

## **OESCA Instructional Coaching Survey Executive Summary**

[Link to Survey Results Summary Spreadsheet](#)

The survey assessed whether Education Service Centers (ESCs) provide Instructional Coaching services to their member districts. Out of 40 participating ESCs, 35 confirmed offering coaching services, while five do not currently provide them. Among the ESCs without coaching services, four expressed interest in offering them in the future. The survey also explored the frequency and focus areas of coaching services. Five ESCs reported ongoing coaching, three provided coaching as requested, and the most common focus areas were literacy and math. Other areas mentioned include career education, general education consulting, gifted education, HQIM, personalized learning, and STEAM education. However, not all ESCs provided expanded responses, limiting the representation of data.

Regarding training and support for instructional coaches, out of 35 responding ESCs, 28 provide training and support. Nine ESCs do not provide specific training, embedding it within content-specific professional development or offering networking opportunities instead. Thirteen ESCs provide ongoing training, and five offer training as requested. Various resources are utilized, including ESC staff, resources from the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), coaching experts like Jim Knight, and external programs/platforms. Training areas cover literacy, math, gifted education, HQIM, and other topics like technology, science/STEM, wellness, and data analysis. However, responses were voluntary and may not represent all ESCs.

Partnerships for instructional coaching training and support were reported by 22 out of 35 ESCs. Collaborations primarily involve SSTs and other ESCs, while the ODE is involved in some instances. Partnerships focus on areas such as literacy, dyslexia, HQIM, data coaching, EL, UDL, MTSS, EVAAS, SAS, resident educator programs, curriculum, threat assessment, data analysis, and technology. However, responses were voluntary and may not capture all ESCs' perspectives.

Utilization of ODE-developed coaching resources was reported by 22 out of 35 ESCs. Resources focused on literacy coaching were the most frequently utilized, including instructional coaching for literacy, peer coaching for literacy, and leading adolescent literacy. Other resources covered formative instructional practices, instructional mentoring, coaching for self-reflection and instructional change, rigor and differentiation, and preparedness for teaching instructional mentoring. However, responses were voluntary and may not reflect all ESCs' practices.

Regarding contracting with coaching experts, seven out of 35 ESCs reported doing so. Universities and coaching consultants/consultant companies were the contracted partners, covering areas such as educational consulting, literacy instruction, career education, after-school programs, foundation support, inquiry learning, and entrepreneurship education. However, responses were voluntary and may not reflect all ESCs' practices.

The primary focus of instructional coaching work among the surveyed ESCs is on literacy, followed by universal instructional coaching that is non-content specific. Other areas of focus include co-teaching, intervention specialists, gifted intervention specialists, math coaching, instructional technology, and science coaching.

Additional insights provided by ESCs included robust coaching services, the need for sustainable funding opportunities, interest in ODE's instructional coaching services, coaching provided by general curriculum staff, challenges with staffing and PD time, and various individual experiences and programs/partnerships.

Regarding support materials/resources for building ESC capacity, the needs mentioned included sustainable funding, expanded professional development opportunities, a common language and better understanding of instructional coaching, regional collaboratives and networking opportunities, and additional resources such as ODE's LMS for Instructional Coaching, expert content area support, coaching endorsement/licensure, and shared services.

Overall, the survey findings highlight the provision and potential growth of Instructional Coaching services among ESCs, diverse training approaches, and resources, collaborative partnerships, utilization of ODE-developed resources, involvement of external coaching experts, primary focus areas, and additional resources.

## **Extended Summary by Survey Item**

### **Do you currently provide Instructional Coaching services to your member districts?**

The survey aimed to assess whether the respondent Education Service Centers (ESCs) currently provide Instructional Coaching services to their member districts. Out of the 40 ESCs that participated, 35 confirmed that they do offer Instructional Coaching services. However, five ESCs indicated that they do not currently provide coaching services.

Among the ESCs that do not currently offer Instructional Coaching, four expressed an interest in providing such services in the future, indicating potential growth in this area.

The survey also explored the frequency of Instructional Coaching services among the ESCs. Among those ESCs that provide coaching, five reported that the services are ongoing, while three indicated that coaching is provided as requested by the districts.

Additionally, the survey sought to identify the areas of focus within Instructional Coaching services. The most common areas identified were literacy and math, with three ESCs reporting each as their primary focus. Other areas mentioned include the Resident Educator Program, career education and workforce development, general education consulting, gifted education, High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM), personalized learning, and STEAM education, with each area represented by one ESC.

It is important to note that the expanded responses regarding frequency and focus were voluntary and not provided by all ESCs, which may limit the overall representation of the data.

Based on the survey findings, a majority of the ESCs currently offer Instructional Coaching services to their member districts, with a notable interest in expanding these services in the future. The most common areas of focus are literacy and math, but a range of other instructional areas are also being addressed through coaching support. These findings provide insights into the provision and potential growth of Instructional Coaching services among the surveyed ESCs.

### **Do you provide training and support for your instructional coaches? Please describe. 35 ESCs, 39 total form responses**

In addition to assessing the provision of Instructional Coaching services, the survey also sought to understand the training and support provided to instructional coaches by Education Service Centers (ESCs). Out of the 35 ESCs that responded, 28 confirmed that they provide training and support for their instructional coaches. However, nine ESCs either do not provide specific training for coaching or embed coaching training within professional development (PD) for content areas. Two ESCs reported that they offer networking opportunities instead of formal training.

Among the ESCs that provide training, 13 indicated that it is ongoing, while five reported offering training as requested or as needed.

Various resources were mentioned for providing training to instructional coaches. Seven ESCs reported that their own staff provides training, while five ESCs rely on resources from the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). Four ESCs mentioned coaching experts such as Jim Knight, while one ESC mentioned SIBME Virtual Coaching, The National Equity Project Coaching, Elena Aguilar's Coaching for Equity,

Cognitive Coaching, Google, Rutherford Learning Group, and SSTs (Student Support Teams) as training resources.

The areas of training for instructional coaches were diverse. Nine ESCs reported providing training in literacy, five in math, three in gifted education, and three in High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM). Other areas mentioned include technology, ODE mandates, science/STEM, curriculum, wellness, project-based learning (PBL), preschool, data analysis, classroom management, and student engagement, each represented by one ESC.

Based on the survey findings, the majority of the ESCs offer training and support for their instructional coaches, although some ESCs integrate coaching training within content-specific professional development or rely on networking opportunities. Training is provided on an ongoing basis or as requested/as needed. Various resources are utilized for training, including ESC staff, ODE resources, coaching experts like Jim Knight, and other external programs and platforms. The training covers a wide range of areas, with a focus on literacy, math, gifted education, and HQIM. These findings provide insights into the training and support provided to instructional coaches by the surveyed ESCs, highlighting the diverse approaches and resources utilized in enhancing coaching effectiveness.

**Are you partnering with colleagues from other ESCs or SSTs in the development and/or provision of instructional coaching training and support? Please describe.**

**35 ESCs, 39 responses**

The survey also explored whether Education Service Centers (ESCs) and Student Support Teams (SSTs) partner with colleagues from other ESCs or SSTs in the development and provision of instructional coaching training and support. Out of the 35 ESCs that responded, 22 ESCs reported partnering with colleagues, while 15 ESCs stated that they do not engage in such partnerships. Two ESCs did not provide a response to this question.

Among the partnerships established, 16 ESCs reported collaborating with SSTs, while 14 ESCs partnered with other ESCs. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) was mentioned as a partner by one ESC.

The areas of focus for these partnerships varied. Nine ESCs reported partnering with colleagues for literacy and dyslexia training, while three ESCs focused on High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM). Other areas mentioned include data coaching, English language instruction (EL), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS), Standards Aligned System (SAS), Resident Educator program, curriculum adoptions/adaptations, threat assessment, data analysis, and technology, each represented by one ESC.

Based on the survey findings, a considerable number of ESCs and SSTs engage in partnerships with colleagues for the development and provision of instructional coaching training and support. These partnerships primarily involve collaboration with SSTs and other ESCs, while the ODE is also involved in some instances. The focus areas of these partnerships span literacy, dyslexia, HQIM, data coaching, EL, UDL, MTSS, EVAAS, SAS, resident educator programs, curriculum, threat assessment, data analysis, and technology. These findings provide insights into the collaborative efforts undertaken by the surveyed ESCs and SSTs in enhancing the quality of instructional coaching training and support, highlighting the range of areas addressed through these partnerships.

**In your process of developing instructional coaching supports, have you utilized any ODE-developed coaching resources that are housed in the ODE LMS?**

**35 ESCs, 39 total responses**

The survey also examined the utilization of Ohio Department of Education (ODE)-developed coaching resources housed in the ODE Learning Management System (LMS) during the process of developing instructional coaching supports. Out of the 35 Education Service Centers (ESCs) that responded, 22 ESCs reported utilizing ODE-developed coaching resources, while 17 ESCs stated that they had not used these resources.

Among the ESCs that utilized ODE-developed coaching resources, several specific resources were mentioned. The most frequently utilized resources include "Instructional Coaching for Literacy" (17 ESCs), "Peer Coaching for Literacy" (13 ESCs), "Leading Adolescent Literacy" (11 ESCs), "Formative Instructional Practices (FIP) Leading and Coaching" (10 ESCs), and "Instructional Mentoring" (10 ESCs). Additionally, "Coaching for Self-Reflection and Instructional Change" (6 ESCs), "Rigor and Differentiation" (5 ESCs), and "Prepared to Teach Instructional Mentoring" (3 ESCs) were also utilized.

Based on the survey findings, a significant number of ESCs have utilized ODE-developed coaching resources housed in the ODE Learning Management System during the development of instructional coaching supports. These resources cover various areas, with a particular emphasis on literacy coaching, including resources focused on instructional coaching for literacy, peer coaching for literacy, and leading adolescent literacy. Other resources utilized span topics such as formative instructional practices, instructional mentoring, coaching for self-reflection and instructional change, rigor and differentiation, and preparedness for teaching instructional mentoring. These findings shed light on the adoption of ODE-developed coaching resources by the surveyed ESCs and highlight the emphasis placed on literacy coaching within their instructional coaching supports.

**Is your ESC contracting with coaching experts in Ohio not employed by an ESC? (i.e., any university faculty or coaching consultant company) Please describe.**

**35 ESCs, 39 responses**

The survey also inquired about Education Service Centers' (ESCs) contracting practices with coaching experts in Ohio who are not employed by an ESC, such as university faculty or coaching consultant companies. Out of the 35 ESCs that responded, only seven ESCs reported contracting with coaching experts, while the remaining 32 ESCs either indicated that they do not contract with external coaching experts or did not provide a response to the question.

Among the ESCs that do contract with coaching experts, five ESCs listed universities as their contracted partners. The universities mentioned include Bluffton University, Bowling Green State University, Lourdes University, Owens Community College, Ohio University Southern, Rhodes State University, University of Cincinnati, and the University of Toledo.

Three ESCs reported contracting with coaching consultants or coaching consultant companies. The coaching consultants and organizations mentioned include EnvisionEd Plus, IMSE, Lewis Family McDonalds (Career Ed), Ohio After School Network, PAST Foundation, Rutherford Learning Group, StartSOLE (Inquiry Learning), and Young Entrepreneurs Institute.

Based on the survey findings, a minority of the surveyed ESCs contract with coaching experts who are not employed by an ESC. The contracted partners mainly include universities and coaching consultants

or coaching consultant companies. Universities mentioned in the responses encompassed a range of institutions across Ohio. Coaching consultants and organizations mentioned in the responses cover various areas, including educational consulting, literacy instruction, career education, after-school programs, foundation support, inquiry learning, and entrepreneurship education. These findings provide insights into the involvement of external coaching experts in the instructional coaching practices of the surveyed ESCs, showcasing the partnerships with universities and coaching consultants to enhance coaching effectiveness and support.

### **Which of the following would you say is the primary focus of this work?**

#### **35 ESCs, 39 responses**

The survey sought to identify the primary focus of the work conducted by Education Service Centers (ESCs) in the realm of instructional coaching. Out of the 35 ESCs that responded, 33 ESCs indicated that their primary focus is on literacy. Additionally, 23 ESCs reported a primary focus on universal instructional coaching that is non-content specific.

Other areas of focus mentioned by the ESCs include co-teaching, intervention specialists, and gifted intervention specialists, which was reported by 19 ESCs. Math coaching was identified as the primary focus by 15 ESCs, while instructional technology was mentioned by 14 ESCs. Finally, science coaching was identified as the primary focus by 9 ESCs.

Based on the survey findings, the majority of the surveyed ESCs have a primary focus on literacy in their instructional coaching work. Additionally, a significant number of ESCs prioritize universal instructional coaching that is non-content specific. Other areas of focus include co-teaching, intervention specialists, gifted intervention specialists, math coaching, instructional technology, and science coaching. These findings provide insights into the primary areas of emphasis in the instructional coaching efforts of the surveyed ESCs, highlighting the importance placed on literacy and the breadth of focus across various content areas and instructional support domains.

### **Which of the following would you say is the specific educator focus of this work?**

#### **35 ESCs, 39 responses**

The survey also aimed to determine the specific educator focus of the work conducted by Education Service Centers (ESCs) in the realm of instructional coaching. Out of the 35 ESCs that responded, the following educator focuses were reported:

- Paraprofessionals: 10 ESCs indicated that their instructional coaching work primarily targets paraprofessionals, providing support and guidance to this group of educators.
- Primary (PreK-3) General Ed. Teachers: All 39 ESCs reported a specific educator focus on primary general education teachers, emphasizing the importance of supporting educators in the early grades.
- Middle School General Ed. Teachers: 33 ESCs identified middle school general education teachers as a specific focus of their instructional coaching efforts, providing targeted support to educators in this grade range.
- High School General Ed. Teachers: 28 ESCs reported a primary focus on high school general education teachers, highlighting the need for instructional coaching at the secondary level.

- Intervention Specialists: 21 ESCs indicated that their instructional coaching work primarily targets intervention specialists, offering specialized support to these educators who work with students requiring additional interventions.

Based on the survey findings, the specific educator focus of the instructional coaching work conducted by the surveyed ESCs varies. However, a strong emphasis is placed on supporting primary general education teachers, middle school general education teachers, and high school general education teachers. Paraprofessionals and intervention specialists also receive significant attention in terms of targeted instructional coaching. These findings underscore the importance of providing tailored support to educators at different grade levels and with diverse roles to enhance their instructional practices and student outcomes.

**Is there any other information about instructional coaching services that you would like to share?**

When asked if there was any other information about instructional coaching services that they would like to share, the Education Service Centers (ESCs) provided additional insights. The responses included:

- Three ESCs mentioned that their ESC offers robust instructional coaching services, indicating the strength and effectiveness of their coaching programs.
- Three ESCs expressed a need for sustainable funding opportunities to support their instructional coaching services, highlighting the financial challenges they face in maintaining and expanding these programs.
- Two ESCs expressed an interest in receiving more information about Ohio Department of Education's (ODE) instructional coaching services, indicating a desire to explore and leverage the resources provided by ODE.
- Two ESCs mentioned that their instructional coaching is provided by their general curriculum staff, indicating the involvement of dedicated staff members in delivering coaching services.
- Two ESCs highlighted challenges such as lack of adequate staffing, lack of substitute teachers for released teachers, and limited professional development (PD) time for teachers, which can impact the implementation and effectiveness of instructional coaching.
- Other individual responses included the utilization of a curriculum coaching model with positive results, the development of instructional coaching for paraprofessionals, ongoing pilot programs, significant impact of literacy instructional supports, coaching not being their primary role, literacy-focused coaching, grant-funded coaching opportunities, and previous coaching programs/partners such as Battelle for Kids, Jim Knight, and Corwin.

These additional insights provided by the ESCs highlight various aspects related to instructional coaching services, including the availability and strength of coaching programs, funding needs, interest in ODE's resources, staffing and PD challenges, and the impact of coaching on specific areas such as literacy. They also demonstrate the diversity of approaches and partnerships in providing coaching services, as well as the ongoing efforts to develop and expand coaching programs.

**What other support materials/resources would you find helpful in building your ESC's capacity toward this work?**

When asked about other support materials/resources that would be helpful in building their Education Service Center's (ESC) capacity for instructional coaching work, the ESCs provided various responses. These included:

- Thirteen ESCs expressed a need for sustainable funding, highlighting the importance of securing long-term financial support for their coaching programs.
- Seven ESCs emphasized the desire for expanded professional development opportunities, including train-the-trainer programs and guidance on structuring and providing coaching services to districts. This reflects the need for ongoing learning and development to enhance coaching effectiveness.
- Three ESCs highlighted the importance of establishing a common language and a better understanding of instructional coaching among ESCs and districts. This points to the need for improved communication and collaboration to align coaching practices and goals.
- Two ESCs expressed the desire for regional in-person collaboratives, activities, and resources to foster networking and shared learning among coaches within their regions.
- Other responses included the request for additional resources such as Ohio Department of Education's (ODE) Learning Management System (LMS) for Instructional Coaching resources, networking opportunities with other ESCs, expert content area support, ODE coaching endorsement/licensure, templates for documentation, continued focus on High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM), access to best practices, a statewide coaching program, incorporating a mix of content and coaching in-state meetings, more information on instructional coaching, an instructional coaching conference, and shared services.

These responses indicate the diverse needs and aspirations of the ESCs in terms of support materials and resources for building their capacity in instructional coaching. Key areas of focus include sustainable funding, professional development opportunities, common understanding and language around coaching, regional collaboration, access to resources and templates, and alignment with state initiatives. These findings underscore the importance of ongoing support, collaboration, and the availability of relevant resources to enhance the effectiveness and impact of instructional coaching efforts.