

UC Berkeley
The CATESOL Journal

Title

Developing Communities of Reflective ESL Teacher-Scholars Through Peer Coaching

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5pt2734s>

Journal

The CATESOL Journal, 7(1)

ISSN

1535-0517

Author

Kinsella, Kate

Publication Date

1994

DOI

10.5070/B5.36568

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Developing Communities Of Reflective ESL Teacher-Scholars Through Peer Coaching

Individuals entering or continuing in the teaching profession across the state of California face a paradox. Their credential and graduate school preservice training is generally inadequate to prepare them to confidently and competently enter today's classroom. Furthermore, inservice opportunities may actually fossilize rather than foster professional growth by failing to provide for teachers exemplary models to emulate and opportunities to engage in reflective practice, collegiality, and shared leadership. At the same time, these teachers are charged with the responsibility of educating a student population that is daily becoming strikingly more diverse with regard to home language and culture, learning and working styles, socio-economic privilege, and degree of social and academic preparation for school success.

Providing effective preservice or inservice training for California's educators in order to better serve such a diverse and changing student population is a formidable challenge for both teachers and administrators. When we ask faculty across the content areas and grade levels to embrace innovative approaches to language, literacy, and concept development for nonnative English speakers such as cooperative classroom structures or specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE), we are not simply asking them to fine tune existing knowledge and skills. We are asking them to adopt instructional approaches that require a fundamental reconsideration of underlying issues of educational access and equity, power and privilege, and individual professional responsibility.

Professional development of this magnitude requires an approach that challenges and integrally involves teachers in the creation and validation of their own knowledge. Current professional development efforts, however, are frequently inadequate to affect long-lasting, significant changes. One day or half-day inservices, regardless of the charisma, credibility and exper-

tise of the trainer, do little to assist and sustain meaningful professional growth. Conferences in specific subject matter fall equally short of addressing educators' needs for complex and ongoing learning about culturally pluralistic pedagogy. In most cases, the rhetoric of instructional innovation touted in the inservice or conference presentation and the initial enthusiasm with which teachers leave the session surpass the reality of institutional or classroom change.

Professional Development and Transfer of Training

Few new or experienced teachers, despite the best of intentions, can move from either a conference workshop or a more intensive staff development program directly into the classroom and begin implementing a new approach with noteworthy success. To acquire even moderately difficult instructional approaches, many teachers need as much as 20 to 30 hours of instruction in its theory, 15 to 20 demonstrations, and an additional 10 to 15 feedback sessions to apply what they have learned (Shalaway, 1985). Programs or innovations that require major revisions in the way teachers presently organize their curriculum and conduct their classes are unlikely to be implemented very well, if at all (Doyle & Ponder, 1977). Predictably improbable is immediate or appropriate use of strategies which require new ways of thinking about learning objectives, and the processes by which students with diverse linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds may each achieve those objectives and be fairly assessed.

In most cases, teachers need considerable time and experimentation to fit the sociolinguistically and politically grounded practices we expose them to in teacher education courses or staff development sessions focusing on instruction for bilingual/bicultural students to their unique pedagogical premises and classroom conditions. Even when professional development includes clear modeling followed by a hands-on practical component, any skill developed in training does not appear sufficient to sustain actual classroom practice with more complex models of teaching. Instead, nearly all classroom practitioners need social support as they labor through the transfer of training process (Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987).

Berman and McLaughlin (1976) introduced the concept of *mutual adaptation* to describe the process by which teachers try out new practices, then adapt and modify them to fit their unique teaching contexts. These Rand researchers found that both the new instructional practices and the classroom setting into which they were brought were gradually changed, but that when staff development sessions were spaced over time, the likelihood of successful implementation and mutual adaptation was far greater. A one-shot workshop (even if the workshop extends over two or three con-

secutive days) does not allow for any period of trial and experimentation or for mutual adaptation. Teachers thus need adequate exposure to the major tenets of a new instructional approach and effective modeling along with time for classroom application.

Another indispensable feature of this fitting process must be opportunities for teachers to do detailed and continuing analyses of their teaching in a context that is both supportive and nonjudgmental yet personally and intellectually stimulating. Goldenberg and Gallimore (1991) maintain that professional development must be "grounded in the mundane but very real details of teachers' daily work lives and in a form that provides the intellectual stimulation of a graduate seminar" (p. 69-70). Certainly, teachers need ongoing guidance and validation to make successful adaptations of new instructional practices to their specific content areas and the special needs of their students.

Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation

Indeed, new school programs and innovations have been found to be most successful when teachers have regular opportunities to meet to discuss their classroom experiences in an atmosphere of collegiality and experimentation (Little, 1982). For most teachers, having a chance to share perspectives, raise questions, and seek solutions to common problems is extremely beneficial. In fact, what teachers appear to appreciate most about professional development is not the actual training, regardless of the expertise of the facilitator or relevancy of the topic, but the opportunity to explore issues and workplace challenges with colleagues (Holly, 1982). Since the power and attraction of staff development appears to lie in the opportunity to interact with fellow teachers, the vital role of follow-up collegial dialogue and positive reinforcement for participants in professional development activities cannot be overemphasized. It is as crucial as the preceding introduction to innovative practices and supporting theory through training. As Guskey (1986) persuasively points out, "Since ... changes (in teacher attitudes and beliefs) occur mainly *after* implementation takes place and evidence of improved student learning is gained, it is continued support *following* the initial training that is most crucial" (p. 10).

Unfortunately, few teaching contexts have strong structures to support the norms of collegiality and experimentation so vital to professional growth and renewal. Frequently, the sociology of a school or a particular department discourages colleagues from soliciting help or offering assistance to fellow teachers. The milieu of many schools fosters isolation, not interaction, and independence, not team orientation. Teachers largely work alone, in their classrooms and offices, some out of desire and some out of

necessity. A new faculty member may work in isolation, not yet having formed comfortable collegial relationships; other novice and veteran teachers may feel that to seek advice actively on curriculum, instruction, or classroom management is admitting a lack of competence and a potential threat to their professional status. Consequently, the critical decisions many faculty members make about teaching and learning stem more from their solitary reflection than from dialogue with trusted and respected colleagues.

Given the challenges of equitably serving California's diverse student learners, often without adequate or appropriate professional support, it is no wonder that many teachers vacillate between the impression that what they are doing is working fairly well and therefore does not warrant any change and a sense of general futility about the teaching profession and their ability to help the majority of their students learn (Moran, 1990). If we want schoolwide faculty to more responsibly and effectively educate their diverse and changing students, creating school norms of collegiality, experimentation, and support is essential.

Peer Coaching

School-based peer coaching is one proven way to improve faculty relations, encourage teachers to talk about teaching in a purposeful manner, and try new instructional practices. Peer coaching is a process in which colleagues voluntarily assist each other in developing their teaching repertoires through (a) reciprocal, focused, non-evaluative classroom observations and (b) prompt, constructive feedback on those observations.

But like many educational innovations, peer coaching is considerably more complex than it appears at first glance. Peer coaching can offer unparalleled support to teachers in their efforts to find new and better ways to educate their diverse students only if a program is supported by both teachers and administrators and carefully designed and implemented with an individual school's or department's culture and needs in mind. To implement a peer coaching program which indeed strengthens professional preparation and helps build a community of reflective educators, careful consideration must be given to the selection of the coaching model and coaching partners, the nature and extent of the training provided in coaching, and any logistical or financial constraints.

Coaching Models

Although various coaching models exist, the three most prevalent are technical coaching, collegial coaching, and challenge coaching. The *technical coaching* model stems from the work of Joyce and Showers (1982) and is used in conjunction with professional development to provide a structure

for the follow up that is essential for mastering complex teaching methods and curricular reforms. This model pairs teachers or teachers and consultants during the professional development session and provides training in using an assessment form designed to capture the key components of the new teaching method. The coaching partners use this form during classroom observations to record the presence or absence of specific behaviors and to later provide focused, nonevaluative feedback. Garmston (1987) highlights the multiple benefits of technical coaching when offered as a complement to quality staff development: enhanced collegiality, increased professional dialogue, creation of a shared pedagogical vocabulary, and maximum transfer of training.

Collegial coaching, most often conducted by pairs of teachers, concentrates on areas the observed teacher wishes to improve. This coaching approach leads colleagues to reflect together on personally relevant issues of teaching and learning. It encourages teachers to develop a habit of self-initiated reflection about their professional practice. The observed teacher's priority, rather than an instructional approach introduced in a staff development session, therefore determines the coaching focus. For example, a teacher may question the equity of student participation in class discussions and activities. Together, the coaching partners would then identify performance indicators for this instructional goal. The coach routinely gathers relevant data during classroom observations, then helps the observed teacher analyze and interpret it. This kind of coaching may be particularly helpful when a teacher wants assistance in getting an objective reading on the classroom dynamics, interaction, or atmosphere. The major goals of collegial coaching thus are to deepen collegiality, increase pedagogical dialogue, and facilitate professional introspection rather than to assist a colleague in mastering specific new instructional practices.

Challenge coaching differs from technical and collegial coaching in both its process and projected outcomes. This coaching format enables teams of educational staff to conduct action research by coming up with creative responses to persistent problems they are experiencing in their daily practice. The term *challenge* refers to resolving a problematic instructional situation. Challenge coaching is conducted in small groups called *challenge teams* rather than pairs. These teams are commonly comprised of fellow teachers; however, unlike technical or collegial coaching practices, administrators and key support staff such as instructional aides and counselors may also be included because of their special perceptions or expertise. The result of challenge coaching is ideally a set of fresh perspectives and alternative strategies to use in the classroom and insightful, supportive feedback as an individual instructor strives to achieve a personal goal. Since collegiality,

trust, and protocol in problem solving through professional dialogue are essential conditions for challenge coaching, this model most successfully evolves after other coaching programs have already been successfully established.

An initial coaching program borrowing from both the technical and collegial coaching models promotes maximum transfer of training while creating a more collegial school environment which promotes professional dialogue and problem solving. Teachers first receive comprehensive training in instructional strategies in tandem with constructive coaching strategies. They are then encouraged to select a colleague as a coaching partner to mutually observe class sessions and collect objective data on specific teaching behaviors, utilizing a practical feedback form but focusing on the partner's preestablished instructional priorities.

Coaching Versus Evaluation

To wholeheartedly embark upon a peer coaching endeavor, most faculty members need to be solidly assured of the trustworthiness and confidentiality of the process. The goals and guidelines for peer coaching must therefore be clearly distinguished from professional evaluation. Traditional teacher evaluation typically implies summative judgment by an administrator or superior about an individual's total professional performance, whereas coaching implies formative assistance by a colleague/peer in a professional development process. It is thus critical that a coach not fall into the role of an evaluator during a coaching session even though it is a challenge for most to refrain from offering occasional unsolicited criticism and advice. Successful coaching programs can only be established in an atmosphere of mutual trust and support where teachers feel it is safe to experiment, fail, reflect, question, solicit help, revise, and try again. Nothing could be farther from this atmosphere than is the practice of traditional teacher evaluation, particularly when a performance evaluation is combined with an assessment for retention, tenure, or promotion. It is not surprising that teachers appear more concerned about negative evaluations for career advancement than in availing themselves of opportunities for professional growth (Corcoran, Walker, & White, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1985). Because an administrator frequently plays a relatively threatening evaluative role with teachers, peer coaching provides an alternative means for instructional support and goal setting in a school. While administrators may reasonably and sensitively help a teacher establish goals for improvement, in true peer coaching programs the process of refining curriculum and instructional delivery is primarily left to teachers working with fellow classroom practitioners.

The Coaching Process

Typically, the peer coaching process involves a preobservation conference and establishment of observation criteria, classroom observation, collection of data, a postconference, and establishment of subsequent observation criteria.

Preobservation conference

During the preobservation conference, the teacher makes explicit for the observer: (a) relevant background information about the class; (b) the intended purpose of the lesson; (c) expected student outcomes and behaviors; (d) planned teaching behaviors and strategies; (e) any special concerns about the lesson; (f) the desired focus of the observation; and (g) logistical arrangements for the observation. It is useful for each coaching partner to complete a preobservation form during this conference to record any pertinent information for the mutual upcoming classroom visits (see Appendix A).

The most difficult aspect of this step in the coaching process is identifying goals and concrete criteria for measuring those goals. Teachers must decide what is really important in their professional development and then try to operationalize those goals. It isn't manageable or fair for a coach to have a partner evade this crucial goal formulation and simply state: "Just come to my class and give me feedback on whatever you observe." The end result is generally counterproductive. The observed teacher may end up with an overwhelming amount of comprehensive feedback which smacks of evaluation, or very general, impractical comments which fail to engender enthusiasm for the program or faith in the partner.

Some teachers find their observations and conferences to be more focused and beneficial if they share common criteria than if they examine completely different aspects of teaching. Many novice coaches find it particularly useful at this stage to have a summary sheet of observable behaviors for specific instructional approaches. When coaching is intended to promote transfer of training, an observation form which recaps major tenets of a staff development session is generally appreciated by faculty (see Appendix B). Another suggestion is that partners select no more than five observation criteria per session. Otherwise, just as when a partner fails to establish observation criteria, the observations lack focus and the follow-up conferences lack substantive data.

Classroom observation

During the actual classroom observation, the peer coach records descriptive data but does not interpret or evaluate concrete classroom action, and instead focuses exclusively on the instructional elements previ-

ously identified by the teacher partner. Multiple data-gathering procedures exist, including record keeping on an observation instrument, audiotaping, and videotaping. Educational researchers have generated a variety of observation instruments which can facilitate data collection during classroom observations, depending on the nature of the instructional behaviors and goals specified by the teacher partner. Good and Brophy's (1984) *Looking In Classrooms* is a particularly good source of observation instruments. However, when coaching is encouraged to accomplish transfer of training, the most logical and manageable instrument is one which outlines the target improvements in instructional design and delivery. This focused observation form can be distributed and discussed during the actual training session and serves as a summary of the major tenets of the new instructional approach. Taking descriptive notes on the observation instrument helps improve the quality and extent of information a partner can share after a visit. However, for some teachers, a classroom observer absorbed in taking copious notes can be distracting to the point of being counterproductive. In such cases, teachers should stipulate during the preobservation conference whether they would be comfortable with a colleague observer taking notes. If not, the coach should be sure to budget 10 to 15 minutes immediately following the classroom visit to complete the observation form and note specific examples and comments. Moreover, to relieve any residual apprehension about peer observations being used for performance reviews, any and all data gathered during the course of the coaching sessions becomes exclusively the property of the observed teacher.

Postconference

During the postconference, the two colleagues discuss what actually happened during the lesson as opposed to what may have been planned. Rather than making recommendations, the observer facilitates this process by asking non-threatening questions. Questions such as "Is that what you expected to happen?" or "How would you do that differently?" prompt the teacher to reflect on the lesson, recalling actual teacher and student behaviors. When offering this feedback, the observer comments on elements of the lesson other than those established in the preobservation conference only if the colleague solicits additional information. In summary, peer coaches provide specific, solicited, limited, constructive feedback on what they see rather than what they feel. To close this session, the observed teacher decides upon the focus for the next observation, directly stating the aspects of curriculum or instructional delivery which should serve as follow-up observation priorities. The coach can facilitate this step by making sure that the items of focus are specific, manageable, and actually observable.

Selecting Coaching Partners

Coaches who are experts on enabling instructional practices in a multicultural classroom, such as bilingual or ESL resource teachers and teacher educators, can indeed provide invaluable professional input on curriculum and instruction if teachers perceive them as trustworthy, skilled colleagues and are willing to solicit their help. However, expecting resource teachers, project directors, or department chairs to provide the bulk of technical assistance following staff development is neither efficient nor realistic. Even exceptionally conscientious resource teachers and administrators, with superb interpersonal staff relations, can only provide ongoing assistance to a fraction of their teachers.

It is also worth noting that most faculty are strongly opposed to attending an inservice or being observed and coached by someone who is not currently teaching in a context similar to their own and experiencing what they view as the realities of the classroom. Furthermore, teachers are apt to resent mandates for schoolwide or departmentwide coaching rather than voluntary participation. Faculty are also likely to react negatively to administrative appointment of coaching partners rather than self-selection.

On a practical basis, most coaching should be performed by teams of classroom teachers working together to broaden their teaching repertoires. They are logistically and psychologically closer together, and if provided with effective, incremental training in new instructional practices as well as in coaching techniques, they are in an ideal position to carry out all coaching functions. Further, if the major responsibility for coaching is placed with peers, status and power differentials are minimized and a more open, trusting, and collaborative atmosphere is created.

To help ensure faculty buy in and reduce anxiety, teachers should definitely be allowed to select their regular coaching partners or to form teams of four to eight colleagues who rotate observing each other. Teacher partnerships may be based on similarity in teaching context or partners may vary considerably in experience, content area, and level. The main ingredients for successful coaching relationships are mutual trust and respect. Nonetheless, there is at least one decided advantage to heterogeneous, interdisciplinary grouping. As members of instructional support teams structured across departments, courses, or grade levels, colleagues become more aware of their common resources and challenges. They also tend to focus their observations and ensuing discussions on target instructional practices and broader educational issues rather than primarily on curriculum.

Training of Coaches

Training in coaching is an essential condition for peer coaching to succeed and not be counterproductive. Although on the surface it appears that observing another teacher conduct a class is a relatively simple, straightforward process, teachers who participate in coaching programs are generally astonished by how challenging it is to be truly objective and faithful to a partner's requested observation criteria when recording data and conferencing. An effective training-for-coaching program trains teachers before they coach and includes follow-up training while the coaching program is under way. If, as Crandall (1983) and Guskey (1986) claim, teacher commitment follows practice rather than preceding it, then follow-up sessions in which all participating teachers can openly discuss their coaching experiences and refine their understandings and skills are even more crucial than initial formal training activities.

Training in coaching must empower teachers by helping them identify practices that impede movement toward collegiality and by equipping them with an extended repertoire of coaching skills. Among these skills, training in factual data gathering is fundamental, yet providing prompt, descriptive, nonevaluative feedback is perhaps the most crucial. A peer coach must have initially collected adequate relevant data on the colleague's preestablished target strategies and behaviors during the classroom observation. The coaching partner must then be ready to praise the observed colleague's efforts step by step while giving specific nonthreatening feedback which is grounded in the observation data. A supportive coach must also know how to ask nonjudgemental questions that help the partner to analyze and evaluate instructional decisions and that prompt reflection and improvement in teaching performance.

If logistics and trust factors favor peers as coaches, it follows that the training of coaches most sensibly takes place during the training of the teaching behaviors and strategies that require coaching. The goals of staff development should provide the broader structure for follow up observations. It is particularly helpful for beginning coaches to establish a narrow observational focus for gathering and reporting data. Some coaching partners experience unexpected difficulty identifying observable instructional goals and performance indicators and find their observations and conferences to be more beneficial if they share common criteria. Again, coaching program administrators can facilitate the process of establishing reasonable observation criteria by ensuring that faculty receive a feedback form which synthesizes target skills and behaviors from the staff development session. With such a form teachers will have not only a common vocabulary for discussing teaching and learning processes but a framework for selecting

instructional goals that are personally significant yet familiar to both members of the coaching partnership.

For example, the observation form in Appendix B was used to summarize the major tenets of a training session focusing on effective small-group work design and implementation in multicultural/multilingual high school and college classes (Kinsella & Sherak, 1993). For that session faculty selected no more than five initial instructional goals to serve as observation criteria for their peer coach. After receiving constructive feedback from their partner on these specific aspects of their classroom small-group work, each teacher then established a new set of criteria for the subsequent observation.

During the coaching training session, teachers greatly benefit from practice in conferencing skills and giving focused constructive feedback using a manageable observation form and watching classroom footage of instructors experimenting with the target instructional goals. The coaching trainer can establish clear observation criteria before teachers view each lesson segment, then facilitate roleplays in which participants provide facilitative feedback to the observed teacher. This crucial observation practice helps minimize any residual reticence about being evaluated rather than assisted by a peer coach.

Another way to help a school community develop a shared professional language and norms of experimentation is to structure regular coaching meetings. Monthly sharing sessions offer coaching teams comprised of faculty from different content areas and grade levels a chance to celebrate and demonstrate their successes, share perspectives, seek solutions to common problems, and gain new motivation to persist and refine skills.

Administrative Support for Peer Coaching

Any effective coaching program requires an active instructional leader. The cellular organization and the prevailing milieu of many schools makes coaching extremely difficult. A congenial, laissez-faire administrator does little to inspire faculty buy in, remove obstacles, foster collaboration, or eliminate teacher isolation.

Truly supportive principals, project directors, and department chairs provide both verbal and tangible support for a coaching program. Initially, they help faculty identify an appropriate coaching model, taking into careful consideration the school or department's culture, history of past change efforts, interstaff trust levels, and the size of the staff. They then lend direction and validation to a program by actually attending all staff development sessions and coaching training sessions, modeling positive coaching behaviors, and responding to coaches' concerns and constraints. Empathic

administrators know how important it is for teachers to work in a climate that supports collegiality and continuous growth. They reflect on their own collegial experiences and recognize how difficult it may be for many teachers to expose themselves to even a peer observer when they have been assigned to classes and largely left to fend for themselves for years.

Active instructional leaders and colleagues, therefore, support coaching efforts as a constructive formative alternative to merely summative evaluation. These administrators further demonstrate their recognition of the value of peer coaching by freeing up time and money to help a program flourish. They offer to take over classes, secure roving substitutes for the program on given days so that teachers can observe each other, and devote faculty meeting time for coaching teams to regroup for collegial sharing. Furthermore, they provide incentives to motivate reticent faculty, who may most benefit from participation, such as small stipends, release time, professional credits, and letters of commendation for personnel files. Finally, they regularly applaud the efforts of coaching teams in departmental and schoolwide staff meetings, personal memos, and campus newsletters.

The Role of Schools of Education

Norms of collegiality and experimentation have been shown to be necessary ingredients for the most effective teacher training (Little, 1982). Collegiality among faculty members means more than friendliness; it entails mutual respect and assistance and connecting on a professional level with a diverse staff. Further, while credential courses may be starting points for theoretical foundations and methodology, they do not begin to cover the wide range of classroom situations and student responses a new teacher is apt to encounter. Teachers in training need to be comfortable fluctuating between the comfortable and the unfamiliar, sharing successes, and openly seeking support in disappointments. This ability to take the risks necessary to teach more effectively and to constantly adjust goals and strategies necessitates a trusting, collaborative environment.

Schools of education can play key roles in preparing teachers who are advocates of reflective practice and collegiality. In their training programs, teacher interns can be shown how to effectively observe and coach each other. Instructional support teams can easily be formed within credential courses to provide mutual support for microteaching endeavors. These same team members can later take turns coaching each other during actual student teaching, as long as master teachers also advocate peer coaching and welcome scheduled visitors. In this way, developing education professionals can receive more extensive and varied feedback on their classroom practice along with more encouragement to persist and refine skills. Moreover, these

coaching opportunities will hopefully instill in new teachers a value for reflection, collaboration, and experimentation which they can carry along with their credentials into the workplace.

Developing Communities of Teacher-Scholars

Peer coaching is certainly one of the most promising avenues for teacher growth, rejuvenation, and empowerment. Used to complement culturally responsive teacher education, a coaching program equips school staff with skills in collaborative reflective practice as well as a structure for supporting ongoing curricular and instructional experimentation. Of perhaps greater importance, coaching strengthens collegial relationships. Whether with a partner or with a team, coaching affords teachers a safe, structured opportunity to raise questions and admit challenges. In this climate of safety and trust, an individual teacher is encouraged to actively seek suggestions from fellow classroom practitioners while undertaking an instructional leadership and guidance role traditionally reserved for administrators. Within such a community of faculty-scholars who continuously engage in the study of their craft, teachers are more likely to find the strength and support to become agents of change who strive to create more democratic schooling environments and who assume responsibility for contributing to the knowledge base of their profession. ■

References

- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. VIII: *Implementing and Sustaining Innovations*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Corcoran, T. B., Walker, L. J., & White, J. L. (1988). *Working in urban schools*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Crandall, D. P. (1983). The teacher's role in school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 41(3), 6-9.
- Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. (1977). The practical ethic and teacher decision-making. *Interchange*, 8(3), 1-12.
- Garmston, R. J. (1987). How administrators support peer coaching. *Educational Leadership*, 44(5), 18-27.
- Goldenberg, C., & Gallimore, R. (1991). Changing teaching takes more than a one shot workshop. *Educational Leadership*, 49(3), 69-72.
- Good, T., & Brophy, J. D. (1984). *Looking in classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Harper & Row.
- Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher*, 15(5), 5-12.

- Holly, F. (1982). Teachers' views on inservice training. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 63(b), 417-418.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 40(1), 4-10.
- Kinsella, K., & Sherak, K. (1993, March). *Making group work really work: More than meets the eye*. Paper presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Atlanta, GA.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Education Research Journal*, 19(3), 325-340.
- Moran, S. W. (1990). Schools and the beginning teacher. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(3), 210-13.
- Rosenholz, S. J. (1985). Political myths about educational reform: Lessons from research on teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 66(5), 349-55.
- Shalaway, L. (1985, September). Peer coaching ... Does it work? *R & D Notes*, pp. 6-7.
- 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, 77-87.

Appendix A

Preobservation Conference Form

Teacher _____ Peer Coach _____

1. Observation Logistics

- a. date _____
- b. classroom _____
- c. beginning time _____ ending time _____
- d. relationship of observer to students:
detached _____ involved _____
- e. seating arrangement for observer:
anywhere _____ assigned _____

2. Class Background

- a. subject area _____
- b. grade level _____
- c. number of students _____
- d. class make-up _____

3. Lesson Description

- a. learning objectives of the lesson:
- b. planned teaching behaviors and strategies:
- c. any concerns about the lesson:

4. Specific Areas for Observation

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.

5. Postobservation Conference

- a. place _____
- b. date _____ c. time _____

Appendix B

Peer-Coaching Observation Form: Groupwork Design and Implementation

Instructor _____ Class _____ Date _____

Peer Coach _____

Directions: Provide feedback for your colleague on the aspects of effective classroom groupwork implementation which she or he has asked you to focus on during this observation. Write specific examples, comments, or questions which you want to be sure to discuss in your postobservation meetings.

- ___ 1. Prepared students with vocabulary and language strategies necessary for the group activity.
- ___ 2. Selected an activity which clearly lent itself to task-based, active collaboration.
- ___ 3. Related the activity to previous lessons and previous activities.
- ___ 4. Made explicit the purpose, procedures, and expected outcome of the group activity.
- ___ 5. Broke a more complicated task into manageable, clearly delineated steps.
- ___ 6. Gave clear oral instructions for the activity, accompanied by a visual aid; wrote the goals, time frame, and procedures on a handout, an overhead transparency, or the chalkboard.
- ___ 7. Modeled the task or a part of the task and checked to see if all students understood the instructions before placing them in groups.
- ___ 8. Established a clear and adequate time frame for students to complete all parts of the task.
- ___ 9. Explained the group member roles with behaviors necessary for completion of the task.
- ___ 10. Appeared to have a clear rationale for small-group formations.
- ___ 11. Encouraged cooperation, mutual support, and development of group accomplishment.

- ___ 12. Took an active, facilitative role while the small groups were in progress by providing feedback and guidance and getting students back on track.
- ___ 13. Saved adequate time to process the completed small-group activity as a unified class, clarifying what was learned and validating what was accomplished.
- ___ 14. Incorporated listening and responding tasks for students to complete during group reports to facilitate task processing and ensure active listening and accountability.
- ___ 15. Provided feedback to students on their prosocial skills and academic accomplishments during and/or after completion of the small-group activity.
- ___ 16. Asked students to evaluate their individual and/or small-group's performance by means of a form, quickwrite, or journal entry.
- ___ 17. Made sure that students saw the connection between what was generated, practiced, or accomplished during the small-group activity and any follow-up individual assignment.

Additional Notes and Comments:

Instructional Goals for Future Observations:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

Kate Kinsella and Kathy Sherak, 1993