

**Action Research:
Cognitive Coaching as a Vehicle to Improve
Teacher Efficacy**

Donna Dildy
Alief Hastings Ninth Grade Center

Strategy

Improving teacher efficacy and reducing teacher isolation are two critical aspects in retaining educators in the profession. Unfortunately, most schools systems do little to encourage teachers to come out of their classrooms to build collegiality, and staff development typically focuses on acquiring new skills of craftsmanship with little emphasis on reflection and self concept (Perkins, 1998; Weasmer & Woods, 1999).

Cognitive Coaching provides a means to reduce teacher isolation (Perkins, 1998; Veenman, de Laat, & Staring, 1998) and to improve teacher efficacy (Edwards & Newton, 1995; Veenman, de Laat, & Staring, 1998) by helping teachers “expand their repertoire of teaching styles, [by] exploring untapped resources within themselves” (Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker 1993, p. 57). Arthur L. Costa and Robert J. Garmston developed the process for Cognitive Coaching based on the clinical supervision model of Cogan and Goldhammer (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. ix). Their nonjudgmental process consists of a planning conversation, observation, and a reflecting conversation. The purpose of every coaching session is “to convey a valued colleague from where he is she is to where he or she wants to be” (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 2). Three fundamental goals of Cognitive Coaching are to establish trust, facilitate mutual learning, and enhance growth toward holonomy. Holonomy is when an individual acts independently while simultaneously acting interdependently within a group (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 3). The coach’s job is to mediate the thinking of the coachee with open-ended questions, paraphrases, probes, and positive presuppositions (Costa & Garmston, 1994; Perkins, 1998).

Throughout the coaching conversations, the coach diagnosis the coachee's five states of mind to facilitate movement toward a more holonomous state (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 130; Edwards & Newton, 1995). The five states of mind are efficacy, flexibility, craftsmanship, consciousness, and interdependence. Costa & Garmston (1994) explain:

The five states of mind are the catalysts, the energy sources fueling holonomous behaviors. For an individual, they represent the continuing tensions and resources for acting holonomously. For an organization, they form an invisible energy field, in which all parties are affected as surely as a strong magnetic field affects a compass. (p. 130-131)

Efficacy

Some characteristics of efficacious people are (1) they believe they can make a difference; (2) they are resourceful; (3) they are self-modifying; (4) they possess an internal locus of control; and (5) they are confident. Research shows that the higher teacher efficacy the higher student performance. On the other hand, teachers with low efficacy often feel rigidity, hopelessness, despair, and withdrawal (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 133-134; Edwards & Newton, 1995).

Flexibility

Some characteristics of flexible people are (1) they are empathetic; (2) they see things from different perspectives; (3) they trust their intuition; (4) they are tolerant of others; and (5) they are creative problem solvers. Flexible teachers are able to successfully coordinate multiple activities to accommodate a variety of learning styles (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 135-136).

Craftsmanship

Some characteristics of craftsmanlike people are (1) they take pride in their work; (2) they constantly strive to improve; (3) they seek to deepen their knowledge and skills; and (4) they strive for precision. Ironically, teachers who possess superior craftsmanship are most often the ones dissatisfied with their results (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 137-138).

Consciousness

Some characteristics of people with high consciousness are (1) they are aware of external and internal events; (2) they are metacognitive; (3) they monitor and adjust their own thoughts, behaviors, and values; and (4) they apply internal criteria when making decisions. Teachers with high consciousness are “with-it” in the classroom. They are aware and able to respond efficiently to many events happening simultaneously (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 138-139).

Interdependence

Some characteristics of interdependent people are (1) they seek collegiality; (2) they contribute to the common good; (3) they draw on the resources of others; and (4) they set aside personal agenda for group goals. Interdependent teachers recognize the importance of giving and receiving help (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 140-141).

It is important to note the states of mind are transitory, transforming, and transformable (Costa & Garmston, 1994, p. 132). They are a snapshot of a person's thinking at that moment. Thus, a teacher who ordinarily has high interdependence may temporarily experience low interdependence due to personal circumstances.

In the spring of 1998 I participated in a seven day Cognitive Coaching training. I found the coaching model to be empowering and thus incorporated it into my repertoire. In the summer of 2001 I attended a five day Advanced Cognitive Coaching training and at that time began thinking about new possibilities for Cognitive Coaching in my school. In my position as instructional specialist, I have many opportunities to talk to teachers about lessons, assessment, and classroom management. I had taken advantage of opportunities to coach my colleagues as often as possible, but I had never tried coaching the same individual regularly. I began to wonder what effects Cognitive Coaching would have on a teacher if used consistently over a period of time. I decided to conduct this action research project to answer the question: What are the effects, if any, of long-term coaching on a teacher's states of mind? I hypothesized the teacher's consciousness and subsequently craftsmanship would improve. For the purposes of this study, I have chosen to focus on four of the five states of mind: efficacy, flexibility, consciousness, and craftsmanship.

Review of Literature

Several research studies both formal and informal have been conducted using Cognitive Coaching and related topics (Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993; Ray, 1998; Anderson, Vail, Jones, & Huntington, 1994; Edwards & Newton, 1995; Veenman, de Laat, & Staring, 1998; McLymont & da Costa, 1998). Garmston (1993) coached two middle school teachers who were very different in their teaching styles. During the four month study, Garmston and the two teachers kept detailed journals. At the end of the study Garmston concluded the teachers "became better thinkers, by becoming more fully

bicognitive (Guild & Garger, 1985). To be bicognitive means to be able to attend to both relationship and task, to be both student- and teacher-centered” (p. 50).

Ray participated in a support group for teachers to share ideas and brainstorm how to implement the math standards in their classrooms. Teachers paired up and took turns coaching each other. After four years of participation, Ray (1998) concluded:

Our project allowed teachers to put theory into practice. I am convinced that Cognitive Coaching is a vehicle that helps teachers change and reform both curriculum development and instruction. It is a supportive process that directly combats the isolation of teaching, provides feedback, aids in reflective thought, and fosters a collegial relationship necessary for growth. (p. 483)

In another study Edwards and Newton (1995) determine the effects of Cognitive Coaching on teacher efficacy and empowerment. Forty-one men and 102 women participated in the study. Using the *Teacher Efficacy Scale*, they concluded that Cognitive Coaching had a positive impact on teacher efficacy.

Other authors have found Cognitive Coaching useful for supporting beginning teachers (Veenman & de Laat, 1998) and helping promote teacher collaboration and collegiality (McLymont & da Costa, 1998; Anderson, Vail, Jones, & Huntington, 1994).

Participants and Setting

My background is in English and in my current position I work with English, social studies, ESL, and foreign language teachers. I decided to work with a science teacher for this project so I could focus exclusively on coaching without being tempted to offer ideas or strategies, thus slipping into an expert or consultative role. Kelly (not her actual name) is a ninth grade science teacher in her fourth year of teaching. We have

worked in the same building for three years but have not had many opportunities to interact one-on-one. Thus, I knew I would need to work on developing trust and rapport with her.

All observations took place in her 3B class. She chose this class because she was feeling frustrated with student behavior and classroom management. The study was conducted at the Alief Hastings Ninth Grade Center.

Procedures

Getting Started

After being coached twice myself, I clarified the procedures I would employ and modified the *Energy Sources Team Self-Assessment Survey* created by Carolee Hayes and Jane Ellison. I planned to administer the survey twice as a pre- and post-survey to assess Kelly's states of mind. Following Costa and Garmston's model (1994), I planned to use the three-phase cycle of coaching: planning conversation, observation, and reflecting conversation. I arranged a time to meet with Kelly.

Pre-Planning Conversation

I began by sharing with Kelly my action research goals of answering the question "What are the effects, if any, of long-term coaching on a teacher's states of mind" and writing a paper about the experience. She agreed to work with me and keep a reflection log after each conversation. We decided to complete five cycles of coaching for a total of six planning conversations (including a pre-planning conversation), five observations, and six reflecting conversations (including a post-reflecting conversation). See Appendix A for examples of planning conversation questions.

We began our first planning conversation clarifying Kelly's goals for the project. She expressed difficulties with her 3B class. She felt the class was totally chaotic and nothing she tried seemed to make any difference. She asked me to observe that class for all five observations and collect data on the following: (1) lesson pace and teacher behaviors; (2) off-task student behaviors; and (3) on-task student behaviors. She wanted the data in the form of anecdotal notes in a four-column table. This was an important step in building trust because the coachee must feel empowered to explore her own teaching by deciding what matters most to her. In addition, I reassured Kelly I would only collect non-evaluative data. My role in her class was purely observer; I was not there to judge or give advice. In this way I tried to build trust and rapport so that she would not do anything differently when I visited her class.

Pre-Survey

Kelly completed the Pre-Survey after our initial conversation (see Appendix B for Pre- and Post-Surveys).

Weeks 1-4

Each week followed the same procedure: (1) planning conversation to clarify goals and data to be collected; (2) observation to collect data as determined by Kelly; (3) reflecting conversation to analyze how the data compared to Kelly's impressions. After each conversation Kelly and I recorded our thoughts in a reflection log.

Due to scheduling conflicts, we had to cancel the fifth cycle of Cognitive Coaching.

Post-Reflecting Conversation

We conducted the final reflecting conversation to analyze the coaching experience (see Appendix A for examples of questions). She analyzed the Pre-Survey results and reflected on how her states of mind had changed over the past four weeks.

Post-Survey

Kelly completed the Post-Survey after our final conversation (see Appendix B for results).

Data Analysis

I compared Kelly's reflection log to mine to determine if my impressions of the coaching experience were the same as hers. I also reviewed the surveys to see how her states of mind had changed.

Description of Results

The results of the Pre-Survey confirmed my initial suspicions about her states of mind. She had high flexibility and low consciousness, craftsmanship, and efficacy. Interestingly, as revealed in our planning conversation, Kelly had high consciousness about what was not working with her 3B class but did not know what to do with that knowledge. Thus, I decided to concentrate on helping her use the knowledge of what was not working to be more precise and intentional in her craftsmanship in future lessons. As our coaching cycles progressed, I observed Kelly's states of mind change. She continued to be highly flexible throughout the four weeks, but somewhere between the second and third week she began to notice patterns with particular students and changed her lesson plans and/or teacher behaviors to see if it would make a difference in student success. By the beginning of the third week she began articulating what was working

instead of just what was not working. She also began to see positive results with many of her students. Her attitude about the class began to change as well. As she compared the data to her own impressions, she admitted it was not as chaotic as she originally thought it was. In the final reflecting conversation she said this was the first time in four years that she felt like a "professional." She had never thought of herself as a professional educator and always worried when someone came into her room because she was afraid they would think her class was disorganized and chaotic. She also said she now saw the connection between reflecting on what happens in a particular class or lesson and how that knowledge should inform future decisions. The results of the Post-Survey confirmed that her consciousness, craftsmanship, and efficacy improved. She expressed gratitude in having been able to participate in this project because she felt more confident about her abilities as a teacher.

Discussion of Results and Implications for Future Use

As I began this project, I wanted to answer the question: What are the effects, if any, of long-term coaching on a teacher's states of mind? I believe the answer to that is there are many positive effects of long-term Cognitive Coaching. I hypothesized that as Kelly's consciousness went up so would her craftsmanship. I did not anticipate it would have such positive impact on her efficacy as well. Those three states of mind are much more connected than I originally thought.

Week 1

When Kelly and I had our first reflecting conversation, her impression of the lesson was different than what the data showed. She thought more students were off task than there really were. She also thought the pacing of the lesson was much slower than it

was. My impression of her states of mind is that they did not change much during the first week. She came into the coaching situation highly conscious that things were not going well but this knowledge did not impact her decision making about future lessons. It is interesting to note that in her reflection log she wrote, "Donna said my pacing appears to be pretty good." As a coach, I do not make evaluative comments. I remember asking her what she thought about her pacing. She drew the conclusion herself that it looked "pretty good," yet she credited the statement to me. One reason for that may be that I stepped out of my role as coach at the end of the conversation. Since Kelly and I had not established a trust relationship at that point, she appeared to need validation from me that she was "okay." Kelly kept asking me what I thought about her lesson. She would make comments like, "You probably think I'm totally disorganized" or "That was totally chaotic, wasn't it?" I struggled with the decision to step out of the coaching role to ease her mind. At the end of the conversation I asked her if she wanted to know what I thought about her lesson. She enthusiastically said yes. I looked at the data and basically articulated back to her the conclusions she had already drawn herself, saying things like, "I agree with your assessment of the pace. You set time limits and stuck to them" or "Your observation about the off-task students not appearing to affect the on-task students seems right on the mark." In this way I validated her own observations without really adding my own judgments or opinions.

Week 2

During the reflecting conversation the second week, Kelly began to focus on the dynamics between teacher-student and student-student and how these dynamics affected the learning environment. She admitted this week's lesson wore her out and she wasn't

sure how much learning really took place. She was particularly concerned about what was happening with the rest of the class when she was focused on working with one student. She has the sense that chaos ensued and she felt helpless to do anything about it. Her efficacy was low the second week. However, there appeared to be a shift in her thinking. She began to be more conscious of the dynamics and how that might inform her next lesson with the class.

In her reflection log she wrote, "Once again I felt that things were chaotic, but Donna pointed out how much the kids were on task." This week I did not step out of the coaching role and oddly enough she still credited me for a conclusion she drew on her own. I believe this may be because her efficacy was low and at this point she did not have confidence in herself to draw her own reliable and useful conclusions. In education we are used to others pointing out what we should be doing. Maybe it was a difficult paradigm shift for Kelly as she began mediating her own thinking.

Week 3

This was the first week I began to see Kelly carry forward new learning. In the reflecting conversation she pointed out things she did intentionally to work with particular students she knew would have a problem with aspects of the lesson. In my reflection log I wrote:

Today is the first time she [Kelly] felt good about her lesson. Her efficacy and consciousness was high today. I have mainly been trying to mediate her thinking in the area of craftsmanship.... I now see her identifying new learning and making choices about future lessons based on that. So her consciousness seems to be improving along with her craftsmanship.

In Kelly's reflection log she wrote, "I'm focusing a little more on EJ than I was before. I am seeing him less as a liability - more as a management situation. Movement is good for EJ but it opens up the prospect of him causing problems again." This comment is in contrast to earlier comments that things were "chaotic" and that she felt helpless to do anything about it.

This is the first week Kelly took ownership of her own insights. She stated in her log, "EJ was still having a hard time staying on task according to Donna's data." She did not credit any of her own thinking to me. This reveals an increase in her efficacy and a deepening of trust in our relationship.

Week 4

This week Kelly's reflection log reveals a significant shift in her efficacy:

This lesson went better than I could have ever dreamed. The stems worked extremely well; I don't recall any inappropriate remarks on the papers and all the students participated. ID [student who was upset over a schedule change] came in and we used her map; she was hesitant at first but I made her my helper and that seemed to break the ice. By the end of the period she seemed happy with her new classmates. It threw me a little that so few kids had done the map for homework as assigned, but I actually had another activity planned for the end and I just threw that out the window to give the kids time to finish. This was good because it gave all the kids a product and no one was left out. The notes section at the end [of the period] did not go well; maybe the kids were tired from the previous activity. Also, maybe I should capitalize on the fact that they seem to

work better at the beginning of the period and perhaps I should have done the notes first.

This is the first time in her reflection log she takes credit for all her thinking and makes observations about what she should do in the future to maximize learning. As always she is a highly flexible teacher, but in our reflecting conversation she admitted that she was beginning to be a better observer of students and she was using her observations to make better decisions about how to handle a situation in the middle of a lesson. She never felt comfortable doing that before.

In the final reflecting conversation Kelly felt this was a valuable experience. She revealed that she was a little apprehensive at first because she did not know me well, but that feeling went away by the second week. She was afraid I would not understand her teaching style and think she was a "bad teacher." As I remained objective and encouraged her to draw her own conclusions, we began to build trust and rapport.

Kelly's final log entry sums up the power Cognitive Coaching had on her thinking:

I used to be flat out afraid of this class. I think I couldn't see the forest for the trees. I have learned that my good kids don't seem to be suffering for the general chaos of my class, and that my chaos is no where as chaotic as I thought it was. I learned that my kids are on task a lot more than I thought, and even though they talk a lot they are usually talking about the material. My pace is a lot better than I thought, and I've started using the teach-time (I used to avoid it like the plague!). I have started to key in on the kids that cause distraction and cater a little more to their schedule and their learning style, and I think I am having less problems with

them during the class period. I'm paying a little more attention to all my kids, not just to a couple of benchmark kids. I feel that I'm doing a better job than I thought I was, and I feel that I can manage this class better than I did before because of the data that Donna has collected. All in all, it was a good experience.

In our reflecting conversation we talked about how she felt about her craftsmanship. She said she was feeling better about it now because the data and our conversations helped her become more intentional about the choices she made to work with her 3B class. She began to see how the decisions she made as a teacher had an impact on students as individuals. The dynamics of teacher-student and student-student were affected by her lesson plans. Now that she made that connection, she felt more in control over what was happening in the class. She felt she had the "space" to make decisions to monitor and adjust based on the reactions of her students. She said this was the first time in her four years of teaching that she felt like a "professional."

When I compared the Pre-Survey to the Post-Survey, I noticed her flexibility stayed the same at 27 points. However, her consciousness increased from 21 points to 28, craftsmanship increased from 22 points to 28, and efficacy increased from 22 points to 28 (see Appendix B). The surveys confirmed my observations of her states of mind.

The results of this four-week Cognitive Coaching study are very encouraging. This type of peer collaboration certainly deserves more exploration. When Kelly and I discussed whether first year teachers would benefit from this, she personally felt her first year was more about survival and her mental resources were not developed enough to benefit fully from coaching. She needed answers, suggestions, and strategies on the spot. She suggested this relationship would be more beneficial to second or third year teachers.

I, however, believe Cognitive Coaching could benefit any teacher regardless of their years of experience. Most districts do have in place mentorship programs for first year teachers and perhaps Cognitive Coaching could be added as another piece to that program. On the other hand, after a teacher's first year, there is little structured support offered. Research has shown that Cognitive Coaching can reduce teacher isolation, increase teacher collegiality, and improve teacher efficacy (Perkins, 1998; Veenman, de Laat, & Staring, 1998; Edwards & Newton, 1995; Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993). These are all critical issues to teachers staying in the profession. If Cognitive Coaching relationships were developed with second through fourth year teachers, perhaps teacher retention would go up as well. Empowering individuals to be self-reflective and self-directed has a positive impact on self-image and efficacy. Therefore, I plan to form new long-term Cognitive Coaching relationships in my building, and I would like to see more opportunities for others to get involved in a school-wide effort.

References

- Anderson, Dana M., Vail, Cynthia O., Jones, Karen, & Huntington, Deborah. (1994 April 9). Professional collaboration: empowering school personnel through peer coaching (Conference paper 150). Denver, CO: University of Georgia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED371496)
- Costa, Arthur & Garmston, Robert J. (1994). Cognitive coaching: a foundation for renaissance schools. Norwood, Me: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Edwards, Jennifer & Newton, Rae R. (1995 April). The effects of cognitive coaching on teacher efficacy and empowerment (Research report 143). San Francisco, CA: California State University Fullerton. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED388654)
- Garmston, Robert, Linder, Christina, & Whitaker, Jan. (1993 October). Reflections on Cognitive Coaching. Educational Leadership, 51, 57-62.
- McLymont, Enid & da Costa, Jose L. (1998). Cognitive coaching the vehicle for professional development and teacher collaboration (Conference paper 150). San Diego, CA: Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED420637)
- Perkins, Sally J. (1998 Spring). On becoming a peer coach: practices, identities, and beliefs of inexperienced coaches. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 13, 235-254.
- Ray, Theresa M. (1998 April). Implementing the NCTM's standards through cognitive coaching. Teaching Children Mathematics, 4, 480-483.

Veenman, Simon, de Laat, Hanneke, & Staring, Corine. (1998 September).

Coaching beginning teachers (Research report 143). Ljubljana, Slovenia: University of Nijmegen The Netherlands. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED426997)

Weasmer, Jerie & Woods, Amelia Mays. (199 Fall). Peer partnering and change.

Kappa Delta Pi Record, 36, 32-34.

Appendix A

The Three-Phase Cycle of Cognitive Coaching

Planning Conversation Questions

1. What is your goal(s) for the lesson?
2. How will you know that your students have reached the goal(s)?
3. How will you help your students reach the goal(s)? What strategies might you employ?
4. What data would you like me to collect about your students and/or yourself?
5. How has this conversation helped you?

Data Collection

1. Coachee determines what data will be collected and in what format
2. Coach gathers data during lesson

Reflecting Conversation Questions

1. How do you feel about the lesson?
2. What do you remember about the lesson that supports this feeling?
3. Would you like to look at the data I collected?
4. How does the data compare to your impressions?
5. What possible relationships exist between teacher decisions/behaviors and student performance?
6. What new learning can you take away from this?
7. How did you benefit from this conversation?

Appendix B

Pre- and Post- SurveysStates of Mind Pre-Survey - September 20, 2001

- This survey is intended to be a diagnostic instrument to assist individuals in examining their development. It is designed to provide data for analysis, reflection, and goal setting.
- In considering the statements it is important to remember that you are responding in a way which best describes your thinking about your teaching *right now*, not how you'd like to be.

SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

- | | | | | |
|--|----|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----|
| 1. I pay little attention to team building in my classes. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 2. I am good at predicting and managing time. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 3. I find it difficult to work when I don't have complete information. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 4. I get my work done as quickly as I can. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 5. I am quick to find answers and solutions. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 6. I strive to improve ways to do things. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 7. My classes are productive and effective. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 8. I consider the impact of my lessons before I teach. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 9. I adjust my norms and change my procedures in order to be more effective. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 10. I am aware of where I am in my development as a teacher and where I want to be. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 11. I draw on my experiences and use the knowledge and skills I have to be an effective teacher. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 12. Others control most of what happens to me. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |

13. My goals have little importance to me. SA A D SD
14. My work has less effect than I would like it to have. SA A D SD
15. I often feel uncertain and fearful in my teaching. SA A D SD
16. I am often uncertain about how to manage student behaviors. SA A D SD
17. I am aware of where I am in my work and where I want to be. SA A D SD
18. As I think about specific issues, I expand my thinking to encompass a larger view. SA A D SD
19. I view situations through my own eyes and the eyes of others. SA A D SD
20. I have control over what happens in my classroom. SA A D SD
21. My communication with my students often needs clarification. SA A D SD
22. I am not always clear about why I'm using a particular process to get something done. SA A D SD
23. I accomplish less than I hope to in my classes and often feel frustrated by lack of closure. SA A D SD
24. I stop during class to monitor and adjust my teaching to be more effective. SA A D SD
25. I am often unsure about the progress I am making with my classes. SA A D SD
26. I examine the positive intentions of my students. SA A D SD
27. The way I work on things stays pretty much the same. SA A D SD
28. I usually don't get through my lesson plan. SA A D SD
29. I know why I am a teacher. SA A D SD

- | | | | | |
|---|----|----------|---|-----------|
| 30. I calibrate my progress against established criteria for excellence. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 31. I adjust my lesson during class in order to be more effective with my students. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 32. I consider several ways of doing things before deciding what might work best. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 33. My work impacts my students' lives. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 34. I tend to overlook what I have learned and don't use it to help me become more effective. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 35. I don't usually think about what will happen to my students as a result of my work. | SA | A | D | SD |
| 36. The goals of my teaching have real meaning for me. | SA | A | D | SD |

Pre-Survey Results - September 20, 2001

SCORING: Record the corresponding score for each number and total.

<u>CONSCIOUSNESS</u>					
1.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>2</u>
4.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
8.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
10.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>2</u>
17.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
22.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
24.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>1</u>
29.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
35.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
TOTAL SCORE					<u>21</u>
<u>EFFICACY</u>					
11.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>2</u>
12.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
13.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
14.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
15.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
20.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
33.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
34.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
36.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
TOTAL SCORE					<u>22</u>
<u>FLEXIBILITY</u>					
3.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
5.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
9.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
18.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>4</u>
19.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>4</u>
26.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
27.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
31.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
32.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
TOTAL SCORE					<u>27</u>
<u>CRAFTSMANSHIP</u>					
2.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
6.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
7.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>2</u>
16.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
21.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
23.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>2</u>
25.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
28.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
30.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>1</u>
TOTAL SCORE					<u>22</u>

States of Mind Post-Survey - November 7, 2001

- This survey is intended to be a diagnostic instrument to assist individuals in examining their development. It is designed to provide data for analysis, reflection, and goal setting.
- In considering the statements it is important to remember that you are responding in a way which best describes your thinking about your teaching *right now*, not how you'd like to be.

SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. I pay little attention to team building in my classes. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 2. I am good at predicting and managing time. | SA | A | D | <input checked="" type="radio"/> SD |
| 3. I find it difficult to work when I don't have complete information. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 4. I get my work done as quickly as I can. | SA | A | D | <input checked="" type="radio"/> SD |
| 5. I am quick to find answers and solutions. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 6. I strive to improve ways to do things. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> SA | A | D | SD |
| 7. My classes are productive and effective. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 8. I consider the impact of my lessons before I teach. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 9. I adjust my norms and change my procedures in order to be more effective. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 10. I am aware of where I am in my development as a teacher and where I want to be. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 11. I draw on my experiences and use the knowledge and skills I have to be an effective teacher. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 12. Others control most of what happens to me. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 13. My goals have little importance to me. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 14. My work has less effect than I would like it to have. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 15. I often feel uncertain and fearful in my teaching. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 16. I am often uncertain about how to manage student behaviors. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 17. I am aware of where I am in my work and where I want to be. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 18. As I think about specific issues, I expand my thinking to encompass a larger view. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 19. I view situations through my own eyes and the eyes of others. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 20. I have control over what happens in my classroom. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 21. My communication with my students often needs clarification. | SA | A | D | <input checked="" type="radio"/> SD |
| 22. I am not always clear about why I'm using a particular process to get something done. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 23. I accomplish less than I hope to in my classes and often feel frustrated by lack of closure. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 24. I stop during class to monitor and adjust my teaching to be more effective. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 25. I am often unsure about the progress I am making with my classes. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 26. I examine the positive intentions of my students. | SA | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | D | SD |
| 27. The way I work on things stays pretty much the same. | SA | A | <input checked="" type="radio"/> D | SD |
| 28. I usually don't get through my lesson plan. | SA | A | D | <input checked="" type="radio"/> SD |
| 29. I know why I am a teacher. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> SA | A | D | SD |

30. I calibrate my progress against established criteria for excellence. SA A D SD
31. I adjust my lesson during class in order to be more effective with my students. SA A D SD
32. I consider several ways of doing things before deciding what might work best. SA A D SD
33. My work impacts my students' lives. SA A D SD
34. I tend to overlook what I have learned and don't use it to help me become more effective. SA A D SD
35. I don't usually think about what will happen to my students as a result of my work. SA A D SD
36. The goals of my teaching have real meaning for me. SA A D SD

Pre-Survey Results - November 7, 2001

SCORING: Record the corresponding score for each number and total.

<u>CONSCIOUSNESS</u>					
1.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>2</u>
4.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>4</u>
8.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
10.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
17.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
22.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
24.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
29.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>4</u>
35.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
TOTAL SCORE					<u>28</u>
<u>EFFICACY</u>					
11.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
12.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
13.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
14.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
15.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
20.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
33.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
34.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
36.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>4</u>
TOTAL SCORE					<u>28</u>
<u>FLEXIBILITY</u>					
3.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
5.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>2</u>
9.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
18.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
19.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
26.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
27.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
31.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>4</u>
32.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
TOTAL SCORE					<u>27</u>
<u>CRAFTSMANSHIP</u>					
2.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>1</u>
6.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>4</u>
7.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
16.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
21.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>4</u>
23.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
25.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>3</u>
28.	SA=1	A=2	D=3	SD=4	<u>4</u>
30.	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1	<u>3</u>
TOTAL SCORE					<u>28</u>