Perceptions of Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Coaches in One Midwestern School District

By
Gerri Michelle Biondo
M.S.Ed. University of Kanas, 1999
B.S.Ed. University of Central Missouri, 1994

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

_____

Chair: Dr. Rick Ginsberg

_____

Dr. Thomas A. DeLuca

_____

Dr. Argun Saatcioglu

_____

Dr. Kelli R. Thomas

_____

Dr. Susan B. Twombly

Date Defended: 29 November 2017

The dissertation committee for Gerri Michelle Biondo
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Perceptions of Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Coaches in One Midwestern School District

_____

Chair: Dr. Rick Ginsberg

Date Approved:

Abstract

Instructional coach programs are being implemented in districts to aid in the increase of student achievement through providing job-embedded professional development. Yet, there is limited research on the perception of instructional coaches' roles and responsibilities from the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. The purpose of this study is to add to the research by examining the perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches. This is achieved by investigating four questions, "How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive responsibilities as defined in the written job description?" "How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive instructional coaches' roles?", "How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceived roles and responsibilities align with how instructional coaches spend their time?"; and "How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the value of instructional coaches?" The data used for this study came from a midwestern school district. Principals, instructional coaches, and teachers from five elementary schools were surveyed and interviewed. The survey was based on the district's instructional coach job description and the amount of time instructional coaches engaged in the duties. The interview questions asked about the roles and responsibilities of the instructional coaches and the value they provide. In addition, district documents related to instructional coaches, including logged time, was collected and reviewed. Considering the surveys, interviews, and documentation made it possible to identify commonalities and variations in the perceptions of principals, instructional coaches and teachers. Findings suggest commitment to change and implementing multiple initiatives were a challenge, the role of instructional coaches was unclear or ambiguous, and instructional coaches primarily impacted students indirectly by being a resource to teachers.

Acknowledgment

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge those individuals who have been instrumental in assisting me with the completing of this dissertation. I am grateful for my dissertation advisor, Dr. Rick Ginsberg for his support, guidance, encouragement, constructive criticism, and emotional support as we worked and reworked this dissertation over the past few years. In addition, I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Rick Ginsberg, Dr. Thomas DeLuca, Dr. Argun Sastcioglu, Dr. Kelli Thomas, and Dr. Susan Twombly. I would also like to thank Dr. Jim Knight for taking time to discusses instructional coach research with me early on in this process.

I am eternally grateful to my family for their ongoing support and encouragement. Thank you to my amazing husband Mike Biondo. Your patience and support of me during this lengthy journey is greatly appreciated as well as your unconditional love. Thank you to my mom, Wilma Todd, who provided emotional support to me at just the right time, as well as the continuous support for my family. Thank you to my children Anna, Gabby, Joe, and Michael who understood my need to complete this dissertation and the many hours my attention was focused on this project and not on them. I am grateful to my extended family as well, whose encouragement kept me going.

I am appreciative of all of my friends that have encouraged me and provided me guidance: Dr. Sandy Clutter, Dr. Sara Jones, Dr. Rhonda Hardee, and Carrie Rolling. Thank you to all of the district administration, principals, instructional coaches, and teachers that participated in the study. Finally, to my school family, I am so thankful that I get to spend my days with you! Thank you to the staff, students, and parents.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my dad, Jerry Lee Todd. He passed away early in my journey of this process. His belief in me and the perseverance he instilled in me are what leads me to the end of the adventure. I can feel him squeezing my shoulders, then wrapping his arms around me, and whispering, "You did it." I love you dad and I miss you!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Instructional coach initiatives are often implemented in districts as a means of solving the problem of lack of student achievement or as a way to enhance current teaching practices. The intention of instructional coaches is to provide job-embedded, high-quality professional development to teachers to help them achieve professional goals and to help students achieve at a high level (Ittner, 2015). Instructional coaching programs, though implemented with the best intentions, have challenges. Some of those challenges include, but are not limited to, commitment to change, role ambiguity, and finding value in their roles. The overall goal of instructional coaching programs is to increase student achievement through teacher development. For instructional coaches to impact teacher development, it is important to understand the challenges and the perceptions of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers.

First, change can be hard for teachers when involved in instructional coach initiatives. The commitment of teachers to change might be impacted by teacher efficacy and teacher control. When teachers believe they have the ability to positively impact student learning, they have a stronger sense of efficacy (Hattie, 2016). Similarly, a lack of control could be a contributing factor to why teachers are at times resistant to change or have become more complacent and therefore are less likely to engage with instructional coaches. Instructional coach programs are designed to have a positive effect on instruction. This can only be done if the teachers believe they have the power within their control to influence students. If teacher efficacy and teacher control is lacking, teacher commitment to change could be hindered.

Second, the role of instructional coach is often ambiguous, although there is a written job description for their position (see Appendix A). Instructional coaches are often asked to take on a

variety of roles depending on what is most pressing at the moment. Role ambiguity or uncertainty (Campbell, 2016; House, Litzman, & Rizzo, 1970) are potential stressors for instructional coaches. Although other role stressors (e.g., role conflict or role overload) have been studied, scholars have argued that role ambiguity is the least controllable from the employee's perspective (Bauer, Ellis, Erdogan, Mansfield, Simon, & Truxillo, 2015). Coaches often struggle with roles and responsibilities that are out of context, unclearly defined, and ambiguous. To help limit ambiguity, Knight (2009) says there are three components that need to be in place to keep a good balance: job descriptions and role expectations, goals, and context. When districts provide clear job descriptions for instructional coaches, the job descriptions are a means of limiting ambiguity.

Finally, instructional coaches are on-site professional developers who work collaboratively with teachers, empowering them to incorporate research-based instructional methods into their classrooms (Knight, 2007). Instructional coaches often have many roles and add value in different ways.   Killion (2006) argued that instructional coaches provide value to teachers through ten primary roles: data coach, resource provider, mentor, curriculum specialist, instructional specialist, classroom supporter, learning facilitator, school leader, catalyst for change, and learner.   These roles are a means for instructional coaches to work collaboratively with teachers and help them grow professionally.

Instructional coaches are intended to enhance teaching practices through job-embedded professional development. The teachers' commitment to change, role ambiguity of instructional coaches, and finding value in the roles of an instructional coach program can be challenging for an instructional coach program. Therefore, if the challenges are not considered and investigated, the impact on teachers might be limited.

This study investigated the perceptions of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers related to the job description of the instructional coach. It focused on the perceptions of the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers related to how instructional coaches spend their time and how instructional coaches impact teachers. A need exists to better understand these concepts because instructional coaching is a relatively new idea and therefore lacking in research support. Cornett and Knight (2009) stated knowing more about the following areas would benefit instructional coaching programs:

> Support systems and professional development for instructional coaches, best practices for instructional coaches, identification of teaching strategies that are most likely to improve student achievement, program evaluation tools that can be used to monitor growth and development, and what impact instructional coaching has on student achievement. (p. 210-213).

The perception of the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers may differ when it comes to the roles and responsibilities of the instructional coaches. A reason for the difference in perceptions is that the pressures from state and federal guidelines and high-stakes testing often impact where instructional coaches spend their time and how they spend their time. This study, which investigated the perceptions about instructional coaches, helps others better identify best practices for instructional coaching programs and districts.

The following research questions guided the study:

RQ1. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive responsibilities as defined in the written job description?

RQ2. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive instructional coaches' roles?

RQ3. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceived roles and

responsibilities align with how instructional coaches spend their time?

RQ4. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the value of

instructional coaches?

Significance of the Research

The rationale for the present study is based on the current state of instructional coaching

programs. Instructional coach approaches are relatively new and in early phases of

implementation (Knight, 2009). It is a growing initiative in schools the past ten years. The

findings in this study are significant for several reasons. First, the study will provide

understanding of the perception of instructional coaching programs from the perspective of

principals, instructional coaches, and teachers in the inaugural year of the program

implementation. It is important to understand the similarities and differences of instructional

coaches' programs from those that are most directly involved in a program. The perceptions of

principals, instructional coaches, and teachers, whether positive or negative, could impact the

effectiveness of an instructional coach program (Austin, Carpenter, Dean, Dyal, & Wright,

2012). Instructional coaches should be closely connected to principals and teachers. If the

perceptions align and partnerships exist among the groups, role ambiguity likely decreases

(Knight, 2007).

Second, the level of ambiguity in instructional coaches job is high (Cornett et al., 2009

Joyce & Showers, 1996). The loosely defined roles of instructional coaches can morph into

instructional coaches doing clerical and less teacher-impactful and student-impactful jobs. This

study examined how instructional coaches spend their time and how their time is spent

differently or similarly to their job description expectations. Identifying how instructional

coaches spend their time helps identify areas with a higher impact and it lessens role ambiguity. Fullan (2012) stated the instructional role of the principal is ambiguous. Principals may think they are in the instructional leadership role when they are observing, but it is likely that is not happening. The instructional role happens when building capacity with teachers focused on learning, monitoring, feedback and corrective action is what really counts (Fullan, 2012, p. 4). Therefore, if principals and instructional coaches are not sure of their roles when supporting teachers, it is possible they add to the confusion of teachers. Improved coaching outcomes are more likely to occur when instructional coaches share a common understanding of the instructional coaches' roles and responsibilities. Job descriptions and performance standards for instructional coaches help provide clarity and indicate how they should spend their time (Knight, 2009). This study adds to the instructional coach research in order to better understand the perception of instructional coaches' value to teachers and to districts.

Limitations

The study assumed that implementation of instructional coaches within the school setting will impact the instructional practices of teachers and the strategies used within their classrooms. The instructional practices and strategies should have a positive impact on student achievement. However, the research has multiple limitations. First, despite the assumption that instructional coaches would positively impact student performance, no student achievement data were analyzed. Second, the study is small in regard to sample size and may not be generalized to other populations. Third, the study was done in a suburban school district, and findings may be different in a larger or smaller district or in a district with different socioeconomic characteristics. Fourth, data were collected during the first year of implementation and in the early part of the second year of the implementation of the instructional coaching program. Due

to the limited amount of time that the instructional coach program has been implemented, the results are restricted to that time frame. Fifth, training and experience varied by principal, instructional coach, and teacher; therefore, personal experiences and expectations of an instructional coach program may differ. Sixth, each building had different building-wide initiatives, student demographics, and teacher demographics. The aforementioned variables could impact the research because the needs of the individual buildings vary. The variance among buildings may affect the identified impact on teacher and students. Seventh, although the surveys and interviews were voluntary, participants may have shared what they thought the right answer should be rather than what they know to be true about instructional coaches. In a similar manner, participants may present information in a positive or negative light depending on their beliefs about instructional coaches, which could impact their report on instructional coaches' role and the impact they have in various buildings. Finally, all data are self-reported, and there were no external validity checks. A misunderstanding could have occurred in regards to the data presented by the participants and unknown bias related to instructional coaches. All these factors are limitations and have an impact on the generalization of any findings.

Overview of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, the research questions, the significance, and the limitations of the study. Chapter 2 contains a history of reform in the district being analyzed and the review of literature for the study. Chapter 3 explains the methodology used in the study. Chapter 4 reports the findings of the data analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the study summary, major findings, conclusions, implications, and concluding remarks.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Over the past two decades, school districts have implemented instructional coaches as a means of improving student achievement. The demands and pressures for schools to have an assessment result that proves students are learning at a high rate often drives the movement of implementing instructional coaches. However, because instructional coaching programs are a relatively new initiative, an implementation problem exists for districts as they are often expecting increased results in a short amount of time. Districts risk investing large amounts of money and time with little evidence of increased student achievement.

Examining the history of the district, instructional coaching, issues with instructional coaching, change in school, teacher efficacy, teacher control, high quality professional development, and student achievement and the research surrounding these components creates a foundational understanding that can be useful for implementing an instructional program. This literature review examines several areas of research: change in schools, teacher efficacy, professional development, instructional coaching, and student achievement.

History of Reform in the District under Study

This section reviews the recent reforms implemented in the district that were studied prior to the instructional coach program. Other information on the district and those interviewed and surveyed for this study appears in Chapter 3. The district had a history of more than twenty years utilizing Title 1 funding for additional staff that were identified as Title teachers. Title 1 funding is to be used to support disadvantaged students. In a discussion with an Assistant Superintendent (S. Jones, personal communication, December 1, 2017), it was learned that over

the years, the primary role of Title teachers was to work directly with students in a small group setting outside of the classroom, a small group setting in the classroom, and in a co-teaching model with the classroom teacher. The needs of the grade level dictated what grade levels Title teachers worked with and the content area of that work, such as reading or math. In addition, the district also charged Title teachers with various tasks including providing professional development to teachers and data collection. Data indicated that the students had limited and inconsistent growth over the years when working directly with Title teachers. The district felt providing personalized professional development for all teachers would support them in delivering high quality instruction. This professional development would be done through individualized coaching with modeling, co-teaching, and conferencing opportunities, as well as providing support with instructional planning and techniques for interventions for low-achieving students. In fall 2014 the formation of the instructional coach program began.

The instructional coach hiring process was initiated in February 2015, and it was complete in late spring 2015. Following the posting, applications were received and interviews conducted by the Central Office administration and building principals. All candidates were from within the district and many had served as Title teachers previously. However, only two of the five that were selected as instructional coaches had been Title teachers. Following their selection, the instructional coaches worked closely with Central Office administration to identify their roles and responsibilities and how to introduce the program to staff. Some of this work was completed over summer 2015 due to their extended contract.

In addition to implementing the instructional coach program during the 2015-2016 school year, other district and building initiatives and changes occurred. The district was in the inaugural year of opening a Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math (S.T.E.A.M.)

school at the elementary level, implementing STAR 360, utilizing MasteryConnect, continuing the newly adopted Standards-Based Grading, implementing Conscious Discipline (CD), and rewriting curriculum to match the new state standards.

S.T.E.A.M. served students in grades kindergarten through sixth grade. Though it was a new program school, it was placed in one of the existing district buildings. Preparation for this initiative during the prior year included hiring a lead principal from within the district, hiring staff from within the district to teach at the new school, and randomly selecting students whose parents applied for their child to attend the school. Thus, there was extensive movement of personnel, and many principals, teachers, and students were in new locations at the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year.

STAR 360 is a compressive interim and formative assessment program. STAR 360 provides valid, reliable students data that assists in making informed decisions about screening, progress monitoring, and student growth. This is designed to help students master state-specific learning standards (Renaissance Learning, Inc., 2017).

MasteryConnect is an on-line data collection tool. MasteryConnect is used for formative assessment, curriculum planning, and interim-benchmark assessment. It is also a means of standards based reporting. Although standard-based grading was implemented in the 2014-2105 school year, MasteryConnect was a new system for reporting on standard-based grading (MasteryConnect, 2017).

CD is a comprehensive classroom management program and a social-emotional curriculum. It is reportedly based on brain research, child development information, and developmentally appropriate practices. CD was specifically designed to make changes in the lives of the adults first (Bailey, 2017). A core group of teachers and administrators attended the

CD Summer Institute in July 2015. These individuals made up the district CD Action Team and were responsible for leading the integration of CD.

In addition to new principals in four of the five buildings, there was a combination of new teachers and a significant number of new students at all of the buildings because of the opening of S.T.E.A.M. At the building level, there were various individual initiatives and district initiatives occurring. Some of those initiatives included implementing a multi-tiered system of support for academics and behavior, one-to-one technology for students, integration across the curriculum, blended learning, and Project Based Learning.

Multi-tiered system of support, sometimes called Response to Intervention (RtI) or Positive Behavior Supports (PBIS), was already being implemented at some schools, but all buildings were required to use the STAR 360 program for the benchmarking and progress monitoring of the academics standards and skills. STAR 360 did not necessarily report on the same information that buildings were using to make decisions about their programming; instead, they were more skill based because they had a multi-tiered system of support, and STAR 360 was more standard-based and general in the reporting.

One-to-one technology for each student was implemented at S.T.E.A.M. where all students were issued an iPad or a MacBook. Though one-to-one was not available at the other four elementary schools, integrating subjects and technology across the curriculum was a focus for all buildings. However, S.T.E.A.M. built strong project based lessons in the area of science. They merged standards in all curricular areas to provide comprehensive student learning. Over the course of the 2015-2016 school year, the S.T.E.A.M. teachers developed units encompassing all subject areas, thus allowing students to apply the various concepts throughout the projects.

Project Based Learning was implemented at S.T.E.A.M. During the 2015 summer, teachers had developed project-based lessons that aligned with the state standards for each grade level. Blended learning classrooms were another S.T.E.A.M focus. Teachers worked to record lessons and place the videos and work on Google Classroom. This allowed students to work through lessons at their own pace in the classroom, while having teacher support for struggling students.

After the 2015-2016 school year started, it was identified that the district's curriculum did not align with the newly revised state standards. Therefore, the district began working with curriculum teams made up by teachers and instructional coaches to align and rewrite the curriculum as needed. An outside consultant was hired to assist the district.

Instructional Coaching

Instructional coach is a term synonymous with intervention specialist, instructional teacher leader, implementation coach, learning specialist, teaching and instructional specialist, Title 1 reading teacher, and curriculum specialist (Cornett et al., 2009). However, for this study, they will be called instructional coaches. Joyce and Showers (1980) pioneered work in the study of mentoring and peer coaching by implying that coaching was an integral part of effective professional development. Instructional coaches are on-site professional developers who work collaboratively with teachers, empowering them to incorporate research-based instructional methods into their classrooms (Knight, 2007).

According to Killion (2006), instructional coaches have ten primary roles: data coach, resource provider, mentor, curriculum specialist, instructional specialist, classroom supporter, learning facilitator, school leader, catalyst for change, and learner. The role of a data coach is to assist teachers in using data to design lessons and instruction that address the learning

needs of students. Creating a safe and blame-free environment can be one of the most challenging aspects of this role. The role of a resource provider is to help teachers locate resources that are not readily available, and the challenging part of this role is the amount of time instructional coaches need to locate required resources.

The role of a mentor often means engaging in all ten of the roles at the same time, because instructional coaches are typically working with new staff. The challenges associated with mentoring include ensuring there is a good balance of providing advice while developing capacity within the teacher.

The role of a curriculum specialist is to focus on the content of what is being taught in the classroom. A challenge for instructional coaches in the role of curriculum specialist is supporting grade levels or content areas in which the instructional coach has no teaching background; this may lead instructional coaches to feel inadequate.

The role of an instructional specialist is to help teachers identify and implement effective teaching strategies. This includes, but is not limited to, instructional methodologies (small group, large group, or lecture) and strategies to differentiate instruction. Not knowing enough about methodologies to reach all students is a challenge for instructional specialist.

The role of a classroom supporter is an instructional coach who works side-by-side with the teacher in the classroom. The challenge for the classroom supporter is teachers may perceive this level of support intrusive.

The role of a learning facilitator is to organize, coordinate, and facilitate learning amongst adults. A challenge for learning facilitators is meeting the diverse needs of the adult learners.

The role of a school leader is to contribute to school-wide and district initiatives. A challenge for instructional coaches is being viewed as a school leader. Instructional coaches may be asked to engage in administrative type responsibilities. Taking on administrative responsibilities can confuse the role of the instructional coach in the school.

The instructional coach also acts as a catalyst for change. The dissatisfaction of instructional coaches with the status quo and finding a balance between sufficient dissonance and disruptive dissonance can be challenging.

Finally, the role of a learner means that the instructional coaches engage in their own continuous development. As in most cases, coaches have a difficult time finding time to dedicate to personal learning. Toll (2008) suggested there is a need to look for clarity in the role of instructional coaches. They are often responsible for duties outside the realm of job-embedded teacher professional development that keeps them from actually coaching and supporting teachers.

Instructional coaches have the potential to help teachers assist students. They also are a means of empowering teachers through shared leadership and high-quality professional development. Researchers studying instructional coaching imply it can improve the achievement of students (Joyce & Showers, 2002). Additionally, an environment that fosters and supports reflection must be present to elicit or maintain change in instructional practice (Coutinho & Gunter, 1997). To increase capacity, the culture and climate of the school must be open to change. The benefit of instructional coaching is that teachers can learn a variety of research-based strategies that are data-driven and can be transferred into daily practice. The implementation of these goals not only leads teachers to grow professionally but can also lead to increased student achievement. While instructional coaches have many roles, their primary

focus should be on providing professional development, working collaboratively with, and empowering teachers to incorporate research-based instructional methods into classrooms with the focus on improving student achievement (Hanover, 2015). Building capacity in the teachers can only strengthen schools and districts.

Issues in Implementation of Instructional Coaching

An overview of the discourse surrounding instructional coaching programs reveals several challenges associated specifically with the implementation of those programs. Lack of uniformity and a framework for these programs as well as teacher skepticism are hurdles for districts to overcome when beginning a coaching endeavor. Coaches often struggle with roles and responsibilities that are out of context, unclearly defined, and ambiguous.

Implementing a reform such as an instructional coaching program presents challenges for districts, such as an assumption of uniformity. Reforms based on assumptions of uniformity in the educational system repeatedly fail (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988). It is also important to recognize no new program or innovation will be implemented in the same manner as often there are multiple initiatives being implemented across districts. Educators are trying to understand how to plan, manage, monitor and execute implementation of programs while utilizing multiple initiatives (Killion, 2016). With multiple initiatives happening concurrently in a district, teachers seldom become committed to a new instructional approach or innovation until they have seen it work in their classrooms with students (Guskey, 2002). Teachers rarely indicate they change practice because they perceived the interventions to be better than their current practice. They continue doing what they know based on their past student success. Close collaboration between program developers and researchers with teachers can facilitate the process of change and can be accomplished in a variety of ways (Guskey, 2002). Given that school initiatives cannot be

implemented without teachers, it is important to consider the amount of control or choice that teachers have or perceive that they have. Teacher control is defined as the degree of power and control practitioners hold over workplace decisions (Ingersoll, 2007).

Unfortunately, too many instructional coach programs have been launched with an insufficient program framework designed to maximize the impact of coaching on teaching and student learning (Knight 2009). The instructional coaches' roles become blurred, and their time is spent in less impactful ways. To ensure their time is spent appropriately and effectively, three components need to be in place to keep a good balance: job descriptions and role expectations, goals, and context (Knight, 2009). First, if job descriptions and role expectations are clearly defined, then instructional coaches and their supervisors can make sure the coaches' time is spent in accordance with the written description and expectations. Next, goals need to be clearly defined and communicated to principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. This allows the coaches to prioritize the tasks or events that are most crucial for the district. Finally, context needs to be considered when making decisions about coaches' responsibilities. Their effectiveness could be impacted by the time of year, being new to a school, their experience level as a coach, the experience level of the teachers, the role of the principal, and the overall school climate and culture.

Harrison and Killion (2006) also highlighted issues with implementing instructional coaching programs that primarily deal with the instructional coaches' roles and responsibilities. Some of those challenges are time to locate the resources, a good balance of providing advice while building capacity when mentoring teachers, support for teachers in grades outside of instructional coaches' teaching experiences, lack of coaches' knowledge about methodologies to reach all students, teachers' perception of instructional coaching support as

intrusive, meeting the diverse needs of adult learners, being viewed as an administrator, striking a balance between sufficient dissonance and disruptive dissonance in regard to change is a challenge, and finding time for coaches to dedicate to their own learning. With the variety of roles that instructional coaches have, the result may be role ambiguity or lack of clarity, which is a potential stressor (House, Litzman, & Rizzo, 1970).

Guskey (2000) stated that change is a gradual and difficult process for teachers who are learning to be proficient at something new, and finding meaning in a new strategies and instructional practices requires both time and effort. Any change that holds promise for increasing teachers' competence and enhancing student learning is likely to require extra work, especially at first. The requirements of extra energy and time can add significantly to teachers' workloads, even when release time is provided. Furthermore, change brings a certain amount of anxiety and can be threatening (Guskey, 2002). The stress and extra workload can impact the quality and quantity of work. In addition, when additional responsibilities are added to an instructional coach that is more administrative, their perception and the perception of others could impact their ability to coach teachers in a non-threatening and trusting manner.

The literature argues that the implementation of a successful instructional program requires clear roles and responsibilities for the coaches, an approach to mitigate teacher skepticism, and an established framework. Role ambiguity becomes a source of stress on the program if the role is not clearly defined.

Change in Schools

The study of the effectiveness of instructional coaching hinges on the assertion that effective change in schools is possible. Elmore (2005) argued that internal accountability leads to effective pressure. According to Fullan (2012), factors for internal accountability include high

expectations around specific goals, transparency of results and practice, a non-judgmental attitude and corresponding intervention to help, leadership pressure and peer interaction focusing on data, and instructional practices that are effective as a last restore before take-over action or other formal intervention. When there is a balance of internal and external accountability there will be higher performance, greater self and group responsibility for results, and more commitment to sustain and enhance all students learning, development and success (Fullan, Hargreaves, & Rincon-Gallardo, 2015). McLeskey and Waldron (2010) supported this when they identified three key features needed for district-wide continuous improvement: develop a collaborative culture, deliver high-quality professional development, and have strong leadership within the building (p. 70). Fullan (2012) indicated that this process needed to be implemented from the bottom up, stating, "We always need to understand impact" (p.1). Knight (2011) stated that superintendents and districts should keep plans for accomplishing change simple because this can lead to routine and effective practices. Organizational routines can serve as a structure to stabilize school practice over time (Parise, Sherer, & Spillane, 2011). Improving instruction is complicated, however, but when all the pieces and people come together, schools can improve teaching (Knight, 2013).

Fullan (2012) indicated principals should help lead teacher learning and development; when principals participated as a learner, it had a positive impact on teacher focus and improvement. Knight (2011) argued principals and teachers are unequal in position, but equality occurs when partnerships are present. Principals can help get the right people in place to lead the professional development (Knight, 2011).

The literature indicates that when specific parameters are met, effective change in schools is possible. Those parameters include, but are not limited to, teacher involvement in the change

process, principal involvement in the learning process, data-driven collaboration of peers, and an organized plan that address all parts of the system.

Teacher Efficacy

The role of instructional coaching programs in schools to activate change not only hinges on the assertion that change is possible but also on the beliefs of teachers in their own efficacy. At the teacher level, when teachers perceive they have influence over school and classroom policy, they exhibit greater efficacy (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran). When teachers believe they can positively impact student learning, teachers have a stronger sense of efficacy (Hattie, 2016). Hattie (2016) identified collective teacher efficacy as the number one factor influencing students over home and community. Collective teacher efficacy is the "perception of teachers in a school that the effects of the faculty as a whole will have a positive impact on students" (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000, p. 408).

Perceptions of influence over school-level procedures and classroom-level policy also positively affect commitment to teaching. When teachers have trusting relationships with principals, the conditions are improved to promote professional learning in schools (Hallinger, Li, & Walker, 2015). Teacher job satisfaction is positively associated with working conditions, staff collegiality, administrative support, positive student behavior, and teacher empowerment (Leslie, Ma, Shen, & Spybrook, 2012). Teacher control or empowerment appears to indirectly benefit students through increased teacher motivation (Gahng, Gamoran, & Porter, 1994; Lee & Nie, 2014). Teacher control over contextually embedded decisions, such as teaching methods, appear to produce positive outcomes for students, but the impact of teacher control over curriculum is unclear.

Poorly designed professional learning can inhibit growth by deprofessionalizing teachers; they feel like assembly line workers (Knight, 2013). Miller and Rowan (2007) argued programmed approaches are likely to be more effective in implementing instructional practices in schools than are adaptive programs. This research demonstrates experienced teachers seldom become committed to a new instructional approach or innovation until they have seen it work in their classrooms with their students (Guskey, 2002). Change is a gradual and difficult process for teachers learning to be proficient at something new, and finding meaning in a new way of doing things requires both time and effort. When schools develop collaborative cultures, educators do not necessarily find new time, but rather they use time in new ways to focus on the work at hand (Khorsheed, 2007). Killion (2016) argued that change depends on learning, which includes acquisition of knowledge, skills, practices, procedures and dispositions. Any change that holds great promise for increasing teachers' competence and enhancing student learning is likely to require extra work, especially at first. Excessive paperwork and high-stakes accountability demands are among the most important stressors and causes of teacher job dissatisfaction (Spruyt, Van Droogenbroeck, & Vanroelenb, 2014). Furthermore, change brings a certain amount of anxiety and can be very threatening (Guskey, 2002).

Teacher Control

Eight themes have been noted that impact the empowerment of teachers. Those themes include time and role constraints, lack of consistency in leadership, conflicts between accountability and student needs, challenges in teaching diverse populations, lack of teacher choice within the reforms, teacher isolation, repeating previously tried strategies, and the impact of political and economic forces on the reform effort (Mungai & Thornburg, 2011). Ingersoll's (2003) work also supports these themes when discussing the notion of teacher shortages. The

reasons for the dissatisfaction of teachers include poor salary, poor administrative support, student discipline problems, lack of faculty influence, poor student motivation, classroom intrusions, inadequate time, and large class sizes. Though these themes are listed individually, they are interconnected. For example, in order for teachers to share leadership, there must be trust in the decision-making skills of the teachers regarding decisions that affect an entire school.

Teachers work hard (Elmore, 2003) as they consistently put in extra hours and go above and beyond expectations set by administration. Teachers have extraordinary influence over student success within the classroom (Wright, 2007), but the influence of teachers is limited outside of their classroom door (Ingersoll, 2007). Unfortunately, teachers have little control over certain factors that affect their students, such as curriculum and the classroom (Ingersoll, 2007). This lack of control could be a contributing factor to why teachers are at times resistant to change or have become more complacent. The teaching profession is different as professionalized employees usually have reasonable amounts of control and autonomy.   However, the hierarchy of involvement (Ingersoll, 2007) is often different. There are large social expectations for schools, specifically acceptable and unacceptable behavior. The limited power coupled with the high expectations and responsibility can create an unbalance. One way to overcome the balance issue is to give teachers control over issues they can control.

Teachers who lead classrooms behind closed doors are given a considerable amount of autonomy in making decisions about the curriculum, in both the content to teach and the pedagogy employed in teaching (Kauffman, 2005). If teachers feel empowered and have some control over change, then they are more likely to be open to ideas that prompt change. Teacher

control is the degree of power and control practitioners hold over workplace decisions (Ingersoll, 2007).

Rarely, if ever, do teachers indicate that they change practice because they perceived the interventions to be better than their current practice. Guskey (2000) hypothesized that changes in beliefs of teachers and motivations are often followed by changes in teacher practice rather than preceded by them. If teachers were to change current practice, there would need to be a way of addressing the teacher's understanding of why they need to alter their current practice (Baker, Chard, & Gersten, 2000). The beliefs of teachers are shaped within their professional communities, in training sessions, and in their interactions with coaches, principals, and facilitators (Datnow & Hubbard, 2016).

The literature indicates that change within a school or district is most likely to occur when teachers who participate in executing the change have ownership and control within that change process. Given their lack of control outside the classroom and their influence inside the classroom, teachers currently work within two different worlds in the same school, one in which they hold much influence but another in which they have no control over the rules that govern that influence. An instructional coaching program is likely to be most successful when teachers have a position of control in its creation.

Professional Development

Instructional coaching programs provide individualized, job-embedded professional development; thus, the success of such a program is informed by the literature surrounding all professional development in education. An evaluation of the literature on professional development reveals the importance of teacher quality on student success, the ramifications of ineffective professional development, the role of teacher readiness for growth, the importance of

making time and space for quality professional development experiences, and what constitutes such experiences.

Instructional coaching has been adopted in schools across the country to facilitate an increase in student achievement by providing high-quality professional learning experiences for teachers (Heineke, 2013). The increased use of coaches is partially due to the professional development requirements contained in the Every Child Shall Succeed Act (ESSA, 2015). The term "professional development" is defined by ESSA as activities that are sustained; they are not stand-alone, one-day, or short-term workshops. Professional development should be intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom focused.

Darling-Hammond (1996) discussed two important features that must be addressed to increase teacher quality, which are increasing knowledge of teachers to meet the demands they face and redesigning schools to support high-quality teaching and learning. Hattie (2012, 2009) supported these ideas in his review of research, arguing teacher quality, the nature of the teacher-student relationship, teacher expectations, and teacher professional development had medium to high effects on students. Additionally, Hattie (2012) suggested instead of focusing on the quality of teaching, the focus should be on the quality of the effect of teachers on student learning. This shifts the focus to student outcomes rather than personalizing it to teachers. Furthermore, high-quality professional development is a central component in nearly every modern proposal for improving education. Policy-makers increasingly recognize that schools can be no better than the teachers and principals who work within them (Griffin, 1983). The effectiveness of high quality professional development as related to school improvement has been well documented (National Staff Development Council, 2001).

A fiscal component is associated with all professional development. At the district level, Hill (2009) stated that 6% of a typical district's budget is focused on professional development. If professional development does not provide the results districts expect, then it is likely they will abandon their initiatives (Christie, 2009). This idea is supported by Desimone (2009) who argued, "understanding what makes professional development effective is critical to understanding the success or failures of many education reforms" (p. 181). Districts must do their research and have a plan to implement initiatives, or otherwise failure is likely to occur, which can be a costly expense for districts.

The financial loss associated with ineffective professional development is significant. Another significant loss occurs when teachers' limited time available for professional development is monopolized by ineffective efforts at promoting and increasing teacher quality. The more time that is lost to such professional development methods, the less opportunity teachers have for effective, individualized job-embedded professional development. Hill (2009) stated, "The professional development system for teachers is, by all accounts, broken. Despite evidence that specific programs can improve teacher knowledge and practice and student outcomes, these programs seldom reach real teachers on a large scale" (p.470). Hill (2009) also claimed most teachers report that professional development reinforced their existing practices and a minority report no effect at all. Hill (2009) argued that there are three main reasons professional development is ineffective. First, the trainers lack expertise in a limited number of areas because they are often expected to be experts in multiple areas. In addition, trainers often have too many responsibilities outside of the professional development role. Second, there is not a transfer into practice, and when the lessons and activities are implemented, the outcome are unfavorable. Finally, at times the professional development does

not align with district-adopted curriculum and instructional approaches. Thus, workshops can be poorly organized and focus on unproven ideas and strategies, meaning that they are not providing effective professional development (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). Doing ineffective things longer does not make them better (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). At some point districts must make the transition to effective practices.

Effective professional development can be the engine for renewal and growth in districts, schools, classrooms and the lives of students (Burney & Elmore, 1998).   According to Guskey and Yoon (2009), "In the history of education, no improvement effort has ever succeeded in the absence of thoughtfully planned and well-implemented professional development" (p.497). Thus, quality professional development is necessary for the continual growth of teachers. The responsibility lies, then, with the district to prioritize professional development that is of the highest quality. To provide effective professional development that has a meaningful effect on teacher learning and fosters improvements in classroom practice, funds should be focused on providing high-quality professional development experiences (Birman, Desimone, Garet, Porter, & Yoon, 2002).

Financial responsibilities are not the only task districts must undertake to ensure quality professional development leads to progress. If teachers are required to be involved with substantial and effective learning opportunities, they must have a desire for learning (Hill, 2009). Several studies suggest there are five main components of effective professional development (Birman et al., 2002; Desimone 2009; Desimone et al., 2013). The components are content focus, active learning, alignment, duration, and collaboration. Content focus can be defined as the subject matter and how students learn. Active learning can be observed; it also needs to include corrective feedback, discussion, and reflection. Indeed, Hattie (2012) argued that

feedback, when presented correctly, is the most powerful element for increasing student learning. When professional development, teacher knowledge, and belief are similar, there is alignment, and this alignment extends to the local and state needs as well. Duration is allowing for sufficient time for learning, working with others to achieve a goal is collaboration, and time is necessary to make all of this happen. Guskey and Yoon (2009) stated "Educators at all levels need just-in-time, job-embedded assistance as they struggle to adapt new curricula and new instructional practices to their unique classroom context" (p.497). Hirsh and Killion (2013) supported this and argued teachers need to set aside three to four hours per week for collaboration and coaching.

Without districts providing timely, job-embedded assistance, teachers struggle to find time to seek out personal learning experiences. In fact, Hill (2009) suggested most teachers engage in only minimum state or district required professional learning, which is the information that is collected and reported. However, Hill (2009) argued the information needs to be in a digestible form and placed in the hands of those making choices about ongoing learning opportunities.

Others have added to the criteria for effective professional development. Hattie (2012) emphasized that for teacher performance to improve student learning, relying on data and evidence is key. Timperley (2005) argued for a focus on student learning and identified five elements for successful professional learning:

- developing shared values and expectations about children
- a collective focus on student learning
- collaboration among faculty
- deprivatizing practice

- reflective dialogue

In a presentation to the Innovative for Applied Education Research, Israel Academy of Science and Humanities, Ginsberg (2017) noted the following:

Some approaches, like the work in the U.S. developed for the National Board for Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS), has shown promise for teachers (a form of national recognition, rather than state licensure). While the NBPTS process is time consuming and expensive, many teachers report that the practice it entails, the use of videotapes to analyze instructional practice, and other aspects of the program are a great form of professional development (Lustick & Sykes, 2006; Ginsberg & Herrmann-Ginsberg, 2005).

Since professional development is an essential avenue for student achievement, it is important to consider abandoning professional development or procedures and processes that do not work or are less impactful. Guskey (2016) stated professional development should be purposeful and intentional. He noted five critical levels of evaluating professional development to insure it is of high quality that are arranged in order from simplest to more complex modes of evaluation. Professional development should be planned with the end in mind; the end is student-learning outcomes (Guskey, 2016). The levels are as follows:

1. Participants Reaction (e.g., Was time well spent in the professional development? Did the material make sense?)

2. Participants Learning (e.g., Did participants acquire the intended knowledge or skill?)

3. Organizations Support and Change (e.g., What was the impact on the organization? Did it affect organizational climate or procedures?)

4. Participants Use of New Knowledge and Skills (e.g., Do participants effectively apply the new knowledge and skills?)

5. Student Learning Outcomes (e.g., What was the impact on students? Did it affect student performance or achievement?)

The intent of the professional development evaluation levels is to help make informed decisions to improve professional development. However, success at a lower level is not indicative of the impact at the next level. Student achievement is the highest indicator of evaluating programs.

Professional development programs are often systematic efforts designed to bring about change in the classroom practices, attitudes of teachers, and learning outcomes of students (Guskey, 2002). Research indicated traditional in-service and professional development activities done in isolation are ineffective for meaningful change (Gulamhussein, 2013). The focus of professional development initiatives needs to be on improving student learning, not fixing teachers (Knight, 2007).

Effective professional development is directly related to school improvement. The current programs for professional development are often isolated experiences, which might not bring about the change that most schools hope to achieve. In addition, the evaluation of professional development often remains at the surface level or level one or level two of Guskey's (2002) professional development evaluation. This is primarily due to the ease of collecting data on the reactions of the participants and self-reports on student learning. However, rarely is new adult learning monitored to verify carryover into daily teaching practices or the impact on student growth is measured. As Knight (2007) argued, job-embedded professional development, like instructional coaching, could be the means of ending cycles that do not have the impact those districts are seeking.

Student Achievement

Principals are being asked to improve student learning by implementing mandated reforms that have consistently proven ineffective in raising student achievement (DuFour & Matos, 2013). Most of the mandated reforms like ESSA or Race to the Top require research-based strategies. However, many of the reforms lack grounding in research. Joyce and Showers (2002) reported that one variable that influences student achievement was the knowledge and expertise of the teacher, for what teachers know and do in the classroom influences what students learn. In a recent study, Sailor (2017) found that classrooms of students performed better on standardized reading assessments when teachers received ongoing coaching beyond the initial teacher training.

Students who have several effective teachers in a row make dramatic achievement gains, while those who have even two ineffective teachers in a row lose significant ground (Sack, 1999; Stronge & Tucker, 2005). Based on Hattie's (2009) analysis of data of all the major contributors to learning (student, home, school, teacher, curricula, and teaching), teachers and teaching are among the most important for impacting student learning. Further research by DuFour and Matos (2013) corroborated that teacher quality is one of the most significant factors in student learning.

Summary

Many educational initiatives are implemented with the intention of improving current practices in a district. Unfortunately, some programs are implemented without a measured outcome (Guskey, 2002). Teachers are the key to implementing programs that impact student achievement. The teachers' growth and development should enhance student learning. In addition, teachers' professional development should be purposeful and intentional. Every one of

Guskey's (2002) five levels of evaluation are important; it is important to ensure that teachers feel their time was well spent and the materials make sense; it is important for teachers to acquire the intended knowledge or skill; it is important that there is a positive impact on the organization; it is also important that teachers apply the new knowledge and skills; and it is important that there is a positive effect on student achievement. There likely is no impact on student learning if the first four levels do not exist.

Instructional coaches wear many hats. Harrison and Killion (2006) referred to the ten roles to achieve collaborating relationships with teachers to empower them to incorporate research based instructional strategies in their classroom. It is well known that high-quality professional development can lead to school improvement. The focus must be on improving student learning, not fixing teachers. Instructional coaching is a means of achieving the much-needed high quality professional development. It is important that instructional coaches' roles and responsibilities and their time be committed to focusing on professional development as a means of increasing student achievement.

Instructional coaching programs are often launched without a strong implementation plan (Knight, 2009). There is a need for a job description and clear definition of instructional coaches' roles. Given that effective coaching can lead to increased student achievement, it is important for districts to plan for the implementation and help principals, instructional coaches, and teachers be willing to accept the idea that coaching is an effective means of professional development (Cornett and Knight, 2009). Instructional coaching often requires schools to shift from traditional professional development to the job-embedded, ongoing professional development that instructional coaches provide. Thus, teacher beliefs and motivations must change before teacher practice can change (Guskey, 2002). If a district can implement a solid

instructional coaching plan and be aware of the challenges and issues, then the likelihood of achieving the highest level of effectiveness will be achieved. Prior research suggests that instructional coaching can develop effective teachers, and in turn, effective teachers lead to increased student achievement (Cornett and Knight, 2009; Knight 2007; Showers, 1984;). In order to shift professional development from being taught in isolation to job-embedded instructional coaching programs, principals and teachers have to perceive the instructional coaches as providing beneficial support and doing what is stated they are supposed to be doing.

Thus, the literature review reveals the importance and value of instructional coaching as a form of powerful professional development. This study examines the perceptions of those involved in an instructional coaching program to determine if principals, instructional coaches, and teachers were clear in their understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the instruction coaches. Given the potential importance of instructional coaches, this study is designed to examine if perceptual understanding across principals, instructional coaches and teachers was similar in a new program, how these perceptions compared to the written job description and actual logged work of instructional coaches, and perceptions of the impact of the instructional coach program.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This dissertation explores the relationship between the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches within one district and the perceptions of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. This dissertation does not attempt to redefine the roles and responsibilities within the district; rather, the intent is to better understand how the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches' job descriptions are implemented and the value of the instructional coaches.

This dissertation utilized a mixed method approach as both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. Quantitative data were derived from a survey measuring the perception of instructional coaches through eyes of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers based on the job description. To personalize the quantitative data and identify the value of instructional coaches, qualitative data were also collected through structured interviews with principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. The qualitative data were used to explain what the instructional coaches looked like in a school setting. In addition, historical documentation related to instructional coaching was collected and put in chronological order to review for patterns and themes.

Sample

The sample for this study is a suburban school district in a midwestern state. The district has four kindergarten through fourth grade schools that function as traditional elementary schools and one school that functions as a S.T.E.A.M. school. The S.T.E.A.M. school serves students in grades kindergarten through sixth grade. The district has a fifth and sixth grade center that continues to function as a traditional elementary school. Approximately 1,500

students were in grades kindergarten through fourth grade. The student demographics are similar

among the five elementary schools. Table 1 shows the building demographics.

Table 1

K-4 School Demographics

2015-2016	Student Enrollment (K-4)	Number of Certified Staff	Administrators	FRL	White	Hispanic	Black	Multi-Racial	Asian	Pacific Islander	Other	Student on an IEP	Students identified as ELL/LEP
School 1	313	20.5	1	56.1	214	73	13	12	0	0	1	38	42
School 2	331	25	1	47.9	249	30	20	23	0	5	4	49	0
School 3	307	24.5	1	69.1	185	95	12	10	0	0	5	42	56
School 4	570	32	2	47.3	449	47	31	35	5	0	3	55	6
School 5	349	27	1	57.8	250	25	36	32	0	0	6	44	0
FRL=Socioeconomic status as identified as Free and/or Reduced Lunch													

However, there are many variables that differ within the five schools. Some of those

variables include but are not limited to the schools' master schedules, the number of teachers

accessing instructional coaches, teacher experience, current teaching status, and leadership

within the schools. In addition, each school has a primary focus of support. For example, one

school serves beginning English as a second language students and other schools service high

need children with autism. More information discussing the demographics of the participants in

the study can be found in Tables 2-4. This school district and elementary schools were chosen

because of their location and the level of implementation of instructional coaches.

In the district there are five elementary buildings, five principals, and two assistant

principals. However, only the principals were interviewed for this study. Instructional coaches

are a new initiative in the school district. In winter 2015, the district began the process of planning for the implementation of the instructional coaches. The five elementary coaches were hired in spring 2015. One day of training from an assistant principal who was a former instructional coach was provided. In addition, the instructional coaches attended monthly cohort meetings with the Regional Professional Development Center. The coaches were given extended contracts and worked during the summer in preparation for the 2015-2016 school year. Each elementary school had a primary instructional coach that they worked with. The instructional coaches were assigned a primary building to support Response-To-Intervention programs and build close relationships with staff members.   However, based on need and expertise, the instructional coaches could work with any teacher or building across the district, pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade. The teachers could access the instructional coaches through face-to-face, email, phone calls, and their website.

The district employs 84 elementary classroom teachers that serve kindergarten through fourth grade. In addition to the elementary classroom teachers, there are art, music, physical education, English as a second language, and special education teachers in each building who also can utilize the instructional coaches. However, for this study, the information was only gathered information from kindergarten through fourth grade teachers as the sample population. The researcher gathered the following information from the sample: school; grade level taught at school; years in education; participation in a teacher induction program; highest degree earned; age; sex; year they began teaching at their school; the number of schools they have taught at the elementary or secondary level (excluding time spent on maternity/paternity leave or sabbatical); and the number of school years they worked as an elementary- or secondary-level teacher in public, public charter, or private schools. There were five principals, five instructional coaches,

and 84 teachers invited to participate in the survey. The five principals, five instructional

coaches, as well as twelve third grade teachers were interviewed. Third grade is the first year

when students participate in state standardized testing. Evaluating the impact of the instructional

coaching program of the teachers at this grade level allowed the researcher to consider the

impact on the district. Tables 2, 3, and 4 contain the responses of the principals, instructional

coaches, and teachers to the personal information collected in the survey. Table 2 displays

demographic information provided by the principals, and it is followed by a summary.

Table 2

Principal's Survey Responses

Average years in education (0 skipped) (5/5 principals)	2 or less years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21-25 years	26 or more years
	0	0	3	1	0	1	0
Participated in a teacher induction program (0 skipped) (5/5 principals)	Yes	NO					
	5	0					
Highest degree earned (0 skipped) (5/5 principals)	Bachelor's	Master's	Specialist's	Doctorate			
	0	2	1	2			
Gender (0 skipped) (5/5 principals)	Male	Female					
	1	4					
1st year as principal in current building (0 skipped) (5/5 principals)	2013-2016	2010-2012	2007-2009	2006 or prior			
	4	0	0	1			
Number of schools serving as a principal (0 skipped) (5/5 principals)	1 school	2 schools	3 schools	4 schools	5+ schools		
	2	1	1	1	0		
Years of experiences as a teacher (0 skipped) (5/5 principals)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+	
	3	2	0	0	0		
Age	20-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	50+	
		1	2	1	1		

Table 2 shows there were similarities and differences among the principals. All five

principals indicated that they had participated in a teacher induction program. At least four

principals shared they had been in education fifteen or less years, were female, and started in

their current building within the same three years. There was greater difference among

principals in the following areas: highest degrees earned, the number of schools they had served

as a principal, years of experiences as teachers, and age.

Table 3

Instructional Coaches' Survey Responses

Years in education (0 skipped) (5/5 instructional coaches)	2 or less years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21-25 years	26 or more years
	0	0	0	4	1	0	0
Participated in a teacher induction program (1 skipped) (4/5 instructional coaches)	Yes	NO					
	2	2					
Highest degree earned (0 skipped) (5/5 instructional coaches)	Bachelor's	Master's	Specialist's	Doctorate			
	0	3	2	0			
Gender (0 skipped) (5/5 instructional coaches)	Male	Female					
	0	5					
1st year working in current building (0 skipped) (5/5 instructional coaches)	2013-2016	2010-2012	2007-2009	2006 or prior			
	2	0	0	3			
Number of schools serving as a teacher (0 skipped) (5/5 instructional coaches)	1 school	2 schools	3 schools	4 schools	5+ schools		
	0	0	1	2	2		
Years of experiences as a teacher (0 skipped) (5/5 instructional coaches)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+	
	0	1	3	1	0	0	
Years of experiences as an instructional coach (0 skipped) (5/5 instructional coaches)	1st year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years		
	1	4	0	0	0		

Table 3 shows information reported by instructional coaches.   All five instructional

coaches except for one answered all the questions. One instructional coach did not respond to

the question about the teacher induction program.   All five instructional coaches are female and either have a Master's Degree or a Specialist. Four instructional coaches have been in education between eleven to fifteen years, have worked in four or more schools, and have worked as an instructional coach for two years. There were varying responses in participating in a teacher induction program, the year they started working in their current building, the number of buildings they worked in as a teacher, and years of experience as a teacher.

Table 4							
Teachers' Survey Responses							
Years in Education (1 skipped) (56/57 teachers)	2 or less years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21-25 years	26 or more years
	5	8	12	8	9	5	9
Participated in a Teacher Induction Program (2 skipped) (55/57 teachers)	Yes	NO					
	36	19					
Highest Degree Earned (1 skipped) (56/57 teachers)	Bachelor's	Master's	Specialist's	Doctorate			
	17	38	1	0			
Gender (1 skipped) (56/57 teachers)	Male	Female					
	1	56					
1st year as an teacher in current building (2 skipped) (55/57 teachers)	2013-2016	2010-2012	2007-2009	2006 or prior			
	22	2	11	20			
Number of schools serving as a teacher (2 skipped) (55/57 teachers)	1 school	2 schools	3 schools	4 schools	5+ schools		
	17	15	17	4	2		
Years of experiences as a teacher (2 skipped) (55/57 teachers)	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+	
	14	10	9	8	5	9	
Grade currently teaching (4 skipped) (53/57 teachers)	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade	Fourth Grade		
	10	12	8	10	13		

Table 4 displays the response of the teachers. Teachers were more varied in their responses and experiences. Fifty-seven teachers responded, but not all of them answered all the

questions. Teachers were most similar in the degrees they held, and all but one of the teachers was female.

The following safeguards were employed to protect the participant's rights: 1) the research objectives were articulated verbally and in writing so that they were clearly understood by the participants (see Appendices B-F) including a description of how data would be used. 2) written permission to proceed with the study as articulated were received from each participant, 3) each participant was informed of all data collection devices and activities, 4) verbatim transcriptions and written interpretations and reports were made available to the participants, and 5) the schools, principals, instructional coaches, and teachers were assigned pseudonyms to protect their identity.

Data were collected from March 2016 through September 2016. This included separate surveys sent to principals, instructional coaches, and teachers; individual structured interviews with the five principals, five instructional coaches, and twelve third grade teachers; and a review of pertinent documentation related to instructional coaching.

Instruments

The researcher created the survey based on the job description used for instructional coaches in the sample district and demographic information. Principals were asked twenty-one questions, instructional coaches were asked twenty-three questions, and teachers were asked twenty-two questions. There were three sections on the survey: roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches, open response for respondent to include additional information, and demographic information. Only common data were reported (see Appendices B-D). A pilot study with one principal, one instructional coach, and one teacher was conducted to verify the clarity of the protocol and questions. The advantages of a web-based survey allowed for rapid

turnaround through web implementation in the data collection from the five principals, five instructional coaches, and 84 teachers at one point in time. There were two parts to each question about roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches. The first part of the question asked how many times per week the duty was performed in a forty-hour week, and the second part of the question asked respondents to identify the amount of time that was spent on the task in a forty-hour week. A five-point Likert Scale was utilized for responses to the survey first part of the question regarding times per week a task is done. The scale was as follows: 1=0 times per week, 2=1-2 times per week, 3=once a day, 4=6-9 times per week, 5=multiple times in a day. In addition, the respondents were asked to identify the amount of time given to the tasks. The scale was hourly from less than one hour, single hours 1-9, and grouped by extended time frames 10-15, 16-20 and 21 or more hours in a forty-hour workweek. The mean score of the responses from the principals, the instructional coaches, and the teachers were calculated.

The interviews were a standard set of questions that was researcher developed (see Appendices E-G). The questions were derived from the Dolby-Holmes (2011) dissertation that was conducted on the perceptions of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers on instructional coaching in elementary schools. These interview questions assessed the value of instructional coaching. Each of the five principals, five instructional coaches, and twelve teachers in a common grade but from different schools were asked to participate in the interviews. The principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' responses were documented through a recording device. Next, the responses were transcribed and returned to the interviewees to verify accuracy of their comments. The responses were then analyzed for patterns and themes.

The district required instructional coaches to track how they spent their time from August 2015 through June 2016. These logs were kept electronically in an Excel-type document. Instructional coaches reported this information individually. The researcher was given permission to access the log documents. The events in the individual logs were aligned to the job description of the instructional coaches. This information was returned to the individual instructional coaches to review for accuracy. The reported time was then combined to report group findings. The logged time was not exact with variance due to travel time, impromptu meetings, and situations that arose without notice. The given time was an average based on a forty-hour workweek for individual instructional coaches and the combined group total. These data were reported individually and combined.

To ensure internal validity as suggested by Creswell (2009), the following strategies were employed:

1. Triangulation of data. Data were collected through multiple sources to include, surveys, interviews, and document analysis.

2. Member checking. The participant served as a check thoughtful analysis process. An ongoing dialogue regarding my interpretations of the participant's reality and meaning ensured the truth and value of the data.

3. Clarifications of researcher bias. The researcher is currently employed as a principal in the district being studied. Due to working closely with the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers a certain level of bias exists. An effort was made to ensure objectivity. However, the bias may shape the way data was viewed and interpreted. This study was commenced with the perspective that instructional coaches do add value to

districts. The researcher's advisor and committee members will serve as examiners of the

data to ensure that biases were limited.

4. Protection of anonymity. No demographic information was shared about specific

individuals to protect the anonymity of the participants. Each school, principal,

instructional coach, and teacher were given an alias.

Procedures and Data Analysis

RQ1. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers, perceive

responsibilities as defined in the written job description?

To answer this question the following was analyzed. A survey for the five principals,

five instructional coaches, and 84 teachers was administered. On the survey questions 1-12, the

respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time instructional coaches spent on each

task. The mean and the range of the estimated time were calculated. The mean scores of the

responses to each question on the survey for each group-principals, instructional coaches, and

teachers, was compared to the elements of the district's job description on a series of tables

[what Huberman and Miles (1994) referred to as a series of meta-matrices].

Interviews with five principals, five instructional coaches, and twelve teachers were

conducted. The first question of the interview asked about job responsibilities; these data were

an opportunity to see if the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' responses matched the

survey ratings and to compare the quantitative ratings on the survey to the job description. The

number of times the identified task was mentioned in the responses of the principals,

instructional coaches, and teachers were calculated and displayed for each group.

The responses from the interviews were coded using Creswell's (2009) steps for data

analysis. Coding is a process of organizing material into segments of text before bringing

meaning to the information. The steps in Creswell's data analysis are as follows: 1) organize and prepare, 2) read through all the data, 3) begin detailed analysis with a coding process, 4) use the coding process to generate a description of categories for analysis, 5) write a narrative of the finding of the analysis, and 6) interpret the meaning of the data.

RQ2. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive instructional coaches' roles?

To answer the second question, a survey for the five principals, five instructional coaches, and 84 teachers was administered. The respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time instructional coaches spent on each task and how often the instructional coaches engaged in the responsibilities in questions 1-12. The mean scores for the responses for each group (principals, instructional coaches, and teachers) were calculated, put in rank ordered from highest ranked response to the lowest ranked response, and compared for similarities and differences.

The survey responses were analyzed separately and compared to the similarities or differences to the interviews. Interviews with five principals, five instructional coaches, and twelve teachers were conducted. (See Appendices E-G). The first question of the interview asked about job responsibilities. The number of times the identified task was mentioned in the responses of the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers were calculated and displayed for each group. This was an opportunity to see if the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' ratings were similar or different and to compare the qualitative comments to the job description. The survey responses were analyzed separately.

RQ3. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers, perceived roles and responsibilities align with how instructional coaches spend their time?

To answer this question, data were drawn from principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' responses to survey questions 1-12, the instructional coaches' logged time, and interviews with all groups. First, the rank ordering of the mean scores of the principals and instructional coaches' responses to questions 1-12 were calculated based on hours per week. Since there were only five principals and five instructional coaches' their individual responses to how many hours instructional coaches engaged in the job description responsibility were put in rank order, compared, and discussed. Open responses from the survey were also reported to better explain the findings.

Next, the instructional coaches tracked their time in an excel-type document for one year. The time was measured based on the job description noted areas of focus. The time spent in each area was calculated in hours and reported. The survey responses from the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers in terms of their rank order were compared to the results of the instructional coach's actual logged time. The findings were reported based on similarities, differences, and overlapping ideas.

Finally, interviews with five principals, five instructional coaches, and twelve third grade teachers were conducted. The first question of the interview asked about instructional coaches' job responsibilities. This was an opportunity to see if the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' responses match the survey ratings and to compare the qualitative comments to the job description.

RQ4. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the value of instructional coaches?

To address this question, data were drawn from interviews and were conducted with five elementary principals, five instructional coaches, and twelve teachers. Questions 2-6 focused on the impact of instructional coaches on teachers. The interviews were analyzed and compared with one another seeking patterns, similarities, and differences to form the basis for identifying categories that were based on Harrison and Killion's (2006) ten roles for school-based coaches regarding the value of the instructional coaches that each group perceives for teachers.

Chapter 4

Findings

This chapter details the findings garnered from the data collected within the five elementary schools included in this study. The data were collected to identify and describe the perceptions of instructional coaches, how their responsibilities align with the written job description, how they spend their time, and the value they provide. The principals, instructional coaches, and teachers who participated in this study completed a survey and were interviewed. The time logs of instructional coaches were also used to better understand how their time was spent. The data used to answer the questions is represented multiple tables followed by a summary of the analysis. However, summaries of the findings from the research questions are briefly displayed in Table 5. The information in the table identifies the commonalities and variations found when analyzing data collected for each question. A brief summary of the findings follows the table.

Table 5

Summary of Findings

	Commonalities	Variations
RQ1. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' perceived responsibilities as defined in the written job description?	All groups agreed with 6 responsibilities from the job description.	• Due to the multiple and varied initiatives in the district and at the building.
RQ2. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive instructional coaches' roles?	Perceptions of principals and teachers were more aligned	• Due to the multiple and varied initiatives in the district and at the building.
RQ3. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' perceived roles and responsibilities align with how instructional coaches spend their time?	• Much agreement among principals • Much agreement among instructional coaches Limited agreement among teachers	• IC spent most of their time on 2 responsibilities, logs showed differently • IC spent little time on personal growth, logs showed differently • IC spent a significant amount of time with new teachers, logs showed differently • IC spent little time on the disaggregation tool and student learning data, logs showed differently • IC spent less time on roles and responsibilities than the logs showed • The teachers ranked duties high in priority, not prevalent in the interviews
RQ4. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the value of instructional coaches?	• All agreed IC were Resource Providers • Two groups agreed IC were Curriculum Specialist and Data Coach	• Lack of trust • Loss of Title teacher • Varied roles • Limited time in buildings
IC=Instructional coach		

The findings were outlined for each research question above in Table 5. First, in research

question one, principals, instructional coaches, and teachers all agreed that instructional coaches

engaged in six responsibilities from the written job description. The variations in the remaining

six responsibilities could be due to the multiple and varied initiatives in the district and at the

building.

Next, research question two considered how principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive instructional coaches' roles. The findings drawn from research question two indicated that the perception of principals and teachers were more aligned than with instructional coaches. As in research question one, the variations that did exist were likely due to the varied initiatives in the district and they five buildings.

Research question three looked closely at principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' perceived roles and responsibilities alignment with how instructional coaches spend their time. The findings indicated the principals agreed on how instructional coaches spent their time. This was similar to the findings from instructional coaches. Teachers, however, had limited agreement on how instructional coaches spent their time. Variations to the responses included instructional coaches spend most of their time on two responsibilities, they spend little time on personal growth, they spend a significant amount of time with new teachers, they spend little time on the disaggregation tool and student learning data, and they spend less time on roles and responsibilities than the logs showed. In addition, the teachers ranked duties high in priority, but those same duties were not prevalent in the interviews.

Finally, research question four considered how principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the value of instructional coaches. Principals, instructional coaches, and teachers agreed that instructional coaches were resource providers. In addition, at least two of the groups agreed that instructional coaches were curriculum specialists and data coaches. The data supporting these findings will be shared and discussed in the following pages of chapter four.

RQ1. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers, perceive responsibilities as defined in the written job description?

The results of the survey response for each group of individuals were compared to the elements of the job description of the school district. The respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time instructional coaches spent on each task. The mean and the range of the estimated time were calculated. The first question of the interviews conducted asked the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers about the responsibilities of the instructional coaches, and the number of times the identified task was mentioned in their responses was calculated. While this does not necessarily capture how often the instructional coaches engaged in the responsibility, it does provide a sense of the depth of responses across those interviewed. The responsibilities that principals, instructional coaches, and teacher did not mention were highlighted as well. The findings will show how principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the responsibilities of the written job description of instructional coaches.

Principals, instructional coaches, and teachers were asked to estimate the amount of time instructional coaches spent on the job duties in their job description. The mean scores for each group are displayed in Table 6, with the range of the means.

Table 6

Differences in Mean Scores from Survey: Principals, Instructional Coaches, and Teachers

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principals Hours Per Week Scale Mean	Instructional Coaches Hours Per Week Mean	Teachers Hours Per Week Mean	Range in Hours Per Week Mean
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	6.2	3.8	3.18	3.02
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	2.8	7	2.13	4.87
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	2	6.6	2.4	4.6
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	1.6	2.5	2.5	.9
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	1.6	5.5	1.96	3.9
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	2	2.5	2.31	.5
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	4.2	5.4	2.96	2.44
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	2.6	2.5	2.18	.42
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	3.2	5	2.76	2.24
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	6.6	6.25	4	2.6
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	3	1.15	2.4	1.85
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	4.8	6	3.57	2.43

As indicated in Table 6, principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceived the

amount of time instructional coaches spent on the following duties similarly. The amount of time

instructional coaches spent on developing an annual assessment calendar (4), designing a data

reflection tool (6), and selecting reports from the disaggregation tool (8) had a difference in the

scale mean of less than 1 point between principals, instructional coaches, and teachers.

Principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceived the amount of time instructional

coaches spent on the following duties slightly differently. The scale mean score that was greater

than one point between principals, instructional coaches and teachers indicated this. The amount

of time instructional coaches spent training teachers to use the data disaggregation tool (7),

studying district achievement data (9), assuming responsibility for professional growth (10),

assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development process (11) and keeping current with computer knowledge (12) were perceived slightly different by principals, instructional coaches, and teachers.

Principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceived the amount of time instructional coaches spent on some duties very differently. The scale mean score that was greater than three points between principals, instructional coaches, and teachers indicated this. The amount of time instructional coaches spent supervising and facilitating curriculum work (1), supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2), developing and supervising the new teacher mentoring program (3), and supervising the implementation of pacing guides (5) was a greater difference than the other duties. The instructional coaches suggested they spent more time in all of areas than the principals and teachers except for supervising and facilitating curriculum work (1).

The variance may appear great at first glance in the perception of time spent on the duties, but there were many comparable averages. Principals and teachers' perceptions were similar with less than one point difference on supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2), developing and supervising the new teacher mentoring program (3), supervising the implementation of pacing guides (5), studying district achievement data (9), assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development process (11), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12).

Principals and instructional coaches' perceptions were similar with less than one point difference on assuming responsibility for professional growth (10). The perceptions of instructional coaches and teachers were very similar with less than one-point difference on supervising and facilitating curriculum work (1). The principals and teachers had the most

common perception of how instructional coaches allocated their time. The instructional coaches tended to indicate they spent more time on seven of the twelve duties than what the principals and teachers indicted.

Five principals, five instructional coaches, and twelve teachers were interviewed. The first question of the interview asked about the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches. Tables 7- 9 consider the written job description duties and the number of times during the interviews that principals, instructional coaches, and teachers mentioned instructional coaches engaging in the duties or identified the duties from the instructional coaches' job description in the interview. A summary follows each table. Table 7, displays the interview responses from the principals.

Table 7

Interview Responses for Principals

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principals' responses
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	17
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	21
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	12
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	9
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	14
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	0
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	24
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	12
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	26
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	7
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	0
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	2

As shown in Table 7, the principals indicated the following duties multiple times as roles and responsibilities or as the primary role of the instructional coach. The duties that were

mentioned by the five principals fourteen times or more included the following: supervising and facilitating teachers in the curriculum (1), supervising the implementation of the district professional development plan (2), supervising the implementation of the pacing guides (5), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), and studying data to select the district professional development focus (9). In the interviews, Principal 5P1 explained how the instructional coaches helped make decisions for curriculum, work with the data tools, and work with district administration to made decisions:

> [Instructional coaches] make curricular decisions for the school district. Organize and implement data collection tools, meet with central office staff to plan curricular task, attend data team meetings, train staff on data collection tools and assessments, and review assessment data with staff.

> In addition, there was agreement on the instructional coaches' roles among the

principals. There were five duties that were mentioned by the five principals two to twelve times: developing and supervising the new teacher mentoring plan (3), developing an annual assessment calendar (4), selecting reports for teachers to reflect on student learning (8), assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12).

> Principal 4P1 explained how instructional coaches work with new teachers, stay current on best practices, provide support with assessment data and working on understanding the data work as follows:

> They [instructional coaches] mentor new teacher 1st and 2nd year and cycle with them. Instructional coaches stay current on best teacher practices, provide quality professional development, data analysis, collaborate with other coaches and district leaders, help work toward the district and school goals.

There was no mention in the principals' interviews of instructional coaches designing a

disaggregation tool (6) or assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development

process (11).

Table 8 summarizes the number of times the five instructional coaches indicated they

engaged in or identified the duties from the instructional coaches' job description in the

interview.

Table 8	
Interview Responses for Instructional Coaches	
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Instructional Coaches' responses
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	25
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	55
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	40
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	12
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	21
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	0
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	32
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	18
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	34
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	4
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	0
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	6

As shown in Table 8, the instructional coaches indicated the following duties multiple

times as roles and responsibilities or as the primary role. The duties that were mentioned by the

five instructional coaches twenty-one times or more included the following: supervising and

facilitating the curriculum (1), supervising and implementing the professional development plan

(2), developing a new teacher mentoring program (3), supervise the implementation of the

pacing guides (5), training all teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), and studying district data to select the district professional development focus (9).

The comments from one instructional coach, 1IC1, discussed working with curriculum, assisting with professional development, working with new teachers and assisting with district initiatives well when explaining the roles:

As an instructional coach I had many roles both at the district and school level. I was a K-12 coach and specialized in ELA and 3rd grade curriculum. I was responsible for mentoring new teachers and new teacher meetings, planning and delivering professional development, writing, editing and revising curriculum, leading the 3rd grade curriculum team, building curriculum maps in MasteryConnect, teaching teachers how to use MasteryConnect, helping with data teams, RtI (Response to Intervention) implementation, modeling lessons for teachers, lesson planning with teachers, resource for teachers K-12.

In addition, there was mention from instructional coaches their roles included developing assessment calendars (4), selecting reports to reflect on student learning (8), assuming responsibility for professional growth (10), and keeping current with technology (12); however, this were not as prominent a as the prior mentioned items. These duties were mentioned between four and eighteen times. 3IC1 indicated that the instructional coach assisted with selecting data to be analyzed by principals and teachers to support student learning; "We spend time gathering data for teachers, for principals, for the district as far as assessment."

There was no mention in the instructional coaches' interviews of instructional coaches designing a disaggregation tool (6) or assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development process (11).

Table 9 summarizes the number of times the twelve teachers indicated that the

instructional coaches engaged in or identified the duties from the instructional coaches' job

description in the interview.

Table 9

Interview Responses for Teachers

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Teachers' Response
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	50
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	88
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	42
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	16
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	31
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	0
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	72
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	27
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	63
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	14
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	0
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	23

As shown in Table 9, the teachers indicated the following duties multiple times as roles

and responsibilities or as instructional coaches' primary role. The duties that were mentioned by

the twelve teachers sixty-three times or more included the following: supervising the

implementation of the professional development plan (2), training teachers to use the district

disaggregation tool (7), and studying district data for professional development (9). Teacher 2T3

explained the roles of instructional coaches' support staff with the district disaggregation tools

and assisting with professional development finding this way: "They're knowledgeable in

curriculum and other programs we use like STAR and Master Connect in our district. I think

they help with professional development on some level."

In addition, the teachers mentioned the following roles of instruction coaches between twenty-three and fifty times: supervising and facilitating curriculum (1), developing and supervising new teacher mentoring plan (3), supervising the implementation of pacing guides (5), select reports from the data disaggregation tool (8), and keeping current with technology (12). Teacher 3T1 indicated that the instructional coach roles include supporting teachers with the curriculum, keeping on pace for reporting periods, and staying current with whatever is needed:

> They also are curriculum experts, so they can provide you with input on the curriculum if you are not sure what the new standards mean. They can also help you with MasteryConnect, grade cards, basically anything that has to do with the schools. If they don't know, then our instructional coach will look into it. Often times they provide articles with new data or brain research or whatever it is.

Teacher 4T1 shared how instructional coaches assist with technology, saying, "I understand (instructional coaches) are to help with new teachers, curriculum, check in to see how things are going, help experienced teachers, help with MasteryConnect, make things are *[sic]* user friendly and help with technical issue."

The teachers only mentioned the following instructional coach duties between zero and sixteen times: developing and supervising assessment calendars (4) designing a data reflection tool (6), assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), and assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development process (11).

When triangulating the results from the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers, common patterns emerged among the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches. The first pattern identified two responsibilities that were primary roles of instructional coaches,

which were supervising teachers in the implementation of the district professional development

plan (2) and training all teachers to use the district disaggregation tool (7).   The second pattern

identified four responsibilities that common for instructional coaches to be actively involved in.

The secondary responsibilities were that instructional coaches focused on supervising and

facilitating teacher teams in the development, implementation, and revision of the district

curriculum (1); developed and supervised new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and

third year programs (3); supervising the implementation of pacing guides (5); and studying

district achievement data and facilitated the selection of a district Professional Development

focus (9). Finally, variations in responsibilities among principals, instructional coaches, and

teachers in showed up with the exception of designing a structured data reflection tool to be used

by teachers across the district (6) and assuming responsibility for learning the Understanding by

Design curriculum development process (11). These were two responsibilities that all groups

agreed that the instructional coaches spent little to any time doing.

It appeared there was alignment of most of the written job duties of instructional coaches

by the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers and instructional coaches. Six duties seem

to be a priority among the three groups, based on the amount of time instructional coaches were

perceived engaging in the activities per week. At least two of the three groups indicated

instructional coaches spend some time on four of the remaining six responsibilities. There was

complete agreement that little to no time at all was spent on two of the duties.

In summary, there were variations of perceptions in the written job description

responsibilities between principals, instructional coaches, and teachers in regard to four

duties. The results of the survey and interviews suggested the instructional coaches spent most

of their time on district initiatives. The variation of the other responsibilities is likely due to the

needs and goals of the individual building and the varied expectations at each building. These findings help better understand how the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches aligned with the written job description.

RQ2. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive instructional coaches' roles?

The mean scores for the survey responses for each group-principals, instructional coaches, and teachers were calculated, put in rank order from highest ranked response to the lowest ranked response, and compared to identify similarities and differences. The survey responses were evaluated separately and compared to the interview responses. The first question of the interview asked interviewees about job responsibilities. The number of times the identified task was mentioned in their responses was calculated. While this does not necessarily capture how often the instructional coaches engaged in the responsibility, it provides a sense of the depth of responses across those interviewed. The responsibilities that principals, instructional coaches, and teachers did not mention were highlighted as well.

The principals, instructional coaches, and teachers were surveyed. They were asked how often instructional coaches participate in the job responsibilities each week. The scale was 1=0 times per week, 2=one to two times per week, 3=once a day, 4=six to nine times a week, and 5=multiple times per day.   Table 10 displays the rank order for each group.

Table 10

Rank Order of Mean from the Survey: Principals, Instructional Coaches, and Teachers

Principals (5)	Times Per Week Mean	Instructional Coaches (5)	Times Per Week Mean	Teachers (57)	Times Per Week Mean
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	3.2	10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	4	12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	2.2
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	3	12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	4	10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	2.2
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	2.6	3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	3	1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	1.93
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	2.6	2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	3	7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	1.84
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	1.8	7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	2.4	9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	1.78
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	1.8	1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	2.4	3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	1.69
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	1.8	9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	2.2	11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	1.66
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	1.6	5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	2.2	8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	1.61
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	1.6	8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	2	4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	1.61
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	1.4	6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	1.8	6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	1.59
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	1.4	4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	1.6	2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	1.56
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	1.4	11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	1.2	5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	1.53

These findings were supported in question one in Table 6 that shows the amount of time the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceived instructional coaches spend their time. When the job descriptions duties are ranked, the principals and teachers have similar perceptions. All three groups agreed the two top areas that instructional coaches spend their time doing in a week are assuming responsibility for professional growth (10) and keeping current with computer knowledge (12).

Instructional coaches felt they spent more time than principals and teachers reported in three areas: developing and supervising new teacher mentoring programs (3), supervising teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan (2), and supervising the implementation of course pacing guides (5).

The principals, instructional coaches, and teachers were interviewed. The first question of the interview asked, "What are the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches?" Table 11 summarizes the responses for principals, instructional coaches, and teachers.

Table 11

Differences in Responses from the Interview for Principals, Instructional Coaches, and Teachers

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principal's' Response	Instructional Coaches' Response	Teachers' Response
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	17	25	50
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	21	55	88
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	12	40	42
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	9	12	16
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	14	21	31
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	0	0	0
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	24	32	72
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	12	18	27
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	26	34	63
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	7	4	14
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	0	0	0
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	2	6	23

These response totals were based on the duties of instructional coaches referenced in the interviews. Principals, instructional coaches, and teachers all indicated the primary roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches are to supervise and facilitate teachers in the curriculum (1), supervise the implementation of the district professional development plan (2), develop and supervise new teachers (3), trained all teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), study achievement data and select the professional development focus (9). As mentioned in the interviews, principals, instructional coaches, and teachers indicated the instructional coaches also developed assessment calendars based on pacing guides (4), supervise the implementation of pacing guides (5), select reports from the data to reflect on student learning (8), assumed responsibility for professional growth (10), and kept current with technology on a limited basis (12). None of the principals, instructional coaches, or teachers mentioned instructional coaches designing a

reflection tool (6) or assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development process (11).

Principal 2P1 highlighted the roles of curriculum and supporting the professional development of the district initiatives including the disaggregation tools when stating the following:

> Instructional coaches are responsible for being curriculum specialist, leading the curriculum efforts and leading the grade level teams. There is a lot of great potential, but the instructional coach program needs more emphasis on impacting instruction in the classroom. They are responsible for different areas, like Conscious Discipline, knowing the content areas and district programs like STAR 360 and MasteryConnect.

Instructional coach 3IC1 stated the primary roles of instructional coaches included professional development, working with the curriculum, supporting teachers with the disaggregation tool, and analyzing data:

> [Instructional coaches' roles] involve providing PD for individuals, for small groups, for buildings, for the district, working with curriculum, working with all of our technology programs like MasteryConnect and STAR and assessment. We spend time gathering data for teachers, for principals, for the district as far as assessment.

Teacher 3T3 indicated that instructional coaches' primary role is supporting new teachers when stating, "They [instructional coaches] are for the new teachers and mentoring the new teachers. I think we need a lot of that so that we retain more new teachers." Teacher 2T2 highlighted the roles of the instructional coaches as working with curriculum, supporting the expectations of the district including the classroom, assisting with implementing district initiatives and helping teachers with the disaggregation tools:

I feel like their roles and responsibilities are to help and assist teachers with curriculum, district policies, and classroom expectations. I feel like they have a multitude of hats that they can wear to help us. I think their biggest task are with desegregating information and implementing things, like the new curriculum and new programs.

Principals, instructional coaches, and teachers commonly perceive instructional coaches supervise and facilitate the district curriculum (1), supervise the district professional development plan (2), and develop and supervise the new teacher mentoring programs (3). There was more alignment among the perceptions of the principals and teachers on the other responsibilities. Most of those responsibilities were perceived as a higher priority to principals and teachers than what the instructional coaches indicated.

In summary, the findings indicated that the perceptions of teachers and principals aligned with each other more than with the perceptions of the instructional coaches. The results suggested district initiatives were the primary focus of instructional coaches. The variance of the other responsibilities may be due to the needs and goals of the individual buildings and the varied expectations at each building. The findings help understand how principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the roles of the instructional coaches.

RQ3. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers, perceived roles and responsibilities align with how instructional coaches spend their time?

To answer this question, data were drawn from principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' responses to survey questions 1-12, from the instructional coaches' logged time, and from interviews with all groups. The data for the groups was organized in this order: principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. The rank ordering of the mean scores of the responses to the survey questions 1-12 were calculated based on hours per week. Since there were only five

principals and five instructional coaches, their individual responses to how many hours instructional coaches engaged in the job description responsibility were put in rank order, compared, and discussed. The instructional coaches were asked to track how their time was spent in an excel-type document. The time was measured based on the job description, calculated in hours, and reported. The instructional coach's actual logged time was compared to the survey responses from the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers in terms of their rank order. The findings were reported based on similarities, differences, and overlapping ideas. The first question of the interview asked about instructional coaches' job responsibilities. This was an opportunity to see if the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' responses match the survey ratings and compare to the qualitative comments of the job description.

Perception of Principals

Table 12 below indicates a comparison of the responses of principals and instructional coaches to the survey. The principals and instructional coaches were asked to base their responses on the following scale within a 40-hour workweek: 1≤1 hour, 2=1 hour, 3=2 hours, 4=3 hours, 5=4 hours, 6=5 hours, 7=6 hours, 8=7 hours, 9=8 hours, 10=9 hours, 11=10-15 hours and 12=16-20 hours. Table 6 indicated the scale mean for the perceptions of the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' responses based on job duties.

Table 12

Differences in Mean Scores for Principals and Instructional Coaches

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principals' Hours Per Week Scale Mean	Instructional Coaches' Hours Per Week Mean	Difference in Scale Means
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	6.2	3.8	2.4
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	2.8	7	-4.2
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	2	6.6	-4.6
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	1.6	2.5	-0.9
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	1.6	5.5	-3.9
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	2	2.5	-0.5
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	4.2	5.4	-1.2
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	2.6	2.5	0.1
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	3.2	5	-1.8
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	6.6	6.25	0.35
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	3	1.15	1.85
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	4.8	6	-1.2

As Table 12 displays, principals and instructional coaches perceived the amount of time instructional coaches spent on several duties similarly. The difference in the scale mean was less than 1 point between principals and instructional coaches. The amount of time instructional coaches spent selecting reports from the disaggregation tool (8), assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), designing a structured data reflection tool (6), and developing an annual assessment calendar (4) were perceived similarly by principals and instructional coaches.

Principals and instructional coaches perceived the amount of time instructional coaches spent on the following duties slightly differently. The difference in the scale mean was greater than 1 point but less than 2 points between principals and instructional coaches. The amount of time instructional coaches spent assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development process (11), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), keeping current with computer

knowledge (12), and selecting the professional development focus (9) were perceived slightly differently by principals and instructional coaches.

Principals and instructional coaches' perceptions of the amount of time instructional coaches spent on some duties differed greatly. The difference in the scale mean was greater than 2 points between principals and instructional coaches. The amount of time instructional coaches spent supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), supervising the implementation of course pacing guides (4), supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2), and developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3) was different than how principals perceived time spent on those duties.

Five principals were surveyed. The survey was anonymous. The order of the principals displayed on Table 13 is based on the order that the surveys were completed. Tables 14-18 display the perceived hours from the survey and the rank order based on the perceived hours for individual principals.

Table 13

Survey Response in Hours from Principals

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principal 1	Principal 2	Principal 3	Principal 4	Principal 5
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	7 hours	4 hours	7 hours	2 hours	6 hours
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	Less than 1 hour	Less than 1 hour	2 hours	5 hours	2 hours
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	Less than 1 hour	2 hours	Less than 1 hour	Less than 1 hour	3 hours
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	Less than 1 hour	Less than 1 hour	1 hour	2 hours
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	Less than 1 hour	1 hour	Less than 1 hour	2 hours
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	3 hours	Less than 1 hour	1 hour	1 hour	Less than 1 hour
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	3 hours	5 hours	2 hours	3 hours	3 hours
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	1 hour	2 hours	1 hour	1 hour	3 hours
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	Less than 1 hour	Less than 1 hour	1 hour	6 hours	4 hours
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	10-15 hours	8 hours	1 hour	5 hours	4 hours
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	Less than 1 hour	Less than 1 hour	1 hour	9 hours	Less than 1 hour
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	2 hours	8 hours	1 hour	2 hours	6 hours

All five principals perceived instructional coaches spending time in a similar way in three job duties. There was less than a three-hour difference in the time spent on a duty in a forty-hour workweek. These three job duties are developing assessment calendars (4) (<1 hour-2 hours), supervising implementation of pacing guides (5) (≤2 hours), and selecting reports for teachers (8) (≤3 hours).

Five job duties of the instructional coaches were perceived similarly by four of the principals spending their time. There was less than a three-hour difference in the time spent on a duty in a forty-hour workweek. The five job duties are supervising the development and implementation of curriculum (1) (4-7 hours), supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2) (≤2 hours), designing a reflection tool (6) (≤1 hours), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7) (3-2 hours), and learning the curriculum development process (11)

(≤1 hours). At least one principal indicated more time was spent on the duties identified above. The outliers were supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2) (5 hours), designing a reflection tool (6) (5 hours), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7) (5 hours), and learning the curriculum development process (11) (9 hours).

Three of the five principals perceived instructional coaches spending time similarly on three instructional coach job duties. There was less than three hours of difference in the time spent on a duty in a forty-hour work week. The three duties were developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3) (≤1 hour), studying district achievement data (9) (≤1 hour), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12) (≤2 hours). At least two principals indicated more time was spent on the duties identified above. The outliers were developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3) (2 and 3 hours more), studying district achievement data (9) (4 and 6 hours more), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12) (6 and 8 hours more). The five principals gave a wide range of responses for the duty assuming responsibility for professional growth and development (10). The range was from one hour up to 15 hours. The difference in perceptions of the principals could be due to the variance in focus at the five elementary schools and their building goals. The perception of the principals could also be based on the varied skill level and expert knowledge of the instructional coach. A few job duties were tied for an identified ranking or range; if they tied, the numbers were showed with and "&" or a "-" if it was a range.

One question on survey allowed for open responses, and two principals responded to the question. One principal noted that in the future, "The instructional coach we had last year focused more on the data and providing training to teachers in small and whole group. I would like to see them working more one on one with teachers." The other principal explained why it

was difficult to estimate the weekly time, stating, "Some of these were difficult to select on a weekly basis as many times the work fluctuates according to the time of year. I just put an average of how I would divide it out based on 4 weeks in a month."

Table 14		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Principal 1		
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principal 1 Perceived Hours	Principal 1 Rank Order
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	7 hours	2
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	3 hours	3 & 4
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	3 hours	3 & 4
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	1 hour	6
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	10-15 hours	1
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	2 hours	5

Table 14 indicates there were five duties that Principal 1 ranked the highest and perceived instructional coaches spending two hours to fifteen hours doing in a workweek. In the opinion of Principal 1, instructional coaches are assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), designing a structured data reflection tool (6), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12). Principal 1 felt that the instructional coach spent 10-15 hours of the time assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), which   was more time than the other

principals thought occurred. This duty was significantly higher than the other duties in terms of

the perceived hours represented.

Table 15		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Principal 2		
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principal 2 Perceived Hours	Principal 2 Rank Order
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	4 hours	4
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	2 hours	5 & 6
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	5 hours	3
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	2 hours	5 & 6
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	8 hours	1 & 2
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	Less than 1 hour	7-12
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	8 hours	1 & 2

Table 15 indicates six duties that Principal 2 ranked the highest as it was perceived

instructional coaches spent from two hours to eight hours during a workweek completing those

duties. Instructional coaches were reportedly assuming responsibility for personal growth (10),

keeping current with computer knowledge (12), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7),

supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), developing and

supervising a new teacher program (3), and selecting reports from the disaggregation tool (8).

Principal 2 felt that the instructional coach spent eight hours of their time assuming responsibility

for personal growth (10) and keeping current with computer knowledge (12).   These duties are

significantly higher than the other duties regarding the amount of perceived time reported.

Table 16		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Principal 3		
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principal 3 Perceived Hours	Principal 3 Rank Order
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	7 hours	1
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	2 hours	2 & 3
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	Less than 1 hour	11 & 12
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	11 & 12
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	1 hour	4-10
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	1 hour	4-10
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	2 hours	2 & 3
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	1 hour	4-10
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	1 hour	4-10
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	1 hour	4-10
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	1 hour	4-10
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	1 hour	4-10

Table 16 indicates three duties that Principal 3 ranked the highest as it was perceived

instructional coaches were spending from two to seven hours during a workweek

completing. Instructional coaches were reportedly supervising the development and

implementation of the curriculum (1), supervising the implementation of the professional

development plan (2), and training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7). Principal 3 felt the

instructional coach spent one hour or less on all the other duties.

Table 17

Response in Hours and Rank Order for Principal 4

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principal 4 Perceived Hours	Principal 4 Rank Order
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	2 hours	6 & 7
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	5 hours	3 & 4
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	Less than 1 hour	11 & 12
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	1 hour	8-10
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	11 & 12
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	1 hour	8-10
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	3 hours	5
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	1 hour	8-10
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	6 hours	2
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	5 hours	3 & 4
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	9 hours	1
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	2 hours	6 & 7

Table 17 indicates seven duties that Principal 4 ranked the highest as it was perceived

instructional coaches were spending from 2 hours to nine hours during a workweek

completing. Instructional coaches were seen as assuming responsibility for learning the

curriculum development process (11), studying district data and selecting the professional

development focus (9), supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2),

assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7),

supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), and keeping current with

computer knowledge (12).

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Principal 5 Perceived Hours	Principal 5 Rank Order
Table 18		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Principal 5		
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	6 hours	1 & 2
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	2 hours	8-10
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	3 hours	5-7
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	2 hours	8-10
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	2 hours	8-10
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	Less than 1 hour	11 & 12
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	3 hours	5-7
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	3 hours	5-7
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	4 hours	3 & 4
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	4 hours	3 & 4
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	Less than 1 hour	11& 12
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	6 hours	1 & 2

Table 18 highlights seven duties that Principal 5 ranked the highest as it was perceived instructional coaches were spending from three hours to six hours during a workweek completing. Instructional coaches were seen as supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), keeping current with computer knowledge (12), studying district data and selecting the professional development focus (9), assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), developing and supervising a new teacher program (3), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), and selecting reports from the disaggregation tool (8). Principal 5 perceived instructional coaches spending two or less hours a week on the other duties.

In summary, four of the five principals indicated instructional coaches prioritized some duties. The duties with the highest priority were ranked first through fifth by at least four principals. The highest priority duties reported by the principals were supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), training teachers on the disaggregation

tool (7), assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), and keeping current with computer

knowledge (12). The other duties were ranked in a wide range or ranked in low priority. One

principal had every duty ranked 2 hours or less except for supervising the development and

implementation of curriculum (1).

The instructional coaches logged their hours for the first year of implementation, but the

logged time was not exact.   Variance occurred due to travel time, impromptu meetings, and

situations that arose without notice. The time that individual instructional coaches logged for

each duty is an average based on a forty-hour workweek. Next, the total amount of time the

instructional coaches spent on a duty in a week was calculated. Then, the range of the five

instructional coaches' time was calculated. Finally, the mean for the total amount of time the

instructional coaches spent on a duty was calculated.

Table 19

Logged Hours Per Week for Instructional Coaches

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	IC-1	IC-2	IC-3	IC-4	IC-5	IC Total Hours Logged Per Week	Range for the Total Hours Logged	Mean for the Total Hours Logged
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	6.95	6.13	4.42	5.83	4.96	28.30	2.53	5.66
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	7.03	10.40	3.45	6.19	4.77	31.85	6.95	6.37
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	0.10	0.12	0.40	0.26	0.56	1.45	.46	.29
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	0.16	0.15	0.48	0.10	0.80	1.68	.70	.34
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.02	1.81	1.89	1.81	.38
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	2.22	1.07	1.52	2.25	4.44	11.50	3.37	2.30
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	6.09	5.67	4.90	7.89	4.94	29.50	2.99	5.90
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	3.76	3.20	2.62	5.06	4.53	19.18	2.44	3.83
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	6.48	3.10	4.02	3.60	6.88	24.08	3.78	4.82
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	0.07	0.58	0.77	0.64	1.40	3.46	1.33	.69

Table 19 indicates the mean for the total hours the instructional coaches logged. There were two duties that no time was logged for: designing a structured data reflection tool (6) or learning about the curriculum development process (11). There are four duties with a mean of one or less: developing and supervising new teacher mentoring programs (3), developing an assessment calendar (4), supervising the implementation of pacing guides (5), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12). The instructional coaches spent less than four hours a week on each of those duties, and the range was 1.81 or less for those four responsibilities as well. The instructional coaches reflected in their logs that they spent a significant amount of time supervising and facilitating curriculum work (1), supervising the implementation of the

district professional development plan (2), training teachers on the data disaggregation tool (7), selecting reports for the data disaggregation tool (8), studying data and selecting the professional development focus (9), and assuming responsibility for professional growth (10).

Perceived roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches among principals mostly align with how instructional coaches spend their time. Variance was seen on a few responsibilities and there were a small number of outliers. Agreement exists on the amount of time instructional coaches spent supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3), developing an assessment calendar (4), supervising the implementation of course pacing guides (5), spending time designing a structured data reflection tool (6), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), selecting the professional development focus (9), learning about the curriculum development process (11), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12). Interestingly, supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2), is the area where instructional coaches spent most of their time; one principal indicated five hours a week were spent on this, while two principals indicated two hours a week, and the other two principals said less than one hour per week. This is similar to selecting reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data (8). The instructional coaches indicated this is where they spent the second highest amount of time, but the principal indicated instructional coaches spent one to three hours a week on this responsibility. The third responsibility with the highest amount of time the instructional coaches spent doing was assuming responsibility for personal growth (10). A wide range of variance existed among the principals, from one hour up to 15 hours.

Perception of Instructional Coaches

Table 20 is a comparison of the hours per week mean to the rank order as reported by

instructional coaches in the survey.

Table 20		
Hours Per Week Mean Compared to the Rank Order for Instructional Coaches		
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Hours per week mean	Ranked hours per week
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	3.8	8
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	7	1
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	6.6	2
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	2.5	9-11
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	5.5	5
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	2.5	9-11
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	5.4	6
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	2.5	9-11
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	5	7
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	6.25	3
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	1.15	12
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	6	4
Note. Mean scale score		

In Table 20, the ranked order is identified in the summary of time based on a great deal of

time (1st-2nd), much of the time (3rd-4th), some of the time (5th-6th), limited amount of time

(7th-8th), and rarely (9th-12th) in regard to priority by instructional coaches.

When surveyed, the instructional coaches indicated they spent a great deal of their time

supervising teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan (2)

(m=7) and ranked this task first. The instructional coaches also indicated they spend a great deal

of their time developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3) (m=6.6) and ranked

this task second in comparison to the other 11 job descriptors.

The instructional coaches indicated they spent much of their time assuming responsibility

for professional growth (10) (m=6.25) and ranked this task third. The instructional coaches also

spend much of their time keeping current with computer knowledge (12) (m=6) and ranked this task fourth in comparison to the other eleven job descriptors.

The instructional coaches indicated they spent some of their time supervising the implementation of course pacing guides (5) (m=5.5) and ranked this task fifth. The instructional coaches also indicated they spent some of their time training all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (7) (m=5.4) and ranked this task sixth in comparison to the other 11 job descriptors.

The instructional coaches indicated they spend a limited amount of time studying district achievement data and facilitating the selection of a district professional development focus (9) (m=5) and ranked this task seventh. The instructional coaches indicated they spent a limited amount of time supervising and facilitating the curriculum (1) (m=3.8) and ranked this task eighth in comparison to the other eleven job descriptors.

The instructional coaches indicated they rarely spend time developing an annual assessment calendar (4) (m=2.5), designing a structured data reflection tool (6) (m=2.5), selecting reports from data disaggregation tool (8) (m=2.5), or assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development process (11) (m=1.15). These tasks were ranked ninth through twelfth in comparison to the other 11 job descriptors.

One question on the survey allowed for open responses, and two instructional coaches responded to the question.   One responded explained the response to the survey:

I spend the majority of my time observing teachers and tracking data based on my

observations. Teachers set goals with me and ask me to track specific types of data.

Then, we reflect on that data. Those goals are tied to the school or district plans, so I

counted those hours in question 2.   For question 3, I also included how often I work with

new teachers in my building, not just the time I spend on the district new teacher

program. The time I spend on my own learning (technology and best practice) typically

occurs outside of my contract hours. I answered 4th grade on question 14 as I began

working with that curriculum team. However, I serve teachers K-4 and 10-12 as well as

manage the curriculum pages and maps for grades 3-4 and all of music.

One instructional coach explained how different tasks are done at specific times of the year:

Many of these things are done during certain times of the school year, so the time spent

on each area can vary greatly week-by-week depending on the time of the school year.

These are estimates/averages. Also, much of our time doesn't fit into any one of these

categories. We serve multiple grade levels.

Five instructional coaches were given an anonymous survey. The order of the

instructional coaches displayed on Table 21 is based on the order that the surveys were

completed. Tables 22-26 display the perceived hours from the survey and the rank order based

on the perceived hours for individual instructional coaches; the findings were then summarized.

In Table 21 and in Table 23, Instructional Coach 2 indicated spending no time at all on eight job

duties; therefore, a zero is indicated on that duty since no time was spent on that task in a

workweek.

Table 21					
Response in Hours Per Week for Instructional Coaches					
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	IC 1	IC 2	IC 3	IC 4	IC 5
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	5 hours	Less than 1 hour	2 hours	6 hours	1 hour
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	4 hours	10-15 hours	4 hours	Less than 1 hour	21+ hours
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	5 hours	10-15 hours	2 hours	6 hours	5 hours
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	3 hours	0	Less than 1 hour	3 hours	Less than 1 hour
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	7 hours	0	Less than 1 hour	10-15 hours	1 hour
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	1 hour	0	2 hours	2 hours	1 hour
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	5 hours	10-15 hours	4 hours	1 hour	2 hours
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	3 hours	0	2 hours	1 hour	Less than 1 hour
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	1 hour	0	16-20 hours	1 hour	3 hours
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	8 hours	0	5 hours	5 hours	3 hours
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	Less than 1 hour	0	Less than 1 hour	3 hours	Less than 1 hour
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	3 hours	0	5 hours	10-15 hours	2 hours
Note. IC=Instructional Coach					

There are four job duties reported in Table 21 in which all five instructional coaches indicated spending similar amounts of time, and all five instructional coaches indicated they spent three or less hours on these duties. The duties are developing assessment calendars (4), designing a data reflection tool (6), selecting reports from the disaggregation tool (8), and learning the curriculum development process (11).

On one job duty, four of the five instructional coaches perceived instructional coaches spending their time similarly. Four instructional coaches indicated they spent three or less hours

studying district data and selecting the professional development focus (9). However, one instructional coach indicated spending sixteen to twenty hours a week on this duty.

There were three instructional coach job duties in which three of the five instructional coaches perceived spending their time in a similar way. They spent two or less hours supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), five to six hours developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3), and one or less hours supervising the implementation of course pacing guides (5). However, two instructional coaches indicated they spent significantly different amount of time than what the other three instructional coaches perceived in three of the above duties. Two instructional coaches indicated they spent five to six hours supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum. Two instructional coaches indicated they spent as much as fifteen hours to two hours developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program. Two instructional coaches spent as much as fifteen hours to seven hours supervising the implementation of course pacing guides.

All five of the instructional coaches perceived the amount of time spent on four duties differently. The range was from no time at all to twenty-one hours a week. The duties with the greatest range variance supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12).

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	IC 1 Perceived Hours	IC 1 Rank Order
Table 22		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Instructional Coach 1		
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	5 hours	3-5
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	4 hours	6
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	5 hours	3-5
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	3 hours	7-9
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	7 hours	2
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	1 hour	10-11
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	5 hours	3-5
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	3 hours	7-9
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	1 hour	10-11
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	8 hours	1
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	Less than 1 hour	12
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	3 hours	7-9
Note IC=Instructional Coach		

Table 22 indicates there were five duties Instructional Coach 1 ranked the highest and perceived spending five hours to eight hours in a workweek completing those duties. The instructional coach supervised the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), developed and supervised new teacher mentoring program (3), supervised the implementation of course pacing guides (5), trained teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), and assumed responsibility for personal growth (10).

Table 23		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Instructional Coach 2		
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	IC 2 Perceived Hours	IC 2 Rank Order
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	Less than 1 hour	4
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	10-15 hours	1-3
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	10-15 hours	1-3
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	0	5-12
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	0	5-12
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	0	5-12
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	10-15 hours	1-3
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	0	5-12
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	0	5-12
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	0	5-12
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	0	5-12
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	0	5-12
Note IC=Instructional Coach		

Table 23 indicates there were four duties Instructional Coach 2 ranked the highest and perceived spending less than one hour to fifteen hours doing in a workweek. The instructional coach reported supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2), developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3), and training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7). Instructional Coach 2 indicated these duties were their sole responsibilities and that three of them were a priority. There was little to no time at all spent on the other duties.

	IC 3 Perceived Hours	IC 3 Rank Order
Table 24		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Instructional Coach 3		
Instructional Coaches Job Duties		
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	2 hours	6-9
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	4 hours	4-5
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	2 hours	6-9
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	10-12
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	10-12
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	2 hours	6-9
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	4 hours	4-5
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	2 hours	6-9
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	16-20 hours	1
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	5 hours	2-3
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	Less than 1 hour	10-12
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	5 hours	2-3
Note. IC=Instructional Coach		

Table 24 indicates there were five duties Instructional Coach 3 ranked the highest,

spending four hours to twenty hours completing those tasks in a workweek. Instructional Coach

3 supervised the implementation of the professional development plan (2), trained teachers on

the disaggregation tool (7), selected the professional development focus (9), assumed

responsibility for personal growth (11), and kept current with computer knowledge (12).

Table 25		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Instructional Coach 4		
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	IC 4 Perceived Hours	IC 4 Rank Order
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	6 hours	3-4
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	Less than 1 hour	12
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	6 hours	3-4
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	3 hours	6-7
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	10-15 hours	1-2
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	2 hours	8
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	1 hour	9-11
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	1 hour	9-11
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	1 hour	9-11
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	5 hours	5
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	3 hours	6-7
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	10-15 hours	1-2
Note. IC=Instructional Coach		

Table 25 indicates there were five duties Instructional Coach 4 ranked the highest,

spending five hours to fifteen hours doing those duties in a workweek. Instructional Coach 4

supervised the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), developed and supervised

new teacher mentoring program (3), supervised the implementation of course pacing guides (4),

assumed responsibility for personal growth (10), and kept current with computer knowledge

(12).

Table 26		
Response in Hours and Rank Order for Instructional Coach 5		
Instructional Coaches Job Duties	IC 5 Perceived Hours	IC 5 Rank Order
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	1 hour	7-9
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	21+ hours	1
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	5 hours	2
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	Less than 1 hour	10-12
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	1 hour	7-9
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	1 hour	7-9
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	2 hours	5-6
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	Less than 1 hour	10-12
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	3 hours	3-4
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	3 hours	3-4
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	Less than 1 hour	10-12
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	2 hours	5-6
Note. IC=Instructional Coach		

Table 26 indicates there were four duties Instructional Coach 5 ranked the highest and spent three hours to twenty-one or more hours in a workweek. Instructional Coach 5 supervised the implementation of the professional development plan (2), developed and supervised new teacher mentoring program (3), selected the professional development focus (9), and assumed responsibility for personal growth (10). However, one duty stood out as a primary focus for this instructional coach, as slightly over half the time in the work week was spent on supervising and implementing the professional development plan.

Four instructional coaches ranked eight duties the highest, and they spent three hours to twenty-one or more hours on in a workweek. Four of the five instructional coaches ranked high developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3) and assuming responsibility for personal growth (10). Three of the five instructional coaches ranked high supervising the

development and implementation of the curriculum (1), supervising the implementation of the

professional development plan (2), and training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7). Two of

the five instructional coaches ranked high supervising the implementation of course pacing

guides (5), selecting the professional development focus (9) and keeping current with computer

knowledge (12) ranked high. The other four duties were ranked lower when considering the

amount of time spent completing those responsibilities. The responses to the survey indicated

the differing priorities for the instructional coaches differed.

Table 19 on page 74 reported the logged time of instructional coaches, the total combined

hours, the range of time for the total combined hours, and the mean for the total hours.   This

information was considered when analyzing the results of the instructional coaches logged time

when compared to the survey results and rank order. There was agreement among the

instructional coaches that their responsibilities were supervising and facilitating teachers and

teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum (1),

training all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (7), and assuming responsibility

for the growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research and improved

instructional strategies, and attending appropriate professional meeting and conventions (10).

These are similar findings to the principals' findings. However, the logged time showed a

significant number of hours focused on supervising the implementation of the district

professional development plan (2), selecting reports from data disaggregation tool for teacher to

use to reflect on student learning data (8), and studying district achievement data and facilitating

the selection of district. As stated in question one, Instructional Coach 4IC1 discussed the

curriculum work and supporting teachers with the disaggregation tools when stating:

We also currently are still currently functioning, as sort of curriculum facilitators I think is

the best way to put it. We are in charge of the curriculum maps for specific grade level

departments … then we sort of troubleshooting, helping people with things like

MasteryConnect and STAR.

Instructional Coach 3IC1 also noted "we spent a lot more time working on curriculum and data,

MasteryConnect and STAR data."

For the most part, perceived roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches align with

how they spent their time. However, there were two responsibilities that were ranked

significantly differently, as the instructional coaches indicated on the survey they spent a

significant amount of time with new teachers (3), but in the logs, there appeared to be very little

time focused on this. Similarly, the instructional coaches indicated on the survey selecting

reports from data disaggregation tool for teacher to use to reflect on student learning data (8) was

of low priority, but when reviewing their logs, this was the second highest logged time. Even

though this was a low priority task, it appears to have been time consuming. The survey

response from one instructional coach reflected the time was focused on only three tasks, but all

of the instructional coaches' logs indicated otherwise.

Perception of Teachers

Table 27 displays a comparison of the responses of teachers and instructional coaches to

the survey. The teachers and instructional coaches were asked to base their responses on the

same scale within a forty-hour week.

Table 27

Difference in Mean Hours Per Week for Teachers and Instructional Coaches

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Teachers' Hours Per Week Scale Mean	Instructional Coaches' Hours Per Week Mean	Difference in Scale Means
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	3.18	3.8	-0.62
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	2.13	7	-4.87
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	2.4	6.6	-4.2
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	2.5	2.5	0
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	1.96	5.5	-3.54
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	2.31	2.5	-0.19
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	2.96	5.4	-2.44
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	2.18	2.5	-0.32
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	2.76	5	-2.24
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	4	6.25	-2.25
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	2.4	1.15	1.25
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	3.57	6	-2.43
Note. Mean scale score			

Table 27 shows that teachers and instructional coaches perceived the amount of time

instructional coaches spent on several duties in a similar fashion as there was a mean difference

less than one point on four of the job description responsibilities. This is a less than one hour

difference in the perceived amount of time spent on each responsibility in a forty-hour

workweek. The amount of time instructional coaches spent supervising and facilitating teachers

on the district curriculum (1), developing an annual assessment calendar (4), designing a

structured data reflection tool (6), and selecting reports from data disaggregation tool (8) were

perceived similarly by teachers and instructional coaches.

Teachers and instructional coaches perceived the amount of time instructional coaches spent on one duty slightly different. The difference in the scale mean was greater than one point but less than two points between the teachers and instructional coaches. The amount of time instructional coaches spent assuming responsibility for learning the curriculum development process (11) were perceived slightly differently between teachers and instructional coaches.

Teachers and instructional coaches perceived the amount of time instructional coaches spent on the following areas differently. The difference in the scale mean was greater than two points between teachers and instructional coaches. The amount of time instructional coaches spent supervising teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan (2), developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3), supervising the implementation of course pacing guides (5), training all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (7), studying district data and facilitating district professional development focus (9), assuming responsibility for professional growth and development (10), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12), was different than how teachers perceived time spent on those duties.

In Table 28, a comparison of responses of teachers and instructional coaches to the survey is shown. The teachers and instructional coaches were asked to base their response on the same scale used in Table 12. In addition, the rank based on the mean for teachers and instructional coaches are displayed.

Table 28

Hours Per Week Mean Compared to the Rank Order for Teachers and Instructional Coaches

Instructional Coaches Job Duties	Teacher hours per week mean	Rank based on mean	Instructional coach hours per week mean	Rank based on mean	Mean difference	Rankings difference (6 SIMILAR)
1) Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.	3.18	3	3.8	8	-.62	-5
2) Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan.	2.13	11	7	1	-4.87	10
3) Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.	2.4	7 & 8	6.6	2	-4.2	-5
4) Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.	2.5	6	2.5	9-11	=	-3
5) Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.	.96	12	5.5	5	-4.54	7
6) Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.	2.31	9	2.5	9-11	-.19	=
7) Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).	2.96	4	5.4	6	-2.44	-2
8) Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.	2.18	10	2.5	9-11	-.32	1
9) Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus.	2.76	5	5	7	-2.24	-2
10) Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.	4	1	6.25	3	-2.25	-2
11) Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.	2.4	7 & 8	1.15	12	1.25	-5
12) Keep current with computer knowledge.	3.57	2	6	4	-2.43	-2

Note. Mean scale score

Table 28 indicates that teachers and instructional coaches ranked the following job

responsibilities similarly: assuming responsibility for personal growth (10) and keeping current

with computer knowledge (12). Not only were they ranked similarly, but they were also ranked

higher in priority. Similar but lower in priority were training teachers on the disaggregation tool

(7) and selecting the professional development focus (9). Finally, although similar, the final

three areas were ranked relatively low: developing an assessment calendar (4), spending time designing a structured data reflection tool (6), and selecting reports from data disaggregation tool for teacher to use to reflect on student learning data (8).

Teachers and instructional coaches ranked the following job responsibilities differently: supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2), developing and supervising the new teacher mentoring program (3), supervising the implementation of course pacing guides (5), and learning about the curriculum development process (11). Supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2) had the largest variance, and this is especially noteworthy given the range of the difference in priority. The mean rank of the instructional coaches was one, and the teachers mean rank was an 11 in priority.

One question on survey allows for open responses, and twenty-one teachers responded to the question. Three of the responses expressed instructional coaches were helpful. One of the respondents stated, "The instructional coaches have been very helpful with Mastery Connect." Eight of the responses were indifferent and many stated they were not sure how instructional coaches spent their time. One respondent commented, "An instructional coach usually attends our PLC weekly. Otherwise, I rarely see an instructional coach. I know they are available if I need help. This is just my perspective on how they divide their time and duties." Seven of the responses indicated they were not sure of what instructional coaches did and offered alternative uses and identified needs. As one respondent commented,

> I can't answer any of the questions because I have no idea what they are doing or how much time they do any of the activities listed above. District and Title money would be better used for teachers working with students like Title teachers in the past.

Instructional coaches help relieve mentoring duties of principals and PD responsibilities of CO administrators.

When triangulating the results from the instructional coaches and the teachers, the categories indicated the roles and responsibilities of instruction coaches include the following. Instructional coaches and teachers agree that instructional coaches spend their time similarly developing an assessment calendar (4), spending time designing a structured data reflection tool (6), and selecting reports from data disaggregation tool for teacher to use to reflect on student learning data (8). Instructional coaches' and teachers' perceptions were varied in the amount of time instructional coaches spent supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1), training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7), selecting the professional development focus (9), assuming responsibility for personal growth (10), learning about the curriculum development process (11), and keeping current with computer knowledge (12). Instructional coaches and teachers viewed the time instructional coaches spent supervising the implementation of the professional development plan (2), developing and supervising new teacher mentoring program (3), and supervising the implementation of course pacing guides (5) very differently. Interestingly, the teachers did not mention the priorities that were reflected in the interviews.

Two primary roles were evident in the interviews when teachers were asked about the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches. Those roles were supervising the development and implementation of the curriculum (1) and training teachers on the disaggregation tool (7). Teacher 5T2 simply stated that curriculum was the priority, "[the roles and responsibilities of the instructional coach] is to help the classroom teacher with curriculum."

Teacher 3T1 discussed the roles of instructional coach are not only supporting teachers with the curriculum but also assisting with the new disaggregation tool:

> They tell you what to expect. They go in and get the data. For instance, I had some new kids come in this year and I didn't have any of their STAR data, so she went in and got me all of their STAR data at the beginning of the year so I could make my corporative groups, based on that data, of course I've had to amend it, at least I've had a starting point.

Teachers perceived roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches differently than how instructional coaches spend their time. Teachers perceived instructional coaches spending less time on the roles than what instructional coaches did spend. In addition, their rankings in priority indicated the same disparity. Finally, there was no mention of the priorities the teachers ranked based on the survey in the interviews. It appears that teachers were not clear on the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches.

In summary, there was agreement among the groups of principals and instructional coaches how the perceived roles and responsibilities align with how instructional coaches spend their time. There was less agreement among the teachers. There was significant discrepancy in the comparison of the instructional coaches' roles and responsibilities and how their time was spent for all groups. This information helps to better understand how the perceived roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches align with how they spend their time.

RQ4. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the value of instructional coaches?

To answer this question, information was drawn from the interview responses from principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. The findings from the groups were organized in

this order: principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. The categories and reported findings

were based on Killion's (2006) roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches. The findings

will reveal the perceived value of instructional coaches from principals, instructional coaches,

and teachers.

Perception of Principals

The five principals that were interviewed perceived instructional coaches providing value

to teachers in three ways. Those three categories were the instructional coach was a curriculum

specialist, data coach, and resource provider. The principals also identified challenges the

instructional coach program faced.

Curriculum specialist. Principals felt instructional coaches most significant impact on

teachers was their role as curriculum specialists. Curriculum included all the work facilitating

the writing, organizing, and planning for the assessment of the curriculum and updating the

curriculum while aligning it with district, state, and national standards. This was a time-

consuming task in the district. Principal 1P1 said,

> Well, I don't think we could have accomplished all that we did with curriculum had we
>
> not had instructional coaches. Honestly speaking, I could not have helped a team do
>
> what they did and do my job as a principal…. Instructional coaches know the ins and outs
>
> of the curriculum kindergarten through fourth grade. I have an awareness of what is
>
> taught, but I am not an expert.

Principal 5P1 indicated what initially was viewed as a challenge became a benefit related

to curriculum:

> I believe early in the year the perceived impact was that teachers would have access to
>
> ongoing support in cycles. In reality this occurred in a limited fashion because of

curricular task prevented them from being in buildings. Conversely, the IC's taking the lead on those tasks freed teachers up to be in their classrooms more often. This was a great benefit to students.

Data coach. Principals indicated instructional coaches were data coaches; this role bridges the gap between research and practice. Instructional coaches helped look closely at individual, class, grade level, building, and district data. They also assisted with analyzing the data and helped focus in on strengths and areas of improvement within the findings. In addition, some coaching cycles included reviewing a teacher's data, looking for areas of strength and improvement for teachers, being an extra set of eyes for teachers, and providing a different perspective. Principals agreed that instructional coaches being a data coach to teachers had an indirect impact on student performance. This is highlighted in Principal 3P1's thoughts:

> The instructional coach helps teachers to disaggregate data so teachers are able to drill down the information and make plans for students' individual needs. She worked with teachers to make specific goals for students focused on areas that students may struggle. Our instructional coach helped teachers to develop strong strategies to use with students for RtI (Response to Intervention) as well as methods to implement the curriculum and technology within the classroom.

Resource provider. Principals indicated that instructional coaches were resource providers to teachers; this role includes, but is not limited to, providing articles, researching ideas and topics, suggesting strategies, providing ideas or materials and just helping and supporting all staff with their needs. For example, Principal 3P1 said

> The instructional coaches have had a positive impact on our teachers. Since having instructional coaches, our teachers are more willing to ask questions and try new

strategies within their classrooms. Having enough time is always an issue for

teachers. The instructional coaches are able to research and bring in new methods for

teachers saving them time and giving them the opportunity to try new strategies that they

may not have tried otherwise.

Principals appreciated the resourcefulness of the instructional coaches. This is highlighted in

Principal's 2P1's thoughts about what it would be like if they did not have an instructional coach

program:

Not that confidential information is shared, but they are sounding boards and can share

their perspective on different situations. There would also be less support for teachers and

administrators for implementing: MasteryConnect, STAR 360, Conscious Discipline, and

the curriculum. Even if the instructional coach isn't assigned a grade level, they have

knowledge/expertise of that grade level. The instructional coaches collaborate often as

team and share information. Principals would have to seek out teachers to lead the staff

in the above areas. Teachers would need more directions from principals. The teachers

have limited time to become experts and their focus needs to be on their students,

whereas instructional coaches don't need that [focus on the students].

Principal 1P1 discussed the impact of instructional coaches being a resource, stating, "I don't

think there is enough time in the day for me to do the work the instructional coaches did and do

my job well. Something would fall short."

Challenges

The principals identified challenges instructional coaches and teachers faced for the

program to have the desired impact. These challenges included trust issues, changes, and

the loss of another district program thought to be effective by some. Principal 2P1 stated time to

build trust is needed:

> Teachers need to be open to the resources from the instructional coaches. There wasn't a
>
> lot of trust at this school partly due to the frequent change of (building)
>
> administration. Honestly, I don't think the instructional coach program is to the point
>
> where it is impacting student learning and instruction because of the lack of trust. It's
>
> going to take time and trust.

Principal 5P1 highlighted the common thoughts about instructional coaches and direct

instruction, "Instructional coaches do not work directly with students, though I think some

teachers wished they could. Like our Title Teachers used to."

The principals appeared to be hopeful about the impact on teachers with the instructional

coach program.   Principal 2P1 noted what would be useful to see in the future:

> I think the instructional coach program has a lot of potential. Instructional coaches are a
>
> good support for teachers and principals. I would like one full time instructional coach
>
> for each building. That would allow them to build relationships, get into classrooms here
>
> more, build trust and dedicated to the school and staff. The instructional coach would not
>
> be spread as thin if there was one in each building. Also, instructional coaches should
>
> report to building principals at times it feels that principals report to instructional
>
> coaches. I just really don't want to share mine.

The principals appeared to be hopeful about the impact on teachers with the instructional

Findings indicated principals perceived instructional coaches as adding value to teachers.

The instructional coaches did this through the roles they assumed, including being a curriculum

specialist, data coach, and resource provider. However, the challenges that the principals felt

hindered the instructional coach program included lack of trust and teachers who were struggling

with the change from Title teachers to instructional coaches. However, the principals were overall hopeful and positive about the impact or potential impact that instructional coaches can have on teachers.

Perception of Instructional Coaches

The five instructional coaches that were interviewed perceived they provided value to teachers in three ways. Those three categories were the instructional coach was a classroom supporter, curriculum specialist, learning facilitator, and resource provider. The instructional coaches also identified challenges the instructional coach program faced.

Classroom supporter. Instructional coaches felt their most significant impact on teachers was when they were engaged with coaching cycles, as they believed cycles had a positive impact on teachers. Instructional coaches would observe a teacher's lesson or review a teacher's data. They were able to help identify areas of strength and improvement for teachers. The extra set of eyes for teachers opened a different perspective on lessons or progress of the students. Instructional Coach 2IC1 highlighted that teachers are often critical of them and sometimes does not see the positive impact they have said:

> We are able to talk openly and honestly about data and instruction. We talk it through with the teachers and together we are able to identify the strengths. Teachers are critical of them and can identify the areas of improvements. Once that is all established we bring in strategies for them to try to improve the areas of weakness and teachers can bring in their own strategies.

Similarly, Instructional Coach 4IC1 felt coaching cycles opens the door to communication and growth:

Well, it does not matter what my coaching cycle is on, it is going to impact that teacher's kids. If you are working with me on classroom management and your classroom management improves, then your instruction is going to improve. Your kids are going to perform better academically. If I am doing a coaching cycle with you on introducing new strategies for a skill, then that is going to impact the way the teacher teaches that skill thus will impact the performance of students.

Curriculum specialist. As a curriculum specialist, the instructional coaches were charged with leading teachers in rewriting curriculum, which included aligning the curriculum to the state and federal standards, organizing curriculum in a program, assisting with creating and revising assessments that were tied to the curriculum. Instructional Coach 5IC1 discussed the focus on curriculum the first year of the instructional program and the benefits of having a solid curriculum:

We have a lot less curriculum work this year. Though I will say that, I mean not that we aren't working and looking in curriculum this year. We were curriculum writing alongside what we are doing this year and that piece we are not as heavily involved in. And that is helpful in the sense of I know we need that solid curriculum for teachers. Last fall we saw a lot of questions were being lead back to curriculum. Gosh, we need a solid curriculum in place for teachers in order to best help them. Um, but it also, so we support that and we do, but not as heavily. And at the same time it opens my time up for more coaching cycles with individual teachers. So, that is a piece I have appreciated.

Learning facilitator. Instructional coaches indicated they were closely involved in the district and building professional development. Professional development was any

training or guidance that instructional coaches provided to teachers on a professional

level. This most often occurred on professional development days.

Instructional Coach 4IC1 felt that instructional coaches balanced teacher needs while

meeting the needs of the district: "I think that we are working very hard to make this program be

an authentic professional development program that we are meeting the needs of the district right

now as it is the best we can."

The instructional coaches were involved in the professional development from early

planning to actually presenting the professional development to teachers. Instructional Coach

1IC1 highlighted this when explaining, "As a coach I was involved in PD planning starting at the

discussion state all the way up to actually delivering PD to teachers and staff."

Resource provider. Instructional coaches indicated they have a positive impact on

teachers by being a resource and increased communication. Being a resource for teachers

includes, but is not limited to, providing articles, researching ideas and topics, suggesting

strategies, providing ideas or materials and just helping and supporting all staff with their

needs. Instructional coaches believed they assisted by keeping everyone informed and current

with district initiatives and directives. The communication included informing teachers of

important and need to know information, emailing and responding to teacher's questions and

concerns, and talking to administration on behalf of the teachers to clarify understanding.

For example, Instructional Coach 1IC1 indicated that new and veteran teachers were

exposed to new ideas when stating:

I think new teachers feel better supported and prepared for their second year. I think

veteran teachers feel more supported as well, but in a different way. It 〔 new ideas 〕

allowed veteran teachers to be revived and refreshed with new things, that they may not have otherwise been exposed.

Instructional Coach 1IC1 also spoke about the wide range of support and resources being provided to teachers:

> The impact on teachers is varied. For new teachers, it's being a mentor and providing support with curriculum, instruction, and classroom management. It's also helping them with getting to know the school and district through policies and procedures. It's teaching them how to enter grades and communicate effectively with parents. The impact on new teachers is wide and varied. For veteran teachers it's helping with technology and how to integrate it in their daily lessons with students. It's teaching them how to use Star 360 and MasteryConnect to track student data and use it guide their instruction. It's keeping them up-to-date on the latest and greatest research based instructional strategies. Overall, it's being a resource for all teachers, listening to struggles, frustrations and celebrations and helping them with whatever they feel they need the most help with.

Instructional Coach 2IC1 highlighted the fact teaching can be very isolating, and instructional coaches provide support when needed:

> Instructional coaches are confidants or people teachers can talk to. They are trustworthy and teachers can ask the questions of them. Teachers have someone to support him or her because the principal can't come in. There is a lot that goes on that people don't know about and we help facilitate that communication. We are another set of eyes or hands that can influence and help implement programs and initiatives. Overall the

response has been positive. Teachers appreciate the support and feedback. Teaching is a lonely job; it's nice to have a peer around.

Challenges

The instructional coaches identified three main challenges. The challenges they face were teachers wanting instructional coaches to work directly with students like Title teachers did, building trusting relationships, and the varied roles and responsibilities they had.

Instructional coaches stated they believed teachers were missing the Title program that allowed Title teachers to work directly with students. Instructional Coach 3IC1 noted feedback:

From the feedback we got, teachers have lots of kids in their classrooms and it's hard to meet everyone's needs and so they felt like those Title 1 reading teachers were able to help them meet the needs of the some kids in their class who need extra support. So the coaches don't really work with the kids. They〔teachers〕want someone to work with the kids and give them that additional support.

Building trusting relationships was a focus as well as a challenge. Instructional Coach 5IC1 explained this by saying, "It was hard the first year, because a lot of teachers didn't really know what our roles were. And so it was hard to get them to open up their classroom and get them to open up with us to be able to work with us."

The instructional coaches understanding of their role was swayed when the primary focus for the first year of being an instructional coach was primarily working with curriculum. Not only did this provide uncertainty to the instructional coaches, it was explained teachers might have been unclear about their roles. Instructional Coach 4IC1 noted that

We also currently are still currently functioning, as sort of curriculum facilitators I think is the best way to put it. We are in charge of the curriculum maps for specific grade level

departments K through 6. So, we provide creating of the curriculum maps and putting

their assessments on their curriculum maps for them. Then sometimes that means

adapting assessments to work in MasteryConnect. So, sometimes there is a little bit of a

role of us making curriculum decisions in terms of assessments have already been

decided on but if we need to tweak the rubric in order to make it work for

MasteryConnect.

Instructional Coach 5IC1 discussed how the uncertainty of their roles and limited trust with

teachers was a challenge, stating: "Last year was hard with the first year, because a lot of

teachers didn't really know what our roles were. So, it was hard to get them to open up their

classrooms and work with us."

Findings indicated instructional coaches perceived they added value to teachers. The

instructional coaches did this by being a classroom supporter, curriculum specialist, learning

facilitator, and resource provider. The instructional coaches also were aware of the challenges

the program faced. Some teachers felt that instructional coaches should work directly with

students like Title teachers did, which was a significant change in practice and beliefs. They

indicated that there needed to be time to build trusting relationships with teachers. The varied

roles and responsibilities made it challenging for them to be engaged in coaching cycles with

teachers. Instructional coaches were positive about the future of the instructional coach program

and the benefits it would provide to teachers. They believed that the positive impact on teachers

would in turn lead to a positive impact on student achievement.

Perception of Teachers

The twelve teachers that were interviewed perceived that the instructional coaches

provided value to them in three ways: the instructional coach was a learning facilitator, school

leader, resource provider, and data coach. The teachers also identified challenges the instructional coach program faced.

Learning facilitator. Teachers felt instructional coaches assisted with building and district professional development. District and building professional development is any training or guidance that instructional coaches provided to teachers on a professional level. Professional development occurred on days that were professional development in nature and in Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

Teacher 3T2 discussed instructional coach support in the PLC:

When we have our PLC meetings, if there are updates within curriculum or with technology pieces we use to evaluate and do assessments, they are there to guide us if we have any questions.

Teacher 4T1 highlighted that an instructional coach participates and synthesizes the professional development:

She also leads and participates in the professional development and she goes out of her way to be a resource. She also filters through district, building, grade level and individual specific professional development needs.

Impacting student achievement is ultimately the goal with professional development. Teacher 1T1 indicated this has happened:

She helped me get the answers that I needed to help my students. That professional development had a direct impact on individual students and classroom and on me as a professional. I also think people got out of it what they put into the instructional coaches. She followed up with me on the strategies I implemented and she really cared about me and how effective the strategy was that I was trying.

School leader. Teachers viewed instructional coaches as school leaders. Instructional coaches helped bridge the gap between district initiatives and goals and putting those into practice. District initiatives and programs included, but were not limited to, Conscious Discipline, MasteryConnect, STAR 360, S.T.E.A.M., and technology integration. Teacher 3T1 said

> And if we didn't have coaches that would be pretty bad when report cards and MasteryConnect didn't work because they do a lot of work on that, hours and hours I know. Because we were able to give our feedback on report card, and they took that and revamped the report cards, and technology was involved but it was mostly the instructional coaches.

As school leaders, the instructional coaches have a wide view of what is happening in the buildings and across the district. Teacher 2T2 highlighted the view instructional coaches have when saying: "They 〔instructional coaches〕 get to see the school community and climate as an overview. Where sometimes I feel like even though I am out in the building, you know, with taking my kids back and forth through our various schedules, I am pretty much in my classroom. I don't see everything."

Resource provider. Teachers had similar responses to principals in that the most significant impact of an instructional coach was being a resource. This includes, but is not limited to, providing articles, researching ideas and topics, suggesting strategies, providing ideas or material and just helping and supporting all staff with their needs. Teacher 1T3 said:

> Instructional coaches seem to be very beneficial. They find resources that you haven't learned about yet, which is great. That causes this chain reaction to share with your team members, as well as other teachers on your grade level in other buildings. I still talk to

first-year teachers and I say, "Hey, my learning coach gave me this resource. Why don't you add this too, if you haven't taught this yet?" I think that just being there support-wise with pulling resources has been really helpful in the building. Since they've taught in the past and they've noticed something that's tried and true, they share that, which is also really beneficial.

Teacher 3T2 identified how instructional coaches showed initiative in providing resources to teachers, stating, "If we come across a project here at S.T.E.A.M., when they find out what we are doing they have a wealth of extra information we may not be aware of to help us through the project." Similarly, teacher 4T1 said, "They check in to see how things are going and even help experienced teachers. They also help with MasteryConnect and make sure things are user friendly and help with troubleshooting technical issues." Teacher 3T3 shared, "They are there to support the classroom teacher. If there is something I want to try, they were willing to help me tried in the classroom or get the resources I need to try it in the classroom."

Teacher 1T1 highlighted how instructional coaches share current best practices:

Instructional coaches had a pulse on what were the current resources, For example: Kagan Strategies. The instructional coach would research on what was out there, through coursework, speakers and staff and teacher experts in the district and share that with me.

In addition, there was much agreement among teachers that instructional coaches save time and increase communication across the building and district. Communication included informing teachers of important and need-to-know information, emailing and responding to teachers' questions and concerns, and talking to administration on behalf of the teachers. Teacher 1T1 shared the impact of having someone to go to for guidance when explaining:

If I had questions on grading, I could ask an instructional coach. She helped me with the new grading system the district was using. She also explained the grading system to me in various ways to use the system to measure students' progress more accurately.

Data coach. Instructional coaches helped look closely at individual, class, grade level, building, and district data. They assisted with analyzing the data, helped focus in on the findings for both strengths and areas of improvement. Teacher 1T1 discussed the multiple examples the instructional coach had shared**:**

The instructional coach gave me examples of testing, ways to grade students, showed me how to use the Response to Intervention data and suggested small group lessons and activities for my students to work on. She also showed us how to monitor the students' progress over time and not just in a snapshot test or quiz or assignment.

Teacher 2T1 agreed that instructional coaches helped focus when looking at data. The teacher stated, "The instructional coach helps to analyze the data, especially when you have a whole PD day for data, and she will help us decide what we really need to focus on."

Challenges

Teachers identified time, meeting obligations, time spent being shared among buildings as challenges instructional coaches face. In addition, responses t the interviews indicated that some teachers preferred Title teachers to instructional coaches in the first year of the instructional coach program initiative. Finally, the value of the instructional coach program was questioned when the district did not fill an instructional coach position that came open after the inaugural year.

Teacher 1T3 discussed the limited access to the instructional coaches and how they try to overcome that obstacle:

It seemed on an average, either by email or in person, I'd talk to them at least three times a week. It was hard when they had their meetings they had to go and they were out of the building. Those seemed to be the days where I needed them the most. They're always one email away, so that was always nice. Even though they weren't here in the building, I can always contact them and they responded in a timely fashion, which was so great.

Some teachers indicated that instructional coaches spent little time in their building, because they had to support other buildings. Teacher 2T1 said, "I wish our coach didn't have to go to two schools, because I think it's nice to have consistency with one school, and I think relationship building would be easier, but other than that I don't have an opinion."

In addition, it was a strong feeling that instructional coaches were responsible for more time consuming clerical tasks than being in the classrooms. Teacher 3T3 highlighted this when saying, "I think they were bogged down with secretarial tasks for curriculum; and more of like programming into a computer. I think that is partly because we do not have a set curriculum that we bought district wide."

Teachers also have a sense that instructional coaches are involved in a lot of meetings therefore the impact on teachers may be limited. Teacher 1T2 noted this when saying:

I'm not really sure what the impact has been. They had a lot of meetings. I believe they were supposed to be a resource to teachers. However, instructional coaches did a lot with: STAR 360 testing, MasteryConnect and MAP testing and were a good resource for these topics. I pictured them in the building more; team teaching, being in the building, helping out teachers, model lessons, helping with lesson plans and being engaged with students (learning).

As previously stated, some teachers were hopeful that Title teachers would come back. Teacher 5T1 stated this, "Title teachers are gone and these are really needed in the schools. The impact has not been huge since they do not work with kids." Teacher 2T2 discussed that students benefited from Title teachers when stating:

I miss the push in. I really saw the benefits for the students when the Title teachers could push-in. It [Title teacher program] was what was best for the kids. There were times when it was best for them to be pulled-out. But the majority of my experiences with Title were that it was push-in.

Several teachers said the responsibilities given to instructional coaches were transferred to other staff members including principals, counselors, and teachers. However, there were a few teachers that felt that if the district did not have instructional coaches that Title teachers would return. Some teachers were indifferent to instructional coaches. Teacher 5T2 went on to say that teachers would carry the load if there were no instructional coaches:

On a building level not much ﹝would be different﹞. Teachers have been running the professional development. On district level they ﹝instructional coaches﹞ are keeping us informed about curriculum updates and MasteryConnect. We did have one professional development this year where the instructional coach taught about reading workshop.

One teacher offered another perspective stating she wasn't sure the district valued the position because one position was not refilled. The teacher is also concerned about the time instructional coaches have to dedicate to each school. Teacher 2T3 noted this concern when explaining her thinking when the district did not replace an instructional coach position that came open:

I guess in a negative way it's kind of affirmed that I'm not sure how relevant the job is because they the〔district〕didn't replace someone. So, now you have this person even less where I think they could have been doing more work with modeling lessons and co-teaching versus now they're even split further. So, we get her one or a couple of days a week versus having her here most of the week. I think they could be doing more, but I think now it's even stretched that they're going to be doing less because she's between two schools.

Findings indicated that teachers perceived instructional coaches provided value to teachers. The teachers felt instructional coaches did this through being a learning facilitator, school leader, resource provider, and data coach. The teachers identified challenges the instructional coaches program faced, including the loss of Title teachers when the instructional coach program initiated, loss of direct student support, and that instructional coaches have a wide range of duties which caused there to be limited time in the buildings to support teachers.

In summary, there was agreement among principals, instructional coaches and teachers that instructional coaches added value by being a resource provider. At least two groups agreed that instructional coaches also added value by being curriculum specialists and data coaches. The major challenges for the instructional coach program that were identified by the groups included lack of trust, loss of the Title teacher program, varied roles among the instructional coaches, and limited time in the buildings. These findings indicate the value of the instructional coaches.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter five includes a summary of the study, an overview of the problem, major findings and conclusions. The chapter concludes with implications for school districts and leaders, and recommendations for future research.

Study Summary

This study was conducted with the purpose of identifying and describing the perceptions of instructional coaches and the impact on teachers from principals, instructional coaches and teachers. Districts, building, and teacher accountability is the basis of Every Child Succeeds Act (2015). To help improve student achievement and aid in closing the achievement gap districts have implemented instructional coach programs. Instructional coach programs are a means of improving students' achievement through supporting and impacting teachers.

Instructional coach initiatives are often implemented in districts as a means of solving the problem of lack of student achievement or to enhance current teaching practices. The role of an instructional coach is often ambiguous, although there is a written job description in the district involved in this study (see Appendix A). Instructional coaches are often asked to take on a variety of roles depending on what is most pressing in the district.

This dissertation explored the relationship between the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches within one district and the amount of time instructional coaches spend engaging in those roles and responsibilities. This dissertation did not attempt to redefine the roles and responsibilities within the district; rather, the intent was to better understand how the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches' job descriptions are implemented and the value of the instructional coaches. The research questions included the following:

RQ1. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' perceived responsibilities as defined in the written job description?

RQ2. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive instructional coaches' roles?

RQ3. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers' perceived roles and responsibilities align with how instructional coaches spend their time?

RQ4. How do principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the value of instructional coaches?

Major Findings

Research question one addressed the perception of the principals, instructional coaches and teachers regarding how the roles of instructional coaches align with the written job description. The results indicated that principals, instructional coaches, and teachers agreed that half of the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches aligned with the job description. They agreed that the instructional coach's primary role encompassed six of the twelve job description responsibilities. Those responsibilities included supervising teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan; developing an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides, training all teachers to use the district disaggregation tool, selecting reports from the disaggregation tool for teachers to use and reflect on student learning, assume responsibility for professional growth, and keep current with computer knowledge. In addition, there was slightly less agreement that instructional coaches also focused on supervising and facilitating teacher teams in the development, implementation, and revision of the district curriculum; developing and supervising the new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs; studying district achievement data and

facilitating the selection of a district professional development focus; and supervising the implementation of pacing guides. In addition, there was strong agreement that the instructional coaches spent little to no time with two of the job responsibilities. Those two duties were designing a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district and assuming responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.

Finally, there was variance in responsibilities between principals, instructional coaches, and teachers in regard to five duties. The results suggested the instructional coaches spent most of their time on district initiatives. The variance of the other responsibilities is likely result of the needs and goals of the individual building and the varied expectations at each building. These findings help better understand how the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches aligned with the written job description.

Research question two addressed the perception of the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers regarding alignment of roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches among the participants. The results indicated that principals, instructional coaches, and teachers that the perceived the primary roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches are to supervise and facilitate teachers in the curriculum, supervise the implementation of the district professional development plan, and develop and supervise new teachers. The findings indicated that the perceptions of teachers and principals more aligned with each other than with the perceptions of the instructional coaches. The results suggested district initiatives were the primary focus of instructional coaches. The variance of the other responsibilities is likely due to the needs and goals of the individual buildings and the varied expectations at each building. The findings help better understand how principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceive the roles of the instructional coaches.

Research question three addressed the alignment of the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches and how they spent their time according to principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. First, the results indicated there was agreement among the principals. The perceptions of principals and the logged time indicated that instructional coaches' supervised the development and implementation of the curriculum, developed and supervised the new teacher mentoring program, developed an assessment calendar, supervised the implementation of course pacing guides, spent time designing a structured data reflection tool, trained teachers on the disaggregation tool, selected the professional development focus, learned about the curriculum development process, and kept current with computer knowledge. Interestingly, instructional coaches spent most of their time supervising the implementation of the professional development plan and selecting reports from the data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data, but the principals perceived instructional coaches spending limited time in these areas. Little agreement existed among principals about the amount of time instructional coaches spent assuming responsibility for personal growth. However, instructional coaches had this area ranked third in priority according to their logged time.

Second, instructional coaches' perceived roles and responsibilities generally aligned with how they spent their time. However, two responsibilities were ranked significantly differently. Interestingly, the instructional coaches indicated on the survey they spent a significant amount of time with new teachers, but in the logs, there appeared to be little time focused on this. In the interviews, many teachers mentioned not having the former Title teachers to support the students. Similarly, the instructional coaches indicated on the survey that selecting reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data was of

low priority, but when reviewing their logs, this was the second highest logged time. Even though this was a low priority task, it appears to have been time consuming.

Finally, teachers perceived roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches differently than how instructional coaches spent their time. Teachers perceived instructional coaches spending less time on the roles than what instructional coaches did. In addition, their rankings in priority indicated the same discrepancy. The teachers ranked duties high in priority; however, those duties were not prevalent in the interview when asked about the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches. There was agreement among the groups of principals and instructional coaches how the perceived roles and responsibilities align with how instructional coaches spend their time, but there was less agreement among the teachers. There was a significant discrepancy in the comparison of the instructional coaches roles and responsibilities and how their time was spent for all groups. This information helps to better understand how the perceived roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches align with how they spend their time.

Research question four addressed the perception of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers regarding the value instructional coaches provide to teachers. First, the findings indicated that principals perceive instructional coaches add value to teachers. The instructional coaches did this through the key factors identified including being a curriculum specialist, data coach, and resource provider. However, the challenges the principals felt hindered the instructional coach program included a lack of trust and that a few teachers were struggling with accepting the change from Title teachers to instructional coaches. However, the principals are overall hopeful and positive about the impact or potential impact that instructional coaches could have on teachers.

Second, instructional coaches perceived they added value to teachers. The instructional coaches did this through being a classroom supporter, curriculum specialist, learning facilitator, and resource provider. The instructional coaches also were aware of the challenges the program faced. Some teachers felt that instructional coaches should work directly with students like Title teachers did. Instructional coaches are to provide support to teachers then in turn the teachers provide the direct support to students. This was a significant change in practice and beliefs. There needed to be time to build trusting relationships with teachers. The varied roles and responsibilities made it challenging for them to be engaged in coaching cycles with teachers. Instructional coaches were positive about the future of the instructional coach program and the benefits it could provide to teachers. They felt that the positive impact on teachers would lead to a positive impact on student achievement.

Finally, teachers perceived that instructional coaches provided value to them. The teachers felt instructional coaches did this through being a learning facilitator, school leader, resource provider, and data coach. The teachers identified challenges the instructional coaches program faced. These challenges included loss of Title teachers when the instructional coach program was initiated, loss of direct student support, and the wide range of duties that instructional coaches have a wide range of duties that means limited time in the buildings to support teachers.

In summary, there was agreement among principals, instructional coaches and teachers that instructional coaches added value by being a resource provider. At least two groups agreed that instructional coaches also added value by being curriculum specialists and data coaches. The major challenges for the instructional coach program that were identified by the groups

included lack of trust, loss of the Title teacher program, varied roles among the instructional coaches, and limited time in the buildings.

Conclusion

This research study drew four main conclusions. First, commitment to change was a challenge. Second, implementing multiple initiatives was a challenge. Third, the role of instructional coaches was unclear or ambiguous. Fourth, instructional coaches' primary impact on students was indirect as they were a resource to teachers.

The first conclusion addressed that change was challenging and lacked perceived commitment. There were two issues drawn from the challenges identified by principals, instructional coaches, and teachers that emerged from the interviews that underscore that teachers expressed little interest in the instructional coach program: teacher beliefs and efficacy. The first issue related to commitment of teachers was beliefs as the beliefs of teachers are shaped within their professional communities, during training sessions, and during interactions with coaches, principals and facilitators (Datnow & Hubbard, 2016). A prevalent desire expressed by the teachers was for the district to continue the Title teacher program, as the teachers believed the Title program met their needs and the needs of their students. Given the desire to continue the Title teacher program coupled with limited knowledge about the instructional coach program, there was not a common set of beliefs about the instructional coaches in the district.   Changes in beliefs of teachers and motivations are often followed by changes in teacher practice rather than preceded by them (Guskey, 2000). The responses from some of the interviews indicated third grade teachers felt that what instructional coaches were offering was not needed. Most of the third-grade teachers did not see the need to change current practices or missed the former Title teacher program. Killion (2016) argued that change depends on learning, which is defined as

acquisition of knowledge, skills, practices, procedures, and dispositions. The disposition or their beliefs at the time of implementation of the instructional coach program appeared limited.

The second issue related to commitment was efficacy. Many of the teachers believed others had the ability to help support students. Teachers indicated they did not have the strategies to help some students make necessary progress; therefore, they relied on Title teachers to do that in the past. Chui and Klassen (2011) argued that teachers are more committed to the profession if they have a variety of teaching strategies and can use them. Instructional coaches are a means of providing strategies and assisting teachers with the implementation of the newly learned strategies. The demographics of the teachers in the district indicated that 68% of the teachers are in the early stages or later stages of their teaching career. Self-efficacy is lower at early career stages and increases through middle career stages and begins to decline again in the later years of the career of teachers, creating a U-shaped pattern (Chui & Klassen, 2011). Therefore, without a strong sense of the value of the instructional coaches, it appears that teachers needed help they did not believe they were getting.

The second conclusion was that implementing multiple initiatives was a challenge. Educators are trying to understand how to plan, manage, monitor, and execute implementation of change in a way that will lead to success, while at the same time implementing multiple initiatives (Killion, 2016). Schools are in frequent state of change. As revealed in the interviews, teachers sensed the instructional coach program was going to be temporary in nature because the district did not replace one of the instructional coaches. This likely contributed to the view that there was a limited commitment to the instructional coach program. The importance of the initiatives implemented in the district varied. When comparing the perceived time among the principals and instructional coaches, responses were highly varied. The

principals believed that the instructional coaches spent limited time in a week on most of the job duties. In addition, principals had varying perceptions of how instructional coaches spent their time. Only three principals perceived two duties demanding eight to fifteen hours a week. However, the majority of perceived time by the principals indicated instructional coaches spent less than two hours a week spent on the majority of the duties. Interestingly, the views of the instructional coaches varied as well. However, four of the five instructional coaches indicated they spent a significant amount of time on one or two duties with upwards of ten to fifteen hours a week doing. Even more interesting, one instructional coach indicated focusing only on three duties, less than one hour on one duty, and no time at all on the remaining eight duties. With the wide range of differences, one can assume there was not a balance of internal or external accountability. Nor did there appear to be any alignment between individual principal and instructional coaches in regard to identifying building priorities. When there is a balance of internal and external accountability, there will be higher performance, greater self and group responsibility for results, and more commitment to sustain and enhance all students learning, development, and success (Fullan, Hargreaves, & Rincon-Gallardo, 2015). For an instructional coaching program to be effective, instructional coaches need to adhere to a system of accountability. Multiple initiatives were being implemented with varying degrees of perceived importance, so the instructional coaches might not have had a clear understanding of which initiatives were most critical and those for which they would be held accountable.

School administrators are able to implement strategies to help manage tension between intended reforms and the stress teachers feel (Brown & Nagel, 2004). However, if the building principals did not have a clear and common plan for instructional coaches, one can assume there was not a clear vision communicated from central office administration. The lack of clarity in

the implementation and lack of ongoing support could be stressful to teachers, who are most directly impacted by the reform. The multiple initiatives and lack of clarity likely contributed to the ambiguity of the instructional coach position.

The third conclusion was that role ambiguity was a stressor for the instructional coaches. As noted in the second conclusion, multiple initiatives and lack of clarity may have contributed to the ambiguity. Teachers and principals likely felt the stress from this as well. The instructional coaches did not understand each facet of their outlined job description. Cornett and Knight (2009) argued that if job descriptions and role expectations are clearly defined, then instructional coaches and their supervisors can make sure the time of instructional coaches is spent in accordance with the written description and expectations. This was a problem in the district studied, and it added to the conflict due to the difference in the roles of teachers and instructional coaches. The survey responses supported this conclusion as well.   The principals identified the primary roles of the coaches differently. In addition, the estimated time instructional coaches engaged in the job descriptors by the principals were different than the logged time of the instructional coaches. The logs of instructional coaches identified that there were significant differences in how they spent their time. On the survey, the responses indicated instructional coaches spent a significant amount of time on a task; however, the logs did not reflect this as the survey responses of the teachers and instructional coaches indicated that the priorities for the instructional coaches differed for several duties. For example, instructional coaches indicated that supervising the implementation of the district professional development plan was ranked first, while the teachers had it ranked eleventh. There was an initial plan created and presented. However, the plan was derailed due to the curriculum work that took priority. The instructional coaches were evaluated using a non-classroom certified staff evaluation tool

(See Appendix H) that did not directly align with the job description. Though there was a plan for implementation, changes during the inaugural year of the program exacerbated the level of uncertainty associated with the instructional coach program. Finally, the lack of a clearly defined job description, the change in the program focus, and the use of the evaluation tool that did not align with the job description contributed to a strong sense of ambiguity.

The fourth conclusion was that instructional coaches primarily impacted students indirectly by being a resource to teachers. Through the interviews with principals, instructional coaches, and teachers, it was understood that the instructional coaches were resource providers in the following ways: researching ideas, suggesting strategies, and ideas or materials. This impact indicates the instructional coach program is fulfilling one of the roles of instructional coaching programs as indicated by the research as Killion (2006) listed being a resource provider as one of ten roles of coaches. The other roles include data coach, mentor, curriculum specialist, instructional specialist, classroom supporter, learning facilitator, school leader, catalyst for change, and learner. There was some agreement among principals, instructional coaches, and teachers that instructional coaches were also curriculum specialists, data coaches and learning facilitators. As curriculum specialists, instructional coaches were directly involved with the teachers in writing the curriculum, aligning assessments to the standards, organizing the curriculum in a user-friendly format, and making updates as needed. As data coaches, instructional coaches assisted the district administration, principals, and teachers with analyzing data at all levels. In addition, they helped identify areas of strengths and weaknesses based on data. As learning facilitators, instructional coaches provided professional learning opportunities for principals and teachers on professional development days and in Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

Finally, an added way to assess the instructional coach program and measure its impact would be to apply Guskey's (2016) professional development framework. Instructional coach programs are considered a form of professional development. As described in the literature review, there are five levels of Guskey's (2016) professional development evaluation, including teacher reaction, teacher learning, support and change, application of new skills, and student achievement. Guskey (2016) also suggested using multiple sources of data to evaluate professional development. Though no data from this study specifically addressed all the levels, there was limited information that provides an assessment of the different levels. A future study could examine this more closely to more accurately evaluate the instructional coach program using multiple sources of data.

The first Guskey level is teacher reaction. The reaction of the teachers in this study was neutral. There was a limited amount of positive support for instructional coaches, but most of the teachers in the interviews did not see the value of the program as reported in the interviews.

The second Guskey level is teacher learning. The learning of teachers was impactful. According to principals and teachers, instructional coaches were helpful in teaching them how to use various programs and the details of those programs. Those programs included, but were not limited to, the assessment program and the data collection tool.

The third Guskey level is providing support and assisting with change. The instructional coaches did help support and facilitate changes in the district. There was agreement from the interviews of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers that instructional coaches helped improve the communication between Central Office administration, building administration, and teachers. Instructional coaches were also able to respond to the questions of the teacher's quickly.

The fourth Guskey level is applying new skills. The principals and teachers did apply new skills they learned from the instructional coaches. Teachers most often did this when implementing the district curriculum, utilizing the assessments programs, and utilizing the resources that were provided.

The fifth Guskey level is student achievement. Though this study did not consider achievement scores as part of the research data, the district's three years of standardized assessment scores for third and fourth grade were reviewed in an ancillary analysis starting before the inaugural year of the instructional coach program and through the second full year of implementation. The scores have stayed relatively the same except for fourth grade math that increased slightly. This information, coupled with the survey and interview responses, indicate that student impact of the instructional program was limited.

The results highlighted instructional coaches had a limited impact on teachers and student achievement. The instructional coaches predominantly served as a resource for teachers. Additionally, they assisted in implementing multiple district initiatives. According to the interviews and the surveys, the small group and individual trainings with the data collections tools, assessment programs, and curriculum updates were beneficial to teachers.

The instructional coaches were important in supporting teachers and being a resource in implementing new district initiatives.   The small group and one-on-one trainings with the data collections tools, assessment programs, and curriculum updates were most beneficial to teachers. This study underscores that instructional coach programs are often implemented without sufficient program and evaluation framework designed to maximize the impact of coaching on teaching and student learning (Cornett and Knight, 2009).

Implications for School Districts

The results from this research have implications for how an instructional coach program is used in practice. The current study investigated the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches and the perceptions of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers within one district. While the research presented in the study indicated that instructional coaches did not have a direct impact on student achievement, there was limited impact on the teachers. There are three implications for school districts when implementing an instructional coach program; communicate and follow a simple plan of implementation, clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the instructional coach, and evaluate the effectiveness of the professional learning associated with instructional coaches.

It is important that districts clearly communicate the intent of the instructional program; including the long-term goals and follow a simple plan of implementation. The instructional coach program was presented to principals and teachers as being implemented to support teachers in each building. However, the shift to instructional coaches primarily supervising the curriculum development created an uncertainty as indicated in the interviews and surveys. In addition, there was not clear communication from administration what the long-term goals were. By communicating the goals, the stress associated with change may have been lowered. A communication and simple plan could also assist in changing school practice. Organizational routines can serve as a structure to stabilize school practice over time (Parise, Sherer, & Spillane, 2011), as happened with the Title program.

Districts leaders should focus on clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches through the job description. Unfortunately, too many instructional coach programs have been launched with an insufficient program framework designed to maximize the

impact of coaching on teaching and student learning (Cornett & Knight 2009). The job description for the instructional coaches in this study was nine years old, and the specific job descriptions referred to programs that have changed or are no longer used in the district (e.g., Understanding by Design). The job description and instructional coach evaluation should be written to reflect the actual roles and responsibilities of the job and the outcomes expected for an instructional coach. This would help lessen the ambiguity of the position. In addition to evaluating the instructional coaches, districts should have a plan for evaluating the overall instructional coach program. Guskey's professional development evaluation is a means of accomplishing this. It is important to consider all levels of the evaluation but also to keep in mind from the start that student achievement is the ultimate goal of professional development.

Based on this study, communicating and implementing a simple plan, clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of the instructional coach, and evaluating the effectiveness of the professional learning associated with instructional coaches are actions for districts to consider. Districts considering these implications and planning for them could increase the effectiveness of an instructional coach program.

Implications for Future Research

Below are recommendations for future research on the perceptions of roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches.

1. It is recommended that future researchers replicate the current study but expand the study to include other grade levels, including middle and high school. This study only focused on the elementary levels of kindergarten through fourth grade.

2. It is recommended that future researchers replicate the current study but focus on the years of implementation beyond the first year. The data from this study primarily focused on the inaugural year of implementation.

3. It is recommended that future researchers replicate the current study and focus on the students' achievement data. This study primarily considered perceptional data to determine the impact on student achievement.

4. It is recommended that future research include urban, suburban, and rural school districts. This type of study would expand the current body of knowledge to include a variety of groups. This study was limited to a suburban school district.

5. It is recommended that future researchers replicate the current study and include more participants by gathering data from larger school districts. This study had limited participants: five principals; five instructional coaches, twelve third grade teachers for the interviews and five principals; five instructional coaches, and 57 kindergarten through fourth grade teachers for the survey.

Concluding Remarks

The results of this study identified and described the perception and the impact of instructional coaches on teachers and students. This research study broadens the knowledge base of districts as initiative implementers, instructional coaches as professional developers, and reaction of teachers to change. This study indicates principals, instructional coaches, and teachers perceived the role and responsibilities of instructional coaches during the inaugural year as being limited. There were three common themes among the response of the principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. Those themes were commitment to change was a challenge,

the role of instructional coaches was unclear or ambiguous, and instructional coaches primarily impacted students indirectly by being a resource to teachers. The experiences and perceptions of principals, instructional coaches, and teachers participating in this study could be useful for school districts considering implementing instructional coaches in their district.

References

Austin, S., Carpenter, L., Dean, M., Dyal, A., Wright, J. (2012). Principal's perceptions of

    effectiveness and necessity of reading coaches within elementary schools. *Reading*

    Improvement, 49(2), 38-51

Bailey, B. (2017). *Conscious discipline*. Retrieved from https://consciousdiscipline.com/

Baker, S. & Gersten, R. (2000). What we know about effective instructional practices

    for English-language learners. *Exceptional Children, 66*(4), 454.

Bauer, T., Ellis, A., Erdogan, B., Mansfield, L., Simon, L., & Truxillo,

    D. (2015). Navigating uncharted waters: Newcomer socialization through the

    lens of stress theory. *Journal of Management, 41*(1), 203-235.

Birman, B. F, Desimone, L. M., Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., & Yoon, K.

    S. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results

    from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy*

    Analysis, *24*(2), 81-112.

Brown, S., & Nagel, L. (2004). The ABCs of managing teacher stress. *Clearing House,*

    76(5), 255-258.

Burney, D., & Elmore, R.F. (1998). *Continuous improvement in Community District #2,*

    New York City. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and

    Development Center.

Campbell, J. W. (2016). A collaboration-based model of work motivation and role

    ambiguity in public organizations. *Public Performance & Management Review*,

    39, 655–675.

Christie, K. (2009). Professional development worth paying for. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 461-463.

Chui, M. M., & Klassen, R. (2011). Practicing and pre-service teachers: Influence of self-efficacy, job stress, and teaching context. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*, 114-129.

Cornett, J., Ellison, J., Hayes, C., Killion, J., Kise, J., Knight, J., Reinke, . . .West, L. (2009). *Coaching approaches and perspectives.* J. Knight (Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Cornett, J., & Knight, J. (2009). *Research on coaching.* J. Knight (Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Coutinho, M., & Gunter, P. (1997). Negative reinforcement in classrooms: What we're beginning to learn. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 20*(3), 249-264.

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research designs: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *78*(3), 193-200.

Datnow, A., & Hubbard, L. (2016) Teacher capacity for and beliefs about data-driven decision making: A literature review of international research. *Journal of Educational Change, 17*(1), 7-28.

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2016). *District demographic data*. Retrieved from http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/Pages/District-and-School-Information.aspx

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional

    development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*,

    38(3), 181-199.

Desimone, L.M., Phillips, K. J., & Smith, T. M. (2013). Linking student achievement growth to

    professional development participation and chances in instruction: A longitudinal study

    of elementary students and teachers in a title school. *Teachers College Record, 115*(5), 1-

    46.

Dolby-Holmes, L. (2011). *Instructional coaching in elementary schools: Perceptions of*

    principals, instructional coaches, and teachers. Electronic Theses & Dissertations. Paper

    383.

DuFour, R., & Matos, M. (2013). How do principals really improve schools? *The*

    Principalship, *70*(7), 34-40.

Elmore, R. F., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1988). *Steady work policy, practice, and the*

    reform of American education. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Elmore, R. F. (2003). Unwarranted intrusion. *Educational Next*, 30-35.

Elmore, R. F. (2005). Accountable leadership. *The Educational Forum, 69, 134-142*.

ESSA (2015). Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95 Stat. 1177. Retrieved

    from https://www2.ed.gov/documents/essa-act-of-1965.pdf

Fullan, M. (2012). Lead the change series: Q&A with Michael Fullan. *ERA*

    Educational Change Special Interest Group, 16.

Fullan, M., Hargreaves, A., & Rincon-Gallardo, S. (2015). Professional capital as accountability.

    Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23(15), 1-22.

Gahng, T. J., Gamoran, A., & Porter, T. J. (1994). *Teacher empowerment: A policy in search of theory and evidence*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Gareis C. R., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2015). Principals, trust, and cultivating vibrant schools. *Societies, 5,* 256–276.

Ginsberg, R., & Herrmann-Ginsberg, L. (March, 2005). Accomplished teachers and their interactions with parents: A comparative analysis of strategies and techniques. Research Digest - Family Involvement Network of Educators. Harvard Family Research Project. Retrieved from: http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/fine/resources/digest/accomplished.html

Ginsberg, R. (January, 2017). *Targeted issues of professional development.* Presentation for The Initiative for Applied Education Research - Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities (Tel Aviv, Israel).

Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 479-507.

Griffin, R., (1983). An agenda for teacher educators. *The Clearing House, 56*(7), 299-03.

Gulamhussein, A. (2013). What will it take to change: Effective professional development in an era of high stakes accountability. *Educational Leadership, 71*(8), 81.

Guskey, T. (2000). *Evaluating professional development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Guskey, T. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. *Educational Leadership,* 45-51.

Guskey, T., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan*, *90*(7), 495-500.

Guskey, T. (2016). Gauge impact with five levels of data. *Journal of Staff Development*, *37*(1), 32-37.

Hallinger, P., Li, L., & Walker, A. (2015). Exploring the mediating effects of trust on principal leadership and teacher professional learning in Hong Kong primary schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 44*(1), 20-42.

Hanover Research (2015). Best Practices in Instructional Coaching. Arlington, VA. Retrieved from
http://www.esc5.k12.in.us/index.php/inside-wvec/documents-and-forms/resources-for-instructional-coaches/856-best-practices-in-instructional-coaching-iowa-area-education-agencies-1/file

Harrison, C., & Killion, J. (2006). *Taking the lead: New roles for teachers and school based coaches.* National Staff Development Council.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Hattie, J. (2016). *Visible learning for literacy: Implementing the practices that work best to accelerate student learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin/A Sage Company.

Heineke, S. F. (2013). Coaching discourse: Supporting teachers' professional learning. *The Elementary School Journal*, *113*(3), 409-433

Hill, H. (2009). Fixing teacher professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 470-476.

Hirsh, S., & Killion, J. (2013). Investments in professional learning must change: The goals are ambitious, the stakes are high-and resources are the key. *The Journal of Staff Development, 34*(4), 10-20.

House, R., Litzman, S., & Rizzo, J. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complete organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15*(2), 150-163.

Huberman, A., & Miles, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage Publications.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). The teacher shortage: Myth or reality? *Educational Horizons, 81*(3), 146-152.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2007). Short on power, long on responsibility. *Educational Leadership*, *6*(1), 20-25.

Ittner, A. (2015). Data drive these coaches: Literacy project merges school goals with teachers' learning needs. *Journal of Staff Development*, *36*(2), 20. Retrieved from http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/154A629C861DA8 98?p=AWNB

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1980). Improving in-service training: The messages of research. *Educational Leadership, 53*(6), 12-16.

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1996). The evolution of coaching. *Educational Leadership*, *53*(6), 12-16.

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

Kauffman, D. (2005). *Curriculum support and curriculum neglect: Second-year teachers' experiences*. NGT Working Paper. Cambridge, MA: Project on the Next Generation of Teachers. Retrieved from http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~ngt.

Khorsheed, K. (2007). Four places to dig deep: To find more time for teacher collaboration.

      Journal of Staff Development, *28*(2), 43-45. Retrieved from

      http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/13EDA7ED246F0E90?WB

Killion, J. (2006). Staff development guide. *Principal Leadership, 6*(9), 45.

Killion, J. (2016). Establish time. *JSD The Learning Professional, 37*(3), 27-31.

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving*

      instruction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Knight, J. (2007). 5 key points to building a coaching program. *Journal of Staff*

      Development, 28(1), 26-31. Retrieved from

      http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/news/13EDA7ED56209CA0?p=AWNB

Knight, J. (2009). *Coaches' roles, responsibilities and reach.* In J. Knight (Ed).

      Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Knight, J. (2011). *Unmistakable impact: A partnership approach for dramatically*

      improving instruction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Knight, J. (2013). *High-impact instruction: A framework for great teaching.* Thousand Oaks,

      CA: Corwin.

Lee, A. N., & Nie, Y. (2014). Understanding teacher empowerment: Teachers' perceptions of

      principal's and immediate supervisor's empowering behaviors, psychological

      empowerment and work-related outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 41,* 67-79.

Lepine, J., Lepine, M., & Podsakoff, N. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge

      stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships

      among stressors and performance. *The Academy of Management Journal, 48*(5), 764-775.

Leslie, J. M., Ma, X., Shen, J., & Spybrook, J. K. (2012). Are principal background and

    School processes related to teacher job satisfaction? A multilevel study using schools and

    staffing survey. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(2), 200–230.

Lustick, D., & Sykes, G. (2006). National board certification as professional

    development: What are teachers learning? *Education Policy Analysis Archives,*

    14(5). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v14n5/.

Mastery Connect. (2017). Retrieved from https://www.masteryconnect.com/

McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. (2010). Establishing a collaborative school culture through

    comprehensive school reform. *Journal of Educational and Psychological*

    Consultation, 20, 58-74.

Miller, J., & Rowan, B. (2007). Organizational strategies for promoting instructional

    change: Implementation dynamics in schools working with comprehensive school reform

    providers. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(2), 252 –297.

Mungai, A., & Thornburg, D. G. (2011). Teacher empowerment and school

    reform. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research, 5,* 205-217

National Staff Development Council, (2001). *Standards for staff development.* Oxford,

    OH: National Staff Development Council.

Parise, L. M., Sherer, J. Z., & Spillane, J. P. (2011). Organizational routines as coupling

    mechanisms: Policy, school administration, and the technical core. *American*

    Educational Research Journal, 48(3), 586–619.

Renaissance Learning, Inc. (2017). Retrieved from

    https://www.renaissance.com/products/assessment/star-360/

Sack, J. L. (1999). Clinton links K-12 dollars, performance: Some critics see federal

    power plan. *Education Week, 28*(20), 20-12.

Sailor, M, (2017). Support for the improvement of practices through intensive coaching

    (SIPIC): A model of coaching for improving reading instruction and reading

    achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 45,* 115-127.

Showers, B. (1984). *Peer coaching: A strategy for facilitating transfer of training.* Eugene, OR:

    Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Spruyt, B., Ban Droognbroeck, F., & Vanroelenb, C. (2014). Excessive paperwork and

    high-stakes accountability demands are among the most important stressors and causes of

    teacher job dissatisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 43,* 99-109.

Stronge, J., & Tucker, P. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning.*

    Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Timperely, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory from

    practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 1–26.

Toll, C. (2009). *Literacy coaching.* In J. Knight (Ed). Coaching: Approaches and

    perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Wright, J. (2007). *RTI toolkit: A practical guide for schools.* Port Chester, NY: Dude

    Publishing.

Appendix A

Instructional Coach Job Description

School District Position Description

Position Title: Instructional Supervisor

Department: Curriculum & Professional Development

Reports To: Director of Curriculum and Professional Development

Prepared By: Dr. X   Date: November 6, 2008

Approved By: Board of Education   Date: November 13, 2008

SUMMARY: Works directly with teachers in the development and implementation of the district curriculum. Is

responsible for diagnosing district learning needs and developing action plans to support those needs.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: *other duties may be assigned.*

- Supervise and facilitate teachers and teacher teams in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum.
- Supervise teachers in the implementation of the district Professional Development plan.
- Develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs.
- Develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides.
- Supervise the implementation of course pacing guides.
- Design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district.
- Train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect).
- Select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data.
- Study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district Professional Development focus.
- Assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions.
- Assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process.
- Keep current with computer knowledge.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES: Supervise the development and implantation of the district

curriculum. Keep the Director of Curriculum and Professional development informed of the program needs and

activities. Assist in implementation of program evaluation for curriculum and professional development as it relates

to the [State Name] School Improvement Program (MSIP).

Appendix B

Principal Survey Protocol

PRINCIPAL SURVEY PROTOCOL

- Years in Education:
- In your FIRST year of teaching, did you participate in a teacher induction program?
- Highest degree earned: bachelor's, master's specialist or doctorate
- Age:
- Are you Male or Female
- In what school year did you become the principal at THIS school?
- In how many schools have you been a principal at the elementary or secondary level?
- Excluding time spent on maternity/paternity leave or sabbatical, how many school years have you worked as an elementary- or secondary-level principal in public, public charter or private schools?

Introductory Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. The purpose of this survey is to identify the impact that instructional coaches have in the district. The survey will last approximately 25 minutes and a 1-5 scale will be used. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Your responses will remain confidential as well as your identity, school, principal, and school district. Please elaborate on specific details and be honest in your response.

1. How often do instructional coaches supervise and facilitate s in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum?

2. How often do instructional coaches supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan?

3. How often do instructional coaches develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs?

4. How often do instructional coaches develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides?

5. How often do instructional coaches supervise the implementation of course pacing guides?

6. How often do instructional coaches design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district?

7. How often do instructional coaches train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect)?

8. How often do instructional coaches select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data?

9. How often do instructional coaches study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus?

10. How often do instructional coaches assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions?

11. How often do instructional coaches assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process?

12. How often do instructional coaches stay current with computer knowledge?

13. Please share any additional information that you think will contribute to the research?

Appendix C

Instructional Coach Survey Protocol

INSTRUCTIONAL COACH SURVEY PROTOCOL

- Grade Level you serve:
- Years in Education:
- In your FIRST year of teaching, did you participate in a teacher induction program?
- Highest degree earned: bachelor's, master's specialist or doctorate
- Age:
- Are you Male or Female
- In what school year did you begin working at THIS school?
- In how many schools have you taught at the elementary or secondary level?
- How many years have you been an instructional coach or a similar role?
- Excluding time spent on maternity/paternity leave or sabbatical, how many school years have you worked as an elementary- or secondary-level teacher in public, public charter or private schools?

Introductory Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. The purpose of this survey is to identify the impact that instructional coaches have in the district. The survey will last approximately 25 minutes and a 1-5 scale will be used. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Your responses will remain confidential as well as your identity, school, principal, and school district. Please elaborate on specific details and be honest in your response.

1. How often do you supervise and facilitate s in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum?

2. How often do you supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan?

3. How often do you develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs?

4. How often do you develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides?

5. How often do you supervise the implementation of course pacing guides?

6. How often do you design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district?

7. How often do you train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect)?

8. How often do instructional coaches select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data?

9. How often do you study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus?

10. How often do you assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions?

11. How often do you assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process?

12. How often do you stay current with computer knowledge?

13. Please share any additional information that you think will contribute to the research?

Appendix D

Teacher Survey Protocol

TEACHER SURVEY PROTOCOL

- Grade Level taught at this school:
- Years in Education:
- In your FIRST year of teaching, did you participate in a teacher induction program?
- Highest degree earned: bachelor's, master's specialist or doctorate
- Age:
- Are you Male or Female
- In what school year did you begin teaching at THIS school?
- In how many schools have you taught at the elementary or secondary level?
- Excluding time spent on maternity/paternity leave or sabbatical, how many school years have you worked as an elementary- or secondary-level teacher in public, public charter or private schools?

Introductory Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. The purpose of this survey is to identify the impact that instructional coaches have in the district. The interview will last approximately 25 minutes and a 1-5 scale will be used. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Your responses will remain confidential as well as your identity, school, principal, and school district. Please elaborate on specific details and be honest in your response.

1. How often do instructional coaches supervise and facilitate s in the development, implementation and revision of the district curriculum?

2. How often do instructional coaches supervise teachers in the implementation of the district professional development plan?

3. How often do instructional coaches develop and supervise new teacher mentoring program, as well as second and third year programs?

4. How often do instructional coaches develop an annual assessment calendar based on course pacing guides?

5. How often do instructional coaches supervise the implementation of course pacing guides?

6. How often do instructional coaches design a structured data reflection tool to be used by teachers across the district?

7. How often do instructional coaches train all teachers to use the district data disaggregation tool (MasteryConnect)?

8. How often do instructional coaches select reports from data disaggregation tool for teachers to use to reflect on student learning data?

9. How often do instructional coaches study district achievement data and facilitate the selection of a district professional development focus?

10. How often do instructional coaches assume responsibility for professional growth and development, keeping current with the new literature, research, and improved instructional strategies, as well as attending appropriate professional meetings and conventions?

11. How often do instructional coaches assume responsibility for learning the Understanding by Design curriculum development process?

12. How often do instructional coaches stay current with computer knowledge?

13. Please share any additional information that you think will contribute to the research?

Appendix E

Principal Interview Protocol

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Participant: _____

Location: _____

Date: _____Time of Interview _____

Introductory Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. The purpose of this interview is to identify the impact that instructional coaches have in the district. The interview will last approximately 45 minutes and will be recorded for accuracy. Following the interview your responses will be typed and returned to you to review and make changes if necessary. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Your responses will remain confidential as well as your identity, school, principal, and school district. Please elaborate on specific details and be honest in your response.

Do you have any questions?

Interview Questions:

1. What are the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches?
2. How has the instructional coach changed your role as a principal?
3. Describe the impact on the teachers since having an instructional coach at the elementary level?
4. How does the instructional coach assist with the academic performance of students?
5. What impact has the instructional coach had on fostering professional development?
6. What would be different if there was not an instructional coach at your school?
7. What else would you like to share with me regarding instructional coaches?

Appendix F

Instructional Coach Interview Protocol

INSTRUCTIONAL COACH INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Participant: _____

Location: _____

Date: _____Time of Interview _____

Introductory Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. The purpose of this interview is to identify the impact that instructional coaches have in the district. The interview will last approximately 45 minutes and will be recorded for accuracy. Following the interview your responses will be typed and returned to you to review and make changes if necessary. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Your responses will remain confidential as well as your identity, school, principal, and school district. Please elaborate on specific details and be honest in your response.

Do you have any questions?

Interview Questions:

1. What are the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches?
2. What has been your impact on the teachers?
3. Describe the impact on the teachers since having an instructional coach at the elementary level?
4. How do you assist with the academic performance of students?
5. What impact have you had on fostering professional development?
6. What would be different if there was not an instructional coach at your school?
7. What else would you like to share with me regarding instructional coaches?

Appendix G

Teacher Interview Protocol

TEACHER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Participant: _____

Location: _____

Date: _____Time of Interview _____

Introductory Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. The purpose of this interview is to identify the impact that instructional coaches have in the district. The interview will last approximately 45 minutes and will be recorded for accuracy. Following the interview your responses will be typed and returned to you to review and make changes if necessary. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. Your responses will remain confidential as well as your identity, school, principal, and school district. Please elaborate on specific details and be honest in your response.

Do you have any questions?

Interview Questions:

1. What are the roles and responsibilities of instructional coaches?
2. How has the instructional coach changed your role as a teacher?
3. Describe the impact on the school since having an instructional coach at the elementary level?
4. How does the instructional coach assist with the academic performance of students?
5. What impact has the instructional coach had on fostering professional development?
6. What would be different if there was not an instructional coach at your school?
7. What else would you like to share with me regarding instructional coaches?

Appendix H

Instructional Coach Evaluation

School District
Performance Evaluation Report
CERTIFIED PERSONNEL – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL

Name:	Position:
School/Location:	Date:

KEY: EXP = Exemplary   O = Outstanding
         EL = Expected Level S/NI = Satisfactory, But Needs Improvement
         U = Unsatisfactory   Not Observed – Leave Blank

RELIABILITY OF WORK RESULTS:	EXP	O	EL	S/NI	U	COMMENTS
Works accurately and according to instructions						
Carries assignments to completion						
Performs work that is neat and consistent in quality						
Requires minimum of checking						
WORK OUPUT:	**EXP**	**O**	**EL**	**S/NI**	**U**	**COMMENTS**
Completes work on schedule						
Produces acceptable amount of work						
Requires minimum of assistance						
JOB KNOWLEDGE	**EXP**	**O**	**EL**	**S/NI**	**U**	**COMMENTS**
Requires minimum of instruction on each new assignment						
Knows all the techniques and phases of job						
SELF RELIANCE AND INITIATIVE	**EXP**	**O**	**EL**	**S/NI**	**U**	**COMMENTS**
Works well independently						
Requires a minimum of supervision						
Arrives at sound decisions without assistance						
Performs worthwhile projects on own						
Makes frequent useful suggestions						

ADAPTABILITY	EXP	O	EL	S/NI	U	COMMENTS
Works well under pressure						
Adjusts to changes in methods and procedures						
Handles new problems well						
Performs under changing working conditions with little loss of efficiency						
Assists other staff members willingly						
Accepts suggestions for improvement readily						
Shows courtesy and tact in dealing with public						
Interacts with co-workers diplomatically						
Relates to students in a positive manner						
WORK HABITS	**EXP**	**O**	**EL**	**S/NI**	**U**	**COMMENTS**
Organizes and plans work well						
Shows interest in job						
Takes proper care of equipment						
Attends work regularly						
Makes conscientious use of work time						
Observes work hours						
Presents a good appearance and represents the school system well						
Promotes safe work environment						

Employee's Signature* _____ Date _____

Evaluator's Signature_____ Date _____

*This signature denotes that the evaluation was conducted. It does not necessarily denote agreement with the results. If you would like to respond in writing to any of the ratings/comments contained in this evaluation, you may do so in the space provided. Send a copy of your response to the building principal and to the Director of Human Resources. Write comments on back (use additional sheet if necessary):

School District
Performance Evaluation Report
CERTIFIED PERSONNEL – NON-INSTRUCTIONAL

JOB TARGETS/DEFICIENCIES	PLANS/ACTIVITIES FOR ASSISTANCE	TIMELINE FOR REMEDIATION

Employee's Signature* _____ Date _____
Evaluator's Signature_____ Date _____

*This signature denotes that the evaluation was conducted. It does not necessarily denote agreement with the results. If you would like to respond in writing to any of the ratings/comments contained in this evaluation, you may do so in the space provided. Send a copy of your response to the building principal and to the Director of Human Resources. Write comments on back (use additional sheet if necessary):