Syncing Our Cycles: An Inquiry-Based Coaching Model for Distant Supervision

Stephanie Schroeder
University of Florida, stephanieelyseschroeder@gmail.com

Elizabeth Currin
University of Florida, ecurrin@mailbox.sc.edu

Syncing Our Cycles: An Inquiry-Based Coaching Model for Distant Supervision

Cover Page Footnote

Both authors contributed equally to this article.

Syncing Our Cycles: An Inquiry-Based Coaching Model for Distant Supervision

Abstract:

In response to calls for a reconceptualized approach to pre-service teacher supervision, we propose a model of distant supervision for teacher candidates that blends two evidence-based professional development practices—instructional coaching and practitioner inquiry. The fusion of these frameworks can foster inquiry communities that may ease the transition from teacher candidate to teacher of record. Citing the dilemmas inherent in distant supervision, we argue that this hybrid coaching/inquiry model of student teaching supervision is more suitable to supervision at a distance than coaching or inquiry alone. We invite both comment and critique, hoping to begin a dialogue about how practitioner research can be both enhanced through other professional learning methods and embedded in teacher preparation even at a distance.

Supervision of student teachers is widely understood to be of critical importance for developing reflective educators (Burns, Jacobs, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2016; Zeichner, 2002). As accreditation standards in teacher education become more stringent (Paulsen & Schmidt-Crawford, 2017), supervision of pre-service teachers should evolve from "a few sporadic classroom observations" (Burns et al., 2016, p. 68) to a more complex, dynamic, and collaborative undertaking, especially as part of comprehensive efforts to update the traditional practices of teacher education to meet the changing times (Darling-Hammond, 2006).

Calls for improvement have yielded alternative models of educator preparation: service learning, cultural immersion, and community schools all fit within a community-oriented teacher preparation experience and tend to center on diversity and community expertise. Conversely, professional development schools (PDS) focus on teacher professionalization (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008). Other suggested improvements for teacher education include cultivating clinical master teachers who serve as both mentors and supervisors (Wilson, 2006), and infusing practitioner inquiry into the PDS model (Mule, 2006). Still others recommend "co-reform," in which School-University Partnerships foster simultaneous renewal (Goodlad, 1990; Allexsaht-Snider, Deegan, & White, 1995). Each of these efforts signals a shift away from a "training model" in favor of "participation, engagement, and reflection" (Hoffman, Wetzel, Maloch, Greeter, Taylor, DeJulio, & Vlach, 2015).

Many of these proposed "best practice" methods of teacher education imagine an ideal—strong professional development school (PDS) networks;

instructional coaches embedded in nearby schools; and tight-knit relationships between mentor teachers, teacher candidates, and university supervisors. Darling-Hammond (2010), for example, writes about developing teacher candidates' knowledge of teaching "practice in practice" (p. 40) through work in PDS schools or strong urban teacher residencies. While we agree these networks should be cultivated, we also acknowledge that in many teacher preparation programs they simply do not exist. Thus, we wonder if in our quest for the ideal, we lose sight of the real—the here and now of teacher education, the programs that lack PDS schools or, out of necessity, must observe teacher candidates virtually. How do we work within the "real" to develop strong models of teacher education? How do we provide high-quality supervision in a distant learning environment that often lacks the same rigor (Simpson, 2006) as a local supervision experience?

We propose a model of distant supervision for teacher candidates that blends two evidence-based professional development practices—instructional coaching (Knight, 2007) and practitioner inquiry (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014). The fusion of these frameworks can foster inquiry communities that may ease the transition from teacher candidate to teacher of record. We argue that this hybrid coaching/inquiry model is more suitable to supervision at a distance than coaching or inquiry alone and is an example of a "new way forward" for practitioner research, as envisioned in this special issue. We invite both comment and critique, hoping to begin a dialogue about how practitioner research can be both enhanced through other professional learning methods and embedded in teacher preparation even at a distance. First, we describe our context and positionality. We then survey literature on video observation, instructional coaching, and practitioner inquiry. Next, we point out the dilemmas inherent in attempting instructional coaching at a distance and suggest a hybrid coaching/inquiry cycle that can mitigate these tensions and enhance the experience overall. We close by offering suggestions for future research.

Our Context and Positionality

The context from which our proposal for a hybrid coaching/inquiry model of distant supervision emerged played an important role in the model's development. As key facilitators during the first year of distant intern supervision at a large, public research university in the southeast, we supervised interns during their year-long student teaching experience. We observed interns' pre-recorded videos via TORSH Talent and used Zoom for one-on-one videoconferences. Interns completed four observations each semester, in addition to participating in a twice-monthly virtual seminar, also through Zoom. Our observation protocols were based on Knight's (2007) instructional coaching model, which has been adapted by the

University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning and used to train coaches like us across the country. Indeed, we were not just learning to supervise at a distance, we were learning to *coach* at a distance.

As coaches, we worked with interns in the final year of a five-year elementary educator preparation program. Ideally, interns begin a year-long field placement in the fall semester and continue throughout the school year, although some begin in spring and finish in fall. Interns take master's level coursework online, which allows flexibility in terms of placement. Local interns engage in professional development through our university, whereas distant interns may participate in the workshops, if any, offered by their respective districts.

The majority of instructional coaches at our university are doctoral students, and, during the transition to the distant model, so were we. Both of us have supervised local interns in a more traditional format, so we were skeptical of the distant model for a number of reasons, including intern assignments in multiple schools and districts and a lack of community and context that would, we believed, impair relationship building and our ability to provide feedback. Our research interests likely made us more critical of coaching at a distance. Elizabeth, for example, has explored the impact of the Age of Accountability on practitioner research, prompting concerns about the fragility of teacher autonomy and technological encroachment in classrooms. Stephanie researches democratic teacher education and the boundary-crossing necessary for democracy to thrive. The forced nature of instructional coaching, in that our interns had no choice but to participate, and the lack of boundary crossing facilitated by our university thus led Stephanie to question the democratic nature of the work. The disembodied surveillance required for the job did not set well with either author. Having studied the theory and practice of practitioner research and led pre- and in-service teachers through inquiry cycles, we put our knowledge of inquiry to use through a self-study of our experiences, recording our insights regarding how instructional coaching and practitioner inquiry could productively merge. We draw from those reflections in this conceptual article.

Literature Review

Distant Supervision of Student Teaching Field Experiences

Despite the theoretical importance of field experience, Darling-Hammond (2010) notes, "the clinical side of teacher education has been fairly haphazard, depending on the idiosyncrasies of loosely selected placements with little guidance about what happens in them and little connection to university work" (p. 40). This problem is even more pronounced in distant models (Simpson, 2006), wherein

prospective teachers work with a cooperating teacher at a distance from the brick-and-mortar site of their teacher education program. Whether university supervisors travel to each teacher candidate or use technology to conduct observations, problems persist for a number of reasons. Programs are generally unable "to select and supervise sites of best practice" (Simpson, 2006, p. 244) when casting a wide geographical net, which also precludes the ability to understand interns' local contexts and be responsive to their needs.

Given the increasing complexity of the capstone field experience, Burns et al. (2016) call for a "reconceptualized" role for supervisors, marked by "sophisticated and interrelated supervisory practices" (p. 68). The use of technology to observe teaching, a practice Kopcha and Alger (2011) suggest is "an effective approach to teacher preparation" (p. 67), can be a means to that end. Though "video as a learning tool" is a decades-old practice in teacher education (McFadden, Ellis, Anwar, & Roehrig, 2014, p. 458), video as applied to supervision is still arguably under-researched. Nevertheless, extant studies have much to offer the distant model of supervision, for instance the assertion that video can shift teacher candidates' focus on "specific, isolated, behaviors" to a more reflective model, "wherein teachers view videos of themselves or others to critically think about the effects of particular actions" (Tripp & Rich, 2012, p. 728). Ideally, that reflection translates to action, and Kopcha and Alger (2011) credit video, especially coupled with expert feedback, as a source of change. Videotaped lessons offer more opportunities for feedback than traditional observations (Alger & Kopcha, 2009); increased flexibility (Paulsen & Schmidt-Crawford, 2017); and the potential for interns to notice, interpret, and reconsider critical classroom moments (Osmanoglu, 2016). Despite its promise, the use of video is not effective in and of itself (Seidel, Blomberg, & Renkl, 2013). Indeed, the "human aspects" of video use prove far more important than the technological aspects (Garrett & Dudt, 1998; Lombardi, 2001, p. 313).

Instructional Coaching

Instructional coaching, an approach advocated by Knight (2007), has been "embraced by administrators and teachers alike" (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2011, p. 12) for placing educators "at the center of their own professional learning" (p. 15). Coaching espouses a "partnership" philosophy, based on equality, choice, voice, reflection, dialogue, praxis, and reciprocity (Knight, 2011). Teachers must make the decision to be coached, rather than feeling as though being coached is a punishment for poor performance (Knight, 2007). According to the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, "Teachers who experience high-quality coaching are more likely to enact new teaching practices and apply them more appropriately" (p. 6). Quality assurance requires adhering to the principles listed

above, so ideally, a coaching cycle begins only after teachers have chosen to participate and rapport is established.

The Lastinger Center's coaching process starts with an interview of the teacher, during which the coach uncovers an area of focus. The coach then observes a lesson and collects relevant data. Then, before meeting with the teacher, the coach creates a data display, "a visual representation of what the coach observed" that serves to "engage the teacher in conversation" (Adams, Ross, Burns, & Gibbs, 2015, p. 25). Using a neutral set of descriptive data gives the teacher "ownership of successes and challenges" and the ability to "recognize and analyze" (p. 25). The data display is purely descriptive—what happened specifically in the classroom, presented in a clear, easy to understand format.

The data display guides the coaching conversation, characterized by parity, reciprocity, choice, and dialogue. Urging teachers to make sense of the data display in terms of the focus area, "Coaches are most effective when they act as critical friends, simultaneously providing support and empowering teachers to see areas where they can improve" (Knight, 2007, p. 26). Teachers remain "the final decision makers" (p. 19), while coaches strive to listen "more than they tell" (p. 25). Making changes to practice, examining the impact of those changes, and continuing in the cycle comprise the next and ongoing step.

Although the instructional coaching model is used primarily with practicing teachers, some teacher education programs have turned to coaching during supervision of teacher candidates. Smith, Stapleton, Cuthrell, Brinkley, and Covington (2016), for example, added instructional coaches to the typical field supervision triad of pre-service teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. In their context, coaches underwent a rigorous selection process, participated in ongoing professional development, and offered 16 hours of professional development to pre-service teachers throughout the internship year. The coaches, as liaisons, were "rooted in the local school district yet directly connected to the university," and successfully encouraged teacher candidates "to try new things" (pp. 352-353), resulting in higher levels of student engagement.

The success of the model in the program described above can be attributed to their reliance on the "six pillars" of effective coaching outlined by the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, Learning Forward, and Public Impact (2016): (1) cultivating a system-wide vision and commitment, (2) being selective in recruitment of coaches, (3) establishing a strong partnership to share responsibility for the learning of pre-service teachers by, among other things, ensuring high-quality training for coaches, (4) creating clearly defined roles for

coaches, (5) offering ongoing support for coaches, and (6) providing adequate compensation. Rather than muddy the role of the coach, conflating it with the more evaluative role of the university supervisor, Smith et al. (2016) hired people who would serve exclusively as coaches, which could "ensure [that] coaching is their primary function" (p. 14). Built around trust, equality, and support, effective coaching requires commitment and vision from multiple stakeholders.

Inquiry

Practitioner inquiry, or "systematic, intentional inquiry by teachers," (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993 p. 5), draws from the traditions of action research, teacher research, self-study, and classroom research (Dana, 2015). Inquiry has inspired teachers to reclaim their rights to knowledge and its production—to wrest the term "research" back from outside observers and highlight insider knowledge (Ulanoff, Vega-Castaneda, & Quiocho, 2003; Webb, 2002). Indeed, inquiry "engages teachers in the design, data collection, and interpretation of data around a question" (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014, p. 8), thus empowering educators to participate in "capital-R Research" (Schiera, 2014, p. 107). Practitioner inquiry has thus been characterized as a democratic form of teacher professional learning that aligns with social justice aims (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009).

Practitioner inquiry is not only a tool used for professional learning: it is a stance, providing "a kind of grounding within the changing cultures of school reform and competing political agendas" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993, pp. 288-289). Teachers with an inquiry stance approach practitioner research organically, not as a project to be completed and "checked off" for professional learning points or credits, but as a seamless part of their work as teachers (Chandler-Olcott, 2002). Inquiry emerges from "felt difficulties" in the classroom, whether "a puzzling moment, student, or learning pattern" (Athanases, Bennett, & Wahleithner, 2015, p. 10) or any problem of practice creating "discomfort or a sense of disequilibrium" (Lysaker & Thompson, 2013, p. 182). Because of these "praxidents," Schiera (2014) argues, "there is nothing 'extra' or 'inaccessible' about practitioner research, just something further and deeper" (p. 108). In other words, the inquiry cycle becomes the natural rhythm of the classroom.

In this article, we rely on Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2014) to describe the practitioner inquiry cycle. With a teacher-developed wondering in mind, the teacher determines a research plan, often in collaboration with others. The plan ideally begins with a review of scholarship on the subject of interest. Gaining insights from the literature, the inquirer determines what data are both necessary and collectable. Field notes, student work, interviews, pictures, and journals are often appropriate options. With a plan in place, the teacher can systematically collect and analyze

data to generate a set of findings. In an inquiry write-up, the teacher provides background information, summarizes the research plan, shares the key take-aways, and provides illustrative evidence. The cycle continues when teacher researchers share their learning with others and develop new wonderings.

For decades now, teacher educators have sought to cultivate a lifelong inquiry stance in pre-service teachers (Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Friedman, & Pine, 2009; Truxaw, Casa, & Adelson, 2011). While some question whether practitioner inquiry can be effective with inexperienced pre-service teachers (Phillips & Carr, 2009), teacher preparation programs can provide a foundation for future teachers who are "data literate, evidence-generating professionals" (Athanases, Bennett, & Wahleithner, 2015, p. 26) capable of embracing "complexities, conditions, and challenges […] to improve their practice, and ultimately students' learning" (Sinnema, Meyer, & Aitken, 2017, p. 17). Indeed, Wolkenhauer and Hooser (2017) argue that teacher educators should challenge "preservice teachers to ask questions about their practices and the status quo of educational settings so that as first year teachers they know how to be critical consumers of pedagogy, curriculum, and system expectations" (p. 11). Making the most of practitioner inquiry demands that we start with teacher candidates, no matter our context.

Feeling Out-of-Sync: The Struggles of the Distant Coach

Our model of distant supervision for teacher candidates blends the two professional development practices described above. In the spirit of inquiry, the idea to fuse instructional coaching with practitioner research was born of a felt difficulty we faced as novice coaches with the added challenge of piloting a distant supervision model. Just as inquirers benefit from the input of critical friends, we invite both comment and critique of this model ultimately hoping to mitigate the dilemmas inherent in attempting instructional coaching at a distance.

As we applied our understanding of the coaching model in practice, we encountered a number of roadblocks. For starters, according to the Lastinger Center (2016), "coaching assignments should aim to create longevity in coaching relationships and the feasibility to work intensively with each teacher" (p. 15). This belief is compounded by the suggestion that instructional coaches "function best when their coaching load is concentrated within a single school and with a small enough group of teachers to allow depth" (p. 16). Adopting the coaching model for a distant internship, then, would seem to be a conceptual mismatch: Elizabeth, for example, supervised 10 interns at 10 different schools in 6 different counties. With the exception of 1 intern, the coaching relationship only lasted for a single semester of the year-long internship. Stephanie's 5 interns were similarly scattered across 4

districts and 5 schools. Building productive connections with principals and mentors, let alone interns, was challenging based on the numbers alone, exacerbated by the necessarily virtual nature of those relationships.

On a purely practical level, having interns scattered across the state makes it difficult to ensure their placements have WiFi and/or videoconferencing capabilities. Lacking access to the equipment at the university and without a guarantee of resources at the school level, our interns, for the most part, used their own devices to record and upload their lessons and videoconference with coaches from home. It is possible, then, that coaches and mentors never meet "face to face," so very rarely did we feel like we were part of a team, hard-pressed to create and maintain the intern-mentor-supervisor triad believed to foster pre-service teacher learning. Moreover, our 90-minute bi-monthly seminar occurred via Zoom and, absent any set curriculum, was loosely based on "what our students needed." While this freedom was appreciated, seminar became a time to take care of administrative work or otherwise "tell" our interns what needed to be done. This didactic approach did little to form community.

In addition to emphasizing partnerships with principals and mentors, Knight (2007) casts instructional coaches as leaders who "accelerate teacher learning [...by] collaborating, modeling, observing, providing feedback, and providing support" (p. 27). Beyond the triad, these practices enable instructional coaches to build relationships with K-12 students, thus becoming deeply embedded members of the school community. In order to be effective teacher leaders, Knight (2007) reasons, coaches must "be sensitive to the cultural norms in a school and [...] work to change norms that are not good for students" (p. 211). It should go without saying that this is an unreasonable expectation for the distant coach, particularly a doctoral student who has no long-term commitment to the role. These dilemmas became our felt difficulties, the problems of our practice that made us uncomfortable. We thus sought a new way forward, a way to work within the real-life dilemmas of teacher education to ease our disequilibrium and enhance the experience for our interns. That way forward—an inquiry-based coaching model for distant supervision—is outlined below.

Syncing Our Cycles: An Inquiry-Based Coaching Model for Distant Supervision

Abiding by Simpson's (2006) assertion that field experience should ultimately be about "learning to enquire and reflect" (p. 243), we see the distant

model of supervision, for all of its flaws, as a site of great potential for combining elements of practitioner inquiry and instructional coaching.

Principles

Our model is defined by three principles: (1) the development of a strong sense of community, (2) the seminar as a critical friends group, and (3) the cultivation of intern autonomy. Building a community of critical friends enhances the role of the existing seminar, a ready-made inquiry community.

Maximizing the potential of that virtual space might mean making use of a learning management system. In our case, Canvas discussion boards could serve as "a form of vicarious experience" (Kopcha & Alger, 2011, p. 67), prompting interns to think outside of their individual classrooms and eventually inviting them to comment on their peers' videos, since "reflection is a social practice" (Sydnor, 2016, p. 70). Sharing videos can result in multiperspectival discussion, increased feedback, and a heightened ability on the part of interns to see how complex and nuanced teaching really is (Johnson & Cotterman, 2015; Osmanoglu, 2016; Sherin & van Es, 2009). Through what Cuthrell, Steadman, Stapleton, and Hodge (2016) term a video grand rounds model, interns' comments evolved "from simple descriptions of teaching events to descriptions of the effects that instruction had on the learner" (p. 21). Instructional coaches can play a pivotal role in this transformation from the superficial to the substantial.

Indeed, Baecher and Kung (2011) urge "a high degree of scaffolding" when working with classroom video (p. 16). Rather than presuming interns know how to watch themselves and their peers, coaches can guide their viewing in early seminars. Wiggins (2012) articulates the challenge of trying to "perceive as we perform" (p. 13). Video stands to mitigate that concern, but only with intentional action. In the standard coaching model, coaches are the ones doing the attentive watching; from our experience, this holds true even when videos are incorporated. Coaches guide interns to carefully examine the data displays, but in a hybrid model, interns would be more accountable for their own videos.

We stand by Cherrington and Loveridge's (2014) assertion that "opportunities for collaborative dialogue and reflection […enable] teachers to critique their knowledge and interpretations about children" (p. 48), and we strive to instill critical dispositions in teacher candidates. Though seminar serves as the foundation for a community of critical friends, it should not be the end point. Rather, as Endacott (2016) avers, teachers must continue "to reflect and grow" as autonomous professionals to avoid becoming "increasingly dependent upon others to evaluate [their] performance" (pp. 44-45). We are careful to note that the cycle

at the heart of our model, described below, scaffolds autonomy through a gradual release of responsibility.

The Cycle

Because our hybrid approach is at the conceptual stage, we have mapped out a semester's worth of steps that we believe to be adaptable to a variety of teacher education contexts. Although our interns undergo a year-long full-time field placement, we recognize that a number of educator preparation programs structure the internship a bit differently. In addition, though we have highlighted a number of specific activities for seminar, paying attention to a few key moments in the semester, there is sufficient freedom and flexibility throughout in order to meet program requirements and student learning needs.

Building rapport (Weeks 1-2 and throughout). The first step of any strong professional learning relationship involves building rapport. This is difficult when coaches and interns only interact virtually. Of course, we should not only be building rapport with interns, but learning about their communities. We recommend interns introduce themselves and their classrooms in a video—not as an observation, but as a "getting to know you" experience, with the added benefit of providing some low-stakes practice with the recording and uploading process. Each intern could take the coach on a tour of the classroom and school and allow students to introduce themselves. Likewise, the coach could "meet" the class through videoconference or a pre-recorded video greeting. We have often noticed that students are confused and intrigued when interns start recording lessons. This set of introductions could serve multiple functions, among them establishing an introduction to the intern and the classroom context, demystifying the video process, and getting interns acquainted with technology. Moreover, this step can reinforce the intern-mentor-supervisor triad by opening the lines of communication between mentor and supervisor.

Building inquiry community and developing wonderings (Weeks 1-4). The focus for early seminars should be community-building, but that does not preclude an emphasis on inquiry. Rather, interns might share clips from their get-to-know-you videos and invite questions from their peers. If inquiry is not already embedded in a teacher education program, coaches should introduce the philosophy and framework that guides practitioner research. With scaffolding in place, interns can easily turn their natural curiosities into rich wonderings that are ripe for investigation. Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2014) turn to researcher Jack Hughes to nourish organic inquiry out of "that nagging that wakes you in the early hours, then reemerges during your morning preparation time […], pushing out of mind those important tasks you needed to accomplish prior to the first bell" (p. 12). Pre-service

teachers can be especially overwhelmed by the daily grind of teaching, but seminar, in addition to being a safe space to share myriad emotions, can also help them develop the skills to transform their worries into wonderings.

If the real-time pressure of seminar stymies some students, discussion boards offer a way to keep the conversation going. Developing a high-quality wondering takes time, which is why our model devotes a number of weeks to this process, rather than jumping into observations right away. Not only does this provide adequate time for wondering development, it also allows for additional community-building. While it is ultimately important that each intern develop an individual wondering, one way to catalyze the brainstorming is to ask more generally about the common real-world dilemmas that teachers face. Dana and Yendol Hoppey (2014) provide a list of passions they believe to be the sources of all wonderings: a child, curriculum, content knowledge, teaching strategies/techniques, beliefs about practice, the intersection of personal and professional identities, advocating social justice, and context. This list, in addition to underscoring the complexity of teaching, enables interns to see the broader implications of their work. Whereas a coaching model focuses on an individual teacher in conversation with an individual coach, discussing the eight passions in seminar opens up the internship experience to the community of critical friends.

Developing a research plan (Weeks 5-6). After a sufficient introduction to problematizing practice and generating wonderings, interns will be ready, with the help of their coach and critical friends, to develop a research plan. This step mirrors the initial step of the coaching cycle, in which the coach interviews a teacher to establish a focus area. In most cases, the coach determines how to collect data to respond to the focus question, yet in our hybrid model, interns share the responsibility. Because seminars occur every other week, distant coaches and interns need some time to contemplate, correspond, and collaborate. Developing a research plan, much like the remaining steps of this process, can be documented in ways that best fit the needs of the program in question.

Video data collection (Weeks 7-12). Starting what we typically think of as the observation process in Week 7 communicates to interns that the final field experience is about far more than performance evaluation. With the foundation described above and with ongoing support from their coach and critical friends, interns are ready to collect data related to their wondering. Activities during seminar, coupled with structured discussion protocols, can give interns experience with a variety of data collection methods: watching video clips, analyzing student work, or surveying interview transcripts. All of these activities, whether centered

on the interns' own data or exemplars procured by the coach, can help pre-service teachers make sense of what is happening in their own contexts.

This process is adaptable to existing procedures and time constraints. For instance, if interns typically submit lesson plans before observations, these can become data. Interns can also, with their coach's help, annotate their lesson plans as part of a post-observation reflection: What might they change? What did they notice about putting the plan into practice? While the coaching model typically omits discussion of the lesson planning stage, all is fair game in the hybrid model.

Analyzing data and generating results (Weeks 13-14). As with capital-R research, practitioner inquiry often involves iterative phases of data collection and analysis. Thus, rather than moving from focus question to focus question, we envision interns grappling with a single, evolving wondering for the course of the semester. For the first round, the coach might create a data display to model that practice. In subsequent rounds, both coach and intern can create data displays so the coach can demonstrate how to triangulate data. These reimagined coaching conversations can also serve as a space for interns to begin thinking about how to write up their inquiries for a larger audience.

Sharing and celebrating (Weeks 15-16). A worthwhile inquiry takes time, and surviving a semester of a full-time field experience is definitely cause for celebration. We thus recommend devoting some time in the final seminar for students to acknowledge their and their peers' accomplishments. Not only does this provide the opportunity to practice their presentation skills, honoring the practitioner research ideal, it also adheres to our principles of community, critical friendship, and autonomy. For supervisors working with year-long interns, this step can get the group ready for the subsequent semester, in which interns might attempt to create data displays for one another.

Staying In-Sync

While we have not yet embarked upon a full-scale roll-out of the model described above, we have informally implemented some aspects of the cycle. For example, Elizabeth has taken steps towards a critical friends group by inviting interns to share tentative focus questions during seminar and sharing more seasoned peers' focus questions from past semesters. During these sessions, interns can brainstorm how they might collect video data. Both of us have incorporated video data during seminar, prompting interns to help one another with a problem of practice illustrated in a self-selected clip. Interns have responded positively to both of these alterations to the coaching cycle. Both of us have also asked interns to

reflect on their practice through video annotation, a feature of TORSH Talent and other video platforms. Rather than reflecting through a standardized form provided to all interns in our program, we find that asking interns to reflect directly on their own practice as it occurs in video enhances our coaching conversations and is one way to cultivate interns' increasing autonomy. Implementing this change can be as simple as asking interns to refer to an existing reflection form to guide their annotations. Lastly, in keeping with the creation of data displays that instructional coaching recommends, both of us have incorporated video screenshots into data displays. We find that interns are able to analyze particular moments in their teaching at a far deeper level than the tally marks or quickly sketched visual data face-to-face coaches create in response to a focus question. However, even as we have tested out bits of our newly conceptualized hybrid cycle with interns, we acknowledge that for the cycle to be true to the spirit of practitioner inquiry, it must be systematic and intentional. We believe the model described above would provide necessary structure and support towards that end.

Conclusion

While we may never grow accustomed to participating in the disembodied surveillance of K-12 classrooms, we recognize how the 21st-century practice of distant supervision is poised to endure for the foreseeable future. Embracing the challenges inherent in video observation, we have suggested here that a hybrid approach, drawing on the research-based principles of instructional coaching and practitioner inquiry, can prepare interns to embark on a career as lifelong learners. Darling-Hammond (2010) has argued that "when teachers complain that university work has often been 'too theoretical,' they usually mean that it is too abstract and general, in ways that leave teachers bereft of specific tools to use in the classroom" (p. 40). Our hybrid model provides future teachers with the tools to continue collecting data regarding their own practice, enabling them to hone an inquiry stance over the course of their professional lifespan. Unlike coaching, which by nature requires both a coach and someone to be coached, an inquiry stance—and the data collection and analysis tools that are learned as part of the process—remain with a teacher far beyond the coaching partnership.

It is worth reiterating that our model is inchoate. Indeed, future research is necessary to put our model to the test in a variety of programs using distant internship placements. Lingering questions remain about time constraints for both supervisor and intern, the level of autonomy that should be provided to interns, the role of the mentor teacher in this model, and the place for corrective feedback in both coaching and inquiry cycles. Particularly as scholars continue to explore "the affordances of video for teacher education and those aspects of teacher cognition

that are influenced by the viewing [and making] of video" (Sherin & van Es, 2002, p. 2535), investigations should also consider how various models of video integration compare with one another. We suggest that adopting our hybrid approach could provide a coherent model of integration to form the basis of such comparisons.

Ultimately, however, we are reminded of the old saying that the perfect is the enemy of the good, and we thus acknowledge that the ideal vision for what we would like to happen in teacher education must contend with concrete realities. To that end, we welcome collaborators to engage in dialogue as to what distant supervision of student teachers should look like. Honoring Sydnor's (2016) belief that "reflection that results in action is what is truly beneficial for improving practice" (p. 68), we look forward to putting our model to work with the help of critical friends.

References

Adams, A., Ross, D., Burns, J., & Gibbs, L. (2015). Talking points: Data displays are an effective way to engage teachers. *Learning Forward*, *36*(1), 24-29.

Alger, C., & Kopcha, T. J. (2009). eSupervision: A technology framework for the 2st century field experience in teacher education. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *18*(2), 31-46.

Allexsaht-Snider, M., Deegan, J. G., & White, C. S. (1995). Educational renewal in an alternative teacher education program: Evolution of a school-university partnership. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *11*(5), 519-530.

Athanases, S. Z., Bennett, L. H., & Wahleithner, J. M. (2015). Adaptive teaching for English language arts: Following the pathway of classroom data in preservice teacher inquiry. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *47*(1), 83-114.

Baecher, L., & Kung, S. (2011). Jumpstarting novice teachers' ability to analyze classroom video: Affordances of an online workshop. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, *28*(1), 16-26.

Boyle-Baise, M., & McIntyre, J. D. (2008). What kind of experience? Preparing teachers in PDS or community settings. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.) (pp. 307-330). New York: Routledge/Taylor Francis.

Burns, R. W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2016). Preservice teacher supervision within field experiences in a decade of reform: A comprehensive meta-analysis of the empirical literature from 2001-2013. *Teacher Education and Practice*, *29*(1), 46-75.

Chandler-Olcott, K. (2002). Teacher research as a self-extending system for practitioners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *29*(1), 23-38.

Cherrington, S., & Loveridge, J. (2014). Using video to promote early childhood teachers' thinking and reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *41*, 42-51.

Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Friedman, A., & Pine, G. (2009). Inquiry on inquiry: Practitioner research and student learning. *Action in Teacher Education*, *31*(2), 17-32.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cuthrell, K., Steadman, S. C., Stapleton, J., & Hodge, E. (2016). Developing expertise: Using video to hone teacher candidates' classroom observation skills. *The New Educator*, *12*(1), 5-27.

Dana, N. F. (2015). Understanding inquiry as stance: Illustration and analysis of one teacher researcher's work. *Learning Landscapes*, *8*(2), 161-172.

Dana, N. F. & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2014). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57*(3), 300-314.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1-2), 35-47.

Endacott, J. L. (2016). Using video-stimulated recall to enhance preservice-teacher reflection. *The New Educator*, *12*(1), 28-47.

Garrett, J. L., & Dudt, K. (1998). Using video conferencing to supervise student teaching. In S. McNeil, J. Price, S. Boger-Mehall, B. Robin & J. Willis (Eds.), *Proceedings of SITE 1998--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 1096-1100).

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hoffman, J. V., Wetzel, M. M., Maloch, B., Greeter, E., Taylor, L., DeJulio, S., & Vlach, S. K. (2015). What can we learn from studying the coaching

interactions between cooperating teachers and preservice teachers? A literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *52*, 99-112.

Johnson, H. J., & Cotterman, M. E. (2015). Developing preservice teachers' knowledge of science teaching through video clubs. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, *26*(4), 393-417.

Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Knight, J. (2011). What good coaches do. *Educational Leadership*, *69*(2), 18-22.

Kopcha, T. J., & Alger, C. (2011). The impact of technology-enhanced student teacher supervision on student teacher knowledge, performance, and self-efficacy uring the field experience. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *45*(1), 49-73.

Lombardi, J. (2001). Supervision of student teachers: emerging models and innovative approaches in the USA. *Teacher Development*, *5*(3), 309-322.

Lysaker, J., & Thompson, B. (2013). Teacher research as a practical tool for learning to teach. *Language Arts*, *90*(3), 181-191.

McFadden, J., Ellis, J., Anwar, T., & Roehrig, G. (2014). Beginning science teachers' use of a digital video annotation tool to promote reflective practices. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, *23*(3), 458-470.

Mule, L. (2006). Preservice teachers' inquiry in a professional development school context: Implications for the practicum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*, 205-218.

Paulsen, T. H., & Schmidt-Crawford, D. A. (2017). Enhancing student teacher supervision through hybridization: Adding e-supervision to the mix. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *58*(2), 166-179.

Phillips, D. K. & Carr, K. (2009). Dilemmas of trustworthiness in preservice teacher action research. *Action Research*, *7*(2), 207-226.

Osmanoglu, A. (2016). Prospective teachers' teaching experience: teacher learning through the use of video. *Educational Research*, *58*(1), 39-55.

Schiera, A. J. (2014). Practitioner research as "praxidents" waiting to happen. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, *11*(2), 107-116.

Seidel, T., Blomberg, G., & Renkl, A. (2013). Instructional strategies for using video in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *34*(1), 56-65.

Sherin, M., & van Es, E. A. (2002). Using video to support teachers' ability to interpret classroom interactions. In S. Talley (Ed.), *Video cases. Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education, SITE 2002 Section* (pp. 2532-2536). Norfolk, VA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education.

Sherin, M., & van Es, E. (2009). Effects of video club participation on teachers' professional vision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*(1), 20-37.

Simpson, M. (2006). Field experience in distance delivered initial teacher education programmes. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *14*(2), 241-254.

Sinnema, C., Meyer, F., & Aitken, G. (2017). Capturing the complex, situated, and active nature of teaching through inquiry-oriented standards for teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *68*(1), 9-27.

Smith, J. J., Stapleton, J. N., Cuthrell, K. C., Brinkley, J., & Covington, V. M. (2016). Improving the internship model: Instructional coaches for teacher candidates. *Teacher Education and Practice*, *29*(2), 344-358.

Sydnor, J. (2016). Using video to enhance reflective practice: Student teachers' dialogic examination of their own teaching. *The New Educator*, *12*(1), 67-84.

The University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning, Learning Forward, & Public Impact. (2016). *Coaching for impact: Six pillars to create coaching roles that achieve their potential to improve teaching and learning*. Gainesville: University of Florida Lastinger Center; Oxford, OH: Learning Forward; and Chapel Hill, NC: Public Impact. Retrieved from www.learningforward.org/coaching-for-impact/

Tripp, T. R., & Rich, P. J. (2012). The influence of video analysis on the process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(5), 728-739.

Truxaw, M. P., Casa, T. M., & Adelson, J. L. (2011). A stance toward inquiry: An investigation of preservice teachers' confidence regarding educational inquiry. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *38*, 69-95.

Tschannen-Moran, B., & Tschannen-Moran, M.. (2011). The coach and the evaluator. *Educational Leadership*, *69*(2),10-16.

Ulanoff, S. H., Vega-Castaneda, L., & Quiocho, A. M. L. (2003). Teachers as researchers: Developing an inquiry ethic. *Teacher Development*, *7*(3), 403-436.

Webb, T. (2002). Teacher power: The exercise of professional autonomy in an era of strict accountability. *Teacher Development*, *6*(1), 47-62.

Wiggins, G. (2012). 7 keys to effective feedback. *Educational Leadership*, *71*(1), 11-16.

Wilson, E. K. (2006). The impact of an alternative model of student teacher supervision: Views of the participants. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*, 22-31.

Wolkenhauer, R., & Hooser, A. (2017). "Inquiry is confidence": How practitioner inquiry can support new teachers. *Journal of Practitioner Research*, *2*(1), 1-11.

Zeichner, K. (2002). Beyond traditional structures of student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *29*(2), 59-64.