University of South Carolina

Scholar Commons

2018

Improving Instructional Practice Through Instructional Coaching

Lauren Dillard
University of South Carolina - Columbia

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd

Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons

Improving Instructional Practice Through Instructional Coaching

by

Lauren Dillard

Bachelor of Arts
University of South Carolina, 2006

Master of Education
The Citadel, 2010

Master of Education
The Citadel, 2012

_____

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education in

Curriculum and Instruction

College of Education

University of South Carolina

2018

Accepted by:

Christopher Bogiages, Major Professor

Todd Lilly, Committee Member

Victoria Oglan, Committee Member

Mary Lou Yeatts, Committee Member

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this to all of my students, past, present, and future. May you all

continue to challenge me to be the educator that you deserve.

Acknowledgments

There are many people I would like to acknowledge. First, I would like to thank Dr. Christopher Bogiages for the consistent guidance and support, as it was essential to the completion of this process. To Dr. Mary Lou Yeatts: Without your influence, I likely would not have begun this process. Thank you for always being a constant source of knowledge and encouragement and for agreeing to serve on my committee. To my administration and colleagues, thank you for your participation in this study. I could not have done any of this without you, and am so grateful to work with such amazing people. To all of the students who have been a part of my journey, all of this is for you; you make me a better teacher. To Meredith: I simply would not have survived this without you. Thank you for being my partner-in-crime during this process, for talking me off the ledge, and for the late night phone calls. To my small group and my church family: Thank you for all the check-ins, small moments of celebration, and mostly the prayers. To all friends and family: Your small pushes of encouragement along the way helped more than you will ever know. To Mrs. Lott: As my kindergarten teacher, you set a lifelong love of learning in place, it all started with you. To Candy Walsh: Thank you for teaching me the ropes to ensure that I would have my own successful classroom one day. To my parents: Thank you for all of the sacrifice it took to get me this far. There will never be enough words to describe my level of appreciation for your love and support throughout

my life. Most importantly, I thank God for loving me and giving grace on days I do not

deserve it. I am blessed beyond measure and owe all of this to You.

Abstract

The purpose of this action research study was to determine how instructional coaching impacted implementation of shared reading strategies in kindergarten classrooms. This study included four teachers from one primary school in South Carolina. All of the teachers that participated in this study had more than two years of teaching experience. Data for this study was collected from surveys, classroom observations, lesson plans, and focus groups.

Teachers, instructional coaches, and administrators at one elementary school are concerned with the students' ability to comprehend materials that are being read to them, as well as reading materials that students are reading independently. Shared reading was identified, by the administrative team, as the intervention to put in place to try to improve reading comprehension. The teachers received sustained professional development from the instructional coach throughout the implementation of shared reading to improve teaching practice. The instructional coach collected teacher information weekly and observed classrooms bi-weekly. This information was used to guide bi-weekly focus groups. Teachers and the instructional coach used data and discussions to collaboratively plan for best instructional practices in regards to shared reading.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

In primary schools, we introduce students to the basics of school: colors, numbers, letters, letter sounds, and to facilitate a love of learning. Ultimately, the goal is for students to succeed in class but also in life. One of the ways we can ensure future success is to build a foundation of literacy skills. For students to become successful readers, they must ultimately be able to comprehend what they are reading or what is read aloud to them. Because all learners have different needs, some students need very little help comprehending, while others need various strategies to improve their comprehension.

Early readers spend so much time recognizing letters and decoding words that they have difficulty comprehending what they've read. It is crucial that schools have a comprehensive reading program that focuses not only on oral reading but on comprehension strategies as well. Knowing how to read words has ultimately little value if the student is unable to construct meaning from the text (Klinger, Vaughn, & Boardman, 2007). An over-emphasis on phonemic awareness, phonics, and word recognition has been the primary focus in most kindergarten through third-grade classrooms, therefore leading to a breakdown in overall comprehension. Among the reasons for poor reading comprehension are the type of instruction, method for decoding,

prior knowledge, a diverse population, and development of vocabulary (Caposey & Heider, 2003).

The administrative team recognized that comprehension was a weakness amongst all grade levels. The student population consists of many English Language Learning (ELL) students, as well as students from low-income families. Lack of educational experiences and conversation at home are thought to be the reason why students have low vocabulary skills, which affects overall reading comprehension.

In South Carolina, students are required to complete a Text Dependent Analysis (TDA) as a part of the end-of-year reading assessment for the state, beginning in third grade. In order to accurately complete a TDA, students must have a solid foundation for comprehension in order to respond accordingly. We discovered after meeting with our partner intermediate school and reviewing the third-grade state reading assessments, students overall were not meeting the state-required level of reading comprehension. Following the meeting, we knew we needed to further investigate our students' reading comprehension as well as reading comprehension strategies that are being taught by our teachers. After some investigation, we determined that teachers are not implementing reading comprehension strategies well. Students are struggling with comprehension when independently reading as well as when teachers are reading aloud to students.

Problem of Practice

Reading comprehension is the ultimate goal of reading (Clay, 1991; Nation & Angell, 2006). According to the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), comprehension can be broken into multiple categories: previewing, retelling (sequence of events, characters and details, vocabulary, teacher support), reflection, and making

connections. Although there are many aspects of comprehension, vocabulary is cited as the biggest hurdle in reading (Zhang, 2008). In elementary schools, vocabulary is responsible for 70% of reading comprehension, according to John Edelson (2017). Therefore, in order for students to develop reading comprehension, they must know the meaning of words. Vocabulary instruction focuses on the meaning of words. One way that educators can teach vocabulary in a kindergarten setting is through shared reading. Shared reading is "an interactive reading experience that occurs when students join in or share the reading of a book or other text while guided and supported by a teacher" (Honchell, 2012). The first focus of shared reading is understanding the meaning of the text, therefore, in order to close the gap between text and reading comprehension, teachers need to examine their instructional intent in shared reading.

Teachers need professional development (PD) to effectively implement shared reading strategies. However, traditional one-shot PD sessions for teachers have been proven inefficient (Bush, 1984). Guskey (2002) believed that teacher change follows a progression: PD, change in classroom practice, change in student outcomes, change in teacher beliefs and attitudes. Additionally, Hawley and Valli (2002) believed that in order for educational reform to occur, there needs to be a comprehensive change, not a one-time PD. Due to the fact that teachers will need continued support through the implementation, the use of an instructional coach is effective (Knight, 2007).

Theoretical Framework

By following a cycle of coaching, instructional coaches are able to provide more thorough PD and follow-up, with observations and feedback. McKenna and Walpole (2008) highlighted different coaching models: peer, cognitive, directive, and responsive.

These models vary in their delivery, focus, and intrusiveness. Instructional coaching, like teaching, can utilize a variety of strategies from different models. Some coaches/schools prefer to use a specific model, while others use a combination of models.

Primarily the role of the instructional coach is to build capacity among teachers and support teachers in improving their instruction (Knight, 2007). By utilizing instructional coaches, districts and schools are able to establish better PD models. Guskey (2000) stated that there are three defining characteristics of PD: intentional, ongoing, and systematic.

PD should not be seen as a set of random, unrelated activities that have no focus; PD should be intentional (Guskey, 2000). Guskey (2000) continued that true PD is deliberate, guided by a clear vision of purpose and planned goals. Viewing PD as a special event that only happens three to four times a year severely limits teachers' opportunities to learn. However, ongoing PD presents a variety of opportunities. Guskey, 2000 states, "Teachers must constantly analyze the effectiveness of what they do, reflect on their current practices, make adaptations when things are not going well, and continually explore new alternatives and opportunities for improvement," (p. 19). These characteristics of PD align closely with the role of the instructional coach.

Knowles (2007) proposed some specific assumptions about adult learners. He described adult learners as independent and self-directed learners who have a much deeper bank of knowledge than that of a child. Other considerations include their dedication to social roles and how that plays a part in learning, and their need for new learning to be justified. Finally, adult learning should be problem centered and immediately applicable to the learners' lives. Instructional coaches not only provide an

opportunity for teachers to receive ongoing PD, they also can incorporate all key elements of adult learning as described by Knowles (2007).

Purpose, Research Question and Rationale

The purpose of this study is to determine how instructional coaching impacts implementation of shared reading strategies in kindergarten classrooms. The following questions will guide the study:

1. What can be learned when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve their practice?

2. What coaching strategies will best support teachers through the implementation of shared reading?

These specific questions are going to focus on the partnership between coaches and teachers through the implementation of shared reading. Throughout the implementation, I provided PD, support, resources, feedback, and opportunities to collaborate with peers to determine the impact of the instructional program when implemented with fidelity. Throughout the study, I revised the implementation after reflecting on current practice. By working through the coaching cycle, the teachers and I were able to determine next steps along the way, so that ultimately our students' reading comprehension would improve.

Researcher Positionality

Action research always is conducted with or by insiders to an organization (Herr & Anderson, 2015). As the instructional coach in the building working with kindergarten teachers, I was an insider collaborating with other insiders. This position allowed me to use collaborative approaches when implementing shared reading but also allowed me to

work collectively in a professional learning community. I, as the coach, and teachers intentionally worked to improve practice by collaboratively planning together, communicating honestly, and providing two-way feedback to be successful. I reflected on my own practice as a coach and ways to refine coaching throughout the case study. In this regard, I am an insider who studies my own practice. This role did not cause any conflict of variance in data reliability, as the qualitative measures stood separately using the patterns identified by the constant comparative data analysis.

Research Design

Action research presents a unique opportunity for teachers to explore their learning by challenging the status quo and examining their classroom or educational environment (Mertler, 2014). It is appropriate for this study, since action research allows for educators to engage in their own inquiry, design the structure of the investigation, collect and analyze their data, and develop findings that lead to best practice (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014). This action research allows for ideas to be tested in real time, while adjustments can be made in the moment (Mertler, 2014). The flexibility of action research is appealing to educators, as it is used as a learning opportunity.

Action research allows a variety of approaches to data collection and analysis, but this study is supported by a qualitative approach. The study is designed to gain descriptions from participants in the field in their natural setting. I rationalized that case studies are best suited this research study because extensive data from multiple sources were used to relate to the participants (Yin, 2009). This study is a single case study of a group of teachers. Detailed descriptions of primary grade teachers' practice of shared reading as a strategy to build vocabulary and comprehension during literacy instruction

was documented, as well as the process of coaching teachers through the process.

The study was conducted in a primary school located in South Carolina. The school has a total of nine kindergarten classrooms, serving approximately 200 students. Approximately 60% of kindergarten students receive free or reduced lunch. This school is identified as a Title I school, receiving federal funds to support reading and math based on free-reduced lunch percentages. The demographics of this grade level are: Caucasian 60%, African American 21%, Hispanic 11%, Asian 0%, Other 8%.

As the instructional coach at the primary school, this school was purposefully selected for the study of the implementation of shared reading. I worked with teachers to conduct pre-observations, PD, bi-weekly observations, weekly feedback forms, and bi-weekly focus groups. As the first step in the action research cycle, the kindergarten teachers were given a survey to determine experience and knowledge about shared reading. A purposeful sampling of participants was chosen: four kindergarten teachers. The teachers included two veteran kindergarten teachers and two veteran teachers who were new to teaching kindergarten. The teachers had various backgrounds with their knowledge and with their teaching of shared reading.

Through the course of the case study, I used a variety of qualitative instruments to collect data. Surveys were first given to the entire team of kindergarten teachers in order to select a meaningful, varied sampling. After teachers were selected, I conducted pre-observations of teacher-identified times of shared reading. During the first week of implementation, I was able to collect observations of the shared reading lesson from all four teachers. At the end of each week, teachers answered a survey about the current week's implementation. Based on observations and teacher feedback, the team of coaches

and teachers met together bi-weekly for a focus group.

Using inductive data analysis, I was able to make use of data as it unfolded during the qualitative case study. I pulled data apart and put it back together, direct interpretation, as materials were read and gained meaning regarding the research questions. Data was read and reread, and coded into various categories of meaning. I established patterns of words and phrases that were repeated between interviews, observations, surveys, and PLC focus groups. Themes emerged from the data that was collected in relation to kindergarten teachers and their practice of shared reading.

Significance of the Study

Significance of this study is that teachers were given the opportunity to refine their instructional practice with sustained PD and the support of an instructional coach. Teachers had the opportunity to collaborate with colleagues and the instructional coach on what was working and what continued supports they needed. The benefit of this is that it was an ongoing process of feedback and refinement in regards to best practices. Ultimately, through the study, teachers were able to feel more confident in their teaching practice and implementation of shared reading.

Limitations of the Study

The culture and climate of each classroom is different. Classroom climate has an impact on the way that an instructional coach interacts with teachers. Secondly, the participants each have a different set of skills, experiences, and interests. Prior experience, background, and knowledge of the teachers as well as their personal preferences and dispositions influenced the ways in which they interact with the coach and with one another. Due to the qualitative nature of this study, and the limited number

of participants, the findings for this study are not generalizable to other school populations.

Organization of the Dissertation

This single qualitative case study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter includes an introduction, problem of practice, theoretical framework, purpose of the study, and research question, research design, data collection and analysis, significance and limitations of the study, organization, and a list of terms. Chapter 2 includes a review of the literature regarding the problem of reading comprehension, theoretical research about PD, teacher learning, and instructional coaching. In addition, there is literature regarding the history of shared reading and the implementation of shared reading. Chapter 3 includes this study's qualitative research approach, traditional approach to qualitative inquiry, case study, purpose of the study, participants, research site, data collection, data analysis, establishing trustworthiness, ethical considerations, role of the researcher, and a summary. Chapter 4 includes the findings of the study, phases of data analysis, setting, participants, themes, subthemes, and a summary. Chapter 5 includes a reflection of action research and what I learned during this study. There is also a plan for future implementation of shared reading. The chapter is organized in six sections: major themes and sub-themes, research questions answered, implications, implications for future research, implications for practice, and findings.

List of Definitions

The following terms and definitions provided clear meaning and understanding of the context in which I used them during this study:

Best practices: "serious, thoughtful, informed, responsible, state-of-the-art teaching"

(Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 2012, p. 2).

Coaching: the communication and interactions between teachers to improve their teaching practice (Harwell-Kee, 1999).

Emergent literacy: knowledge of the forms and functions of print and the relationship between written and oral language usually learned in the preschool years (Teale & Sulzby 1986).

Gradual release of responsibility: the gradual transfers of responsibility of a task from teacher to the student (Brown, 2004).

Instructional Coach: an on-site professional developer who teaches educators how to use proven instructional methods (Knight, 2006).

Primary grades: include pre-k through third grade (Bornfreund, 2013).

Professional Development: a comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to improving teachers' effectiveness in raising student achievement (National Staff Development Council, 2001).

Reading comprehension: "the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning" (Snow & Sweet, 2003, p. 1).

Reading text levels: three levels of text difficulty:

      a. an easy text (95 to 100% correct),

      b. an instructional text (90 to 94% correct),

      c. a hard text (80 to 89% correct) (Clay, 2005, p. 55).

Shared reading: a rich "interactive reading experience that can be enjoyed in whole classes, groups, or in pairs as students view the same text that is read by the teacher or an experienced reader to support literacy and comprehension skills" (Short, Kane, &

Peeling, 2000, p. 287). Specifically, shared reading was an interactive teaching and learning strategy that engaged all students as they enjoyed reading out loud from the same text *with* a teacher or proficient reader in a nonthreatening environment (Harp, 1993).

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Introduction

In the context in which this study has taken place, administrators, coaches, and teachers have expressed a concern regarding reading comprehension in all grade levels. Students within the identified primary school, such as English language learners (ELL) or students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, come to school with limited language experiences. This lack of exposure is thought to be the reason why students have low vocabularies, which affects overall reading comprehension. Students have difficulty with comprehension when independently reading as well as when teachers are reading aloud to students. In an effort to address comprehension concerns early, teachers will be implementing shared reading in kindergarten classrooms with the assistance and feedback from the instructional coach.

The purpose of this study is to determine how instructional coaching impacts the implementation of shared reading strategies in kindergarten classrooms. By implementing new instructional practices during shared reading, kindergarten teachers may help decrease the vocabulary gap that contributes to comprehension difficulties.

Chapter 2 will provide a review of the literature regarding reading comprehension, theoretical framework of PD, teacher learning, and effective instructional coaching,

followed by a review of shared reading. Finally in this chapter, there will be literature to describe action research and case studies.

Reading Comprehension in the Early Grades

Comprehension instruction is an issue that cannot be put off until later grades because it is believed to cause irreparable damage to many primary students (Teale et al., 2007). Comprehension instruction is important in helping readers understand complex text. The reader, text, and activity are essential elements in the definition of reading, and reading comprehension is defined as "the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning" (Snow & Sweet, 2003, p. 1). Durkin's (1978–1979) seminal study revealed the lack of comprehension instruction in elementary schools across America. Since her study, efforts have been made to identify cognitive strategies to increase students' understanding of text (Brown, Pressley, Van Meter, & Schuder, 1996).

Because of the "No Child Left Behind Act" (2001), many teachers did not implement shared reading in their classrooms. However, Fisher, Frey, and Lapp (2008) found that the value of shared reading was evident in preschool- through high school-aged students.

Reading comprehension is the ultimate goal of reading (Clay, 1991; Nation & Angell, 2006). A primary role of shared reading is to help students gain a variety of strategies that can be used to understand text (Clay, 1991). Teachers can provide opportunities for students to read for enjoyment and to help them become independent and proficient readers. Teachers can also build students' reading comprehension through metacognitive awareness. Metacognitive awareness includes: developing the plan of

action before reading, monitoring the plan during reading, and evaluating the plan after reading through questioning (Frey & Fisher, 2007).

Across the nation, there is little evident comprehension instruction in kindergarten through third grade (Neuman, 2001). Rarely does one read in the same sentence the words "comprehension instruction in primary grades" because many current reading instruction advocates believe comprehension instruction is not necessary for learning to read (Pearson & Duke, 2002).

The National Reading Panel (NRP) (2000) reported similar findings relative to the small amount of comprehension instruction in kindergarten through second-grade classrooms. In recent decades, the idea of comprehension instruction has evolved from teaching a string of comprehension skills, which include sequencing, note taking, details, and following directions, to an emphasis on thinking skills such as activating background knowledge, creating visual images, monitoring, and summarizing (Pearson & Duke, 2002). The National Reading Panel (2000) found that only 8 categories of comprehension instruction out of 16 had a scientific basis for classroom instruction. These instructional strategies included comprehension monitoring, cooperative learning, graphic organizers, questioning and answering, generating questions, story structure, summarization, and multiple-strategy teaching. Comprehension instruction has changed from teaching strategies in isolation to teaching a "set" of strategies in a highly interactive, engaged, and collaborative setting (Pearson & Duke, 2002). The instructional setting of this study was similar to that of shared reading.

Theoretical Framework

Professional Development

PD is an important part of the teaching profession. Evaluating the effectiveness of PD workshops continues to be a difficult task for those in the educational field.

Changes as a result of PD may or may not happen in a positive manner. Guskey (1986) shared that three outcomes of staff development are: changes in teacher beliefs and attitudes, change in classroom practices, and changes in the learning outcomes of students. He felt that the order of occurrence of these outcomes was the most important. His proposed model was that of change in teachers' classroom practices, change in student learning outcomes, and then change in teachers' beliefs and attitudes. He shared that only after changes in student learning outcomes take place can there be significant change in teachers' beliefs and attitudes. Guskey also suggested three guiding principles for significant and sustained educational improvements. These include: (a) recognizing that change is a gradual and difficult process for teachers, (b) ensuring that teachers receive regular feedback on student learning progress, and (c) providing continuous support and follow-up after the initial training. These principles suggest that change is an orderly process and is likely to happen and be long lasting. Educational leaders must emphasize change in order for there to be an opportunity for change.

Darling-Hammond (1997) reported that there were some aspects of teaching little known to the public concerning PD:

> Professional development investments are fairly paltry, and most districts'
> offerings, limited to "hit and run" workshops, do not help teachers learn the
> sophisticated teaching strategies they need to address very challenging learning

goals with very diverse populations of students. Most school districts do not

direct their professional development dollars in a coherent way toward

sustained, practically useful learning opportunities for teachers. And, teachers

have little time to learn from one another: In U.S. schools, most teachers have

only 3 to 5 hours a week in which to prepare their lessons, usually in isolation

from their colleagues. (p. 2)

Hawley and Valli (2002) stated that, "effective professional development

alone will not cause educational reform, but when viewed as part of a comprehensive

change process that is multi-faceted, improvements will inevitably follow" (p 10). This

reinforces the importance of considering the many aspects involved with working

toward change.

It is important to not only allow teachers the opportunity to attend PD events

but also to give them the opportunity to implement new ideas in their classrooms.

Guskey, (2002) suggested a sequence of events to provide enduring change in

teachers' attitudes and perceptions of PD. After nearly two decades of research, he

shared that it is not the PD event itself but allowing the teachers the opportunity to

successfully implement the new knowledge gained because of the PD that causes

changes in teachers' attitudes and beliefs. When teachers can see new strategies work,

they believe the PD works. This type of experience can help to change their attitudes

and beliefs.

Looking at attitudes and beliefs about PD is important. Scott and Sutton (2009)

shared that "little is known about teachers' positive and negative emotions associated

with professional development and the likelihood that teachers will adopt the aims of that

professional development" (p. 152). This shows the importance of continuing to examine teacher attitudes about PD. Effectiveness of past activities could have effects on attitudes about attending future events.

Teachers as Learners

The concept of instructional coaching was designed around Knowles' (1977) adult learning theory (ALT) and Bandura's (1993) social cognitive theory (SCT). When children enter classrooms, they enter with varied experiences, external influence, and background knowledge. In order to effectively meet school, district, and state mandates, a teacher must not only be knowledgeable in her content but also about her students' learning styles, personalities, strengths, and areas of weakness. Teachers also have to be aware of developmental milestones of students as well, based on their grade level and age. With varied tools, teachers' effectiveness is now being determined by student success. However, instructional coaches realize that there are various factors that ultimately determine whether teachers are effective.

PD is one way that schools help teachers stay up-to-date with the latest instructional strategies. According to Killion, Harrison, Bryan, and Clifton (2012), one role of the instructional coach is to "assist with coordinating and planning effective school-level professional development" (p. 54). Therefore, it is critical that instructional coaches not only know about best practices for student learners but are also aware of how adults learn as well.

Knowles' (1970) ALT indicates that there is a distinct difference between the child learner and the adult learner. Knowles clarified that the process of learning is about the transformation of individual behavior and attitudes through gaining knowledge; for

true learning to happen, a behavioral shift should be evident. Knowles referred to Maslow's (1962) idea of self-actualization: "The idea of self-realization as seen in the hierarchy of needs describes how the individual cannot even conceive of obtaining new knowledge unless the basic human needs are being met" (p. 36). Therefore, as an individual matures, "his need and capacity to be self-directing, to utilize his experience in learning, to identify his own readiness to learn, and to organize his learning around life problems, increases steadily … [so] when adult learners rely on newfound knowledge to heightened levels of professional success, they willingly engage in the learning process" (p. 43). In order to have teachers take ownership of their learning and actually use it in the classroom, they must be engaged with explicit strategies in becoming self-reflective (Woolfolk, 2013). One strategy is to have situations where adults can converse with others who will validate them and challenge them. Through social interactions such as these, adult learners develop a perceived self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy is vital for motivation to engage in certain activities, such as implementing new teaching strategies in the classroom (Merton, 1948). Similar to self-efficacy, teacher efficacy can be credited to an "individual teacher's belief in their own abilities to plan, organize, and carry out activities required to attain given education goals" (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014, p. 612). Therefore, teachers who have experienced some failure in the past may be hesitant or resistant to try new things. PD is critical in learning new strategies and improving teaching in the classroom. Often times, teachers are given limited choices for PD, and even less opportunity to be reflective (Aguilar, 2013). This makes teachers even more hesitant to try new things because of lack of support, lack of time, and a lack of understanding the content after a quick workshop-type PD session.

However, there is now enough research to support that "teachers [would be] more likely to integrate newly-learned instructional strategies into their regular teaching … if provided with coaching from peers or experts" (Denton & Hasbrouck, 2009, p. 152).

The Role of Instructional Coaching

Teacher accountability has increased with the involvement of the federal government in public education. The goal of the government is to increase student achievement. Former president George W. Bush declared that education should be a priority, thus causing a focus on the way in which teachers teach (Peterson & West, 2003). The passing of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) created pressure to improve instruction and made school leaders hyper-focus on the relationship between instructional practice and student achievement.

In order for educators to improve their practice and increase student achievement, they need help enhancing their strategies, skills, and techniques (Sayler, 2003). Knight (2006) suggested that the research on coaching implies that instructional coaching can have the potential to impact teaching strategies, which will eventually lead to growth in student achievement. This development has led many school districts to utilize instructional coaches for ongoing PD for teachers.

Prior to instructional coaching, the two models used for teacher training were the industrial model and the clinical model. Glickman (1992) declared that the industrial model, used in the 1940s to 1960s, provided feedback to teachers from district office personnel. Training resembled that of factory workers: Time efficiency, results driven, and quality control were the focus of importance. The overall evaluation was formal and deemed ineffective because it was not teacher or student focused. The clinical model was

a new training model brought forth in the 1960s. This model focused on a POP cycle: pre-conference, observation, and post conference. Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) described the *pre-conference* as a way to establish objectives and purpose for the lesson, the *observation* of the lesson was completed by a trained evaluator to determine if the teacher could successfully meet the set objectives, and the *post conference* provided feedback to the teachers.

The utilization of instructional coaches provides opportunities for ongoing PD. Instructional coaching began in the early 1980s as a strategy to improve the quality of implementation of new curriculum and instructional strategies (Joyce & Showers, 1996). Today, the POP cycle is used throughout many states evaluation systems, including South Carolina, and instructional coaches have been trained to use this model with teachers to help support their personal growth and student achievement.

After staff development evaluation revealed that fewer than 10% of teachers actually applied what was learned, Garet et al. (2001) proposed coaching as an alternative. Early coaching research showed that teachers who had coaching relationships tried new implementation strategies more frequently than those without coaching experiences (Harwell-Kee, 1999). For instructional coaching to be effective, it must be a blend of early models that allow opportunities for transfer information from the trainings into the classroom. The typical coaching model began as a process of collaborative planning, observation, and feedback in order to increase the level of implementation (Joyce & Showers, 1996).

Large cities such as Boston, New York City, Philadelphia, and Dallas launched the first coaching programs, which quickly gained popularity across the United States.

This education reform started small, with part-time coaches assigned to multiple schools. The coaches worked with teachers in planning groups in addition to modeling lessons for teachers so they could easily replicate them at a later time (Russo, 2004).

Today instructional coaching has become the means for districts to provide ongoing PD. The coaching model of planning, modeling, pre-conference, observing, and post-conferencing has enhanced overall teacher quality. Coaching integrates a teacher's learning with the teacher's practice, and provides support for improvement (Harwell-Kee, 1999; Poglinco & Bach, 2005).

Instructional Coaching Models

There are various coaching models that differ in their delivery, focus, and relative intrusiveness (McKenna & Walpole, 2008). Just like teaching, there are many strategies from the various models that can be used. Some schools use a specific model, while others use a combination of the different models. A review of these coaching models follows: peer, cognitive, directive, and responsive.

Peer coaching. The least intrusive coaching approach is peer coaching. This coaching model is collaborative and provides a bridge from PD to classroom implementation (McKenna & Walpole, 2008). While working in teams, teachers plan together to identify objectives for their instruction and develop specific lesson plans. Teachers improve their practice or try new instructional strategies in the classroom, usually following a cycle of modeling, practice, and feedback. As the implementation takes place, they observe each other and provide feedback. According to Deussen et al. (2007), teachers who receive this type of coaching are more likely to use new strategies appropriately than teachers who received the traditional workshop PD.

Cognitive coaching. This coaching model focuses on metacognition, in which the coach works closely with teachers to engage in conversation using powerful questions to get them to reflect deeply on their practices while facilitating self-directed learning (Knight, 2009).

There are four phases to cognitive coaching: planning, goal setting, observation, and reflective post conference. First the teacher and coach meet to articulate the teacher's goals. Next, together the coach and the teacher establish clear strategies to achieve the goal and identify what evidence would show that the goals are met. Then, the coach observes to gather evidence and document the teacher's achievement of the goal. Finally, the coach and the teacher have a reflective conference to share evidence and make decisions for future teaching based on what was learned from the evidence. The cognitive coaching process provides the teacher opportunities to restructure their educational practice as they engage in dialogue and reflection (McKenna & Walpole, 2008).

Directive coaching. In the directive coaching model, the coach is an expert, identifying and supporting the teacher's specific area of strength or weakness. The coach helps the teacher implement a program using specific practices. This process is much more implementation-focused than teacher-focused (Ippolito, 2009). Directive coaching is closely aligned with the theoretical work of Guskey (2002), who argued that PD efforts are most effective if they focus on changing teacher behavior first, so that teachers can witness the results of new instruction in the form of increased student achievement and *then* adopt new attitudes and beliefs based on classroom evidence. Guskey's PD evaluation (2000) clearly outlines a way for an instructional coach to determine if teachers are accurately implementing what they have learned in PD. Some teachers are

not as likely to change in directive approaches. As a result, this model is best used with new teachers who are eager to learn from a veteran expert (Duessen et al., 2007).

Responsive coaching. Responsive coaching develops respect and caring instructional relationships between teachers and coaches. This model closely resembles cognitive coaching, as coaches work with teachers to improve their ability to reflect (Dozier, 2006). Within responsive coaching, teachers self-reflect, so their needs as well as the needs of their student guide the coaching process. Teachers are initiators of the coaching conference in responsive coaching, as the conferences are designed to target instruction needs that the teacher has identified. This approach helps deepen teachers' understanding about making learning effective as they reflect on cumulative coaching experiences (Steiner & Kowal, 2007).

<center>**Shared Reading Background**</center>

Shared reading is an instructional technique that originated in New Zealand by Don Holdaway. Holdaway (1979) developed the idea of shared reading as a group instructional technique that mirrored lap reading—when parents read bedtime stories to their children. This joyful experience is a special time for parents to read to their children in a safe and warm environment. Children listen with pleasure as no demands are made on them, and parents receive gratification as they bond with their children. Holdaway believed that beginning reading instruction that was similar to the bedtime story experience provided many opportunities for successful learning.

Holdaway (1979) declared schools universally had not reached their goal of providing a literate society and that all kinds of resources had been put into the effort of helping children who had failed. He suggested, "instead of setting up expensive and

<center>23</center>

wasteful remedial programs with a whole new establishment to support them in their inescapable efforts of grinding the indignity deeper, we should find a preventive solution" (p. 12). Holdaway (1979) suggested shared reading literacy transactions be implemented as the center of literacy instruction in the classroom. Holdaway (1979) further suggested that in order for shared reading or any teaching to occur, the environment must be conducive to learning. In a conducive learning environment, teachers model skills that are then effectively practiced by students. Holdaway (1979) concluded that if the environment is not conducive to learning, the resulting ineffective teaching leads to failure.

Holdaway (1979) described the three stages of a new literacy experience: discovery, exploration, and independent experience and expression. The first stage, *discovery,* involves a book introduction. The main purpose of the book introduction is for enjoyment. The child interacts with the text without experiencing pressure. In a classroom setting, children use background knowledge to make predictions as they become familiar with text vocabulary. The second stage, *exploration,* involves rereading. In a home setting, the child asks his parents to read the same story again and again. In a classroom setting, children view and read the same text multiple times with the teacher. During these readings, the teacher points to each word. Concepts of print, such as how text is read top to bottom and left to right, are developed. Strategies for solving the problems in the texts are presented to children within whole and meaningful texts. The third stage, *independent experience and expression,* involves children engaging in role-playing, spending time reading and creating expressions of meanings from the text. In a classroom setting, students engage in social interaction relative to the arts and writing as

they independently interpret text.

Martinez and Roser (1985) conducted a case study that investigated how children's response to text changed as they became familiar with stories. Martinez and Roser conducted studies in homes and preschools. An adult read four-year-old children three unfamiliar stories six times. The "talk was classified according to form (whether the talk was a question, comment, or answer), and focus (whether the talk was directed toward the story's title, characters, events, details, setting, language, or theme)" (Martinez & Roser, 1985, p. 783). Findings revealed children in both home and preschool settings engaged in more talk after parents' and teachers' repeated readings of familiar stories. Martinez and Roser (1985) reported, "when a parent or teacher reads the same story to children several times, the children begin to attend to different aspects of the story than they did on the first reading" (p. 782). Exposing children to good books for reading aloud is beneficial, however, repeated readings of familiar books during story time is also beneficial (Martinez & Roser, 1985).

Traditions and Context of Shared Reading

Shared reading can be used to unlock text meaning while simultaneously integrating the application of strategies such as predicting, questioning the text, and inferring. Don Holdaway (1979) suggested that students had the potential "to teach themselves within a properly supported environment" (p. 7).

Vygotsky's and Piaget's theory of child thinking is evident in metacognition. Vygotsky (1978) speculated that children develop the capacity for self-regulation through interaction with more knowledgeable peers or teachers. Piaget (1977) theorized that peers challenge one another's theory and therefore advance cognitive development.

Shared reading mirrors Pearson and Gallagher's (1983) concept of the gradual release of responsibility. Teachers initially provide strong support by reading aloud to students. The teacher then models how good readers use metacognition to gain meaning from the text. Frey & Fisher (2008) defined metacognition as "thinking about one's thinking," which includes using strategies to help students get unstuck, such as self-questioning and self-monitoring, when experiencing problems in the text. During shared reading, teachers provide support as needed to help students independently use strategies. To make meaning of any piece of text, the strategies modeled during shared reading could be used (Brown, 2004).

Shared reading can be linked to Vygotsky's theory. Learning is not limited to a child's developmental level but by what he can do with the assistance of a teacher or experienced other (Bodrova & Leong, 2006; Tompkins, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky (1978) initiated the concept of the zone of proximal development. Scaffolding and gradual release were consistent with Vygotsky's theory of learning through social interaction (Brown, 2004; Tharp & Gallimore, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978). Modeling, scaffolding, and gradual release of responsibility were the integral elements of shared reading.

Shared Reading Implementation

Marie Clay (1966) first used the term emergent literacy during her study of young children's acquisition of literacy as they interacted with books, reading, and writing. Emergent literacy is a gradual process that took place from birth to age five when the child was able to write using conventions (Sulzby & Teale, 1991). Emergent literacy integrates all parts of language, which include reading, writing, speaking,

26

listening, and viewing (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). Emergent readers acquire literacy from direct instruction and from their engagement in stimulating and responsive environments (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). Emergent readers are exposed to and engaged in shared reading experiences as they became motivated and encouraged to interact with the text (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998).

Emergent literacy included three critical predictors of reading success: the child's development of language, conventions of print, and phonological awareness (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). The first critical predictor of reading success is the development of language. Weizman and Snow (2001) reported that children must engage in rich language input in order to develop their vocabulary and semantic knowledge. They further reported that rich immersion in conversation assists children in understanding the names of objects and how they go together.

The second critical predictor of reading success is conventions of print, which include the following: permanence of print, concepts about print, concepts of words, and language talk about print (Aldridge, Kirkland, & Kuby, 2002). Concepts about print was an example of conventions of print, which includes concepts such as the cover page, the title, reading the left page before right page, return sweep to the left of the next line, etc. Children engage in the concepts about print during the first years of school as they move toward successful performance (Clay, 2005). Change occurs from having a little knowledge towards having a control of all these concepts, which happens for most children within about two years of beginning literacy learning (Clay, 2005, p. 48).

The third critical predictor of reading success is phonological awareness.

Phonological awareness referred to the ability to detect or manipulate the sound structure of oral language (Lonigan, 2006, p. 78). A child with the ability to detect and manipulate syllables, rhymes, or phonemes learns to read quickly (Lonigan, 2006).

Schickendanz and McGee (2010) examined 19 studies reported by the National Early Literacy Panel (NELP) in 2008. They noted that more comprehensive approaches are needed when reading to preschoolers during shared story reading. They further noted that children's understanding of meaning, vocabulary, sentence structure, and Clay's (1993) concepts about print could be supported through shared reading interventions.

The research states that "Shared reading activities were often recommended as the single most important thing adults can do to promote the emergent literacy skills of young children" (NELP, 2008, p. 153). Holdaway (1979) developed shared reading for emergent readers, who notice and recognized that print holds meaning. Shared reading is also valuable for older students (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001). Fluency develops as the reading patterns of older students change. Their knowledge about the world increases as they engage in direct and indirect experiences. During shared reading, they gain knowledge from perspectives that could be different from their own (Brown, 2004). Although text selections change from the "Three R's"—rhyme, rhythm, and repetition—to more complex and challenging text, teachers select relevant and important shared reading materials (Manning, 1997). Older students learning a second language also benefit from shared reading as they participated in small-group discussion. Overall, emergent, primary, and older readers engage in similar shared reading experiences: rereading, word analysis, comprehensive, vocabulary, fluency, and explicit modeling by teachers and peers (Brown, 2004). However, "no matter what the

purpose for conducting a shared reading lesson, engaging students' interest and heightening their motivation to make meaning should be paramount" (Brown, 2004 p. 62).

Rereading. Children in kindergarten and Grades 1 and 2 enjoy rereading poems, chants, and other favorite texts. These can be familiar text or new text chosen by the teacher (Routman, 2003). Teachers use pointers or sliding pieces of paper as they read text line-by-line; therefore, students are engaged in the text visually and orally. As students engage in repeated readings, their self-confidence is increased. Repeated readings increase fluency, word familiarity, phonemic awareness, and phonics. Teachers address phonics concepts and high frequency words after rereading the texts with students several times (Tompkins, 2006). Moyer (1982) indicated that repeated readings provided practice on all levels. Repeated readings help students with the integration of word identification skills, which promotes comprehension. Word work is also evident in shared reading as students become familiar with text by rereading.

Turn taking. Another implementation of shared reading involves students taking turns to read to each other using trade books or basal readers. First graders read in pairs while second and third graders read in groups of three and four. The whole class is divided into pairs or threesomes for approximately 15 minutes as the teacher monitors them in small groups. This process gives students opportunities to work on strategies with their peers before they read in formal settings with the teacher (Otto, 2006).

In addition to building important reading skills and processes, shared reading can be implemented to motivate students to want to read more as teachers model their

passion for reading (Brown, 2004). Novice and veteran teachers can use this approach during whole- and small-group instruction to develop students' specific literacy skills. Shared reading helps teachers to transition from prescribed basal reading instruction to a comprehensive and interactive literacy program. Shared reading can be implemented across the curriculum in all grade levels (Brown, 2004).

Text selection for shared reading. Mooney (1990) recognized that teachers' careful selection of text during shared reading affords students many opportunities to be successful as they become convinced in their roles as readers and writers. Students become co-readers and co-writers as they actively engage in selected texts. When teachers accept student approximations, students feel empowered and become involved in the text. Teachers' careful selection of text also provides opportunities for students to authentically engage in text that was modeled by the teacher. Teachers' gestures such as nodding and smiling encourage students to join in reading with teachers using the "Three R's,"—rhyme, rhythm, and repetition (Manning, 1997). Mooney (1990) noted student participation is encouraged as teachers read with intonation to encourage oral or "in the head" reading by students. Mooney further noted that texts selected by teachers encourage students to enjoy reading as they acted as readers and writers.

Teachers must select high-interest texts in order for students to make predictions and construct meaning. Rhyme, rhythm, and repetition are features evident in texts selected by teachers of shared reading. Other key elements include:

> the appeal of the book to the child, the appropriateness of the story's shape and
> structure, the effectiveness of the language, the authenticity of the story, the
> help illustrations give readers in gaining meaning, and the appropriateness of

the book's format. (Mooney, 1990, p. 27)

DeMoulin (2001) affirmed that young children enjoy reading books that rhyme. Clay (1991) suggested that in order to enhance life-long reading, teachers should carefully select texts to focus on specific reading skills and strategies. According to Clay (2005), when selecting text, teachers need to keep in mind that the text must be simple enough for the learner to bring existing competencies, must contain phonemic richness, and must also be semantically and syntactically rich (p. 33).

Teachers must carefully choose text that will allow them to focus on a text feature or a specific comprehension strategy (Frey & Fisher, 2007). Books that are chosen should be on students' independent or instructional reading level (Frey & Fisher, 2007). The *independent level* is where the student reads materials on her own without support from a teacher or more skillful other. The student should have no more than 4 unknown words in 100. The *instructional reading level* is where the student learn to read new words with moderate challenges. At this level, the student experiences 1 unknown word in 10 by practicing the new strategies without being overwhelmed. At the instructional level, the teacher supports the student by working in his zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). The *frustration reading level* is where the student read materials that are too challenging. Materials at this level include more than 1 unfamiliar word in 10.

Clay stated that, "For learning to occur it is very important to ensure that the difficulty level of the reading materials presents challenges from which the child can learn and not difficulties that disorganize what he already knows" (p. 24). Texts should be related to class content and provide explicit illustrations that reflect the strategy or

reading behavior of the lesson (Frey & Fisher, 2007). Before teachers read the text, they tell their students what strategy they are modeling. This procedure is modeled throughout the text. During shared reading, words in the texts are visible to all students no matter where they are seated in the group (Frey & Fisher, 2007). The visibility of the text could be accomplished by using enlarged text, projected text, or individual personal copies.

Students' personal enjoyment is the overall purpose of text selection during shared reading. A "big book" used during shared reading is a *tool* for shared reading and not an approach. The teachers' approach to the text used to support students' active participation is more important than the idea of a "big book" or regular-sized book during shared reading (Mooney, 1990).

Shared Reading's Effect on Comprehension

Response to intervention (RTI) supports the academic needs of all students through teachers' differentiated instruction founded on research-based practices and progress monitoring (Boyles, 2009). RTI has three tiers: Tier 1 classroom teachers provide explicit whole-group instruction and incorporate the gradual release of responsibility. Tier 2 students are instructed in homogeneous groups by their classroom teacher. Tier 3 students who experience difficulties in Tier 2 are taught in a small group by the classroom teacher (Boyles, 2009).

Teachers can use shared reading to get Tier 1 instruction off to a solid start (Boyles, 2009). Tier 1 includes explicit instruction that is provided by the classroom teacher. In Tier 1, the classroom teacher incorporates the gradual release of responsibility. Additionally, Tier 1 instruction is systematic teaching of comprehensive

objectives from a year-long continuum (Boyles, 2009). RTI does not include using only state or district materials such as the basal because they are not sufficient for the academic needs of all students, nor does RTI include reading books to and with students and asking random questions at the end of the text (Boyles, 2009).

Tier 2 and Tier 3 includes comprehension intervention for students who experience difficulty based on their response to Tier 1 instruction. In shared reading, Tier 2 intervention consists of a small homogeneous group of students. Tier 2 intervention does not include whole-class instruction. In shared reading, Tier 3 intervention consists of students who experience difficulty based on their response to Tier 2 instruction. Tier 3 intervention does not include whole-class instruction. Boyles (2009) affirmed, "All classrooms are Response to Intervention (RTI) classrooms—from pre-kindergarten through high school" (p. 49). He emphasized that

> Response to Intervention (RTI) is a federal mandate that makes official what good teachers have known all along: all regular education and special education students are entitled to instruction founded on research-based practices and progress monitoring. And all students will respond positively to instruction when that teaching is appropriately differentiated-with different students receiving different kinds of support based on their very different needs. (Boyles, 2009, p. 49)

According to Boyles (2009), RTI includes four components: systematic instruction for all students, ongoing student assessment data including benchmarking and progress monitoring, differentiated instruction with more intense interventions for students who need them, and parent involvement that keeps parents apprised on student progress (p.

xiii).

Fisher et al. (2008) partly addressed reading comprehension in shared reading with older children. The focus of their study was on modeling multiple categories during shared reading, such as comprehension, vocabulary, text structures, and text features. This was a large-scale study of students in Grades 3 through 8 in an urban school. Findings showed that teachers modeled their own thinking during shared reading without asking individual questions. Students were encouraged to talk with a fellow classmate, jot down ideas, ask questions, and indicate agreement by modeling "fist-to-five" (Students held up the number of fingers to represent their agreement of a statement read by the teacher). Teachers modeled reading comprehension during shared reading by activating background knowledge, inferring, visualizing, connecting, synthesizing, and evaluating. They modeled by using context clues, word parts, and resources. The teachers also modeled text structures as they read and paid attention to structures of nonfiction and fiction texts. Text features were modeled to determine the importance of texts: headings, captions, boldface words, illustrations, graphs, etc. This study illustrated 25 teachers' different approaches to daily modeling during shared reading. Findings suggested the importance of teachers having a clear purpose for selecting text during shared reading and that teacher modeling should not lengthen reading instruction during shared reading. Findings further suggested modeling shared reading and think-alouds could help students pay attention to what their brains were doing during reading.

Ness (2011) contended that in the past three decades, significant gains have been made towards understanding how readers employ strategies to construct meaning from text. Constructing meaning was "the most important thing about reading comprehension"

(Block et al., 2002, p. 3).

During explicit instruction of reading comprehension strategies, teachers "use specific cognitive strategies or they reason strategically when they encounter barriers to comprehension" (National Reading Panel [NRP], 2000, pp. 4–39). Teachers taught comprehension strategies through explicit strategy instruction in order to help students understand what they read (Duffy, 2002). During a shared reading experience modeling, being aware of and using the zone of proximal development, scaffolding, and self-regulation connected to Vygotsky's learning theory of social interaction (Brown, 2004; Vygotsky, 1978). Interaction with text and other people helped students develop their ability to comprehend (Vygotsky, 1978). The process of the gradual release of responsibility was a result of students' increasing proficiency in using reading strategies (Brown, 2004; Pearson & Gallagher, 1983).

Ness (2011) reported prior to the 21st century, researchers demonstrated that students could independently transfer reading strategies after eight months of explicit instruction in comprehension strategies (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Block, 1993; Collins, 1991). More recently, researchers have demonstrated that students can continually transfer explicit instruction in comprehension strategies after eight weeks of instruction (Cummins, Stewart, & Block, 2005).

Ness (2011) conducted an observational study in 20 Grade 1–5 classrooms during the 2008–2009 school year. The goal of the research was to identify elementary teachers' frequency of implementing reading comprehension instruction. Additionally, direct classroom observations were made to determine which reading instructional strategies the teachers used. Research sites included two elementary schools in the northeast. The first

school site was comprised of kindergarten through fifth-grade students in a suburban area. The second school site was comprised of kindergarten through fifth-grade students in a recently founded (2002) charter school. The ethnic background of the first school's student population was made up entirely of White students. The small town included a population of 6,000 residents with a per capita income of $23,146. The ethnic background of the second school's student population was exclusively Black in a neighboring city with a per capita income of $16,775.

Each school's language arts curriculum in the Ness study included daily oral language, vocabulary, listening comprehension, response to literature, and textual analysis. Students in the first school received 90 minutes of daily literacy instruction from a basal reader. Students in the second school received 180 minutes of literacy instruction from picture and chapter books. Findings revealed fourth-grade classes showed the highest scores on reading comprehension measures and third-grade classes showed the lowest scores. The reading comprehension strategies that occurred the most were making predictions/prior knowledge, question answering, and summarization. The study did not specifically address comprehension instruction in the context of shared reading.

A study by Kindle (2011) compared the practices of four preschool teachers during the reading aloud of a common text. Kindle's study looked at shared reading in relationship to the development of language. Kindle's study broadly defined shared reading as reading aloud to children in an interactive manner to promote language development, listening comprehension, and pre-based skills. The one-year study was done in an urban midwestern school district at an early childhood center. The participants in Kindle's study included Hispanic, White, Asian, and Black students. Eighty percent of

the student population received free and reduced lunches. The prekindergarten children attended the center during the 2009–2010 school year. Findings suggest that teachers' approaches to shared reading should be more purposeful and intentional in order for students to receive the maximum benefit from their reading experiences. Language patterns differ among children from low socioeconomic families (Hart & Risley, 1995). Differences in this study revealed various levels of interaction among preschoolers and teachers. Further research was suggested to help preschool teachers provide maximum high-quality interactions. Kindle's findings were consistent with studies that report teachers need to be trained "in ways to read with children (reading in small groups as well as with the whole class), leaving time for child questions and open-ended questions" (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001, p. 331). Wasik (2010) believed that "without this training, it is likely that implementation of even the highest-quality curricula will vary across early childhood teachers, undermining efforts to build children's language skills at the very time when interventions could have the strongest long-term effects" (p. 621). While the Kindle study addressed the value of the implementation of shared reading with low-income children, it did not specifically address how shared reading can affect comprehension.

In many urban schools across the United States, there is a comprehension instruction gap in primary grades (Teale et al., 2007). Primary grade teachers can engage students in a good beginning with respect to early literacy to help them experience positive results in later years. Primary grade teachers can rethink their focus to systematically engage students in comprehension instruction (Teale et al., 2007). Shared

reading has the potential to address this gap in comprehension strategy instruction in urban primary schools.

Methodology

Action Research

Action research is used to help school personnel improve practice by systematically developing a question then obtaining and analyzing data to answer the question and improve outcomes for students (Giles, Wilson, & Elias, 2010). As the instructional coach at my school, I felt action research was the most appropriate research style for this study. I was able to recognize a problem of practice within our school and take steps toward improving it within classrooms. Action research is defined as a cyclical process of planning, acting, developing, and reflecting (Mertler, 2014). This research has been extremely effective as a tool for PD, allowing teachers to positively impact their teaching and therefore the success of their students (Giles et al., 2010).

Durak et al. (2016) described action research as useful with teachers because it helps their professional and personal growth. He continued that by expanding their professional knowledge, teachers are encouraged and willing to try new strategies. Additionally, action research increases teachers' responsiveness to their students, and once they try new methods and see positive results within their classroom, they are more likely to share that with their peers (Yigit & Bagceci, 2017). The flexibility to make these real-time adjustments while teaching is appealing for educators, which makes for more willing participants.

Some overall challenges of action research concern training, interest, and time. Some teachers are hesitant to take on action research because they already struggle to fit

in their daily responsibilities. Teachers also feel that when implementing new strategies in their classroom, they do not understand enough about the research and strategies. However, many teachers are willing to participate in the action research because of the positive impact on students in the classroom (Bolghari & Hajimaghsoodi, 2017).

Overall, action research creates opportunities for teachers to improve their practice, which increases student engagement and overall performance. Iwaski et al. (2017) found that action research helps support meaningful engagement, which ultimately increases the students' interest in the lessons. Furthermore, Iwaski et. al (2017) determined that participating in an action research study, teachers are much more effective with supporting at-risk students by creating meaningful experiences. The action research study I completed with my teachers helped them have authentic conversations with their students to connect with read-alouds, enhancing the students' vocabulary.

Qualitative Research

For the purposes of this study, I used a qualitative research design to document the implementation of shared reading in the classroom because the beliefs and feelings of the teachers in this study were essential. Creswell (2014) stated that "qualitative research is a type of education research in which the researcher relies on the views of the participants; ask broad questions, describes and analyzes these words for themes" (p. 39). Within a qualitative study, data can be obtained in various ways. Generally, most information is collected from participants regarding their experiences, opinions, and knowledge through observations, interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups (Patton, 2003). Given the nature of this study's problem of practice, the best way to collect and consider the feelings and opinions of the teachers is through qualitative methods, where

data could be collected, organized, coded to establish themes, labeled, and interpreted (Creswell, 2014). Action research with educators allows evidence to be gathered through written, oral, and observational collections; these naturally occurring data points are all qualitative in nature.

Qualitative research was a natural fit for this type of study because it allowed teachers to implement and reflect on elements within the classroom setting. Creswell (2014) explained that qualitative research allows a researcher to explore a problem in its natural setting, where emerging themes lead to interpretations. Since this study's problem of practice sought to explore many factors relative to the impact of teaching practice with a select group of teachers over a period of time, a multitude of data, qualitative in nature, emerged for consideration and reflection (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

The data analysis process involves coding data into themes, categorizing, and drawing conclusions (Jasper, 1994). For this particular study, there were several forms of data collection, including, surveys, observations, interviews, and focus groups. Initially, I interviewed teachers about their experience with and current knowledge of shared reading. I also completed pre-observations of teachers during their scheduled "shared reading" time. With the results of those two interactions, I was able to intentionally plan for and create PD to fit their particular needs. The four teachers and I met for the PD and to create a plan for the implementation of shared reading. Every other week for 8 weeks, we met as a focus group to determine what was working well, and what needed continued support. We used that time to target specific vocabulary that would be taught during the shared reading lessons. On the opposite weeks of focus groups, I completed classroom observations. During this time, I recorded interactions between the teachers, the students,

and the text. Finally, teachers completed a survey at the end of each week. Questions included what they tried that was new within shared reading that week, what went well during that week, what needed refinement for the next week, and what supports they needed from the coach for the next week. This method was utilized because it embraces the structure of action research: plan, act, observe, reflection cycle (Herr & Anderson, 2015).

I used constant comparative analysis across the various data types to ensure consistency and strong themes and patterns. Constant comparative analysis is a method of analyzing qualitative data by coding information that was collected into emergent themes or codes and is reviewed multiple times until no new themes emerge.

Conclusion

This literature review examined the historical framework of shared reading and instructional coaching. The theoretical basis for implementing shared reading as well as coaching models was explored as well. This review provided a strong base for my action research study. The review has provided evidence that there is a need for shared reading to help develop students' vocabulary, thus improving their overall comprehension (Aldrige, Kirkland & Kirby, 2002; Clay, 2005; Frey & Fisher, 2007; Weizman & Snow, 2001; Whitehurt & Lonigan, 1998). Also, the literature suggests that teachers are more willing to implement new strategies in their classrooms with the proper support such as instructional coaching that consists of planning, modeling, observing, and providing feedback (Glickman, 1992; Joyce & Showers, 1996; Knight, 2006; Peterson & West, 2003; Russo, 2006; Sayler, 2003). The findings of the research support the problem of practice and help support the use of qualitative action research in the current study.

My qualitative study examined two questions: What challenges do teachers encounter when implementing shared reading? What coaching strategies will best support them through implementation? This study was grounded in research of similar case studies and implemented a qualitative research approach. The literature indicates that the use of an instructional coach model will have a positive influence on the implementation of shared reading. The following chapter, Methodology, will address my research questions by describing participants and providing a thorough explanation of the process for data collection and analysis.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter will describe the action research design of the proposed study. The purpose of this study is to determine how instructional coaching impacts the implementation of shared reading strategies in kindergarten classrooms in order to build vocabulary and comprehension during literacy instruction. Following Mertler's (2014) multiple stage process, this research study was carried in four stages: the planning stage, the acting stage, the developing stage, and the reflecting stage. Each stage is described in further detail in this chapter.

Purpose Statement

As stated in Chapters 1 and 2, the purpose of this study is to describe primary grade teachers' implementation of shared reading strategies to build vocabulary and reading comprehension during literacy instruction in one primary school in South Carolina. By implementing new instructional practices during shared reading, kindergarten teachers help decrease the vocabulary gap that contributes to reading comprehension difficulties.

This action research study concentrates on the issue of coaching teachers in their use of a model that supports the implementation of shared reading. As the researcher, and

instructional coach, I worked with four kindergarten teachers to implement shared reading in their classrooms. Over the course of 10 weeks, I provided a PD workshop for the teachers, they began implementing shared reading, I was able to complete bi-weekly observation, and during off-weeks we met as a focus group to identify areas of success and challenges. This study focused on two research questions:

- What can we learn when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve their practice?

- What coaching strategies will best support them through the implementation of shared reading?

This chapter will address the methodology associated with both of these research questions.

Rationale for the Selected Methodology

In this action research study, I worked to improve teacher practice by developing a research question, then gathering and analyzing data (Giles et al, 2010). Teachers collaboratively worked with one another and the instructional coach to improve their practice of implementing shared reading. This reflective process of continual collaboration fits perfectly within the action research structure (Herr & Anderson, 2015). Action research is cyclical, with data always informing the next phase. Therefore, the steps in this research study included developing a plan, implementing the plan, evaluating the effects of implementation, and spending time reflecting and planning for adjustments that needed to be made. Herr and Anderson (2015) presented the five goals of action research as: generation of new knowledge, achievement of action-oriented outcomes, education of the researcher and the participants, results that relevant to the local setting,

and sound and appropriate methodology. As the researcher/instructional coach, my goal was to meet all of these areas in order to demonstrate growth in the areas of coaching teachers through an implementation process.

Qualitative data is advantageous in education research because it is dependable, real time, and anecdotal in nature based on the subjects (Creswell, 2014). This action research investigation considered a variety of qualitative data points such as questionnaires/surveys, observations, and focus groups. As the creator of these qualitative sources, I felt validity was imperative to ensure measures were accurately represented (Mertler, 2014). Teachers first completed a survey about their knowledge of shared reading, so that I could gauge PD needs. After engaging in PD, teachers began implementing shared reading. At the end of each week, teachers would complete another survey about their implementation that week. Every other week, I also went into the classroom for observations. I used the constant comparative method of analysis after each of these encounters, which influenced subsequent focus group encounters. It is crucial to categorize the data that is being compared in order to find value in it (Dey, 1993). Patton (2015) reminded researchers that their role is to establish patterns, creating categories through the use of a creative approach to make meaningful and careful judgments.

Context and Participants

This action research study was completed at a primary school in coastal South Carolina. The school has a total of 8 kindergarten classrooms, serving approximately 185 students. In addition, the school is identified as a Title I school, receiving federal funds to support reading and math based on 66% of students receiving free or reduced lunch.

Teachers were asked to voluntarily participate in the study, with no less than 50% participation. A survey was given to teachers to determine total years of experience, years of experience in kindergarten, experience and knowledge of shared reading. A total of four classroom teachers were selected to participate in the implementation of shared reading. All of those teachers are female and had an array of teaching experience. Of the participants, two of the teachers have taught only kindergarten—one for 11 years and the other for 9 years. One teacher taught kindergarten for 3 years of her 5 years of experience, and the remaining teacher was in kindergarten for the first time in her 17 years of experience. Each teacher indicated that they had little to some experience and knowledge of shared reading.

As the instructional coach at a primary school on the East Coast, I chose this school because of its convenience. As the researcher, I worked with teachers to collaboratively create lesson plans, conduct weekly classroom observations, and provide opportunities for reflection and support through the implementation of shared reading.

Research Methods

Guskey (2000) asserted that "the idea of action research is that educational problems and issues are best identified and investigated where the action is; at the classroom and school level. By integrating research into these settings and engaging those who work at this level in research activities, findings can be applied immediately and problems soled more quickly" (p. 46). Action research is an innovative model that allows for growth in PD and school improvement. With the knowledge of PD and its effectiveness, I began my research process by sharing with teachers the problem of student comprehension. As I researched reading comprehension, it became apparent that

shared reading was a strategy that could be used to increase comprehension. As teachers

and I worked together through this implementation, I used a variety of methods to

determine what happened when the coach and teachers worked together, and what

coaching strategies were most beneficial to the teachers during this implementation.

Table 3.1

Data Collection Methods

Data Collection Methods	Description	Frequency	Documents
Pre- and Post-Survey	Completed by teachers. Collection of teaching and shared reading experience.	1 time at the beginning 1 time at the end	Appendix B
Surveys	Completed by teachers. Collection of qualitative teacher data about shared reading implementation.	Weekly	Appendix C
Classroom Observations	Conducted by researcher to see the progression of implementation	Bi-Weekly	Appendix D
Focus Groups	Conducted by researcher. Professional collaboration between teachers.	Bi-Weekly	Appendix E

Data Collection Tools

Survey/questionnaire. Through either open- or closed-ended questions, a survey

allows the researcher to have written documentation from the research participants

(Mertler, 2014). Due to the ease of creating, distributing, collecting, and analyzing,

surveys are a valuable data collection tool (Butin, 2010). Surveys allow researchers to

gather large amounts of information relatively quick (Mertler, 2014). In the beginning of

this study, participating teachers completed a survey (Appendix B) about their years of

experience and their knowledge of shared reading. From this data, I was able to choose a sampling of teachers with a variety of experience with teaching, experience in kindergarten, and experience with shared reading. Furthermore, this allowed me to create a PD session tailored to their specific knowledge about shared reading.

In addition, I conducted weekly surveys with participating teachers through Google Forms (Appendix C). This data allowed me to know where teachers were in their implementation as well as their attitude towards the implementation. All of the questions were open ended for teachers to give honest feedback. This weekly data allowed me to structure our focus group conversations toward the needs of the teachers based on their feedback. I looked for similarities and trends in the responses from week to week to ensure teachers were supported and able to continue successful implementation.

Observations. Classroom observations allowed me to see teachers in their natural setting (Kawulich, 2005). This data is useful because it contains both verbal and non-verbal expressions of feelings, levels of engagement, and allowed me to see situations that would not be noticed otherwise. Kawulich (2005) stated that the use of participant observation can increase the validity of the study. Before the original PD, I completed a pre-observation during the teachers' scheduled shared reading times. While in the classroom, I scripted exactly what the teacher was saying and what students were saying (Appendix D). This information, paired with the questionnaire that teachers filled out, helped me to create my PD.

Once the implementation of shared reading began, I observed each classroom bi-weekly for a total of 16 observations. During these observations, I scripted again what the teacher said and what the students said. In addition to classroom observations, I

attended each focus group, where we discussed the implementation from the week, reflected on classroom practice based on teacher feedback and classroom observation, and created plans for the upcoming weeks. I recorded our focus group meetings in order to be fully present and engaged in the conversations.

Focus groups. According to Mertler (2014), a focus group is a simultaneous interview, consisting of 10 to 12 people. As classroom teachers and an instructional coach, we thought of this time as more of a professional learning community (PLC). DuFour (2004) defined a PLC using three big ideas: ensuring that students learn, culture of collaboration, and a focus on results. Therefore, during these focus group meetings, the teachers and I took time to talk about what was working and what was not to ensure that students were engaged in the shared reading experience. We collaboratively came up with plans for the following weeks to improve practice from what had happened. Teachers were actively listening and supported each other with suggestions of what worked in their classrooms for other teachers to try. Ultimately, the focus was to increase their reading comprehension by teaching vocabulary through shared reading, so we discussed how students were responding differently week after week.

Based on the focus group's planning (Appendix E), I made sure to have "look fors" in the next week's observation so that we could determine how our plan was actually being implemented in the classroom. During focus group meetings, I audio-recorded the conversations; later, the meetings were transcribed.

Methods

The planning stage. The topic of this study is to increase students' reading comprehension, more specifically, how explicit vocabulary instruction through shared

reading strategies in the classroom can increase comprehension. The support of instructional coaching was utilized to accomplish this overall goal. Mertler (2014) stated, "Undoubtedly, [teachers] may have experiences that differ from yours and that may give you further insight into your ideas for action research" (p. 59). To determine the best candidates to work with, I created a questionnaire regarding the teachers' year of experience, years of experience in kindergarten, experience at various schools, and experience with shared reading. Teachers who were interested in participating were asked to fill out the survey, and from there I narrowed the number of participants down to four. Once those volunteers were chosen, I created a survey that allowed me to gain knowledge about these four teachers' levels of understanding of shared reading, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension strategies. With knowledge of teachers' understanding of shared reading, I was able to create a PD workshop. I reviewed the literature to help guide and inform the development of the action research questions as well as this proposed plan, and it assisted me in becoming more knowledgeable in the area of current implementation strategies for shared reading in kindergarten classrooms. I reviewed an array of literature that both supports and contradicts my views in order to gain a broad understanding of what will work best for teachers. A qualitative approach was used to collect data in this proposed study.

The acting stage. Initially, all study participants completed a survey composed of open-ended questions. The questionnaire served as a means to determine teachers' knowledge of shared reading practices, explicit vocabulary instruction, and how both of those impact reading comprehension.

During the eight weeks of implementation, teachers participated in a PD session about shared reading, engaged in a planning session with each other and the instructional coach, were observed bi-weekly during the implementation process, and on non-observation weeks teachers were a part of a focus group. The focus groups were semi-structured, with several predetermined questions to gauge teacher perception of how implementation was going, as well as opportunity for them to share questions and concerns. During this time, I encouraged teachers to be reflective about their lessons and used that opportunity to share feedback from the observations. At the end of each week, teachers were asked to complete a survey about their implementation of shared reading. Questions included: Which component of shared reading did you implement new this week? What went well? What do you feel can be improved for next week? What supports do you need for the upcoming week? These survey answers helped me, as the coach, determine next steps for focus groups or additional supports that teachers needed.

At the end of the implementation period, all participants completed a final questionnaire. The final questionnaire consisted of several of the same questions from the initial survey for the purpose of analyzing changes in perspective from the beginning to the end.

The developing stage. The data analysis was used to develop an action plan for students that will be moving to new grade levels, as well as a plan for how I can help support teachers in my role as instructional coach. The plan included new strategies for teachers to use in the classroom to increase reading comprehension, as well as how I can support teachers with shared reading strategies through PD. Through consistent self-reflection, classroom observations, and participation, modifications were made along the

way. However, I was able to document the reasoning behind the revision and stay true to the nature of the research.

The reflecting stage. I communicated the results of this study to the teachers who implemented the new strategies, the leadership team (members of administration, guidance, teachers at all grade levels, special education teachers, and school psychologist) at the school, and the administration (principal, assistant principal for instruction, and Title I Facilitator). In addition, I shared the findings with district English language arts coordinators and curriculum specialists.

<div align="center">

Data Analysis

</div>

All data that was collected during this study was qualitative in nature. When analyzing large quantities of qualitative data such as surveys, questionnaires, observations, and focus group notes, it is necessary to reduce the volume of data by coding it and organizing the codes into themes (Creswell, 2014; Mertler, 2014). Mertler (2014) described coding as "the process of organizing the data by bracketing chunks … and writing the category in the margins" (p. 247). Organizing the codes into broad themes is called "winnowing." This is the process of focusing on some data and disregarding the rest, so that the data can be aggregated into a small number of themes (Creswell, 2014).

I sent surveys throughout the study. Initial surveys simply determined the various levels of teaching experience and the knowledge of shared reading. Both of these sets of information were used to determine participants and plan for PD. Once the study began, teachers completed a weekly survey. This information was coded to determine emerging baseline patterns and themes within the data. During classroom observations, I scripted

the lesson. The script included direct verbiage from the instruction of the teacher as well as the response of the students. This information was coded to determine any emerging pattern. While participating in the focus group, I audio recorded the discussions. In order to organize and prepare the data for analysis, I transcribed the recordings. This typed document was then printed and coded. As information was coded, common themes emerged. These themes represented a variety of perspectives. They were supported with specific evidence and quotes.

All of the data underwent two rounds of coding. First, I read over the data. Then I reread and began coding the text. Descriptive coding was used during the first round of coding. Descriptive coding summarizes the data into a word or short phrase (Saldana, 2009). Once all of the data was initially coded, I began to categorize the data. During this phase of coding, I was looking for relationships between codes and the frequency of codes. Next, I went back and coded the data a second time. During this round of coding, I looked for larger themes/categories by highlighting the recurring ideas in the data. This coding, known as pattern coding, led to larger codes that pulled together the data into a more meaningful unit of analysis (Saldana, 2009).

Validity and Transferability

Validity means that data has been accurately collected and measures what it claims to measure, and *reliability* means that approaches that are taken are reliable, consistent, and stable (Creswell, 2014; Mertler 2014). Creswell (2014) articulated that researchers always try to identify threats to reliability and validity by raising questions about the ability to conclude that the intervention has affected the outcome and not additional factors. Throughout the study, to ensure the validity, reliability, and

trustworthiness of my data, I implemented strategic practices.

First, I used multiple data sources as well as collection methods in order to support the findings of my research question. By triangulating the data, Creswell (2014) explains that validity within a study is increased if the researcher creates themes within the research by joining several sources. I was able to triangulate my data by using three different collection methods. I was able to examine teacher surveys weekly and analyze classroom observations and focus group conversations every other week, which allowed for qualitative data to be collected in multiple forms each week. To ensure the reliability of all of the qualitative data, there were multiple rounds of coding and consistent code definitions. I performed an additional method to ensure validity, known as member checking, by sharing my transcribed interviews, observations, and findings with the teachers for their review (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

I also based my study around well-grounded literature that created strong theoretical frameworks. By using best pedagogical and methodological strategies with my teachers, the validity and reliability of the study was strengthened. Developing a trusting relationship with my participants, the teachers, I was able to set a culture for learning and collaboration so that when observations took place, they were a part of the teachers' natural patterns of behavior and teaching. This persistent observation also allowed me to ensure validity and reliability in my study.

Ethical Considerations

The participants in this study were teachers and students within a primary school. As researcher, I obtained a signed informed consent form from each participant. The informed consent form detailed the purpose of my research project along with a

description of the study. Teacher participants were asked to complete both a questionnaire at the beginning, weekly surveys, and participate in bi-weekly focus groups. The participatory requirements were included on the informed consent form. All participants were notified that they would remain anonymous and that results of the study would be shared with educators outside the study. The information that was shared on the consent form served as evidence that I, as researcher, planned to uphold the principle of accurate disclosure.

As the researcher, I conducted myself in an honest manner throughout the study, ensuring that study participants are treated fairly. Again, in order to protect the privacy of the educators and students involved in the study, the researcher obtained written permission (the informed consent form) prior to sharing survey or interview results. Finally, I upheld the principles of beneficence and importance by conducting a research study that sought to benefit the educators and students in my school with effective reading intervention.

<center>**Summary**</center>

Qualitative action research is an outstanding way for educators to improve their practice. Because teaching is so complex, most teachers rarely have opportunities to explore problems and solutions or share new strategies and approaches. Within this chapter, Methodology, I addressed my research questions and its relevance to the qualitative research methods, defined the participants of the study and their role, and provided a detailed explanation of how qualitative data were collected and analyzed. Using action research within classrooms allows the research to be more meaningful and to ultimately have a greater impact on learning. In the following chapter, Finding and

Discussion, I go a step further in my analysis to demonstrate how this data was interpreted.

Action Plan

Mertler (2014) described an action plan as taking the results of the data analysis, interpretations of the data, and final thoughts and formulating a plan of action for the future. What is most important is that the finding from this study are used in the future to try new strategies or carrying out or putting into practice strategies that we have learned in PD (Mertler, 2014). Reflection is a vital part of developing this action plan.

The action plan draws on what I learned from my research questions and the study itself. Based on the reflections of my findings, I created an outline of how this process can be implemented and supervised in the future. As educators, we are always looking to improve upon instructional practice, so I will carry what I learned into a plan for the future.

Chapter 4

Findings and Discussion

Summary of Methodology and Methods

Creating and facilitating valuable PD opportunities that are intentional, ongoing, and systematic can be complex for school leaders (Guskey, 2000). This type of PD has the potential to change teachers' practice, thus increasing student achievement. Instructional coaching has been proven to be an effective model in implementing and maintaining this type of PD (Knight, 2007). This chapter explores the findings of two research questions: What can we learn when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve their practice? What coaching strategies will best support them through the implementation of shared reading?

In order to answer these research questions, I implemented an action research design (Herr & Anderson, 2015), collecting qualitative data. These data sources included surveys, classroom observations, and focus groups. Once this data was collected, it was analyzed using both descriptive and pattern coding (Saldana, 2009). I analyzed all data sources separately, then I merged my learning from those sources for final analysis. After coming to the conclusion with the administrative team that reading intervention was an academic area of improvement within my school, I researched and identified shared reading as a possible intervention to help support comprehension. Shared reading is

defined as a reading experience that is interactive and allows students to share in the reading of the book, while the teacher models the skills of proficient readers (Holdaway, 1979).

As the instructional coach, I made the decision to begin the shared reading implementation in kindergarten classrooms. Once participants were selected, each teacher was given a pre-implementation survey and pre-implementation observations were conducted. With this information, differentiated PD was created and the implementation began. I asked teachers to complete weekly surveys in order to determine my next steps as a coach. In addition, I observed the teachers bi-weekly, and in the weeks when observations did not take place, we met as a focus group for discussion, clarification, and planning.

The remainder of this chapter will entail detailed descriptions of the findings for each research question. The findings for Research Question 1—what can we learn when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve practice?—will identify themes that emerged as critical to have in place when coaches and teachers collaborate. An interpretation of the findings will follow the results. The findings for Research Question 2—what coaching strategies will best support teachers through the implementation of shared reading?—will be presented in a cyclical description of what was found throughout the action research study. Concluding this chapter will be a summary of key findings and discussion of both research questions, as well as an introduction of the action plan that will be discussed in the final chapter.

Findings: Question 1

Research Question 1: What can we learn when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve practice?

The approach I used to investigate this study was interacting with teachers on a consistent basis to target a specific area of improvement, research a strategy to demonstrate growth in that area of improvement, facilitate PD for teachers regarding that strategy, and have sustained communication regarding implementation. To investigate this question, I had various interactions with the teachers. These interactions were cyclical and allowed the opportunity to plan, act, observe, reflect, and then make adjustments to the implementation with the teachers. Once the implementation of shared reading began, the cycle included collection of data through weekly surveys, bi-weekly observations, and bi-weekly focus groups. I audio-recorded the focus groups to allow more active participation. In order to best understand the collaboration between the teachers and the instructional coach, I transcribed the audio recordings; I then analyzed these transcriptions along with observations and teacher survey data. Through the process of the data analysis, I reviewed each interaction with teachers, including quotes from each, until three themes emerged as most important when collaborating to improve practice: (a) expanding relationships, (b) classroom application, and (c) PD. These were not predetermined themes, however, they are supported by the work of Knight (2007), who highlighted partnerships, empowering teachers to master new practices, and PD within schools.

Expanding Relationships

It is critical for instructional coaches and teachers to expand their relationships when collaborating to improve practice. To ensure expanding relationships, teachers must be engaged in the experience, feel supported and reassured by each other and the coach, and have open communication. The literature notes that "instructional coaches believe in supporting others' abilities to grow and excel and they communicate through their coaching conversations that they see themselves as partners—not bosses. Coaching conversations encourage others to be reflective and exercise responsibility" (Reilly, 2010). Positive, trustworthy relationships between instructional coaches and teachers, allow teachers to experience partnerships and someone advocating for their success. When teachers and coaches "think together," the coach provides expertise, while encouraging the teacher to use discretion and add insight, providing a balance between advocacy and inquiry (Knight, 2018). The assertions made by Knight (2008) were confirmed by the themes that emerged from the data in this study. The participant responses to the surveys and the comments voiced during the focus groups supported this idea of building relationships through positive partnerships.

Table 4.1

Expand Relationships

Code	Utterance	Source
Engaging	"Talking it out together really helps."	Survey
Supporting	"I knew I wasn't alone to figure things out."	Focus group
Communicating	"Consistently received feedback."	Focus group
Reassuring	"Encouraged me to think outside of the box."	Focus group

Table 4.1 presents evidence of codes that were compiled from the teacher surveys and focus groups that support the idea of expanding relationships. All teachers identified expanding relationships as a key element in collaborating to improve practice. Gina described relationships as "providing us with the opportunity to collaborate with you if we have questions, even if it's not during focus group time. You're available anytime I have questions and are present in my classroom." Emily agreed: "As a first-year kindergarten teacher, I enjoy engaging in conversation with you and the rest of the team. I've been reflective in my practice because you encourage us to think beyond what we did the week before."

Throughout the implementation of shared reading, teachers persisted even when aspects of implementation seemed difficult. Paige shared during focus group: "my students seem bored with my book choices, can I try a different type of text next week?" This admittance of struggle demonstrated that just because students did not seem interested, she was willing to try something different within the approach to engage her students. Emily asked for suggestions from the group regarding different question types. She felt like she was always asking basic "who," "what," or "where" questions: "I want to make sure I'm having them think deeper during shared reading, but I think I always ask them basic questions. When you come in next week can you record the questions that I ask, so I can see them?"

The final codes that were repeated most often within the data were follow-through, support throughout implementation, and encouragement. During the last focus group of the study, I asked teachers what made the most difference with how we implemented

shared reading versus other implementations that have happened over the years. Maddie stated,

> Ya know, the process was really on-going. Each week, you either observed, or we had group, so we consistently received feedback and were able to talk with each other about what was going well, or when we needed help. I never felt like I was doing anything "wrong," but if I was off-track, you questioned my thinking, and encouraged me to think out of the box.

Paige followed up by stating, "I agree, most PD is taught once, then expected to be implemented. With this, we had PD, practiced, received feedback, and practiced some more. That support helped not only my teaching, but also my consistency with trying something new, I knew I wasn't alone to figure things out."

The opportunities to collect qualitative data via interviews (surveys and focus groups) allowed me to control the questioning to gain deeper understanding of teachers' perspectives. Knight (2007) supported the idea that teachers should feel valued and as if their opinions matter when working with a coach. By expanding relationships their relationship with me as their coach, the teachers were more open to the idea of implementing shared reading. The trust that was established between the teachers and me led to them to ask questions related to shared reading. Teachers became vulnerable with their learning, and the trust within the group empowered them to seek information.

The theme of classroom application arose next in the analysis of data. This data focuses on the instructional coach supporting teachers in the classroom environment.

Classroom Application

In this section, I demonstrate the applied practices of shared reading within the kindergarten classrooms. In this section, I present data the teachers shared about the process of implementing shared reading with the assistance of the instructional coach. Table 4.2 presents evidence of codes that were compiled from the teacher surveys, focus groups, and classroom observations that support the idea of classroom application.

Table 4.2

Classroom Application

Code	Utterance	Source
Preparing	"We can use something other than the poems?"	Focus Group
Observing	"From observations, what do you think I need to improve on?"	Survey
Creating	"We're going to write our predictions on the anchor chart."	Classroom Observation

The data in this section was consistent among the teachers throughout the implementation of shared reading. Before beginning the implementation, the teachers and I met together to go through PD that was specific to their understanding of shared reading. During this meeting time, I shared descriptions of what happened throughout the shared reading lessons. I was able to not only share content about the lessons but also the different text types and the question types that teachers could be asking. Emily asked during the first session, "so we can use something other than the poems provided to us?" After explaining to her there are various text options that she can choose from, she asked

if I could work with her to choose a different option that would fit within the content she was teaching. Each week, teachers filled out surveys, including what supports they needed for the following week. Consistently teachers asked for help with finding different types of books. Paige stated one week, "I would like book suggestions that would be great for decoding words." Maddie wanted "big book titles about either autumn or pumpkins," while Emily wanted a big book that was non-fiction that included photographs. Additionally, the teachers asked for suggestions regarding use of the lesson throughout the week: One teacher felt that "by the end of the week, I am struggling for what to do," while another teacher wanted to know "how to use charts during the lesson to document thinking."

Collaborative planning and modifying/adjusting procedures were very intertwined throughout the implementation. During the first focus group, Gina was sharing about how she "integrated the skill of labeling into my lesson while reading 'The Five Senses,'" when Paige said, "oh, I like the idea of labeling parts within the text." As the instructional coach, as the implementation continued and teachers were more comfortable, I became less of a source of knowledge and more of a provoker of thinking through questioning, as teachers interacted together. I asked questions such as: "so if that worked well for you this week, how will you plan for more intentional and meaningful interactions between your students rather than them answering questions one-at-a-time to you?" During these interactions between the teachers and me, I provided clarification for understanding and planning in order for modifications to be made.

In each end-of-week survey, teachers had to identify what went well in their lessons during the week. While creating the agenda for the focus groups, I used a few of

the things they said as talking points. For example, one week Gina reported that "the children loved the book and the general subject of it. They were able to relate to it." I mentioned that in focus group: "So Gina, you said your students love the book and were able to relate to the content, tell us about that." Through these conversations, teachers were able to develop new ideas from each other. This was demonstrated most prevalently in the surveys as well. One of the questions was "what did you try that was new this week"; teachers would reference new activities that they tried. Consistently teachers would reference focus group conversations in the surveys: "I chose a book this week that focused on different types of text (bold and italicized) to talk about with my students this week, like Paige talked about last week." Emily stated,

> I tried something new that you suggested last week, we identified different types
> of punctuation. When I read I modeled expressive speech with an exclamation
> point, or inflection with a question mark, and we did it altogether. By the end of
> the week, I didn't read it the way we practiced earlier in the week, they called me
> on it. Never even thought about teaching grammar this soon in kindergarten.

By putting new learning into practice teachers became better practitioners in the area of shared reading. While this implementation process was well documented, as the coach, I wanted to take particular note of what the teachers were saying, the questions they were asking, and the level of collaboration they were involved in, to successfully launch shared reading later with all teachers. The cycle of practicing, being observed, participating in focus group conversations and practicing again allowed teachers to develop ideas and modify plans through collaborative planning. This approach of allowing teachers to be decision makers supports Knight's (2018) theory of inventing

improvements. In addition, the teachers collaborated with me when they needed clarification on different ways to approach shared reading as well as when resources/idea were needed.

Professional Development

The final theme that the data revealed regarding the improvement of practice due to the collaboration between coaches and teachers is the importance of PD. Table 4.3 presents the repetitive codes that were established regarding PD. When communicating in focus groups and surveys, teachers use staff development and PD interchangeably.

Table 4.3

Professional Development

Code	Utterance	Source
Learning	"I now understand the true purpose of shared reading."	Post Survey
Professional Growth	"I came across this [article] and wanted to share with the group."	E-mail

Before the implementation of shared reading in the kindergarten classrooms, teachers had some idea of what was involved based on answers from a survey. I created a PD that incorporated what they knew with best practice. Once the PD had taken place, teachers and I planned for Week 1 of implementation. During the first week (and every other week following), I completed observations in each classroom. During Week 2, we met for our first focus group. During this focus group, we had the opportunity to discuss what new strategy they tried, what went well within the lessons, and what they needed

support with. By having sustained conversations about shared reading, teachers were able to clarify meaning, ask for support, and change misconceptions.

When given the initial survey, every teacher had some knowledge of shared reading. By being able to clarify the purpose for shared reading, teachers gained a deeper understanding of why we chose to implement it with best practice. After our PD session, Emily admitted, "that makes a lot of sense, to be honest, I got caught up in the district required poem-of-the-week and really didn't know why." Maddie followed with "yea, I kind of agree with that. I knew there was a purpose, but I thought shared reading was really only used to point out phonics within text, ya know, instead of just being isolated words." Once the teachers knew the "why" behind what I was asking them to try, they were willing to try it. During the first focus group, most of the conversation was geared towards improvement. Teachers filled out a survey on what they thought went well, but they also wanted to ensure their instruction was on target. Gina did not use any tracking devices (point, reading strips, laser, etc.) during her read aloud, "but why do I need to do that, it's a read aloud?" After I explained to her the importance of tracking reading during a shared reading experience, Maddie echoed, "Gina, we're used to every kid having a copy of a poem and being able to follow along, now it's with a big book, they have to be able to follow along from a distance."

During the fifth week of implementation, one of my teachers sent an e-mail with a website she found regarding shared reading. Her e-mail stated, "I was looking for a few more suggestions, and came across this, wanted to share." So for the Week 6 focus group, we discussed the information that was shared on the site and how it would be beneficial for the students. Paige, the sender of the website, said, "I have such a squirrely bunch that

I thought the dramatic play would be fun. Keep them engaged, but still staying within the context of the book. I don't know how I'm going to do it yet, but I want to try it." Emily encouraged Paige with a suggestion: "Why don't you create movements for each page of the story, then teach it to them on the second day of reading?" Gina suggested, "or what you could do is teach them that certain words have movements, and while you're reading the book they have to listen for those words. That will keep their attention on the listening." Maddie followed with, "yea, but then they might not actually be listening to the story as much as they're just listening for the word." Emily said, "We could Google it. You found the idea online, I'm sure someone out there has a strategy for how to implement it." Since we wouldn't be meeting in focus group for another two weeks, I volunteered to find some resources for them: "I'll look up some ways that other teachers have used it and send it to you guys by Thursday so you can plan for it next week. I'll look to see if there are a few different ways, that way you will have some choice." Ultimately by reading more about it, and having collaborative conversation about it, teachers' plans for guided reading were much more thorough.

By collaborating in consistent PD through the process of shared reading implementation, teacher practice was improved. Aguilar (2013) articulated that the difference between effective coaching and traditional PD is that "coaching is an ongoing effort focused on developing a specific and agreed-on set of … practices" (p. 119). Teachers knew what the ultimate goal was and were given sustained support through the implementation. The feedback regarding the intentionally created PD allowed me to see the value in meeting teachers where they are versus training everyone from one starting point.

Interpretation of Data

Research Question 1 sought to answer what could be learned when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve practice. There were three themes that emerged from the data: expanding relationships, classroom application, and PD. Through this entire process, we were able to improve instruction in the classroom for students by working together, asking questions, introducing new strategies to students, and being reflective.

Classrooms are often very personal for teachers. So I had to spend time really ensuring that teachers knew they had a trusting relationship with me. Aguilar (2013) stated, "without trust there can be no coaching" (p. 74). I earned and maintained that trust primarily through communication and confidentiality. Whether teachers were doing well or needed improvement on their strategies, conversations were honest. I sent weekly e-mails to help keep them on track. It was essential for the teachers to know that I was a partner in the planning process and in no way was I evaluating their performance. In any good partnership, a person challenges others to expand their thinking, but it would have been a difficult task if trust had not been established first. In addition, the face-to-face groups really allowed for all of the teachers to have vulnerability, which is hard to do with a coach alone; to be vulnerable with three colleagues plus a coach was uncomfortable for some in the beginning. However, the end result was a very open forum for teachers to have conversation by asking and answering questions. By expanding these collegial relationships, teachers were able to draw from a large bank of knowledge and ultimately improve their teaching practices.

Visiting classrooms was a vital component of teachers' classroom application. Having instructional coaches in the classroom gives teachers the opportunity to discuss feedback regarding instruction. Knight (2007) explained that these collaborative meetings

"are based on mutual respect between professionals … [engaging] in conversation where both parties use data as a point for dialogue" (p. 122). Collaborative conversations regarding where a teacher currently is and which area of shared reading she wants further clarification on help to develop a plan of action. Planning is very intricate, with a lot of things to consider like standards, activities for the lesson, resources needed, and instructional strategy that will be used. Having an opportunity to plan with a team means more ideas and less pressure to have "the" answer. Intentional planning changed the conversations that were happening between teachers and their students because teachers had already anticipated possible answers/misconceptions. The observations and feedback helped to improve classroom practice, and over time, the children's answers and questions during shared reading became more thoughtful as well, showing a higher level of overall comprehension of what was being read to them.

In this study, I also identified sustained PD as a way to improve practice. So often, teachers are required to participate in sit-and-get PDs. From these PDs there is usually some expectation of taking content into the classroom and using it immediately, but no support is provided. Depending on the set up, there is usually very little follow-up from a PD session to ensure that implementation is taking place. Therefore, with everything else that teachers have on their plates, the information taught in PD sessions tends to be discarded. This study showed that PD, when followed-up with observations, feedback, and reflection, allows for stronger implementation. This supports Guskey's (2000) theory that PD should be intentional, ongoing, and systematic. In this study, teachers were not expected to implement everything at once, but gradually, and if they were unsure of next steps, they could ask me or their peers who were also implementing shared reading.

There were supports in place to clarify understanding and to engage in deeper conversations, which led to learning more. When coaches expand relationships with teachers, support them through classroom applications of newly implemented programs, and provide sustained PD, the instructional practices of teachers increase.

<center>**Findings: Question 2**</center>

Research Question 2: What coaching strategies will best support teachers through the implementation of shared reading?

As an instructional coach, it was vital for me to be reflective in order to be effective. For this case study, I wanted to determine the impact of ongoing PD. While supporting teachers through shared reading implementation, I wanted to focus on four different coaching strategies to determine if extended PD provided effective teacher support. These coaching strategies include: utilizing teacher feedback, sustained communication through coach feedback, participating in collaborative planning, and sharing a variety of resources. I chose these four strategies as a focus because, generally speaking, when a PD session is too broad, the feedback from teachers is that they do not know where to start, there is not enough time for planning, and that they do not have available resources. By focusing on only four coaching strategies, I was able to begin to understand which strategies do and do not support teachers when implementing new teaching strategies in the classroom.

Beginning Phase of Shared Reading Implementation

During the beginning of shared reading implementation, it was important for me, as the coach, to know the level of teacher understanding of the specific teaching strategy. Once I collected that information through surveys and pre-observations, I gave teachers

<center>71</center>

PD that was specific to their previous understanding. This PD helped to define shared reading, provide explicit examples, and to clear up misconceptions. At the end of the first training, we planned for the first week of implementation of shared reading. During the first week of implementation, I observed each classroom, and at the end of that week, teachers completed a survey. The data from these sources helped guide our focus group, which took place the second week of implementation. This section will describe in detail the beginning period of shared reading implementation.

Data. Participants answered a survey before implementation of shared reading and completed the same survey at the end of the research period (Appendix B).

Table 4.4

Pre-Observation

	Focus	Questions Asked	Types of Questions	Student Interaction	Type of Text	Tools Used
Emily	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Gina	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Maddie	Fire Safety	none observed	none observed	talking to each other while illustrating	poem	notebook, glue, crayons
Paige	Fire Safety	4	what	answering teacher questions	poem	notebook, glue, crayons, SMARTBoard

The data (see Appendix G) demonstrated teachers' knowledge of shared reading prior to implementation. Overall, pre-implementation data shows that teachers believed they have somewhat of an understanding of shared reading, and that they implemented it each day. The teachers were using poems provided by the school district for what they identified as shared reading. To deepen my understanding of their answers and how to

tailor the PD I would be creating, I also completed pre-observations. During this time, I

went into teachers' rooms during the time that was indicated as "shared reading" on their

schedule. I did not notify teachers in advance that I would be there, as I wanted to

observe their authentic instruction for shared reading.

Observation data from the classrooms (Table 4.4) revealed that teachers did not

see shared reading as a priority or have a deep knowledge of shared reading. Of the four

classrooms, only two were engaged in shared reading during the time that their schedule

indicated. One of the teachers who was not teaching shared reading said "oh, I don't have

any shared reading plans for this week," while the other stated "we just ran out of time

today." The two teachers who were teaching shared reading had some understanding of

shared reading. In one class, all of the students were sitting at their assigned seats at their

tables. They each had a copy of a poem about fire safety. Students were gluing the poem

in their notebooks and then illustrating it under the poem in their notebook. After all

students were finished gluing, they were told to go to the carpet, where the teacher

transitioned into a lesson about beginning sounds and reviewed their sight words on the

SmartBoard. I was in the room 21 minutes, and 12 minutes consisted of the shared

reading activity, but no reading was observed. In the remaining class, the students were

sitting on the carpet, chorally reading the poem together from the SmartBoard. The

teacher asked "what is the poem about," and students replied "fire." The teacher

explained to the students that they would be gluing their poems into their journals and

they were going to illustrate their poem after gluing it in. The teacher asked about good

ideas for illustrations, and the students provided answers: "fireman," "fire trucks,"

"smoke." The teacher praised their ideas, and students went back to their tables to

complete gluing and illustrating. I observed for 22 minutes, and the duration of the observation included shared reading-type activities.

The surveys and the observations revealed there was a need for an intensive introduction of shared reading as it is intended to be taught versus what is provided to the teachers weekly as a part of the English Language Arts curriculum. I used a checklist (Appendix A) to determine that teachers knew some parts and pieces but really were unsure about the in-depth nature of shared reading and its' components. In addition, the teachers' lesson plans were indicative of a lack of understanding of shared reading (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5

Example of Teacher Lesson Plan

Shared Reading				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
NO SCHOOL	David Shannon author study Read *David Goes to School*	David Shannon author study Read *David Gets in Trouble*	David Shannon author study Read *Duck On A Bike*	David Shannon author study *A Bad Case of Stripes*

By now, I was able to use teacher surveys, classroom observations, and current lesson plans to determine teacher knowledge of shared reading. As I created the PD, I was able to use this data to create a presentation that outlined the definition, purpose, text types, and lesson formats for shared reading. I was also able to clarify specific misconceptions that had been determined by the data.

Teachers and I decided on a date to meet for me to present information on shared reading to them. At the conclusion of this presentation, we collaboratively planned lessons for the first week of implementation. Teachers left the meeting with titles of the books they were going to use, a focus for the shared reading experience, a simple format for the week's lessons, and ideas for tools they could begin using during shared reading time. During the first week of shared reading implementation I completed classroom observations (Appendix D) in order to adequately support them moving forward. Table 4.6 shares data that was observed.

Table 4.6

Week 1 Observations

	Focus	Questions Asked	Types of Questions	Student Interaction	Type of Text	Tools Used
Emily	parts of a book	9	what, why	none	big book	pointer
Gina	prediction	7	what, who, how	none	big book	none
Maddie	-parts of a book - exclamations	8	what, why, does	none	big book	pointer
Paige	predictions	12	what, are, does	none	big book	anchor chart, pointer

In order to respect the limited amount of time that teachers have to meet, I sent them weekly feedback (Appendix F) via e-mail after observations were completed. In addition to classroom observations, I asked that teachers complete an end-of-week survey (Appendix C) as well. Their responses are shared in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7

Week 1 Teacher Survey Data

	Emily	Gina	Maddie	Paige
Q1: What did you try that was new this week?	Making Predictions	Reading the same book every day for the entire week	Reading the same book all week	Covering words for them to predict what they are.
Q2: What went well?	My students were able to comprehend a story with good details because of the time we spent talking about the pictures and how pictures help us in our reading.	Picture walk went very well. The students were very into it. We were able to dig deeper and learn different vocabulary such as museum, fossils and quarry	The student enjoyed using the same book all week, they were engaged and making connections.	The students connecting that they can read the book by using the pictures through our picture walk.
Q3: What do you feel can be improved for next week?	My pacing of the lessons - I feel that I spent a little too much time reviewing from the previous day's lesson, which caused my students to lose a little of their attention.	More work with the actual text. I would like more interaction, questioning while I am reading	I feel I can do a better job on the picture walk. The book was long and I rushed doing the picture walk.	What words to cover for them to predict.
Q4: What supports do you need for the upcoming week?	I have everything that I need at this time.	I am going to try a non-fiction book about dinosaurs next week. So my focus can be on using the text and having the kids turn and talk. I want to dig deeper with the text. So I have talked with our media specialist and she is going to find me a good book she says!	I feel like by the end of the end of the week I am struggling for what to do.	None at this moment.

Focus groups were held every other week (opposite of classroom observations) to ensure that teachers felt support through implementation. We met during Week 2 as a team to communicate about implementation of shared reading, clarify any points of confusion, and plan collaboratively together based on that feedback. During the first one-hour focus group, we spent 23 minutes discussing the teachers' feelings about Week 1 and Week 2 implementation and we addressed questions that they had encountered over the last week and a half. The remaining time was spent planning for Week 3. During planning, we started with standards to see what comprehension skills teachers could tie into their shared reading lesson. This was not their isolated reading time, but the goal was to support content across the curriculum. Teachers chose a focus, a book title, set a general procedure (every day is slightly different), and planned for materials. As the teachers went into Week 3 of implementation, Table 4.8 provides an example of the lesson plan that was created.

Interpretation. The surveys and the observations revealed there was a need for an intensive introduction of shared reading as it is intended to be taught versus what is provided to the teachers weekly as a part of the English Language Arts curriculum. Teachers knew some parts and pieces but really were unsure about the in-depth nature of shared reading and its components.

Classroom observations during this time provided opportunities for us to work through the challenges of implementation early. Teachers were able to try what they had learned, then receive feedback via e-mail. Marzano (2013) agreed that feedback should be timely and specific, highlighting areas where improvement is needed so that changes

77

can be made accordingly. This two-way communication allowed for me as the coach to combine what I saw with what teachers were trying when I was not in the room. In the initial focus group, teachers were able to discuss what went well and what could have gone better, and then had an opportunity to be intentional in their responses by planning accordingly.

Table 4.8

Teacher Lesson Plan Week 3

Shared Reading				
Monday	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**
We will be introducing the book Seed, Sprout, Pumpkin. This is not a big book. We will do a picture walk and explain that this book is nonfiction and what that means—I will point out how pictures are labeled and how we can use these to gather information	We will review the book and what nonfiction means. I will read the book through stopping only for very large words that the children may not understand.	Early Out - Lunch time	We will look at the book again. This time, we will talk about certain points of the book - specifically the life cycle of the pumpkin and other pages with labels and talk about what they tell us.	We will look at the book again and talk about the facts that we have learned about pumpkins. What did this book teach us? Turn and talk to your partner about 1 new thing you learned.

During this time of the implementation, teachers were open to changing their ideas of shared reading. Each teacher had chosen a different type of text and had implemented at least one component of shared reading. The discussions during focus

group were supportive and encouraging, as teachers shared about the first week and a half of shared reading. I was able to use this information to determine my next steps as a coach.

Middle Phase of Shared Reading Implementation

As the cycle of implementation for shared reading continued, I was able to be more intentional in my coaching strategies: utilizing teacher feedback, sustained communication and coach feedback, participating in collaborative planning, and sharing a variety of resources. Over time, teachers began to implement more of the tools that were taught, their lesson plans included more detail, indicating more intentional planning, and difference began to emerge between teachers in their observations and planning. As the instructional coach, I was able to determine, based on the shared reading checklist (Appendix A), which components were being thoroughly addressed and which ones I needed to focus on with teachers.

Data. During this portion of the implementation, classroom observations happened during Weeks 3 and 7. The observation was just one day of the week, so communication was critical since I only got a snapshot of what was happening in the classroom. The data that I collected (Table 4.9) included the focus of the lesson, how many questions were asked during the lesson, the types of questions that were asked, if students had an opportunity to interact with each other, what type of text was used for the week, and what tools were used. The goal for teachers was that practice would improve from the first focus group, so feedback included a goal for the next week.

Table 4.9

Mid-Implementation Observations

	Focus	Questions Asked	Types of Questions	Student Interaction	Type of Text	Tools Used
Emily						
Week 3	text features: bold/italics	11	what, how	none	picture book	pointer, wiki stix
Week 7	visual cues	9	what, why, how	none	big book	highlighter tape, pointer, sticky notes
Gina						
Week 3	making connections	22	what, have, does, can, did, are	turn and talk	big book	pointer, sticky notes
Week 7	-text features: bold/italicized -connections	9	which, do, what, why,	none	big book	anchor chart, wiki stix
Maddie						
Week 3	non-fiction	18	what, why, how, where, can, do	think-pair-share	big book	pointer, sticky notes
Week 7	predictions	15	why, how	none	picture book	anchor chart, pointer
Paige						
Week 3	sequencing	22	what, are, did, who, were	none	big book	pointer, sticky notes
Week 7	asking questions	13	what, why, do	turn and talk	big book	sticky notes, anchor chart

80

During collaborative planning, teachers and I discussed best practice, strategies they could try in the coming week, focus ideas that aligned with standards, and questioning techniques that teachers could try to deepen the conversations during shared reading. Conversations during these planning times became more indicative of best practice. However, unlike earlier during implementation, now teachers had the freedom to choose their book title, the focus they thought would best pertain to their students, and the overall structure of their lesson. Teachers chose write their plans in a variety of ways, as seen in Appendix H.

In addition to collecting information based on classroom observation and teachers' lesson plans, the teachers continued to fill out surveys every Friday, which revealed what teachers tried that was new. This can be seen in their lesson plans as well as what I observed in the classroom. Some examples of teacher responses are:

Week 4: Instead of an overall prediction of the entire story, students made predictions by looking at the front and back cover. Then they made predictions for each page based on that page's illustrations.

Week 6: We worked on making connections, students were making connections between themselves and the book.

Week 7: I used a KWL chart during shared reading time.

Week 8: I wanted the children to notice how the author made certain words bigger and italicized. We talked about why this was done and by the end of the week they were able to say what those words were.

On these surveys, teachers could also request assistance on instructional ideas or resources. The levels of support varied throughout the implementation. There were some

weeks when teachers indicated they did not need support, some weeks when they needed help gathering resources, and some weeks where they needed help with the shared reading instruction. As seen in Table 4.10, there were a total of 20 responses during the middle period of implementation.

Table 4.10

Mid-Implementation Supports Needed

	Instructional Support	Resource Gathering	Total Support Requested
Emily	3	1	4/6, 67%
Gina	1	0	1/6, 17%
Maddie	1	2	3/6, 50%
Paige	3	2	5/6, 83%

For example, at the end of the fourth week, Maddie stated, "I feel like by the end of the week, I am struggling for what to do. I need some help to keep the lessons going." A few weeks later, Paige indicated she needed assistance with anchor charts, "[I need help with], how to use charts for shared reading." Emily once asked for feedback, as it was an observation week, "what do you think I need to improve on? Any suggestions?" More often than instructional strategies, teachers wanted help gathering resources: "Can we order some wiki stix, those were fun?," "I want to use non-fiction during shared reading as well. Can you help me find some quality non-fiction big books?," "I want to use a nonfiction book since we are learning about science, and I had trouble finding a big book that has photograph," and "Book suggestions that would be good for decoding covered words."

Interpretation. Throughout this time, the data revealed a distinction between the teachers and each of their implementations. Emily and Paige are newer members to the

kindergarten team, although they both have previous teaching experience. Gina and Maddie are veteran members of the kindergarten team, and have only ever taught kindergarten together at the same school.

Both Emily and Paige requested the most amount of assistance with ideas and resources during the implementation of shared reading. Both teachers requested instructional support more frequently than resources. The level of support was also indicated in the lesson plans, as both teachers had explicit procedures in their lesson plans as well. The veteran kindergarten teachers, Maddie and Gina, requested much less assistance during the shared reading implementation. They each had a basic plan for shared reading in their lesson plans that included the activity of the day and the book title. In directive coaching, these results are indicative of the findings of Duessen et al. (2007), who stated that this model of coaching is best used with new teachers who want to learn from veterans.

Even though both sets of these teachers did not utilize all of the coaching strategies that were available to them, it was not reflected in their classroom observations. Each teacher made growth from the pre-observation to the Week 7 observation. During the pre-observation, two teachers did not even have lessons available for observation. However, at the end of Week 7, each teacher had used various types of text such as poems, picture books, and big books. Also, I noticed that the number of questions that teachers asked decreased overall, but the level of questioning increased from basic recall with what, where, and when questions, to deeper analysis of the story with why and how questions. This improvement was from an integration of the teachers' learning with the practices of the teachers, supported by the instructional coach (Harwell-Kee, 1999).

Final Phase of Shared Reading Implementation

As the cycle of shared reading implementation came to a close, I was able to obtain a few final pieces of data. I collected a final round of classroom observations, and teachers completed the post-implementation survey (Appendix I).

After the 10 weeks of instructionally sound implementation of shared reading, teachers were asked to fill out the same survey they filled out before the implementation of shared reading. The answers were distinctly different.

Each teacher felt very comfortable in her understanding of shared reading. By the end of the 10-week period, each teacher had established routines for shared reading that lasted throughout the week. Throughout implementation, students were able to experience different types of text during shared reading, including big books, picture books, and poems. The instructional focus also shifted during the lessons to include comprehension skills such as prediction and asking & answering questions. Students were encouraged to use visual cues as well as sounds to determine words. Teachers indicated that they did not have any questions about the process of shared reading but would like to have a larger variety of big books available in our school library. Additionally, I was able to see a progression in the teachers' implementation of the shared reading components. Appendix J shows how each teacher demonstrated positive change in the areas of pre-reading, during reading, and after reading.

As I reflected on my original coaching strategies, I wanted to determine how much I was able to share a variety of resources with the teachers throughout the entire implementation period. One of the questions on the weekly survey was "what supports do you need for the upcoming week?" There were 40 total responses from the survey, 10 of those were requests for resources. When thinking ahead for the following week, teachers

only needed resources 25% of the time. There were occasions when teachers would come directly to my office at various times to ask for help locating resources. In 10 weeks, I had seven verbal requests for materials that were logged. Table 4.11 shows a total amount of resources that were requested by teachers during the 10-week implementation period.

Our school library has approximately 58 big books, however, the titles were limited. Teachers requested books on a certain topic such as apples, pumpkins, and community helpers because in our library, we had one big book about apples and one about pumpkins. When teachers asked for resources, they had already gone to our school library and what they wanted was not available. I was able to locate books through either other instructional coaches, librarians at other elementary schools, or our public library.

Table 4.11

Request for Resources

Specific Titles	Topics	Genre	Skills Based
8	5	3	1

Overall Interpretation

Comparing the pre-implementation and post implementation survey data from teachers demonstrates that providing ongoing PD during the implementation of shared reading proved effective. By utilizing teacher feedback, providing opportunities for coaching feedback, collaboratively planning, and sharing a variety of resources, teachers were able to make connections from what they knew to what they learned and

successfully shifted their instruction to make the shared reading experience more intentional.

The data indicated that teachers were thinking more deeply about their practice as the weeks progressed. I used teacher surveys to help guide conversations/support teachers through the implementation of shared reading, which proved beneficial to me for knowing how to best support each teacher. By allowing teachers to choose their goals based on their struggles, I empowered them to feel like professionals, which opened them up to sharing the real struggles on the survey that they weren't necessarily willing to admit during the focus group. Without the surveys, I do not think I would have gotten the in-depth responses that I did from teachers. Knight (2007) agreed that giving teachers a voice and a choice builds a trusting relationship between the coach and the teacher, therefore the teacher feels freedom to try new things.

After reviewing observational data and seeing the progress in classrooms, I determined collaborative communication seemed to guide the success. If feedback had strictly been given to teachers to use on their own to create a plan without conversation, the instructional changes would not have been as intentional. When teachers were given an opportunity to ask questions and gain understanding, they were more willing to try new things. Although there are still shared reading strategies on which we can improve, growth happened each week. Therefore, I have confidence that feedback with collaborative conversation was a successful coaching strategy.

Although the lesson plans for shared reading did not demonstrate growth from every teacher, growth was definitely observed from the beginning to the end of shared reading implementation. The classroom observations were indicative of deeper

understanding of shared reading by the teacher, as resources were available and ready, students' participation indicated a routine, and teachers' questions were better as they were prepared. Woolfolk (2013) believed that in order for teachers to take ownership of their learning and actually use it in the classroom, strategies must be engaging. One strategy to help engage teachers is placing them in social situations where they can converse with other adults who will validate and challenge them. By providing the support and collaboration of colleagues and the coach, implementation of shared reading was successful.

Providing resources for teachers was an easy way to support teachers, generally taking little time to find what they were looking for. With the instructional strategy feedback, I was really able to help guide them, but also I used those responses to guide our focus-group conversations as well. As the coach, I wanted to encourage collaboration between teachers, so I wanted teachers to be able to share their expertise with one another. Additionally, by sharing the good and the not-so-good of each week, I was able to keep teachers motivated by celebrating their students' success, or I was able to provide encouragement. However, with gathering materials, ultimately this particular coaching strategy was not the most effective strategy regarding the implementation of shared reading. Teachers have the same access to other school librarians as instructional coaches. Therefore, I was able to help save the teachers some time, but if I had not done so, the books would have been an e-mail away. If each teacher had asked for this type of assistance every week, perhaps sharing a variety of resources would have been more effective.

Conclusion

This action research study investigated the collaborative practice between instructional coaches and kindergarten teachers, as well as the most effective coaching strategies to ensure best practice during the implementation of shared reading. The focus of this study was based on an administrative observation of a specific problem of practice. To ensure alignment between the problem and the study, teacher participants were intentionally selected to represent a variety of experiences. Using a qualitative approach, data was collected over the course of the study and analyzed by identifying themes within the data. The results of this data indicated that when instructional coaches use specific strategies while collaborating with students, they had a positive impact on the implementation of shared reading.

Data collection included surveys, classroom observations, and focus groups. The same sets of data were used to answer both research questions but through a different lens. The first research question was: What can we learn when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve practice? Analysis the data from the interactions between teachers and myself revealed three themes that positively impacted teacher/coach collaboration: expanding relationships, classroom application, and PD. The second research question— What coaching strategies will best support teachers through the implementation of shared reading—was answered by analyzing coaching behaviors. Providing individualized PD, utilizing teacher feedback, communicating and providing coach feedback, participating in collaborative planning, and sharing a variety of resources were coaching strategies I analyzed to determine if they were effective in supporting teachers.

This chapter has outlined the findings and interpretations of the original research questions. Mertler (2014) taught that action research follows a cycle of planning, acting,

developing, and reflecting. This chapter, along with previous chapters, has shown that the

cycle for action research was followed throughout the study. In the next chapter, I will

outline next steps for improvement through my reflection of the study.

Chapter 5

Reflections and Implications

Reflection

Introduction

The purpose of this action research study was to answer two research questions: What can we learn when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve practice? What coaching strategies will best support teachers through the implementation of shared reading? As documented in the findings and interpretations of Chapter 4, collaboration between instructional coaches and teachers with the use of specific coaching strategies led to best practices in regards to shared reading. Qualitative data collection tools included surveys, classroom observation records, and focus group transcriptions. The data analysis reported three main themes that are key for optimal collaboration when improving practice: expanding relationships, classroom application, and PD. In addition, providing individualized PD, utilizing teacher feedback, communicating feedback, and participating in collaborative planning were the most effective strategies during the implementation of shared reading. By following Mertler's (2014) cycle of planning, acting, developing, and reflecting, this chapter will complete the cycle of the action research process with a reflection and a plan for future research. While reflecting, I determined which interventions were most beneficial and which unforeseen factors may

have occurred, and how this information can guide decisions about implementing new strategies now and in the future.

Teacher Insight

Throughout this research study, I asked teachers for feedback. I explained to teachers that I wanted honest feedback in order to improve practice. Teachers were given a pre-implementation survey, which was equivalent to any pre-assessment teachers would give to students, and observations were completed prior to creating PD. The insight I received from these data sources allowed for me to customize the implementation. Teachers appreciated the validation for what they did know and the new information that they were taught about shared reading. Weekly, teachers completed another survey, which allowed me to gauge teacher attitudes by their responses to successes or challenges. Teachers maintained positivity throughout the implementation because their feedback was monitored, valued, and guided the levels of support that they needed.

Classroom Observations

Observations of shared reading happened in each classroom every other week. These observations allowed me to see the teachers' implementation in practice. Having both surveys and observations offered me the opportunity to know teachers' perceptions versus their practice. In the first round of observations, I scripted the entire lesson with no real focus. Using the scripted notes and the PD, I created an observation form (Appendix C). At the focus group the next week, I shared the observation form with teachers so they knew what to expect from the observations.

Observations provided information about the teachers' focus for the lessons, question types and quantity, the level of student interaction with each other, the types of

texts teachers chose to use, and any tools they added to the shared reading experience. Classroom observations were the most useful tool for me as a coach, but the teachers never really enjoy being observed.

Focus Groups

We met in focus groups on the weeks that observations did not take place. Within focus groups, topics for every week included: successes, questions/concerns, feedback from coach, and collaborative planning. In order to ensure that teaching practice was impacted, we established group norms together, which included:

- being attentive during the meeting, e.g., no cell phones

- respecting the agenda items and timeframe, e.g., no tangents

- being prepared with materials for planning

- actively engaging in group conversations

- maintaining positivity and being open minded.

This follows a similar format of the school's grade-level professional learning communities (PLCs), so teachers knew the expectations (Appendix E).

While we were in focus groups, we planned for the following two weeks. During planning, teachers used their thematic pacing guides to try to find text that would correlate with their themes. From there, we looked at the standards that would be taught during those units to see which ones teachers could integrate into their shared reading lesson. If teachers chose to use big books (which most often they did), they would have to obtain copies of the books to determine the focus of the daily lessons based on the content of the book. During these planning sessions, I added suggestions for teachers to take their shared reading to the next level: adding deeper-level/open-ended questions,

adding a different tool to the list, creating an anchor chart for the focus, etc. Focus groups were a necessary part of the implementation to maintain consistency in understanding and implementation. Groups usually lasted an hour, and teachers were engaged in the conversation.

Implications for Next Steps

As I reflect upon the processes in this action research study, I am aware that there are limitations that make it difficult to determine which coaching strategy had the greatest impact on teachers' implementation of shared reading. However, I am satisfied in the overall positive change in the teachers' practice since implementation of shared reading strategies, and I believe it is worth developing an action plan based on the results of this study. Understanding that action research is an ongoing process (Mertler, 2014), I will continue to monitor teachers' understanding overall to determine what works best for each teacher in order to continue to provide them with adequate support. What follows in the rest of this chapter is a reflective discussion of the changes I would make to this research study, a summary of my action plan, and implications for future practice.

<div align="center">

Discussion of Changes

</div>

The study was designed using a qualitative action research study, which asked the questions: What can we learn when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve their practice? What coaching strategies will best support them through the implementation of shared reading? The research participants were four kindergarten teachers at one elementary school. The study implemented four data collection methods: surveys (Appendices B and C), observations (Appendix D), focus groups (Appendix E), and lesson plans.

If I had the opportunity to conduct this study again, I would make some minor changes to my process of implementation. At the beginning of the study, I collected some preliminary data on teachers' understanding of shared reading. After determining their level, I provided PD and we planned the first week together. Planning was an opportunity for teachers to get clarification on any questions they had or to share ideas with the group. However, teachers had a lot of freedom in the beginning. That allowed for some teachers to go all-in while others took one small step at a time. In the future, I would scaffold this process a bit more. The first week, I would provide teachers with a specific text type and a specific next step. By phasing in one component of shared reading at a time, the flow of implementation would flow a bit better, feedback would be more specific, and focus group conversations would generate ideas around similar topics.

Next, I would complete observations weekly. By waiting every two weeks, there were times when teachers needed additional support without realizing it. It was never too late to fix misconception, but weekly observations would have provided an opportunity for quicker corrective feedback. Additionally, by only completing four observations per teacher, I was likely to miss a portion of the shared reading experience. I rarely made it into classrooms on Mondays to see the pre-reading lesson. I knew based on lesson plans and evidence within the classroom that those components were being taught, but I did not get to see the teachers engage with the students. Having more time would have allowed for more opportunities to see every teacher teach every component.

Finally, I would change the data collection methods. This study included all qualitative data as I examined teacher and coach behaviors during the implementation of shared reading. However, based on Guskey's (2002) research, teachers do not change

their attitudes about new instructional strategies until they see an increase in student achievement. Ultimately, when implementing new strategies, the goal is to improve student achievement. However, that was not the focus of this study, and therefore, student data was intentionally not discussed. In future studies, I would have some quantitative data that demonstrates student comprehension before implementation of shared reading as well as student comprehension after implementation of shared reading to determine if that effects teacher implementation.

Action Plan for Future Investigations

Developing an Action Plan

Developing an action plan is an essential part of the process of action research (Mertler, 2014). An action plan gives me the opportunity to think about the process of conducting action research, with a focus on next steps. This action plan allows me to think about what I learned about my topic that I did not know before I started, and what unintended consequences resulted from my study (Mertler, 2014). I developed the following action plan in order to continue the process of learning that began with this research study.

Purpose

Just as the purpose of this research study was to determine what can be learned from teachers and instructional coaches collaborating together, as well as coaching strategies that were most effective, so is this the purpose of this action plan. The findings indicated that when teachers and instructional coaches collaborate, relationships, classroom application, and PD are the most important. Additionally, it was found that

coaching had a positive impact on the implementation of shared reading by using teacher feedback, providing sustained feedback, and participating in collaborative planning.

Objectives

1. Teachers and coaches may continue to expand relationships to improve instructional practice.
2. Teachers may continue to be supported through classroom application by receiving feedback.
3. Teachers may continue to receive sustained PD.

Suggested Strategies

In order to continue this implementation throughout the entire building, I would create an opportunity for the teachers who participated in this study to act as teacher leaders throughout the next phase.

To start, I would work with each teacher leader to ensure they are equipped to present the PD in a way that articulates the importance of shared reading. During this time, I would also prepare them as leaders of the focus group conversations. I envision that each teacher would lead one grade level (4K–second grade). Once these grade-level trainings have begun, the teacher leaders and I will meet again in focus groups to determine what is going well or what they need support with in regards to mentoring teachers who are implementing shared reading. Teacher leaders will be responsible for PD, focus groups, and planning.

Additionally, I would meet with the school administrative team. The administrative team would be trained in the same shared reading PD as the teachers. Each administrator will be responsible for classroom observations and feedback directly to the

teachers for one grade level. Therefore, I will train the administrative team using the observation form and the feedback template, ensuring specificity when giving feedback to maintain fidelity across the building. In order to make sure administration is all on the same page, each administrator will observe a teacher leader teaching shared reading, fill in the observation form and feedback template, and compare them to make sure we are all aligned. Once the administrator completes all observations, they will provide feedback to the teacher who was observed, the teacher leader, and the instructional coach.

As the instructional coach, I will collect teacher survey data each week to establish what is going well, what could be improved, and what supports teachers need. Then I will work directly with the teacher leaders to use this feedback as points of discussion during focus groups throughout implementation. If teacher leaders need additional support, I will be available for them by attending focus groups or giving more specific PD. By using this process, all teachers may have the same sustained PD with support through school-wide implementation of shared reading.

Implications for Future Study

The overall action research study was a positive experience that yielded positive results, but it is important to keep teacher individuality in mind when considering the implementation of shared reading throughout the school. Some teachers are not comfortable receiving PD and feedback from their peers and prefer it from "experts" such as administrators and instructional coaches, while other teachers may thrive when it is their peer working directly with them. Additionally, the teachers who were selected for this study were volunteers, and it cannot be assumed that this study will have the same results with a school-wide implementation.

Another implication for a future study would be quantitative data collection and the timeframe and the number of teachers participating. While the results of this study do indicate a positive result from specific coaching strategies, if we have a specific assessment to determine student levels, then use all teachers to implement shared reading over a prolonged period of time, with progress monitoring and a post-assessment to determine growth, we might narrow down which strategies were most effective.

Conclusion

The problem of practice addressed in this action research study was improving reading comprehension through the use of shared reading. The research questions that guided this study and were addressed to help solve the problem were: What can we learn when teachers and coaches collaborate to improve their practice? What coaching strategies will best support them through the implementation of shared reading? Data for this study was collected from teacher surveys, observations, lesson plans, and focus groups.

Prior to the start of the study, teachers completed a pre-implementation survey, and I, as the coach, completed pre-observations to determine teacher understanding of shared reading. During the intervention period, teachers were given sustained PD, feedback, and support.

Through the process of the study, there was an increase in the shared reading strategies that were being implemented. Teachers tried new strategies each week that were shared with me (the instructional coach), as well as with the team of teachers during the focus group. Classroom observations provided me an opportunity to reflect on what was going well and what needed to be redefined. Feedback allowed me to have open

dialogue with the teachers regarding the implementation. All of this information was used as a guide during planning for the next week in order to continue to improve shared reading implementation.

In reflecting on my personal experiences during this process, I have had the opportunity to get to know each of the teachers better as individuals and as teachers. I had to allow the process to be inclusive and collaborative versus me being the giver of information. As an instructional coach, I have grown and learned so much as I watched teachers try new ideas and work together to overcome attitudes towards something new. This action plan aims to further learning not only about shared reading but also about teacher/coach relationships and how by working together, we can improve instructional practice.

References

Aguilar, E. (2013). *The art of coaching: Effective strategies for school transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Aldridge, J., Kirkland, L., & Kuby, P. (2002). *Jumpstarters: Integrating environmental print throughout the curriculum* (3rd ed.). Birmingham, AL: Campus Press.

Aldridge, J., Kirkland, L., & Kuby, P. (2002). *Jumpstarters: Integrating environmental print throughout the curriculum* (3rd ed.). Birmingham, AL: Campus Press.

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretical view of basic processes in reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 255–291). New York, NY: Longman.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117–148.

Block, C. C. (1993). Strategy instruction in a student-centered classroom. *Elementary School Journal, 94*(2), 137–153.

Bodrova, E., & Leong, D. J. (2006). Vygotskian perspectives in teaching and learning early literacy. In D. Dickonson & S. Neuman (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 243–256). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Bolghari, M. S., & Hajimaghsoodi, A. (2017). Action research as a bottom-up approach

    to foster teacher involvement in language curriculum change. *Journal of*

    Language Teaching & Research, 8(2), 362–369.

Bornfreund, L. A. (2013). An ocean of unknowns: Risks and opportunities in using

    student achievement data to evaluate preK–3rd-grade teachers. Washington, DC:

    New America Foundation.

Brown, R., Pressley, M., Van Meter, P., & Schuder, T. (1996). A quasi-experimental

    validation of transactional strategies instruction with previously low-

    achieving second graders. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*, 18–37.

Brown, S. (2004). *Shared reading for grades three and beyond: Working it out together.*

    Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

Bush, R. N. (1984). *Effective staff development in making schools more effective:*

    Proceedings of three state conferences. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Butin, D. (2010). *The education dissertation: a guide for practitioner scholars.* Thousand

    Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Caposey, T., & Heider, B. (2003). *Improving reading comprehension through*

    cooperative learning. (Unpublished dissertation). St. Xavier University &

    Pearson/Skylight, Chicago, IL.

Clay, M. M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*.

    Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. M. (2005). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Portsmouth,

    NH: Heinemann.

Collins, C. (1991). Reading instruction that increases thinking abilities. *Journal of Reading, 34*, 510–516.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Cummins, C., Stewart, M. T., & Block, C. C. (2005). Teaching several metacognitive strategies together increases students' independent metacognition. In S. E. Israel, C. C. Block, K. L. Bauserman, & K. Kinnucan-Welsch (Eds.), *Metacognition in literary learning: The theory, assessment, instruction, and professional development* (pp. 227–295). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaun Associates.

Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2014). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching. *The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.* Retrieved from http://www.nctaf.org/documents/DoingWhatMattersMost.pdf.

DeMoulin, D. F. (2001). The hidden value of personalization and rhyme in reading. *Reading Improvement, 38*(3), 116–118.

Denton, C. A., & Hasbrouck, J. (2009). A description of instructional coaching and its relationship to consultation. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation, 19*(2), 150–175.

Deussen, T., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Autio, E. (2007). "Coach" can mean many

    things: Five categories of literacy coaches in Reading First. REL Northwest 5.

    Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis.* London: Routledge.

Dickinson, D. & Tabors, P. (2001). *Beginning literacy with language: Young children*

    learning at home and school. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Dickonson, D. K., & Neuman, S. (Eds.) (2001). *Handbook of early literacy.* New York,

    NY: The Guilford Press.

Dozier, C. (2006). *Responsive literacy coaching: Tools for creating and sustaining*

    purposeful change. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Duffy, D. (2002). The case for direct explanation of strategies. In C. C. Block & M.

    Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp.

    28–41). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

DuFour, R. (2004). What Is a "Professional Learning Community"? *Educational*

    Leadership, 61, 6–11.

Durak, G., Yünkül, E., Cankaya, S., Akpinar, S., Erten, E., Inam, N., & Tastekin, E.

    (2016). Content analysis of master theses and dissertations based on action

    research. *Journal of Education And Training Studies, 4*(12), 71–80.

Durkin, D. (1978–1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading

    comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *12*, 481–538.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). *Better learning through structured teaching: A framework*

    for the gradual release of responsibility. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2008). Shared readings: Modeling comprehension,

vocabulary, text structures, and text features for older readers. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(7), 548–556.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers: Teaching comprehension, genre, and content literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2007). *Reading for information in elementary school: Content literacy strategies to build comprehension.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Garet, M., Porter, A., Desimone, L., Birman, B., & Yoon, S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 915–945.

Giles, C., Wilson, J., & Elias, M. (2010). Sustaining teachers' growth and renewal through action research, induction programs, and collaboration. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *Winter*, 91-108

Glickman, C. (1992*). Supervision in transition: The 1992 ASDC yearbook*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R., & Krajewski, R. (1980). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *American Educational Research Association*, (May), 5–11.

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

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8,* 381–391.

Harp, B. (1993). *Bringing children to literacy: Classrooms at work.* Norwood, MS:

    Christopher-Gordon.

Harwell-Kee, K. (1999). Coaching. *Journal of Staff Development, 20*(3), 28–29.

Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (2001). The essentials of effective professional development:

    A new consensus. In D. Boesel (Ed.), *Continuing professional development* (pp

    1–17). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Library of

    Education.

Herr, K., & Anderson, G. L. (2015). *The action research dissertation: A guide for*

    students and faculty (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: SAGE.

Holdaway, D. (1979). *The foundations of literacy*. Auckland, New Zealand: Ashton

    Scholastic.

Honchell, B. A., & Schulz, M. M. (2012). Engaging the youngest readers with shared

    reading experiences. *Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education, 4*(3), 59–67.

Ippolito, J. (2010). Three ways that literacy coaches balance responsive and directive

    relationships with teachers. *The Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 164–190.

Jasper, M. A. (1994). Issues in phenomenology for researchers of nursing. *Journal of*

    Advanced Nursing. 19(2), 309–314.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1996). The evolution of coaching. *Educational Leadership,*

    53(6), 12–16.

Kawulich, B. B. (2005). Participant observation as a data collection method. *Forum:*

    Qualitative Social Research 6(2). Retrieved from

    http://home.sogang.ac.kr/sites/kylee/Courses/Lists/b6/Attachments/21/Participant

    %20Observation%20as%20a%20Data%20Collection%20Method%20(2005).pdf.

Killion, J., Harrison, C., Bryan, C., & Clifton, H. (2012). *Coaching matters.* Oxford, OH: Learning Forward.

Kindle, K. J. (2011). Same book, different experience: A comparison of shared reading in preschool classrooms. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 7*(1), 13–34.

Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., & Boardman, A. (2007). *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Knight, J. (2006). Instructional coaching. *School Administrator, 63*(4), 36–40.

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

Knight, J. (2009). *Instructional coaching a partnership approach to improving instruction: A multimedia kit for professional development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: Androgogy versus pedagogy.* New York, NY: New York Association Press.

Knowles, M. S. (1977). Adult learning processes: pedagogy and andragogy. *Religious Education 72*(2), 202-211. Retrieved from file:///H:/Knowles_AdultLearningTheory.pdf

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Lonigan, C. J. (2008). Conceptualizing phonological processing skills in prereaders. In M. C. McKenna & S. Walpole (Eds.), *Solving problems in the teaching of literacy. The literacy coaching challenge: Models and methods for grades K–8.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Manning, M. (1997). 14 ways to use shared reading. *Teaching PreK–8, 28*, 129–131.

Martinez, M., & Roser, N. (1985). Read it again: The value of repeated readings during

    story time. *The Reading Teacher*, *38*(8), 782–786.

Maslow, A. H. (1962). Some basic propositions of a growth and self-actualization

    psychology. *Perceiving, behaving, and becoming: A new focus for education*, 34–

    49.

Mertler, C. (2014). *Action research: improving schools and empowering educators*.

    Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Merton, R. K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. *Antioch Review, 8*(2), 193–210.

Mooney, M. E. (1990). *Reading to, with, and by children*. Katanah, NY: Owen.

Moyer, S. B. (1982). Repeated reading. *Journal of Reading Disabilities, 15*(10), 619–

    623.

National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidenced-based*

    assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications

    of reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups. Washington, DC: National

    Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Ness, M. (2011). Explicit reading comprehension instruction in elementary classrooms:

    Teacher use of reading strategies. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education,*

    25, 98–117.

Neuman, S. B. (2001). The role of knowledge in early literacy. *Reading Research*

    Quarterly, *36*(4), 468–475.

Nicoll-Hatton, V., & Primary English Teaching Association. (1992). Big books

    revisited: An interview with Don Holdaway. *PEN, 86,* 1–10.

Otto, B. (2006). *Language development in early childhood* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle

    River, NJ: Pearson.

Patton, M. Q. (2003). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA:

    SAGE Publications.

Pearson P. D., & Duke, N. K. (2002). Comprehension instruction in the primary

    grades. In C. C. Collins Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension*

    instruction: Research-based best practices (pp. 247–258). New York, NY:

    Guilford Press.

Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension.

    Contemporary Educational Psychology, *8*, 317–344.

Peterson P., & West, M. (2003). *No child left behind? The politics and practice of school*

    accountability. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Piaget, J. (1977). *The essential Piaget*. New York, NY: Basic Book.

Poglinco, S., & Bach, A. (2005). The heart of the matter: Coaching as a vehicle for

    professional development. *Kappan, 85*(5), 398–400.

Routman, R. (2003). *Reading essentials: The specifics you need to teach*

    reading well. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Russo, A. (2004). School-based coaching: A revolution in professional development—or

    just a fad? *Harvard Education Letter, 20*(4), 1–4.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Thousand Oaks, CA:

    SAGE Publications Ltd.

Sayler, B. (2003). Alternatively and traditionally certified teachers: The same but

    different. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(663), 16–27.

Schickedanz, J. A., & McGee, L. M. (2010). The NELP report on shared story reading: Reading interventions (chapter 4): Extending the story. *Educational Researcher, 39*(4), 323–329.

Scott, C, & Sutton, R.E. (2009). Emotions and change during professional development for teachers: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *3*(2), 151–171.

Short, R. A., Kane, M., & Peeling, T. (2000). Retooling the reading lesson: Matching the right tools to the job. *Reading Teacher, 54*(3), 284–295.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. *Psychological Reports, 114*(1), 68–77.

Snow, C. E., & Sweet, A. P. (2003). *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Steiner, L., & Kowal, J. (2007, September). *Issue brief: Principal as instructional leader: Designing a coaching program that fits.* Washington, DC: The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement.

Teale, W. H., & Sulzby, E. (1986). *Emergent literacy as a perspective for examining how young children become writers and readers.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Teale,W. H., Paciga, K., & Hoffman, J. L. (2007). Beginning reading instruction in urban schools: The curriculum gap ensures a continuing achievement gap. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(14), 344–348.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1991). *Rousing the minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context.* New York, NY: Cambridge.

Tompkins, G. E. (2006). *Literacy for the 21st century: A balanced approach.* Upper

    Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Vygotsky L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher*

    psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wasik, B. A. (2010). What teachers can do to promote preschoolers' vocabulary

    development: Strategies from an effective language and literacy professional

    development coaching model. *The Reading Teacher*, *63*(8), 621–633.

Weizman, Z. O., & Snow, C. E. (2001). Lexical input as related to children's vocabulary

    acquisition: Effects of sophisticated exposure and support for meaning.

    Developmental Psychology, 37, 265–279.

Whitehurst, G. J., & Lonigan, C. J. (1998). Child development and emergent literacy.

    Child Development, 69, 848–872.

Woolfolk, A. (2013). *Educational psychology* (12th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ:

    Pearson.

Yigit, C., & Bagceci, B. (2017). Teachers' opinions regarding the usage of action

    research in professional development. *Journal of Education and Training Studies,*

    5(2), 243–252.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks,

    CA: SAGE.

Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2012). *Best practice: Bringing standards to*

    life in America's classrooms. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Appendix A

Components of Shared Reading

Shared reading includes the use of one text for an entire week.

Types of Text (choose 1 per week)	- big book - wall charts/stories - poetry - chants - songs - morning message - class news - text on SMARTBoard
Pre-Reading	- discussion of parts of the book - predictions - picture walk - questioning
During Reading— 1st Reading	- teacher read aloud (models fluency) - pointer (of any type) used - questioning
During Reading— Rereading	- words covered with sticky notes - word attack strategies are happening during reading - find letters, word patterns, or sight words - discuss unfamiliar vocabulary - prediction of words, phrases, or storyline - questioning - students reading along
Reading Strategies during rereading	- echo reading - choral reading - take a turn reading
After Reading	- checking of predictions - story sequencing - students talk about their thinking (turn & talk) - open-ended questions - students have access to the text after

Appendix B

Pre/Post Implementation Survey

Answer each question as it directly relates to you and your experiences.

1. How comfortable are you with shared reading?

   a. Not at all   b. Somewhat   c. Very

2. Do you currently use a shared reading approach in your classroom?

   a. No, never   b. Occassionally   c. Yes, everyday

   2a. If yes, what text/tools do you use during shared reading?

   _____

   _____

   2b. If yes, what is your instructional focus during shared reading?

   _____

   _____

   2c. If yes, record your procedures for a shared reading lesson.

        D1:_____

        D2:_____

        D3:_____

        D4:_____

        D5:_____

3. What questions do you have about shared reading?

    _____

    _____

Weekly Teacher Survey

Answer each question as it pertains to you.

1. What did you try that was new this week?

    _____

    _____

    _____

2. What went well?

    _____

    _____

    _____

3. What do you feel can be improved for the next week?

    _____

    _____

    _____

4. What supports do you need for the upcoming week?

    _____

    _____

    _____

Appendix D Observation

Template

Teacher:	Date:	Time:	Focus:
Teacher Observations		Student Observations	

Focus Group Agenda Form

Shared Reading Implementation Focus Group Agenda

Meeting Norms:	Teacher	Present	Absent
• Be attentive during the meeting- no cell phones. • Respect the agenda items and timeframe- no tangents. • Be prepared with materials for planning. • Actively engage in group conversations. • Maintain positivity and be open minded.	Instructional Coach		
	Emily		
	Gina		
	Maddie		
	Paige		

Topic for Discussion	Minutes/Notes
What's going well?	•
What could be improved?	•
Plans for upcoming week:	Focus & Book Title: • New Strategies that could be tried: • Possible Questions: • General Plan: M— T— W— Th—

	F—
Materials Needed:	•
Other Notes/Concerns: •	

Appendix F

Feedback Form

Name:	Date:
Title:	Type of Text:
Focus:	
Questions Asked throughout lesson:	

Student Interaction:

Tools Used During Observation:

Things to consider:

Appendix G

Pre-Implementation Survey

Question	Emily	Gina	Maddie	Paige
Q1: How comfortable are you with shared reading?	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat
Q2: Do you currently use a shared reading approach in your classroom?	Yes, everyday	Occasionally	Yes, everyday	Yes, everyday
Q2a: If yes, what text/tools do you use during shared reading?	Poem, crayon, sight word cards	Poem	Poem, highlighters, notebooks	Poem, yellow crayon, journal
Q2b: If yes, what is your instructional focus during shared reading?	I follow the district pacing for shared reading, so whatever the focus is.	Usually we look for sight words, then we read for fluency	Phonics and fluency	Popcorn words, sometimes specific letters that we're working on
Q2c: If yes, record your procedures for a shared reading lesson.	D1: Teacher reads D2: T re-reads, Ss are "word detectives." D3: T & S reads, Ss "butter" their popcorn words	D1: I really don't do it enough to have a D2: consistent routine. D3: D4:	D1: Teacher reads aloud while Ss follow along. D2: T read, then Ss and T read aloud together. D3: T&S choral read, students highlight popcorn	D1: Teacher reads poem aloud on SmartBoard. D2: T reads one line at a time, Ss repeat that line. D3: Ss read aloud together D4: Ss glue the

	D4: Ss glue poem in book and draw a picture D5: none	D5:	words. D4: Ss illustrate their poem in their notebooks. D5: I don't teach shared reading on Fridays	poem into their journal and illustrate it. D5: I only teach it for 4 days.
Q3: What questions do you have about shared reading?	Do shared reading lessons always need to be aligned to what is currently being taught? Or, can I deviate from the rest of my ELA lesson skills if I find a good shared reading activity that might help increase their understanding of a skill they are struggling with?	None, right now	At this moment no...	Do you need to do a Turn and Talk every time you do a shared reading?

Appendix H

Week 7 Lesson Plans

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Materials
Emily Weekly Focus: *Making Predictions *Non-Fiction book *intro Beginning Sounds *Words that Rhyme	T will talk about the book (title, front cover, title pg, back cover) T/Ss will take a picture walk through the book T will ask students to make predictions based on cover/title and picture walk T will record 5 predictions from student responses	T will rvw the book (title, front cover, title pg, back cover) Rvw lesson from last week about Non-Fiction books T will rvw students' predictions about the story read yesterday T will read the book orally to the class After T reads story, T/Ss will check and discuss their predictions	T will ask students to retell information from the story Ask Ss what makes this book Non-Fiction: It is about the true story of the first Thanksgiving; It gives facts T will tell S's that they will use their knowledge and clues from the book to guess words that are covered throughout the book	T will read the story aloud; students will echo read T will tell the students they are going to complete an activity about Thanksgiving from then and Thanksgiving now Step 1 of the above activity: Students color the different pictures in the boxes on the activity Step 2 of activity: Students place the correct picture in	*11:30–11:40, then con't after PE* T will assess students' knowledge rhyming words PE – 11:50–12:30 Con't to complete Unit 3 Assessments	Materials *Lrg. Copy of Book – The First Thanksgiving Day *Ts Pointer *Chart Paper [hanging on lrg easel]

				the box it matches		
Gina	What do you think happened at the First Thanksgiving? We will list our thoughts. I will introduce our book "The first Thanksgiving"—We will picture walk it.	We will review what we talked about and our thoughts about the first Thanksgiving. We will read the book and look at the pictures and discuss what we see and the details	We will list anything new we have learned—we will read again and practice asking and answering questions about Thanksgiving	We will look at the illustrations in the story and see how they give us information and help us understand the text.	We are going to read the Littlest Pilgrim as a follow up to The first Thanksgiving	none listed
Maddie	Book : The Very First Thanksgiving Day. The class will chart/ discuss what they do/eat/dress on Thanksgiving.	Book : The Very First Thanksgiving Day. The class will review what Thanksgiving is like in the present and then take a picture walk of the book. They will make comparisons from the pictures of the differences between our present day Thanksgiving and the first Thanksgiving.	Book : The Very First Thanksgiving Day. The teacher will read the book. The class will check to see if the assumptions they made from the picture walk are correct.	Book : The Very First Thanksgiving Day. The class will read the book and use picture and context clues to decipher words that have been covered up.	Book : The Very First Thanksgiving Day. The class will complete a Thanksgiving Now and Then Venn diagram.	none listed
Paige	-Focus: Picture Walk	PE 1:10 - 1:50	-Focus: Predictions 1. TW read	-Focus; Fluent reading and	-Focus: Initial sounds	Title: "Long Ago

1. TW ask students the parts of the book (front cover, back cover, etc.). 2. T & SW Picture walk; asking questions during the picture walk. -Materials: "Long Ago Children" book	"Long Ago Children" 2. TW stop along the way to ask students to predict what may happen next in the story. 3. TW ask students if their predictions were right. -Materials: "Long Ago Children" book	connecting pictures & reading words 1. TW read the story "Long Ago Children" while using a pointer for students to follow along and can hear fluent reading -Materials: "Long Ago Children" book	1. TW reread "Long Ago Children" 2. SW decode covered words using initial sound -Materials: "Long Ago Children" book	Childre n"

Note. T: Teacher; S: Student; Ss: Students; TW: Teacher will; SW: Student will; Lrg: Large; Con't: Continue.

124

Appendix I

Post Implementation Survey

	Emily	Gina	Maddie	Paige
Q1: How comfortable are you with shared reading?	Very	Very	Very	Very
Q2: Do you currently use a shared reading approach in your classroom?	Yes, everyday	Yes, everyday	Yes, everyday	Yes, everyday
Q2a: If yes, what text/tools do you use during shared reading?	Big books, poems, picture books, highlighting tape, pointer, anchor charts, wiki sticks, sticky notes	Big books, picture books, wiki stix, KWL charts, question charts, pointer	Big books, books on the SmartBoard, pointer, various anchor charts, highlighter tape	Big books, sometimes still the poems, some picture books on the ELMO, wiki stix, sticky notes to track thinking
Q2b: If yes, what is your instructional focus during shared reading?	It depends on the day, but by the end of the week I want them to have a deep understanding of the text. We do some phonics, but we don't hunt for sight words like	Prediction, comprehension, asking and answering questions, some phonics skills	Our standard right now is asking and answering questions, so that. Prediction during the picture walk. Anchor charts have helped us visually see our thinking	Well it depends on the day, but each week we cover different phonics skills, we do a picture walk and make predictions, and we answer questions.

	before.			
Q2c: If yes, record your procedures for a shared reading lesson.	D1: Picture walk with predictions, features of the book D2: Read story aloud all the way through. D3: Reread the story, stopping along the way to point out different aspects D4: Double-special area, no shared reading D5: All read book together, have class conversation with open ended questions, sometimes turn & talk.	D1: Picture walk with predictions, T reads aloud book. D2: Read the story again, this time focusing on phonics skills or illustrations that create meaning. D3: Choral read book together, choose open question from the question jar and students turn & talk. D4: Ss illustrate a picture about the story. D5: Double planning day	D1: Double Day, I don't do shared reading on Mondays. D2: Take a picture walk, and recording our thinking on chart paper. D3: Begin reading the book, stopping along the way if we come to one of the predictions to confirm if it was correct or incorrect. D4: Finish reading the book, add our new learning to the chart paper. D5: Go back and re-read the book together to increase fluency.	D1: KWL chart, just looking at the Title and Cover page, what do we know about the topic? D2: Double Specials D3: Picture walk, make predictions as we see the illustrations. Add to the KWL things that we would like to learn from this book. D4: Read the story (sometimes we don't finish), turn & talk to neighbor and then record our new learning on the KWL chart. D5: Finish reading the book, and if there is time, illustrate our comprehension.
Q3: What questions do you have about shared reading?	I don't have any right now, as long as we can continue open conversations, I'll be fine. This has been great learning.	Can we look into expanding our big book collection in the library? We have a few good titles, but some more recent ones would be great.	Can we make everyone do this? (haha) I do not have any questions but as a suggestion, maybe we can work with the new librarian next year on some newer big books.	I don't have any questions, this has been great, thanks for challenging me.

Appendix J

Implementation of Shared Reading

		Types of Text	Evidence of Pre-Reading	Evidence of During Reading	Evidence of After Reading
Emily	Pre-Observation	none	none	none	none
	Last Observation	poem	- title boxed in - pictures used on the poem	- sight words highlighted - teacher copy had words covered with sticky notes -choral reading	- students drew pictures of their understanding - glued into student notebook
Gina	Pre-Observation	none	none	none	none
	Last Observation	big book	- predictions on anchor chart	- teacher used pointer - students asked and answered questions -choral reading	- book in the student library - students checked predictions on anchor chart
Maddie	Pre-Observation	poem	none	- words highlighted	in student notebook
	Last Observation	big book	- predictions on anchor chart - students identified	- students had hand motions to go along with the book while choral	- students participated in turn & talk - book in the student library

			parts of the book (title, back/front cover, author, illustrator)	reading - teacher had words covered with sticky notes - teacher used a pointer while reading	- students made connections to the text
	Pre-Observation	poem	none	- students read aloud with teacher	in student notebook
Paige	Last Observation	big book	- students identified parts of the book (front/back cover, spine, title, title page)	- teacher used a pointer while reading - students found popcorn words with wiki stix	- students participated in turn & talk - book in the student library - students made connections to the text