

Fundamental Components of Personalized Coaching Models

Erika R. Carlson

New Jersey City University

Abstract

To advance the progress of creating a more socially-just higher education landscape, student learning needs to be an institutional priority. The lack of disaggregating student learning outcomes assessment data to identify and eradicate existing equity gaps in learning continues to be problematic. However, providing faculty with data alone is not enough. It is essential that faculty also learn how to use the data. Implementing a personalized coaching model of professional development where faculty and specialized professional staff work in partnership is imperative to address this problem of practice. The current article reviews existing literature to identify the essential elements that contribute to the success of coaching models in education. The findings suggest that a successful coaching model should utilize a coach internal to the academic institution, establish a collaborative partnership between faculty and coach built on trust, coaching sessions should be frequent and held in an inclusive environment, and should obtain consistent support of senior administration communicated to the college-wide community.

Keywords: Faculty coaching, personalized coaching model, disaggregated assessment data

* Corresponding author: Erika R. Carlson, New Jersey City University,
ecarlson2@njcu.edu

Recommended citation: Carlson, E. R. (2022). Fundamental components of personalized coaching models. *The Journal of Assessment in Higher Education*, 3(1), 1-20. doi: 10.32473/jahe.v3i1.129170

©Journal of Assessment in Higher Education. Published under Creative Commons License CC BY- 4.0 International.

Introduction

The lack of disaggregating student learning outcomes assessment data to identify and eradicate existing equity gaps in learning continues to be a problem in higher education as it hinders the progress of advancing social justice in academia. The discussions on disparities in equity are traditionally discussed through educational outcomes such as retention, graduation, persistence, and transfer but not at the course or programmatic learning outcome level. The identification and eradication of equity gaps at the course and programmatic learning outcome level would in theory dramatically reduce the equity gaps at the educational outcome level. Therefore, a central focus on examining disaggregated assessment learning outcomes data in addition to educational outcomes data is needed. To address this issue, faculty need to be provided with disaggregated student learning outcomes assessment data to identify equity gaps in learning. Ideally this could occur, through partnership with the academic institution's institutional research staff to develop a valid assessment method for data collection and then to align individual student assessment data with demographic data (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity) for disaggregation purposes.

Given the complexities involved in data collection and interpretation, professional development would assist faculty in this task. Interpreting student outcomes assessment data can be challenging for faculty who are not as experienced with data interpretation techniques and skills (Desimone, 2009). Disaggregating data provides a deeper understanding of the variables being examined and simultaneously creates an added layer of complexity for faculty data interpretation. The goal of this article is to review existing literature to identify the essential elements that contribute to the success of coaching models in education. The intent of the findings is to implement a targeted personalized coaching model that embeds building data interpretation skills and faculty confidence in working with disaggregated learning outcomes assessment data, and employ culturally responsive and equity-centered assessment methods if inequities in assessment data are identified.

In higher education, the professional development of faculty describes activities and programs designed to improve instruction (Amundsen et al., 2005) and support faculty members so they can fulfill their teaching, research, and college service roles (Centra, 1989), and arguably its most important function is to act as an essential tool for the advancement of learning and student success. Desimone (2009) suggested professional development should include three central components: (a) develop teachers' content knowledge with clear connections between theory and practice, (b) utilize an applied approach to adult learning, incorporating ongoing and personalized training and mentoring, and (c) provide opportunities for feedback and self-reflection.

Although there are several approaches to professional development such as workshops and training, these core elements of professional development are most aligned with a personalized coaching model of professional development (Crawford et al., 2017). Van Nieuwerburgh (2012) described coaching in the educational setting as:

a one-to-one conversation focused on the enhancement of learning and development through increasing self-awareness and a sense of personal responsibility, where the coach facilitates the self-directed learning of the coachee through questioning, active listening, and appropriate challenge in a supportive and encouraging climate. (p. 17)

Desimone (2009) found student learning was one of the central components in evaluating the effectiveness of professional development models. Desimone suggested a comprehensive framework that reviews three core elements: (a) key features of the model are content and active learning focused and involve collective participation; (b) assessment of the way the model affects faculty understanding and knowledge, their practice, and student learning; and (c) contextual factors (i.e., student, teacher, and academic institution characteristics) are related to the effectiveness of professional development. Although this evaluative framework incorporates student learning as a key indicator of a coaching model's success, it does not identify suggestions for how data are used and provided to faculty to better assess these dimensions. Akhavan (2015) found the ability to help faculty understand the use of data, to better plan instruction for student achievement, should be embedded in all coaching model frameworks. The identification of how coaching models are used to better enhance faculty understanding and utilization of data are primarily limited to K–12 academic institutions in the literature.

Glover (2017) proposed a data-driven coaching model to advance faculty practices and positive student outcomes. The model included three primary components: (a) an emphasis on the student learning environment, (b) faculty enrolled in modeling and feedback practice, and (c) utilization of a formalized data-driven implementation framework (Glover, 2017). The data-driven instructional coaching model incorporated a 5-phase cyclical process for coaches to elevate classroom achievement centered around data analysis and assessment of needs and implementing interventions to achieve the identified goals. In a randomized experiment, 61 schools were randomly assigned to a control condition or an intervention condition of personalized professional development. The findings supported the value of a data-based coaching approach for improving teaching, learning, and overall student performance (Glover, 2017).

Implementing a personalized coaching model of professional development where faculty and specialized professional staff in institutional research work in partnership is imperative as it can assist faculty in answering assessment questions that may come up when examining student learning outcomes data, provide faculty with culturally responsive and equity-centered assessment methods, and coach faculty through interpretation of real-time assessment data. This collaborative and focused effort to help faculty better understand and interpret disaggregated student learning outcomes data to address equity gaps in student learning is the proposed intervention technique for this problem of practice. It is clear from the evidence traditional coaching models work. The current review process was guided by the overarching question: *What are the fundamental components of successful personalized coaching models for faculty to address inequities in learning outcomes data?* The purpose of the article is to identify and synthesize the essential elements that

contribute to faculty coaching models to develop a data interpretation centered personalized coaching model to eradicate existing inequities in student learning outcomes assessment data.

Method

Multiple search strategies were used to investigate the factors that contribute to the success of personalized coaching models in higher education. This literature review relied on three types of data to gain a comprehensive understanding of personalized coaching: (a) empirical publications found in the library database, (b) professional organizational websites, and (c) conversations with professionals in the field.

Empirical Publications

Articles were identified by searching seven electronic databases: Academic Search Premier, APA PsycArticles, APA PsychInfo, Education Source, Educational Administration Abstracts, ERIC, and MasterFILE Elite. Search terms included “faculty,” OR “instructor,” OR “college teacher,” AND “coaching model,” OR “personalized professional development” OR “faculty coaching,” AND “community college,” AND “assessment,” AND, “student learning outcomes.”

Articles for inclusion in this literature review had to meet the search criteria set that included: (a) peer-reviewed journal articles, research reports, book chapters, evaluative reports, and theses/dissertations between the years of 2005–2020; (b) articles specific to professional development coaching model content, structure, application, and effectiveness; and (c) literature reviews, reports discussing the results of a specific coaching model for faculty professional development, or empirical studies that used qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods. Articles were excluded if they were not discussed in educational settings, coaching was not discussed in the context of professional development for advancing student outcomes, were not focused on interactive, in person coaching models, and if they were not primary reports of research findings.

The initial literature review search identified 94 empirical publications for review. Publications were first reviewed by title to determine relevance. Of the original 94 articles, 22 (i.e., 23%) did not meet the criteria. The abstracts of the remaining articles were reviewed, 21 (i.e., 29%) of the articles failed to discuss the structure, application, and effectiveness of coaching models as a tool for professional development. Failing to meet the inclusion criteria, these publications were not considered for further analysis. Of the remaining articles reviewed, 22 articles (i.e., 43%) discussed alternative coaching models not in the context of professional development of faculty in higher education or were specific to working with children enrolled in behavioral analysis-based programs. For this reason, these articles were not considered for further analysis.

Of the scholarly articles identified through a search of empirical research publications, 29 were found to meet all the inclusion and exclusion criteria and were subsequently retained for the analysis. Sixteen articles used qualitative methods primarily consisting of surveys, interviews, focus groups, or case studies, seven articles employed a mixed methodology approach, and six articles were literature reviews of academic or instructional coaching as a strategy for faculty professional development.

Public Scholarship Search

Additional articles were identified by searching the public-facing websites of six professional organizations utilizing coaching models with faculty in postsecondary academic institutions or organizations providing faculty support in understanding data and analytics: (a) Achieving the Dream, (b) Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, (c) Academic Impressions, (d) Inside Higher Ed, (e) Education Week, and (f) U.S. Department of Education. Search terms across these websites included “coaching model,” “disaggregated educational outcomes,” “personalized professional development,” “data” and “academic coaching.”

Articles for inclusion in this literature had to meet the following search criteria set that included: (a) peer-reviewed journal articles, research reports, reflection pieces, or blogs between the years of 2010–2020; and (b) reported and/or discussed findings on or in the context of coaching models for faculty professional development. Publications were excluded if they were explored outside of educational settings. Publications were first reviewed by title to determine relevance. The abstracts and/or overview of the reports were reviewed next, if the publications did not discuss the results and implications of the findings or did not make inferences relevant to a higher education landscape, they failed to meet the inclusion criteria and were not considered for further analysis.

Approximately 17 public scholarship works were reviewed through a search of public-facing websites of professional organizations. Nine were found to meet all the inclusion and exclusion criteria and were retained for analysis and interpretation. The majority (i.e., 66%) of the public scholarship pieces were reports discussing specific coaching models where qualitative methods of interviews, focus groups, and case studies were the primary data collection methods. There were a total of two (i.e., 22%) reflection pieces, and one (i.e., 11%) blog.

Professional Perspectives

To gain a practice-based understanding of personalized coaching models for faculty professional development, five conversations were conducted with faculty and administrators experienced in utilizing a personalized coaching/mentoring framework for faculty professional development. Individuals were from both public and private academic institutions, primarily community colleges and had one of the following roles: faculty, director of center for excellence in teaching and learning, director of institutional research, or assistant dean for teaching and learning. Those from 4-year institutions had previous professional experience in a community college setting. Conversations took place during a

3-week period during the Fall 2020 semester. Individuals responded to a total of four questions:

- What is the ideal group composition and environment for a successful personalized coaching model?
- What are the challenges of coaching faculty on utilization and interpretation of assessment data?
- What are the greatest challenges to implementing a successful personalized coaching model?
- What are the necessary elements for a coach to be a valuable addition to faculty professional development?

The responses from all five interviews were retained for analysis.

Results

There were seven themes that emerged throughout the research process as contributing to the successful implementation of a coaching model of faculty professional development (see Table 1). Themes were extracted from three primary data sources: (1) empirical publications found in the library database, (2) professional organizational websites, and 3) conversations with professionals in the field. Extracted themes included: (a) coach characteristics, (b) trust in a coach, (c) collaborative partnership between faculty and coach, (d) one-on-one coaching model, (e) coaching environment, (f) utilizing a coach internal to the academic institution, and (g) frequency of coaching sessions.

Evidence on Effectiveness of Coaching

A personalized coaching model of professional development, often referred to as peer coaching, is an inquiry-based learning framework of collaboration between faculty or more accomplished peers (Poglinco et al., 2003). Although there is no one standard model of coaching, peer coaching programs are typically defined as two or more professional colleagues working together to improve their professional knowledge and skills (Poglinco et al., 2003). Peer coaching programs provide companionship, technical feedback, prompt the analysis of applications of knowledge to instruction, and encourage the modification of the instruction to meet student needs, and facilitate the practice of new methods and understanding (Joyce & Showers, 1982).

Researchers Ma et al. (2018) investigated the effectiveness of a personalized peer coaching approach to instructor learning participation, learning design skills, and in-practice teaching abilities utilizing a quasi-experiment research design. Ma et al. examined an expert guidance-based personalized learning approach of ten pairs of peer participants, a 3-step approach that included diagnosis, personalized recommendation, and personalized evaluation in comparison to a personalized peer coaching model. The expert guidance-based personalized learning approach did not foster a collegial or supportive relationship between faculty and expert. The approach required faculty submit their initial

lesson plans and an expert would review the plan and identify any existing issues in the proposed lesson. The expert in turn referred the faculty member to a series of resources to improve their pedagogy, to be reviewed independently. The personalized peer coaching model, approach utilized a one-on-one coaching effort with two faculty colleagues engaged in a mutually supportive relationship, for a period of 5 weeks. A mixed-methods analysis showed instructors in the personalized peer coaching experimental condition had a significantly higher occurrence of all seven dimensions of teachers' learning participation (i.e., raising questions, discovery and explanation, conflict, support, reflection, sharing, and affective communication) as compared to the expert guidance-based control condition (Ma et al., 2018). The research also found the personalized peer coaching model was more successful in faculty learning design skills (i.e., learning process design, pedagogies, and teaching ideas) and in-practice teaching abilities (Ma et al., 2018).

Additionally, successful peer coaching programs have been found to improve student academic and behavioral outcomes through improved teaching practices (Joyce & Showers, 2002, Snyder et al., 2015). Implementation frameworks from various academic fields utilizing a coaching model provide evidence coaching assists practitioners bridge the gap between research and practice by continually developing and honing faculty skills learned in various professional development trainings (Pierce & Buysee, 2014). Consistent with Pierce and Buysee (2014), Connor (2017) also found coaching models are promising frameworks for providing effective faculty professional development.

Factors that Contribute to Effective Coaching

Coach Characteristics

In a mixed-methods analysis, the Pennsylvania Institute for Instructional Coaching, identified successful coaches should exhibit several characteristics. They suggested coaches should be well positioned to understand the professional development needs of the faculty, they should integrate long range professional development strategies and align it with the institution's mission, and ideally coaches work onsite with senior leadership to foster a supportive environment for coaching (Medrich & Charner, 2017). Knight and van Nieuwerburgh (2012) identified coaches should employ effective listening, dialogical questioning, and other relationship-building strategies.

Hasbrouck (2017) proposed a student-focused coaching model emphasizing a collaborative relationship between faculty and specialist/coach. Hasbrouck identified for the model to be successful, coaches need to have some level of successful teaching experiencing (i.e., a minimum of 3–5 years), a deep knowledge of the content area for their coaching work, and a general interest in working collaboratively with colleagues. The model also expressed the importance for coaches to demonstrate they are willing to “get his or her hands dirty in the real-world work in which all teachers must engage” (Hasbrouck, 2017, p. 23).

As part of the professional perspectives data collection, this notion was expressed further by a director of institutional research. She explained when working with faculty on data interpretation, the coach needs to be an expert in the field, patient, and familiar with

explaining and answering questions, experience she commented is “best obtained when a coach also has teaching experience;” she noted in her experience faculty tend to be more receptive to learning from colleagues/coaches who have tangible experience in the classroom, no matter the content. A faculty member echoed these sentiments and explained a coach should be patient and approachable if they are to work with sensitive content such as assessment data as data in general can be intimidating for faculty if they do not have a statistics background. Faculty went on to explain coaches should be authentic and genuine when supporting faculty professional development, and although the coach should be an expert in the field, they need to be aware of the potential arrogance or intimidation of their mannerisms as that will undoubtedly lead to unsuccessful coach–faculty relationships.

Trust in a Coach

A review of the coaching model literature overwhelmingly found coaching requires a positive relationship in which the faculty trust the coach and coaching relationship (Creasy & Paterson, 2005; Gómez Palacio et al., 2019; Hasbrouck, 2017; Knight, 2007; Lofthouse, 2019). Whitmore (2002) suggested the foundation of a successful coaching relationship is one that establishes an environment of trust, safety, and is of minimal pressure, where the coach can be seen as a sounding board. Additionally, when faculty were asked about the challenges to successful coaching models of professional development, they explained creating a relationship of trust and respect is the foundation to a successful coaching relationship, but this relationship organically develops over time where most coaching models are shorter-term and align with an initiative or college-wide special project.

Gómez Palacio et al. (2019) conducted a qualitative study to explore the effectiveness of a proposed coaching model. Researchers collected data through questionnaires, individual and multiple coach coaching sessions, and final evaluative reports provided by coach and mentee. There were a total of five adjunct faculty that met with three coaches during the first 2 of 5 coaching sessions. After the first two small group coaching sessions, faculty were able to select the coach they felt they connected with the most and the remaining personalized coaching sessions were with their self-selected coach. Through this research, Gómez Palacio et al. found genuine interest and trust in a coach was an integral component of successful coaching sessions. Consistent with findings from Gómez Palacio et al., Goldvarg and Perel de Goldvarg (2012) also found faculty trust in a coach and genuine interest were expressed at academic institutions that required a coaching model as part of faculty professional development. O’Connor and Lages (2005) argued trust is crucial in a coaching relationship. Hasbrouck (2017) found establishing and maintaining mutual trust is essential and requires coaching interactions remain confidential unless specific permission is granted.

Collaborative Partnership Between Faculty and Coach

Most of the literature found coaching models were successful when coaches were partners, faculty opinions were respected, and the process was collaborative (Connor,

2017; Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018; Lofthouse, 2019). In the classroom strategies coaching model proposed by Reddy et al. (2017), they explained faculty should be viewed as active collaborators in the coach–faculty relationship and contributors to the decision-making process. Consistent with Reddy et al., Hasbrouck (2017) suggested in their student-focused coaching model both coach and faculty member should be a truly collaborative process with a jointly held belief between parties.

Moreover, the National Framework for Mentoring and Coaching (Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education, 2005) identified collaborative coaching is valuable as it is seen as a reciprocal process between peers. Knight and van Nieuwerburgh (2012) explained coaches should respect and honor the expertise of faculty by grounding coaching in the fundamental belief “coach and teacher see their relationship as an authentic partnership between equals and not a relationship between an expert and a novice” (p. 4). The partnership between faculty and coach should be established through equality and seen as a relationship between equals (Schein, 2009) where individual choices are in turn collaborative decisions (Knight & van Nieuwerburgh, 2012). In a qualitative research study of faculty experiences with coaching, Akhavan (2015) found faculty expressed a desire to have coaches sit side by side with them during one-on-one coaching sessions. Faculty reported the act of sitting side by side to be a symbolic action of respect, care, and equality (Akhavan, 2015). This demonstrated and communicated to faculty the coach was not in charge but there as an equal who in partnership would be learning from the faculty they were assigned to coach.

A director of Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning expressed in an interview the most successful coach–faculty relationships are those where collaboration is a fundamental element. She stated, “collaboration communicates respect and without respect there are only failed professional partnerships.” Walden University’s coaching model of faculty development explained the fundamental structure of their coaching framework to be a central component to its success. The coaching model was designed with a personalized peer relationship approach, incorporating problem-focused, contextualized opportunities for faculty to collaborate (Bedford, et al., 2014). The Walden coaching model is characterized as an individualized, confidential, nonevaluative framework and offers three guided pathways to support the professional development of faculty through this collaborative personalized coaching process: self-assigned coaching, request from colleague leadership, and new faculty orientation (Bedford et al., 2014). The success of the faculty–coach partnership is highly dependent on administrative support. Hasbrouck (2017) found administrators and other academic leadership who directly support and evaluate coaches are essential to a successful coaching model outcome. The Texas school ready coaching model also found ongoing training and supervision of coaches to support student success and continuous improvement was one of the core elements to ensuring a successful coaching program (Crawford et al., 2017). Moreover, a director for the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning explained in an interview to have a successful coaching program faculty seek out, senior administration need to encourage and support the faculty coaching model as a whole by communicating the problem of practice and how the faculty coaching model centered around the problem of practice is the solution.

One-on-One Coaching Model

Utilizing a one-on-one coaching model compared to a small group composition is a key theme threaded throughout the literature. In a mixed-methods analysis incorporating longitudinal survey data, case studies, secondary data analyses, interviews, and focus groups across more than 50 studies and analyses, the Pennsylvania Institute for Instructional Coaching, found faculty reported one-on-one instructional coaching as a valuable process to their professional learning and assists them with improving their practice and instruction that have a direct impact on student engagement and learning (Medrich & Charner, 2017).

There are several elements with varying degrees of efficacy, based on situational factors, that need to be considered with respect to a one-on-one versus a small group personalized coaching model. Attributes of the faculty that influence their success in small group compared to a one-on-one setting include confidence, number of years of teaching experience, their individual disposition in how they perceive assessment data. Furthermore, faculty expressed during an interview they feel more comfortable and less vulnerable working with a coach in a one-on-one setting when learning data interpretation and discussing sensitive data in relation to student success in the classroom.

Coaching Environment

During an interview with a director of institutional research, as part of the scope of professional perspectives data collection, she shared when coaching faculty with data it is best to create a safe and comfortable environment and suggested going to the faculty member's office in lieu of an administrator's office as the administrative office environment can communicate arrogance of an inflated sense of importance on the part of the coach. Moreover, in an interview with an assistant dean for teaching and learning, she explained a coaching environment should be both physically and emotionally comfortable if faculty are going to feel secure in learning from a faculty or administrator colleague. She went on to explain the best way to create this space is to stay student-centered and focus on the professional development intervention as a tool for advancing equitable student success. Gómez Palacio et al. (2019) found conducting faculty coaching sessions in an informal and comfortable environment provided a feeling of safety and security for faculty. Similarly, in a qualitative case study analysis conducted by Lofthouse (2019), the successful coaching environment was described by the participants as a space where coaches listened and were attentive to faculty allowing them to be vulnerable and "do their best thinking" (p. 7).

Internal Versus External Coach

As part of the professional perspectives data collection, a director of a Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning explained during an interview that utilizing an internal coach who is perceived to be knowledgeable and trustworthy is more likely to engage faculty in the repeated interactions of a successful coaching relationship. Additionally, in an interview with an assistant dean for teaching and learning, it was suggested an internal

coach be used as opposed to a coach external to the academic institution. She explained coaching involves big and small interactions that are formative, relational, and better established by someone who understands and is familiar with the culture of the institution. She expressed the need for an external coach to be the individual that kicks off the initiative and provides the point of pressure and importance of the need for faculty to receive personalized coaching as it relates to disaggregated assessment data, but they could not also be the line of support for the coaching model as that is better found within an expert internal to the institution.

The Center for Faculty Excellence at Walden University developed a personalized faculty coaching program in 2011 and highlight their faculty coaching model is rooted in the utilization of internal faculty experts who serve as coaches. Coaches are faculty members and lateral colleagues from within the academic institution that possess a proven track record of reliable teaching performance (Bedford et al., 2014). Consistent with findings from Bedford et al. (2014), in a qualitative research study of 269 faculty (i.e., 243 participated in survey research, 23 participated in focus group sessions) data were collected and coded over the course of 3 years; researchers found overall that coaching had a positive impact on student learning and identified people skills and a good working relationship between faculty and coach as among the most essential attributes in a coaching experience (Akhavan, 2015). Providing additional support for the need to select coaches internal to the academic institution. The National Framework for Mentoring and Coaching (Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education, 2005) encouraged educators to identify and utilize mentoring practices within their academic institution and build on the existing relationships and culture.

Frequency of Coaching Sessions

In a literature review synthesizing research of the key elements of professional development, Desimone and Pak (2017) found successful coaching models include a substantial amount of contact hours between coach and faculty. During interviews with faculty, they expressed successful, individualized coaching models should be highly structured with biweekly coaching sessions lasting no less than 1 hour, for a period of no less than 1 semester and involve streamlined communication between faculty and coach.

Faculty explained coaching models fail when coaching sessions are unstructured and intermittent with varying durations of time. In a randomized controlled experimental study, researchers explored the effects of a personalized professional development program on student outcomes of 55 faculty and 193 students (Buyse et al., 2010). Faculty were randomly assigned to a control condition or receive the intervention, consisting of three professional development components including a personalized coaching approach. Among the findings, researchers noted intense, personalized coaching sessions of faculty with periodic follow ups throughout the semester were significant in increasing student outcomes (Buysee et al., 2010). Hasbrouck's (2017) student-focused faculty coaching model outlined the need for coaches to make regular and consistent contact with the faculty they are coaching. Additionally, Yoon et al. (2007) conducted a qualitative analysis of studies exploring the potential effect of professional development on student

achievement and found summer institutes with subsequent follow up sessions were an essential element of the structure of successful professional development models. Consistent with the findings from Yoon et al., in a block-randomized experimental design of two cohorts of faculty ($n = 153$) across 25 schools, Blazar and Kraft (2015) found faculty exposed to shorter summer institutes (i.e., 3 weeks) required more subsequent follow up with coaches when compared to faculty who completed longer summer institute trainings (i.e., 4 weeks). Furthermore, key dimensions extracted across all coaching models of professional development included: frequency, length of time, and periodicity of the coaching sessions, behavior of coaches, and identified focus of the intervention implemented (Crawford et al., 2017; Powell & Diamond, 2013; Reddy et al., 2017).

Conclusion

A personalized coaching model is the evidence-based solution for helping faculty to better understand and interpret disaggregated student learning outcomes assessment data. A personalized coaching model targeted and focused on building skills and faculty confidence is a modification of the traditional coaching model in that the personalized coaching model approach has the coach act as a thought partner in approaching, interpreting, and applying culturally responsive and equity-centered assessment methods in real time to address existing inequities in student learning outcomes data. The personalized coaching model approach offers faculty real-time disaggregated assessment data with the opportunity to identify and implement equity-centered assessment methods to close inequities in student learning. It is through exploring disaggregated data faculty will be able to identify and eradicate existing equity gaps in student learning.

There were seven key themes found in the literature for developing and implementing a successful personalized coaching model. The characteristics of a coach are fundamental in its success. A coach with strong interpersonal skills and previous teaching experience to create a more meaningful connection with the faculty they coach. The shared teaching experience is a pillar for trust between the coach and faculty member, a key component in the personalized coaching approach. Coaching sessions need to be a collaborative partnership between faculty and coach to collectively work toward the shared goal. A one-on-one interaction between faculty and coach is fundamental to a successful coaching model. It allows for a deeper connection between faculty and coach, especially when sensitive issues are being discussed such as reviewing disaggregated student learning outcomes data. The coaching environment should be comfortable and inclusive and allow for vulnerability between faculty and coach. Utilizing a coach internal to the academic institution appears to be the best approach for implementing a personalized coaching model as they are familiar with the climate and culture of the institution. Finally, coaching sessions should be frequent and allow for a substantial amount of contact hours between faculty and coach. Including the aforementioned components into a personalized coaching model will lay the foundation for successfully working with faculty to disaggregate learning outcomes assessment data for the purpose of identifying and eliminating existing equity gaps in student learning.

ORCID: 0000-0001-6116-0401

References

- Akhavan, N. (2015). Coaching side by side: One-on-one collaboration creates caring, connected teachers. *Journal of Staff Development*, 36(3), 34–37.
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/1692720265?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true>
- Amundsen, C., Abrami, P., McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Krbavac, M., Mundy, A., & Wilson, M. (2005). *The what and why of faculty development in higher education: An in-depth review of the literature* [Conference presentation]. AERA, Montreal, CA.
<http://www.sfu.ca/rethinkingteaching/publications/CAmundsen.etal.pdf>
- Bedford, L., McDowell, M., & Downs, L. D. (2014). Enhancing faculty performance through coaching: Targeted, individualized support. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 4(4), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v4i4.221>
- Blazar, D., & Kraft, M. A. (2015). Exploring mechanisms of effective teacher coaching: A tale of two cohorts from a randomized experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(4), 543–566. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373715579487>
- Buysse, V., Castro, D. C., & Peisner-Feinberg, E. (2010). Effects of a professional development program on classroom practices and outcomes for Latino dual language learners. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 25(2), 194–206.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2009.10.001>
- Centra, J. A. (1989). Faculty evaluation and faculty development in higher education. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, (pp. 155–179). Agathon Press.
- Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education. (2005). *Mentoring and coaching CPD capacity building project (2004–2005): National framework for mentoring and coaching*. CUREE.
- Connor, C. M. (2017). Commentary on the special issue on instructional coaching models: Common elements of effective coaching models. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(1), 78–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1274575>
- Crawford, A., Zucker, T., Van Horne, B., & Landry, S. (2017). Integrating professional development content and formative assessment with the coaching process: The Texas school ready model. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(1), 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1241945>
- Creasy, J., & Paterson, F. (2005). *Leading coaching in schools*. National College for School Leadership.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181-199.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140>

- Desimone, L. M., & Pak, K. (2017). Instructional coaching as high-quality professional development. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(1), 3–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1241947>
- Glover, T. A. (2017). A data-driven coaching model used to promote students' response to early reading intervention. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(1), 13–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1260401>
- Goldvarg, D., & Perel de Goldvarg, N. (2012). *Applied coaching competencies with international standards*. Granica Editions.
- Gómez Palacio, C., Gómez Vargas, D. E., & Pulgarín Taborda, H. (2019). Coaching as a professional development strategy for adjunct instructors in a Columbian university. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 21(1), 121–135.
<https://doi.org/0.15446/profile.v21n1.71362>
- Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. (2018). *Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all*. Corwin Press.
- Hasbrouck, J. (2017). Student-focused coaching. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(1), 21–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1252219>
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 40(1), 4–8.
https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198210_joyce.pdf
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction*. Corwin.
- Knight, J., & van Nieuwerburgh, C. (2012). Instructional coaching: A focus on practice. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice* 5(2), 100–112.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2012.707668>
- Lofthouse, R. (2019). Coaching in education: A professional development process in formation. *Professional Development in Education*, 45(1), 33–35.
<https://doi.org/0.1080/19415257.2018.1529611>
- Ma, N., Xin, S., & Du, J. Y. (2018). A peer coaching-based professional development approach to improving the learning participation and learning design skills of in-service teachers. *Educational Technology & Society*, 21(2), 291–394.
<https://mllab.bnu.edu.cn/docs/20190830132126993148.pdf>
- Medrich, E., & Charner, I. (2017, March). *Educator-centered instructional coaching practices that work: Lessons from PIIC research*. The Science of Improving Lives.
<https://instituteforinstructionalcoaching.org/attachments/article/301/LegacyReport.pdf>
- O'Connor, J., & Lages, A. (2005). *Coaching with NLP: A practical guide to get the best of yourself and others*. Urano Editions.

- Pierce, J. D., & Buysee, V. (2014). Effective coaching: Improving teacher practice and outcomes for all learners. *Transforming State Systems to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities*. National Center for Systemic Improvement.
https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/NCSI_Effective-Coaching-Brief-508.pdf
- Poglinco, S. M., Bach, A. J., Hovde, K., Rosenblum, S., Saunders, M., & Supovitz, J. A. (2003). *The heart of the matter: The coaching model in America's choice schools*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Powell, D. R., & Diamond, K. E. (2013). Studying the implementation of coaching-based professional development. In T. Halle, A. Metz, & I. Martinez-Beck (Eds.), *Applying implementation science in early childhood programs and systems*, (pp 97–117). Brookes.
- Reddy, L. A., Dudek, C. M., & Lekwa, A. (2017). Classroom strategies coaching model: Integration of formative assessment and instructional coaching. *Theory Into Practice*, 56(1), 46–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1241944>
- Schein, E. H. (2009). *Helping: How to offer, give, and receive help*. Berrett-Koehler.
- Snyder, P. A., Hemmeter, M. L., & Fox, L. (2015). Supporting implementation of evidence-based practices through practice-based coaching. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 35(3), 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121415594925>
- Study.com. (2016, September 29). *What is professional development?*
<https://study.com/academy/popular/what-is-professional-development.html>
- Van Nieuwerburgh, C. (2012). *Coaching in education: Getting better results for students, educators, and parents*. Karnac.
- Whitmore, J. (2002). *Coaching for performance: Growing people, performance and purpose*. Nicholas Brealey.
- Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W. Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/rel_2007033.pdf

APPENDIX

Table 1.

Summary of Research Studies, Findings, and Themes Extracted from a Synthesis Analysis of Factors that Contribute to Successful Personalized Coaching Models in Education.

Author and year	Setting	Study design	Findings	Theme
Akhavan (2015)	High School	Survey research and analysis of student achievement data to determine positive factors of coaching affecting student learning.	Coach characteristics need to include good interpersonal skills, focus on individual needs of the faculty member for development, help faculty understand data for instruction. Coaching works best in a side-by-side setting.	Collaborative partnership between faculty and coach.
Bedford, McDowell, and Downs (2014)	Private university	Coaching program implementation and evaluation.	Successful coaching programs include internal faculty coaches and lateral colleagues from within the academic institution that possess a proven track record of reliable teaching performance.	Internal vs. external coach.
Blazar and Kraft (2015)	Charter schools	Block randomized experiment of two cohorts exposed to MATCH Teacher Coaching.	Faculty exposed to shorter summer institutes (3-weeks) required more subsequent follow up.	Frequency of coaching sessions.
Buyse, Castro and Peisner-Feinberg (2010)	Pre-Kindergarten	Randomized controlled experimental study of a personalized professional development program on student outcomes.	Intense personalized coaching sessions of faculty with periodic follow ups throughout the semester were significant in increasing student outcomes.	Frequency of coaching sessions.
Connor (2017)	K-12 institutions	Synthesis analysis of instructional coaching articles.	Coaching models are successful when coaches were partners, faculty opinions were respected, and the process are collaborative.	Collaborative partnership between faculty and coach.

Author and year	Setting	Study design	Findings	Theme
Crawford et al. (2017)	Pre-Kindergarten	Program implementation and evaluation.	Ongoing training and supervision of coaches to support student success and continuous improvement is one of the core elements to ensuring a successful coaching program.	Collaborative partnership between faculty and coach.
Desimone and Pak (2017)	Colleges, Universities, and K-12 institutions	Synthesis analysis.	Successful coaching models include a substantial amount of contact hours between coach and faculty (bi-weekly coaching sessions lasting no less than one hour).	Frequency of coaching sessions.
Goldvarg and Perel de Goldvarg (2012)	Public University	Case study.	Faculty trust in a coach and genuine interest were expressed at academic institutions that required a coaching model as part of faculty professional development.	Trust in a coach.
Gómez Palacio et al. (2019)	Public University	Qualitative analysis of questionnaires, coaching sessions, and evaluative reports.	Genuine interest and trust in a coach was an integral component of successful coaching sessions.	Trust in a coach.
Hasbrouck (2017)	Colleges, Universities, and K-12 institutions	Program implementation and evaluation of student-focused coaching model.	A successful peer-coaching model requires that coaches need to have some level of successful teaching experiencing (a minimum of 3-5 years), a deep knowledge of the content area for their coaching work, and a general interest in working collaboratively with colleagues.	Coach characteristics.
Knight and Nieuwerburgh (2012)	Primary schools, secondary schools, universities	Synthesis analysis and evaluation of coaching.	Coaches should respect and honor the expertise of faculty. Decision-making should be collaborative between coach and faculty mentee.	Collaborative partnership between faculty and coach.

Author and year	Setting	Study design	Findings	Theme
Lofthouse (2019)	Primary and secondary schools	Qualitative case study analysis.	Successful coaching environment is a space where coaches listen and are attentive to faculty allowing them to be vulnerable.	Coaching environment. Collaborative partnership between faculty and coach.
Medrich and Charner (2017)	Colleges, Universities, and K-12 institutions	Mixed-methods analysis across longitudinal survey data, case studies, secondary data analyses, interviews, and focus groups.	Faculty reported one-on-one instructional coaching as a valuable process to their professional learning and assisted with improving their pedagogy to directly impact student engagement and learning.	One-one-one coaching model.
Powell and Diamond (2013)	K-12 institutions	Coaching program implementation and evaluation.	Key dimensions across coaching models of professional development include frequency, length of time, and periodicity of the coaching sessions, behavior of coaches, and identified focus of the intervention implemented.	Frequency of coaching sessions.
Reddy, Dudek, and Lekwa (2017)	Elementary schools	Coaching program implementation and evaluation.	Faculty should be viewed as active collaborators in the coach-faculty relationship and contributors to the decision-making process.	Collaborative partnership between faculty and coach.
Yoon et al. (2007)	Elementary schools	Post-hoc analysis of studies examining the effect of professional development on student achievement.	Summer institutes with subsequent follow up sessions were an essential element of the structure of successful professional development models.	Frequency of coaching sessions.

This page intentionally left blank.