching. All of the groups worked from the same worksheet, which gave everyone a chance to compare their thinking with the rest of the training group.

Strategies for gathering data from the observation were also explained and discussed. A worksheet which can be used for this purpose was presented (see Appendix E.) The concept of script-taping was explained and practiced. In addition, other methods of collecting data were discussed. During the practice sessions teachers were encouraged to use the script-taping method so that

the data gathered by the group was consistent. This part of the Collegial process lasts for a class period.

For this Collegial model, the next step in the process is the strategy session. This process was described during the second session as a time to appoint one member the feedback coordinator and to discuss the feedback process. The feedback coordinator is responsible to organize and outline the ideas that are generated by the team during the strategy session. During the feedback session itself, the coordinator is responsible to make sure that the session functions as planned. While any member of the team can give feedback, it is the responsibility of the the feedback coordinator to facilitate the process. One of the suggestions that was given during training was to focus on one major suggestion that the team has for the teacher they observed.

During the training for feedback, teachers were encouraged to write down a list of positive things that happened during the observation that they could come back to if they got stuck during the feedback process. Again, this part of the process was modeled and practiced three times, the first by viewing a videotape, the second time by watching the trainers, and the third time by practicing in a simulated session. A worksheet which can be used to organized this information appears in Appendix E.

It was explained that while the team was conducting the strategy session, the teacher was spending the period reflecting about the lesson. It was emphatically explained that the "teacher does not teach this period." "We don't take the time to reflect as

teachers. When it's over, it's over. You will have a few things you thought were pretty damn good. You're looking for confirmation of the things you think went well."

The fourth step in the process, the feedback conference, was given a great deal of attention. Mr. Adams explained that in the past, the evaluations of the summer workshop had indicated that this was the part of the process with which teachers felt most uncomfortable, and the part that they wished they had had more training on.

The feedback conference was introduced on the second day by videotape. The videotape was a simulation of an entire session based on a lesson that was viewed during the first workshop. Mr. Adams and Ms. Brown were the team members for this simulation. They recommended that the session begin with the feedback coordinator asking the teacher how he/she felt that the lesson went. The teacher's response should then guide the team regarding the feedback they give to the teacher.

Mr. Adams reiterated the need for letting the teacher direct the feedback session by saying that you "must listen to what that person is saying. People will change when they're ready. . .not one minute before. You can't make them ready." He recommended listening to the person who was observed for clues about their agenda. He also reminded the participants to give suggestions regarding something that can be changed, not something that the teacher has no control over. Finally, he suggested three ways to "fill dead air: answer their question with a question, give a

positive, or go to the observation feedback checklist and ask a question."

During the third workshop day, this process was again reinforced with a role-playing session. Mr. Adams and Mr. Carlson took turns going through a pre-observation conference followed by a videotaped classroom lesson. Participants acted as collegial team members and asked questions during the pre-observation conference and collected data during the lesson. This videotape was of an art teacher teaching a lesson about various periods in art history. The lesson was very poorly done. Participants then divided into groups to conduct a strategy session. They struggled to plan what they would say during the feedback session. Each of the three groups then took turns role-playing a feedback session with Mr. Carlson. It is interesting to note that based on their training each of the groups ended up planning a very similar strategy for feedback.

People seemed most fearful of this part of the process. One of the new participants remarked that she was more afraid to hurt someone than to be observed. This was apparent because of the initial reluctance of any of the new people to take on the role of feedback coordinator. They were advised that this was the time to practice, and that saying the wrong thing now wouldn't hurt anyone's feelings. Even at the end of the workshop feedback continued to be the one area that the new participants felt the most insecure about.

The process conference for observers was described, but a great deal of time was not spent on practice or discussion of this part of the process. By the third day, the groups did have a process

conference after the feedback session was modeled. The process conference takes place immediately after the feedback session but after the observed teacher leaves the room. The purpose of this time is to discuss the feedback session and to determine whether anything was left out or left unclear to the teacher. The group reflects on how well they did as a group. Anything that was forgotten or vague will be discussed with the observed teacher during the post-observation conference.

During the role-playing sessions on the third and fourth day, the post-observation conference was discussed and practiced. This part of the process takes place some time within a week following the observation. One team member conducts the post-observation conference with the observed teacher. It is this team member's responsibility to contact the observed teacher to set up a time and place for the post-observation conference. The purpose of this step is to clarify anything that was left unclear and to reinforce the ideas discussed during the rest of the process. This can be a time for reinforcing the positives and restating suggestions. Typically this is a less formal part of the process. Again, participants had an opportunity to role-play this step in the process.

Another goal of the summer workshop was to improve diagnostic teaching skills. This occurred during the role playing opportunities as well as through the goal setting process. For example, one of the videotapes was of an art teacher explaining art history in a very short lesson. There were obviously several things wrong with the presentation: too much material in a short lecture,

no visual representation of ideas, no advanced preparation of materials. During the role-playing time devoted to feedback preparation, teachers discussed their own perceptions of this class. Even though the focus of the discussion was feedback, the teachers had to diagnose the instruction in order to consider areas for feedback. In this example, the problems were the most obvious; however, in other simulations, the same practice in diagnosis occurred.

As a part of the collegial process, teachers write goals related to their own classroom. New teachers and team leaders wrote these goals during the summer workshop. This expectation relates to the diagnosis of teaching as teachers had to think about their own class and determine area(s) they want to work on for improvement.

As an observer it was interesting to notice the changing relationships between the participants of the summer workshop. Teams were changed so that different people worked together each day. This was an opportunity for the team leaders to get to know the various new participants. All of the participants were willing to participate fully by the end of the four days.

### Reflections About the Training Process

This team of trainers has been conducting a summer training program for nine years. They have had the experience of good experiences and bad experiences to help them plan for training. The workshop is designed to meet all of the goals set at the beginning.

It provides the information, experiences, and opportunities necessary to make new participants feel comfortable with the process. Having the team leaders attend is worthwhile. They make the initial role playing experience valuable, and they help establish a climate of trust and camaraderie. The training component is certainly one of the most important assets this program has to ensure its success.

## CHAPTER V

### Conclusions and Recommendations

This case study was conducted in an effort to analyze an existing peer coaching model to determine why it is effective. The review of the literature suggested a variety of models and concepts to consider in the planning of a peer coaching program. Much of the literature provides examples of such programs that have been in effect for only a short period of time; there are few studies of programs over time. This case study examines a program in its ninth year of implementation. It is hoped that this information can be used by other schools who are considering implementing such a program to avoid pitfalls and to include all of the necessary components.

### Research Questions

Five research questions were identified prior to beginning this research study.

1. What motivates teachers to become involved and to stay involved in this program? In examining teacher responses to interview questions, it is interesting to group them by whether the teacher is experienced with the program or not. When asked why they joined the program, experienced teachers listed such things as reduced isolation, chance to see other teachers, having been encouraged by a friend, wanting to continue to grow as a teacher, and hoping to get help from colleagues. New participants

identified things such as having heard good things from others, having seen people already in the program keep coming back, wanting an opportunity to watch other teachers teach, having been encouraged by department chairperson, and recognizing it as a way to grow as a teacher. While the answers are not all that different, a slight variation occurs in that new participants seemed to rely more on "word of mouth" feedback from others.

While one new teacher admitted that he joined so that he doesn't have to go through the clinical supervision process with his department chairperson, teachers were less likely to list this benefit than administrators. Most of the other responses to this question can be grouped into three categories: desire to reduce isolation, wanting to improve instruction, and looking for the opportunity to share resources.

2. What are the teachers' perceptions about how the program affect collegiality? For many teachers, the Collegial program was the only time that they were able to talk to their colleagues about teaching. Some reported having time set aside during department meetings, but many said that this doesn't occur. Teachers familiar with the literature about peer coaching mentioned things like reduced isolation. It is interesting to note that one of the teachers was described by several people as having changed his personality as a result of the program.

Administrators mentioned, almost universally, that the teachers who participate are all good teachers. One department chairperson referred to them as the best in the school. While

teachers didn't specifically point this out, the framework of their responses indicated that they felt that this was true. They wanted the opportunity to get their team's ideas about areas of concern. They wanted feedback about their teaching. They obviously respected the teachers with whom they were working.

3. According to the teachers, how does the program affect instruction and resource sharing? Each teacher was able to give at least one example of something he/she had learned through this program that had changed their teaching behavior. This learning experience may have been a result of feedback from being observed or it may have come from seeing how other teachers teach.

Teachers valued the fact that teams were interdepartmental. They explained that they learned many strategies from teachers in other departments that could be used in their own classrooms.

Some of the teachers who had been involved for an extended period of time described their role as a "mentor" to new people. Team leaders, in particular, saw themselves as being able to help less experienced teachers grow in the profession.

Two teachers specifically talked about how teaching had become routine for them. The Collegial program forced them to think about what they are doing and why they are doing it. This cognition became valuable to them.

4. What are the benefits reported by administrators? Their responses included things like personal growth, reduced isolation, opportunity to talk with other teachers, learning from their peers, camaraderie, common language, knowing the science of teaching,

being able to experiment, sharing ideas, and taking time to reflect. They also almost universally mentioned the fact that this program replaces the clinical supervision on off years. Very few of the teachers mentioned this benefit. Many of the administrators said that they encouraged people to join the program.

5. What are the characteristics of a successful training component? Some of the characteristics noted through observation were that the program develops both trust and expertise. Trust is established among the participants and for the program model. Expertise in diagnosing teaching situations and in working with a colleague are established. The training covers the process itself and some of the research about peer coaching. Most importantly, the training provides teachers an opportunity to role play each of the steps in the process in a mock situation. This is critical for new participants in developing their own confidence in the program.

### Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the analysis of data collected through interviews, participant observations, and document review:

#### Administrative Support

This program receives support and encouragement from the administration. Administrators encourage teachers to participate, recognize those that do, and provide appropriate rewards as well. These rewards are both extrinsic and intrinsic. Extrinsic rewards

include graduate credits, less supervisory duties for team leaders, and no clinical supervision for teachers every other year. Intrinsic rewards include recognition and support. The program is supported financially by the Board of Education. Substitutes teachers are provided for participants, compensation is given for team leaders to attend the summer workshop, a stipend is paid for the coordinator to teach the summer workshop, and the coordinator is released from some of his teaching responsibilities.

### Types of Teachers Who Participate

The teachers who participate are considered the "best" in the district. There is no stigma attached to participation as there would be if teachers who needed remediation were involved. In fact, some teachers join to be able to observe teachers they recognize as being among the best in the district. Teachers who participate are open to trying new strategies, are reflective about their teaching, and tend to be self-directed.

### Why Teachers Join

Teachers join for a variety of reasons. Many feel that it is a way to help them improve their teaching. They believe that the program provides the avenue to help them improve the delivery of instruction and share ideas and resources. Some teachers talk about how the program reduces the isolation of the teaching profession.

### Relationship to the Supervision Program

Administrators connect this program with the district's supervision program rather than its staff development program. They feel that teachers participate because it is an alternative to the clinical supervision model. Every other year, teachers in the district have the option to elect participation in a self-evaluation model or the Collegial model instead of the usual clinical supervision model.

### Relationship to the Staff Development Program

While much of the literature about peer coaching addresses the fact that it helps transfer training, this Collegial program is not tied to the district's staff development program. Teachers receive their training in a variety of ways, not necessarily because of this program. The program does, however, often provide training to the participants. For example, two Saturday workshops are conducted for new participants. The topics of these workshops are related to the interests of the participants.

### Collaboration

Teachers value the collaborative nature of the program. They state that they find that they are able to talk about teaching with the members of their team. They say that there are times that teachers talk to each other during department meetings and in their office areas but that lack of time often negatively influences these opportunities.

### Teacher Satisfaction

Teachers say that the most satisfying thing about teaching concerns relationships with students and other teachers. These relationships are enhanced through this collaborative process. They value the relationships developed among team members. Their responses are similar to those addressed in the research (Chapman & Lowther, 1982, Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984; and Zahorik, 1987). Zahorik (1987) specifically mentions the satisfaction of collegial interactions and professional growth.

### Teacher Motivation

The reasons teachers give for participation in the program could be characterized using Herzberg's (1976) theories as motivators. They include: growth, achievement, and recognition. The things that teachers report as being the most dissatisfying thing about their job almost universally refer to the paperwork. Herzberg would certainly characterize these responses as dissatisfiers.

When discussing the negatives about the program, many teachers referred to the amount of time it takes. They talked about time away from the classroom and time spent completing the paperwork. A few teachers felt that the program would be better if it was just done within their own school so less time would be spent travelling.

### The Relationship to Evaluation

While there is some tie between this program and evaluation, care is taken to minimize this relationship. Participants are careful to keep all information confidential. While this program can be used to replace the clinical supervision process during alternate years, evaluators do not have any specific information about what occurs during the observations.

Some concern exists about administration participation in the program. In particular, some teachers are leery about Mr. Carlson being an observer during Collegial cycles. There is no concern, however, about Ms. Brown participating even though she is a department chairperson.

### The Importance of Training

The extensive training program during the summer contributes to the effectiveness of the program. New teachers, in particular recognize this importance. The summer workshop begins the development of trust relationships. New participants become familiar with the process of the Collegial cycle, and they develop a level of confidence in it through the role playing process. Summer training is also a time for team leaders to determine the team compositions for the following year.

### Critical Components

When asked to list the most important components of the program teachers talk about trust, confidentiality and the fact that the program is voluntary.

### The Importance of Climate

The climate that exists in the district contributes to the success of the program. While very few people who were interviewed stated this as a factor, they often talked about how the district valued teacher improvement. They also mentioned that the district supported teachers when they wanted to try new things.

### Recommendations

Based on this case study the following recommendations are made to districts considering or planning a peer coaching program:

1. Consider the climate of the school or district. If the climate is not open and supportive, develop a plan to improve these areas prior to beginning a peer coaching program.
2. Recognize the importance of the training component. Do not neglect training for teachers both in the process and in the areas of trust and confidentiality.
3. The model used should allow all of the steps needed to complete the entire process: pre-observation conference, observation, strategy session and teacher reflection, feedback session, process conference, and post-observation conference.

4. Determine how the program will be funded. Teachers report that the time involved in participation is a concern. Providing substitutes can be considered both an advantage and a disadvantage.
5. Recognize the concern among teachers about administrative involvement. Teachers may be uncomfortable having administrators included in the program.
6. The selections of partners or teams does not necessarily need to be voluntary. This program works successfully with assigned teams.
7. Teachers in this program value the opportunity to see teachers from other departments. Consider having teachers work with partners or teams that teach a variety of subjects.
8. Recognize the importance of a voluntary participation policy. Teachers should not be forced to be involved.
9. Do not use the program to remediate poor teachers. Peer coaching is a technique to help good teachers continue to develop not for poor teachers to improve.
10. While the transfer of training can be one of the benefits of peer coaching, peer coaching does not necessarily need to be strongly tied to a staff development program. Teachers can benefit from observation as well as from feedback.
11. Consider using peer coaching as a way of motivating experienced, successful teachers. Allowing such teachers to act as mentors can be a positive experience.

### Suggestions for Further Study

To follow up this study, it would be interesting to know more about the perceptions of the teachers who haven't participated in this program. What are their reasons for not participating? How much information do they have about it?

Also, what about the teachers who participated for at least one year and no longer do so? Are there consistent reasons for "dropping out?" While there were some examples given of negative situations, are there other problems that exist of which no one is aware?

This study involved a high school district. It would be interesting to investigate the nature of a program in an elementary district to compare the results. Should teams involve teachers from various grade levels? Do elementary teachers express similar concerns about collaboration and isolation?

What about districts who have discontinued peer coaching programs? Interviews conducted with administrators and teachers of such programs could provide insights into what can go wrong. These conditions could then be avoided in the future.

### Reflections About the Research

The limitations of the methodology used in this study have been previously addressed, however, after having the opportunity to study this program, certain characteristics stand out. This program has provided teachers a needed opportunity to reflect about their practices as teachers, to reduce the isolation often felt in this

profession, and to share teaching resources and ideas. Having watched the process and talked to 18 knowledgeable people about it, there is no doubt that it works. Having the support of the Board of Education is critical, both financially and with public acknowledgement of the benefits of the program. However, this is a program that was conceived, developed, and that is now administered by the teachers themselves. They are the key to its success.

APPENDIX A  
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

## DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

	Xavier High School	York High School
Number of Students	1,220	1,560
% College Prep	100%	100%
Graduation Rate	93.3%	98.2%
Average Class Size	18.2	16.1
% Enrolled in :		
Math	89.9%	86.1%
Science	90.8%	86.0%
English	108.1%	110.2%
Soc. St.	72.4%	77.6%

## TOTAL DISTRICT DATA

## Teacher Characteristics

White 99.7%, Hispanic 0.3%

Female 46.7%, Male 53.3%

Total Number of Teachers	201
Average Teaching Experience	19.1 years
Teachers with Bachelors Degree	12.5%
Teachers with Masters and Above	87.5
Pupil/Teacher Ratio	14.5:1
Pupil Administrator Ratio	141.1:1
Average 1989-90 Teacher Salary	\$48,756
Operating Expense/Student (1988-89)	\$9,498

APPENDIX B  
INITIAL LETTER FROM MR. ADAMS

May 22, 1991

Chris Jakicic, Principal  
Willow Grove School  
777 Checker Drive  
Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089

Thank you for your continued interest in our District Collegial Consultation Peer Evaluation Program. I am glad to send you the list of participants for 1991-92 (continuing and new), some recruitment materials, and a copy of our handbook.

As we discussed earlier on the phone, you will be contacting me and others in the future for more information. I'm happy that you chose to include our Collegial Consultation Program as part of your doctoral dissertation research.

Sincerely,

District Collegial  
Consultation Coordinator

APPENDIX C  
TENTATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

TENTATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS  
TEACHERS

DECISION TO GET INVOLVED

1. How long have you been teaching? How long have you been involved in peer coaching?
2. I'd like to explore with you the reasons that you decided to get involved with this program. Was anything different than it is now/ what you were teaching, etc.?
3. Can you think back to when you made that decision, and what it was that made you get involved?  
    probe--other people involved in the decision  
        --other teachers you knew who were doing it
4. As you reflect on the reasons that you first joined the program, have they proven to be true now that you are in it?
5. What reasons do you have for staying in the program?

COLLEGIALITY

6. Tell me about your relationship with your team members  
    probe--talk to them other than during this process  
        feel differently about different people  
        is there one person who has been more helpful than others  
        go to them when you're having a problem with student or curriculum or strategy
7. Has the relationship changed since the beginning? In what way?
8. Has being involved in peer coaching changed your relationship with other teachers who aren't involved in peer coaching?
9. Do you talk about peer coaching with them?
10. Is it helpful to have teachers from other subject areas on your team? In what ways?

11. Has this program affected the way you think about teaching?  
How?

12. How helpful has the feedback you've gotten from team members been? Can you give me an example...

#### TEACHER SATISFACTION/MOTIVATION

13. Are you satisfied with your current position? Why/Why not?

14. Overall, how satisfied are you with the progress you've made in your professional career?

15. Do you consider yourself open to trying new teaching strategies?

16. What do you find most satisfying about teaching?

17. What do you find most dissatisfying about teaching?

18. Has peer coaching changed the way you feel about teaching?

#### INSTRUCTION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT

19. How do you choose the teaching strategy you are going to look at in the peer coaching process?

20. How does this relate to your school/district's staff development program?

21. Has peer coaching improved your teaching? How do you know?

22. Has peer coaching provided a collegial relationship? (Do you feel you can discuss problems, share ideas, enjoy successes?)

23. Has the feedback you've received from your team helped you with planning future lessons?

24. Has the feedback you've received changed the way you teach a lesson?

25. Do you feel you've integrated the new teaching strategy into your repertoire?
26. Has your team helped you to apply the new strategy to your own situation?
27. Has the feedback you've received made you feel good about your teaching?

## TENTATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ADMINISTRATORS

### PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT

1. Do you encourage teachers to become involved in the Collegial Consultation program? How? Why?
2. Are there any particular "types" of teachers that you encourage to participate?
3. Have you seen a change in the teachers who have been involved? Can you give me an example?
4. Has the program increased your workload in any way?
5. Were you involved when the program started?

### COLLEGIALITY

6. Have you seen a change in the way teachers share ideas or resources? Has this carried over into other areas such as other department members?
7. Do you support the idea of having teachers from various departments on the same team? What is the benefit?
8. Do you talk to teachers in the program about their experiences?

### TEACHER SATISFACTION/MOTIVATION

9. Have you seen a change in the way teachers who have participated feel about teaching?

10. Have you seen a change in the willingness of teachers to try new things because of this program?

11. Do the teachers who have participated seem more satisfied with teaching?

#### INSTRUCTION/STAFF DEVELOPMENT

12. Do participating teachers "carry over" ideas gathered in the staff development process into this program?

13. Has peer coaching improved instruction?

14. Has peer coaching made a difference in the evaluation process?

15. Do you have any concerns/reservations about this program?

16. If someone asked you why this school district supports this program, what would you say?

#### TENTATIVE QUESTIONS DISTRICT COORDINATOR

1. What is your role?

2. How much of your time is involved in the program?

3. Could you explain the history of the program and your involvement?

4. How has the program changed from the beginning?

5. What were your experiences in the program as a teacher?

#### TENTATIVE QUESTIONS ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT FOR CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. How did you get involved with this program? How were you trained and how did you develop the training program?

2. How does this program "fit" with the rest of your staff development plan for the district?

3. Coaching is often suggested as a way to change a school's culture or climate--do you see this happening?
4. What about transfer of training?
5. Do you personally encourage teachers to participate?
6. Has there ever been a problem because you're an administrator with you observing groups?
7. What changes have you seen as a result of the collegial consultation process?
8. Do you talk to teachers about their experiences?
9. Can you give me an idea of what the cost of the program is to the district?

APPENDIX D  
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

September 3, 1991

Mr. Adams  
High School

Dear Mr. Adams,

I am contacting you after receiving permission to conduct research in your district for my dissertation on peer coaching. The purpose of my research is to examine an effective model which could be used by other districts. Since your district's collegial consultation program has proven successful I am interested in talking to teachers who have been involved with it. Much of the information I plan to gather will come from interviewing the participants in the program.

I would very much like to have the opportunity to interview you to gather information about your experiences and/or expectations of the program. The interview should take between 30 and 45 minutes and can be done during a plan period at your convenience. I will also be available either before or after school if you prefer. Should you have any questions feel free to contact me at 541-3660 (w) or 520-1574 (h).

I will call you in the next several weeks to arrange a convenient time. I hope that the beginning of the school year goes smoothly for you.

Sincerely,

Chris Jakicic

Graduate student, Loyola University of Chicago

September 3, 1991

Mr. Adams  
High School

Dear Mr. Adams,

I enjoyed the opportunity to meet you and become involved in the summer workshop for Collegial Consultation. As you know, I am presently writing my dissertation on peer coaching and am looking specifically at this program as a model for other districts. Much of the information I plan to gather will come from interviewing the participants in the program.

I would very much like to have the opportunity to interview you to gather information about your experiences and/or expectations of the program. The interview should take between 30 and 45 minutes and can be done during a plan period at your convenience. I will also be available either before or after school if you prefer. Should you have any questions feel free to contact me at 541-3660 (w) or 520-1574 (h).

I will call you in the next several weeks to arrange a convenient time. I hope that the beginning of the school year goes smoothly for you.

Sincerely,

Chris Jakicic

Graduate student, Loyola University of Chicago

APPENDIX E  
WORKSHEETS FOR COLLEGIAL OBSERVATIONS

**COLLEGIAL CONSULTATION**

## Pre-Observation Data

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Room \_\_\_\_\_

Class \_\_\_\_\_ Period \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

Level \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

## Pre-Conference

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Room \_\_\_\_\_

Campus \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

## Providing Context for Observation

1. Briefly describe concepts, activities, content that have been developed immediately prior to this observation. What are you building on?

2. List the objectives for this class session.

At the end of this class period, the STUDENT will be able to:



### Observation Feedback

What particular teaching behaviors do you want monitored? Check or list the items on which you particularly want feedback. You may prioritize if you wish.

<input type="checkbox"/> Lesson Design/Structure <input type="checkbox"/> Anticipatory Set <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Input <input type="checkbox"/> Right brain <input type="checkbox"/> Questioning <input type="checkbox"/> Thinking Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Visual <input type="checkbox"/> Auditory <input type="checkbox"/> Tactual/Kinesthetic <input type="checkbox"/> Modeling <input type="checkbox"/> Check for Understanding <input type="checkbox"/> Guided Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Closure	<input type="checkbox"/> Time Utilization <input type="checkbox"/> Student Involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Clarity <input type="checkbox"/> Flexibility <input type="checkbox"/> Enthusiasm <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom Management <input type="checkbox"/> Other <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-top: 10px;"/> <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-top: 10px;"/> <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-top: 10px;"/>
--	--

and/or

I am having a particular problem with

and need suggestions on

- 4 -

### Special Considerations

Are there any special group or individual characteristics or circumstances of which the team should be aware?

Please have this data prepared and sent so that team and staff members have the materials BEFORE the pre-observation conference. **DON'T FORGET TO ATTACH AN APPROPRIATE SEATING CHART.**

COLLEGIAL CONSULTATION  
Observation Data Sheet

---

(class taught)

---

(level)

---

(period)

---

(teacher's name)

---

(date)

TIME	REPORT OF CLASS ACTIVITIES/METHODS/CONTENT	OBSERVER'S COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

## STRATEGY SESSION

Facilitating Teaching  
Behaviors (+)  
(put in priority order)

Impeding or Neutral Teaching  
Behaviors (-)  
(put in priority order)

Strategies/Interventions  
for Improvement  
(put in priority order)

Facilitating Teaching Behaviors (+) (put in priority order)	Impeding or Neutral Teaching Behaviors (-) (put in priority order)	Strategies/Interventions for Improvement (put in priority order)

APPENDIX F  
RECRUITMENT LETTER

April 15, 1991

Dear Colleague,

Soon you will have the opportunity to join a very special program. Imagine being part of a program which offers you the following benefits:

1. Exposure to new teaching techniques, procedures, activities, strategies and ideas which are being used successfully by your peers.
2. A chance to share educational concerns with your peers in a non-threatening, confidential, and professional atmosphere.
3. Support and help from your peers in identifying and dealing with learning and behavior problems that impede students success.
4. Participation in a program that is as enjoyable as it is rewarding.
5. Satisfaction in improving your own performance in a personalized staff development program.
6. The opportunity to earn one "A" or "E" credit toward professional advancement and lane change for attending a four day summer workshop.
7. The opportunity to earn an additional "A" or "E" credit for participation during the school year.
8. For those who qualify, the chance to use your Collegial Consultation experience as an alternative supervisory mode to clinical supervision.
9. The chance to "specialize" in a certain area or pursuit during the school year (if enrollment is sufficient).

Look for an informative brochure and an application in your mailbox very soon.

District

Collegial Consultation Coordinator

APPENDIX G  
SUMMER WORKSHOP GOALS

## OBJECTIVES OF THE COLLEGIAL CONSULTATION SUMMER WORKSHOP

At the end of the Workshop, the participants should have accomplished the following:

1. Established a climate of trust, confidence, respect, and rapport for one another.
2. Learned the Collegial Consultation Process.
3. Improve one's diagnostic teaching skills.

## REFERENCES

- Anastos, J., & Ancowitz, R. (1987). A teacher-directed peer coaching project. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 40-42.
- Barnes, R. E., & Murphy, J. F. (1987). Staff development: Help teachers help themselves. . . And, 'peer coaching' is a good way to go about it. Executive Educator, 9(9), 23 & 29.
- Barnett, B. G. (1985). Peer-assisted leadership: Using research to improve practice. The Urban Review, 17(1), 47-64.
- Benoit, B., & Bruan, J. (1989). The mentor as an expert coach: A model for rural school districts. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(6), 488-489.
- Boiarsky, C. (1985). Changing teachers' attitudes and behaviors through modeling and coaching. English Education, 17(1), 26-31.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational Research (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Brandt, R. (1982). On improving teacher effectiveness: A conversation with David Beliner. Educational Leadership, 40(1), 12-15.
- Brandt, R. (1987). On teachers coaching teachers: A conversation with Bruce Joyce. Educational Leadership, 44(5), 12-17.
- Bruneau, B. J. (1988). A case study of the process of reflective coaching in collaboration with teachers in the process of planning and implementing emergent literacy concepts in their kindergarten programs (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 12A.

- Buchmann, M., & Schwille J. (1983). Education: The overcoming of experience. American Journal of Education, 92(1), 30-51.
- Chapman, D. W., & Hutcheson, S. M. (1982). Attrition from teaching careers: A discriminant analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 19(1), 93-105.
- Chapman, D. W., & Lowther, M. A. (1982). Teachers' satisfaction with teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 75(4), 241-247.
- Christen, W., & Murphy, T. (1987). Inservice training and peer evaluation: An integrated program for faculty development. NASSP Bulletin, 71(500), 10-18.
- Copeland, W. D., & Jamgochian, R. (1985). Colleague training and peer review. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(2), 18-21.
- Desrochers, C.G., & Klein, S. (1990). Teacher-directed peer coaching as a follow-up to staff development. Journal of Staff Development, 11(2), 6-10.
- Flanders, N., Bowyer, J., Ponzio, R., Ingvarson, L., Tisher, R., Lowery, L., & Reynolds, K. (1987). Support systems for teachers who form partnerships to help each other improve teaching. Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(3), 5-24.
- Freiberg, H. J., Waxman, H. C., & Houston, W. R. (1987). Enriching feedback to student-teachers through small group discussion. Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(3), 71-82.
- Garmston, R. J. (1987). How administrators support peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 44(5), 18-26.
- Gibble, J.L., & Lawrence, J.D. (1987). Peer coaching for principals. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 72-73.
- Glatthorn, A. A. (1987). Cooperative professional development: Peer centered options for teacher growth. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 31-35.

- Glickman, C. D. (1988). Supervision and the rhetoric of empowerment: Silence or collision? Action in Teacher Education, 10(1), 11-15.
- Hall, L. (1988). A descriptive and exploratory study of peer coaching and selected factors in the working environment of elementary, middle, and high school teachers in a large suburban Virginia public school system. (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 09A.
- Hauwiller, J. G. (1986). The telephone teleconference revisited. Educational Leadership, 43(6), 56-57.
- Herzberg, F. (1976). The Managerial Choice. Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Hilfiker, L. R. (1969). The relationship of school system innovativeness to selected dimensions of interpersonal behavior in eight school systems. (Technical Report No. 70). Madison, WI: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, University of Wisconsin.
- Hutchins, C. L., Everson, S., Ewy, R., Marzano, R., Chapmank, H., Kessler, B., & Mello, L. (1984-1985). What's noteworthy on: Beginning the school year, time management, discipline, expectations, motivation, instruction, coaching. Noteworthy.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1987). Research shows the benefits of adult cooperation. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 27-30.
- Johnson, D., Maruyama, G., Johnson, R., Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal

structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 89(1), 47-62.

- Joyce, B., Hersh, R., & McKibbin, M. (1983). The structure of school improvement. New York: Longman.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 379-385.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1981). Transfer of training: The contribution of "coaching". Journal of Education, 163(2), 163-172.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40(2), 4-9.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1983). Power in Staff Development Through Research on Training. Virginia: ASCD.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1987). Low Cost arrangements for peer coaching. Journal of Staff Development, 8(1), 22-24.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1988). Student Achievement Through Staff Development. New York: Longman.
- Kegan, D. L., & Rubenstein, A. H. (1972). Measures of trust and openness. Comparative Group Studies, 3(2), 179-201.
- Kent, K. M. (1985). A successful program of teachers assisting teachers. Educational Leadership, 43(3), 30-33.
- Kent, K.M. (1987). Conditions for collaboration among colleagues: Is your district ready? Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(3), 50-58.
- Leggett, D., & Hoyle, S. (1987). Peer coaching: One district's experience using teachers as staff developers. Journal of Staff Development, 8(1), 16-20.
- Leggett, D., & Hoyle, S. (1987). Preparing teachers for collaboration. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 58-63.

- Litt, M. D., & Turk, D. C. (1985). Sources of stress and dissatisfaction in experienced high school teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 78(3), 178-185.
- Little, J.W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Research Journal, 19(3), 325-340.
- Little, J.W. (1985). Teachers as teacher advisors: The delicacy of collegial leadership. Educational Leadership, 43(3), 34-36.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). A blueprint for empowering teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(7), 473-477.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper.
- McFaul, S. A., & Cooper, J. M. (1983). Peer clinical supervision in an urban elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(5), 34-38.
- McFaul, S. A., & Cooper, J. M. (1984). Peer clinical supervision: Theory vs. reality. Educational Leadership, 41(7), 4-9.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Moffett, K. L., St. John, J., & Isken, J. (1987). Training and coaching beginning teachers: An antidote to reality shock. Educational Leadership, 44(5), 34-36.
- Mohlman, G., Kierstead, J., & Gundlack, M. (1982). A research-based inservice model for secondary teachers. Educational Leadership, 40(1), 16-19.
- Munro, P., & Elliott, J. (1987). Instructional growth through peer coaching. Journal of Staff Development, 8, 25-28.

- Murphy, J., Murphy, C., Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1988). The Richmond County school improvement program: Preparation and initial phase. Journal of Staff Development, 9(2), 36-41.
- Neubert, G.A., & Bratton, E.C. (1987). Team coaching: Staff development side by side. Educational Leadership, 44(5), 29-32.
- Nevi, C. (1988). The future of staff development. Journal of Staff Development, 9(4), 59-62.
- Paquette, M. (1987). Voluntary collegial support groups for teachers. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 36-39.
- Pataniczek, D., & Isaacson, N. S. (1981). The relationship of socialization and the concerns of beginning secondary teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 32(2), 14-17.
- Phillips, M.D., & Glickman, C.D. (1991). Peer Coaching: A developmental approach to enhancing teacher thinking. Journal of Staff Development, 12(2), 20-25.
- Ponzio, R. (1987). The effects of having a partner when teachers study their own teaching. Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(3), 25-40.
- Raney, P., & Robbins, P. (1989). Professional growth and support through peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 35-38.
- Rogers, S. (1987). If I can see myself, I can change. Educational Leadership, 45(2), 64-67.
- Roper, S., Deal, T., & Dornbusch, S. (1976). Collegial evaluation of classroom teaching: Does it work? Educational Research Quarterly, 1, 56-66.
- Rorshach, E., & Whitney, R. (1986). Relearning to teach: Peer observation as a means of professional development. American Educator, 10(4), 38-44.
- Rosenholtz, S. J., & Kyle, S. J. (1984). Teacher Isolation: Barrier to Professionalism. American Educator, 8(4), 10-15.

- Rosenholtz, S. J., & Smylie, M. A. (1984). Teacher Compensation and Career Ladders. The Elementary School Journal, 85(2), 149-166.
- Russell, T. L., & Spafford, C. (1986). Teachers as reflective practitioners in peer clinical supervision. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. L. (1973). Field Research Strategies for a Natural Sociology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Servatius, D., & Young, E. (1985). Implementing the coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 42(7), 50-53.
- Showers, B. (1984). Peer coaching: A strategy for facilitating transfer of training. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.
- Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational Leadership, 42(7), 43-48.
- Showers, B. (1987). The role of coaching in the implementation of innovations. Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(3), 59-70.
- Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 77-87.
- Simmons, J., & Sparks, G. (1985). Using research to develop professional thinking about teaching. Journal of Staff Development, 6(1), 106-116.
- Smith, S. C. (1986). New structures build collaboration among teachers and administrators. OSSC Report, 27(1), 1-7.
- Smith, S.C. (1987). The collaborative school takes shape. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 4-6.

- Sparks, D. (1990). Cognitive coaching: An interview with Robert Garmston. Journal of Staff Development, 11(2), 12-15.
- Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development for teachers. Journal of Staff Development, 10(4), 40-57.
- Sparks, G. M. (1983a). Inservice Education: Training activities, teacher attitudes, and behavior change. (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 05A.
- Sparks, G. M. (1983b). Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching. Educational Leadership, 41(3), 65-72.
- Sparks, G. M. (1986). The effectiveness of alternative training activities in changing teaching practices. American Educational Research Journal, 23(2), 217-225.
- Sparks, G. M., & Bruder, S. (1987). Before and after peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 54-57.
- Sparks, G. M., Nowakowski, M., Hall, B., Alec, R., & Imrick, J. (1985). School improvement through staff development. Educational Leadership, 42(6), 59-61.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research. Newburg Park: Sage.
- Storm, B.E. (1981). When teachers observe teachers: A study of peer supervision. (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 06A.
- Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1984). Promoting the developmental growth of supervising teachers: Theory, research programs, and implications. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 53-60.
- Wildman, T. M., & Niles, J. A. (1987). Essentials of Professional Growth. Educational Leadership, 44(5), 4-10.

- Wildman, T. M., & Niles, J. A. (1987). Reflective teachers: Tensions between abstractions and realities. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(4), 25-31.
- Wilkes, P. B. (1988). Mentor teams: A study of peer coaching and collaboration in elementary preservice field experiences. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 05A.
- Williams, M. (1986). Peer coaching improved my teaching. Policy and Practice. Sacramento, California: California School Boards Association.
- Williamson, L.S., & Russell, D. (1990). Peer coaching as a follow-up to training. Journal of Staff Development, 11(2), 2-4.
- Zahorik, J. A. (1987). Teachers' collegial interaction: An exploratory study. The Elementary School Journal, 87(4), 385-396.
- Zumwalt, Karen K. Improving Teaching. Virginia: ASCD, 1986.

## VITA

Christine A. Jakicic was born on November 11, 1952 in Richmond, Virginia.

She completed grammar school in St. Petersburg, Florida, and attended high school in Texas and Florida, graduating from Notre Dame Academy in St. Petersburg. She graduated with a B.S. in Science Education (Biology) from Florida State University. She received her Masters Degree in Science Teaching from Governors State University in 1983 and a Certificate of Advanced Study in Administration from National College of Education in 1986.

She taught junior high science at Maple School in Northbrook, Illinois from 1975 through 1988. In addition she was an Instructional Support Teacher in the areas of science and math, and the Science Department chairperson. In 1988 she took the position of Assistant Principal at Butterfield School in Libertyville, Illinois. Currently she is the Principal at Willow Grove School in Buffalo Grove, Illinois.

The author is married to John Jakicic.

## APPROVAL SHEET

This dissertation submitted by Christine A. Jakicic has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Philip Carlin, Director  
Associate Professor  
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Max Bailey  
Associate Professor  
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Edward Rancic  
Assistant Professor  
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

This dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

March 24, 1992  
Date

Philip M. Carlin  
Director's Signature