



Teacher Development

An international journal of teachers' professional development

ISSN: 1366-4530 (Print) 1747-5120 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rtde20>

Coaching between experts – opportunities for teachers' professional development

Miriam Ben-Peretz, Eli Gottlieb & Ido Gideon

To cite this article: Miriam Ben-Peretz, Eli Gottlieb & Ido Gideon (2018) Coaching between experts – opportunities for teachers' professional development, *Teacher Development*, 22:3, 303-313, DOI: [10.1080/13664530.2018.1438310](https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2018.1438310)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2018.1438310>



Published online: 06 Apr 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 25



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Coaching between experts – opportunities for teachers' professional development

Miriam Ben-Peretz^a, Eli Gottlieb^b and Ido Gideon^c

^aDepartment of Education, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel; ^b Mandel Leadership Institute, Jerusalem, Israel; ^cLevinsky College of Education, Tel-Aviv, Israel

ABSTRACT

Sharing experiences among teachers is an important part of professional development. Coaching is defined as an ongoing process in which experts engage with practice, with the purpose of continuous improvement. This article will discuss the principles of peer coaching in teacher development, by examining a specific case of peer coaching between two experienced teacher educators. From this analysis, we derive two major concepts as guiding the process of peer coaching: *joint deliberation* and *metapedagogy*. These two features are conceptualized using excerpts from the case study and from the literature.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 30 June 2016
Accepted 2 June 2017

KEYWORDS

Professional learning;
metapedagogy; deliberation;
coaching; teacher
development

Background – the principles of peer coaching

Scholars, practitioners, and policy-makers have long recognized that sustained school improvement depends on lifelong learning by teachers at least as much as it depends on effective pre-service training (Darling-Hammond 2008; Feiman-Nemser 2012; Flores and Day 2006). The mentoring of novice teachers by more experienced teachers is widely considered an effective way to guide new practitioners into the field and to support their continued professional growth (Achinstein et al. 2010; Feiman-Nemser and Parker 1993; Orland-Barak 2014). Studies that have examined such mentoring have tended to focus on pre-service mentoring and the mentoring of novice teachers in their first year or two out of college (Feiman-Nemser and Parker 1993). We argue for a conception of in-service teacher development that transcends the hierarchical relationship between mentor and mentee, to achieve a dialogical interaction between two established professionals. Peer coaching can be effective and satisfying for teachers by providing them with an opportunity to observe, reflect, exchange ideas, and share problem-solving (Bergen, Engelen, and Derksen 2006; Zwart et al. 2008).

Peer coaching describes precisely this sort of non-hierarchical relationship. Peer coaching generally involves two colleagues engaged in a mutually supportive relationship, aimed at improving practice (Lu 2010). Different models and practices of peer coaching have been a part of teacher development, both in-service and pre-service, since the early 1980s

(Joyce and Showers 1980). Gottesman (2000) points to the difference between the role of the 'evaluative supervisor' and the coach. Gottesman's non-evaluative model of peer coaching supplies 'simple procedures and rules for teachers to begin the conversation about instructional strategies in a non-threatening manner and also includes a structure to begin lesson analysis without evaluation' (Gottesman 2000, 13). The non-hierarchical nature of peer coaching is the starting point of our article, as we especially focus on the structure of interaction between two experienced senior teacher educators.

Teaching is something that generally happens behind closed doors, away from the attentions of peers and researchers. To overcome this 'pedagogical solitude,' Shulman (1993) calls for the transformation of teaching into community property by making it visible and valuable by peer review. The idea of a shared world of practice as a basis of professional improvement is a fundamental assumption of Gawande (2011), who discusses examples of coaching between experienced professionals from a variety of professions, including sports, music, and medicine. According to Gawande, experts can improve their performance by inviting another expert to provide feedback after viewing their work. Coaching assumes that professional improvement is possible at any stage of one's career. Indeed, it may be even more necessary at advanced stages, when experienced practitioners have fewer opportunities to invest in their own self-improvement. Gawande (2011) describes this as a 'plateau,' in which the professional needs to seek external assistance:

During the first two or three years in practice, your skills seem to improve almost daily ... You learn the problems that can occur during a particular procedure or with a particular condition, and you learn how to either prevent or respond to those problems ... Over time, you learn how to head off problems, and, when you can't, you arrive at solutions with less fumbling and more assurance.

In his study of the professional induction of psychiatrists, Light (1979) suggests one possible reason for such plateaus. According to Light, professional identity is established by engaging with uncertainties concerning professional knowledge, proper diagnosis of problems, best possible procedures, and relations with colleagues and clients. The process of becoming a professional means gradually gaining a feeling of control over these uncertainties, by developing an 'approach' that has 'internal and circuitous consistency, which one could call ideology' (Light 1979, 319). Practitioners may seek to avoid the 'discomfort of uncertainty' by relying on 'ideological formulations' (296). We would argue that this insight is relevant also to the teaching profession, where 'ideological formulations' about teaching and learning may inhibit continued professional learning of teachers. Once a teacher's professional understanding of his or her practice supports a more or less stable perception of what teaching is and how to solve problems, there is little incentive to 'push forward' and continue to learn about teaching – from colleagues, from literature, or even from one's own experience.

Coaches, however, may accompany practitioners well into their professional lives, becoming their 'eyes and ears' and providing critical feedback within a sustained relationship, wherein areas for improvement are agreed upon through mutual deliberation, rather than through formative assessment (as in the case of Gottesman's 'clinical instructor' or mentor). For the purposes of in-service professional development of teachers, the practice of coaching of experienced teachers by other experienced teachers may be one way to overcome the pedagogical solitude that Shulman (1993) describes. By relating to the professional teaching

experiences of others, teachers may create opportunities to reflect on and improve their own practice.

But the breach of solitude may also constitute a major risk in the relationship between coach and coachee in that the coachee will accept too readily the coach's judgment and advice (Hobson and Malderez 2013). Kohler et al. (1997) point to the implication of this risk in schools, when teachers may perceive the process of coaching a violation of 'traditional norms of autonomy, privacy, and equality in schools' (Kohler et al. 1997, 241). We argue that in some cases, this tendency may be even more dangerous when the coach chooses the general themes and issues around which the conversation revolves. When this happens, the coachee does not play an active part in deciding how to address his or her own teaching process in mutual discussion. The two concepts that we offer in this article, *deliberation* and *meta pedagogy*, might serve to equalize the input of both sides in the dialogical coaching process. The two concepts will be discussed later in the article, but for now we can point to the major difference between the two: deliberation will be used to describe the *process* of peer coaching, and meta pedagogy will be used to describe the *content* of peer coaching.

Method

In this article, we examine the kinds of learning that take place in coaching between experienced teachers. We collected our data from a series of coaching episodes that took place between Miriam Ben-Peretz and Eli Gottlieb in the winter of 2012. Inspired by Gawande (2011), Eli invited Miriam to observe his weekly classes, and to meet immediately thereafter for a conversation. The classes were part of a six-part course Eli was teaching at a mid-career professional development program for educational leaders on the topic of 'identity and education.' Both the coach and coachee are experienced teacher educators, with a background in research and teaching relevant to the course. However, the coach (Miriam) had over 30 years' more experience in these areas than did the coachee (Eli).

Following each observed class, Miriam and Eli met to discuss Miriam's observations. Eli's classes were videotaped, and Eli and Miriam's post-observation conversations were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim. These transcripts were then analyzed qualitatively. Major themes that emerged from this analysis are presented further on, leading to recommendations for the professional development of teachers.

Theme 1: non-hierarchical joint deliberation

The first theme we identified in Eli and Miriam's conversations was their collaborative, non-hierarchical structure. In contrast to mentor-mentee interactions, in which the mentor instructs the mentee, Eli and Miriam's conversations did not exhibit any clear hierarchy of professional knowledge. Each of the experts treated the other as equally responsible for the development of the conversation, pointing to issues that arose from practice and suggesting a way forward. We identify the dynamic in such situations as closely related to Schwab's (1982) conception of educational deliberation.

In Schwab's analysis, deliberation differs from debate. In debate, people who have already formed their opinions gather to advocate and defend them. In deliberation, on the other hand, there is a joint effort to address the issue at hand by engaging with different

perspectives. Deliberation contrasts also with ‘alternating monologues,’ where there is sequential talking but no real listening, let alone empathy (Parker 1997). Deliberation is a form of dialog in which participants present particular positions, but they are open to changing their minds. Moreover, deliberation is not simply a tool for achieving understanding, but also an ‘*experience of moving toward and possessing understanding.*’ (Schwab 1982, 105). In other words, the experience of deliberation itself is a significant part of what is learned.

In the case of deliberation between experts, the symmetry between the two professionals means that their respective opinions both ‘matter.’ We believe that it is this ‘jointness’ and lack of hierarchy that enabled the deliberation to problematize assumptions that formerly seemed stable. In this regard, the coaching episodes involved what Gadamer (1975) calls ‘fusion of horizons.’ Such fusion occurs when each participant in a dialog examines his or her own presuppositions and acknowledges the claims of his or her discussion partner. This is achieved, not through accepting one or other of the positions expressed, but by acknowledging the differences between each position and thereby modifying the positions through an act of joint deliberation.

We will now illustrate this feature of expert–expert coaching with an excerpt in which Miriam comments on Eli’s practice of asking students to read aloud. The excerpt is drawn from the second of the three coaching episodes. It followed Miriam’s observation of the course’s fourth class.

- M: Several times you let them read aloud. And I asked myself, what’s the value of reading aloud? And I thought that it’s important, that it brings an additional element into the whole subject of the class. The class is also a performance. And, look, when you read you give a very clear significance to the text [...] But, again, you need to think about how to structure it and how much to use it. I’m not sure that the educational message is entirely clear.
- E: Yes ... there are really two things that led me to reading aloud. One is to place the text very much at the center. As opposed to the text being a kind of background and then we spill out whatever we have in our guts. The second thing is that there are texts that are difficult but important enough to spend time on them. So a big part of my work on this kind of reading is to choose the shortest text.
- M: Right, that’s excellent
- E: But there’s a great cost here. It’s kind of infantilization, something maybe a bit forced, that’s reminiscent of a classroom.
- M: But the paragraph is really complex, that last paragraph that you read. But I think, for example, in the previous class I attended, you spoke about how you have to let the text speak to you. So you need to repeat that message. Why read the text? What does it mean? And today you used, also in this context, the distinction between what the author does and what he says. It’s not clear to me that they understand it [...] The texts are so appropriate that it’s a shame not to make full use of them [...] These students are supposed to learn something for their future work. So, there could be considerations, after the analysis, like: What would you do? Should these things be discussed? And in what context? To what ends? Give it in the context of their professional identities.

Miriam begins by affirming Eli’s pedagogical choices (‘I thought that it’s important’). Then she asks a series of probing questions. These questions are delicate and oblique (‘I asked myself what’s the value of reading aloud’), and Miriam goes to great lengths to show her support for Eli’s pedagogical choices (‘it brings an additional element’, ‘also a performance’, ‘a very clear significance’). But she is quite forceful in suggesting questions for Eli to address (‘you need to think about how to structure it and how much to use it. I’m not sure that the educational message is entirely clear’).

Eli responds by articulating his rationale for placing so much emphasis on reading aloud ('there are really two things'). Miriam affirms Eli's choices ('Right, that's excellent'). Then, Eli shares with Miriam his own doubts ('But there's a great cost here'). Miriam reassures him ('But the paragraph is really complex'). However, she does not leave things there. She encourages him to articulate further the reasons he gave to the students for reading this way ('you spoke about how you have to let the text speak to you. So you need to repeat that message. Why read the text? What does it mean?'). She then goes on to suggest additional ways in which the coachee might exploit the texts he selected. In particular, she encourages him to take into account the broader context within which the identity issues with which the texts deal impact upon the lives of his students, and the practical educational questions this raises for them. However, she is careful not to leave Eli 'hanging,' with a set of abstract questions on which to reflect on his own. Instead, she brings the conversation back to practice and offers a variety of possible discussion questions that he could take up with his students in a future class.

The ebbs and flows in this excerpt illustrate the non-hierarchical, collaborative nature of expert-expert coaching. Coach and coachee are not engaged in instruction or debate. Nor are they attempting to formulate a solution to a specific practical problem. Instead, they are engaged in a joint deliberation to advance their understanding of the professional field in which they both operate. As the conversation proceeds, a new, collaboratively constructed understanding emerges of the practice of reading aloud, with its benefits and costs. As mentioned above, in deliberation, the subject matter is negotiated within the encounter between the coach and coachee. In the example above, the coach chooses significant themes in the observed lesson and opens them to a joint effort to understand the role of this example from the coachee's lesson. By analyzing the role of reading aloud, the coachee is able to understand in depth and to define in his own terms the practice of his own teaching. It is interesting to note that the coachee introduces themes that are removed from the direct issue of classroom dialog. The result of deliberation is the creation of a collaboratively constructed new understanding of educational themes and concepts. Furthermore, we recognize in the process of deliberation a thematic dynamic – the conversation between the coach and coachee moved from dealing with a particular example (like reading aloud), to a more general concept that describes pedagogic interaction. The following section will develop the concept of metapedagogy as a description of this process.

Theme 2: Metapedagogy

The theme described and illustrated above – 'joint deliberation' – focuses on the *form* of expert-expert coaching. It is less about *what* the coach and coachee discussed than about *how* they discussed it. Our next theme focuses on a distinctive feature of the content of their joint deliberations. We call this feature, 'metapedagogy.' Metapedagogy might be conceived as a set of skills that is hierarchical to pedagogy. If pedagogy is learning to teach, metapedagogy is learning to learn to teach. It is an attempt to make the knowledge of practitioners available to others in spite of the fact that it has embedded in it a substantial tacit dimension. 'The knowledge that is produced has embedded in it a substantial tacit dimension' (Fielding et al. 2003, 34).

Metapedagogy is the outcome of processes that make this tacit knowledge explicit and public, thus, practical knowledge that is created in classrooms becomes available between

school boundaries. Thus, metapedagogy does not stem from theoretical discourse but rather from the concrete practice of teachers. The concept of metapedagogy is crucial to understanding mentoring between experts. It is a process that enables the sharing of knowledge created by expert teachers. Brown, McIntyre, and McIntyre (1993) argued that teachers lack a professional language to discuss their practice. The notion of metapedagogy as presented herewith opens the door to the creation of such a language. It allows individual teaching process and insights gained to become public knowledge.

We use this term to refer to talk about the coachee's general approach to teaching and overall teaching style. This use of the prefix 'meta' has much in common with the use to which it is put in the term 'metaphysics.' It is 'meta' in the sense that discussion of one's general teaching style or approach 'goes beyond' or 'underlies' one's specific teaching practices. This is similar to how discourse about what exists (metaphysics) goes beyond or underlies discourse about how what exists moves through space and time (physics). It is also 'meta' in the sense that it 'comes after,' just as in Andronicus of Rhodes's canonical edition, Aristotle's volume on first philosophy comes after his volume on science. As we will illustrate below, talk of the coachee's general educational approach tended to come after, and emerge from, talk of specific pedagogical practices.

It is important to distinguish the above notion of metapedagogy from other uses of this term in the educational literature (whether hyphenated as meta-pedagogy or written, as here, as a single word). Some have used the term 'meta-pedagogical' to mean simply, 'about teaching or learning.' Examples include Block's (2000) definition of 'meta-pedagogical awareness'; Bravo et al. (2014) definition of 'meta-pedagogical discussions'; McDonald's (2012) discussion of teachers' 'meta-pedagogical' goals, and Aleinikov's (2013) use of the term 'meta-pedagogy' as a synonym of teacher training. In our view, the addition of the 'meta' prefix in these cases is superfluous. Pedagogical discourse is, by definition, discourse *about* teaching.

We define metapedagogical discourse as talk about one's general approach to teaching. The closest precedents we could find for this in the literature were Finney and Philpott's (2010) discussion of formal versus informal metapedagogies and Ergas's (2015) comparison of 'out there' and 'in here' metapedagogies. However, unlike them, we do not conceptualize metapedagogies dichotomously. Since we conceive of metapedagogies simply as sets of general principles that underlie one's teaching practices, we assume their potential number to be indeterminate, rather than fixed at two.

We have gone to such lengths to distinguish our use of the term 'metapedagogy' from others in the literature because we believe that the concept is crucial to understanding a feature of expert-expert mentoring that might be one of its characteristic strengths. We hope this will become clear from the excerpt below.

This excerpt is drawn from the third coaching episode, which took place following the sixth and final class of the course. At the point at which we join them here, Miriam and Eli are discussing the apparent discomfort and disengagement of some of the students:

- E: What is preventing them from participating? What's stopping them?
- M: Do you think that my sitting there disturbs them?
- E: Not at all. Because it's the same also when you're not in the room. It doesn't make a difference.

- E: [...] I thought it was a bit of a shame that there wasn't more variety [in the cases they prepared for homework]. Also there, they played it safe. What do I mean played it safe? I explained to them the difference between [identity formation] as an implicit goal or an explicit goal. And I said that sometimes the more interesting cases are when it's implicit. And they didn't go there. I think that each of them, without exception, brought an example of an intervention or institution whose explicit goal was to shape identity. And that's how it appeared in their goals, that's how it was defined. So here too there's the same phenomenon. They don't want to fail.
- M: Yes, they don't want to fail. They don't want to jump into the water. They want to walk on the beach.
- E: [...] there must be something in the way I'm formulating the questions or formulating the assignments or over structuring. Something here is shaping their experience. It's not possible, it doesn't make sense to me. These are people I've seen. [...] And this isn't typical of them. So there must be something connected to the specific situation.
- M: [... The course] was very varied in terms of opportunities – 'opportunities to learn,' let's call them. So they're not used to it. And most of these opportunities are very 'exposing.' And the last thing they really want to do is to expose themselves. Because, I suppose, this is a very competitive framework. I think you give them a remarkable opportunity to grow, really remarkable. Among other things, it's the collateral curriculum, to see how you can learn, what you can bring, how to connect things. Because they haven't necessarily seen teaching like this. But I think that it threatens them a little. So I think that perhaps one of the pedagogical solutions is not to give up but always to dedicate, beforehand, afterward, and during, a few minutes to say why we are doing this, what's hard about it, and what do you feel like when we do it.

Here, uncharacteristically of their conversations thus far, Eli turns to Miriam with a direct question ('What's stopping them?'). However, Miriam immediately returns the conversation to its format of joint deliberation, by answering with a question with one of her own ('Do you think that my sitting there disturbs them?'). After tentatively ruling out the possibility that her presence is a significant source of disturbance, Miriam invites Eli to consider other differences between his class and classes taught by other members of the faculty.

Eli responds by bringing an additional case of the students holding back. This time, the example is from a homework assignment that Eli discussed with the students in a class that Miriam did not attend. Eli characterizes their work on the assignment as taking the easier, less 'exposing' route, concluding that, 'they don't want to fail.' Miriam confirms this characterization of the students ('they don't want to jump in water. They want to walk on the beach.').

At this point in the conversation, Eli and Miriam might simply have cemented their agreement and moved on to another topic. They would have succeeded in shifting onto the students themselves the 'blame' for their limited engagement in class assignments. Both Eli and Miriam could then have felt good about Eli's teaching and their joint analysis thereof.

But this isn't what happened next. Instead, Eli continues to worry away at the reasons for the students' discomfort, and to share his puzzlement with Miriam. Specifically, he wonders aloud how he might be unintentionally contributing to their discomfort or reticence ('something in the way I'm formulating the questions or formulating the assignments or over structuring'). This moment illustrates how metapedagogical discourse may originate in a discussion of a specific, practical problem, but it soon transcends the specifics and focuses less on problem-solving than on gaining greater insight into one's basic assumptions about teaching.

Miram immediately reassures Eli that his teaching approach has great advantages ('you give them a remarkable opportunity to grow'), including exposing the students to varied and novel forms of learning. But she also notes the downside of all this novelty ('they haven't necessarily seen teaching like this ... I think that it threatens them a little'). She ends by encouraging Eli not to give up, but to find ways to explain his approach and reassure the students. Again, as in the previous excerpt, she does not do this only in the abstract, but offers concrete suggestions of specific practices ('say why we are doing this, what's hard about it').

An important difference between expert–novice and expert–expert interaction is the level of acquaintance with the professional world of practice. The expert–novice relationship is marked by a responsibility on the part of the expert to introduce the novice into a professional world, through its terminology and practical considerations. The expert–expert relationship, however, is based on the assumption that both practitioners have been introduced to their shared world, that both are fluent in its terminology and the fundamental questions that underlie it. It is this shared fluency that allows Eli and Miriam to move smoothly from shorthand descriptions and discussions of specific pedagogical problems to broader questions of metapedagogy.

A detailed empirical comparison of expert–expert coaching and expert–novice coaching is beyond the scope of this article. However, we suspect that this focus on metapedagogy will be much more prevalent in expert–expert coaching than in the coaching of novices by experts.

Discussion – expert–expert coaching – a possible model

We often hear grand statements about the importance of ongoing professional development and lifelong learning. The model of expert–expert coaching explored here is a model worth developing. Viewing teachers as experts in teaching, coaching between teachers could draw on this model, and promote professional in-service development.

The kind of coaching we described above appears to differ in intriguing respects from forms of coaching usually associated with teacher professional development. It does not focus on problem-solving or induction into the profession. Instead, it is a form of joint deliberation that provides experienced professionals with opportunities to raise important professional issues in their practice.

Whereas experts help novices broaden their pedagogical repertoire or point out pedagogical issues they may otherwise have overlooked, experts help other experts to reflect on their overall approach through metapedagogical deliberation, and the relations between this approach and their practice.

One of the interesting insights that came up in this case of coaching is the 'tension of openness.' This tension applies to students as well as to teachers. Not knowing 'the right answer' sometimes confuses students and teachers and makes them uneasy. However, in a situation where two experts exchange insights concerning a joint experience, this 'tension of openness' expands the professional horizon of each expert. By relating to their experience from a position that does assume a given answer, both experts develop an improved and fuller view of their profession.

Conclusion – the value of joint reflection

There is a tendency in any professional setting to indulge in the privacy of one's own work, rather than share it, and its challenges, with others. Sometimes this is due to fear of criticism. Sometimes it is due to fear that one's best ideas and practices will be copied or co-opted. Sometimes it is simply because no formal time or space has been set aside for such deliberation to take place. Shulman's concept of 'pedagogical solitude' (1993) points to a certain feature of teaching which makes it even harder for expert teachers to improve. We propose a dialogical perspective in teacher development as a way of overcoming this solitude.

The emphasis in training of in-service teachers is often on facilitating encounters between the teacher and new developments in the field, such as approaches to teaching or new research findings. Another form of in-service training focuses on teachers' understanding of their disciplinary subject matter, for example, biology or music. In both cases, professional (pedagogical or disciplinary) knowledge is understood as something that is brought to the teacher *from the outside*. We suggest a different perspective on in-service professional development, which is centered on the practical, daily knowledge that experienced teachers gather in years of work, or on *experiential knowledge*. Our approach is a part of a general stream of thought in education that emphasizes the 'practical,' the quotidian aspect of teachers' experiences. Educationalists such as Schwab (1982), Jackson (1986) and Shulman (1993) invite engagement with the 'reality' of educational practice. Following their lead, we wish to point to several key features of coaching between experts:

- (1) Much could be learned when teachers share experiences in joint analysis of their work. In this study, we conceptualize the process by referring to Gadamer's notion of 'fusion of horizons.' Deliberation between two experts may result in a new understanding of practice which expands both sides' professional knowledge. We therefore suggest that teachers' professional development should include creating, rather than receiving new knowledge.
- (2) Professional development as a process of coaching between teachers does not rely on a hierarchical relationship. We suggest that when two experienced teachers meet, 'two masters,' what matters is not the professional hierarchy between the two but rather the professional world they share. Both have accumulated experiences and developed their own 'professional ideology,' and in deliberation, both put forth their understanding of practice. Their deliberation, beyond improving their respective practice, may contribute new knowledge to the shared professional world.
- (3) Joint reflection is a remedy for the professional solitude inherent to teaching. Without opportunities for sharing teaching experiences, teachers might lose the sense of joy in opening their professional world before others. There is inherent joy in performing well in one's profession, and in sharing it with colleagues. In his essay 'Eros and Education,' Schwab regards the significance of the emotive factor of learning: 'Eros, the energy of wanting, is as much the energy source in the pursuit of truth as it is in the motion toward pleasure, friendship, fame, or power ... and the best means of education will be one which taps it most effectively' (1978, 109). Sharing practice means that experienced teachers can have a chance not only to improve intellectually, but also to rekindle their own desire for what they do.

We conclude by suggesting that the continued professional development of experienced and expert teachers depends on creating the times and spaces for expert–expert deliberation and mutual reflection. This will enable focusing on the ways learning could be shared and improved, among experienced teachers. A program in which expert teachers coach each other has the potential for improving teaching and learning in schools.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Miriam Ben-Peretz has been the Chair of the Department of Teacher Education and the Dean of the School of Education at the University of Haifa, as well as the President of Tel-Hai College. Her main research interests are in the fields of curriculum, teacher education, professional development, and policy in education. She has been, and still is, a visiting professor in prestigious universities abroad. She chaired several policy committees of the Ministry of Education in Israel. In 1997, she received the Lifetime Achievement Award of the Curriculum Studies Division of the American Educational Research Association in recognition of outstanding contribution to curriculum studies over an extended period of time. In 2006, she received the Israel Prize for Research in Education and the EMET Prize (Prime Minister's prize) for Educational Research. Since 2010, she has been a foreign associate of the National Academy of Education (NAEd).

Eli Gottlieb has directed the Mandel Leadership Institute since 2007. He holds degrees in philosophy and developmental psychology from the University of Cambridge and a doctorate in the psychology of education from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He served as a visiting professor in cognitive studies in education at the University of Washington, an adjunct lecturer at the School of Education at the Hebrew University, and a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. His research examines the relations between cognition, identity, and education.

Ido Gideon is a doctoral candidate in philosophy of education at Oxford Brookes University and a lecturer at Levinsky College of Education. His research interests include philosophy and sociology of education, political education, and teacher education.

References

- Achinstein, B., K. Adams, S. Z. Athanases, E. Bang, M. Bleeker, C. L. Carver, and S. Dolfin. 2010. *Past, Present, and Future Research on Teacher Induction: An Anthology for Researchers, Policy Makers, and Practitioners*. Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Aleinikov, A. G. 2013. "Creative Pedagogy." In *Encyclopedia of Creativity, Invention, Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, edited by E. G. Carayannis, 326–339. New York: Springer.
- Bergen, T. C. M., A. J. A. Engelen, and K. J. J. Derksen. 2006. "The Quality of Coaching in Relation to the Professional Development of Teachers." In *Competence Oriented Teacher Training. Old Research Demands and New Pathways*, edited by F. K. Oser, F. Achtenhagen, and U. Renold, 97–144. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Block, D. 2000. "Learners and Their Meta-Pedagogical Awareness." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10 (1): 97–124.
- Bravo, M. A., E. Mosqueda, J. L. Solís, and T. Stoddart. 2014. "Possibilities and Limits of Integrating Science and Diversity Education in Preservice Elementary Teacher Preparation." *Journal of Science Teacher Education* 25 (5): 601–619.
- Brown, S., D. McIntyre, and D. McIntyre. 1993. *Making Sense of Teaching*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Darling-Hammond, L. 2008. "Teacher Learning That Supports Student Learning." *Teaching for Intelligence* 2: 91–100.
- Ergas, O. 2015. "The Deeper Teachings of Mindfulness-Based 'Interventions' as a Reconstruction of 'Education.'" *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 49 (2): 203–220.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. 2012. *Teachers as Learners*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., and M. B. Parker. 1993. "Mentoring in Context: A Comparison of Two US Programs for Beginning Teachers." *International Journal of Educational Research* 19 (8): 699–718.
- Fielding, M., M. Eraut, J. Thorp, I. Cunningham, C. Jones, J. Craig, and M. Horne. 2003. "Factors Influencing the Transfer of Good Practice: Initial Literature Review." University of Sussex. Unpublished paper.
- Finney, J., and C. Philpott. 2010. "Informal Learning and Meta-Pedagogy in Initial Teacher Education in England." *British Journal of Music Education* 27 (1): 7–19.
- Flores, M. A., and C. Day. 2006. "Contexts Which Shape and Reshape New Teachers' Identities: A Multi-Perspective Study." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 22 (2): 219–232.
- Gadamer, H.- G. 1975. *Truth and Method*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gawande, A. 2011. "Personal Best: Top Athletes and Singers Have Coaches. Should You?" *The New Yorker*. October 3. <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/10/03/personal-best>
- Gottesman, B. L. 2000. *Peer Coaching for Educators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Hobson, A. J., and A. Malderez. 2013. "Judgementoring and Other Threats to Realizing the Potential of School-Based Mentoring in Teacher Education." *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education* 2 (2): 89–108.
- Jackson, Philip W. 1986. *The Practice of Teaching*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Joyce, B., and B. Showers. 1980. "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research." *Educational Leadership* 37 (5), 379–385.
- Kohler, F. W., K. M. Crilley, D. D. Shearer, and G. Good. 1997. "Effects of Peer Coaching on Teacher and Student Outcomes." *The Journal of Educational Research* 90 (4): 240–250.
- Light, D. 1979. "Uncertainty and Control in Professional Training." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 20 (4): 310–322.
- Lu, H. L. 2010. "Research on Peer Coaching in Preservice Teacher Education – A Review of Literature." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26 (4): 748–753.
- McDonald, D. 2012. "Building Experiential Knowledge through Hypothetical Enactments: A Meta-Pedagogical Process." *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal* 6 (1): 1–18.
- Orland-Barak, L. 2014. "Mediation in Mentoring: A Synthesis of Studies in Teaching and Teacher Education." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 44: 180–188.
- Parker, W. C. 1997. "The Art of Deliberation." *Educational Leadership* 54 (5): 18–21.
- Schwab, J. J. 1982. "Eros and Education." In *Science, Curriculum, and Liberal Education: Selected Essays*, edited by I. Westbury and N. J. Wilkof, 105–132. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shulman, L. S. 1993. "Forum: Teaching as Community Property: Putting an End to Pedagogical Solitude." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 25 (6): 6–7.
- Zwart, R. C., T. Wubbels, S. Bolhuis, and T. C. Bergen. 2008. "Teacher Learning through Reciprocal Peer Coaching: An Analysis of Activity Sequences." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24 (4): 982–1002.