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ABOUT YOUR CO-PRESENTERS

Michael Dolcemascolo, M.A. is an independent consultant who presents workshops on Cognitive Coaching\textsuperscript{SM}, Adaptive Schools, learning styles, presentation skills and many other topics to urban, suburban, and rural schools.

Michael delightfully spends much of his energy mentoring coaches who wish to become agency trainers for their systems and also regularly facilitates groups who are planning, reflecting, problem-resolving, and engaging in change.

Michael holds a Bachelor of Arts Degrees in philosophy and English from Montclair State University, an M.A. in cultural symbol systems from Syracuse University's Department of Religion, and a C.A.S. in educational administration from the State University of New York.

Jane Ellison, Ed.D. is an independent consultant who provides consultation to school districts and other organizations in the areas of Cognitive Coaching\textsuperscript{SM}, Adaptive Schools, change and transition, learning-focused leadership, quality professional development, and facilitation. She is the co-author with Carolee Hayes of 

\textit{Cognitive Coaching: Weaving Threads of Learning and Change into the Culture of an Organization} and \textit{Effective School Leadership: Developing Principals with Cognitive Coaching}.

Jane was the Director of Elementary Education for Douglas County School District Re.1 from 1988-1998. In that position, Jane was responsible for the development of elementary standards and curriculum, the monitoring of instruction, and the supervision and evaluation of principals. Jane was a principal for 15 years -- 4 in Douglas County, Colorado and 11 in Tinley Park, Illinois. Her teaching experience is in the primary grades and at the graduate college level. She holds a B.A. in Elementary Education and Social Sciences from SMU, an M.Ed. in Elementary Supervision from the University of North Texas, and an Ed.D. in Administration from VPI&SU, Blacksburg, Virginia. She is a certified Teacher and Principal Perceiver Specialist.
OUTCOMES

Participants will have:

• understanding of how maps and tools of CC apply to the evaluation process
• understanding of how evaluation can support self-directedness
• increased confidence in using evaluation as an opportunity to support growth

RESOURCES


FOUR SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

Coaching
Cognitive Coaching℠ is a process developed by Art Costa and Bob Garmston with the intention of developing self-directedness in individuals. The coach operates from a belief that people are intrinsically motivated to learn and grow, striving to be their best. Cognitive Coaching℠ builds capacity in a person’s efficacy, craftsmanship, consciousness, flexibility, and interdependence through non-directive conversations designed to mediate thinking and access resourcefulness. It assumes thinking precedes action and seeks to provide support for thoughtfulness. It is a constructivist process.

Collaborating
Collaborating is a process where two or more people work as equals toward a common goal. To co-labor requires sharing thinking, ideas, and resources in order to move toward the desired effect. Each person makes contributions to the best of his/her capacity.

Consulting
Consulting is the offering of expertise to another in order to assist the person in becoming more resourceful. Consultation can be in the form of ideas, advice, resources, or advocacy for an idea or position. The goal of consulting is always to help the person become more self-directed as a result of the new information or thinking.

Evaluating
Evaluating is using an agreed upon set of standards to make judgments about a person’s performance. The evaluator uses data collected over time to compare the performance of the person to the agreed upon standard. The purpose of evaluation is to promote growth towards becoming more self-assessing and self-directed.
As widespread reform in teacher evaluation sweeps across the United States, school districts are responding by developing new professional performance review protocols for use in the evaluation process. Experts agree (Danielson & Mc Geeal, 2000; Hammond 2013: Silverberg & Jungwirth, 2014) however, that it is not the evaluation instrument, but the evaluation process, particularly the communication between the evaluator and the teacher, that will determine whether or not evaluation supports growth and learning. As stated by Danielson and McGreal (2000):

In general, activities that engage teachers in self-assessment and reflection on practice and activities that involve collaboration, will contribute to professional learning. This suggests that, to the extent possible, the teacher (rather than the administrator) should direct evaluation activities. Evaluation should provide maximum opportunities for self-directed inquiry. The teacher, in other words, should play as active a role as possible. (p. 61)

For a system to achieve this for individuals, Linda Darling-Hammond (2013) asserts that teacher evaluation needs to be part of a “teaching and learning process that supports continuous improvement” (p. 3). She believes such a system would not only benefit individual teachers but the profession as a whole, which in turn would ensure more effective support for student learning. A new system should also focus on collaborative, not competitive, processes. Arthur Costa (email communication, July 14, 2014) adds:

Another reason for promoting self-evaluation for teachers is that it models the same value that we hold for students. We spend far too much time and resources evaluating students and thus we rob them of the opportunities to evaluate themselves.

The maps and tools of Cognitive Coaching℠ offer the skill set needed for administrators and supervisors to conduct an evaluation process that supports professional development and promotes self-directedness in those they are evaluating. There is little research that indicates traditional evaluation supports growth; there is a substantial body of research indicating Cognitive Coaching℠ supports growth. Integrating Cognitive Coaching℠ into the evaluation process brings a growth-producing dimension often missing from traditional evaluation. We call this integrated approach self-directed evaluation.

Self-directed evaluation uses structures and skills to engage the thinking of the person being evaluated in conversations about his/her performance. In these conversations, the evaluator intentionally builds the capacity of the person being evaluated for self-managing, self-monitoring and self-modifying behaviors. According to Costa and Kallick (2004, pp. 51-52), self-directed people:
• clarify outcomes and gather relevant data;
• think flexibly;
• develop alternative strategies;
• draw on past knowledge;
• think about their thinking;
• persevere in generating alternative action plans;
• know how and where to turn when perplexed;
• reflect on experience and evaluate;
• analyze and construct meaning;
• are open to continuous learning;
• readily admit they have more to learn;
• can change self.

We see these behaviors as the outcomes of self-directed evaluation conversations. When teachers display these behaviors, we believe students achieve at higher levels.

Costa (email communication, July 14, 2014) further asserts:

The categories of excellence [used in a self-directed evaluation conversations] can be derived from many sources, Hattie, Danielson, Marzano, Silver and others. Any set of criteria may be used, based on research, values and staff agreements. Involving teachers in the development and application of these practices is another way to for them to assess their own performance. The purpose is for self-mastery. Teachers’ self-authoring of descriptions and indicators of what they will be doing and saying if they are using the practice effectively, promotes self-managing, self-monitoring, and self-evaluating. It also provides a mental rehearsal prior to performance. The intent is for teachers to describe the categories of behaviors, hold them in their head as they apply them, (self-monitoring) and then self-evaluate their performance and make plans for improvement. Each category should be sufficiently clear so that teachers can learn from the self and other-observed feedback about their behavior and to seek ways to improve.

Costa concludes, “School leaders should, instead of adopting someone else’s domains and standards, build common agreements among staff and give them time and practice as a group in translating them into observable behaviors.”

School districts’ professional performance review protocols offer the what of evaluation – the knowledge and skills on which performance is being evaluated; self-directed evaluation conversations offers the how – the knowledge and skills to engage in dialogue about growth.

Cognitive Coaching℠ is particularly appropriate for a growth-producing evaluation process for five reasons. Cognitive Coaching℠ is:
1) focused on the thinking that produces behavior;
2) procedural knowledge, in addition to declarative knowledge;
3) research-based and congruent with current neuroscience;
4) a growth mindset;
5) trust-based.

1) Cognitive Coaching℠ is focused on the thinking that produces behavior
An evaluator who supports a teacher’s thinking will have a greater impact on the
teacher’s performance because it is the teacher’s thinking that produces the
behaviors that are being evaluated. A teacher who has the opportunity to decide
what is good or poor, appropriate or inappropriate, effective or ineffective, is more
likely to transfer these decisions into practice. This powerful approach to
improving instructional practice focuses on the intellectual skills, perceptions, and
decisions that underlie effective teaching.
“The mission of Cognitive Coaching℠ is to produce self-directed persons with the
cognitive capacity for high performance both independently and as members of a
community” (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p.16). According to Ellison and Hayes
(2006), the phrase cognitive capacity differentiates Cognitive Coaching℠ from
other models of coaching or supervision. The unique goal of this work is to
develop an individual’s ability to engage in higher level thinking, such as
evaluating, analyzing, and inferring.
The focus on cognition aligns with the original intention of Morris Cogan (1973) in
creating the clinical supervision model. “Cogan envisioned the purpose of clinical
supervision as ‘the development of a professionally responsible teacher who is
analytical of his own performance, open to help from others, and self-directing’ ”
(Costa & Garmston, p. 8).

Costa (email communication, July 14, 2014) comments:
For insights to be useful, they need to be generated from
within, not given to individuals as conclusions. This is true
for several reasons. Teachers will experience the adrenaline-like
rush of insight only if they go through the process of making
connections themselves. Defining the practice as actions
creates a more vivid picture inside the mind of the teacher as
to what they will be doing, saying, or feeling if they are performing
the behavior. It is more likely that we can agree on actions than
on definitions, inviting teachers to envision what they would see
themselves doing or hear themselves saying if they are, for
example, using powerful questions.

In addition, this would be true for breaking an old habit as well. When
teachers envision what a behavior looks like and sounds like, it makes
possible the elimination of undesirable habits. Change requires observing
the pattern that we presently have and then making a conscious decision
to break that pattern. We can put our attention to what was missing. We
can begin to attend to changing our behaviors and seeing the benefit when we do so.

To that end, Cognitive Coaching℠ is about self-directed learning guided by skillful application of tools for planning, reflecting, problem-resolving, and calibrating.

Pink, (2009), maintains that external rewards or punishments (what he refers to as Motivation 2.0 or “the carrot and the stick”) do not work for complex, creative tasks like they did for what Pink calls “rule-based routine tasks” (p. 206). Instead, Pink says mastery, autonomy, and purpose are the most powerful motivators. He advocates abandoning the belief that if something is rewarded, the behavior increases, and that punishment can alter or extinguish unwanted behavior. Mastery is defined as our urge to get better at what we do; autonomy is the need to direct our own lives; and purpose is the need to do something that matters (Pink, 2009). Self-directed evaluation addresses the motivators of mastery (to continually improve), autonomy (self-directedness), and purpose (to serve a greater good).

This approach represents a major shift from top down models that seek to “install” behaviors in others. As one business manager who participated in Cognitive Coaching℠ training expressed it, “Tell them what and how they should go about it”, and that will more likely “create compliant resistance than the open embracing of change” (Dyer, p. 89). Rather than this directive coming from an expert/boss, Cognitive Coaching℠ offers the alternative of a constructivist approach, in which one’s own thinking and understanding informs one’s behavior. Renate and Jeffrey Caine (1997), who link discoveries in the neurosciences with educational practice, offer this reflection:

Perhaps the most significant thing we have confirmed for ourselves is that, although actions are important, the thinking that influences and shapes what we do is far more critical. Changing our thinking is the first thing we have to do both individually and collectively, because without that change we cannot possibly change what we really do on a day-to-day basis. Regardless of what new “method” or latest technique is attempted, the mind/brain will always choose to reduce such practices to fit entrenched assumptions and beliefs. To really restructure anything means to restructure our thinking and shift deep connections to our psyche. (p. vi)

The evaluator’s primary role, then, is to engage thinking that results in self-modification which will sustain longer lasting change. Far more important than simply telling people what to do, are developing rapport, trust, listening, and posing questions that support thinking. Cognitive Coaching℠, provides evaluators with the conversation structures and skills to engage teachers’ thinking so they can be self-managing, self-monitoring and self-modifying.
2) Cognitive Coaching℠ is procedural knowledge, in addition to declarative knowledge

An evaluator who knows all the components of the evaluation process (declarative knowledge) still needs the skills (procedural knowledge) to engage in growth-producing conversations. Cognitive Coaching℠ offers the maps and tools (procedural knowledge) to structure conversations around professional standards (declarative knowledge). Cauley (1986) wrote that procedural knowledge can be the “task specific rules, skills, actions, and sequences of actions employed to reach goals.” Marzano (2007) explains that procedural knowledge is oriented toward skills, strategies, or processes, while declarative knowledge is informational in nature.

When fully developed, procedural knowledge is performed at a level of automaticity, implementing a process as a whole, without consciously thinking about the discrete parts of the process. We see this in our most skillful teachers as they appear to effortlessly re-engage an off-task student or transition from one activity to another. We also see this in our most skillful evaluators as they listen, check for understanding, offer data and pose reflective questions, resulting in improved performance.

“For procedural knowledge to develop,” Marzano (2007) asserts, “it must be practiced” (p. 61). Learning and practicing Cognitive Coaching℠ provides evaluators with the procedural knowledge they need to conduct conversations around performance criteria. Cognitive Coaching℠ supports informed teacher decision-making through strategies that not only enhance teachers’ intellectual capacities, but also increases their capacity to modify themselves (e.g., behaviors, thinking, mindsets, knowledge, skills).

3) Cognitive Coaching℠ is research-based and congruent with neuroscience

Numerous studies have investigated the impact of Cognitive Coaching℠ since it was first developed in 1984, making it one of the most researched models of coaching in education. A clearinghouse of these studies is maintained by Jenny Edwards. Her Cognitive Coaching℠: A Synthesis of the Research (2014) includes benefits of Cognitive Coaching℠ such as improved student test scores, growth in teacher efficacy, increased teacher reflection, and development of more professional school cultures.

Relevant research is being conducted by Richard Boyatzis (Kropko, 2010), distinguished university professor, and professor of organizational behavior, cognitive science and psychology at Case Western Reserve University. Dr. Boyatzis has used fMRI to track the diametrically opposed reactions in the human brain to both compassionate and critical coaching methods. If the individual being coached focuses on options, goals, and desired states—hallmarks of the Cognitive Coaching℠ model—instead of weaknesses,
shortcomings, or criticizing, positive areas in the brain light up and stay lit for five to seven days. Even more importantly, the research showed that by “trying to fix a person,” or by pointing out shortcomings in the person, the brain sends out messages to defend itself from the perceived attack. People start to shut down and resist change.

Research is emerging in the neurosciences that has retrospectively supported the fundamental principles and approach of Cognitive Coaching℠. Rock (2009), offers such support. He asked us to imagine “what it is like when you interact with someone who makes you notice what’s good about yourself, who is clear with his expectations, who lets you make decisions, who connects with you on a human level, and who treats you fairly” (pp. 196-197). Rock asserts that the brain has social needs that must be met to function at its best. He developed the acronym, S.C.A.R.F., to assist us in remembering and understanding the critical social needs of the human brain. The social needs are Status, Certainty, Autonomy, Relatedness and Fairness:

- **An individual seeks status in an organization.** In an evaluation system where feedback includes answers and solutions, the evaluator’s status is raised and the teacher’s status is lowered. Providing feedback in the form of data and questions allows teachers to find their own solutions and increases the personal sense of status.

- **We are hardwired for certainty.** Many people find personal or institutional change to be extremely difficult and stressful; the implementation of new evaluation systems with high visibility and high stakes is radical change. Evaluators who build trusting relationships with staff members increase feelings of certainty and decrease feeling of ambiguity.

- **Autonomy** is the need to feel in control of one’s life and to have choices. When evaluators provide teachers with choices for self-improvement and self-direction, rather than micro-manage, they are supporting the brain’s need for autonomy.

- **Relatedness** is the need to feel connected to others and to collaborate. It is supported by the mirror neurons in the brain that allow us to feel empathy for others. By establishing and sustaining professional learning communities, evaluators support the brain’s need for relatedness.

- **Finally, humans have a strong sense of fairness,** which is as critical to well-being as food and shelter. When a sense of fairness is present, there is an increase in positive brain activity in the prefrontal cortex. Implementing an evaluation system grounded in shared standards and processes significantly contributes to a sense of fairness.

An evaluation process that is grounded in both research and neuroscience results in reduced anxiety, increased positive perceptions about the process of
evaluation, and improved student learning. This is especially critical, given the sweeping changes that are taking place in teacher evaluation across the country.

4) **Cognitive Coaching℠ promotes a growth mindset**

Presupposing that people are not broken, and do not need to be fixed is a basic tenet of Cognitive Coaching℠. Holding the positive presuppositions that people are essentially good, that they think, and that they act with positive intentions, supports their growth.

According to Dweck (2006), when people have a “growth mind-set” they believe that intelligence can be developed through education and hard work; that slipups are based on lack of effort and can be remedied; and that challenges are energizing. On the other hand, when people have a “fixed mind-set” they believe that intelligence is a fixed trait, and that human beings are powerless to change. Having to work hard means a person is dumb, and challenges just make mistakes more likely, causing a person to look less smart.

Dweck (2006) suggested that the “fixed” mind-set can be recognized when someone says that “I feel smart when I don’t make mistakes,” or “When I finish something first and it’s perfect,” or “When something is easy for me, but others can’t do it.” People with a “growth” mind-set might say that they feel smart “When it’s really hard, and I try really hard and I can do something I couldn’t do before.”

For two years, Dweck (2006) followed two groups of students of similar academic standing who were transitioning to junior high school. The “fixed” mind-set students showed an immediate drop off in grades and did worse over the two years. The “growth” mind-set students showed an increase in their grades over the two years.

Dweck (2006) offered another study, in which those praised for intelligence became discouraged when given hard problems. Their performance declined, even on easier problems. Those praised for effort showed greater persistence, and their performance improved.

In still another study, researchers found that managers who had a fixed mind-set were less likely to seek or welcome feedback from their employees than were managers with a growth mind-set, who saw themselves as works-in-progress. After supervisors learned more about the value and principles of a growth mind-set, they became more willing to coach their employees (Dweck, 2006).

Cognitive Coaching℠ supports evaluators in presuming positive intentions and believing that humans continue to grow cognitively. This growth mindset results in generative professional conversations.

5) **Cognitive Coaching℠ is trust-based**

“Trust is the glue that binds community members to one another” (Garmston & Wellman, 2009, p. 17). Tschannen-Moran (2004) defined trust as “the willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is benevolent, honest, open, reliable, and competent” (p. 17).
This is equally true for teacher communities, classroom communities, and parent communities. When all three parties hold the above expectations for their relationships, and these expectations are grounded in shared goals and values, trust is a powerful resource for learning.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) in their seminal work in Chicago schools, named four criteria for discernment of trust: respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity.

- **Respect** comes in the form of basic civility and a willingness to listen deeply to what each person has to say. Parents, students, and teachers need opportunities to talk with and influence each other and to believe that they can positively affect educational outcomes.

- **Competence** is the sense that each party has the ability to carry out its appropriate roles and produce desired outcomes. This applies to both academic results and teacher-student relationships. When incompetence goes unchecked, it erodes trust and undermines shared efforts toward improving learning.

- **Personal regard for others** means that we treat each other with mutual support and caring, as people rather than roles. We are a social species, wired for relationships and reciprocity. Extending ourselves to and for others is like making a deposit in a bank account; the interest in this account compounds with each deposit.

- **Integrity** is the congruence between saying and doing. In trusting relationships, this means we believe that a sense of morality and ethical behavior is operating in others and in the ways we are interacting. Following through with agreements and commitments is a key aspect of integrity.

What is the result of having these four elements of trust present? Bryk and Schneider (2002) concluded “…schools performing in the top quartile on standardized tests were more often schools with high levels of trust than those performing in the bottom quartile” (p. 111). They also examined the 100 schools that had made the greatest and least annual gains on standardized tests and analyzed each school’s survey results on trusting relationships. They found that schools reporting strong trust links in 1994 were three times more likely to report eventual improvements in reading and mathematics scores than those where trust levels were low. By 1997, schools with high levels of trust had a one-in-two chance of being in the "improving" category, compared with school with low levels of trust, which had only a one-in-seven chance.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) concluded, “Schools that reported low levels of trust both in 1994 and 1997 had "virtually no chance of showing improvement in either reading or mathematics" (p. 111). Cognitive Coaching℠ supports evaluators in
building trusting relationships. As Margaret Wheatley (1992) reminds us, “Relationships are all there is” (p.19).

Conclusion
If we are to make a difference in the current achievement and future lives of students, it is imperative that we do all we can to support the growth and development of teachers and leaders. Educational leaders (Costa & Garmston, 2013 Rev; Fullan, 1993; Garmston & Wellman, 2013 Rev) believe that to make a difference in our schools, we must create cultures of collaboration and inquiry. Self-directed evaluation conversations have a fractal quality in which self-directedness pervades the culture of the system and becomes a norm for everyone.

Others (Bryk & Schneider 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2004) emphasized the role of trust in developing such cultures. Trusted leaders who are skilled collaborators and inquirers, are more likely to establish and maintain such school cultures. As part of the culture, trust, collaboration and inquiry are nowhere more important than in the evaluation process.

In their recent review of evaluation models across the United States, Silverberg and Jungwirth (2014) concluded:

A huge cultural shift for many teachers and administrators is making the shift to an evaluation system built on reflection, self-assessment, accountability, and collaborative goal-setting. This new way of being is supported by dialogue, collaborative analysis of data, and coaching. Collaboration and coaching require a whole new identity as an ‘evaluator’ and a new set of skills to nurture and grow effective teachers.” (pp. xvi-xvii)

Self-directed evaluation supports this shift and reflects the knowledge, skills and perceptions needed to develop a new identity as an evaluator. Leaders who use structures and skills to engage in growth-producing conversations as the evaluator, build the capacity of the person being evaluated. It is this capacity that will ensure that change is intrinsic, intentional, and sustainable. The future is in our schools and classrooms today; only with such change can we have a positive influence on the future.
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## PROVIDING FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like the way you immediately shifted your assignment when you noticed that the students were not ready to complete that independently.</th>
<th>26 of your students turned in an exit slip.</th>
<th>Why thinking about the progress of your students, what are some benefits you are getting from your formative assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nice job!! Make sure they understand these instructions before you begin.</td>
<td>13 boys answered questions during the one-hour class period.</td>
<td>What are some possible alternatives that you might use to assess student learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really appreciate all you’ve done for us this year. You did a nice job of following through with what you’ve practiced. You need to set the stage for your lesson. You are a master teacher. You have a real talent for organizing and covering all the details. That didn’t work. The kids loved the activity. They were so focused. Your pacing is too fast for some of your students.</td>
<td>Your students came to art class 10 minutes after the bell rang. Three students offered questions to other students during the class discussion. A parent called today and said, “I appreciate the extra effort that the teacher is making for my child.” The transition from reading to math was 5 minutes. You named five safety rules for your students. One student said, “I don’t know how to do this.” After taking homework questions, you gave a reading assignment.</td>
<td>What are some things you are learning from this lesson and unit? How did you decide to organize the lesson in this sequence? What are some things you are noticing about how using manipulatives is affecting learning? What are you noticing as you compare the two assessments? How are you thinking of addressing the needs of your English language learners for this unit? What other resources might be available to assist you with this? How are you holding students accountable for using correct writing conventions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELF-ASSESSMENT  
CALIBRATING CONVERSATIONS

Please reflect by using this instrument to indicate your current level with each of the following.
1 – unaware  2 – aware, not evident in practice  3 – with conscious effort  4 – with automaticity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Tools</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish rapport by matching:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• posture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• gesture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tonality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• breathing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• give other person time to think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• take time for self to craft responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• prior to asking a question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• acknowledging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• organizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• abstracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of an invitation in questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• approachable voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• plural form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tentative language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• positive presuppositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• open-ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asks teacher what data might be collected in observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses an agreed upon rubric/self assessment for deciding on what data to collect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops specificity with teacher about how data will be collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses data as third point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks questions relevant to the interpretation of the data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions of the Calibrating Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Placement and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Placement and Values, Beliefs, and Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on the Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CALIBRATING CONVERSATION

When there is an externally generated instrument/document that provides a standard for performance, the coach uses the Calibrating Conversation Map to structure the interaction. To calibrate means to establish the standard and mark the units shown on a measuring instrument. For example, in Washington, D.C at the Bureau of Weights and Measures, there is a weight that is exactly one pound, which is the standard against which all scales are calibrated. The Calibrating Conversation uses an externally generated, mutually agreed upon document to support the coachee’s thinking in measuring his/her progress as reflected on the document. Examples of documents are a teaching framework, an evaluation instrument, a rubric. Key to the Calibrating Conversation is that the document is externally generated, mutually agreed upon, and locally adopted as representing excellence in the field of endeavor. Also key is that the purpose of the calibrating conference is to support self-directed learning.

Important in this conversation is the quality of the dialogue about the standards as opposed to the standards themselves. In order for the coachee to calibrate his/her progress toward the standard, the coach must first support the coachee in making meaning of the standards. It is by allowing the coachee to make meaning through dialogue that the coach mediates the thinking of the coachee.

The document being used in the Calibrating Conversation becomes what is called a 3rd point in the communication. The third point serves as a focus separate from each of the parties in the conversation. That is, the coach is the 1st point, the coachee is the 2nd point and the document is the 3rd point. The value of designating a 3rd point is that both parties can refer to it in an impersonal way. The 3rd point does not belong to either party; it is simply a reference point for the conversation.

Within the territory of the Calibrating Conversation Map there are six regions that the coach navigates to mediate the coachee’s thinking (Figure 1). Each region has a specific purpose, designed to support the coachee in reaching objectives or goal(s) reflected by the document. The coach uses the basic tools of Cognitive Coaching® (rapport, pausing, paraphrasing, and posing questions) to mediate the coachee’s thinking.
Select a focus
In this region the coach asks the coachee to decide on what aspect of the document s/he wants to focus. This is important, given that most documents contain a great deal of information. The selected focus should be one that can be addressed in the amount of time scheduled for the conversation. The coach might ask, “On what aspect of the document would you like to focus today?” or “What aspect of the document is of interest to you for today’s conversation?”

Identify existing level of performance or placement on a rubric and give supporting evidence.
In this region, the coach is interested in finding out where the coachee sees him/herself on the document. The coach poses questions to specify thinking in order for the coachee to be clear about the data that supports his/her self-assessment. The coach might ask, “Where do you see yourself currently?” and “What might be some examples of how that plays out for you?”

Specify desired placement and explore values, beliefs, and identity congruent with desired placement
In this region the coach asks the coachee where s/he would like to be. This supports the coachee in establishing a goal or objective for him/herself, toward which s/he wants to move. The coach might ask, “So at what level of competence would you like to be on this behavior?”

This region is also designed to go to the deep structure of the coachee’s thinking to validate the importance of the desired placement. The coach is interested in raising the consciousness of the coachee about the importance of the desired placement. The coach might ask, “What might be some of the beliefs or values motivating you to reach this level?” or “Who will you be when you reach this level?” or “What makes this important to you?”

Establish behavioral indicators for new placement
In this region the coach is interested in having the coachee envision him/herself doing what it is s/he aspires to do. The coachee should be specific in identifying what it looks, feels and sounds like to achieve the level s/he desires. The coach might ask, “What might it look and sound like when you reach that level?” “Please describe some examples.” “By when do you want to achieve that?”

Describe support needed to get to a higher level of performance and commit to action
In this region the coach is interested in having the coachee draw on his/her resources to determine what it’s going to take to reach the goal/desired placement. The coachee should identify what support s/he will need to reach the goal. This support might be in the form of strategies, materials or the support of other people. Once support is described, the coachee should state what s/he will do to implement the plan and the data collection tool(s) that might be used. The coach might ask, “What might be some resources you will need to reach this level?” or “What might it take for you to apply these strategies?” or “What kind of
help might be useful to you?” or “What is the most powerful step you might take?” or "In what format might the data be recorded?” or "What data collection tool(s) might be helpful to you?”

Reflect on the coaching process, explore refinements, and explore ways of using this process on your own
This is the same region that concludes the other Cognitive CoachingSM Conversations. In this region, the coach asks the coachee to reflect on the conversation in which s/he just engaged. The intent of this region is to give the coachee the opportunity to identify what was helpful and what supported thinking. The coach might ask, “How has this conversation been helpful to you?” or “How has this conversation supported your thinking?” or “Where are you now in your thinking compared to where you were when we started?”

Although the Calibrating Conversation is grounded in the Cognitive CoachingSM support function, it can also be used in each of the other support functions.

• The Calibrating Conversation can be used in the collaborating support function when the intention is that the two people involved share data to develop mutual understanding/meaning. In such a conversation, it is important that both parties contribute to the conversation in a balanced way.

• The Calibrating Conversation can be used in the consulting support function when the coach has expertise about the standard. In this case, the coach would be providing information to explain aspects of the document with the intention to increase understanding of the document.

• The Calibrating Conversation can be used in the evaluating support function for self-assessment. Before the conversation, the evaluator might ask the person to complete the evaluation document and the evaluator would also complete the document. The focus of the conversation would then be on comparing the two assessments and understanding each person’s point of view.
**Figure 1 - COGNITIVE COACHING℠ CALIBRATING CONVERSATION**

**Map**

*Coach mediates by having the coachee:*

- Select a **focus**.

- Identify **existing level of performance or placement on a rubric** and give supporting **evidence**

- Specify **desired placement** and explore **values, beliefs, and identity** congruent with desired placement

- Establish **behavioral indicators** for new placement

- Describe **support needed** to get to a higher level of performance and commit to action

- Reflect on the **coaching process**, explore refinements, and explore ways of using this process on your own

**Tools**

*Coach navigates the map using the tools below:*

- **Pause** to allow you and your partner time to think.

- **Paraphrase** from time to time; summarize your partner’s thoughts by saying, “So…”

- **Pose questions to specify thinking** by asking, for example, “Specifically, which area might you want to focus on?”

- **Pose questions to explore thinking** by asking, for example, “What might be some of the values that cause you to want to move to that level?”

- **Pay close attention** to your partner; attend with your mind and your body.