

Coaching for Coherence: How Instructional Coaches Lead Change in the Evaluation Era

Sarah L. Woulfin¹ and Jessica G. Rigby²

Instructional coaching has emerged as a prevalent and much-lauded instrument for capacity building. This essay argues that coaching can be aligned with teacher evaluation systems to work toward the effective implementation of instructional reforms, including Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards. Within the current policy context, coaching can support reform by (a) developing shared understandings, (b) modeling practices, and (c) brokering ideas. We discuss examples of coaches' leadership actions related to the evaluation process, thus illustrating the potential for coaching to promote coherence in instructional improvement. We conclude by discussing barriers to the enactment of reform-aligned coaching as well as implications for leaders positioned at multiple levels of the education system.

Keywords: coaching; educational policy; evaluation; instructional reform; leadership; teacher education and development; qualitative research

From the standards movement of the 1990s to Race to the Top and Common Core reforms, education policies have placed instructional improvement squarely at the center of reform efforts. Over this time period, policymakers and reformers have retooled teacher evaluation to address persistent issues of teacher quality (Steinberg & Donaldson, 2015). In response to these forces, many states and districts turned to instructional coaching (Neufeld & Roper, 2003). For example, in the early 2000s as part of Reading First, a branch of No Child Left Behind, many states instituted systems to hire and develop reading coaches. More recently, millions of dollars in federal funding, including Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and turnaround School Improvement Grants, have been allocated toward coaching (Kutash, Nico, Gorin, Rahmatullah, & Tallant 2010). Most districts now utilize coaching as a capacity-building instrument for promoting individual and system-level instructional change. Yet, oftentimes, coaching is only loosely tied to existing structures of districts and schools and, as a result, may not be fully leveraged in service of instructional improvement (Mangin & Dunsmore, 2015).

The recent adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) has brought matters of teacher learning to the fore. Not only do teachers need to learn new content to respond substantively to

these reforms, they need to learn new ways of teaching, often far from their training and current practice (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Gamoran et al., 2003; Kazemi, Franke, & Lampert, 2009). To enable learning aligned with these reforms, teachers benefit from ongoing and embedded professional learning opportunities (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995) that incorporate instructional and content expertise (Hochberg & Desimone, 2010; Stein & Nelson, 2003). Armed with specific instructional and content expertise, coaches have the potential to conduct this heavy educative lifting to bring about instructional change. However, as currently enacted, coaches are not systemically positioned to take on this work. The coach's role is not yet institutionalized; it varies across states, districts, and even within schools (Deussen, Coskie, Robinson, & Autio, 2007; Mangin & Dunsmore, 2015). Additionally, the systems supporting coaches and the integration of their work with other initiatives remain weak.

Responding to these tensions in reform, we address the following question: How can coaches serve as part of a coherent system that links evaluation policy with instructional improvement aligned to ambitious standards? This conceptual

¹University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT

²University of Washington, Seattle, WA

paper begins with a brief review of the nature of evaluation policies and the functions of coaches. We then argue that coaches enact three key leadership actions that meld new-generation evaluation policy and content-specific instructional reform: developing shared understandings, modeling practices, and brokering ideas. We conclude with suggestions for enacting coaching in this policy era, including how administrators might structure coaching to ensure that evaluation systems support the developmental needs of teachers and bolster instructional improvement efforts.

The Changing Field of Teacher Evaluation

Recent federal policies like Race to the Top played a role in accelerating the articulation of new, tightened evaluation systems (Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012; Hallgren, James-Burdumy, & Perez-Johnson, 2014). Most new-generation evaluation systems utilize the following multi-stage process spanning the school year: (a) goal setting, (b) observations collecting evidence on highly specified frameworks and feedback that shares evidence of strengths and areas of opportunity, and (c) aligned professional development (Steinberg & Donaldson, 2015). It is important to note that for the sake of consistency, these evaluation systems are not discipline-specific and thus lack specificity and alignment to new content standards. However, depending upon its implementation, evaluation has the potential to leverage instructional improvement. On the one hand, it can be used in a technical way, with infrequent observations with little or no feedback, a checklist of observed pedagogical practices put in the teacher's box and an assigned end-of year summative rating. This mode of implementation produces a one-size-fits-all summative assessment of educator quality.

On the other hand, evaluation can be used adaptively to support an educator's development of specific, complex teaching moves. With the goal of improvement, adaptive implementation is highly contextualized, accounts for the complex environment, and engages diverse actors across evaluation's stages (Berman, 1978). Rather than a technical implementation that is focused on compliance and checking boxes, adaptive implementation connects evaluation routines to teachers' content and grade-level-specific daily work, with collaborative goal setting tied to standards and students; discussion of strengths and limitations in the content and pedagogy of instruction; and tailored professional development providing content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987). Furthermore, it responds to teachers' growth needs in direct relation to ambitious student learning standards in particular content areas.

Current systems place the onus on principals and other administrators to engage in the dual foci of evaluation: accountability and development. Administrators must observe and rate teachers using a standardized rubric in a systematic manner (Hallgren, et al., 2014). They must also identify and design professional learning opportunities for teachers (Rigby, 2015). However, it is untenable for principals to completely enact the accountability and development foci on their own, because, in general, they lack the specialized content knowledge and resources, including the time, for contextualized, ongoing learning opportunities (Gabriel

& Woulfin, 2017; Rigby, et al., 2017). This is particularly true if evaluation systems are to be used to support teachers' content-specific improvement. Therefore, it is necessary to consider how district and school-based instructional leaders, including coaches, can work collectively on instructional improvement efforts. In particular, leveraging coaches' disciplinary knowledge could assist with adaptive implementation of evaluation to advance individual and system-level improvement.

Instructional Coaching

Bearing responsibility for building teacher capacity and catalyzing reform, coaches engage in instructional leadership tasks with individuals and with groups of educators (Author; Bean, 2004). Oftentimes, this involves developing teachers' understanding of new or different approaches to curriculum and instruction (Matsumura, Garnier, & Spybrook, 2013). Furthermore, by providing teachers with content-specific instructional expertise, coaches expand teachers' understanding of standards and curricula to foster reform (Campbell & Malkus, 2013; Coburn & Woulfin, 2012; Lockwood, McCombs, & Marsh, 2010; Matsumura, et al., 2013). Coaches draw on their learning community knowledge or the ability to facilitate collective learning while working with teams of teachers; this includes identifying goals for teacher learning; intentionally sequencing experiences; and fostering a positive, productive culture amongst teachers (Borko, Koellner, & Jacobs, 2014).

Researchers have also pointed out that coaches can take on a political role (Kersten & Pardo, 2007; Woulfin, 2015). In particular, coaches funnel messages from the district and school levels and frame instructional policy with teachers and leaders. For example, in grade-level team meetings they may discuss specific elements of a new curriculum or devote greater attention to aspects of an initiative that will be monitored by administrators. These activities can influence teachers' enactment of a reform (Coburn, 2006).

Although coaches' educative and political activities have the potential to contribute to instructional improvement, they are not always leveraged towards reform. Policymakers and administrators frame coaches' work in myriad ways, including as curriculum specialists, data analysts, and mentors (Mangin & Dunsmore, 2015). There are substantial differences in the structures and practices of coaching across contexts. For example, depending on the system context, it may be seen as more or less legitimate for coaches to lead a group of teachers in the learning experience of classroom walkthroughs. Finally, weak links exist among coaching, evaluation systems, and instructional reforms, with questions remaining about the compatibility of the norms of coaching and evaluation (Goldstein, 2006; Showers, 1985).

Coaches' Leadership Actions Supporting Improvement

Coaches carry out numerous responsibilities, and their content knowledge and learning community knowledge can support individual and system-level improvement aligned with the goals of both evaluation and ambitious instructional reform. However, questions remain about their role in the adaptive implementation

of evaluation to support teacher growth toward ambitious instructional reforms. This paper advances the argument that coaches facilitate coherence between evaluation and instructional reform by enacting three key leadership actions: (a) developing shared understandings, (b) modeling practices, and (c) brokering ideas.

First, coaches develop teachers' and leaders' shared understandings of evaluation and instructional reforms. Coaches' engagement with individuals or groups of teachers and principals helps form common conceptualizations of the evaluation process and of elements of new standards and instructional methods that, in turn, construct coherence for learning and improvement (Spillane, Reiser, & Reimer, 2002). Second, coaches model evaluation activities and instructional practices in a low-stakes manner during their work with teachers (Bean, 2004). By conducting content-specific classroom observations, providing feedback to teachers, and teaching demonstration lessons all aligned to a teacher's specific evaluation goals and instructional frameworks, coaches can foster situated, discipline-specific learning aligned with evaluation. Third, coaches broker ideas about evaluation and instructional reforms with teachers and leaders. That is, coaches can share evidence on teachers' beliefs, skills, and practices associated with reforms with principals, while also bringing the principal's ideas and priorities to teachers (Hall & Simeral, 2008). This brokering of ideas on evaluation and instructional reform, or bidirectional communication amongst differentially positioned educators, moves ideas about these improvement efforts across boundaries to enable change. In the following section, we provide examples of these leadership activities unfolding across various stages of evaluation.

Developing Shared Understandings of Reform

In the goal-setting and professional development (PD) stages, coaches can develop shared understandings of evaluation and instructional reform between teachers and principals. These efforts to foster collective sensemaking of reforms matter because, if educators identify and learn about instructional issues collaboratively, it enables coherent change to occur in schools as organizations (Coburn, 2001; Honig & Hatch, 2004).

Coaches can provide content-specific expertise to teachers as they select and write their goals to ensure a match between principles of ambitious instructional reforms and the evaluation process. For example, in accordance with the Standards for Mathematical Practice, an element of Common Core, coaches can lead teacher teams to set and understand goals related to instructional moves that foster students' ability to "construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others" (<http://www.corestandards.org/Math/Practice/>). In this manner, coaches support teachers' formation of common understandings of appropriate instructional goals in mathematics.

In the PD stage, coaches can enable teachers to form clear, shared understandings of complex reforms. Coaches can plan and facilitate detailed, content-specific PD for teams of teachers that hone in on facets of new instructional frameworks and evaluation systems. Furthermore, they can ensure that this PD matches specific gaps in teachers' skills as identified by the evaluation rubric. These content-specific learning opportunities

would be infused with the principles and practices of specific reforms. For example, if preliminary results from evaluations signal that a grade level is struggling with integrating purposeful discourse in English language arts instruction, a coach can lead an activity during a team meeting focused on strategies to plan and facilitate this pedagogical approach. To increase the likelihood that this type of PD fosters coherence, it is essential that coaches hold content-expertise, deeply understand teachers' learning needs, and are adept at facilitating adults' learning.

Modeling Reform-Oriented Practices

In addition to developing shared understandings of evaluation and instructional reforms, coaches can model practices aligned to these reforms. Coaches' modeling of the observation–feedback stage and of new instructional approaches is a potent strategy for teacher and administrator professional learning because it demonstrates the nuts-and-bolts of reforms in a contextualized manner.

Coaches' nonevaluative observations inside classrooms, paired with content-specific, constructive feedback to teachers, model the observation process as an improvement strategy (Bean, 2004; Teemant, 2014). These observations can concentrate on new approaches to instruction and offer content-specific feedback with the potential to catalyze changes in practice matching current instructional reforms. Consequently, coaches' feedback could function as a model for principals of content-specific feedback that is useful for teacher growth. It is critical to emphasize that these observations are distinct from administrators' formal observations, which typically employ a rubric with low content specificity for consistency across classrooms and schools, and observations rely upon a trusting coach–teacher relationship (Aguilar, 2013; Goldstein, 2006).

Additionally, in response to a teacher's specific growth areas and goals, coaches can teach demonstration lessons reflecting new standards and approaches, thereby providing tailored, content-specific PD to teachers. We propose that coaches' modeling of the observation–feedback routine infused with targeted, supportive feedback and developmental opportunities, including demonstration lessons, has the potential to cultivate adaptive implementation of evaluation.

Brokering Ideas on Reform

Finally, coaches can broker ideas on goal setting, observation–feedback, and professional development. Coaches' brokering involves bidirectional communication with teachers and principals so they can share evidence on instructional strengths and weaknesses and determine foci and strategies for improvement. As discussed by sociologists, brokering provides access to a wider range of ideas and permits leaders to tailor solutions to particular needs (Burt, 2005; Stovel & Shaw, 2012). Therefore, coaches' brokering has the potential to close information gaps among teachers, coaches, and administrators (Burt, 2005). Consequently, a school's "entire network will benefit from the diffusion of innovation" (Adler & Kwon, 2002, p. 29).

During goal setting, coaches can transmit ideas between administrators and teachers to foster coherence for high-quality

instruction. For instance, coaches can facilitate discussions with teachers and administrators regarding appropriate assessments in specific content areas that teachers should administer to monitor students' progress toward new standards.

With regard to PD, coaches can engage in communication that raises coherence amongst school goals, teachers' needs, and PD offerings. In particular, coaches, as uniquely positioned intermediaries, can strategically share ideas regarding teachers' learning needs with district and school administrators. This communication enables the design of high-quality, tailored professional learning opportunities that meets the needs of individuals and teams of teachers. That is, coaches and administrators could codesign and facilitate a range of professional learning opportunities that tie the content of instructional frameworks with the pedagogical expectations of the evaluation rubric to foster coherence across reforms.

Challenges to Transforming Coaching

We acknowledge that obstacles exist at the school and district levels to harness the knowledge, skills, and positioning of coaches to create coherence between evaluation systems and ambitious instructional reforms. First, the friction between teachers and administrators could hinder coaches' efforts to serve as catalysts of instructional improvement. Currently, there is a sharp line of demarcation between coaching and evaluation, with coaches typically positioned as intermediaries who support teachers in a nonevaluative manner, as opposed to administrators with the authority to formally supervise teachers (Goldstein, 2006). If coaches become associated with evaluation, teachers may resist engaging in coaching and may be less likely to seek out support from coaches on instructional matters.

Until district and school leaders wield evaluation as an instrument for development as well as assessment, it is likely that there will be continued resistance to the evaluation system and its supports, including coaching. This requires a deep cultural shift on behalf of school systems, educators, and teachers' unions. A positive culture for instructional improvement can lead to learning because it enables experimentation and change (Fullan, 1998; Little, 1982). We underscore that cultural change in this direction is recursive and most likely to occur through the joint work (Wenger, 1998) of coaches collaborating with principals and teachers around instructional improvement. Thus, we need not wait until we have ideal conditions in which coaches can thrive; it is through the work itself that these conditions can be built.

Second, there are weaknesses in district infrastructure for the selection and development of coaches. District leaders' identification and support of coaches is crucial so they have the capacity to work toward coherence in concert with administrators and teams of teachers. To this end, leaders should consider aspiring coaches' knowledge, skills, and dispositions with regard to instruction, policy, and adult learning (Hopkins, Ozimek, & Sweet, 2016). Coaches, like all other adults, benefit from professional development to improve their practice (Gallucci, Van Lare, Yoon, & Boatright, 2010). Similar to extant research on supports for principals as instructional leaders (Boston, Henrick, Gibbons, Berebitsky, & Colby, 2016), coaches would benefit from formal and informal supervision and professional learning

so they can carry out leadership actions in a manner that advances district and school goals.

Finally, coaches work in schools, complex organizations that require extensive organization, alignment, and management. Principals will need to create school-based systems to organize and support coaches' work to ensure alignment with the school's goals and conditions. These systems need to attend to structural entailments of instruction, such as goals for students' learning, instructional materials, assessments, teacher professional learning, and instructional oversight, as well as to the ways in which they are implemented and integrated with one another (Cobb & Jackson, 2011; Hopkins & Spillane, 2015). In addition, research indicates that principals must take other leadership actions to ensure coaches' success, including motivating teachers to implement the strategies they work on with their coaches (Matsumura, Sartoris, Bickel, & Garnier, 2009; Matsumura & Wang, 2014) and attending to school power dynamics when structuring coaches' work (Huguet, Marsh, & Farrell, 2014). Although these challenges are not trivial, they are neither insurmountable nor distinct from other challenges that districts and schools face relating to systems building toward instructional improvement.

Conclusions and Implications

This paper illuminates coaches' potential role to serve as part of a coherent system of supports that weaves together evaluation policy with instructional improvement aligned to ambitious standards. We expose the affordances of utilizing coaches' content knowledge and expertise and their ties to administrators and teachers to promote complex instructional reform. We also delineate coaches' activities to promote teachers' and leaders' individual and collective learning regarding elements of the evaluation system and new instructional frameworks.

As states and districts march toward new goals for educator quality under the Every Student Succeeds Act, it is crucial to consider how the collective practices of instructional leaders, including coaches and principals, build teacher capacity and catalyze improvement. In this policy era, teachers and principals all benefit from ongoing development. We emphasize that coaches can develop shared understandings, model practices, and broker ideas to facilitate the aligned enactment of evaluation and instructional reform.

To advance the field's understanding of coaching, qualitative research is needed on when and under what conditions coaches are able to develop shared understandings, model practices, and broker ideas about major reforms. This research could also ascertain the ways in which state policy, district conditions, and school leadership enable coaches to function as part of the infrastructure for instructional improvement. Additionally, quantitative scholarship is needed on the impact of coaching on administrators' technical versus adaptive evaluation-related activities. Reformers could apply findings from this scholarship to design coaching systems promoting instructional improvement.

This piece has several implications for leaders at multiple levels of the education system to fully realize the role of coaches. First, to reduce ambiguities, district administrators must clearly and persuasively frame coaching as a tool for instructional

improvement (Coburn, 2006; Woulfin, Donaldson, & Gonzales, 2016). District leaders should delineate the roles and responsibilities of coaches for school leaders, teachers, and coaches themselves. While emphasizing that coaching supports professional learning in various subject areas, district leaders should clarify the boundaries between coaching and evaluation. In particular, they need to emphasize that coaches do *not* evaluate, but they *do* assist teachers with multiple aspects of the evaluation process (Aguilar, 2013). Furthermore, district leaders should frame the ways in which coaching enables teacher growth as measured by formal evaluation activities. This would enable educators to hold common understandings of the integration of coaching with systemic improvement efforts.

Second, school administrators should create conditions for coaches to engage in purposeful, strategic work aligned with various facets of evaluation and instructional reform. It follows that principals should arrange systems with time and space for coaches to collaborate with teachers and administrators, model practices, and broker ideas for coherent, contextualized professional learning. Enabling coaches to engage in content-specific activities aligned to both new standards and evaluation goals can play a pivotal role in leading teachers and schools toward adopting ambitious instruction.

NOTE

We would like to acknowledge the feedback and guidance of the University of Washington College of Education Junior Faculty Writing Group, Rachael Gabriel, and Cynthia Coburn.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1), 17–40.
- Aguilar, E. (2013). *The art of coaching: Effective strategies for school transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In G. Sykes & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3–32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bean, R. M. (2004). *The Reading Specialist*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Berman, P. (1978). *Designing implementation to match policy situation: A contingency analysis of programmed and adaptive implementation*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Borko, H., Koellner, K., & Jacobs, J. (2014). Examining novice teachers' facilitation of mathematics professional development. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 33, 149–167.
- Boston, M. D., Henrick, E. C., Gibbons, L. K., Berebitsky, D., & Colby, G. T. (2016). Investigating how to support principals as instructional leaders in mathematics. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1942775116640254
- Burt, R. S. (2005). *Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, P., & Malkus, N. (2013). Elementary mathematics specialists influencing student achievement. *Teaching Children Mathematics*, 20(3), 198–205.
- Cobb, P., & Jackson, K. (2011). Towards an empirically grounded theory of action for improving the quality of mathematics teaching at scale. *Mathematics Teacher Education and Development*, 13(1), 6–33.
- Coburn, C. E. (2001). Collective sensemaking about reading: How teachers mediate reading policy in their professional communities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 145–170.
- Coburn, C. E. (2006). Framing the problem of reading instruction: Using frame analysis to uncover the microprocesses of policy implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 343–379.
- Coburn, C. E., & Woulfin, S. L. (2012). Revisiting loose coupling theory: Classroom implementation in an era of prescriptive policy making. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 5–30.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E., & Rothstein, J. (2012). Evaluating teacher evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(6), 8–15.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 597–604.
- Deussen, T., Coskie, T., Robinson, L., & Autio, E. (2007). *“Coach” can mean many things: Five categories of literacy coaches in reading first* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 005). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Fullan, M. (1998). Leadership for the 21st century: Breaking the bonds of dependency. *Educational Leadership*, 55(7), 6–10.
- Gabriel, R. G., & Woulfin, S. L. (2017). *Making teacher evaluation work: A guide for literacy teachers & leaders*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gallucci, C., Van Lare, M. D., Yoon, I., & Boatright, B. (2010). Instructional coaching: Building theory about the role and organizational support for professional learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47, 919–963.
- Gamoran, A., Anderson, C. W., Quiroz, P. A., Secada, W. G., Williams, T., & Ashmann, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Transforming teaching in math and science: How schools and districts can support change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Goldstein, J. (2006). Debunking the fear of peer review: Combining supervision and evaluation and living to tell about it. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 18(4), 235–252.
- Hall, P. A., & Simeral, A. (2008). *Building teachers' capacity for success*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hallgren, K., James-Burdumy, S., & Perez-Johnson, I. (2014). *State requirements for teacher evaluation policies promoted by Race to the Top*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education and Evaluation. Retrieved March 10, 2016, from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20144016/pdf/20144016.pdf>
- Hochberg, E. D., & Desimone, L. (2010). Professional development in the accountability context: Building capacity to achieve standards. *Educational Psychologist*, 45, 89–106. doi:10.1080/00461521003703052
- Honig, M. I., & Hatch, T. C. (2004). Crafting coherence: How schools strategically manage multiple, external demands. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 16–30. doi:10.3102/0013189X033008016
- Hopkins, M., Ozimek, D., & Sweet, T. M. (2016). Mathematics coaching and instructional reform: Individual and collective change. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 46, 215–230.
- Hopkins, M., & Spillane, J. P. (2015). Conceptualizing relations between instructional guidance infrastructure (IGI) and teachers' beliefs about mathematics instruction: Regulatory, normative, and

- cultural-cognitive considerations. *Journal of Educational Change*, 16(4), 421–450.
- Huguet, A., Marsh, J. A., & Farrell, C. C. (2014). Building teachers' data-use capacity: Insights from strong and developing coaches. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(52). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n52.2014>
- Kazemi, E., Franke, M., & Lampert, M. (2009, July). *Developing pedagogies in teacher education to support novice teachers' ability to enact ambitious instruction*. Paper presented at the 32nd Annual Conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Kersten, J., & Pardo, L. (2007). Finessing and hybridizing: Innovative literacy practices in reading first classrooms. *Reading Teacher*, 61(2), 146–154.
- Kutash, J., Nico, E., Gorin, E., Rahmatullah, S., & Tallant, K. (2010). *The school turnaround field guide*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/district-policy-and-practice/Pages/The-School-Turnaround-Field-Guide.aspx>
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(3), 325–340.
- Lockwood, J. R., McCombs, J. S., & Marsh, J. (2010). Linking reading coaches and student achievement: Evidence from Florida middle schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 32(3), 372–388. doi:10.3102/0162373710373388
- Mangin, M. M., & Dunsmore, K. (2015). How the framing of instructional coaching as a lever for systemic or individual reform influences the enactment of coaching. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(2), 179–213.
- Matsumura, L. C., Garnier, H. E., & Spybrook, J. (2013). Literacy coaching to improve student reading achievement: A multi-level mediation model. *Learning and Instruction*, 25, 35–48.
- Matsumura, L. C., Sartoris, M., Bickel, D. D., & Garnier, H. E. (2009). Leadership for literacy coaching: The principal's role in launching a new coaching program. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45, 655–693.
- Matsumura, L. C., & Wang, E. (2014). Principals' sensemaking of coaching for ambitious reading instruction in a high-stakes accountability environment. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(51). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n51.2014>
- Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity: Promises and practicalities*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute Program on Education and the Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Retrieved from <http://www.annenberginstitute.org/sites/default/files/product/268/files/Coaching.pdf>
- Rigby, J. (2015). Principals' sensemaking and enactment of teacher evaluation. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(3), 374–392.
- Rigby, J. G., Larbi-Cherif, A., Rosenquist, B. A., Sharpe, C. J., Cobb, P., & Smith, T. (2017). Administrator observation and feedback: Does it lead toward improvement in inquiry-oriented math instruction? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 53(3), 475–516. doi:10.1177/0013161X16687006
- Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 42(7), 43–48.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 387–431.
- Stein, M. K., & Nelson, B. S. (2003). Leadership content knowledge. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 423–448.
- Steinberg, M., & Donaldson, M. (2015). The new educational accountability: Understanding the landscape of teacher evaluation in the post-NCLB era. *Education Finance and Policy*, 11, 340–359.
- Stovel, K., & Shaw, L. (2012). Brokerage. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38, 139–158.
- Teemant, A. (2014). A mixed-methods investigation of instructional coaching for teachers of diverse learners. *Urban Education*, 49(5), 574–604. doi:10.1177/0042085913481362
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woulfin, S. L. (2015). Catalysts of change: An examination of coaches' leadership practices in framing a reading reform. *Journal of School Leadership*, 25(3), 526–557.
- Woulfin, S. L., Donaldson, M., & Gonzales, R. (2016). District leaders' framing of educator evaluation policy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(1), 110–143.

AUTHORS

SARAH L. Woulfin is an assistant professor at the University of Connecticut, 249 Glenbrook Rd., Unit 3093, Gentry Building, Storrs, CT 06269-3064; sarah.woulfin@uconn.edu. She uses organizational theory to investigate the relationship between education policy and practice, focusing on how infrastructure and leadership affect instructional reform.

JESSICA G. Rigby is an assistant professor in the College of Education at the University of Washington, Seattle, M207 Miller, Seattle, WA 98195; jrigby@uw.edu. Her research uses lenses from organizational sociology to understand the role of school and district leaders in the implementation of policy, classroom instruction, and improving teacher practice toward increasing equitable outcomes for historically marginalized communities.

Manuscript received June 14, 2016

Revisions received January 23, 2017 and May 3, 2017

Accepted May 9, 2017