

Preparing Instructional Coaches for Teachers in America's Public Schools

Lisa J. Lucas
West Chester, Pennsylvania

Abstract

Growing numbers of classroom teachers and reading specialists in schools across the United States are being asked to provide coaching to their colleagues, a form of job-embedded professional development. This paper describes an approach to developing instructional coaches with a particular focus on coaching presence. Presence in this context means supporting teachers with an open-minded appreciative stance, paying attention mindfully and without judgment. Teaching future coaches how to notice their own mental models and communication styles helped this cohort of future coaches skillfully navigate coaching conversations with teachers that fostered opportunities for honest reflection regarding their instructional practices, leading to opportunities for future change and growth.

Keywords: Coaching, presence, instructional coaches, literacy coaches, the art of coaching, mindfulness

Introduction

The International Coach Federation identifies *coaching presence* as a core coaching competency and defines it as the “ability to be fully conscious and create spontaneous relationship with the client, employing a style that is open, flexible, and confident” (International Coach Federation, 2008b, p. 2). This article explores coaching in an educational setting, which includes mindfully coaching by cultivating a presence stance. The hope is that this article can serve as a platform for further research on best practices in training instructional coaches who are deployed in schools to support teachers. This paper is conceptual in nature; it grew out of the author’s varied experiences coaching teachers and personal clients as well as training and supervising instructional coaches.

Instructional coaching: an emerging but ambiguous role

Growing numbers of educators across the United States are being assigned the role of providing support and guidance to their colleagues through the process of coaching (Hasbrouck & Denton, 2007). Coaching has become a popular model in schools for providing job-embedded, individualized, and sustained professional development to teachers (Bean, Swan & Knaub, 2003). The emergence of coaches in schools was a response to educators' recognition that traditional one-shot approaches to professional development – where teachers hear about instructional practices but do not receive follow-up support – don't improve teaching practices (Knight, 2009). Teachers require on-site, job-embedded support to translate research into practice. Many school systems have deployed coaches to improve teaching and student learning, though little empirical evidence currently exists showing the effects of coaching on teachers and on the performance of their students (Neufeld & Roper, 2003; Russo, 2004). These individuals serve as workshop leaders, facilitators of instructional meetings, and instructional coaches to their colleagues.

This paper focuses on graduate students who were enrolled in a literacy coaching certificate program. Literacy coaches, broadly defined by Symonds (2003), are teachers who are released from teaching students to model lessons, observe classroom instruction, and coach teachers one-on-one or in grade-level groups to promote best practices in literacy instruction. Puig and Froelich (2006) define literacy coaches as those that support teachers to better understand critical pedagogy and the need for changes in instructional practices based on evidence. Walpole & McKenna (2004) define a coach as a learner, a grant writer, a planner, a researcher, and a teacher. There are as many job descriptions of coaches as there are training programs for coaches. Some coaches conduct demonstration lessons, others focus on data analysis meetings, while still others provide reading support to students and coach teachers.

In a 2016 report, the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, and two education-focused organizations, Learning Forward and Public Impact, stated that for coaches to be successful, the systems they work in must provide them with necessary training, professional development, and ongoing support. Learning Forward, the University of Florida Lastinger Center, and Public Impact are members of the Redesign PD Partnership. The Redesign PD Partnership includes more than 25 leaders from top education advocacy, membership, and philanthropic organizations, as well as state and local education agencies.

With the various models of coaching being implemented and the rising number of coaches in schools, what seems to be lacking is consensus regarding what the training of coaches should entail. The credentialing process for coaches varies widely. Training is dependent to some extent on the role that the coach will assume. The graduate students enrolled in the literacy coaching cohort all had different experiences, current job descriptions and future goals. Since their roles were so varied, I often referenced Silsbee's (2010) broad definition of professional coaching: "That part of a relationship in which one person is primarily dedicated to serving the long-term development of effectiveness and self-generation in the other" (p. 4).

Instructional coaching programs vary from state to state, and from school district to school district. Just as there is no standardization or regulation for life coaching, there is no consistency among instructional coaching programs. Coaches may receive training from multiple sources, each providing something different, and often conflicting in approach. Or, like me, they may initially receive no formal training at all. I had been the first instructional coach at a suburban public school district 15 years prior. I had then been promoted to program director of organizational and professional development. One of my roles was to hire, train, and supervise coaches. I subsequently transitioned into the world of higher education and am currently an associate professor at a state teaching university. I was assigned to teach the Educational Leadership and Change Theory course to the first cohort of coaches seeking a literacy-coaching certificate at our state university. Just as there is an art, not just a science to teaching, I intentionally designed my course to blend the art and science of coaching.

The art and science of coaching

Froelich and Puig (2007) state that there is an art to coaching as much as there is a science. They have found that the most successful coaches possess a combination of skills and talents that merge the art and science of coaching.

In education, the science of coaching includes substantial data collection and analysis of students' performance, assuring fidelity to implementation of new programs, and modeling instructional procedures that are grounded in research. Joyce and Showers (1995) state that it is vital that coaching not be confused with or used for evaluation of teachers. Costa and Kallick (1993) reiterate that coaches must be clear about the nature of the coaching relationship, and that this relationship should not be used for evaluation or judgment. Coaching in most schools is optional, by invitation only. When I had

supervised coaches in the school district, the deployment of coaches was an effort to improve communication and collaboration among the ten elementary schools, to improve the implementation of specific programs, and to improve the quality of instruction in classrooms. One of the greatest obstacles the coaches faced was the perception that the coach was there to fix or improve the teacher. Initially, coaches were viewed as experts, or as quasi administrators. That label of expert often created tension. That tension was often evident in progress monitoring meetings.

In schools, during progress monitoring meetings, teachers, administrators, coaches, and support staff convene regularly to review student data, look for trends, and determine action plans to help individual students. An administrator generally facilitates the meeting, and teachers may feel vulnerable when their own students aren't making adequate yearly progress. Their vulnerability shows itself in many ways, often as defensiveness. The suggestion of coaching was often received with mixed emotions. The perception among teachers was that if you need coaching, you weren't doing your job well enough. Schools have a particular hierarchical structure that shapes interpersonal relationships. Where the coach is seen in the hierarchy is key. This relational aspect of coaching is critical. This is where the science can intersect with the art of coaching. A coach with knowledge of content and with the ability to navigate through a teacher's defenses, in order to form a trusting, collegial relationship, has an opportunity to make an impact.

Galloway (2000) defines coaching as "the art of creating an environment, through conversation and a way of being, that facilitates the process by which a person can move toward desired goals in a fulfilling manner" (p.177). It was this "way of being" that I wanted to focus on. The coaches in my school district years ago were trained in the science aspect of coaching, but missing was the art of creating the type of environment Galloway described. The art of coaching was something that they considered only rarely, if ever. The art of coaching cannot be reduced to a tool or technique. A coach who connects to the teacher, in a way that says, "It's OK, I see you, and you are OK," can connect to the spirit of the teacher who seeks to achieve those results. Without the right intention and the right way of being, coaches can fail to connect, and teachers may fail to realize their full potential.

A decade later, I had the opportunity to train a new cohort of prospective coaches, and I was determined to blend the art and science of coaching. My experience coaching in the past ten years had convinced me that what it took to improve in anything was the ability to be present, to pay attention, and to

mindfully attend to the task at hand. If coaches could model this presence, and teachers could suspend judgment and trust in the process, the result would be teachers who were more metacognitive about their teaching and present for their students. Coaches could be more than master teachers modeling good teaching strategies; they could provide doorways for teachers to discover and develop their own capabilities and rekindle their passion for teaching.

I wanted coaches to see something in the teachers they worked with that many teachers no longer saw in themselves; to hold the space for their true essence to emerge. Contrary to the traditional notion that a coach was there to fix or set teachers straight, my message was just the opposite: that a coach's primary role was to practice the art of paying attention in the present moment, without judgment. In a traditional educational system, this stance is virtually unheard of. Most educational coaches were content specialists perceived as experts in the field, there to provide resources and answers. One of my goals was to challenge some of the mental models that were ingrained in the coaches from their own educational conditioning. I wanted them to recognize that the coach's role is not to provide the answers, but instead to be a guide to uncover the answers that are already inside.

Background of the coaching certificate

The coaching certificate was housed in the Literacy Department in the College of Education. I was based in the Early and Middle Grades Department, a separate department in the College of Education. I had been asked to teach the course because of my past experience as a public school administrator and former instructional coach. I had completed numerous coach training programs and my scholarship focused on coaching and mentoring. My long-time membership on the Pennsylvania Coaching Collaborative Board, first as school district administrator, and later as the state university representative, had kept me current in the field of instructional coaching. The Pennsylvania Collaborative Coaching Board was created by the Pennsylvania Department of Education in an attempt to ensure consistency of coaching practice across all of Pennsylvania's state sponsored coaching initiatives. One of the areas that warranted an increased level of consistency was to clarify the role of the individuals who provided support and training to school-based coaches. The consistency of coaching practices and the clarity regarding who should provide training and support to coaches is still lacking.

The opportunity to teach a course titled *Educational Leadership and Change Theory*, which was the second of four six hundred level graduate

courses that would result in a coaching certificate, was a unique one. Although the university was offering a coaching certificate, no formal certificate or accreditation is required to become a coach in Pennsylvania. School districts don't require that a coach be certified. The majority of coaches are strong teachers who were either encouraged or self-selected to pursue coaching (Aguilar, 2013). Few formal university programs are currently available nationally for training instructional coaches. This is most likely because no formal accreditation is necessary to become an instructional coach in most schools.

The coaches in training enrolled in the coaching certificate program were classroom teachers and reading specialists who had already completed a Master's program in literacy. Only a few had dabbled in coaching in their role as reading specialists. All were enrolled in the program in anticipation of their current position potentially evolving into a coaching role. In order to design the course, ideally, I would have known which coaching model would be used in their school and how their role as a coach would be defined, but neither the coaches in training nor I knew even if they would ultimately be coaching.

What I did know was that preparing coaches needed to focus on developing coaching skills, not content skills. Although I knew the science of best literacy instruction and research-based instructional strategies, my goal was to focus on the art of coaching. The other courses in the certificate program would provide the theory, data analysis techniques and literacy content knowledge. I knew from firsthand experience that deepening their content knowledge of literacy wouldn't make them effective coaches. If a coach is a literacy expert, but knows nothing about how to get a reluctant teacher to agree to coaching, all of their content-area knowledge and understanding of best instruction would be irrelevant. They needed to learn how to engage teachers to be willing to first let them in the door. Sensitivity and attention to building a trusting relationship were crucial. Teachers needed to be comfortable not just with the idea of coaching, but also with the actual coach as a person. Coaches needed to understand the importance of cultivating authentic relationships that were non-judgmental. I had witnessed many outstanding coaches who had a variety of approaches, but one common trait was always present – their presence. The International Coach Federation core competencies are common knowledge to those in the field of professional coaching, but are rarely, to my knowledge, alluded to when training instructional coaches in the field of education.

Developing a presence stance

I knew from experience that the most successful coaches went beyond the science of implementation of research-based strategies. They connected to the teachers in a way that was difficult to describe. They had an intuitive capacity to see something that is not yet in existence. It was this intuitive capacity that I relied on when I made the choice to cultivate coaching presence in my students. And rather than teach the students, I intended to coach the coaches in training.

One of my intended outcomes of the course was that the coaches in training would become more aware of how to be present in their daily lives. Greene (1973) observed that a key aspect of presence is being present to oneself. When we assume a presence stance it's possible to navigate through daily life from an inner quiet and stillness. I believed that developing that inner quiet would help them be more mindful coaches.

As vital as presence would seem to be to the act of teaching, few of the coaches in training had apparently ever consciously considered its role in teaching and learning. It was not often explicitly taught in teacher education programs, mentioned on lists of qualities for certification, or talked about by pre- and in-service supervisors (Garrison & Rud, 1995; Liston, 1995).

I stressed the need to establish collaborative, reflective relationships with teachers; instead of telling teachers what to do, I showed them how to help teachers reflect on what they were currently doing, and what they would like to be doing differently. The concept of teachers and coaches working together as learners was consistent with Toll's (2005) research, which found coaches who were perceived as 'knowing it all' were ineffective in supporting the implementation of new programs that required changes in teacher's practices.

Awkward beginnings

I began our first class by explaining that, as coaches, we have an opportunity to be fully present with another human being. Our presence is a gift to those we coach, and to ourselves: cultivating the art of awareness, learning to be present in each moment without judgment. Although it sounded simple, with greater awareness of true presence they became aware of how often their attention was hijacked by multiple distractions. I made it clear that this would be lifelong work, rarely mastered. My coaches in training looked at me warily.

I attempted to put words to this elusive but essential quality. Fortunately, after leaving the school district, I had enrolled in a professional coaching program, and as a professional career coach I was a member of the International Coach Federation. I was well versed in the Federation's coaching core competencies. Although not grounded in an education context, the International Coach Federation competencies identify a set of foundational skills, one of which is coaching presence (International Coach Federation, 2008b, p. 2). The federation describes coaching presence in the following way:

Coaching Presence—Ability to be fully conscious and create spontaneous relationship with the client, employing a style that is open, flexible and confident.

1. Is present and flexible during the coaching process, dancing in the moment.
2. Accesses own intuition and trusts one's inner knowing —"goes with the gut."
3. Is open to not knowing and takes risks.
4. Sees many ways to work with the client and chooses in the moment what is most effective.
5. Uses humor effectively to create lightness and energy.
6. Confidently shifts perspectives and experiments with new possibilities for own action.
7. Demonstrates confidence in working with strong emotions and can self-manage and not be overpowered or enmeshed by client's emotions.

Realizing I needed to embrace these qualities myself in order to coach my coaches in training, I also recognized that I needed to rely on something other than my own intellect. I trusted that the right thoughts, actions and words would come through me. I let go, and let something else steer. Personally, I call that something, that presence, spirit. Incorporating spirituality into a public institution felt more than a bit dangerous. In the public sector, spirituality is seldom mentioned. Public schools have long ago separated church and state. The word *spirit* is charged, especially when used in the context of a public educational institution.

Tisdell (2003) captured the cause of my unease: "Those involved with institutions of higher education," she asserted, "have traditionally been taught

that it is (only) the rational, scientific thought that is worthy of attention” (2003, p. 25). It follows that “our reputations as valid scholars may be at risk if we openly explore the development of relationships between student, subject, and teacher.” Jones (2005) concurred: “And because it is our reputation as scholars, rather than our ability to bring our students into relationship with our subject, that is rewarded in the traditional system, many educators find it best to remain discreet where the spirituality of teaching is concerned” (p. 3). I remained discreet.

My philosophy of teaching has always been that to teach is to demonstrate. Never once did I mention the word spirit, but I felt a presence in the classroom beyond my own intellect. I’m a born skeptic and a believer in science, but I know from experience that science can’t always explain the things that can happen in the midst of teaching or coaching, when you let go and let something else guide your thoughts and words. One of my coaches in training remarked, “Our class feels religious, but in a good way; it feels like something else happens in here.” That “something else” can be called many things. I explained that this feeling is presence, which is an element of the *art* of coaching. We discussed how coaching, similar to art, is often guided through intuition, also one of the attributes described under the presence competency noted by the International Coach Federation.

A coach with intuition has an ability to see something that has not yet emerged, but could, if the coach surrenders and trusts the process. I embraced the role of coach/professor, suspended judgment, and trusted that the coaches in training would arrive at the destination in their own time. My role was to create optimal learning experiences, craft creative assignments, and, most importantly, foster a classroom climate that embraced risk taking and authentic conversations, which were only possible if we established trust. I intentionally created a syllabus that provided multiple lenses and experiences through which the coaches in training could view their role as future instructional coaches. It took a great deal of preparation and planning in order for me to let go and trust the process of each class, and I articulated this concept to the class on several occasions. I designed assignments and structured each class to encompass what I called a *presence stance*. Rather than continuing to try to define presence, we experienced it.

The power of stories, breath, and connecting

We began our classes at the university by simply taking some deep cleansing breaths in which we transitioned from the business of the day into our

evening coaching course. Siegel (2007) advocates that by placing your awareness on your breath you can reduce the emotionally charged area of the brain that causes stress and improve the capacity to sustain attention. The physical and psychological benefits of deep cleansing breaths and the implications for coaching are profound. Hendricks (1995) describes that correct breathing can allow tension to melt from our bodies and clarify and focus our minds.

The coaches in training hesitantly participated, but there was definitely a feeling of unease in the room. Their unease did not dissipate when I explained their first assignment.

They were instructed to conduct an appreciative interview with a classmate. Cooperrider and Whitney (1999) define appreciative inquiry as the cooperative search for the best in people, their organizations, and the world around them. It involves systematic discovery of what gives a system 'life' when it is most effective and capable in economic, ecological, and human terms. Appreciative inquiry involves the art and practice of asking questions that strengthen a system's capacity to heighten positive potential. When we share a personal story, actually personalizing the subject matter, we become 'real' people with 'real' feelings and experiences. The coaches in training eyed one another cautiously and I felt their apprehension. The questions began: Where was the rigor? What rubric would be used to assess the interview? How would this help them learn to coach?

I explained that, as a coach, there is an art to asking the right question at the right time and then listening with your full attention. The art of deep listening is a key skill for a coach. When we listen, we broaden our perspectives and increase positive emotions in the brain. When we pose questions with deference, the questions can foster collaboration and invite equity into the relationship. Our neurobiology is wired for relationships, empathy, stories and service (Zak, 2012). Sadly, this has been largely forgotten in the rush to focus on standardized testing and data-driven instruction in schools. Once again, the International Coach Federation's core competencies regarding communicating guided my intentions to focus on active listening techniques.

I wanted the class to understand that coaching is relational; our brains are primed for relationships, pleasure, patterns, novelty and prediction (Willis, 2006). Experience and a deep place of presence guide that opportune time. I believed that they would have authentic, meaningful conversations. I urged them to craft thoughtful, appreciative-focused questions, and then simply listen.

I trusted them, and slowly, I began to earn their trust. I essentially adopted the presence stance I wanted them to adopt with the teachers they would someday support. I trusted that the emerging narratives would connect them in a way that no lecture or reading assignment could. It did. Trust increased, and we came together as a community of learners. They became curious about this very different approach to coaching.

Next, we practiced listening to each other's stories and noticing our own mental models. Senge (2000) defines mental models as the mindsets, values and beliefs we hold about how the world works. They help us make sense of the systems we work in, but they are often flawed because the models we have built are simply stories we have created based on our own perceptions. In my former role as an instructional coach, I had trained myself to listen to the language used by the teachers I worked with and I often had helped them explore other modes of thinking. For example, teachers often formed assumptions about how they were perceived by parents, colleagues and administrators. When those models weren't positive, there was often a problematic relationship, which affected the teacher's performance. The first step I took was to make those perceptions visible, and help them realize that they weren't always true, and that the teachers could reframe the situation. I asked open-ended questions, such as "It would help me understand if you'd give me an example of ..." or "What's another way you might interpret that situation?" I was trying to reframe their mental models and bring awareness to some of their unconscious beliefs.

We spent many classes immersed in coaching consultations and scenarios based on their current interactions with teachers. In class, the coaches in training would pose a current dilemma they were encountering at work and together we would practice coaching. Often I would hear them ask one another, "Do you know that is true?" They were beginning to challenge one another's mindsets and perceptions. As a class, we created and refined a brainstorming protocol that was solution oriented. These scenarios allowed us to connect with one another and realize the commonalities we experienced in our separate worlds. We also practiced *not* giving advice. I shared the research with my coaches in training that showed conversations revolving around how teachers could fix their instructional strategies usually resulted in little change. People don't resist change; they resist being changed (Borwick, 1969). It's easy for coaches to fall back into advice giving, but this is not coaching. Krapu (2016), in his article on coaching from the philosophy of science perspective, expands on the notion that the coaching profession is built on the principle that people are creative, resourceful and whole. Coaching does not impose change on

people; instead, it allows people to take responsibility for developing their own capabilities.

I knew from past experience that the more that coaches pointed out teachers' deficits, the less likely teachers were to be open minded about new possibilities. Research indicates that appreciative, strengths-based inquiries are more effective and empowering than analytic, deficits-based inquiries (Buckingham, 2007; Cooperrider & Whitney, 1999; Fredrickson, 2006). Adult learning theories and growth-fostering psychologies support this emphasis on strengths (Dweck, 2006), which fosters optimism in the coaching conversation, rather than judgment. As a class, we spent a great deal of time practicing suspending judgment.

Coaches who know their literacy content, but can't connect with teachers, would most likely not be trusted. Teachers can be sensitive to feedback, and without a trusting relationship, most feedback is interpreted as criticism. It was with this knowledge that I designed their culminating assignment, which was a teacher observation followed with a post-conference that used the appreciative inquiry stance we had been practicing in class. I wanted my students to see that the teachers they worked with had unlimited potential, and their potential would only be realized if the coach could see teachers through the eyes of non-judgmental awareness and acceptance.

The assignment was as follows:

Arrange to visit a teacher's classroom to observe teaching and to have a subsequent coaching conversation with that teacher. In a pre-conference, inform the teacher that the focus of the observation will be on discovering strengths and noticing vitality: the things done well in the classrooms that are facilitating student learning and enjoyment. During the observation, look for signs of full engagement, both on the part of the teacher and the coaches in training. Schedule a post-conference with the teacher. Prior to the start of the post-conference, review your notes and prepare yourself to take an appreciative, strengths-based approach. Remember that you are not suggesting what the teacher should be doing differently. For this assignment, focus on the things that are going well. Notice and set aside any negative judgments. Remember the mantra: "What we appreciate, appreciates."

Begin with the following appreciative interview questions.

1. What was the best experience during the lesson, a time when you felt engaged, and happy with what was going on? Describe that moment in detail.

2. What do you value most about teaching and yourself as a teacher?
How does that come through in your teaching?
3. When things go well in your classroom, what helps you to be successful? What enables you to be at your very best?

Offer your own strengths-based, classroom observations in ways that confirm and bolster the teacher's answers to the appreciative interview questions. Be sure to note how your observations connect with the teacher's core values, inherent ambitions, and generative conditions. Affirm the teacher's competence and thank the teacher for the opportunity to collaborate together.

After the session, reflect and write a reflective essay addressing the following questions.

1. To what extent did you maintain a strengths-based focus and orientation?
2. Were there times when the conversation reverted to focusing on deficits and fixing problems?
3. How did you bring it back to a discussion of strengths, vitalities, aspirations, and possibilities?

The results of this assignment far exceeded my expectations and intended outcomes. The coaches in training had not embraced this assignment with eager anticipation; to the contrary, they thought the teachers they observed would ridicule them for wasting their time. The opposite occurred. They formed connections, which opened the door to subsequent coaching, and engaged in honest reflection. They began to understand that they were doing more than modeling instructional practices; they were rekindling hope and optimism in teachers. Teachers were used to receiving advice and focused feedback from coaches, not being asked appreciative-style questions. The questions ignited honest, thoughtful reflection.

Palmer (1999) describes good teachers as possessing a capacity for connectedness that weaves a complex web of connections among themselves, their subjects, and their students, so that students can learn to weave a world for themselves. Palmer asserted that the most important question a teacher could ask was "Who is this child, and how can I nurture his or her gifts?" I concur, and also believe the primary role of a coach is to ask, "Who is this teacher, and how can I nurture his or her gifts?"

This connectivity is a primary ingredient in establishing a coaching relationship. Connecting begins with listening. Throughout the semester, the coaches in training had spent a great deal of time practicing listening. Not all teachers are effective listeners; often, teachers are used to talking more than listening. The coaches in training were seasoned teachers and reading specialists, and were used to being the authority, spending a great deal of their day telling others what to do by consulting, offering advice and solutions.

Practicing paying attention

I wanted the coaches to see something in the teachers they worked with that many teachers no longer saw in themselves; to hold the space for their true essence to emerge. Contrary to the traditional notion that an instructional coach was there to fix or set teachers straight, this course emphasized that a coach's primary role was to practice the art of paying attention in the present moment, without judgment. In a traditional educational system, this stance is virtually unheard of. Presence is often elusive amid the competing demands of the teacher's day. The coaches had an opportunity to model this presence quality during their workdays. The coaches in training spent considerable time during their traditional school day in professional development sessions that were focused on research-based strategies to support good instruction. By blending the theories that were promoted in professional development at their schools and merging theory with interpersonal, honest conversations about best practice, they began to stimulate honest dialogue and reflection with the teachers. Many coaches shared that the teachers remarked that they "felt heard for the first time in a long time."

Conclusion

Coaching can do more than improve a teacher's instruction; it can prompt teachers to question how they see themselves and their students. Rubrics, protocols, and content expertise do not hold a candle to the gentle essence that radiates from coaches who create connections and relationships with the teachers they support. Techniques, strategies, and methodologies – the science of coaching – are important, but coaches must go beyond the science of coaching and embrace the art of coaching. Coach training in education should strive to blend the art and science seamlessly. A focus on presence based coaching can serve as a platform from which to explore future coach professional development and training.

References

- Aguilar, E. (2013). *The art of coaching: Effective strategies for school transformation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bean, R. M., Swan, A. L., & Knaub, R. (2003). Reading specialists in schools with exemplary reading programs: Functional, versatile, and prepared. *The Reading Teacher*, 56(5), 446-455.
- Borwick, I. (1969). Team improvement laboratory. *Personnel Journal*, 48(1), 18-24.
- Buckingham, M. (2007). *Go put your strengths to work: 6 powerful steps to achieve outstanding performance*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Cooperrider, D. L. & Whitney, D. (1999). Appreciative Inquiry: A positive revolution in change. In P. Holman & T. Devane (Eds.), *The change handbook: Group methods for shaping the future* (pp. 245-263). Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (1993). Through the lens of a critical friend. *Educational Leadership*, 51(2), 49-51.
- Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset*. New York: Random House.
- Fredrickson, B.L. (2006). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. In Csikszentmihalyi, M. & Csikszentmihalyi, I.S. (Eds.) *A life worth living: Contributions to positive psychology* (pp. 85-103). NY: Oxford University Press.
- Froelich, K. & Puig, E. (2007). The magic of coaching: Art meets science. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 3(1), 18-31.
- Gallwey, W. T. (2000). *The inner game of work*. New York: Random House.
- Garrison, J. W. & Rud, A. G. Jr. (1995). *The educational conversation: Closing the Gap*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as stranger*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hasbrouck, J., & Denton, C. A. (2007). Student-focused coaching: A model for reading coaches. *Reading Teacher*, 60(7), 690-693.
<https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.60.7.11>
- Hendricks, G. (1995). *Conscious breathing: Breathwork for health, stress release, and personal mastery*. New York: Bantam Books.
- International Coach Federation. (2008b). ICF professional coaching core competencies. Retrieved from www.coachfederation.org/includes/media/docs/CoreCompEnglish.pdf
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). *Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of School renewal* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

- Jones, L. (2005). What does spirituality in education mean? *Journal of College and Character*, 6(7). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1485>
- Knight, J. (2009). Coaching. *The Journal of the National Staff Development Council*, 30(1).
- Krapu, T. (2016). Coaching from a philosophy of science perspective. *Philosophy of Coaching: An International Journal*, 1(1), 8-20. <https://doi.org/10.22316/poc/01.1.02>
- Liston, D. P. (1995). Intellectual and institutional gaps in teacher education. In L. J. W. Garrison, & A. G. Rud Jr. (Eds). *The educational conversation: Closing the gap*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity – Promises & practicalities*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute Program on Education and the Annenberg Institute for School Reform.
- Palmer, P. (1999). The spirit in public education. *Educational Leadership*, 56(4), 6-11.
- Puig, E.A., & Froelich, K.S. (2006). *The literacy coach: Guiding in the right direction*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Russo, A. (2004). School-based coaching. *Harvard Educational Letter*, 20(4), 1-3.
- Senge, P. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York: Doubleday.
- Siegel, D. (2007). *The mindful brain: Reflection and attunement in the cultivation of well-being*. New York, NY: Mind Your Brain, Inc.
- Silsbee, D. (2010). *The mindful coach: Seven roles for facilitating leader development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Symonds, K. W. (2003). Three ways to fund literacy coaching. *Journal of Staff Development*, 24(4), 54-58.
- The University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, Learning Forward, & Public Impact. (2016). *Coaching for impact: Six pillars to create coaching roles that achieve their potential to improve teaching and learning*. Gainesville: University of Florida Lastinger Center; Oxford, OH: Learning Forward; and Chapel Hill, NC: Chapel Hill Press.
- Toll, C. A. (2004). Separating coaching from supervising. *English Leadership Quarterly*, 27(2), 5-7.
- Walpole, S., & McKenna, M. (2004). *The literacy coach's handbook: A guide to research-based practice*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Willis, J. (2006). *Ignite*. Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Zak, P. (2012). *The moral molecule: How trust works*. New York: Penguin Group.