Cognitive Coaching^{SM}:

Delivering Feedback that Stimulates Thoughtful Change in Practice

Show-Me Professional Development Conference
"Energizing Professional Learning"
March 5-7, 2017

Jay Roth
JRoth@Lebanon.k12.mo.us
Director of Curriculum & Instruction, Lebanon R-III School District

Thinking Collaborative Trainer for Adaptive Schools & Cognitive Coaching^{SM}

SESSION OUTCOMES

- *Explore current research on the impact of the coaching approach*

- *Acknowledge the different ways to support teachers beyond evaluation*

- *Classify different forms of feedback*

- *Recognize that observable behaviors are choices that reflect a manifestation of thinking*

- *Observe a coaching conversation with feedback**

FOUR SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

SUPPORT FUNCTIONS	PURPOSE	INTENDED OUTCOME	SOURCE OF CRITERIA FOR JUDGMENT
Evaluating	Conform to a set of standards and criteria adopted by the organization.	Judge and rate performance according to understood externally produced standards.	The evaluator in reference to established standards
Consulting	Inform regarding student needs, pedagogy, curriculum, policies, procedures; provide technical assistance and teaching standards.	Increase pedagogical and content knowledge and skills; institutionalize accepted practices and policies.	The consultant
Collaborating	Form ideas, approaches, solutions, and focus for inquiry.	Solve instructional problems; apply and test shared ideas; learn together.	The two (or more) colleagues
Cognitive CoachingSM	Transform the effectiveness of decision-making, mental models, thoughts, and perceptions and make reflection a regular practice.	Help another person to take action toward his or her goals while simultaneously helping that person habituate self-directed learning: self-managing, self-monitoring, self-modifying	The person being coached (e.g. the teacher)

RESEARCH EXCERPTS:
WHY A COACHING APPROACH?

Research Finding #1 (David Rock)

One of the things the human brain craves in order to function effectively is a sense of status. Status can be defined as a position of value, a ranking of being equal to or more than others in one way or another (smarter, funnier, healthier, richer, more organized, stronger...). Our brains seem to work on status subconsciously. When we feel that our status is elevated, our brain releases dopamine and other "happy" neurochemicals that actually make us feel better. The downside of status is that while it makes people focus, there are always winners and losers. It forces us to feel competitive and to see other people as a threat. It impacts relationships and reduces collaboration in the workplace.

David Rock says that the only good solution involves the idea of playing against yourself. Competing with yourself and competing with others harnesses the exact same brain circuitry. You can experience the power of the thrill of "beating the other guy" by making the other guy YOU. It gives you a chance to feel ever-increasing status without threatening others.

When others try to give us advice or solve a problem for us, we lose our sense of status and feel threatened. When we give corrective feedback, we diminish the status of others, leaving them feeling dependent on others of greater status. "The more you can help people find their own insights, the easier it will be to help others be effective." Finding one's own answers elevates our perceived status.

Source: Rock, D. (2009). Your Brain at Work. HarperCollins Publishers. New York, NY

Research Finding #2 (Case Western Reserve University)

Researchers observed brain images when participants were coached using two different coaching tones. One encouraged envisaging a positive future, and the other set a more standard tone by focusing on a person's failings and what he or she ought to do. The more positive coaches stimulated better cognitive functioning and increased perceptual accuracy and openness in the person being coached even 5-7 days after the coaching. Emphasizing weaknesses, flaws, or other shortcomings, or even trying to "fix" the problem for the coached person had an opposite effect. The major implication is that people typically coach others in education with a bias toward the negative, and correcting what the person is doing that is wrong. The Case Western University research suggests "that this closes down future, sustainable change, as we expected."

Source: Case Western Reserve University (2010, Nov 19). Coaching with compassion can 'light up' human thoughts. *ScienceDaily*.

RESEARCH EXCERPTS:
WHY A COACHING APPROACH?

Research Finding #3 (John Hattie)

John Hattie, in his synthesis of 800 meta-analyses, posits that when teachers make learning visible, teachers see learning through the eyes of students, while students see teaching as pivotal to their learning. The evidence suggests the biggest effects on student learning occur when teachers become learners of their own teaching. Of the 6 identified domains (student, home, school, curriculum, teacher, and teaching), "microteaching," ranked highest in the teacher domain (with an 0.88 effect size) and 4th overall of the 138 ranked influences. Microteaching, in teacher education programs, typically involves conducting a lesson and then engaging in post-discussion about the lesson. In one of the contributing meta-analysis the conclusion was that "theory, demonstration, and practice, as well as feedback and coaching," be included.

When bringing the evidence together, Hattie says developing teachers' accounts of classroom experience is key. "By questioning one another, eliciting replays and rehearsals, using evidence in these narratives, and offering and revising interpretations and explanations," teachers can build their principles of practice from both their conceptual training roots, as well as the intricacies of the classroom.

Source: Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. Routledge. New York, NY

Research Finding #4 (Carol Sanford)

One research study by Carol Sanford found that children by the early school age could no longer correctly interpret whether they were following simple instructions: they would defend their responses as accurate even when shown photos of themselves not in compliance. However, with only a few short weeks of being asked to reflect on the accuracy of their response to the same exercise, without any external input, they became increasingly accurate at judging their own success. Sanford suggests that accurate self-assessment capability is systematically eroded in our culture, but one that can be regained with practice.

Sanford also concludes that external feedback actually reduces one's capacity for accurate self-reflection. Continuing feedback reinforces our expectation that others will and should tell us how we are doing, and it reduces our capacity to be self-reflective and self-accountable. Feedback best comes in the form of questions that increase self-reflection and therefore self-governance.

Source: Sanford, C. (1997). Myths of high performance work systems #1 interactive feedback process. InterOctave Development Group. Battleground, WA

FEEDBACK TAKES ONE OF THESE FIVE FORMS

Judgmental Statements

Nice job.

Exemplary

That's lousy.

That's a great chart.

That was a great way to teach that!

That was a good way to teach that!

Wonderful lesson!

True for the Observer

I completely understood your lesson!

Your intro to the topic didn't capture my attention.

This inservice was worthy and relevant to me.

There's too much stuff on your walls.

Inferences – Maybe, Maybe Not...

The kids learned a lot.

You must have spent a long time preparing that lesson.

Your classroom management techniques are working.

Could I offer you some suggestions?

Use more visual aids.

Inarguable Facts

80% of your kids scored proficient or higher.

The enrollment numbers in your classes has decreased every year.

You called on 8 girls and 7 boys during the class discussion.

We got the grant you worked on!

Reflective Questions

How did you decide which strategy to use with your ELL kids?

What criteria did you use to measure whether or not students were getting the concept?

What patterns are you seeing in the data?

FEEDBACK LOOP

1:
Standard

4:
Action

2:
Evidence

3:
Choice

THINKING

DRIVES

BEHAVIOR /
CHOICE