


2005

Coaching for Metacognitive Instructional Practice

Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch

University of Dayton, kkinnucanwelsch1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/edt_fac_pub

 Part of the [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#), [Pre-Elementary, Early Childhood, Kindergarten Teacher Education Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Kinnucan-Welsch, Kathryn, "Coaching for Metacognitive Instructional Practice" (2005). *Teacher Education Faculty Publications*. Paper 4.

http://ecommons.udayton.edu/edt_fac_pub/4

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Teacher Education at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teacher Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Coaching for Metacognitive Instructional Practice

Kathryn Kinnucan-Welsch
University of Dayton

Reflective metacognition is thinking and going over what you know about your own learning and understanding on a certain topic or task. This can be a professional development tool because you know how much work or effort a task will take. You will be better able to manage your time and know if you will need additional help.

—Regina Jackson

Teaching is a complex activity. As a teacher educator, I experience the complexity of teaching everyday through the struggles, dilemmas, and triumphs of pre-service and inservice teachers with whom I work. As I peruse the 51 chapters of *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Richardson, 2001), I am struck by the breadth and depth of what teachers must know and be able to do, and how this is represented in an extensive knowledge base.

This knowledge base is often overwhelming in the field of literacy instruction. The research on reading and writing, and the contexts that influence how children learn to read and write, has been extensive (Flood, Lapp, Squire, & Jensen, 2003; Kamil, Mosenthal, Pearson, & Barr, 2000). When one considers the high stakes connected with literacy development for children, families, teachers, and school district administrators, what teachers know and can do is a focal point for how we judge the effectiveness of our schools (Taylor & Pearson, 2002). What teachers know and can do becomes apparent in the literacy development of each learner. One goal for the research on literacy processes and instruction is to support all learners, young and old, as literate, participating members of community.

As authors in this volume have suggested, one way to identify students who are becoming accomplished readers and writers is to observe the degree to which

COACHING IN TWO SETTINGS

The examples of coaching presented in this chapter are taken from my research as a participant in a statewide literacy professional development initiative: the Literacy Specialist Project (Kinnucan-Welsch, 2003a, 2003b; Rosemary, Grogan, et al., 2002). The central aim of the Literacy Specialist Project, launched in 2000 by the Ohio Department of Education, is to provide professional development to educators in the state of Ohio that supports enhanced understanding in the teaching of reading and writing. The professional development incorporates foundational knowledge of literacy processes and pedagogy represented in a series of professional development sessions known as *Teaching Reading and Writing: A Core Curriculum for Educators* (Roskos, 2000). In 2002–2003, 158 literacy specialists worked with over 1,100 teachers in 79 districts using the Core Curriculum materials.

I am one of 13 field faculty representing 8 universities directly involved in the initiative. We work with the literacy specialists through monthly meetings and site visits to support them in their sessions with teachers and in coaching. The vignettes about coaching presented in this chapter are taken from this initiative.

Coaching for a District Focus on Spelling

Donna is a literacy specialist in a small district in a rural, but growing, area of Ohio. After her first year as a literacy specialist, she worked in the second year of the project with a group of three second-grade teachers, Judy (in her 5th year of teaching), Terry (in her 6th year), and Fran (in her 11th year; all names are pseudonyms). They met monthly for full-day meetings during the 2001–2002 school year. Donna had written a grant that provided for substitute teachers. The district had decided to focus on improving spelling instruction for this academic year, so Donna immersed her teachers in reading, videos, demonstration lessons, and student data that pertained to writing, word study, and spelling.

In addition to the focus on spelling instruction, the teachers each selected a child from their class and administered several informal assessments, including oral reading of leveled text, writing sample, and spelling/word knowledge. Based on the assessment data, the teachers decided on an instructional focus, planned instruction, and monitored student progress toward the instructional goal. The agendas for the monthly meetings included deepening the teachers' knowledge base about spelling and writing instruction, as well as discussions about the case studies of the individual children they had chosen.

The vignette I have chosen to share is from one of the all day meetings with the teachers on March 27, 2002. I was able to attend part of the meeting, so I was able to participate in the discussion and gather artifacts that indicate what they were learning. The agenda for the March 27, 2002, meeting is in Fig. 20.1.

Core Curriculum March 27, 2002	
I.	Housekeeping/Updates
	A. How's it going?
	B. Teacher information survey
II.	Continuing the Assessment Cycle
	A. Ongoing assessments - analyzing and interpreting the data
	Reading *Running Records
	Writing *Writing Samples
	Spelling *Writing Samples/Weekly Assessments
	B. Planning and Evaluating Further Instruction
	Protocols/Tapes/Transcripts
	What have we learned? Where do we need to go next?
	C. Periodic Assessments - Planning
	Reading *DRA/Off grade Reading Proficiency
	Writing *Writing Proficiency Benchmark Assessment
	Spelling *DSA [Developmental Spelling Assessment]
III.	Taking Another Look at Spelling/Word Study
	A. Reading - "Word Walls that Work", Janet Wagstaff
	B. Linking Spelling and Writing - How are we doing?
	C. Video - "Learning about Writing", Linda Dorn
	D. Developing mini-lessons to teach spelling and writing strategies
Lunch	
P.M. John Smith Elementary School	
I.V.	In the classroom
	A. Lessons
Terry and Judy: Will you get together and plan your afternoon schedule for the sub so we can have a block of time in each of your classrooms to work with some individuals or small groups, including your case study child? The rest of the class will need to be doing something fairly quiet. Plan for about 30 minutes in each classroom. I will teach a minilesson and you will teach another similar lesson immediately following mine. Fran can be the observer this time. We will debrief afterwards in the center room. If you have specials that interfere let me know so we can work out something else. Donna	

FIG. 20.1.

This agenda provides a glimpse of how Donna's plan for the day with her second-grade teachers incorporated many of the aspects of what coaches do. First, Donna had told me in a previous conversation that the teachers began the year with little knowledge of how to assess and appropriately instruct students based on spelling assessment data. Donna purchased *Word Journeys* (Ganske, 2000) for the teachers, and they had spent considerable time in previous sessions learning the Developmental Spelling Assessment (DSA) and designing instruction based on

where children were in spelling development. Judy, one of the participating teachers, told me during the meeting that at the beginning of the year she was a bit apprehensive about implementing this approach to spelling instruction. She said, "We all had the DSA on our shelves, but we have 10 other books to read also."

Donna was aware of their apprehension, and acknowledged that they were aware of the gaps in their knowledge base. She devoted considerable time in the second-grade classrooms modeling how to assess the children and followed up during their meetings to explain how to interpret the data. On March 27, after 6 months of support from Donna, the teachers came with data from their case study children that included data on spelling development.

A second aspect of Donna's coaching evident from this agenda is that she supported the teachers in understanding how student data should drive instruction. One of the characteristics of accomplished teachers is that they know what children know and can do, and how to teach them (assisted performance) so that they reach the next level of accomplishment. Donna wanted these second-grade teachers to design instruction for children based on what they can do and what they need to learn. The teachers each chose a child, assessed the child using several informal instruments at the beginning of the school year, and designed and implemented instruction with Donna's support. During the March 27 meeting, the teachers brought their case study data and a brief summary of where their child was at this point in time. Judy's summary of her second-grade child follows¹:

Jordan came to me reading at a "G" level. He is now reading at a 92% at the level "M." Hopefully, he will hit benchmark by the end of the school year. He is writing and has improved. At the beginning of the year, his writing consisted of short sentences. His stories did not have a beginning, middle, or ending. Now his writing has a title, beginning, middle, and ending, in addition to a problem and solution. He still struggles with his spelling, though he has improved in this area from the beginning of the school year. He began spelling in the Letter Name stage and is now transitioning into the Within Word stage. Some of his spelling concerns are related to his speech.

I will continue to work with Jordan in all these areas. In reading, I want him to become more fluent and not depend so much on his strategies. His strategies are interfering with his fluency. I want him to continue to use his strategies when stuck on words, in a quick manner so it does not interfere with the meaning of his writing. I would like to see more detail. I want him to continue to emphasize the visual part of the word. This visual part is the manner in which he can picture what a word looks like when he goes to spell the word.

Overall, Jordan has improved in all three areas. My main goal for him is to be reading at grade level by the termination of the school year. It looks promising that he will attain benchmark status for second grade. His writing and spelling have some areas of concern. Jordan is a hard worker who wants to succeed; he has come a long way this year. (Judy, case study summary, 3/27/02)

¹For specific details on the reference to spelling levels, refer to Ganske (2000).

The teachers shared, in turn, their case study summary. The conversation focused on what instructional strategies would support each child to progress in literacy development. Next is a brief excerpt of the conversation. Judy is describing how she had engaged Jordan in a repeated reading to improve his fluency. During the reading, she had called Jordan's attention to how he was reading like a robot. Notice how Donna gave Judy some feedback on her instruction:

Judy: [referring to repeated reading] And this is kind of like the next step. [recalling what she said to Jordan] "Let's try and make it sound not like a robot." He said it perfectly, so it was interesting to see if this repetition works and to not let it go but to do it again you don't really have to spend that much time each time you do it.

Donna: And even with some of the phrases that he did, it comes natural. They don't realize that they know they start with part four for some reason and it sounds right. So we just hope that they continue to carry that over. I really did like too the way you noticed he had slipped back into the robot reading. And that you caught him right away. (coaching meeting, 3/27/02)

The aforementioned excerpt, although brief, does provide a glimpse of one of the more powerful aspects of coaching. Donna had suggested to Judy during a previous session that Judy try repeated reading of familiar text with Jordan. Judy was able to monitor Jordan's progress in fluency, and Donna also plays a role here in monitoring Judy's progress. Donna had addressed the topic of fluency in previous meetings with the teacher. As coach, Donna's role was to ask what does Judy know about fluency? What does she still need to learn?

I have described how Donna provided resources for the teachers that deepened their knowledge about literacy assessment and instruction. I have also described through Judy's summary and a brief excerpt of a coaching conversation, how analyzing student assessment data can be a powerful coaching context. Now I would like to turn to how Donna provided a scaffold for the teachers to more systematically design and implement instruction.

After the teachers and Donna had talked about the case study data, they turned to a focus on instruction. One of the professional development resources that Donna used with the teachers to help them improve instruction was the video *Learning About Writing* (Dorn, 1999). Donna showed excerpts from this video and the teachers talked about how the instruction that was modeled in the video could be adapted to their classrooms. Donna, realizing that teachers often have difficulty transferring what they see in videos to their own classrooms, brought a minilesson organizer that she had adapted from *Snapshots* (Hoyt, 2000), one of the resource books she had purchased for the teachers. Using the mini-lesson organizer as a guide (See Fig. 20.2), Donna and the teachers co-planned a lesson focused on writing. Following the planning in the morning session, Donna taught the lesson in Fran's classroom, providing a model of instruc-

Gradual Release of Responsibility
Mini-lesson Planning Organizer

Teachers Name _____ Date _____
Subject _____

GRR Model	Mini-lesson components
Introduce the Topic/Strategy Explain the goal to your students. Tell them what they will learn.	
Model the use of the strategy Talk out loud about what you are doing. Tell the students what you are thinking. Explain why you are doing what you are doing and how you decide when and if to use the strategy. The goal is to make your thinking as transparent as possible so the students will understand how to use and apply the learning.	
Provide guided practice Work with your students to practice the strategy. This is often a good time for partners, cooperative groups, or teams to work together and support each other while you act as coach, praising appropriate use of the strategy and assisting those who need additional help. This is also a good time to assess how well your students understood your demonstration.	
Offer independent practice Children work independently using the strategy in their personal work. This is a second opportunity to assess understanding, support appropriate uses of the learning, and re-teach as needed.	
Encourage self-reflection Students now have a chance to stop and consider: What did we just learn (the content)? How did the strategy work for us (the process)? How else might we use the strategy?	

FIG. 20.2. Adapted with permission from *Snapshots* © 2000 by Linda Hoyt. Published by Heinemann Publishers, Inc., a division of Reed Elsevier, Inc., Portsmouth, NH. All rights reserved.

tion for the teachers. The group then moved to Terry's classroom, and she taught the same lesson to her children. After a debriefing on Terry's lesson, the group moved to Judy's classroom, Judy taught, and they ended the cycle with a final debriefing. This was a routine that Donna and the teachers had followed all year, as each teacher had the opportunity to teach, observe, and debrief.

According to Tharp and Gallimore's definition of assisted performance (1988), teachers can look for support from the environment as well as from a more expert other. Donna was providing support by co-planning instruction with the teachers that she would model that afternoon. Following the modeling, Judy and Terry taught a lesson that afternoon that was similar to the one Donna modeled. In other

words, Donna modeled and provided the opportunity for guided practice for the teachers. Donna also provided a concrete object that became a part of the teachers' environment, the minilesson planning organizer. The teachers would be able to use this organizer in the future as they planned lessons in their grade level team meetings. Planning instruction that takes children from where they are to where they need to be is challenging. A parallel challenge is providing professional development that takes teachers from where they are to where they need to be. The framework of gradual release of responsibility provides a model of assisted performance that applies to all learners, children and adult.

What is also rather striking about this planning tool is that it encourages children to be metacognitive as well. Note the last section, "encourage self-reflection." The questions in that section encourage children to think about their own thinking and to be metacognitive in their use of the strategy. This tool, and the purpose for which Donna used it, provides an example of how to support both teacher and student metacognition.

So, to summarize, I would like to offer a few thoughts about this vignette before turning to the second one. First, Donna was intentional and deliberate about enhancing the teachers' knowledge about the content of literacy instruction. The teachers knew what they didn't know, and Donna provided resources and opportunity to discuss the content and to apply the content in practice.

Second, Donna encouraged the teachers to think about their own thinking and actions during the session discussions. The teachers brought artifacts, including data, case study summaries, lesson plans, and the like, around which the conversations took place. Again, Donna was encouraging the teachers to view teaching from a metacognitive perspective by facilitating discussion, asking questions, modeling instruction, and co-planning. In each of the context-embedded activities, Donna made her thinking transparent to the teachers so they could analyze their own knowledge and actions in the same way. Finally, Donna encouraged teachers to use tools that would assist them in self-monitoring and improving their teaching.

Did the teachers see themselves as being more aware of their teaching actions following these sessions? I conducted an end-of-year interview with Donna and two of the teachers, and comments from this interview indicate that they were more aware:

Judy: I think I am just more aware of their ability and, you know, I'm thinking more [about] DSA. I think I analyzed or just knew more about what to expect and what not to expect and I was able to move students to their appropriate level sooner than I was last year. Actually we would give them spelling assessments and then we would analyze. Okay, this student is ready, this student is not ready. So I felt as a teacher I was able to get them more on the appropriate level and have them be challenged, but also be successful in that area.

Fran: And I think I had kids and I don't know if it was me being more aware and being more experienced because I had done it a year, but I moved kids into the next level sooner than I had the year before and I felt pretty comfortable doing that. I knew they were definitely ready, whereas last year I was hesitant. I just felt more comfortable with the program having that year of experience. I felt good about the time I put into the spelling because I believe in it, it is important, and I just think the way my kids look at words is totally different than they have before.

KKW: Do you think your teaching is different in terms of helping kids with spelling?

Fran: Yes, I think it is more natural now. It's not so much the spelling. We do spelling for thirty minutes a day or depending on the day. I think it is more, we integrate it more throughout different subject areas, in the writing and, because we are more familiar with it, it just comes naturally to teach it more. (end-of-year interview, 5/08/02)

Judy and Fran were able to articulate how they had adjusted their spelling instruction based on what they had learned through the coaching support Donna had provided throughout the year. In other words, the comments from the interview suggest that coaching had supported these teachers in being more meta-cognitive as teachers as they identified their intentional decisions regarding instruction and adjusted based on student progress. I would now like to turn to the second coaching vignette.

Transcript Analysis as a Context for Coaching

This vignette also comes from the Literacy Specialist Project described earlier in this chapter. I examined coaching conversations that took place over three cycles using the *Teacher Learning Instrument* (Rosemary & Roskos, 2001; also see Kinnucan-Welsch, 2003a, 2003b, and Rosemary, chap. 19, this volume). The purpose of this research was to examine how coaches coach teachers using an analytical framework for examining teaching, the TLI.

The underlying premise of the TLI is that instruction can be analyzed on two dimensions. First, each literacy instructional episode should have identifiable, salient features that distinguish that instruction. For example, a word building lesson has features that distinguish it from a word sort. These fundamental features, or teaching actions, are termed *protocol features* in the TLI. The second dimension of teaching that is analyzed in the TLI is evidence of instructional talk that scaffolds learning. These features are called *scaffolding features* in the TLI.

To use the TLI, teachers audiotaped three lessons targeting the same student learning goal, transcribed a segment of the lesson, and analyzed the lesson according to protocol and scaffolding features. Each teacher-literacy specialist

(coach) pair had conversations about the lessons using the analyzed transcript as a guide. The TLI cycle is a context through which coaches support teachers toward more metacognitive instructional practice. The vignette presented is taken from the conversations of one coach-teacher dyad.

Susan (coach) and Connie (teacher) chose to focus on Oral Language: The Language of Literacy. This domain of instruction supports the development of children's oral language, a critical component of literacy development. This protocol was one that was described in the CORE Curriculum materials that the literacy specialists used in their professional development sessions with teachers. The protocol is represented in Fig. 20.3. Because the coach and the teacher each analyzed the transcript using the protocol and scaffolding features as a guide, the conversations contain reference to these features.

Susan and Connie had three conversations over a course of several weeks. Each conversation was focused on an excerpt of a lesson that Connie had taped and transcribed. The focus here is on how the talk between the coach and the teacher about the lesson encouraged Connie to be more metacognitive in her instruction.

The focus of this lesson was fluency. Connie was working with a small group of first-grade children. She read the book *The Elves and the Shoemaker* to them and then distributed stick puppets to help them retell the story. The children became

Protocol features for: Language of Literacy Protocol: Narrate modeled stories	Scaffolding Features
P1 Focus attention on using oral language for a purpose P2 Explain the language function (for reading/writing, for inquiry, for social interaction) P3 Model the talk that supports the function P4 Provide opportunities for practicing language function and related talk P5 Give feedback on using oral language for a purpose	S1 Joint problem solving (involve children in meaningful activity; helping children learn by doing) S2 Intersubjectivity (coming to a shared understanding; working toward a shared goal) S3 Warmth and responsiveness (creating a positive emotional tone; providing verbal praise; attributing competence to child) S4 Staying in ZPD (organizing activities that are challenging for children, but achievable by them with assistance; using instructional talk that prompts them to talk, encourages them to tell more, and adds to their thoughts and ideas) S5 Self-regulation (stepping back to let children take control of own activity; providing assistance as needed to support children's problem-solving)

FIG. 20.3.

rather distracted with the stick puppets and were not very successful in reaching their goal.

Susan opened conversation one by asking Connie to comment on what her overall impression of the lesson was. It is important to note here that Susan made a choice to open with an opportunity for the teacher to provide feedback, a metacognitive task. It is also interesting to note that Susan encouraged Connie to provide feedback to herself, an example of what Tharp and Gallimore (1988) referred to as providing assistance to self:

Susan: I think that the first thing I would like to talk about is your overall impression of how we think this went and take a look at, thinking back, at how you originally envisioned this lesson was going to go and then some of the things that happened as planned and then some of the things that happen as things do when you work with kids.

Connie: OK. I had hoped that because I was using what I thought was a familiar story, *The Elves and the Shoemaker*, and because I was giving them puppets to work with, stick puppets, and because I didn't think they had a lot of opportunity to do something like that, I thought that they would be more engaged, more anxious to retell the story, when in fact, I don't think I ever actually got to a P5.

From that invitation for Connie to provide feedback on the lesson, Susan drew Connie's attention to the main coaching point of conversation one in the TLI series, why the students were distracted and not engaged in the retelling:

Susan: Well, I really think we'll hold off on the protocol thing for a while. What I really wanted to bring to your attention and to our discussion about this lesson is the fact about how well the preplanning went, how your materials were prepared, and how everything there was as you would expect for first grade . . . you know, I thought that all of that was very well planned out in advance, and as we talked while we were transcribing we felt we were having a hard time listening to the children and yourself because things were becoming very frustrating, I noticed, and I don't want to be overly critical at this time.

Susan then commented on the specific student behavior that indicated the students were not focused on the task. Based on that observation, she provided for Connie a specific goal for her next lesson, that is, to establish student engagement:

Susan: Because this is the first time we tried this, but I noticed frustration in your approach and I think the children's frustration came out later when they started to, you know, beat each other up with their

little stick puppets. They probably, at this point, were not catching on . . . at least that's my impression . . . so, let's talk a little bit about that because there were things that did work but there were other things that probably could be adapted a little better.

Connie: I agree . . . Because . . . I wanted to give them encouragement and I wanted to applaud them for their efforts, but I never even had the opportunity to do that. You're right, it was just turning into frustration. So, I tried to pick something that was more challenging and maybe I should have picked a more familiar story so they could have carried the story without my support as much as I did.

Susan: . . . and then they would get an idea of how your language use would build the story and even use a little bit of that metacognition with them, you know "I'm stuck here. . . . I don't know what I should say, but this is what happened in the story" you know, tell them what you are thinking. (TLI, cycle 1, debriefing conversation)

This is a brief excerpt of the first cycle debriefing conversation, but we can see how the coach is assisting performance through the coaching conversation. The transcript of the lesson provided a concrete record of the instruction, and Susan suggested (taking Connie's lead) a specific improvement for her next lesson, modeling a retelling for the children. The coach and the teacher returned to this in the second conversation:

Susan: Overall, though, as I remember, the first lesson was all of you and very little of the children participating. But, in the second one, I see there was more dialogue the children were using. Why do you think they were better able to put the dialogue in this time, other than familiarity? There were some other things that must have happened.

Connie: Well, there was repetition, a lot of repetition, of a story that they were very familiar with. We did rehearse it. . . . I don't think we really rehearsed the story in the first lesson. I was hoping that as part of the lesson that they would be able to retell and recall and they could not do that with *The Elves and the Shoemaker*. This one was a little easier for them to do.

Susan: Talk a little bit about the modeling that might have occurred in this one as compared this one. I think we both talked about that there was a need for you to do more modeling of that language.

Connie: Right, I did. I read the story to them and as I was telling them the story I was acting it out with the puppets so they could actually see what their puppet might be doing while they were speaking and I . . . I guess that//

Susan: So, as I look at the transcript, I do see many more instances of the P2, which is the modeling of the language, so they were hearing

from you and then knowing what you were going to expect, and how they were going to participate. What do you think about the ZPD issue, because that was such a big one from last time?

Connie: It's very important that they have to understand the language, understand the story elements, the problem and solution and at the same time have a clear sense of what they are going to be doing. (TLI cycle 2, debriefing conversation)

The exchange, which occurs early in the conversation, does return to what Connie and Susan agreed would be a focal point for Connie to think about her teaching, modeling a retelling. Although the talk does not seem to move below the surface level, Connie is thinking about her teaching and comments on what the students need to know to be able to retell.

These are glimpses of the complete conversations, and I have done a more detailed analysis of coaching conversations within the TLI (Kinnucan-Welsch, 2003b). The point I would like to make for the purposes of this chapter is that structured coaching conversations provide another opportunity for coaches to support teachers in developing a metacognitive orientation to their practice. Susan was able to refer to a concrete record of her teaching over time, the transcript, and that created a context in which the coach-teacher conversation focused on how the teacher can engage in metacognitive processing of instruction. What did I do in this lesson? How can I adjust the lesson the next time that will better meet the demands of the task for the children? What do I need to know about retelling that I might not now embed in my instruction? Some of these questions were asked by the coach, and some were asked by the teacher of herself, which is an indication that she was becoming self-monitoring and self-regulating in her teaching actions.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The role of the literacy coach is evolving to meet the demand for high quality professional development that is embedded in the daily work of teachers and teaching. Many districts have allocated resources for this role, and despite the challenge of limited resources, it appears that coaching positions will continue to increase in number.

The role and practice of coaching, however, is still ambiguous and uncertain. It is clear that we do not know what we need to know about coaching as a metacognitive process. Research is needed to determine what effective coaching looks like. Research is also needed to define high quality professional development for coaches. The research is beginning to provide clear descriptions of accomplished teaching in the area of literacy (Taylor & Pearson, 2002). We do not yet have a research base on what accomplished coaching looks like.

A second area of needed research must address the relationship between accomplished coaching, accomplished teaching, and student learning. Sykes (1999) commented that the link between professional development and student learning has not been tightly established. An even more tenuous connection exists between coaching and student learning. As educators, we must begin to explore what the appropriate paths are that will illuminate these questions.

CONCLUSIONS

Hacker (1998) defined metacognition as "knowledge of one's knowledge, processes, and cognitive and affective states, and the ability to consciously and deliberately monitor and regulate one's knowledge, processes, and cognitive and affective states" (p. 11). To summarize this journey into the worlds of two coaches, I would suggest that coaching is an essential and viable professional development structure that can support teachers being more metacognitive about their instruction. Coaching can take many forms, as these vignettes would suggest, and research is needed to shed light on what models of coaching yield the greatest benefits in terms of enhanced practice and greater student achievement. Teachers, like learners who are metacognitive in their actions, are more deliberate, and intentional. Coaching holds promise as one way to support teachers in metacognitive instructional practice.

The current era of accountability is placing increasing pressures on children, teachers, educators, and policymakers. Teachers deserve substantive professional development, just as children deserve effective teachers of reading. Hopefully, insights from future research on coaching, assisted performance, and metacognition will help shape future directions in policy and program development.

METACONNECTION FOR CHAPTER 20

In chapter 19, we learned about the *Teacher Learning Instrument* and how coach-teacher dyads engaged in a cyclical process of planning, analyzing, and improving instruction. In the final chapter focusing on professional development, Kinnucan-Welsch invited the reader into two coaching contexts in which coaches and teachers improved their practice by incorporating metacognitive principles.

REFERENCES

- Anders, P. L., Hoffman, J. V., & Duffy, G. G. (2000). Teaching teachers to teach reading: Paradigm shifts, persistent problems, and challenges. In M. L. Kamil, P. M. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (3rd ed., pp. 719-742). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bean, R. M., Cassidy, J., Grumet, J. E., Shelton, D. S., & Wallis, S. R. (2002). What do reading specialists do? Results from a national survey. *The Reading Teacher*, 55, 736-744.
- Dole, J. A. (2004). The changing role of the reading specialist in school reform. *The Reading Teacher*, 57, 462-471.
- Dorn, L. (1999). *Learning about writing*. York, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Elmore, R. F., & Burney, D. (1999). Investing in teacher learning: Staff development and instructional improvement. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 263-291). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Beasley, K. (1997). Mentoring as assisted performance: A case of co-planning. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building a world of new understandings* (pp. 108-126). Bristol, PA: Falmer.
- Flavell, J. H. (1977). *Cognitive development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Flood, J., Lapp, D., Squire, J. R., & Jensen, J. M. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ganske, K. (2000). *Word journeys: Assessment-guided phonics, spelling, and vocabulary instruction*. New York: Guilford.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 915-945.
- Hacker, D. J. (1998). Definitions and empirical foundations. In D. J. Hacker (Ed.), *Metacognition in educational theory and practice*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved from <http://emedialibrary.com>
- Hawley, W., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession* (pp. 127-150). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R., & Stigler, J. (2002). A knowledge base for the teaching profession: What would it look like and how can we get one? *Educational Researcher*, 31(5), 3-15.
- Hoyt, L. (2000). *Snapshots*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- International Reading Association. (2004). *Standards for reading professionals: Developed by the professional standards and ethics committees of the International Reading Association* (rev. ed.). Newark, DE: Author.
- Kamil, M. L., Mosenthal, P. B., Pearson, P. D., & Barr, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of reading research* (3rd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kinnucan-Welsch, K. (2003a, April). *Coaching as assisted performance*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kinnucan-Welsch, K. (2003b, December). *Coaching for improved teaching: An analysis of assisted performance in a professional development context*. Paper presented at the 53rd annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ.
- Lyons, C. A., & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). *Systems for change in literacy education: A guide to professional development*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Moll, L. C. (1990). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, V. (Ed.). (2001). *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Richardson, V. (2003). The dilemmas of professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84, 401-406.

- Robb, L. (2000). *Redefining staff development: A collaborative model for teachers and administrators*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rodgers, E. M., & Pinnell, G. S. (2002). *Learning from teaching in literacy education: New perspectives on professional development*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rogoff, B., & Lave, J. (1984). *Everyday cognition: Its development in social context*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosemary, C. A., & Roskos, K. A. (2001). *Teacher learning instrument*. Unpublished manuscript, John Carroll University, University Heights, OH.
- Rosemary, C. A., Freppon, P., Kinnucan-Welsch, K., with Grogan, P., Feist-Willis, J., Zimmerman, B., Campbell, L., Cobb, J. Hill, M., Walker, B., & Ward, M. (2002). Improving literacy teaching through structured collaborative inquiry in classroom and university clinical settings. *Yearbook of the National Reading Conference*, 51, 368–382.
- Rosemary, C. A., Grogan, P. R., Kinnucan-Welsch, K., Zimmerman, B., Campbell, L., Fesit-Willis, J., & Freppon, P. (2002, December). *Scaffolding teacher learning as a scaffold for student learning: An analysis of assisted performance using activity setting framework*. Paper presented at the 52nd annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.
- Roskos, K. A. (2000). *Teaching reading and writing: A core curriculum for educators*. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.
- Sweeney, D. (2003). *Learning along the way: Professional development by and for teachers*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Sykes, G. (1999). Teacher and student learning: Strengthening the connection. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession* (pp. 127–150). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, B. M., & Pearson, P. D. (Eds.). (2002). *Teaching reading: Effective schools, accomplished teachers*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. In A. Iran-Nejad & C. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 24, pp. 173–209). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.