

**MEDICINE HAT SCHOOL DISTRICT #76
MODEL FOR TEACHER SUPERVISION
AND EVALUATION:
THE COACHING TEAM**

MARION E. CARTER

B. Ed., University of Alberta, 1963
Dip. Ed., University of Lethbridge, 1981

A One-Credit Project
Submitted to the Faculty of Education
of The University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF EDUCATION

LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA

July, 1991

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My first thank you goes to Dr. Richard Butt for his counsel and advice as this document evolved. I greatly appreciated his willingness to become my major supervisor.

I would like to thank Dr. David Townsend for all his support and encouragement as I have worked towards my M.Ed. I would also like to thank him for the assistance he gave to the Coaching Team as we became the trainers for our District.

Dr. Myrna Greene and Carillon Purvis are both deserving of a personal thank you for their patience and understanding as I pursued my M.Ed.

A special thank you goes to Dr. Harold Storlien and Les Omotani for giving me the opportunity to serve on the Coaching Team. To the Coaching Team members: Patty Ambrosio, Al Bloomfield, Richard Brooks, Erhardt Frank, David George, Cal Hauserman, Rick Massini, Ray Skow, Jerry Smith and Sandy Umpleby, a heartfelt thanks. Without their cooperation, this project would not have been possible.

To conclude, I would like to acknowledge the support and encouragement I received from my family and friends, and to Linda Baisley for her assistance in the typing of this project.

ABSTRACT

This paper on the Coaching Team contains a research and literature review on the various elements of staff development. Following this is a brief history of Medicine Hat School District #76 Coaching Team that was involved in training teachers in peer supervision and coaching. Results of the members' replies to questionnaires are presented with a personal analysis of some of these results. Suggestions to other school districts contemplating using their own personnel for staff development are then offered.

The most powerful form of learning, the most sophisticated form of staff development, comes not from listening to the good words of others but from sharing what we know with others. Learning comes more from giving than from receiving. By reflecting on what we do, by giving it coherence, and by sharing and articulating our craft knowledge, we make meaning...we learn.

Roland Barth

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
TWO	STAFF DEVELOPMENT: A LITERATURE REVIEW	4
	Definition of Staff Development.....	4
	The Need for Staff Development.....	5
	Problems with Staff Development	6
	Possible Solutions to Staff Development	9
THREE	THE COACHING TEAM	21
	Purpose, role and tasks of Coaching Team.....	21
	The First Year	23
	The Second Year	29
	The Third Year	31
	The Fourth Year	33
FOUR	RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES	36
FIVE	CONCLUSION	49
	The Coaching Team	49
	Suggestions for Other School Districts	51
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	53

APPENDIX A 56

APPENDIX B 58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Medicine Hat Model for Teacher Supervision and Evaluation was the title given to a special project begun in Medicine Hat School District #76 as a result of the District's desire to ensure consistency amongst its evaluators, and with Alberta Education's Management and Finance Plan.

The decision was made to provide training for the school district's personnel, including both administrators and teachers, in a teacher supervision and evaluation model. Initial training in, and discussion of the Model was begun at an Administrators' Seminar in June 1985 under the direction of Dr. David Townsend. The model used consists of four stages: pre-conference with the teacher to determine what the supervisor and teacher will be focusing on during the lesson; observation of the lesson; data-analysis of the observation data; and post-conference to discuss the data and determine if and when further visits will be made.

In the fall of 1985, Dr. David Townsend worked with 120 teachers and administrators who had been paired for the training. They became groups A - D, meeting in groups of 30 for six half-day sessions. At the same time that the District's personnel were receiving training, a three year evaluation of the project was being conducted by the University of Lethbridge with Dr. Myrna Greene as project director.

During the next year, Dr. Townsend continued to provide the training and groups E and F were formed. He also offered advanced training for those who wanted to become more knowledgeable in the process. Because Dr. Townsend would not be available the following year to carry on the indepth training, the District decided to use its own personnel to provide instruction to the teachers not having had the opportunity to enrol in the program. Six people from the group who took the advanced training were asked to work towards this goal. They became known as the "Coaching Team".

The intent of this paper is to discuss staff development of a school district's personnel. The literature review will focus on several dimensions of staff development, including problems and programs that have proved successful.

Following this, a summary will be made of how the Medicine Hat School District's Coaching Team was assembled, what their mandate was, how they worked together, how their training sessions were planned and delivered, and how participants evaluated their inservicing.

Next a summary of the results of a questionnaire given to present and past coaches will be made. The questionnaire will ask the coaches to describe their involvement in the project, the positive aspects of using one's peers as staff developers, how the project has changed over the years and what they foresee as the future focus of the project. In addition, main points made during personal interviews will be incorporated.

The final section of the paper will compare how the Coaching Team conducted their training program with ideas from various authors. Following this, suggestions to school districts who may wish to use their own personnel as staff developers will be listed.

CHAPTER II

STAFF DEVELOPMENT: A LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review focuses on four dimensions of staff development. To begin, several definitions of staff development will be reviewed. In conjunction with these, reasons for staff development will be put forward. A third section will deal with various problems encountered when providing staff development activities, while the remainder of the chapter will propose various solutions to overcome these problems.

Definition of Staff Development

In the 1981 ASCD yearbook, Dillon-Peterson

". . . presented staff development and organizational development as the gestalt for school improvement which in turn would lead to maximum personal growth and a better atmosphere for effective school changes (Wideen, 1987, p. 2)."

Using Fenstermacher and Berliner's definition, staff development is the ". . . provision of activities designed to advance the knowledge, skills and understanding of teachers in ways that lead to changes in their thinking and classroom behavior (1983, p. 4)."

For Vaughan (1983) staff development is seen as a means of insuring that recent findings regarding the improvement of teacher effectiveness can be used to make a difference in schools.

Guskey (1986) in his article entitled "Staff Development and the Process of Teacher Change" writes,

". . . staff development programs are a systematic attempt to bring about change - change in the classroom practices of teachers, change in their beliefs and attitudes, and change in the learning outcomes of students (1986, p. 5)."

Change appears to be the key element in the term staff development - change in the beliefs, attitudes, thinking and behaviour of teachers which leads to changes in teacher effectiveness which, in turn, should lead to positive changes in students' learning outcomes.

The Need for Staff Development

No matter what definition is used, why is staff development necessary? Guskey (1986) writes that it is only through high quality staff development that there can be improvements made in education. Even though teachers have been prepared to take on the task of teaching, the knowledge obtained at colleges and universities needs to be continually expanded and updated because of the tremendous change and innovation in education. According to Rubin (1975), when beginning educators leave their respective institutions, they begin a journey towards obsolescence, as undergraduate training is only adequate for five to seven years. Not only teachers, but administrators and supervisors must strive to remain current in both the theory and practice of teaching.

Wideen (1987) also stresses the necessity of staff development because of the tremendous amount of new knowledge accumulated over the past thirty years. But, simply presenting new curriculum with its resources cannot be considered good inservicing. There has also been a tremendous change within the classroom itself so that

. . . even a modest innovation requires change of a most complex nature (p. 13)." Finally, staff development must take place throughout the career of the teacher as the training received before entering the classroom will never be sufficient.

It is important to remember that when one is discussing staff development, it is understood that it is to help educators in general, and not just individual teachers in individual classrooms with individual problems. Also, it is essential to remember that staff development is also necessary when educators are asked to assume new roles within their own schools or elsewhere in the district.

Problems with Staff Development

After teachers have entered their own classrooms for the first time, and faced the reality of what exists there, they often report they feel unprepared by their university training. They are reluctant to admit this to supervisors and turn to colleagues for help and support (Flanders, 1980). This collegiality could be considered the initial step in staff development. Experience, too, plays a role in helping teachers become the best they can be. But what about the value of workshops?

According to Flanders, teachers rate these as a poor third to collegial support and experience in contributing to their own growth. Various writers would agree that workshops are not the answer. When Verma (1984) writes about the "one-shot, fragmented,

irrelevant type of staff development activity (p. 9)," he is referring to the type of workshop most teachers have experienced.

When Policelli (1987) talks about what is effective professional development, she says it is "certainly not . . . inoculating teachers with one-day shots of inservice (p.54)." Hannay (1990) would concur saying that "one-shot" P.D. workshops are no longer acceptable to educators.

What is wrong with a short one or two day workshop? Are not most of the speakers vibrant enough to warrant listening to and are not most of the materials and information given useful enough to be taken back to the classroom? Even when these two questions are answered in the affirmative, there is a problem - "carryover". Joyce and Showers (1983) found that the average American teacher spent three days in inservicing (rarely more than one day at a time), but that teacher behavior was seldom changed as a result. Their findings are often displayed in the following chart:

<u>Training Components</u>	<u>Skills Attained</u>	<u>On-Site Application</u>
Theory +	10 - 20%	5 - 10%
Demonstration +	30 - 35%	5 - 10%
Practice +	60 - 70%	5 - 10%
Feedback +	70 - 80%	10 - 20%
Coaching	80 - 90%	80 - 90%

As one can see, even if a person has been given the theory and a demonstration, has been given the opportunity to practise and

received feedback on the performance, the maximum transfer of the latter into the classroom is only in the range of from 10% to 20%.

Valencia and Killion (1988) name five obstacles to teacher change through staff development. Besides the lack of opportunities for follow-up, practice, feedback and coaching, they also list teacher isolation (meaning that teachers are given little opportunity to learn from each other, whether it be watching excellent teachers teach, or simply talking to each other about education). The third problem is that teachers are reluctant to try something new which may cause more problems for the class and the teacher than existed before the idea was put forward. Fourthly, they state that presenters of information to teachers have failed to understand that the needs of adult learners are different than those of children. Finally, they suggest that change has always been seen as being capable of happening in precise and predictable ways, but this does not allow for individual professional and personal needs.

Wideen (1987) maintains that part of the reason inservice has proven to be ineffective is that,

". . . the programs are typically carried out by distant rationalists well removed from classroom activity. What has become abundantly clear is the importance of teachers being actively engaged in the process and the need for them to gain control and power over the projects that they are to implement (p. 2)."

Stephens (1990) suggests that one of the reasons inservice programs do not work is because of the lack of support for the programs, not by the teachers, but by the principal. She reasons

that the principal is the key determiner of whether or not programs succeed or fail.

Possible Solutions to Staff Development

No one seems to disagree that there is a need for staff development - the problem is finding what approaches might work.

Verma (1984) suggests there are three tenets necessary for successful staff development: planning, implementation, and evaluation. In the planning stage, it must be determined what is presently happening and what changes are desired. This can be accomplished through the use of observations in the classrooms, case studies, and interviews or questionnaires. These needs can then be transformed into behavioral objectives. Accomplishment of these can then be met through ". . . workshops, demonstrations, individual study, visits to other classrooms, case study, groups discussion and programmed learning (p. 10)."

Verma names the implementation component as being complex and critical. This is where the action is - where the uncertainties are confronted and the unknowns are met. Implementation involves change in both people and the structure of the organization. Communication amongst teachers and administrators, and support from, and flexibility of, administrators are also key points to consider in the implementation stage. Organizational climate must be conducive to change. This climate can be improved through teacher participation in decision making, frequent meetings to keep people informed, peer learning and peer problem solving

opportunities, administrative support and finally, time and resources in the support of implementation.

Verma notes that the evaluation stage must be continuous and not just done before and after an activity. Evaluations may be collected through ". . . questionnaires, interviews, observers' reports, student tests, case studies, activity logs, and video-taped or recorded lessons (p. 13)."

Other writers suggest a more elaborate staff development plan is necessary for success.

Wood, Thompson and Russell (1981, pp. 59-91) have proposed an effective program which first requires understanding of their assumptions regarding inservicing. They have eleven such assumptions which have been summarized below:

1. Inservicing must continue throughout one's career.
2. Long term staff development can use short-term workshops and classroom supervision.
3. Inservicing should improve programs and personnel's performance.
4. Adults need to know they have control to avoid threat and anxiety.
5. Individualization of inservicing is crucial.
6. Cooperation amongst peers will lead to change.
7. Supportive environment (climate, trust, communication, peer support) is essential.
8. The school (not the district or individual) is where change will occur.

9. The district must supply resources and training to produce change.

10. The principal must be committed to the project.

11. Programs must be based on research, theory and educational practice.

They then outline their five stage model for inservice education:

Stage I - Readiness

The leadership and support for the inservicing of the school staff must initially come from central office personnel and the principals of the schools. There must also be open communication among them and other educators on staff in the schools. Once this has happened, the planning may begin with written goals, description of the program and practices, and a broad four-to-five year plan for the implementation of the desired changes.

Stage II - Planning

In this stage the objectives related to knowledge, strategies or skills, and attitudes must be agreed to by those involved in the change process. A needs assessment will give the planners understanding of what is and what should be within the schools. Feedback from participants, especially through interviews, is helpful. Available resources including materials, time, money, and personnel must be known.

Both teachers and administrators need to be involved in the planning and can be assisted in this task by a steering committee.

Stage III - Training

Wood, Thompson and Russell state that even though there are other options, the workshop will probably continue to be the vehicle for inservice. But, it must be different than those of the past. In order to accomplish this, participants must understand the objectives; the various expectations of learners must be taken into account; and the relationship of workshop content to participants' careers must be made clear.

Small groups can be formed within the workshop so that people may learn from each other. They will also have control over their own learning. In the training sessions, it is also important that the participants practise the learning, and then receive feedback from the group. This puts a sense of "realness" into the sessions.

The leadership for the sessions must come from persons who have expertise in the area. It is particularly beneficial if local personnel are used. It must be stressed, however, that these people have to have the knowledge necessary to achieve credibility amongst their peers. If such local people are not available, then external consultants should be used. Another suggestion is to train local teachers and administrators so that they become the trainers for the workshop sessions. As compensation, these people can be given time away from their jobs, special recognition, or some form of monetary compensation.

It is essential that there be feedback from the participants at the end of the sessions either through interviews, or anonymously. There must also be discussion amongst those involved

as to learnings obtained and possible problems. Finally, there must be a commitment to implement what has been learned.

At the end of the training, summative and formative evaluations must be completed in order to determine the effectiveness of the training.

Stage IV: Implementation

It is important that the implementation of what has been learned begins almost immediately. This enables participants to transfer their knowledge to the workplace before forgetting sets in. Written implementation plans are useful.

Assistance to teachers can come from peers or supervisors. One way this is easily accomplished is to have teams of teachers from the same school attend the workshops so they can work with each other later.

However, long term implementation and change will not take place unless principals and administrators give recognition to the people making the changes and support the changes through funds and other resources.

Stage V: Maintenance

Change will not be permanent unless there is a process by which it can be determined the new behaviours are continuing. This can be accomplished through self-monitoring, peer supervision, teacher interviews, and teacher questionnaires.

The previous proposals have stressed the necessity of teacher input into staff development. Policelli (1987) writes about a program at a high school in Connecticut which allowed teachers to

become staff developers. Experienced English teachers finished a year long program and became the staff developers for the school system. She begins by naming the elements present in her system which allowed for success. Firstly, there was support from the administration in the form of both money and time. Secondly, the planner, who also taught, had authority to propose a plan and organize the events. Thirdly, teachers were given power and the opportunity to work together. Fourthly, a risk-taking atmosphere was apparent, and finally, the learning experiences for the adults were authentic.

She then reports the steps necessary for progress: an analysis of the needs; a meeting of teachers for goal-setting; workshops related to expressed needs conducted by speakers from outside the district; research during the summer; and lastly, teacher-led workshops for the teachers in the district. These were held during school time so substitutes were hired to cover classes. The presenters were paid for the four meeting days, and for the five days of research and writing. This funding and the fact that their administrator was present at some of the meetings were seen as strong indicators of the school district's support for the program.

For the staff developers, it was reported that self-esteem grew for both presenters and participants. Teachers shared ideas, created new ones, and revelled in the atmosphere of collaboration.

Stephens (1990), who blames the lack of the principal's support for the demise of staff development, goes on to explain

what she feels principals must concentrate on in order to achieve success. She names these ". . . the four C's: commitment, collaboration, communication and coordination (p. 25)." Commitment refers to the principal's desire to ensure the staff grows professionally by staying current through attending conferences, working with consultants and being kept informed of inservice workshops. The second "C" is for collaboration, that is, making it possible for teachers to be involved in planning for staff development. But, it does not end there. Teachers must feel they are being listened to, and that the principal genuinely wants to work with them. Communication, the third "C", does not only involve informing teachers of upcoming events through written memos. It means indicating the principal is willing to listen to the teachers when they tell what they feel they need in order to become the best they can be.

This type of collaboration amongst teachers can led to peer coaching which Hannay (1990) suggests is "an extremely effective means to personal professional development (p. 3)." In her article on creating a climate for peer coaching, she maintains that the successfulness of this method depends upon six factors. Without these, peer coaching will have a difficult time succeeding. These are:

1. Cooperative emphasis - This refers to the amount of cooperation existing between teachers in the past. Success in facilitating coaching activities is dependent upon teacher cooperation both on their own teams and between teams.

2. Teacher-teacher rapport - Professional and personal relationships between teachers must also be strong if the feedback from peer coaching is to be of benefit.

3. Teacher commitment - This requires persistence on the part of teachers as they establish priorities and work with peers to attain goals.

4. Goals - Peer coaching needs school goals for school-based projects rather than individual goals in order to achieve success.

5. Decision-making - Teachers must determine their own professional and personal growth needs and how these are to be achieved. They must also have worked at determining group needs.

6. Principal's commitment and support - The principal has a many-faceted role - facilitator, supporter and team player. This person needs to let the staff know there is support for the time and resources necessary for peer coaching to succeed.

She then goes on to describe the Practice-based Professional Development Strategy (PPDS) which she maintains can be used by itself or as a prelude to peer coaching. The strategy is ". . . grounded in the assumption that changes in practice precede changes in beliefs about what constitutes effective learning and teaching strategies (p. 5)."

In reviewing the elements of PPDS, one realizes many are similar to those proposed by previous writers describing what is necessary for successful staff development. First, there must be an initiation stage in which planning and monitoring begin which requires regular meetings of the school improvement team.

This team, it is suggested, should have in its membership the principal and staff members selected because of their leadership characteristics and credibility with their colleagues. Their first task is to determine where the school is now in an area of teaching practices and where it wants to go. A long-term plan can then be developed. The team is also responsible for monitoring the plan - listening to teachers' concerns and making adaptations to the plan when required.

The implementation phase is next. It consists of five steps, repeated as often as is necessary. These are an input session leading to planning for teaching, then feedback on planning, followed by teaching, and finally feedback on teaching. This can then lead back to an input session or on to planning for teaching. Teachers work in pairs to help each other in achieving success with a new innovation.

Hannay also suggests that there can be four to five cycles per year as one cycle can take four to five weeks. She states some time for planning should be available during the school day.

According to Hannay, this strategy for implementation of a goal set by the school staff gave the teachers the power to have control over their own growth. It also changed the collegial climate. This became evident in the feedback sessions when teachers began to take over the discussion in the sessions instead of relying on the facilitator to lead. Because the meetings were non-evaluative, teachers began to take risks and a climate of encouraging experimentation emerged. Rapport within teacher

pairings proved to be a crucial element in success in peer coaching. All staff now had a stake in school-improvement goals and became accountable to themselves, each other, and the students. The principal was seen as a team player as well. Hannay concludes by stating that this process (PPDS) became the foundation for the introduction of peer coaching in which the goal is personal growth achieved through "classroom observation and feedback by a peer (p. 8)."

A similar program of teachers observing each other used in Medicine Hat, Alberta is an outgrowth of a supervision and evaluation project. In September 1985, Medicine Hat School District #76 began a training program for their administrators and teachers in a supervision/evaluation Model which consists of a cycle of a pre-conference, classroom observation, analysis of the data collected, and a post-conference. A Project Steering Committee, with membership from central office staff, administrators and teachers, was created to plan the schedule of sessions and any other events related to the project. Because the Board had approved the project, the superintendent became the person most responsible for the Model. A trainer from outside the District, Dr. David Townsend, provided the instruction for the first three years. Then a Coaching Team who had the training and had taken advanced training provided the instruction of the Model to the remainder of the teachers wishing to participate.

An extensive evaluation of all aspects of the Project was conducted by a team from the University of Lethbridge, headed by

Dr. Myrna Greene (1989). When reporting on the Coaching Team, it was noted that all members were primarily teachers, although four of the six did have administrative responsibilities (p. 189). Those who took the training from this Team felt it was a positive experience and the administrators of the Model praised the Coaching Team for its efforts and called it "a resounding success (Ibid.)".

The evaluation team stated that the use of the supervision/evaluation Model was successful and attributed it to several factors including:

- the large numbers of teachers involved
- the atmosphere of camaraderie
- the positive attitude of central office
- the large numbers of both administrators and teachers on the Steering Committee and the regularity of their meetings
- the dedication of the Coaching Team
- the comfortable feelings teachers have when they visit each other's classrooms and the 'sense' that teachers know what each other is doing in the classroom (Ibid., p. 193).

An outside observer from the Government of Alberta's Department of Education was impressed with the program as well and speculated that the changes that occurred would have normally taken an average of ten to fifteen years. The changes he was referring to had actually taken three years (p. 192-193).

Leadership was seen as the most significant factor in determining whether or not the program was a success. Administrative support was of paramount importance even if teachers

assumed leadership roles implementing the Model in their own schools. Leadership also came from the central office administration, the Steering Committee and the Coaching Team (p.p. 197-198).

Greene et al reported that success was also dependent upon participants perceiving the Model as being beneficial to them in the "real" world of teaching.

"Critical to this seemed to be the role of the Coaching Team. The Team allowed other teachers to see that the direction of the Model rested with colleagues who focused on classroom practice and peer coaching as the future direction for the Model (p. 199)."

The report concludes with the statement, "Clearly the Medicine Hat School District is a district with a vision and an implementation strategy, and other school districts who wish to implement significant change could find no better model (p. 205)."

CHAPTER III

THE COACHING TEAM

Purpose, role and tasks of the Coaching Team

The six member Coaching Team was assembled by Les Omotani, assistant superintendent (Program Services), in the spring of 1987. The group began working together almost immediately so that they would be prepared to work with a new group of trainees in the fall.

The first meeting was held after school with Les Omotani and Harold Storlien, assistant superintendent (Education Administration and Personnel), in attendance. The members of the Team were told that they had the full support of the Board and central office personnel and could begin designing the training program for the teachers enrolling in the program.

The group consisted of four males all from secondary schools (three vice-principals and one department head) one female secondary vice-principal and one female elementary teacher. One of the first decisions made was to select the chairman for the group - one of the male vice-principals. He has continued as chairman to the present time. The second major decision was to name the group the "Coaching Team". Originally it was to be called the "Training Cadre", but the group felt "Cadre" was similar enough to "cadaver" to warrant the change!

The first meeting lasted approximately one and a half hours. During that time the coaches expressed their opinions about how and

when the training program should proceed. It was agreed that they would continue to follow the six half-day session format established in the past, with three sessions before Christmas and three after Christmas - the last session slated for April. The sessions before Christmas were to deal with the reason for, and the history of, the supervision and evaluation project in Medicine Hat. The teachers would then receive training in the format necessary for successful pre-conferences. They would also be led through several data collection instruments and asked to try using them with "real" classes. The sessions after Christmas were to continue focusing on data collection instruments and analyses of the data and then to move on to criteria needed for successful post-conferences. Teachers were to be asked to role play conferences, video tape "real" conferences and then share their tapes in small groups. As the meeting progressed, Team members began to get to know each other better and one could sense a relaxed atmosphere developing.

The Team realized there would have to be many more meetings before they actually began the training of the new groups. Because each member had many other school responsibilities, it was difficult to find an after-school meeting time. It was also pointed out that people are tired by the end of a school day. Finally, after much discussion, it was decided that breakfast meetings might be the best alternative. Over the years, Tuesday at 7:00 a.m. became the normal meeting time. Consequently, the group renamed itself the "Breakfast Club" even though it remained the

"Coaching Team" to others. At that first meeting, the coaches were informed that a sum of money had been set aside for professional development. They could all go together to one conference per year or could choose their own.

The First Year

In the fall of 1987, an invitation was extended by the superintendent, Dr. K. Sauer, to those teachers who had not had the training. It was stressed that participation was strictly voluntary. Those in charge of the project did not want teachers to think they were being forced to participate. Potential participants were also encouraged to team up with a partner. The partner could be someone from the same grade level, same school, or different grade level and school. The idea was to choose someone with whom one could work during and following the sessions. When the requests for training were tabulated, it was found that two groups of thirty could be formed. These were named Groups F and G. Because more than sixty teachers had applied, the extras were put on a waiting list and were told they would have access to the training the following fall.

With the formation of the groups, the planning for the sessions began in earnest. The Coaching Team (Breakfast Club) met to determine what was to happen in each of the six sessions, but spent the most time deciding on the first day's presentations.

As the format for the session was developed, all members of the group brainstormed and gave suggestions, until a consensus was

reached. Each member volunteered to lead the training group through a section of the half-day's events. The same scenario occurred throughout the first year for each of the remaining half-day sessions. The training groups had the choice of alternating mornings and afternoons so they were not away from their school the same time each day.

The first session began with journal writing which asked the participants three questions: Why am I here? What do I want from this? How do I feel right now? Following this, the two assistant superintendents welcomed the group and then introduced the Coaching Team. Members gave brief summaries of their involvement in the Project. Participants then introduced themselves, named their schools and made any other comments they chose. At this point the assistant superintendents left the group and the Coaching Team began the training. As with each of the sessions, a warm-up activity was used to acquaint the teachers with each other and to help create a relaxed atmosphere. The group then observed a teaching episode which was on video tape and discussed what they had seen. The session ended with an overview of the philosophical and conceptual bases of the supervision cycle. Blank tapes were distributed to the teachers who were asked to video themselves teaching. The tapes were for personal use only. The idea was to give teachers the opportunity of watching themselves teach - something that does not happen very often. The session concluded with journal writing, responding to the three questions: What was important about today's activities? What do I want to remember?

How do I feel right now? The teachers handed in one copy of their journal writing with a number known only to them. In this way Les Omotani could give feedback to the Coaching Team as to the appropriateness of their sessions, and at the same time he could watch for growth amongst individual participants.

The five remaining sessions followed the format of a warm-up activity to begin the session and journal writing at the end. During the second session, the history of the project in Medicine Hat was reviewed. Next the group observed a teaching episode using a specific data collection sheet, but the emphasis of the session was on what should be included in the pre-conference. Considerable time was spent on statements which could be considered inference, fact or judgement. Participants were asked to categorize a series of twenty statements and the results were discussed. They were then asked to change the inferential and judgement statements into factual ones whenever this was possible. The Team stressed that one should avoid using judgement statements when working with peers. Teachers then practised an imaginary pre-conference with a partner while an observer looked on. The "homework" assignment was to tape an actual pre-conference with a partner. Roles were then reversed. If possible, the observed lessons were to be taped as well.

In the third session, the teachers formed smaller groups and observed each other's pre-conference tapes. Following the viewing, teachers made comments or asked questions of the people who were taped. Observation skills were practised at the session, once

again using lessons taped by the coaches. The group was asked to tape a pre-conference using a different observation technique and then discuss the lesson with the teacher before the fourth session.

During the fourth session, participants discussed their experiences with their taping, and reviewed pre-conferencing and observation skills. The bulk of the session, however, was devoted to collection and analysis of data. The assignment was to collect and analyze data collected at the next visit with a teacher.

Most of the fifth session was devoted to the post-conference. The group discussed the criteria for a successful post-conference and were given the opportunity to watch taped post-conferences with members of the Coaching Team acting as supervisors and teachers. Once more they role-played their own post-conference in groups of three with the third person acting as an observer. They were then asked to tape their own post-conference and to bring the tapes for sharing during the sixth session.

The final session in April proceeded as planned. After the warm-up activity, there was a review of the complete cycle: pre-conference, observation, analysis of data and post-conference. Teachers then shared their post-conference tapes with each other in small groups. After a question/answer period and the journal writing, the rest of the half-day was given over to Dr. Townsend. He stressed the usefulness of the cycle and encouraged teachers to make use of the opportunities to open their classrooms to each other.

During the year the Team continually evaluated the progress of the training. After each morning session, the Team went out for lunch to relax, discuss the morning's events, and determine whether or not changes needed to be made to the afternoon's program. After the final session of each day, the group met again to evaluate the day and make suggestions for the next meeting. The group usually met early in the morning of the following week at which time Les Omotani presented the group with a summary of the participants' evaluations. These were taken from the participants' journal writings. Les categorized these as being positive, neutral and negative statements. As well, he generalized the comments made so that the Coaching Team knew what the teachers had found beneficial and with what they needed more help.

When some of the Coaching Team members focused on the negative statements, Mr. Omotani reminded the group that was not where attention should be placed. Almost all of the comments and perceptions were positive, and that this was where the efforts of the Team should be placed. He told the group to believe in their product and to believe in themselves.

As the year progressed, the Coaching Team continued to work closely together. They actively involved the participants as much as possible during the sessions. When the pre- and post-conferences were discussed, tapes made by the coaches were used. (This strategy was employed to show participants that the coaches, too, were willing to take risks.) Later in the year, when the

teachers began volunteering their own video tapes, the Team felt that the strategy had been successful.

During the two meetings when participants were asked to form groups of three (supervisor, teacher, observer), and practise their own pre- and post-conferencing skills, feedback via the journals indicated that this was a popular activity.

Teachers were also actively involved in the collection of data. Tapes of individual coaches teaching their own classes were used. The teachers, having been given several data analyses to work from, were then asked to collect data from the tapes. Coaches and teachers worked together in small groups to determine how the data should be presented to the teacher whose lesson was viewed. When brought back to the large group, the various ways of presenting the data were shared.

Once the six sessions were completed, the Team met with Les Omotani to learn how the participants evaluated their experiences. He gave the coaches summary sheets containing the data collected from the journal writings of the final sessions. Of the fifty teachers surveyed, thirty-nine made what Mr. Omotani classified as positive comments about their experiences, seven were considered "neutral" and two made comments considered negative. He also told the coaches that participants expressed excitement about continuing to use the Model, confidence in their ability to do so and appreciation for the sessions. Two concerns which consistently surfaced were finding time to complete a full cycle and apprehension about using some of the data collection instruments.

In the spring of 1988, a special recognition banquet was held for those who had engaged in the Model during the year. Presentations were made to Groups A through G dependent upon the number of years they had been involved. Certificates were given to one year participants, pins to those involved for two years and portfolios to those having three years in the program.

The coaches met once more before the school year ended to determine what would happen the following year. All agreed they had enjoyed the year and were looking forward to working with two new groups of teachers.

The Second Year

Early in the fall of 1988, the Team had its first breakfast meeting. By that time, invitations to participate in the training had already been distributed. Enough teachers had responded so that Groups H and I were formed.

The Team decided that they would follow the format of the previous year's training with only a few changes.

Firstly, it was felt that the time devoted to the post-conference was too short and that it needed to be discussed earlier in the sessions. This was accomplished.

Secondly, and probably the most significant change was that the Team decided to avoid using video tapes of pre- and post-conferences, and teaching episodes. They thought it would be more interesting and beneficial to the group if these were shown "live". Once again, the Team had decided to take a risk.

When it came time for the session on the pre-conference, two Team members met a week before to decide what would be discussed at that time. A brief sketch of the pre-conference was worked out, but not rehearsed as the Team concluded that it would seem more natural if there was no script. It proved to be a successful idea for when the two presented the live pre-conference, the participants clapped and shouted "Bravo". From that day forward, no video tapes of conferences were used as an instructional tool, but teacher-made tapes were still shown to small groups for discussion purposes.

To avoid using taped lessons, actual teaching episodes were developed. The first lesson was conducted by a secondary art teacher who had undergone the training in a previous year. She volunteered to teach part of the group, while the rest of the group observed and collected data to be discussed later in the session.

Feedback from the journals indicated that this was a change very much enjoyed and appreciated.

In addition to the six sessions, the Coaching Team also arranged to have a "refresher" session for any of previously trained people in Groups A through H who were interested in attending. This was held in an evening with supper provided part way through the session. Approximately fifty people attended this workshop. A quick review of the Model was given. This was followed by two pre-conferences - one with a science teacher and one with a language arts teacher. The group then chose in which lesson they wanted to participate and went to the rooms of those

teachers. Data collected was shared with the group who had become the students for each lesson. A post-conference was held with the teacher. One of the coaches acted as the supervisor. The smaller groups then returned for a debriefing of the whole session. Feedback through journals revealed that the evening had been very successful. Participants expressed a desire for more of these "hands-on" events even if it meant giving up an evening.

Once again, the school district celebrated the success of the program with a banquet and presentations to recognize the participation of Groups A to I.

The Third Year

The beginning of the 1989/90 school year saw a change in the membership and number of coaches. One of the original six members left the Team, taking a year's sabbatical to return to university to pursue a doctorate. Three more members were added: a female secondary teacher, a male secondary department head and a male elementary teacher.

With the addition of the new members, meetings were held to acquaint them with what had happened during the previous years when the Coaching Team had taken over the training. Two of the three had received their inservicing from Dr. Townsend, but the third had trained with the Coaching Teams, so he could give us even more insight into how the sessions were received.

Early in the fall an informal barbecue, sponsored by the school district, was held at a nearby farm. The idea was to renew

old acquaintances and remind teachers that money was available to visit each other's classrooms during the coming school year. (This was also the year of the name change. Instead of the "Medicine Hat Model for Teacher Supervision and Evaluation" (T.S. & E.), it became known as "Medicine Hat School District #76 Coaching, Supervision and Evaluation Program" (C.S. & E.).

Planning for the new Groups J and K commenced early in the fall as well. Changes were made to the format of the sessions once more. Because almost all of the teachers in the District were familiar with the Model, it was decided the Model's four components could be taught earlier than in previous years, so that practising of the Model by the participants could commence sooner. Less time was spent discussing the history of the project so that more time could be devoted to data collection instruments and to analyses of the data.

The Team also wanted to show how the Model could be used for more than just supervision/evaluation objectives. During the second session, three live pre-conferences were role-played for the groups with three different scenarios. In the first, a teacher had returned from a conference and was interested in sharing some of the new ideas gained. When a fellow teacher expressed interest in learning more about these, the first teacher invited her into his classroom to see how one of the new techniques could be used. The second scenario involved a teacher interested in receiving feedback from a colleague as to how the class worked with a new way of story writing. A group of students causing a problem in a class became

the setting for a third pre-conference. To add credibility to these pre-conferences, the coaches actually did visit the classrooms, collected the data and shared it with the group so that the live post-conferences were based on facts.

Another reason for having the three scenarios was to show the participants that the conferences did not have to take a great deal of time and did not have to be formal. These were two of the reasons given by previous trainees for not using the Model to any great extent.

This time the year-end celebration became quite informal. Instead of a banquet, a barbecue was held at the same location as the fall barbecue. There were fewer and shorter speeches, but presentations were still made to the new trainees. Group, instead of individual presentations, were made to the previous year's participants.

The Fourth Year

Once again the Coaching Team had a membership change. The second member of the original six declined to return as the pressures of the assignment as a department head prevented full participation.

Two new coaches, both male elementary vice-principals, were added to the Team in the fall of 1990. Their addition meant that all members did not need to be present for all the sessions and new responsibilities could be assumed.

By this time almost all of the District's teachers had received the training, so there was only a need for one group to be formed. It consisted mainly of teachers new to the profession or new to the District and became Group L.

Because most of the participants had some experience with the Model, either through university courses, or in their own schools, it was felt the training could be completed in a shorter period of time. The objective was to have the sessions completed by mid-January. The new group proved to be very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. Since there was only the one group, the first two half-day sessions of previous years were combined into a full-day session early in October. The next three sessions were held before the end of December so that the objective of having the final session before the end of January was reached.

Another reason for completing the sessions earlier in the year was because the Coaching Team wanted the opportunity to show how the Model had moved away from the formal supervision and evaluation format to a more informal peer coaching. They recognized the formal method was still necessary when administrators visited classrooms in order to evaluate, but newer participants in the program (Groups I to L) had had the coaching aspect stressed. The Team wanted teachers to use the Model to learn from and to help one another so that both teachers and students could benefit. They also knew that many teachers were not taking advantage of monies available for classroom visits, mainly because of the time they

felt they needed to have a full cycle of pre-conference, observation, analysis of data, and post-conference.

The Team planned for one session for the Permanent Steering Committee and another for Groups A and B (administrators who had received the first training). The Team showed the groups how pre-conferences could be held in a brief period of time and how teachers could use the Model to learn from the observed teacher and also give feedback to that teacher. A demonstration lesson followed in which the participants became the students. It was stressed that teachers in schools were now becoming peer coaches instead of supervisors.

According to the feedback from the journals, the sessions were very well received. Many administrators admitted they had not realized that this was the way the Model was being presented and expressed enthusiasm for the change.

In addition to these sessions, the Team also arranged for a three-session workshop on Cooperative Learning and a four-session workshop on the Socratic Method. These were held in the evenings with supper provided so teachers would not have to be away from their classes. They were led by three of the school district's teachers only one of whom was on the Coaching Team.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES

The following chapter is devoted to the results of the written questionnaire distributed to the eleven coaches - nine presently active and two who left the Team (one after two and one after three years). All eleven responded to the questionnaire. When appropriate, comments will be made about the results.

1. How long have you been (were you) on the Team?

The range here was from one year to four years. Four of the original six members are still on the Team. The average for the entire eleven members was 2.5 years.

It would appear that there is considerable dedication to the Team once one becomes a member. The two who left, one after two years and one after three years, were reluctant to leave, but one had left the city to pursue a doctorate, and the other left because of a new assignment and the job pressures of the new appointment.

2. Who asked you to join?

Six members of the Team were approached by Les Omotani, assistant superintendent, and five by Dr. Harold Storlien, the new superintendent as of 1989. Dr. Storlien recruited the later Team members as Mr. Omotani was given a sabbatical leave to pursue his doctorate in 1990-1991.

3. When did you first become involved in the C.S. & E. Program?
What was your involvement?

All Team members received instruction in the Model from Dr. David Townsend, either through training in Medicine Hat or from his University of Lethbridge courses. Consequently, five of the Team had been actively involved in using the Model prior to 1985 when training of the administrative staff began.

When taking the instruction from Dr. Townsend through the District's program, the coaches were paired up with either an administrator or a teacher and were expected to participate in as many cycles as possible. Those who elected to enrol in the university credit courses were also expected to team up with a colleague, video-tape their conferences and lessons, and were given marks for their efforts. Because of this, they had the added incentive to participate as fully as possible.

4. With what C.S & E. activities have you been involved?

Besides instructing teachers in the Model, all of the coaches have pursued additional interests. They have all attended or presented at the evening workshops. As well, two of the coaches have chaired meetings of the Permanent Steering Committee whose membership included all of the coaches, three representatives from central office, eleven administrators, two department heads and nine teachers. One of the coaches has also chaired Permanent Executive Team meetings while the second has gone on to co-chair two of the Summer Academy Workshops. These week-long workshops held in early July began in the summer of 1988 and were an offshoot of the C.S. & E. program. The chairman of the Team also serves on the Continuing Action Team (C.A.T.'s) which is involved in

organizing and promoting social functions as well as developing the evening workshops. Another three Team members serve, or have served, as school facilitators, meaning that these are the people on school staffs who are approached when teachers wish to carry on cycles with colleagues on the same staff or those at other schools.

Consequently, it can be concluded that the coaches are very actively involved in preserving the program.

5. What qualities do you feel are necessary in order to be a successful coach for staff development of one's peers?

Coaches listed seventeen attributes of a successful coach. These are listed in descending order with the numbers of coaches mentioning the entries to the right.

<u>Attributes</u>	<u>Total Responses (N=11)</u>
good interpersonal skills and the ability to work with others	7
knowledge of and ability to analyze teaching strategies	6
solid experience in teaching	6
knowledge of and belief in the coaching process	4
concern for professional development of self and colleagues	4
willing to take risks	3
strong communication skills	2
enthusiastic	2
tactful and non-judgmental	2

innovative	1
respect of peers	1
strong leadership skills	1
open-minded	1
trusting	1
willing to commit a large amount of time	1
love of teaching	1

It is not surprising the Team members felt the ability to work with others, to have a solid basis in the experience in teaching, and to understand various teaching strategies were of uppermost importance. What is interesting is that only one listed strong leadership skills but it could be speculated that this is what teamwork is all about - the ability to work together with all taking a leadership role at various times.

6. List the positive features of using coaches for staff development.

Although they worded their responses in different ways, the Team as a whole agreed that using local school personnel as coaches gave credibility to staff development. Local people know what is happening in the District and have a better sense of what may or may not be feasible. They are also seen as being one of "us" and not one of "them", giving a "bottom-up" grassroots approach to change and innovation. When others observe coaches taking risks, they are more likely to do so, too. On-going staff development

rather than a "one-shot" approach from an "expert" is also perceived as a positive feature.

In addition, using this method is seen as being beneficial to the coaches. They can share ideas with others, take advantage of the peer support and, as a consequence, become more conscious of their own teaching.

7. List changes you would recommend to the present system of using coaches.

The number one change suggested by six of the eleven was that the coaches should now move into the various schools. If this was accomplished, the benefits would include improvement of teaching and coaching skills for both teachers and administrators. It would also allow coaches to work more closely with beginning teachers and with more experienced teachers working on special projects. One of the drawbacks of this suggestion is that if the coach were to come from another school, there could be the perception that an outside "expert" was being brought in. Some staff members might not be accepting of this strategy.

Other improvements included a greater rotation of team members within the Team, having a "teacher only" Team and assigning coaches to specific teaching strategies so they could offer workshops in these, either on their own, or with another teacher knowledgeable in that particular area. This would allow both coaches and teachers to become "winners". The "teacher-only" Team conflicts with the opinion of some of the other coaches who felt it was important to have both teachers and administrators. There is

general agreement, however, that there needs to be more representation from the elementary schools. It was suggested that because most of the staff has been trained in using the Model, the Team could bring in other groups of personnel knowledgeable in certain areas. They could then share their knowledge with others. When their task was complete, they could leave the Team and new members from other areas of expertise could be recruited.

Time off during the school day for coaches to plan the inservicing of new teachers and the follow-up workshops was a change listed. The drawback of this idea, however, is that coaches would be taken away from their teaching and/or administrative duties, something they have tried to avoid in the past. A solution to this problem would be to have actual time built in to some or all of the coaches' school timetables.

8. How do you feel the C.S.& E. program has changed since its inception?

Perhaps it is the name change that answers this question. In the beginning it was the "Model for Teacher Supervision and Evaluation", but this has now changed to the "Coaching, Supervision and Evaluation Program". Once coach noted that the C.S.& E. acronym could be maintained, but by changing it to C. & S.E. (Coaching and Supervision/Evaluation), the emphasis would be on the teachers and the teaching rather than the supervision and evaluation aspects. Nine of the eleven coaches agreed that the biggest change that had occurred was that the program has moved away from the supervision of teachers to the more informal

opportunities for teachers to learn from each other. Although the more formal cycles still take place because administrators must evaluate teachers, the emphasis of the program has moved to peer coaching. It has become a more practical model and more suitable to staff development.

9. If you could change the program in any way, what would you do?

Overlapping of this question with question number seven was apparent. The moving of coaches into the schools was once more emphasized in the respondents' comments. It was also proposed that the new emphasis on peer coaching rather than supervision/evaluation be publicized more frequently, as it was suggested that some administrators and many teachers are unaware of the change. This could account for the fact that not all of the previously "trained" personnel have taken advantage of the program.

Another change would be to make sure administrators supervise each other to maintain continuity within the District.

10. What do you foresee for the future of the C.S.& E. program?

Most of the coaches appeared to have an optimistic forecast for the future with continued growth in the area of staff development. Teachers increasing their repertoires of teaching strategies and skills was one of the predictions for the future. School-based projects with teachers selecting their area of concern and providing peer support and coaching for each other was also predicted. This would also allow for expansion into the area of curriculum development. The hope for expansion to involve all

teachers on a regular basis and to have constant follow up among all of the groups were also listed.

Three coaches made cautionary remarks. The future could be ". . . hazy unless specific steps are taken to provide the direction and means for teachers to apply their skills of coaching and supervision, and to get administrators involved in both aspects with teachers and with themselves." "Because of the variety and scope of activities there is a danger of losing track of what we are trying to accomplish." "It is difficult to move from supervision to staff development."

It was pointed out that the groundwork for peer coaching has been laid. In the beginning the principal, having had the initial training, was instrumental in determining how many cycles took place in the school. Now that most of the staff has had experience with the Model, the principal has now become a facilitator ensuring that teachers are able to pursue their desire to visit each other's classrooms.

Even though none felt that the program would fail to progress and move into other areas, these cautionary statements must be noted.

11. What are your thoughts of using a school district's personnel as coaches for staff development of their peers?

This question created the most enthusiastic responses: "super idea", "the ONLY way to go", "great", "excellent idea", "the only acceptable way", "everyone wins".

It was pointed out that by using one's own personnel, the District was telling them they were true professionals who were competent, trustworthy and skilful. The selection of coaches, however, has to be completed with care, ensuring they have been properly trained beforehand, and then given the freedom to carry on with their assigned tasks. In this way their particular expertise can be put to work. Time out from classroom duties was once again mentioned as a potential problem.

12. What advice would you give to districts who may wish to use their teachers as coaches for staff development?

In addition to ensuring that potential coaches have been well prepared to take on the task of staff development, it was stressed that the selection had to be done very carefully. (Just because personnel is knowledgeable, it does not automatically mean that success will occur. They must display leadership skills, and at the same time be willing to work as a team, sometimes suppressing their own desires in order for the group to succeed.)

Stressed as well, were the coaching attributes of:

- flexibility
- faith
- courage
- commitment to the program
- understanding of the teaching-learning experience
- ability to make decisions and
- desire to learn new strategies

It was further suggested that districts use a team consisting of both administrators and teachers as both have meaningful roles to play. Adequate communication and information exchange amongst all stakeholders was also listed as an important consideration.

Districts should also realize that money will have to be allocated to the coaches, either in providing time out of school for planning and inservicing, or in allowing coaches to attend conferences in order to further their own professional development.

Furthermore, other districts could study the Medicine Hat experience in order to learn from its successes and mistakes. A two-word statement by one coach said it all, "Do it."

13. What position did you have when you first became a coach? (e.g. teacher, vice-principal) At what level?

14. Has this changed?

During the school years 1987 - 1990 there were twenty-three opportunities for administrative positions in the District in the following areas:

- 4 department heads
- 7 elementary vice-principalships
- 7 elementary principalships
- 2 secondary vice-principalships
- 3 secondary principalships

It could be speculated that with the high profile of being on the Coaching Team, this would automatically make for a change in work assignments. This has proven to be untrue as shown in the following table:

PRESENTLY	DURING TIME ON TEAM	BEFORE JOINING	CHANGE
elementary teacher	the same	the same	no
elementary teacher	the same	the same	no
elementary vice-principal	the same	the same	no
elementary vice principal	the same	the same	no
junior high teacher	the same	the same	no
high school vice-principal	the same	the same	no
high school vice-principal	the same	the same	no
junior high vice-principal	the same	the same	no
junior high vice-principal	the same	the same	no
junior high department head	the same	the same	no
high school department head	teacher and then department head	high school teacher	yes

As can be seen, only one coach had a change in assignment. However, because of the added job pressures, that coach chose to leave the Team after being at the new position for one year.

15. Has your experience as a coach helped you to become a better teacher?

There was an unanimous "yes" as an answer to this question with added comments of "somewhat", "absolutely", and "most certainly". It was concluded that those involved as coaches benefitted by learning more about teaching strategies, by understanding the dynamics of teaching-learning situations, and by increasing their own confidence and willingness to try new ideas. The experience of being on the Coaching Team was seen as an invigorating one -- something "new" to add to one's career. The

suggestion was also made that when one helps someone else learn, one learns as well.

16. Has your experience on the C.S. & E. coaching Team helped you to be a stronger member of your staff? In what ways?

To this question the responses were:

Yes 7

Not really 2

It has helped cement relationships 1

I don't know 1

The "yes" respondents elaborated by indicating an increased confidence when working with both teachers and students. Several mentioned a better ability to express opinions on educational issues. Many are now called upon to help teachers in situations requiring teaching expertise. At the same time, coaches are able to learn from colleagues teaching in areas other than their own.

Those responding with a "not really" indicated that their staffs had not completely accepted the program. Instead, their own staff relationships had been strengthened by school-based projects.

With the exception of one coach, all felt their staff relationships had been strengthened either because of school-based projects, or because of the program itself. It should be noted, however, that school-based projects are often made possible because of C.S. & E. funding.

17. Do you feel more positive towards teaching now that you have this leadership experience?

The "yes" responses were eight in number which is significant. Half of these cited learning about all the "good" teachers the District has, and how the District strives to promote professionalism amongst staff members as reasons for their positive feelings towards teaching.

Three felt there had been no change personally as they had always felt positive towards teaching and this attitude had not been changed. However, being on the Team had broadened their teaching experiences.

CHAPTER V**CONCLUSION**

The conclusion will compare the operation of the Coaching Team with the ideas from various authors quoted in the literature review. Suggestions for school districts considering using their own personnel for staff development will be based on research and on experience of the Coaching Team.

The Coaching Team

The necessity for careful planning is stressed in the quest for successful staff development. The Coaching Team would be given high marks in this area. Their frequent early morning meetings earned them the nickname "The Breakfast Club". But, this was not the only time they met. After school, in the evenings, and on weekends were also times when the group met whether as a whole or in smaller groupings. Planning for each training session was very carefully executed so that each coach knew exactly what was expected. After the session, planning for the next began almost immediately.

Goal-setting played a large part during these planning sessions. Sometimes, they were immediate goals to be attained at the next session. Others were long-range goals to be reached during the school year, or sometime in the future.

A supportive environment is also essential. The Team provided this by showing they were ready to risk their reputations as teachers and "perform" in front of their peers. They role-played pre- and post-conferences and taught lessons so trainees could gather data. In doing so, participants seemed more willing to take risks themselves. The friendly and congenial atmosphere which developed over the sessions was appreciated by the teachers. This was expressed to the Team both verbally and in written evaluations.

The coaches also attempted to make the sessions meaningful and practical so that teachers would see the reason for learning about the Model. Participants were given choices for homework assignments - they were asked to look for something that would actually be useful to them. They were also given opportunities for active participation. Lecturing was avoided. Instead there was group participation with teachers and coaches having input. When lessons were being taught, participants collected the data, and developed their own displays for the post-conferences. Large and small group discussions were used to encourage those involved to express their personal opinions.

Evaluation is another essential component of staff development. The Team ensured that this took place through anonymous journal writings at the end of each session. These were given to the Central Office liaison person who would then give the Coaches a summary of the evaluation so that, if necessary, the focus for the next session could be changed.

The Coaching Team also showed a strong sense of commitment to the Project, another essential element for success. It was extremely rare that a coach missed a meeting or a training session. Even though they had other duties to perform, they always ensured they were at the sessions, even if they were unable to stay for the whole time.

At the end of the sessions, the Team made the teachers aware that just because the training was over, support from the Team did not cease. Participants were encouraged to contact individual members if they had any questions about the use of the Model. The Team did not want to lose contact with their groups. Consequently, they arranged for workshops on various teaching strategies, hoping that those attending would use the method and receive feedback from their peers through a cycle of observation.

The Team thus moved from the more formal supervision and evaluation cycles to cycles of peer coaching.

Suggestions for Other School Districts

Based upon the literature review, the evaluation of the Medicine Hat Project and the feedback from the Coaching Team, the following are suggestions for school districts considering using their own personnel for staff development.

1. Select the personnel very carefully. They must be perceived as being competent teachers, knowledgeable about teaching strategies, and having expertise in the area being devoted to

staff development. Having the ability to work together in a group is essential.

2. Provide for outside assistance for the team whenever the team deems it to be necessary.
3. Have an administrator from central office act as the contact person so that communication lines will remain open. This person should be seen as a team member able to make suggestions, but not actually planning for the team.
4. Be willing to trust that the team will have the best interests of the district and its teachers uppermost in their thoughts.
5. Realize that careful planning for inservicing is essential. This may necessitate release time from school duties particularly during the initial stages of the program.
6. Be prepared for the possibility that the coaching team will change and grow. There may be a change in membership numbers and personnel, or a change in the delivery of the program.
7. Ensure that the team knows it has the support of central office personnel and the school board. If there are any problems that need to be discussed, they should be discussed in an atmosphere of openness and trust.
8. Find ways to reward the team members. It can be as simple as a telephone call or a memo, or it can take on a monetary value in the form of time off work or the allocation of funds for a professional development activity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dillon-Peterson, B. Staff Development/Organization Development. (1981 Yearbook). Washington, ASCD.
- Fenstermacher, G., & Berliner, D. A Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of Staff Development. (N-2046-NIE). Santa Monica, California: Rand. November 1983.
- Flanders, Tony. "Teacher Realities, Needs and Professional Development" from The Professional Development of Teachers, a Summary Report of a Study Done for the Professional Development Division of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 1980.
- Greene, Myrna L. (Project Director). "Final Technical Report". Evaluation of the Medicine Hat Model for Teacher Supervision and Evaluation. The University of Lethbridge, Faculty of Education. July 15, 1989.
- Guskey, Thomas R. "Staff Development and the Process of Teacher Change". Educational Research 15 (5), pp. 5 - 14. May 1986.
- Hannay, Lynne M. "PPDS: creating a climate for peer coaching". The Canadian School Executive. pp. 3 - 8. January 1990.
- Joyce, Bruce & Beverly Showers. "Power in staff development through research on teaching". Alexandria. VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 1983
- Policelli, Ann K. "Teachers Become Staff Developer: Setting a Force in Motion". Journal of Staff Development. pp. 54 - 57. Summer 1987, Vol. 8, No. 2.
- Rubin, Louis J. "The Case for Staff Development". Professional Supervision for Professional Teachers, pp. 34 - 38. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.
- Stephens, Elaine C. "Make staff development the heart of school improvement". The Executive Educator. pp. 24 - 25. November 1990.
- Valencia, Sheila W. & Joellen P. Killion. "Overcoming Obstacles to Teacher Change: Direction from School-Based Efforts". Journal of Staff Development. pp. 2 - 8. Spring 1988. Vol. 9. No. 2.
- Vaughan, J. "Using research on teaching, schools and change to help staff development make a difference". Journal for Staff Development. pp. 7 - 23, 4(1), 1983.

Verma, Surjet. "Staff Development - a systematic approach". Education Canada, pp. 9 - 13. Fall 1984.

Wideen, Marvin F. & Ian Andrews. Staff Development for School Improvement "A Focus on the Teachers". New York: The Falmer Press, 1987.

Wood, Fred H., Steven R. Thompson & Sister Frances Russell. "Designing Effective Staff Development Programs", Staff Development/Organization Development. Betty Dillon-Peterson, Chairperson & editor. ASCD Yearbook 1981.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CURRENT COACHING TEAM MEMBERS

1. How long have you been on the Team?
2. Who approached you to join?
3. When did you first become involved in the C.S. & E. program?
What was your involvement?
4. With what C.S. & E. activities have you been involved?
5. What qualities do you feel are necessary in order to be a successful coach for staff development of one's peers?
6. List the positive features of using coaches for staff development.
7. List changes you would recommend to the present system of using coaches.
8. How do you feel the C.S. & E. program has changed since its inception?
9. If you could change the program in any way what would you do?
10. What do you foresee for the future of the C.S. & E. program?
11. What are your thoughts on using a school district's teaching personnel as coaches for staff development of their peers?
12. What advice would you give to districts who may wish to use their teachers as coaches for staff development?
13. What position did you have when you first became a coach?
(e.g. teacher, vice-principal) At what level?
14. Has this changed?

15. Has your experience as a coach helped you to become a better teacher?

16. Has your experience on the C.S. & E. Coaching Team helped you to be a stronger member of your staff? In what way?

17. Do you feel more positive towards teaching now that you have this leadership experience?

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PREVIOUS MEMBERS OF THE COACHING TEAM

1. How long were you involved with the Coaching Team? What reason(s) did you have for leaving?
2. How long have you been on the Team?
3. Who approached you to join?
4. When did you first become involved in the C.S. & E. program? What was your involvement?
5. With what C.S. & E. activities have you been involved?
6. What qualities do you feel are necessary in order to be a successful coach for staff development of one's peers?
7. List the positive features of using coaches for staff development.
8. List changes you would recommend to the present system of using coaches.
9. How do you feel the C.S. & E. program has changed since its inception?
10. If you could change the program in any way what would you do?
11. What do you foresee for the future of the C.S. & E. program?
12. What are your thoughts on using a school district's teaching personnel as coaches for staff development of their peers?
13. What advice would you give to districts who may wish to use their teachers as coaches for staff development?

14. What position did you have when you first became a coach?
(e.g. teacher, vice-principal) At what level?
15. Has this changed?
16. Has your experience as a coach helped you to become a better teacher?
17. Has your experience on the C.S. & E. Coaching Team helped you to be a stronger member of your staff? In what way?
18. Do you feel more positive towards teaching now that you have this leadership experience?