Teachers' Perceptions of the Literacy Coach's Impact on Classroom Practice

Andrew S. Frye
B.A., University of Kansas, 2001
M.A.T., Mary Baldwin College, 2003

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of
Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

_____
Major Advisor, Verneda Edwards, Ed.D

_____
Jim Robins, Ed.D

_____
Sharon Zoellner, Ph.D

Date Defended: September 25, 2015

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to examine the impact of literacy coaching on teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. The research was also conducted to further determine whether a teacher's building level or years of teaching experience impacted the teacher's perception of the literacy coach's ability to improve classroom instruction. The research design for this study was quantitative in nature. The sample was limited to 711 elementary, middle, and high school teachers from District XYZ who had access to a literacy coach in their building.

As part of this quantitative study, archival survey data was used to examine the relationship between literacy coaching and teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. A survey designed by District XYZ was used to evaluate the literacy coaching program during the 2013-2014 school year. The four research questions concerning teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction were analyzed using chi-square tests of independence.

Results from the hypothesis testing indicated a statistically significant difference in teachers who spent time with a literacy coach perceived that their classroom instruction improved. More specifically, the findings revealed elementary, middle, and high school teachers and teachers with different levels of teaching experience who spent time with a literacy coach perceived their classroom instruction improved.

Dedication

To my parents, your commitment to education has been an inspiration. I am proud to follow in your footsteps.

To Michelle, your endless love and enduring support has been my bedrock.

To Abel, even though you had not joined us yet for the lion's share of this journey, being able to hold you as I finished writing gave me renewed purpose. I hope this accomplishment helps you stand on my shoulders, just as I have stood tall on my parents' shoulders.

Acknowledgements

The credit for the completion of this dissertation must be shared with many. I have been blessed with a family whose unconditional love and support have made it possible for me to complete my doctoral degree. I am also indebted to my wife, Michelle, for her love and support. Her patience, words of encouragement, and ability to see the big picture have kept me focused and determined to finish.

I appreciate the guidance of my major advisor, Dr. Verneda Edwards, whose support gave me the confidence and direction to complete this part of the journey successfully. I would also like to thank the remaining members of my committee, Dr. Katie Hole, Dr. Jim Robins, and Dr. Sharon Zoellner, for investing their time to offer feedback and guidance. The successful completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without all of you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

School districts have begun to implement variations of the learning coach model to increase student achievement through continuous, job-embedded professional development. These relatively new positions have a variety of names such as reading or literacy coach, math coach, technical coach, collegial coach, team coach, cognitive coach, peer coach, learning coach, or instructional coach. Although their titles differ, they are all largely defined as on-site professional developers who support teachers to incorporate research-based instructional practices (Knight, 2009).

As instructional leaders, each coach potentially has many responsibilities including organizing and implementing state testing, making sense of and presenting data, leading professional development, conducting study groups, and modeling best instructional practices in the classroom. Coaches may also be responsible for observing and providing feedback to teachers, co-teaching, co-planning lessons and units, implementing interventions for low achieving students, organizing instructional materials, and partnering with the principal to make instructional decisions (Borman & Feger, 2006). The growth of the position has led the International Literacy Association (ILA), formerly known as the International Reading Association (IRA), to realign their reading specialist standards to include literacy coaches, which reflects the most current research (ILA, 2010). Even with the inclusion of standards specifically for literacy coaches, there are a variety of interpretations of roles and responsibilities made at the district and building levels.

Despite best intentions, the dilemma faced by instructional coaches and school leaders is that too many coaches are given the wrong type of work or too little time with teachers. Because of this, there can be limited impact on classroom practice (Saphier & West, 2009). Research has shown coaching efforts can be squandered and "good coaching" cannot be achieved because the coach is not able to develop and sustain the right environment for teacher learning and instructional improvement (Fullan & Knight, 2011). For these reasons, it is important for school leaders to understand how instructional coaches spend their time and the relationship between coaching roles and student achievement. Research documenting the positive relationship between coached teachers, improved teacher practice, and student achievement gains are beginning to emerge (Garet et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2008; Moss et al., 2008; Poglinco et al., 2003).

Background

Beginning in 2001 with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), legislators have generated reform efforts by increasing demands for student achievement (Guskey, 2000). With student achievement gains as the end goal, the NCLB legislation stated "professional development programs [should] incorporate activities, like coaching, that are provided consistently over time" (Kowal & Steiner, 2007, p.1). The NCLB Act (2002) also stipulated that states must provide new and experienced teachers with "teacher mentoring, team teaching, reduced class schedules, and intensive professional development and use standards or assessments for guiding beginning teachers that are consistent with challenging state student academic achievement standards" (Sec 2113.c.2).

The U.S. Department of Education (2002) provided further guidance for professional development in the document *Guidance for the Reading First Program* by stating "coaches, mentors, peers, and outside experts" are advised "to develop and implement practices and strategies for professional development that should be evident in an effective reading program" (p. 7). Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Education (2002) stated professional development must be an "ongoing, continuous activity, and not consist of 'one-shot' workshops or lectures. Delivery mechanisms should include the use of coaches and other teachers of reading who provide feedback as instructional strategies are put into practice" (p. 26).

The NCLB mandate, along with emerging research on adult learning and effective professional development, resulted in a shift in the professional development landscape and the rise of different forms of the coaching model. School districts across the nation embraced coaching and invested time and financial resources in the hope of improving teacher practice and student achievement (Kowal & Steiner, 2007). Along with the emergence of various coaching models as a professional development vehicle, many prominent school reform providers implemented coaching as a key part of their reform efforts. School reform providers, including High Performing Learning Communities, America's Choice, and Breaking Ranks, have all created roles for coaches to work with teachers to support their reform efforts (Borman & Feger, 2006).

The current study took place in an urban Midwest school district, which is henceforth referred to as District XYZ. The district itself is comprised of 14 Kindergarten through fifth grade elementary schools, six middle schools, three high

schools, one alternative high school, and two magnet schools. During the 2013-2014 school year, district enrollment was approximately 14,000 students, 77% of which qualified for free or reduced-price lunch. Of the students attending District XYZ, 40.48% were White, 29.05% were Hispanic, 19.41% were African American, and 11.05% were other ethnicities (Kansas State Department of Education, 2015). The current study included data from 711 Kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers who were employed in District XYZ during the 2013-2014 school year.

Each elementary school in the district has a full time literacy and math coach. There is also a literacy coach and math coach at each of the district's middle schools and high schools. The secondary level coaching positions vary from half-time to full-time, depending on building needs and population. In the 2013-2014 school year, District XYZ expanded their use of coaches to include a coach who works with elementary English Language Learner (ELL) teachers and a coach who works with pre-kindergarten teachers.

Statement of the Problem

School districts across the country are searching for ways to increase teacher knowledge and improve classroom instruction through meaningful professional development. Research on the role of literacy coaches in teacher professional development is limited, although the value of coaching is consistently advocated in the literature (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Knight, 2007; Kowal & Steiner, 2007; Lieberman, 1995; Neufeld & Roper, 2003; Saphier & West, 2009; Vogt & Shearer, 2007). Feldman and Tung (2002) examined how teachers perceive the activities in which they participated

with the literacy coach. Teachers reported coaching activities were beneficial for improvement of instructional practice, but also reported that a major barrier to the literacy coach model was the amount of time spent with a coach. Feldman and Tung (2002) also noted teachers with less than 10 years of experience found coaching more useful than veteran teachers. Poglinco et al. (2003) reported accessibility as a major factor in how teachers perceive the literacy coach model and how supported they felt in implementing new instructional strategies into their classroom instruction. With continued budget shortfalls on the horizon for school districts and the relatively high cost of the coaching model as a professional development program, additional research is needed to determine the impact of the literacy coach model based on the number of years a teacher has taught and their ensuing experience level.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which a literacy coach had an effect on the teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to determine whether the literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improving classroom instruction as affected by building level (elementary, middle, or high school) or teacher experience (0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, or 21 years plus).

Significance of the Study

Positions that support teachers through coaching can cost a system several thousand dollars per teacher per year (Knight, 2007). Therefore, it is important that principals and district-level administrators understand the impact coaching has on

increasing teacher knowledge, improving classroom instruction, and increasing student achievement. The current study can add to the current body of research regarding teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of literacy coaching and the implementation of improved teaching strategies. The current study could add to the knowledge base about initiating and sustaining instructional leadership. Findings from this study could offer literacy coaches, principals, and district level administrators insight on how to improve the effectiveness of the literacy coach position, potentially allowing literacy coaches to be more successful in positively impacting teacher instruction.

Delimitations

Delimitations are the "self-imposed boundaries set by the researcher on the purpose and scope of the study" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 134). The delimitations for the current study were as follows:

- Only one urban district was used for this research.
- Participants included elementary, middle, and high school teachers in District XYZ who worked with a literacy coach.
- Data were collected during the 2013-2014 school year.

Assumptions

Assumptions help the researcher frame the study, interpret data, and provide significance for the conclusions (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008). The following assumptions were made in this study: (a) all respondents approached the survey in a serious manner and responded in an honest and accurate way, and (b) the literacy coach model was implemented in each school in the same way.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used to guide this study:

RQ1. To what extent is there a relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction?

RQ2. To what extent does the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among grade levels?

RQ3. To what extent is the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among teachers' years of experience?

RQ4. To what extent is the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction different among teachers' grade levels and years of experience?

Definition of Terms

This section of the study contains key terms that will be used throughout the study.

Coaching. Coaching is a strategy of professional development intended to engage educators in collaborative work designed to contribute to the growth of teacher's instructional ability (Neufeld & Roper, 2003).

Instructional coaching. "Instructional coaches work with teachers to help them incorporate research-based instructional practices… [which] help students learn more effectively" (Knight, 2007, p. 12).

Literacy coach. According to the Literacy Coach Clearinghouse (LCC, 2008), which is a joint venture between the ILA and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), a literacy coach is "a reading specialist who focuses on providing professional development for teachers by giving them the additional support needed to implement various instructional programs and practices" (para. 1). Furthermore, the LCC (2008) states a literacy coach should "provide essential leadership for a school's entire literacy program by helping create and supervise long-term staff development processes that support both the development and implementation of literacy programs" (para. 1).

Reading specialist. "Primary responsibility [of a reading specialist] is instruction of children who need additional support with literacy, sometimes as a part-time Title I teacher; as the only school reading professional may spend very little time coaching, modeling, and co-teaching" (Vogt & Shearer, 2007, pp. 190-191).

Overview of the Methodology

Archival data were used for the current study. A survey designed by District XYZ was used to evaluate the literacy coaching program during the 2013-2014 school year. Survey data included teachers' perceptions of their improvement in classroom instruction. The instrument was created by a multidisciplinary team from District XYZ. The independent variables included teachers' perceptions of improvement in classroom instruction, the literacy coach working with the teacher, the teachers' years of experience, and building level. Each hypothesis was tested using a chi-square test of independence.

Organization of the Study

The study is divided into five chapters. The background, statement of the problem, and the purpose and significance of the study were provided in chapter one. An overview of the delimitations, assumptions, research questions, definition of terms, and overview of the methodology were provided. In chapter two, the literature reviewed for the study is focused on the following areas as the main concepts for the study: the shift in professional development and adult learning, coaching as a school based professional development model, and the literacy coach model. The third chapter contains the methodology of the study. Additionally, chapter three contains the research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, measurement, validity and reliability, data collection procedures, data analysis, hypothesis testing and limitations of the study. In chapter four, the findings of the study are presented through the descriptive statistics and hypothesis testing results. The fifth chapter concludes the study by providing a summary of previous chapters, findings related to the research in the literature, and conclusions highlighting implications for action and recommendations for future research.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Due to the limited resources available to provide professional development to teachers and staff, schools are faced with tough decisions on how to maximize student learning. States, districts, and schools across the nation have embraced the coaching model as a means to strengthen instruction and improve student learning. Due to the rapid expansion of literacy coaching as a professional development model, federal, state, and local policymakers as well as district-level and school-level administrators have little data regarding the effectiveness and impact of coaching on teacher learning and student achievement (Russo, 2004).

A review of the related literature and a summary of key concepts as related to the current study are provided in this chapter. The literature review addresses adult learning and the change in teacher professional development, the characteristics of effective professional development, and professional development's impact on teacher learning. The review also focuses specifically on the various coaching models, particularly the definition and implementation of the literacy coach model. Finally, the relationship between the variety of roles and responsibilities taken on by literacy coaches, time spent working directly with teachers, and gains in student reading achievement are examined in the literature review.

Professional Development

Research regarding adult learning has brought attention to the effectiveness of professional development practices used by many districts and schools across the

country. Specifically, researchers have questioned the effectiveness of teacher participation in workshops and conferences led by an outside consultant, or in-service led by district personnel (Guskey, 2000; Neufeld & Roper, 2003). These forms of professional learning, commonly referred to as "sit and get," do little to influence classroom practice (Guskey, 2000; Knight, 2007; Lieberman, 1995; Neufeld & Roper, 2003). The scope of instructional approaches to support adult learning should include a wide range of opportunities to think critically, collaborate and solve problems with others, and the opportunity to use their own experiences. These approaches are often overlooked and underutilized when it comes to teachers as learners (Lieberman, 1995).

Policymakers and legislators have put new expectations for teacher professional development alongside the reform efforts focused on student learning. Specifically, legislation has been a significant contributor to these reform efforts by increasing demands for student achievement (Guskey, 2000). As a result, researchers have suggested a paradigm shift in teacher professional development.

For years, school district budgets allowed for a maximum of two or three school or district-wide programs each year. Typically, school districts focused their professional development on the expertise of external trainers. During these in-service sessions, teachers received professional development that may or may not have connected directly with their classroom instructional practices. The in-services do not offer participants any follow-up or ongoing support, which research has shown calls the effectiveness of this model into question (Bush, 1984; Guskey, 2000; Lawrence, 1974).

In one widely cited study, Lawrence (1974) found in-service programs consisting of a single session were largely ineffective. The research included a review of 97 studies and evaluation reports of teacher in-service education that were utilized to determine the characteristics of a successful program. Results indicated the in-service opportunities that have the best chance of being effective are those that allow teachers an opportunity to share with each other, to apply new learning, and involve feedback, all of which are not manageable during a one-time in-service (Lawrence, 1974). Similarly, according to a statement made in *Guidance for the Reading First Program* (U.S. Department of Education, 2002), a recommendation was made that professional development should be an "ongoing, continuous activity, and not consist of 'one-shot' workshops or lectures. Delivery mechanisms should include the use of coaches and other teachers of reading who provide feedback as instructional strategies are put into practice" (p. 26).

Shifts in professional development and adult learning. The most important result of professional development should be the transfer of newly learned knowledge and skills into a teacher's classroom practice (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). Researchers have identified commonalities in quality adult learning and professional development programs that focus on the need for continuous learning. Research has shown the ineffectiveness of the one-time in-service approach that is not accompanied by additional job-embedded relevant professional development, which meets the need for continuous learning (Bush, 1984; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Joyce & Showers, 1980, 2002; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997).

Joyce and Showers (1980) were among the earliest researchers to hypothesize that the integration of new skills and strategies with classroom practice would require continuous learning through on-site coaching as an additional training component. Through the analysis of more than 200 studies in which researchers investigated the effectiveness of various training methods, Joyce and Showers (1980) found certain training elements improved a teacher's ability to transfer new knowledge and skills to classroom practice. Joyce and Showers (1980) determined effective professional development should be comprised of three elements, including the study of the theory behind the skill or strategy, the opportunity to observe the skill or strategy being used multiple times with students, and the opportunity to practice the skill with students and receive feedback. The last two elements, observing multiple demonstrations and having the opportunity to practice a skill in their classroom and receive feedback, created a paradigm shift in professional development through the addition of on-site coaching to the training sequence (Joyce & Showers, 1980).

In another widely cited study determining the effectiveness of professional development, Bush (1984) examined the potential impact a workshop had on a teacher's ability to adopt and implement a new strategy into classroom instruction. Based upon teacher, principal, and superintendent interview data collected over the course of five years from 20 school districts in the state of California, the findings from this study showed only 10% of teachers successfully implemented a new skill or strategy in their classroom when given a presentation on the theory of the new strategy. Bush also found that successful teacher implementation could be increased to 13% if the skill or strategy

was demonstrated for the teacher. Teachers given a chance to practice in a controlled situation demonstrated a 16% increase in effectiveness when using the skill in the classroom. This rose to a 19% increase for teachers who implemented the new skill when the teacher received feedback while practicing the new skills. Bush (1984) reported if teachers were provided instruction that included theory, modeling, practice, feedback, and site-based support, the rate of implementation increased to 95%. Given the significant increase in successful implementation when provided with the right support, studies such as this demonstrate the important role job-embedded professional development in developing a teachers' ability to adapt newly learned strategies into their classroom instruction (Bush, 1984).

From emerging research on professional development, Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) further examined the essential characteristics of an effective teacher professional development program. A common theme in their review was the departure from traditional, one-day in-service training to a more collaborative and sustained approach supported by on-site coaching. From the principles they presented, Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) stated professional development must "be sustained, ongoing, intensive, and supported by modeling, coaching, and the collective solving of specific problems of practice" (p. 598).

Sparks and Hirsh (1997), through a review of the emerging research on professional development, provided key shifts which would help educators continue to move away from the traditional workshop approach. Many of the shifts, such as creating professional development that is results-driven, standards-based, and focused on content

and content specific pedagogy, placed the focus of the professional development effort squarely on what students need to learn. The other major shift Sparks and Hirsh (1997) included in this new vision of professional development was the need for professional development to be continuous, site-based, and job-embedded. They explained that while workshops and external trainers have their place in a comprehensive professional development effort, the type of learning teachers need to affect change should take place during the school day through coaching and study groups who collaboratively review student data and plan for learning (Sparks & Hirsh, 1997).

The first edition of *Student Achievement through Staff Development* (Joyce & Showers, 1988) reported that professional development was not as effective in the transfer of knowledge and skills into classroom practice without the accompaniment of some form of in-school coaching. Fourteen years later, Joyce and Showers (2002) published the same book in its third edition as a continuation of their review of research on training design and their hypotheses related to the transfer of new learning into classroom practice. They noted that during the 14 years between the first and third edition of their books, one of the biggest shifts in the field of professional development has been that "the duration and intensity of many training events have greatly increased, including various forms of follow-up and continuing technical support" (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 69).

The model of adult learning proposed by Joyce and Showers (2002) clearly supports the literacy coach model. For instance, the first component of the model focuses on theory, which involves teacher understanding of the concepts behind a new skill or

strategy through a variety of discussions, readings, and lectures. Demonstration is the second component, which provides opportunities for teachers to observe the skills and strategies students are being taught in the classroom. The third component is focused on practice. To be able to successfully integrate a particular teaching strategy or technique into classroom practice, teachers must practice the newly acquired skills in front of other teachers or small groups of students (Joyce & Showers, 2002). For example, Joyce and Showers (2002) point out "to bring a teaching model of medium complexity under control requires 20 or 25 trials in the classroom over a period of about 8-10 weeks" (p. 74). The fourth training component is in-class coaching. This involves a teacher and coach working collaboratively as new skills are learned and implemented. The goal of the in-class coaching component is to be able to solve problems and seek solutions when they arise during the implementation of a particular teaching strategy or technique (Joyce & Showers, 2002).

Joyce and Showers (2002) found the percentage of participants likely to attain a new concept increased when training components were employed. For example, when demonstration and practice were added to the study of theory, significant increases were noted in teacher knowledge and skills. Similarly, when the four training components were present, not only was there a significant increase in knowledge and skill, but teacher's ability to transfer the particular strategy or technique to consistent implementation in their classroom also increased dramatically (Joyce & Showers, 2002).

Coaching as school-based professional development. In 2001, to help guide professional development efforts, the National Staff Development Council (NSDC),

along with 40 other professional associations and education organizations, developed the 12 Standards for Professional Learning. The concept of coaching relates directly with five of the 12 NSDC (2001) standards:

- Learning Communities: "organizes adults into communities of learners whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district" (p. 1).
- Leadership: "requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement" (p. 2).
- Resources: "requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration" (p. 3).
- Learning: "applies knowledge about human learning and change" (p. 8).
- Collaboration: "provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate" (p. 9).

In addition, an effective coach has the potential to address the rest of the NSDC (2001) standards:

- Data-driven: "uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement" (p.4).
- Evaluation: "uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact" (p. 4).
- Research-based: "prepares educators to apply research to decision making" (p. 6).
- Design: "uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal" (p. 7).

- Equity: “prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement” (p. 10).
- Quality teaching: “deepens educators’ content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately” (p. 11).
- Family involvement: “provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately” (p. 12).

Thus, the coaching model is consistent with all NSDC standards for effective professional development. For this reason, as districts across the country work to improve a teacher’s instructional ability, the coaching model is increasingly used to lead professional development. The Center on Education Policy (2006) reported 60% of school districts in 2004-2005 had adopted some form of coaching as a professional development vehicle. Terms like content coaching, change coaching, technical coaching, collegial coaching, challenge coaching, team coaching, cognitive coaching, peer coaching, and instructional coaching have all been observed in the literature. According to Neufeld and Roper (2003), no matter what the coaching model is called, it can be described as a strategy of professional development intended to engage educators in collaborative work designed to contribute to the growth of a teacher’s instructional ability.

Content area coaches. For the purpose of the current study, which is focused solely on content coaching in the area of literacy, the following explanation further defines the role of a content coach in school-based professional development. Content coaches are defined by their focus on discipline-based instructional improvement. In particular, content coaches focus on a specific academic discipline, such as literacy or mathematics.

Content coaches, as described by Neufeld and Roper (2003), participated in a variety of activities at both the school and classroom level. For instance, at the school level content coaches assist as teachers take what they have learned about new instructional strategies into their classroom. When challenges or questions arise about the new strategy, the content coach is available as support. Also, at the school level, content coaches help teachers learn about formative assessments, review data with teachers to inform instruction, plan and conduct professional development, and work with the principal to plan future goal setting.

At the classroom level, content coaches help create a safe environment free of the negative criticism that is so often associated with evaluation for teachers to improve their practice (Neufeld & Roper, 2003). To do this, they engage teachers in planning and implementing lessons, developing and finding curriculum materials and resources, encouraging conversations centered on best practice, demonstrating specific strategies and lessons in the classroom, and observing classrooms to provide feedback about strategies and practice. Content teachers also meet with individual grade-level teams and provide small group professional development (Neufeld & Roper, 2003).

The majority of the literature on the use of coaching as a professional development model defines the skills a coach needs to effectively work with teachers. In addition to being highly knowledgeable in their content area, it is important for an effective coach to have additional characteristics. Overall, researchers conclude a highly qualified coach is essential to a successful coaching program (Kowal & Steiner, 2007).

Characteristics of an effective coach. The common skills of an effective coach have been summarized in recent literature and include three broad categories: pedagogical knowledge, interpersonal skills, and content expertise (Kowal & Steiner, 2007). Dole (2004) outlined the deep pedagogical knowledge and large understanding of instructional strategies coaches need to be able to draw upon to improve student learning. Through interview data collected from a small group of literacy coaches, Dole (2004) found that the coach's ability to develop and implement instructional strategies makes the coach more likely to earn the trust of teachers, which aids in their development as educators. Furthermore, Dole (2004) found that to lead, teachers felt coaches needed to understand the classroom structures that best promote student learning.

According to Knight (2007), "coaching is about building relationships with teachers as much as it is about instruction" (p. 33). The importance of "people skills" required for a coach to be successful is nearly unanimous in the research (Ertmer et al., 2005; Knight, 2004, 2007). Using survey data collected from 107 teachers who had observed an instructional coach within the past year, the Center for Research on Learning at the University of Kansas found that if the coach was able to build strong relationships,

communicate clearly, and establish trust and credibility with teachers, teachers reported being encouraged and inspired to improve their teaching practices (Knight, 2004).

Research has shown that coaches also identify interpersonal skills as integral to their role. For example, Ertmer et al. (2005) used interview data from 31 coaches to examine coaches' perceptions of the knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics needed to be a successful coach. All respondents highlighted interpersonal skills as being important. Twenty-four of the 31 coaches emphasized that interpersonal skills, which they summarized as building relationships, fostering trust, and establishing credibility, were the most important characteristics of a coach. Once established, coaches reported these relationships helped them use their content expertise to facilitate changes in teachers' classroom practice (Ertmer et al., 2005).

The literature on effective coaches states that along with strong pedagogical knowledge and interpersonal skills, coaches must also possess a deep understanding of their content area (ILA, 2010; Poglinco et al., 2003). For example, the ILA (2010) revised their standards for reading specialists to also include literacy coaches. The reasoning behind the update was to ensure that literacy coaches have the same content expertise as a reading specialist (ILA, 2010). According to the standards, literacy coaches need a high understanding of the evidence-based foundations of the reading and writing process. The ILA's standards further specify the need for literacy coaches to be experts in supporting student learning in reading by integrating a comprehensive, balanced curriculum.

The Literacy Coach Model

Given the wide range of coaching models and lack of consistent interpretation, it is important that literacy coaches, administrators, and policymakers have a clear definition of the literacy coach model. According to Toll (2005), a literacy coach has several main responsibilities.

> A literacy coach is one who helps teachers to recognize what they know and can do, assists teachers as they strengthen their ability to make more effective use of what they know and do, and supports teachers as they learn more and do more. (p. 4)

In Vogt and Shearer's (2007) definition of the literacy coach model, the primary responsibility of a literacy coach is to support teachers through individual or group professional development, and to model, confer, coach, and observe teachers to help improve instructional practice. Barbara Chesler, a member of the IRA Standards and Ethics Committee, stated that "literacy coaches are leaders in their schools in providing professional development and support to classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in the areas of reading and writing" (as cited in The Reading Coach, 2004, p. 3). It is important to note that within all of these definitions, there is a critical emphasis placed on working with teachers. Even if the overall desired outcome is raising student performance, the literacy coach still needs to focus on teachers to help achieve that goal (Toll, 2005; Vogt & Shearer, 2007). A number of organizations that seek to develop teacher quality, such as the ILA, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), and

the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), have developed literacy coach standards and outlined roles and responsibilities to help implement quality coaching programs.

The ILA used a meta-analysis of research syntheses to summarize both historical and emerging research findings on literacy instruction. This research helped define the six standards, which include foundational knowledge, curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, diversity, literate environment, and professional learning and leadership (ILA, 2010). In addition to standards, the ILA (2010) also provided an outline of the roles of a literacy coach, such as supporting teacher learning, and developing, leading, and evaluating the school's literacy programs.

In 2006, key organizations representing secondary school teachers collaborated to specify what literacy coaches must know and be skillful in to effectively train different content area teachers in literacy techniques. This partnership included the National Council of Teachers of English, the International Reading Association, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Science Teachers Association, and the National Council for the Social Studies. The resulting *Standards for Middle and High School Literacy Coaches* are meant to complement the ILA's *Standards for Reading Professionals*, which were developed for literacy coaches but did not include issues related to content area knowledge (IRA, 2006).

To codify the skills and knowledge needed by secondary school literacy coaches, representatives from each organization gathered empirical evidence over the course of a year and a half. The resulting standards are divided into two parts: leadership standards

and content area literacy standards. The leadership standards include the following three literacy coach competencies: skillful collaborators, skillful job-embedded coaches, and skillful evaluators of literacy needs. The skillful collaborator standard outlines the literacy coach's role as one who collaborates with the school's literacy team to determine strengths and areas of need to improve student's literacy skills. The skillful job-embedded coach standard calls for literacy coaches to work with teachers individually, in collaborative teams, or with departments, to provide support on a wide range of literacy strategies. Another role included in this standard is for literacy coaches to observe and provide feedback on instruction related to literacy. The skillful evaluator of literacy needs standard outlines the literacy coach's role as one who leads faculty in the selection and use of assessment tools to determine student literacy weaknesses and then conducts regular meetings with content area teachers to review assessment data and monitor student progress (IRA, 2006).

The content area literacy standard contains just one competency for a secondary literacy coach to be a skillful instructional strategist. The content area literacy standard specifies the role of the literacy coach as one who understands and demonstrates multiple comprehension strategies within the disciplines of mathematics, science, social studies, and English language arts. Furthermore, the role of the literacy coach is to collaborate with the content area teacher to incorporate literacy strategies in their discipline (IRA, 2006). Despite the guidelines provided by the *Standards for Reading Professionals* and the *Standards for Middle and High School Literacy Coaches* to help guide quality literacy coaching programs, research shows great diversity in how teachers, coaches, and

administrators view the day-to-day roles and responsibilities of literacy coaches (Deussen, Coskie, Robinson, & Autio, 2007; Feldman & Tung, 2002; Marsh et al., 2008; Moss et al., 2008; Poglinco et al., 2003; Vanderburg & Stephens, 2009).

Literacy coach roles and responsibilities. Feldman and Tung (2002) investigated teacher perceptions of the roles, activities, and impact their school's literacy coach had on the school's reform efforts. The study was centered on the interviews of 75 teachers from five schools who received coaching from the Center for Collaborative Education in Boston, Massachusetts. The findings of the study showed teachers perceived the literacy coach as playing an integral role in effecting school change. The reason stated was that the literacy coach engaged teachers in activities such as reviewing student work, planning for instruction, and engaging in data-based inquiry, all of which teachers perceived as beneficial to improving instructional practice (Feldman & Tung, 2002).

In one of the most widely cited studies exploring the roles and responsibilities of the literacy coach model, Poglinco et al. (2003) identified trends in the implementation and impact of literacy coaching within America's Choice schools. As part of an annual evaluation of America's Choice schools, the study used both qualitative and quantitative data to show the impact of the literacy coach model on teachers and students. The data collected by CPRE included surveys of teachers and administrators in America's Choice schools from across the country, site visits to observe classroom instruction, interviews of teachers, students, and school administrators, observations of national, regional, and school-level professional development, and a collection of student performance measures

(Poglinco et al., 2003). According to the findings from the study, literacy coaches felt there was a not a clear definition of the literacy coach role, which made their job difficult and caused confusion about their role with teachers and administrators. Moreover, Poglinco et al. (2003) reported most coaches came to understand their role while on the job.

> Most coaches understood their jobs to include: setting up a model classroom, modeling America's Choice instructional techniques to teachers with students in a classroom setting, conveying information to teachers about America's Choice through teacher meetings, and generally serving as a resource to teachers implementing writers and readers workshops in their classrooms. (p. 10)

The literacy coaches in the study also reported a substantial difference in the amount of time within their role should be divided between planning with teachers, teacher observation, and feedback to teachers. This suggests there was a substantial variance in the day-to-day roles of literacy coaches within America's Choice schools (Poglinco et al., 2003).

In another extensively cited study exploring the roles and responsibilities of the literacy coach model, Deussen, Coskie, Robinson, and Autio (2007) examined data collected from 203 Reading First schools in five western states (Alaska, Arizona, Montana, Washington, and Wyoming). The collected data included surveys and interviews administered to K-3 teachers and literacy coaches at Reading First schools. Deussen et al. (2007) found that while literacy coaches handled similar responsibilities, and for the most part performed the same tasks, the amount of time allocated to a specific

task varied greatly among coaches. Furthermore, utilizing a cluster and qualitative analysis, the researchers categorized the literacy coaches as either data-oriented, managerial-oriented, student-oriented, individual teacher-oriented, or teacher group-oriented (Deussen et al., 2007). If a literacy coach was categorized as data-oriented, they spent an average of 45% of each week on data-related tasks. Literacy coaches who were categorized as managerial-oriented spent the majority of their time facilitating meetings and keeping systems running in their schools. If a literacy coach was categorized as student oriented, they reported seeing their work with students as central to their role. Student-oriented literacy coaches, on average, spent just 14% of their time working with teachers. Teacher-oriented literacy coaches spent between 41-52% of their time working directly with teachers. The teacher-oriented literacy coaches could then be categorized as either individual or group oriented, with many working with small groups of teachers and approximately one-third tending to work with individual teachers (Deussen et al., 2007). Overall, the variation of different orientations among coaches is significant because even though they held the same job, the literacy coaches defined and performed their work in a variety of different ways (Deussen et al., 2007).

Another study, which suggested the day-to-day work and roles of literacy coaches assumed a variety of forms, was conducted by Marsh et al. (2008). The study was designed to review the statewide Florida literacy coach program. Established in 2001, the Just Read, Florida! (JRF) initiative set the goal of having all students read at or above grade level by 2012. To support the effort of JRF, the state allocated funds to districts to hire full-time, site-based literacy coaches. Marsh et al. (2008) analyzed data gathered

during 2006-2007 to understand how literacy coaching was being implemented across the state and the perceived effects of the literacy coach. Data included surveys of principals, coaches, and teachers in 113 middle schools in eight large Florida districts. The data also included two case studies, which was comprised of interviews, focus groups, and observation in six Florida schools. Coaches reported dividing their time among a range of activities, which could be categorized into six areas: "formal instructional work with teachers, informal coaching, coaching-related administrative work, data analysis, non-coaching administrative duties, and their own professional development" (p. 82). Of particular interest in their findings, Marsh et al. (2008) reported that literacy coaches viewed their number one role as working with individual teachers on instruction. Despite this view, the results showed the time spent on working with individual teachers did not represent half of their overall time, as the state of Florida encouraged in the JRF initiative (Marsh et al., 2008).

The authors of the Reading First Implementation Evaluation Final Report also investigated the day-to-day work and roles of literacy coaches (Moss et al., 2008). The study included survey data from 1,600 school-based Reading First coaches, principals, and teachers in nationally representative samples of Reading First schools and non-Reading First schools. A portion of the study focused on the roles literacy coaches viewed as important to their jobs. From the findings, the researchers concluded the literacy coach role in both Reading First and non-Reading First schools were divided into three categories: roles that support teachers' instruction, administrative and school support roles, and teacher support roles (Moss et al., 2008).

Similar to the previous studies, Vanderburg and Stephens (2009) researched the work literacy coaches participated in and their role in improving instructional practice. Thirty-five teachers, participants in the South Carolina Reading Initiative who had worked with the same literacy coach for three or more years, were interviewed to determine their perceptions on the roles and responsibilities of the literacy coach. Specifically, the researchers sought to understand what specific coach-initiated changes the teachers made in their practices and which literacy coach roles the teachers considered most helpful. According to the interview data, Vanderburg and Stephens (2009) found that because of their coach, most teachers:

> (1) were willing to try more things in their classroom, (2) used more authentic means of assessing student needs, (3) modified instruction based on students' needs, and (4) changed their beliefs and philosophies based on the educational theory and research they read. (p. 1)

For instance, all 35 teachers in the study felt that, because of their coach, they experimented with more new strategies than they would have tried in the past. Similarly, most of the teachers (28 out of 35) discussed how the literacy coach helped them learn about the research behind an instructional strategy, which led them to use more research-based practices (Vanderburg & Stephens, 2009). With regard to which coaching roles teachers valued the most, the researchers found teachers felt creating ways for them to collaborate, teaching them about research-based practices, and providing them with ongoing support were most helpful. For instance, 25 of the 35 teachers commented on how much they valued collaboration with the literacy coach and their team, because it

provided them with the time to share the strategies they were employing in their classrooms and discuss the needs of individual students (Vanderburg & Stephens, 2009).

Time as a barrier to the literacy coach model. Since the literacy coach model is aimed at providing ongoing, job-embedded professional development for teachers, the amount of time coaches spend with teachers is a critical element. In a study of literacy coaching in schools that received a Reading First grant, Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) investigated the relationship between the amount of time the literacy coach spent directly working with teachers and student reading gains in those teachers' classrooms. The study was conducted in a large urban school district in its first year of a Reading First grant. Participants included 12 literacy coaches, 121 K-3 classroom teachers whom worked with the literacy coaches, and 3,029 students in those teachers' classrooms. The data sources for the study included a structured literacy coaching log to determine how coaches spent their time and student pre- and post-test scores to measure student reading gains. From this data, Elish-Piper and L'Allier (2011) found that the highest average student reading gains occurred in classrooms where a literacy coach spent the most time and consequently had the most interactions. From the four grade levels included in the study, the total number of coaching hours was a significant predictor of student reading gains in Kindergarten and second grade (Elish-Piper & L'Allier, 2011). The findings from this study established a relationship between the amount of time a literacy coach spent with a teacher and student reading gains. Even with the promising findings of studies such as the one cited above, many coaches spent a great deal of time on other tasks (Deussen et al., 2007; Elish-Piper & L'Allier, 2011; Poglinco et al., 2003; Roller, 2006).

In addition to exploring the literacy coach role in America's Choice schools, Poglinco et al. (2003) explored the relationship between the amount of time the literacy coach spent directly working with teachers and teacher perceptions of improved classroom instruction. Results indicate that the wide interpretation of literacy coach's roles caused teachers to perceive there being an overall lack of time spent on coaching roles, which teachers felt negatively reflected on the ability of the literacy coach to impact instructional practice. Time continued to play an important role in teacher perceptions of the literacy coach model in teacher's ability to have individual interactions with the coach. The results showed that teachers often believed individual interactions were the most effective part of the literacy coach model. Finally, Poglinco et al. (2003) reported coach accessibility as a major factor in how teachers perceived the literacy coach model. As reflected in their teacher interviews, coach accessibility had a major influence on how supported teachers felt when implementing new strategies in their classroom.

In another broadly cited study exploring the literacy coach model, Roller (2006) examined survey data to determine what responsibilities and qualifications literacy coaches were required to have for their positions. From a data set including survey results from 182 literacy coaches, Roller (2006) found that coaches spent more time on assessment and instructional planning activities than on working with individual teachers. Literacy coaches reported spending close to five hours per week, on average, working on assessment and instructional planning activities and between two to four hours preparing and conducting professional development sessions. When asked about working with

individual teachers, Roller (2006) found coaches spent two to four hours discussing lessons taught, observing, and in demonstration teaching. In terms of supporting teachers during lesson planning, respondents reported spending less than an hour per week in preparing specific lessons with teachers, which was less than 15% of a 40-hour work week (Roller, 2006).

Deussen et al. (2007) found coaches in other settings showed a slightly longer amount of time spent with teachers. Using data collected from 203 Reading First schools, the researchers found the literacy coaches spent on average 28% of their time in the classroom with teachers or working with teachers directly on their classroom instruction. The tasks that filled up the other 72% of the coaches' time included meetings, student interventions, working with data, and documentation (Deussen et al., 2007). These findings deviate sharply from the 60% to 80% of time some states stipulate literacy coaches funded by a Reading First grant should be working directly with teachers (Deussen et al., 2007).

The Literacy Coach Model and Gains in Student Achievement

Although a large base of research has been established on the variety of literacy coaches' roles and how they spend their time, there has been limited research linking the literacy coach's role to gains in student achievement. While studies similar to Elish-Piper and L'Allier's (2011) investigation have shown literacy coaching can make a significant impact on student reading achievement, other studies have found little to no impact. A study of the state-wide literacy coach program in Florida middle schools investigated the relationship between literacy coaching, increased classroom practice, and student

achievement gains. Marsh et al. (2008) used both qualitative and quantitative research methods to document the effects of coaching on student achievement. Researchers found the majority of reading and social studies teachers in the study reported the literacy coach had a positive impact on their knowledge of effective classroom practice (Marsh et al., 2008). Furthermore, 40% of social studies teachers and 47% of reading teachers characterized the literacy coach's influence on their classroom practice as "moderate to great" in scale (Marsh et al., 2008). In terms of the relationship between literacy coaching and student achievement gains, Marsh et al. (2008) reported that the evidence was inconclusive regarding the impact of coaching on achievement. Working with a coach was associated with small but significant improvements in reading scores for half of the cohort analyzed (Marsh et al., 2008). The researchers also found a small, but significant relationship between how often the literacy coach reviewed reading assessment data and an increase in student reading scores (Marsh et al., 2008).

Other studies have found no positive effects associated with literacy coaching. Garet et al. (2008) examined the impact of two research-based professional development interventions for reading instruction. One of the professional development interventions, referred to as treatment A, included a teacher institute series that began in the summer and then continued through the school year. The other professional development intervention, treatment B, was the same institute series plus access to a site-based literacy coach. Researchers used data collected from 270 teachers in 90 schools in six districts, with equal numbers of schools randomly assigned to treatment A, treatment B, and a control group. Key findings from the study were that : (a) although there was a positive

impact on teacher's knowledge of reading instruction, neither of the two professional development interventions resulted in significantly higher assessment scores at the end of the one-year study; (b) the addition of a site-based literacy coach did not have a statistically significant impact on teacher classroom practice; and that (c) the following year, there was no statistically significant impact on students' assessment results (Garet et al., 2008).

Similar to studies such as those cited, the research linking the relationship between the literacy coach model and student achievement gains is still emerging. Overall, throughout the shift in teacher support, from one-time in-services to continuous, on-site coaching, school districts have invested a great deal of human and financial capital into trying to create effective professional development. Therefore, it is important to evaluate how influential the professional development is on teacher learning and improved classroom practice.

Evaluating Professional Development

The billions of dollars spent on professional development in the United States reveal that continuing education is a big business (Hill, 2009). With estimates placing the figure between 1%-6% of total district expenditures (Hertert, 1997; Killeen, Monk, & Plecki, 2002; Odden, Archibald, Fermanich, & Gallagher, 2002), it is no wonder that legislators, researchers, and school leaders see the importance of evaluating professional development to ensure its effectiveness. The call for rigorous evaluation of professional development programs has become so strong that an evaluation component was written

into the federal NCLB Act, some state legislation, and standardized by groups like NSCD (NCLB, 2001; NSCD, 2001; School Community Professional Development Act of 2014).

No Child Left Behind (2001), for instance, states professional development programs will be "regularly evaluated for their impact on increased teacher effectiveness and improved student academic achievement, with the findings of the evaluations used to improve the quality of professional development" (Sec 9101.34.a). The call for evaluating professional development has also been made on the state level. For example, in the School Community Professional Development Act of 2014, Florida enacted legislation which requires schools and districts to "provide for the continuous evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of professional development programs in order to eliminate ineffective programs and strategies and to expand effective ones" (Sec. 1012.98.8). The NSCD (2001) has also stressed the importance of evaluation by including it as one of their 12 Standards for Staff Development. As part of the process standards, NSDC describes evaluation as "staff development that improves the learning of all students and uses multiple sources of information to guide improvements and demonstrate its impact" (p. 5).

Even with the call to evaluate professional development by NSDC, state, and federal legislations, evaluating the impact of professional development is often reported as the weakest link in the professional development chain (Guskey, 2000). Furthermore, since the focus of professional development has been event-driven professional development activities such as seminars, workshops and speakers, it is important to remember that less formal ongoing, job-embedded professional development activities

such as coaching need to be evaluated as well to make sure the activities are achieving their purposes (Guskey, 2002).

Guskey (2000) indicated effective professional development evaluations require the collection of five critical levels of information: participant's reactions, participant's learnings, organizational support and change, participants' use of new knowledge, and student learning outcomes. Guskey explained that with each succeeding level, the gathering of evaluation information becomes more complex, and that success at each level is imperative. In the five levels of professional development evaluation, teacher perception is a central component of what is measured. For example, in levels 1 and 2, the evaluations measure the teacher's perceptions and reactions to the professional development activities. In level 3, the evaluations measure the teacher's perceptions of the culture of the organization in how it approaches professional development. In levels 4 and 5, the evaluations measure the effectiveness of the professional development based on the teachers' perception of their ability to implement the new knowledge and its ultimate impact on student achievement (Guskey, 2000).

Since the literacy coach model distinctly focuses on teachers improving their instructional practice, it is important to include teacher perceptions in the evaluation of the literacy coach model. Researchers acknowledge it is best to study the impact of professional development on the growth of teacher knowledge only, because "to have an impact on student achievement of a detectable magnitude, the impact on teacher knowledge must be quite substantial" (Wayne, Yoon, Zhu, Cronen, & Garet, 2008, p.

476). For these reasons, the current study was focused solely on determining teacher perception of the literacy coach model.

Summary

The pertinent literature specific to the study in the area of professional development and literacy coaching was reviewed in this chapter. The shift in professional development was analyzed and the characteristics and standards for effective professional development were identified. The characteristics of effective coaching models were summarized and the literacy coach model was specifically explored. Studies related to literacy coaching roles, responsibilities, time the literacy coach spent directly working with teachers, and subsequent gains in student reading achievement were highlighted. The methodology used in this study is presented in chapter three, along with the research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, measurement, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations.

Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study was to determine whether a literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improved classroom instruction. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to determine whether the literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improving classroom instruction as affected by building level or teacher experience. In this chapter, the methodology used to conduct the research study is presented. The chapter also includes the research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations of the research. A detailed overview of the survey used to gather data, including its measurement, reliability and validity, is included.

Research Design

A quantitative, non-experimental survey design was used for this study. According to Creswell (2009), a quantitative survey is a "means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables" (p. 4). The dependent variable was teachers' perceptions regarding the difference literacy coaches made as measured by the district designed survey. The independent variables of the study were teacher experience and teacher building level.

Population and Sample

The population selected for the current study were elementary, middle, and high school teachers in District XYZ with the literacy coach model in each school. The sample for the study included 711 teachers from District XYZ.

Sampling Procedures

The sampling for this study was purposive rather than random. Choosing the subjects purposively "involves selecting a sample based on the researcher's experience or knowledge of the group to be sampled" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 175). Only data from teachers in District XYZ working with literacy coaches were included in this study.

Instrumentation

The instrumentation for the study was a survey for elementary, middle, and high school teachers (See Appendix A). The survey used for the study was created, piloted, and administered to all teachers in District XYZ. The teacher survey contains four sections, including general demographic information about the teachers, teacher perception of the amount of time the literacy coach spent in the teacher's classroom, teacher perception of the types of activities the literacy coach was involved with, and teacher perception of the influence literacy coaches had on improving classroom instruction.

Measurement. Items in the first section of the survey utilized a list of choices. Participants indicated their years of teaching experience (0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20 or 21 years) in item 1. Item 2 was used to determine the respondent's building level (Elementary, Middle, or High School). Item 3 was used to determine the respondent's current position (Elementary Classroom Teacher, Other Teacher, Pre-K Classroom Teacher, Secondary (6-12) English Language Arts, Secondary (6-12) Mathematics, Secondary (6-12) Science, Secondary (6-12) Social Studies, Support Staff, and Support Teacher). Item 4 was used to determine if a mathematics coach was assigned full-time or

part-time in the respondent's building. Item 5 was used to determine if a literacy coach was assigned full-time or part-time in the respondent's building.

In the second section of the survey, participants were asked to quantify the number of hours per month a coach worked with them. For item 6, respondents approximated how many hours per month they worked one-on-one with their math coach during the year. For item 7, respondents approximated how many hours per month they worked with their literacy coach one on one during the year. For item 8, respondents approximated how many hours per month they worked in collaborative groups with their math coach during the year. For item 9, respondents approximated how many hours per month they worked in collaborative groups with their literacy coach during the year.

In the third section of the survey, a Likert-type scale was used to determine a teacher's perception of how frequently they participated in particular activities with the math and literacy coach and to rate how useful those activities were toward improving classroom instruction. For the items, a 4-point Likert-type scale was used with the following anchors: *Never*, *Rarely*, *Sometimes*, and *Often*. For items 10 and 11, participants rated how frequently they engaged in the following activities with the math coach and literacy coach, respectively: collaborative problem solving, reflective conversations, analyzing student work, observations, providing professional development, co-teaching, co-planning, attending collaboration meetings, engaging teachers in the coaching cycle, and modeling a lesson. For item 12, participants rated the following coaching activities on usefulness toward improving classroom instruction: collaborative problem solving, reflective conversations, analyzing student work,

observations, providing professional development, co-teaching, co-planning, attending collaboration meetings, engaging teachers in the coaching cycle, and modeling a lesson.

In the fourth section of the survey, a Likert-type scale was used to determine teacher perception of how influential the coaching activities were on improving the teacher's classroom instruction. Participants were asked to respond by selecting one of the following choices: *Not Useful, Somewhat Useful, Useful, Very Useful,* and *Not Sure or Not Applicable*. The following activities were listed: collaborative problem solving, reflective conversations, analyzing student work, observations, providing professional development, co-teaching, co-planning, attending collaboration meetings, engaging teachers in the coaching cycle, and modeling a lesson. For the third item, participants rated the following coaching activities on usefulness toward improving classroom instruction: collaborative problem solving, reflective conversations, analyzing student work, observations, providing professional development, co-teaching, co-planning, attending collaboration meetings, engaging teachers in the coaching cycle, and modeling a lesson.

In the fifth section of the survey, participants were asked to respond by selecting *Yes* or *No*. The following statements were included in this section:

- Resources and feedback are provided in a reasonable time from our building coaches.
- Our building math coach has a good understanding of my students, their needs, and the type of assistance and instructional support I need.

- Our building literacy coach has a good understanding of my students, their needs, and the type of assistance and instructional support I need.
- Our building math coach has a good understanding of the mathematics content they provide.
- Our building literacy coach has a good understanding of the English Language Arts content they provide.
- Our building math coach has been influential in helping me improve my classroom instruction.
- Our building literacy coach has been influential in helping me improve my classroom instruction.

In the sixth section of the survey, a Likert-type scale was used to determine teachers' perceptions of how effective the district's coaching model was in changing instructional practices and improving student's achievement. Participants were asked to respond with the following choices: *Not Effective*, *Effective,* and *Highly Effective*.

Validity and reliability. For an instrument to be valid and reliable, it needs to be consistent in each of its applications and measure accurately what it is intended to measure (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008). A multidisciplinary team from District XYZ piloted the survey to establish content validity. The team included teachers, administrators, and coaches. The survey was sent to the team to determine if the survey would be comprehensible to teachers who would be asked to participate in the research. Reliability of the survey data was conducted as part of the current study and results are reported in chapter four.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission was obtained to conduct the present study through a 2-step process. First, the process to obtain permission from the Baker University Institutional Review Board (IRB) was initiated. The IRB request was submitted to Baker University on May 11, 2015 through electronic mail (see Appendix B). Approval was granted to conduct research from the IRB committee of Baker University on May 22, 2015 (see Appendix C). Next, permission was obtained to conduct the study in District XYZ. A Research Proposal Application was electronically mailed on May 14, 2015 (see Appendix D). After examination of the research proposal, written permission to conduct the research was received on May 21, 2015 through electronic mail (see Appendix E).

Archival data were secured from District XYZ. The teacher names and building identification were omitted for confidentiality purposes. The data were organized in an Excel document for the convenience of organization and input into IBM® SPSS® Faculty Pack 23 for Windows for data analysis.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was used to examine relationships among the teachers' perceptions of improvement in classroom instruction, the teachers' years of experience, and the teacher's building levels.

RQ1. To what extent is there a relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction?

H1. There is a relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction.

A chi-square test of independence was used to test H1. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ2. To what extent does the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among grade levels?

H2. There is a difference in the perceptions of elementary teachers who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

H3. There is a difference in the perceptions of middle school teachers who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

H4. There is a difference in the perceptions of high school teachers who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

Chi-square tests of independence were used to test H2, H3, and H4. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ3. To what extent is the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among teachers' years of experience?

H5. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 0-5 years of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

H6. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

H7. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 11-15 years of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

H8. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

H9. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 21 years plus of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

Chi-square tests of independence were used to test H5-H9. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ4. To what extent is the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction different among teachers' grade levels and years of experience?

H10. The relationships between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among teachers' grade levels and years of experience.

A chi-square test of independence was used to test H10. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

Limitations

Limitations are factors in a study that "may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings or on the generalizability of the results" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 133). The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. Participants who are new to the district or have less than one year of teaching in the district might not understand or be comfortable completing the survey.
2. The survey used to assess teachers and coaches' perceptions was created by the district.

Summary

Restated in this chapter was the purpose of the study, which was to determine whether a literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improved classroom instruction. The quantitative research design was explained. Four research questions were presented, and ten hypotheses were formulated. The participants were teachers from District XYZ, and the sampling procedure was purposive. A 23-item survey consisting of six sections was used to measure the variables. The six sections of the survey included demographic information, the amount of hours per month a literacy coach worked with the teacher, identification of the types of activities the teacher and coach completed together, and identification of teacher perceptions on how influential the literacy coach was on improving the teacher's classroom instruction and improving student achievement. Data analyses and hypothesis testing were explained, along with the limitations of the study. The results of the data analyses are presented in the next chapter.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this research was to analyze whether a literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improved classroom instruction. The research was also conducted to further determine whether a teacher's building level or years of teaching experience impacted the teacher's perception of the literacy coach improving their classroom instruction. Presented in chapter four are the descriptive statistics for the sample and the results of the data analysis for the hypotheses associated with each of the research questions posed in the study. Chi-square tests were utilized to test the research hypotheses.

Descriptive Statistics

The survey was distributed electronically to teachers who worked with a literacy coach in District XYZ during the 2013-2014 school year. Seven hundred and eleven teachers responded to the survey. Out of the 711 respondents, 361 were elementary teachers, 172 were middle school teachers, and 178 were high school teachers. A total of 244 teachers reported spending no time with a literacy coach and 467 teachers reported spending time with a literacy coach. The years of teaching experience of survey participants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Years of Teaching Experience

Years Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percent
0 to 5	192	27.0
6 to 10	157	22.1
11 to 15	104	14.6
16 to 20	91	12.8
Over 20	167	23.5
Total	711	100.0

Hypothesis Testing

The results of the hypothesis testing to address the four research questions used to guide this study are presented in this section. Each research question is followed by its corresponding hypothesis statement(s). The method used to test each hypothesis is described along with the results of each test. The significance level of .05 was utilized for all statistical analyses.

RQ1. To what extent is there a relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction?

H1. There is a relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H1 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 226.390$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$. See Table 2 for the observed and expected frequencies for H1. Analysis of the data

indicated more teachers who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach were in disagreement more than agreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. Conversely, more teachers who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H1.

Table 2

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H1

		Improvement in Instruction				
Time with Literacy Coach		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	45	33	114	22	7
	Expected	23.8	33.2	52.9	73	38.2
Time spent	Observed	26	66	44	196	107
	Expected	47.2	65.9	105.1	145	75.8

RQ2. To what extent does the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among grade levels?

H2. There is a difference in the perceptions of elementary teachers who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H2 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 95.831$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$. See Table 3 for the observed and expected frequencies for H2. Analysis of the data indicated more elementary teachers who designated that no time was spent with the

literacy coach were in disagreement more than agreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. Conversely, more elementary teachers who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H2.

Table 3

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H2

Time with Literacy Coach Elementary School Level		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	13	14	31	7	2
	Expected	5.3	12.2	10.2	23.3	16.0
Time spent	Observed	14	48	21	111	79
	Expected	21.7	49.8	41.8	94.7	65.0

H3. There is a difference in the perceptions of middle school teachers who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H3 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 53.367$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$. See Table 4 for the observed and expected frequencies for H3. Analysis of the data indicated more middle school teachers who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach were in disagreement more than agreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. Conversely, more middle school teachers who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H3.

Table 4

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H3

Time with Literacy Coach Middle School Level		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	17	7	36	7	2
	Expected	9.2	8.4	22.0	23.3	6.2
Time spent	Observed	4	12	14	46	12
	Expected	11.8	10.6	28.0	29.7	7.8

H4. There is a difference in the perceptions of high school teachers who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H4 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 53.066$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$. See Table 5 for the observed and expected frequencies for H4. Analysis of the data indicated more high school teachers who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach were in disagreement more than agreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. In addition, a majority of high school teachers who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach selected not applicable. Conversely, more high school teachers who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H4.

Table 5

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H4

Time with Literacy Coach High School Level		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	15	12	47	8	3
	Expected	12.0	9.4	29.2	24.5	9.9
Time spent	Observed	8	6	9	39	16
	Expected	11.0	8.6	26.8	22.5	9.1

RQ3. To what extent is the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among teachers' years of experience?

H5. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 0-5 years of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H5 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 78.914$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$. See Table 6 for the observed and expected frequencies for H5. Analysis of the data indicated more teachers with 0-5 years' of teaching experience who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach marked not applicable that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. Conversely, more teachers with 0-5 years' of teaching experience who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H5.

Table 6

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H5

Time with Literacy Coach Teachers with 0-5 Years' Experience		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	6	4	26	2	2
	Expected	2.9	3.8	8.0	14.3	10.9
Time spent	Observed	7	13	10	62	47
	Expected	10.1	13.2	28.0	49.7	38.1

H6. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H6 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 60.059$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$. See Table 7 for the observed and expected frequencies for H6. Analysis of the data indicated more teachers with 6-10 years' of teaching experience who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach were in disagreement more than agreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. Conversely, more teachers with 6-10 years' of teaching experience who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H6.

Table 7

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H6

Time with Literacy Coach Teachers with 6-10 Years' Experience		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	12	8	22	3	1
	Expected	5.4	7.3	9.5	16.8	7.0
Time spent	Observed	5	15	8	50	21
	Expected	11.6	15.7	20.5	36.2	15.0

H7. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 11-15 years of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H7 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 17.671$, $df = 4$, $p < .05$. See Table 8 for the observed and expected frequencies for H7. Analysis of the data indicated more teachers with 11-15 years' of teaching experience who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach were in disagreement more than agreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. Conversely, more teachers with 11-15 years' of teaching experience who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H7.

Table 8

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H7

Time with Literacy Coach Teachers with 11-15 Years' Experience		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	4	4	17	5	1
	Expected	3.2	6.3	8.9	10.1	2.5
Time spent	Observed	6	16	11	27	7
	Expected	6.8	13.7	19.1	21.9	5.5

H8. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H8 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 28.392$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$. See Table 9 for the observed and expected frequencies for H8. Analysis of the data indicated more teachers with 16-20 years' of teaching experience who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach were in disagreement more than agreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. Conversely, more teachers with 16-20 years' of teaching experience who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H8.

Table 9

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H8

Time with Literacy Coach Teachers with 16-20 Years' Experience		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	9	10	13	3	1
	Expected	4.8	8.8	7.5	9.7	5.3
Time spent	Observed	2	10	4	19	11
	Expected	6.2	11.2	9.5	12.3	6.7

H9. There is a difference in the perceptions of teachers with 21 years plus of teaching experience who work with a literacy coach regarding improvement in instruction.

The results of the chi-square test of independence for H9 indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 49.655$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$. See Table 10 for the observed and expected frequencies for H9. Analysis of the data indicated more teachers with 21 years plus of teaching experience who designated that no time was spent with the literacy coach were in disagreement more than agreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. Conversely, more teachers with 21 years plus of teaching experience who designated that time was spent with the literacy coach were in agreement more than disagreement that the literacy coach improved classroom instruction. This supports H9.

Table 10

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H9

Time with Literacy Coach Teachers with 21 Years Plus of Experience		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
No time spent	Observed	14	7	36	9	2
	Expected	8.7	8.3	20.5	20.5	10.0
Time spent	Observed	6	12	11	38	21
	Expected	11.3	10.7	26.5	26.5	13.0

RQ4. To what extent is the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction different among teachers' grade levels and years of experience?

H10. The relationships between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among teachers' grade levels and years of experience.

The results of the chi-square tests of independence for H10 indicated statistically significant differences between the observed and expected values. See Table 11 for the results of the chi-square tests among grade levels and the number of years of experience. Each relationship between time spent and the perception of improved classroom instruction was statistically significant except for teachers with 11-15 years of experience and 16-20 years of experience in both middle and high school grade level. See Table F1 in Appendix F for the observed and expected frequencies.

Table 11

Chi-Square Tests of Independence Results for H10

Building Level		χ^2	*df*	*p*
Elementary	0 to 5 years	30.723	4	< .001
	6 to 10 years	26.281	4	< .001
	11 to 15 years	10.660	4	< .05
	16 to 20 years	22.915	4	< .001
	20 plus years	19.005	4	< .05
Middle	0 to 5 years	25.795	4	< .001
	6 to 10 years	15.253	3	< .05
	11 to 15 years	4.065	4	.397
	16 to 20 years	3.841	4	.428
	20 plus years	14.140	4	< .05
High	0 to 5 years	19.149	4	< .05
	6 to 10 years	16.713	4	< .05
	11 to 15 years	8.000	4	.092
	16 to 20 years	5.808	4	.214
	20 plus years	21.155	4	< .001

Summary

Chapter four included descriptive statistics and hypothesis testing. The survey results were analyzed using IBM® SPSS® Faculty Pack 23 for Windows. Each research question was addressed by one or more hypothesis tests. The results of the chi-square tests provided evidence of statistically significant differences in the responses of teachers who agreed that the literacy coach improved the teacher's classroom instruction.

Presented in chapter five are the implications of the findings, connections to the literature reviewed for the study, implications for action, and recommendations for further research opportunities.

Chapter Five

Interpretation and Recommendations

School districts across the country have begun to implement the literacy coach model to increase student achievement through continuous, site-based professional development. The dilemma faced by literacy coaches and school leaders is that too many coaches are given too little time with teachers or given the wrong type of work. For these reasons, the literacy coach's impact on improving classroom practice has been limited (Saphier & West, 2009). Research has shown literacy coaching efforts can be squandered if the coach is not able to develop and sustain the right environment for teacher learning and instructional improvement (Fullan & Knight, 2011). Because of this, it is important for school leaders to understand how coaches spend their time and the relationship between coaching roles and student achievement. The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of literacy coaching on teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. The research was also conducted to further determine whether a teacher's building level or years of teaching experience impacted the teachers' perceptions of the literacy coach improving their classroom instruction. The results of this study contribute to the body of research about coaching, specifically the impact of literacy coaches working with classroom teachers. Provided in this chapter was a summary of the findings of the current study and recommendations for future research related to the literacy coach model and professional development.

Study Summary

This study was conducted to examine the impact of literacy coaching on teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. In addition, this study determined whether the literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improved classroom instruction as affected by grade level or years of teaching experience. The following section summarizes the current study. An overview of the problem, the purpose of the study and research questions, review of methodology, the study's major findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future research are provided.

Overview of the problem. Limited research has been published investigating the relationship between literacy coaching and teacher years of experience, teacher building level, and teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. Studies such as Feldman and Tung (2002) noted teachers with less than 10 years of experience found coaching more useful than veteran teachers. Other studies, such as Poglinco et al. (2003), reported accessibility as a major factor in how teachers perceive the literacy coach model. The literacy coach model and having the ability to engage in ongoing, site-based professional development is valued by teachers (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Knight, 2007; Kowal & Steiner, 2007; Lieberman, 1995; Neufeld & Roper, 2003; Saphier & West, 2009; Vogt & Shearer, 2007). The study was conducted to examine whether a literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improved classroom instruction. Specifically, the study was conducted to determine whether a teacher's building level or years of teaching experience impacted the teacher's perception of the literacy coach improving their classroom instruction. Recognizing that the use of the literacy coach

model is a significant financial commitment for a district, it is essential that educational leaders are aware of how teachers perceive the literacy coach's impact in different building levels and by teachers with different years of teaching experience.

Purpose statement and research questions. This study was designed to examine whether a literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improved classroom instruction. Additionally, data were analyzed to determine whether the literacy coach had an effect on the teacher's perception of improving classroom instruction as affected by grade level or teaching experience.

The following research questions were used to guide this study:

RQ1. To what extent is there a relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction?

RQ2. To what extent does the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among grade levels?

RQ3. To what extent is the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction differ among teachers' years of experience?

RQ4. To what extent is the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction different among teachers' grade levels and years of experience?

Review of the methodology. Using a non-experimental quantitative research design, Kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers' perceptions were collected in the form of archival survey data from District XYZ. The focus of the survey was on teachers' perceptions of a literacy coach improving classroom instruction. The population of interest was teachers who worked in a building with a literacy coach model. The sample for this study consisted of 711 teachers employed in District XYZ during the 2013-2014 school year. Responses to the survey items were analyzed in relationship to the research questions addressed in this study. Chi-square tests of independence were used to test the hypotheses in this study.

Major findings. Findings of the study are presented with regard to each of the research questions. The first hypothesis was conducted to assess the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction. An analysis of the data revealed that teachers who spent time with a literacy coach perceived that their classroom instruction improved. This suggests that teachers in District XYZ perceive the literacy coach model has a positive impact on improving classroom instruction.

The second, third, and fourth hypotheses were conducted to examine to what extent the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction while working with a literacy coach was affected by the building level of the teacher. An analysis of the data showed that elementary, middle, and high school teachers who spent time with a literacy coach perceived that working with a literacy coach did improve classroom

instruction. This suggests that teachers at each building level in District XYZ perceived the literacy coach model as having a positive impact on improving classroom instruction.

The fifth through ninth hypotheses addressed to what extent the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction while working with a literacy coach was affected by the years of experience of the teacher. An analysis of the data showed more teachers with different levels of teaching experience who spent time with the literacy coach perceived that working with a literacy coach did improve classroom instruction. This suggests that teachers with different levels of teaching experience in District XYZ perceived the literacy coach model as having a positive impact on improving classroom instruction.

The tenth hypothesis was conducted to examine to what extent the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction while working with a literacy coach was affected by the years of experience of the teacher and the teacher's building level. An analysis of the data showed each relationship between time spent and the perception of improved classroom instruction was statistically significant except for teachers with 11-15 years of experience in the middle and high school grade level. The other exception was for teachers with 16-20 years of experience in both middle and high school grade levels.

Findings Related to the Literature

Examined in this section are the study's findings as they relate to the literature regarding the literacy coach model and professional development. Specifically, the

research focused on the relationship between a literacy coach working with a teacher and the teacher's perception of improvement in classroom instruction

In terms of a teacher's positive perception of the literacy coach model, the findings of this study support previous research on continuous, site-based professional development. Research has shown that professional development opportunities which allow teachers to share with each other, apply new learning, and receive feedback have the best chance of effectively improving classroom instruction (Lawrence, 1974). Bush (1984) noted the important role job-embedded professional development plays on teacher's ability to adapt newly learned strategies into classroom instruction. The writing of experts in the field of professional development also highlighted the fact that the type of learning teachers need to affect change should include a collaborative and sustained approach supported by on-site coaching (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Joyce & Showers, 2002; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997). The study provides further empirical support for on-site coaching as a professional development model by showing the majority of teachers who spent time with a literacy coach perceived an improvement in classroom instruction.

Prior research has also shown coaches help create a safe environment free of the negative criticism associated with evaluation (Neufeld & Roper, 2003). It is this environment in which teachers are able to improve their practice. Feldman and Tung (2002) noted when the literacy coach engaged teachers in activities such as planning for instruction, reviewing student work, and engaging in data-based inquiry, teachers perceived the literacy coach as being beneficial to improving instructional practice. The

findings of this study support the positive perception teachers have of a literacy coach improving classroom instruction.

Literature clearly shows that time plays an important role in teacher perceptions of the literacy coach model. The results of the study, which builds on existing literature and earlier studies (Poglinco et al., 2003; Roller 2006), further demonstrated a relationship between the amount of time the literacy coach spent directly working with a teacher and the teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. Likewise, Deussen et al. (2007) and Marsh et al. (2008) found that although the amount of time allocated to a specific task varied greatly among coaches, teachers perceived the literacy coach as positively influencing instructional practice. The study provides further empirical support that teachers who reported having access to a literacy coach perceived an improvement in classroom instruction. Finally, it was originally intended for the current study to analyze the specific amount of time teachers reported working directly with a literacy coach and whether there was a difference in the perceived improvement of classroom instruction. However, this specific data was not available.

The study findings on the question involving teacher years of experience contribute to the body of research regarding the relationship between level of experience and perception of improved classroom instruction. Feldman and Tung (2002) found that teachers with less than 10 years of experience found coaching more useful than veteran teachers. Findings from this study indicated teachers from each level (elementary, middle, and high school) and with all levels of teaching experience perceived the literacy coach supports the improvement of classroom instruction.

The literature review supported the need to evaluate how influential professional development is on teacher learning and improved classroom practice. The findings in this study support the research of Guskey (2000), who found in professional development evaluation teacher perception is a central component of what is measured. Researchers acknowledge that since the literacy coach model distinctly focuses on teachers improving their instructional practice, it is best to study the impact of professional development on the growth of teacher knowledge only (Wayne et al., 2008). The study provides further empirical support for the positive relationship between literacy coaching and teacher perceptions of the growth of teacher knowledge in the form of improved classroom instruction.

Conclusions

This section provides conclusions drawn from the study. This section also contains implications to help educational leaders understand how literacy coaching can be used as a professional development model. Implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks are provided.

Implications for action. The current study can be used by school leaders to inform professional development practice and the implementation of the literacy coach model. This study supported the relationship between literacy coaching and teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. Professional organizations that support the literacy coach model, such as the ILA and the NCTE, should continue to refine their standards to address the importance of time spent with teachers as it relates to literacy coaching and improvement in instructional practice. School districts that have already

implemented or are considering implementing literacy coaching should develop the model to maximize the amount of time literacy coaches spend with teachers. School districts should also consider that teachers of all grade levels and with different levels of experience perceive benefits from working with a literacy coach. Finally, boards of education and the organizations that support them should also note the connection between literacy coaching and teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction.

Recommendations for future research. The study allowed the researcher to evaluate the relationship between literacy coaching and teachers' perceptions of improved classroom instruction. The recommendations below are made for others interested in conducting similar research to determine further benefits of utilizing literacy coaches.

1. It is recommended future researchers extend the study by expanding the sample to include K-12 teachers from different sized districts and different demographics. Doing this would allow researchers to generalize the results across different types of districts in which the literacy coach model is implemented.
2. It is recommended future researchers include the perception of others (e.g., literacy coaches, principals) as it relates to the relationship between literacy coaching and improved classroom instruction. By including the perceptions of more stakeholders, a school district could more accurately draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the literacy coach model.

3. It is recommended future researchers examine the activities the literacy coach and teacher participated in together and which activities the teachers found most helpful. Doing this would provide clarity as to which coaching activities most benefit teacher learning.
4. It is recommended future researchers examine actual changes in instruction while having access to the use of a literacy coach. This would allow researchers to further evaluate the effectiveness of the literacy coach model.
5. It is recommended future researchers examine the amount of time the teacher spends with a literacy coach and the teacher's perception of improved classroom instruction.
6. It is recommended future researchers extend the study by conducting a study with a mixed-methods research design. By including qualitative elements, the research would be able to capture teachers' perspectives regarding what types of activities they found most beneficial from working with a literacy coach.

Concluding remarks. This study sought to identify and address the relationship between literacy coaching and teacher's perception of improved classroom instruction. The findings of this study offer important contributions regarding the literacy coach model and its use in improving teacher instructional practice. The transfer of newly learned knowledge and skills into a teacher's classroom is the most important result of professional development (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). Current trends in education appear to promote site-based, continuous teacher professional development, which can be supported by the literacy coach model (Knight, 2007). For this model to be

effective, the accessibility of literacy coaches and the time they are able to spend supporting teachers in implementing new instruction strategies into their classroom instruction is paramount. As building leaders collaborate with literacy coaches to outline their role and responsibilities, it is important to maximize the amount of time spent working directly with teachers.

The results presented in this study should compel educational leaders and literacy coaches to examine the role they play in teacher professional development. The results also serve as a reminder about the importance of maintaining site-based, continuous professional development in the form of the literacy coach model. An understanding of the connections between literacy coaching and improved classroom instruction could lead to the successful implementation of new instructional strategies and ultimately, to increased student achievement.

References

Borman, J., & Feger, S. (2006). *Instructional coaching: Key themes from the literature.* Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University.

Bush, R. (1984). *Effective Staff Development. In making our schools more effective: Proceedings of three state conferences.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratories.

Center on Education Policy. (2006). *From the capital to the classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Author.

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deussen, T., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Autio, E. (2007).*"Coach" can mean many things: Five categories of literacy coaches in Reading First*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan 92*(8), 597-604.

Dole, J. (2004). The changing role of the reading specialist in school reform. *The Reading Teacher, 57*(5), 462-470.

Elish-Piper, L., & L'Allier, S. (2011). Examining the relationship between literacy coaching and student reading gains in grades K-3. *The Elementary School Journal, 112*(1) 83-106.

Ertmer, P. A., Richardson, J., Cramer, J., Hanson, L., Huang, W., Lee, Y., et al. (2005). Professional development coaches: Perceptions of critical characteristics. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15(1), 52–75.

Feldman, J., & Tung, R. (2002). *The role of external facilitators in whole school reform: Teacher's perceptions of how coaches influence school change.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Fullan, M., & Knight, J. (2011). Coaches as system leaders. *Educational Leadership, 69*(2), 50-53.

Garet, M., Cronen, S., Eaton, M., Kurki, A., Ludwig, M., Jones, W., Uekawa, K., et al. (2008). *The impact of two professional development interventions on early reading instruction and achievement*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

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

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. *Educational Leadership, 59*(6), 45-51.

Hertert, L. (1997). *Investing in teacher professional development: A look at 16 districts*. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States.

Hill, H. (2009). Fixing teacher professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 90*(7), 470-477.

International Reading Association. (2006). Standards for middle and high school literacy coaches. Newark, DE: Author.

International Literacy Association. (2010). Standards for reading professional, revised 2010. Newark, DE: Author.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1980). Improvising inservice training: The messages of research. *Educational Leadership, 37*(5), 379-385.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1981). Transfer of Training: The Contribution of Coaching. *Journal of Education, 163*(2), 163-172.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1988). *Student achievement through staff development*. (1st ed.). New York: Longman.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kansas State Department of Education (2015). *KSDE report card*. Copy in possession of the author.

Killeen, K. M., Monk, D. H., & Plecki, M. L. (2002). School district spending on professional development: Insights available from national data (1992-1998). *Journal of Education Finance, 28*(1), 25-49.

Knight, J. (2004). Instructional coaching. *StrateNotes, 13*(3), 1-5.

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Knight, J. (2009). Coaching: The key to translating research into practice lies in continuous, job-embedded learning with ongoing support. *Journal of Staff Development, 30*(1), 18-22.

Kowal, J., & Steiner, L. (2007). Instructional coaching. Retrieved from http://www.centerforcsri.org

Lawrence, G. (1974). *Patterns of effective inservice education: A state of the art summary of research on materials and procedures for changing teacher behaviors in inservice education.* Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education.

Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76,* 591-96.

Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse (2008). Role of a literacy coach. Retrieved from http://www.literacycoachingonline.org/aboutus/literacy_coach.html

Lunenburg, F., & Irby, B. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavior Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Marsh, J. A., Sloan McCombs, J., Lockwood, J. R., Martorell, F., Gershwin, D., Naftel, S., et al. (2008). Supporting literacy across the sunshine state: A study of Florida middle school reading coaches. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Moss, M., Fountain, A. R., Boulay, B., Horst, M., Rodger, C., & Brown-Lyons, M. (2008). *Reading first implementation evaluation: Final report.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

National Staff Development Council. (2001). National staff development council's standards for staff development, revised. Oxford, OH: Author.

Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity. Promises and practicalities*. Cambridge, MA: Education Matters.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110 § 101 (2002)

Odden, A., Archibald, S., Fermanich, M., & Gallagher, H. A. (2002). A cost framework for professional development. *Journal of Education Finance, 28*(summer), 51-74.

Poglinco, S., Bach, A., Hovde, K., Rosemblum, S., Saunders, M., & Supovitz, J. (2003). *The heart of the matter: The coaching model in America's choice schools.* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy and Research in Education.

Roller, C. (2006). *Reading and literacy coaches report on hiring requirements and duties survey*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Russo, A. (2004). School-based coaching: A revolution in professional development—or just the latest fad? *Harvard Education Letter, 20*(4), 1-4.

Saphier, J., & West, L. (2009). How coaches can maximize student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(4), 46-50.

School Community Professional Development Act, Pub. L. No. 1012.98 § 8 (2014)

Sparks, D. & Hirsh, S. (1997). *A new vision for staff development.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

The reading coach. (2004). *International Reading Association: Best practice brief.* Retrieved from http://www.reading.org/Libraries/resources/BPBrief_ reading_coaches.pdf

Toll, C. (2005). *The literacy coach's survival guide*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Guidance for the reading first program.* Washington, DC: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Vanderburg, M. & Stephens, D. (2009). *What teachers say they changed because of their coach and how they think their coach helped them*. Retrieved from http://www.literacycoachingonline.org/briefs/what_teachers_say_about_coaching_1.2.09.pdf

Viadero, D. (2007). New thinking on staff development. *Education Week, 1*(1), 15-17.

Vogt, M. & Shearer, B. (2007). *Reading specialists and literacy coaches in the real world.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wayne, A. J., Yoon, K., Zhu, P., Cronen, S., & Garet, M. (2008). Experimenting with teacher professional development: Motives and methods. *Educational Researcher*, *37*(8), 469-479.

Appendices

Appendix A: Coaching Program Survey

Coaching Program Survey for Teachers

The purpose of this survey is to gain valuable and honest feedback about the district's coaching program. The input you provide will assist in program improvements. Thank you for taking the time to complete the coaching program survey.

***1. How many years of classroom teaching experience do you have?**

***2. Select your building level.**

***3. Select your current position.**

***4. Is the math coach assigned full-time or part-time in your building?**

***5. Is the literacy coach assigned full-time or part-time in your building?**

***6. Approximately, how many hours per month have you worked one on one with your ELL coach this year?**

***7. Approximately, how many hours per month have you worked one on one with your math coach this year?**

***8. Approximately, how many hours per month have you worked one on one with your literacy coach this year?**

***9. Approximately, how many hours per month have you worked in collaborative groups with your ELL coach this year?**

***10. Approximately, how many hours per month have you worked in collaborative groups with your math coach this year?**

***11. Approximately, how many hours per month have you worked in collaborative groups with your literacy coach this year?**

Coaching Program Survey for Teachers

***12. I clearly understand the role of the coaches in my building.**

***13. Rate how frequently you engage in the following activities with your math coach.**

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Collaborative Problem Solving	◯	◯	◯	◯
Reflective Conversations	◯	◯	◯	◯
Analyzing Student Work	◯	◯	◯	◯
Observations	◯	◯	◯	◯
Providing Professional Development	◯	◯	◯	◯
Co-Teaching	◯	◯	◯	◯
Co-Planning	◯	◯	◯	◯
Attending Collaboration Meetings	◯	◯	◯	◯
Engaging Teachers in the Coaching Cycle - Pre-conference, Observation, and Post-conference	◯	◯	◯	◯
Modeling a Lesson	◯	◯	◯	◯

***14. Rate how frequently you engage in the following activities with your literacy coach.**

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Collaborative Problem Solving	◯	◯	◯	◯
Reflective Conversations	◯	◯	◯	◯
Analyzing Student Work	◯	◯	◯	◯
Observations	◯	◯	◯	◯
Providing Professional Development	◯	◯	◯	◯
Co-Teaching	◯	◯	◯	◯
Co-Planning	◯	◯	◯	◯
Attending Collaboration Meetings	◯	◯	◯	◯
Engaging the Teacher in the Coaching Cycle - Pre-conference, Observation, and Post-conference	◯	◯	◯	◯
Modeling a Lesson	◯	◯	◯	◯

Coaching Program Survey for Teachers

***15. Rate the following coaching activities on usefulness toward improving classroom instruction.**

	Not useful	Somewhat useful	Useful	Very useful	Not sure/N/A
Collaborative Problem Solving	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Reflective Conversations	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Analyzing Student Work	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Observations	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Providing Professional Development	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Co-Teaching	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Co-Planning	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Attending Collaboration Meetings	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Engaging Teachers in the Coaching Cycle -Pre-conference to Observation to Post-conference	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Modeling a Lesson	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

***16. Resources and feedback are provided in a reasonable time from our building coaches.**

***17. Our building math coach has a good understanding of my students, their needs, and the type of assistance and instructional support I need.**

***18. Our building literacy coach has a good understanding of my students, their needs, and the type of assistance and instructional support I need.**

***19. Our building math coach has a good understanding of the Mathematics content they provide.**

***20. Our building literacy coach has a good understanding of the English Language Arts content they provide.**

***21. Our building math coach has been influential in helping me improve my classroom instruction.**

Coaching Program Survey for Teachers

***22. Our building literacy coach has been influential in helping me improve my classroom instruction.**

***23. How effective is the district's coaching model with respect to changing your instructional practices?**

***24. How effective is the district's coaching model with respect to improving your students' achievement?**

25. What services did you receive from the coach this year?

26. What services did you want that you did not receive from the coach this year?

27. In what ways has the coach helped you improve your teaching practice?

28. What barriers or obstacles interfered with your work with your coach?

29. What new skills or knowledge has the coach helped you with this year?

30. What revisions to the coaching program would you recommend for next year?

Appendix B: Baker University IRB Request

BAKER UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
GRADUATE DEPARTMENT

Date:
IRB PROTOCOL NUMBER _____
(IRB USE ONLY)

IRB REQUEST
Proposal for Research
Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board

I. Research Investigator(s) (Students must list faculty sponsor first)

Department(s) **School of Education Graduate Department**

Name	Signature	
1. Dr. Verneda Edwards	Verneda Edwards	Major Advisor
2. Katie Hole	_____	Research Analyst
3. Dr. Jim Robins		University Committee Member
4. TBD		External Committee Member

Principal Investigator: Andrew S. Frye
Phone: 540-292-9307
Email: andrewsterrettfrye@gmail.com
Mailing address: 16512 W. 79th Terr. Lenexa, KS 66219

Faculty sponsor: Dr. Verneda Edwards
Phone: 913-344-1227
Email: Verneda.Edwards@bakeru.edu

Expected Category of Review: _X_ Exempt ___ Expedited _ __Full

II: Protocol: (Type the title of your study)

Teachers' Perceptions of the Literacy Coach's Impact on Classroom Practice

Summary

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

The purpose of this study is to determine if the amount of time a literacy coach spent in a teacher's classroom had an effect on the teacher's perception of improved instructional strategies. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to determine if the amount of time a literacy coach spent in a teacher's classroom had an effect on the teacher's perception of improving student achievement as affected by grade level (primary or intermediate) or teacher experience (five or less, six to ten, 11-15, or 15 years plus of teaching experience).

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

There will be no conditions or manipulations included in this study, which will examine teachers' perceptions regarding a literacy coach's effect on improved student achievement as affected by grade level or teacher experience.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.
Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

The research questions will be addressed by analyzing archival data, which include teacher surveys, literacy coach surveys, and coaching logs. These surveys were designed by the [redacted]. Moreover, subjects did not encounter any psychological, social, physical or legal risk.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

No, stress to subjects will not be involved.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

No, subjects will not be deceived or misled in any way.

Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

No, there will not be a request for personal or sensitive information.

Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

No, subjects will not be presented with materials which might be considered offensive, threatening, or degrading.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

Since archival data was used, no time will be demanded of any of the subjects participating in the study.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

The subjects included in the archival data are literacy coaches and elementary school teachers from [redacted]. Subjects will not be solicited or contacted.

What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

Archival data will be provided from the [redacted]. All participants will be referred to by an identification number, which refers to their grade level and building. Furthermore, no inducements will need to be offered to the subjects for their participation.

How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

No consent from is required. All data is archival.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

No, data from this study will not be made part of any permanent record that can be identified.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.

No, the fact that a subject did or did not participate in the study will not be made available to any supervisor, teacher or employer.

What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with it after the study is completed?

Data generated for this study will not be used for any other purposes. No name or other identification will be available to identify any of the subjects. The data will be stored in a password-protected flash-drive, which will be kept in a locked drawer. The data will be stored for one year. Afterwards, the data will be destroyed.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

No, there will not be any risks involved in the study.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

Archival data collected by [redacted] in the form of coaching logs and teacher and coach surveys will be used for the study. The data was collected during the 2013-2014 school year.

Appendix C: Baker University IRB Approval

BAKER UNIVERSITY
Own Confidence

Baker University Institutional Review Board

May 22, 2015

Dear Andrew S. Frye,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application and approved this project under Exempt Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.

Please inform this Committee or myself when this project is terminated or completed. As noted above, you must also provide IRB with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If you have any questions, please contact me at CTodden@BakerU.edu or 785.594.8440.

Sincerely,

Chris Todden EdD
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
Verneda Edwards PhD
Sara Crump PhD
Erin Morris PhD
Scott Crenshaw

Appendix D: Research Proposal Application

Application to Conduct Research in [redacted]

Complete this form and email it to [redacted] or mail a paper copy to:

[redacted]

Name of individual proposing study: Andrew Frye
Professional title: School Improvement Specialist, Clear Creek Elementary, USD #232
Home address (street, city, state, zip): 16512W. 79th Terr. Lenexa, KS 66219
Contact number(s): 540-292-9307
Email address: asfrye@usd232.org

Institution, organization or agency with which individual is associated:

Name of institution: Baker University
Address (street, city, state, zip): 8001 College Boulevard #100, Overland Park, KS 66210
Reason for study : ☐ College or university course requirement ☐ Doctoral Degree ☐ Master's Degree ☐ Other (explain below)

*If study is being conducted for course requirement for a degree, please provide the name of the course instructor, major advisor or committee chairperson and secure his/her signature for approval and support below.

Instructor, major advisor or committee chairperson: Dr. Verneda Edwards
Full title: Associate Professor
College/University: Baker University Contact number: 913.344.1227
Address (street, city, state, zip): 8001 College Boulevard #100, Overland Park, KS 66210

I have reviewed the proposed research study and consider the project to be educationally worthwhile and the research technique to be satisfactory. I also agree to provide assurance that the submitter will comply with the established regulations and procedure for conducting research studies in [redacted]

Signature of instructor, advisor, or committee chairperson

Application to Conduct Research in [redacted]

Complete this form and email it to [redacted] or mail a paper copy to:

[redacted]

Name of individual proposing study: Andrew Frye
Professional title: School Improvement Specialist, Clear Creek Elementary, USD #232
Home address (street, city, state, zip): 16512W. 79th Terr. Lenexa, KS 66219
Contact number(s): 540-292-9307
Email address: asfrve@usd232.org

Institution, organization or agency with which individual is associated:

Name of Institution: Baker University
Address (street, city, state, zip): 8001 College Boulevard #100, Overland Park, KS 66210
Reason for study : Γ College or university course requirement P' Doctoral Degree Γ Master's Degree Γ Other (expain below)

*If study is being conducted for course requirement for a degree, please provide the name of the course instructor, major advisor or committee chairperson and secure his/her signature for approval and support below.

Instructor, major advisor or committee chairperson: Dr. Verneda Edwards
Full title: Associate Professor
College/University: Baker University j Contact number: 913.344.1227
Address (street, city, state, zip): 8001 College Boulevard #100, Overland Park, KS 66210

I have reviewed the proposed research study and consider the project to be educationally worthwhile and the research technique to be satisfactory. I also agree to provide assurance that the submitter will comply with the established regulations and procedure for conducting research studies in [redacted]

Signature of Instructor, advisor, or committee chairperson

Appendix E: Permission to Conduct Research

[redacted]

[redacted]

May 21, 2015 Office of Assessment & Evaluation

Andrew Frye
16512 W. 79th Terr.
Lenexa, KS 66219

Dear Mr. Frye,

Your study, "Teacher Perception of Literacy Coach Impact on Classroom Practice", was approved. Your [redacted] supervisor will be [redacted], Director of Assessment and Evaluation. If you have questions about conducting your study, please contact me at [redacted].

All data containing personally-identifiable information collected by or on behalf of [redacted] that are provided to the Researcher and all information derived from those data, and all data resulting from merges, matches, or other uses of the data provided by [redacted] with other data, are subject to this Agreement and are referred to herein as the "subject data." The subject data under this Agreement may be provided in various forms including but not limited to written or printed documents, computer tapes, CD-ROMs, hard copy, or encrypted files.

Researcher shall not use or disclose the subject data for any purpose not expressly stated in the Research Proposal Application approved by [redacted], unless the Researcher has obtained advance written approval from the [redacted] Research Liaison.

Researcher may publish the results, analysis, or other information developed as a result of any research based on the subject data made available under this Agreement only in summary or aggregate form, ensuring that the identities of individuals included in the subject data are not revealed.

The Researcher may use the subject data only for the purposes stated in the Research Proposal Application. District policy requires the researcher to provide the district with a report of the research findings within six months of completion of the study.

If you have any future research projects involving [redacted] we can be reached at [redacted] for an updated research application.

Sincerely,

[redacted]
Research Committee

Appendix F: Observed and Expected Frequencies for H10

Table F1

Observed and Expected Frequencies for H10

Time with Literacy Coach		Improvement in Instruction				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Applicable	Agree	Strongly Agree
Elementary: 0 to 5 Years						
No time spent	Observed	0	1	7	1	2
	Expected	.4	1.0	1.3	4.3	3.9
Time spent	Observed	4	9	6	40	36
	Expected	3.6	9.0	11.7	36.7	34.1
Elementary: 6 to 10 Years						
No time spent	Observed	4	6	5	0	0
	Expected	1.2	3.8	1.9	4.8	3.3
Time spent	Observed	2	14	5	25	17
	Expected	4.8	16.2	8.1	20.2	13.7
Elementary: 11 to 15 Years						
No time spent	Observed	3	2	5	3	0
	Expected	1.1	3.1	2.5	4.9	1.3
Time spent	Observed	2	12	6	19	6
	Expected	3.9	10.9	8.5	17.1	4.7
Elementary: 16 to 20 Years						
No time spent	Observed	3	3	4	0	0
	Expected	1.1	2.2	1.1	3.1	2.5
Time spent	Observed	1	5	0	11	9
	Expected	2.9	5.8	2.9	7.9	6.5
Elementary: 21 Years Plus						
No time spent	Observed	3	2	10	3	0
	Expected	2.3	2.9	4.1	5.5	3.2

Time spent	Observed	5	8	4	16	11
	Expected	5.7	7.1	9.9	13.5	7.8
Middle School: 0 to 5 Years						
No time spent	Observed	4	2	11	0	0
	Expected	1.7	2.5	5.8	4.1	2.9
Time spent	Observed	0	4	3	10	7
	Expected	2.3	3.5	8.2	5.9	4.1
Middle School: 6 to 10 Years						
No time spent	Observed	6	1	6	2	-
	Expected	3.5	.9	3.1	7.5	-
Time spent	Observed	2	1	1	15	-
	Expected	4.5	1.1	3.9	9.5	-
Middle School: 11 to 15 Years						
No time spent	Observed	1	1	6	2	0
	Expected	1.3	1.7	3.8	2.9	.4
Time spent	Observed	2	3	3	5	1
	Expected	1.8	2.3	5.3	4.1	.6
Middle School: 16 to 20 Years						
No time spent	Observed	3	2	5	2	1
	Expected	1.7	2.3	4.5	3.4	1.1
Time spent	Observed	0	2	3	4	1
	Expected	1.3	1.7	3.5	2.6	.9
Middle School: 21 Years Plus						
No time spent	Observed	3	1	8	1	1
	Expected	1.2	1.2	4.8	5.2	1.6
Time spent	Observed	0	2	4	12	3
	Expected	1.8	1.8	7.2	7.8	2.4

High School: 0 to 5 Years						
No time spent	Observed	2	1	8	1	0
	Expected	1.9	.4	3.4	4.9	1.5
Time spent	Observed	3	0	1	12	4
	Expected	3.1	.6	5.6	8.1	2.5
High School: 6 to 10 Years						
No time spent	Observed	2	1	11	1	1
	Expected	1.5	.5	6.3	5.3	2.4
Time spent	Observed	1	0	2	10	4
	Expected	1.5	.5	6.7	5.7	2.6
High School: 11 to 15 Years						
No time spent	Observed	0	1	6	0	1
	Expected	1.0	1.0	4.0	1.5	.5
Time spent	Observed	2	1	2	3	0
	Expected	1.0	1.0	4.0	1.5	.5
High School: 16 to 20 Years						
No time spent	Observed	3	5	4	1	0
	Expected	2.3	4.5	2.8	2.8	.6
Time spent	Observed	1	3	1	4	1
	Expected	1.7	3.5	2.2	2.2	.4
High School: 21 Years Plus						
No time spent	Observed	8	4	18	5	1
	Expected	5.5	3.7	12.8	9.2	4.9
Time spent	Observed	1	2	3	10	7
	Expected	3.5	2.3	8.2	5.8	3.1