Democracy can provide the direction, goals, purposes, and standards of conduct that our profession and society desperately need. Clinical supervision can provide the means of translating democratic values into action, while strengthening teachers' teaching skills, conceptual understanding and moral commitment.

—Pajak, 2000, p. 292

Note: Before you begin reading this chapter, please complete the questionnaire in Figure 1.2 on pages 32–33.
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WHAT IS SUPERVISION?

Defining supervision has been a source of much debate for years (Bolin, 1987). Is supervision a function of administration, curriculum, staff development, action research, or a combination of these and other activities? Alfonso and Firth (1990) noted that the study of supervision lacks focus largely due to the “lack of research and continuing disagreement on the definition and purposes of supervision” (p. 188). In this volume, we view supervision as the center for the improvement of instruction. Supervision is the process of engaging teachers in instructional dialogue for the purpose of improving teaching and increasing student achievement. We believe that supervision for the improvement of instruction will continue to be the foremost concern of supervisors and other educational leaders well into the 21st century.

The Evolution of Supervision

Supervisory practice has evolved since its origins in colonial times, and its effectiveness as a means of improving instruction depends on the ability of educational leaders to remain responsive to the needs of teachers and students. An educational leader’s resolve to remain adaptable also depends on an appreciation of the changing and evolving nature of supervision, especially in the new millennium. An educational leader who understands the history of supervision and how current demands are influenced by that history will be better able to confront the technological, social, political, and moral issues of the day. Educational leaders also will have to develop the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are the foundation for effective supervisory practice. This chapter explicates how supervision has evolved to its current state, how you might respond to ever-increasing supervisory needs and demands, and how your beliefs and attitudes affect how you react to daily challenges.

Vignette

Arlene Spiotta was recently appointed vice principal of Regional Valley High School, where she has worked as a teacher for three years. An affable, popular teacher, Arlene had been a teacher at Westfield High School, located in a neighboring township, for eight years. Prior to that, she was a teacher for five years in two schools in another state. She recently earned her supervisory certification and master’s degree in administration and supervision at a local college.

Although Arlene received a warm welcome on the opening day of school in September, she noticed that teachers on the grade levels she supervises react much differently to her now. In one instance, she was passing the room of a former teacher-colleague, Linda Evans, who at the time was at her desk, assisting a student. When Linda noticed Arlene looking into the classroom, she stiffened in her chair and abruptly sent the pupil back to his desk. After receiving a stern and cold stare, Arlene proceeded down the hallway to her office. Arlene wondered why her colleague Linda acted so differently when she saw her now.

Reflection

Why do you think Linda reacted to Arlene the way she did? What factor(s) may have contributed to this situation? What dilemma is she facing in her new role?
Arlene Spiotta took for granted the fact that she was now in a position very different from that of Linda Evans. Although they were former colleagues and friends, Arlene was now a supervisor. As a supervisor, she was expected to assist and evaluate her former colleagues.

Linda Evans, on seeing Arlene apparently staring into the classroom (an assumption, we might add, that may or may not have been accurate), reacted as she had previously to other supervisors for whom she had worked. Her former supervisors were overbearing bureaucrats who looked for evidence of teacher incompetence at every turn.

Arlene, too, may have been influenced by what she considered to be behavior “expected” of a supervisor, that is, daily patrol or inspection of the hallways. After all, not only had Arlene been certified and trained as a supervisor in a state that mandates that all teachers be formally observed at least twice a year (eight times for nontenured teachers), but as an experienced teacher (of how many years? Right—16), she had been exposed to many supervisors who had conducted themselves in very autocratic and bureaucratic ways.

Had Arlene been cognizant of how past practices of supervision can affect current relationships between teachers and supervisors, she might have tried more earnestly to establish a spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation.

One of the authors recalls a time when he confronted a similar situation and the difficulty he had in circumventing expected supervisory roles. An excerpt from Jeffrey’s diary is instructive:

My first appointment as an assistant principal was at P.S. “Anywhere, USA.” I arrived at the school in September. My predecessor’s reputation was there to greet me.

Mr. Stuart Oswald Blenheim was known as a stickler for every jot, tittle, and iota inscribed in the Board of Ed’s rules and regulations. He carried a tape measure, a portable tape recorder, and a stethoscope, and considered teachers to be one of the lower forms of sapient life. The others were nonprofessional staff members and students—in “descending” order.

This supervisor made his opinions abundantly clear by word and deed. Woe to the pupil caught wandering the halls without appropriate documentation. No excuses accepted. Period. End of message.

Furthermore, the offending miscreant’s pedagogue was called on the carpet, raked over the coals, strung up by the thumbs, and subjected to a wide variety of other abusive clichés.

Stuart Oswald Blenheim was short; so short that it was difficult to see him among a group of eighth or ninth graders. He took full advantage of his camouflage, so that he could spy on his charges. He was known to walk up quietly to a room, place his stethoscope to the door, and gradually straighten his knees and stand on his toes so as to see through the small glass window. Teachers were constantly on the lookout for a bald head rising in their doors’ windows.
Any teacher who observed this latter-day Napoleon lurking in the halls was honor bound to pass the information on to his or her neighbors. A note referring to “Pearl Harbor,” “Incoming Scud Missiles,” “Sneak Attack,” or “Raid’s Here” was enough to raise blood pressure and churn digestive juices.

Last spring, he was appointed as principal in a school on the other side of the city.

Such was Blenheim’s repute that all the teachers whom I supervised avoided my presence like the very plague. On one occasion, I passed by a room and noticed a teacher caringly assisting a pupil at her desk. Suddenly, the teacher “felt” my presence, quickly straightened her posture, and proceeded nervously to the front of the room to resume writing on the board. I walked away bewildered. However, after ascertaining that I did not suffer from halitosis, dandruff, or terminal body odor, I realized the problem. Honestly, I couldn’t blame them. After all, Blenheim’s initials suited him perfectly.

Thus, I was forced to overcome these habits of fear and distrust and, somehow, to win my teachers’ and students’ trust.

During my first meeting with my teachers, I asked rather than told them not to think of me as their supervisor. I hoped that they would consider me a colleague with perhaps more experience and responsibility in certain areas. I wanted to work with them and learn about their own expertise, knowledge, interests, and ideas. . . . I was not going to spy on them. I was not going to humiliate them. I was a real human being, just like they were, just like the children were.

They had a difficult time accepting this. They had been abused for seven years by a petty tyrant and did not believe that any AP could think differently. After all, Blenheim had been rewarded for his fine methods. This had to be the AP road to promotion.

I promised that there would be no sneak attacks. We would do our best to cooperate and learn together. I would share my experiences and readily seek their expertise and ideas so that they could be effective teachers.

It took three to six months of hard work on my part and caution on theirs, but we’ve finally reached the point where we smile at each other when we meet in the hall. Several of them have come to me with professional and personal problems. They were a bit surprised at some of my proposed solutions. The word got around that Blenheim was really gone.

Stuart Oswald Blenheim is, of course, a caricature of an autocratic supervisor who occupied the position Jeffrey Glanz assumed many years ago. Yet the essential message is clear: Autocratic methods in supervision still prevail, and if changes are to be made, then understanding the antecedents for such practices is necessary. To understand the changing context of supervision, a brief excursion into the history of supervision is necessary.
THE INFLUENCE OF HISTORY

History can be understood as an attempt to study the events and ideas of the past that have shaped human experience over time; doing so informs current practice and helps us make more intelligent decisions for the future. How are prevailing practices and advocated theories connected to the past? How is what you currently do influenced, in any way, by previous practices and theories of supervision? How can an understanding of the past help us practice supervision today?

Our intention in this chapter is to indicate that past supervisory theory and practice influence what we believe about supervision and how we carry out our work with teachers and others. This chapter will help you identify your belief systems related to supervisory practice and how these beliefs are connected to history and the history of supervision. This identification will lay the initial foundation for the construction of a supervisory platform.

Guidelines for the creation of your own initial “personal vision statement” are a special feature of this chapter. As we indicate, what you believe about teaching and learning, for example, inevitably affects how you approach the practice of supervision. Subsequent chapters will encourage you to develop a “personal supervisory platform” that builds upon your personal vision statement.

Site Practice

1. Prepare five questions to ask two school supervisors about their beliefs and practices in relation to improvement of classroom instruction:
   - Record the questions and responses.
   - Reflect on each supervisor’s answers. Describe consistencies and inconsistencies in the responses and compare the supervisors’ actual practices to the responses given. Do they “walk the talk” (practice what they preach)?
   - What surprised you in their responses (positively or negatively)? Why?
   - Compare the two supervisors’ responses and reflect on the similarities and differences between their answers.

   or

2. Ask two supervisors and two teachers what they consider to be the five most important tasks of instructional supervision.
   - Include a script of their responses.
   - What were the differences and similarities in the teachers’ answers and in the supervisors’ responses?
   - Compare the teachers’ responses with those of the supervisors. Explain the differences and similarities. What surprised you in their responses (positively or negatively)?

(Continued)

Reflection/Microlab*

Who or what in your personal or professional background influenced your present supervisory beliefs? What are some positive supervisory experiences you have encountered? What are some negative supervisory experiences you recall? Why did you feel that way? What does supervision look like in your school?

*See Resource A for microlab guidelines. Set up an Internet discussion board or wiki through your school or university media center to exchange reflections and hold electronic microlabs. Also, choose an e-mail partner and share reflections via e-mail between classes.
The History

Supervision has medieval Latin origins and was defined originally as “a process of perusing or scanning a text for errors or deviations from the original text” (Smyth, 1991, p. 30). Later recorded instances of the word supervision established the process as entailing “general management, direction, control, and oversight” (see, e.g., Grumet, 1979). An examination of early records during the colonial period indicates that the term inspector is referenced frequently. Note the definition of supervision in Boston in 1709:

Be there hereby established a committee of inspectors to visit ye School from time to time, when and as oft as they shall think fit, to Enform themselves of the methodes used in teaching of ye Schollars and to Inquire of their proficiency, and be present at the performance of some of their Exercises, the Master being before Notified of their Coming, And with him to consult and Advise of further Methods for ye Advancement of Learning and the Good Government of the Schoole.

—Reports of the Record Commissions of the City of Boston, 1709

The inspectors were often ministers, selectmen, schoolmasters, and other distinguished citizens. Their methods of supervision stressed strict control and close inspection of school facilities. As Spears (1953) explained, “The early period of school supervision, from the colonization of America on down through at least the first half of the nineteenth century, was based on the idea of maintaining the existing standards of instruction, rather than on the idea of improving them” (p. 14).

American schooling, in general, during the better part of the 19th century was rural, unbureaucratic, and in the hands of local authorities. The prototypical 19th-century school was a small one-room schoolhouse. Teachers

Shadowing Assignment: Shadow a supervisor of instruction for one day or on a few days when the supervisor is observing classes.

1. Provide a detailed log of the supervision of instruction that you observed. You may include any activities that you feel were related to supervision of instruction.
2. Describe the supervisory approaches and the process that the supervisor used.
3. What was effective in what you observed? Why? How will these effective practices improve classroom instruction? What did the teacher(s) learn?
4. Did the supervisor do anything that you would have done yourself? What and why or why not?
5. Were there supervisory practices that need improvement? Why? Did the supervisor do anything that you would NOT do? Were you surprised by anything the supervisor did? Why or why not? What would you do differently?
6. How did you feel about the “activities” before shadowing? After?

Source: The first and second sections of this site practice were adapted from Glickman et al. (1998).
were “young, poorly paid, and rarely educated beyond the elementary subjects”; teachers were “hired and supervised largely by local lay trustees, they were not members of a self-regulating profession” (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 17). These local lay trustees (called ward boards) who supervised schools were not professionally trained or very much interested in the improvement of instruction (Button, 1961).

The tradition of lay supervision continued from the American Revolution through the middle of the 19th century or, as commonly referred to, the end of the Common Era. Despite the emergence during this period of a new “American system of educational thought and practice . . . the quality of supervision would not improve appreciably” (Tanner & Tanner, 1987, p. 10). With the advent of a district system of supervision and then state-controlled supervision beginning in the late 19th century, however, the character of supervision did, in fact, change dramatically.

### SUPERVISION IN THE LATE 19TH CENTURY

In general, unprecedented growth precipitated by the Industrial Revolution characterized the second half of the 19th century. The expansion of American education, which had started in the days of Horace Mann, whom Tanner and Tanner (1987) characterized as the “first professional supervisor,” continued and assumed a new dimension in the latter decades of the 19th century. The schoolmen, specifically superintendents, began shaping schools in large cities into organized networks. Organization was the rallying cry nationally and locally. There was a firm belief that highly organized and efficient schools would meet the demands of a newly born industrialized age. That hierarchically organized public schools, as social institutions, would meet the crises and challenges that lay ahead was beyond doubt (Bullough, 1974; Cronin, 1973; Hammock, 1969; Kaestle, 1973; Lazerson, 1971).

The reform movement in education in the late 19th century was reflective of the larger, more encompassing changes that were occurring in society. Although rapid economic growth characterized the 19th century, reformers realized that there were serious problems in the nation’s schools. In the battle that ensued to reorganize the nation’s schools, sources of authority and responsibility in education were permanently transformed (Tyack, 1974). By the end of the 19th century, reformers concerned with undermining inefficiency and corruption transformed schools into streamlined, central administrative bureaucracies with superintendents as supervisors in charge. Supervision, during this struggle, became an important tool by which the superintendent legitimized his existence in the school system (Glanz, 1991). Supervision, therefore, was a function that superintendents performed to oversee schools more efficiently.

Supervision as inspection was the dominant method for administering schools. Payne (1875), author of the first published textbook on supervision,
stated emphatically that teachers must be “held responsible” for work performed in the classroom and that the supervisor, as expert inspector, would “oversee” and ensure “harmony and efficiency” (p. 521). A prominent superintendent, James M. Greenwood (1888), stated emphatically that “very much of my time is devoted to visiting schools and inspecting the work.” Three years later, Greenwood (1891) again illustrated his idea of how supervision should be performed: The skilled superintendent, he said, should simply walk into the classroom and “judge from a compound sensation of the disease at work among the inmates” (p. 227). A review of the literature of the period indicates that Greenwood’s supervisory methods, which relied on inspection based on intuition rather than technical or scientific knowledge, were practiced widely.

Supervisors using inspectional practices did not view favorably the competency of most teachers. For instance, Balliet (1894), a superintendent from Massachusetts, insisted that there were only two types of teachers: the efficient and the inefficient. The only way to reform the schools, thought Balliet, was to “secure a competent superintendent; second, to let him reform all the teachers who are incompetent and can be reformed; thirdly, to bury the dead” (pp. 437–438). Characteristic of the remedies applied to improve teaching was this suggestion: “Weak teachers should place themselves in such a position in the room that every pupil’s face may be seen without turning the head” (Fitzpatrick, 1893, p. 76). Teachers, for the most part, were seen by 19th-century supervisors as inept. As Bolin and Panaritis (1992) explained, “Teachers (mostly female and disenfranchised) were seen as a bedraggled troop—incompetent and backward in outlook” (p. 33).

The practice of supervision by inspection was indeed compatible with the emerging bureaucratic school system, with its assumption that expertise was concentrated in the upper echelons of the hierarchy. Many teachers perceived supervision as inspectional, rather than as a helping function.

Because supervision as inspection through visitation gained wide application in schools, it is the first model that characterizes early methods in supervision (see Table 1.1, Model 1).

Our brief examination of early methods of supervision indicates that (1) amid the upheavals of late-19th-century America, supervision emerged as an important function performed by superintendents, and (2) inspectional practices dominated supervision.

The Emergence of the Distinct Position of Supervisor

In the first two decades of the 20th century, schooling grew dramatically. As the size and complexity of schools increased, greater administrative specialization was readily apparent. Supervisors gained in stature and authority in the early 20th century. In addition to the building principal, a new cadre of administrative officers emerged to assume major responsibility for day-to-day classroom supervision. Two specific groups of supervisors commonly were found in schools in the early 20th century (see Table 1.1).

First, a special supervisor, most often female, was chosen by the building principal to help assist less experienced teachers in subject matter mastery.
Special supervisors were relieved of some teaching responsibilities to allow time for these tasks, but no formal training was required. Larger schools, for example, had a number of special supervisors in each major subject area.

Second, a general supervisor, usually male, was selected not only to deal with more general subjects such as mathematics and science but also to “assist” the principal in the more administrative, logistical operations of a school. The general supervisor, subsequently called vice principal or assistant principal, prepared attendance reports, collected data for evaluation purposes, and coordinated special school programs, among other administrative duties.

Differences in functions between special and general supervisors were reflective of prevalent 19th-century notions of male-female role relationships. William E. Chancellor (1904), a prominent 19th-century superintendent, remarked, “That men make better administrators I have already said. As a general proposition, women make the better special supervisors. They are more interested in details. They do not make as good general supervisors or assistant superintendents, however” (p. 210). Representative of the bias against women in the educational workplace were notions espoused by William H. Payne (1875): “Women cannot do man’s work in the schools” (p. 49). Payne, like many of his contemporaries, believed that men were better suited for the more prestigious and lucrative job opportunities in education.

It is also interesting to note that teachers readily accepted the special supervisors. Special supervisors played a very useful and helpful role by assisting teachers in practical areas of spelling, penmanship, and art, for example. In addition, these special supervisors did not have any independent authority and did not serve in an evaluative capacity, as did, for example, the general supervisor, who was given authority, albeit limited, to evaluate instruction in the classroom. Therefore, teachers were not likely to be threatened by the appearance of a special supervisor in the classroom. General supervisors, on the other hand, were concerned with more administrative and evaluative matters and, consequently, were viewed by the classroom teachers as more menacing. Special supervisors also probably gained more acceptance by teachers, most of whom were female, because they too were female. General supervisors were almost exclusively male and perhaps were perceived differently as a result. Frank Spaulding (1955), in his analysis of this period of time, concurred and stated that general supervisors “were quite generally looked upon, not as helpers, but as critics bent on the discovery and revelation of teachers’ weaknesses and failures, . . . they were dubbed Snoopervisors” (p. 130).

The position of the special supervisor did not, however, endure for a very long period in schools. General supervisors gradually usurped their duties and responsibilities. The relative obscurity of special supervisors after the early 1920s can be attributed to discrimination based on gender. As a group comprising an overwhelming number of females, special supervisors were not perceived in the same light as were general supervisors, principals, assistant superintendents, and superintendents, who were, of course, mostly male. Gender bias and the sexual division of labor in schools go far toward explaining the disappearance of the special supervisor as such.1 In short, general supervisors gained wider acceptance simply because they were men.

**Reflection**

How does gender affect your role and function as a supervisor today? Explain and provide an example.
Numerous technological advances greatly influenced American education after 1900. As a result of the work of Frederick Winslow Taylor (1911), who published a book titled *The Principles of Scientific Management*, “efficiency” became the watchword of the day. Taylor’s book stressed scientific management and efficiency in the workplace. The worker, according to Taylor, was merely a cog in the business machinery, and the main purpose of management was to promote the efficiency of the worker. Within a relatively short period of time, *Taylorism* and *efficiency* became household words and ultimately had a profound impact on administrative and supervisory practices in schools.

Franklin Bobbitt (1913), a professor at the University of Chicago, tried to apply the ideas that Taylor espoused to the “problems of educational management and supervision” (p. 8). Bobbitt’s work, particularly his discussion of supervision, is significant because his ideas shaped the character and nature of supervision for many years. On the surface, these ideas appeared to advance professional supervision, but in reality they were the antithesis of professionalism. What Bobbitt called “scientific and professional supervisory methods” (p. 9) were, in fact, scientific and bureaucratic methods of supervision aimed not at professionalizing but at finding a legitimate and secure niche for control-oriented supervision within the school bureaucracy.

In 1913, Bobbitt published an article titled “Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City-School Systems,” which presented 11 major principles of scientific management as applied to education. Bobbitt firmly held that management, direction, and supervision of schools were necessary to achieve “organizational goals.” Bobbitt maintained that supervision was an essential function “to coordinate school affairs. . . . Supervisory members must co-ordinate the labors of all. . . . find the best methods of work, and enforce the use of these methods on the part of the workers” (Bobbitt, 1913, pp. 76, 78). The employment of scientific principles in supervision, said Bobbitt, is a necessity for the continued progress of the school system.

Many supervisors were eager to adopt Bobbitt’s ideas of scientific management for use in schools. However, a few did not readily accept his views. One of the more vociferous opponents of Bobbitt’s ideas was James Hosic (1924), a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University. Hosic contended that Bobbitt’s analogy was largely false:

> Teaching cannot be “directed” in the same way as bricklaying. . . . In education, the supervisor’s function is not to devise all plans and work out all standards and merely inform his co-workers as to what they are. . . . [The supervisor] should not so much give orders as hold conferences. . . . His prototype is not a captain, lieutenant, or officer of the guard in industry, but chairman of committee or consulting expert. (pp. 82–84)

Despite Hosic’s criticism, schoolmen of the day readily adopted the business model, as evidenced by William McAndrew (1922), who said about his role as supervisor in the school, “I am the captain of big business” (p. 91).

The criticisms against Bobbitt’s methods, nonetheless, accurately stressed a number of disturbing ideas. First and foremost was the ill-conceived notion that...
“education in a school” is analogous to “production in a factory.” Bobbitt claimed that “education is a shaping process as much as the manufacture of steel rails.” Supervisors in the early 20th century were becoming aware of the fallacy of this logic as well as realizing the negative effects of bureaucracy in education. Bobbitt’s “scientific management and supervision” found justification within a school organization that was bureaucratically organized.

Still, it remains clear that the significance of Bobbitt’s work was in his advocacy of scientific and professional supervisory methods. Supervisors thought that their work in schools would be more clearly defined and accepted by adopting Bobbitt’s principles of scientific management. Supervisors believed, as did Bobbitt, that “the way to eliminate the personal element from administration and supervision is to introduce impersonal methods of scientific administration and supervision” (p. 7). This was often translated into rating schemes. In a short time, supervision became synonymous with teacher rating.

In sum, just as “supervision as inspection” reflected the emergence of bureaucracy in education, so too “supervision as social efficiency” was largely influenced by scientific management in education (see Table 1.1, Model 2). Supervision as social efficiency was compatible with and a natural consequence of bureaucracy in education.

**Democratic Methods in Supervision**

Bureaucratic supervision, relying on inspectional methods and seeking efficiency above all else, dominated discourse in the field from 1870–1920. This sort of supervision attracted much criticism from teachers and others (Rousmaniere, 1992). Representative of the nature of this opposition were the comments of Sallie Hill (1918), a teacher speaking before the Department of Classroom Teachers, decrying supervisory methods of rating. Hill charged:

There is no democracy in our schools. . . . Here let me say that I do not want to give the impression that we are sensitive. No person who has remained a teacher for ten years can be sensitive. She is either dead or has gone into some other business. . . . There are too many supervisors with big salaries and undue rating powers. . . . (p. 506)

The movement to alter supervisory theory and practice to more democratic and improvement foci, while at the same time minimizing the evaluative function, occurred in the 1920s as a direct result of growing opposition to autocratic supervisory methods (see Table 1.1, Model 3). Consequently, supervisors tried to change their image as “snoopers” by adopting alternate methods of supervision. The following poem, quoted in part, indicates the desired change of focus to more democratic methods in supervision:

*With keenly peering eyes and snooping nose,*

*From room to room the Snoopervisor goes.*

*He notes each slip, each fault with lofty frown,*

*And on his rating card he writes it down;*
His duty done, when he has brought to light,
The things the teachers do that are not right . . .
The supervisor enters quietly, “What do you need? How can I help today?
John, let me show you. Mary, try this way.”
He aims to help, encourage and suggest,
That teachers, pupils all may do their best.

—Anonymous, 1929

Influenced in large measure by Dewey’s (1929) theories of democratic and scientific thinking as well as by Hosic’s (1920) ideas of democratic supervision, supervisors attempted to apply scientific methods and cooperative problem-solving approaches to educational problems (Pajak, 2000). Hosic cautioned the supervisor to eschew his “autocratic past”: “The fact that he is invested for the time being with a good deal of delegated authority does not justify him in playing the autocrat . . . To do so is neither humane, wise, nor expedient” (1920, pp. 331, 332). Continuing to build a philosophic rationale for the supervisor’s involvement in “democratic pursuits,” Hosic explained that it was no longer viable to apply techniques of the past. Hosic believed, as did Dewey, that it was possible to reshape a school system that had originated with the idea of bureaucratic maintenance so that it would comply with the principles of democracy.

Democratic supervision, in particular, implied that educators, including teachers, curriculum specialists, and supervisors, would cooperate to improve instruction. Efforts by prominent superintendent Jesse Newlon reinforced democracy in supervision. In an article titled “Reorganizing City School Supervision,” Newlon (1923) asked, “How can the ends of supervision best be achieved?” He maintained that the school organization must be set up to “invite the participation of the teacher in the development of courses.” The ends of supervision could be realized when teacher and supervisor worked in a coordinated fashion. Newlon developed the idea of setting up “supervisory councils” to offer “genuine assistance” to teachers. In this way, he continued, “the teacher will be regarded as a fellow-worker rather than a mere cog in a big machine” (pp. 547–549). Participatory school management and supervision had their origins in the work of Newlon.

**Scientific Supervision**

In the 1930s and 1940s, educators believed that autocratic supervisory practices were no longer viable. They urged more scientific approaches to supervisory practice in schools. The early attempts to apply science via rating cards were now losing favor. Burton (1930), a prolific writer in supervision, explained that the use of “rating schemes from our prescientific days . . . would be wholly inadequate today.” Although Burton recognized the usefulness of rating in some instances, he believed that “it is desirable and rapidly becoming possible to have more objectively determined items by means of which to evaluate the teacher’s procedure” (p. 405).
One of the foremost proponents of science in education and supervision was A. S. Barr (1931). He stated emphatically that the application of scientific principles “is a part of a general movement to place supervision on a professional basis.” Barr stated in precise terms what the supervisor needed to know:

Supervisors must have the ability to analyze teaching situations and to locate the probable causes for poor work with a certain degree of expertness; they must have the ability to use an array of data-gathering devices peculiar to the field of supervision itself; they must possess certain constructive skills for the development of new means, methods, and materials of instruction; they must know how teachers learn to teach; they must have the ability to teach teachers how to teach; and they must be able to evaluate. In short, they must possess training in both the science of instructing pupils and the science of instructing teachers. Both are included in the science of supervision. (pp. x, xi)

Barr (1931) said the supervisor should first formulate objectives, followed by measurement surveys to determine the instructional status of schools. Then, probable causes of poor work should be explored through the use of tests, rating scales, and observational instruments. The results of supervision, continued Barr, must be measured. Most important, according to Barr, the methods of science should be applied to the study and practice of supervision. More concretely, Barr (1925) asserted that a scientific analysis of teaching is a necessary part of the training of a supervisor: “How can the scientific knowledge of the teaching process be brought to bear upon the study and improvement of teaching?” Barr contended that teaching could be broken down into its component parts and that each part had to be studied scientifically. If good teaching procedures could be isolated, thought Barr, then specific standards could be established to guide the supervisor in judging the quality of instruction. He based his scientific approach to supervision “upon the success of the professional student of education in breaking up this complex mass into its innumerable elements and to study each objectively” (pp. 360, 363).

Throughout the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, the idea that supervision involves improving instruction based on classroom observation gained momentum. Supervision as a means of improving instruction through observation was reinforced by the use of “stenographic reports,” which were the brainchild of Romiott Stevens, a professor at Teachers College, Columbia University. Stevens thought that the best way to improve instruction was to record verbatim accounts of actual lessons “without criticism or comment.” Stevens’s stenographic accounts were “the first major systematic study of classroom behavior” (Hoetker & Ahlbrand, 1969).

Supervisors during this era advocated a scientific approach toward their work in schools (see Table 1.1, Model 4). Scientific supervision was considered to be distinct from social efficiency and entirely compatible with democratic practices (Dewey, 1929). Burton and Brueckner (1955) claimed that “a few individuals still speak, write, and supervise as if science and democracy were antagonistic, or at least not easily combined. The truth is that each is necessary in an integrated theory and practice” (p. 82).
Supervision as Leadership

Democratic and scientific supervision continued well into the 1950s. Democratic methods in supervision, however, clearly were expanded and clarified in the 1960s in the form of supervision as leadership (see Table 1.1, Model 5).

The political and social upheavals resulting from the urban plight, concerns for justice and equality, and antiwar sentiments dramatically affected education—and supervision, in particular. Virulent criticisms of educational practice and school bureaucracy were pervasive (e.g., Silberman’s Crisis in the Classroom, 1970). Educators also took a serious look at supervisory practices in schools. The legacy of supervision as inspection that found justification in the production-oriented, social efficiency era was no longer viable. Bureaucratic supervision was not viable either. A new vision for the function of supervision was framed.

The work most representative of the 1960s was undoubtedly the anthology of articles that originally appeared in Educational Leadership, compiled by then editor and associate director of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Robert R. Leeper (1969). Leeper and the authors of this anthology maintained that supervisors must extend “democracy in their relationships with teachers” (p. 69). The way to accomplish this was to promulgate supervision as a leadership function.

Harris (1969) expressed the ideals of supervisory leadership this way:

The word leadership refers to showing the way and guiding the organization in definitive directions. New leadership is needed in this sense of the word. Two kinds are required:

1. Those in status positions must lead out with new boldness and find better ways of influencing the schools toward rationally planned, timed change.
2. New leadership positions must be created, and coordinated to facilitate the enormously complex job of leading instructional change. (p. 36)

Although issues of instructional leadership would not gain popularity for another 15 years, supervision as leadership essentially emerged in the 1960s.

The principal focus of supervision during this time was a concerted effort by those engaged in supervision to provide leadership in five ways: (1) developing mutually acceptable goals, (2) extending cooperative and democratic methods of supervision, (3) improving classroom instruction, (4) promoting research into educational problems, and (5) promoting professional leadership.

Clinical Supervision

Uncertainty plagued the field of supervision by the 1970s. Markowitz (1976) stated,
The supervisor in the educational system is plagued by ambiguities. His or her position in the authority structure is ill-defined and quite often vulnerable. There is a lack of clarity in the definition of his or her role and a lack of agreement on the functions associated with supervision. (p. 367)

Alfonso, Firth, and Neville (1975) described this role ambiguity in terms of a “power limbo;” that is, supervisors are “neither line nor staff, neither administration nor faculty, but somewhere in between” (p. 342). Wilhelms (1969) concurred that supervision had witnessed tremendous change: “Roles are changing; staff organization is swirling; titles and functions are shifting,” said Wilhelms, “but whether his [sic] title is ‘principal,’ ‘supervisor,’ ‘curriculum coordinator,’ or what not, the person in a position of supervisory leadership is caught in the middle” (p. x).

Lacking focus, a sound conceptual base, and purpose, supervision explored alternative notions to guide theory and practice in the field. Efforts to reform supervision were reflective of a broader attempt to seek alternatives to traditional educational practice. Clinical supervision grew out of this dissatisfaction with traditional educational practice and supervisory methods. Goldhammer (1969), one of the early proponents of clinical supervision, stated that the model for clinical supervision was “motivated, primarily, by contemporary views of weaknesses that commonly exist in educational practice” (p. 1).

The premise of clinical supervision was that teaching could be improved by a prescribed, formal process of collaboration between teacher and supervisor. The literature of clinical supervision has been replete with concepts of collegiality, collaboration, assistance, and improvement of instruction. Bolin and Panaritis (1992) explained that clinical supervision “appealed to many educators” because of its “emphasis on ‘collegiality.’” The rhetoric of clinical supervision favored collaborative practice over inspectional, fault-finding supervision.


Clinical supervision, although advocated by professors and authors of textbooks, did not by any means gain wide acceptance in schools (see, e.g., Garman, 1997). Although clinical supervision received its share of criticism (e.g., Bolin & Panaritis, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1987), educators throughout the 1970s continued to argue that democratic methods of supervision should be extended and that vestiges of bureaucratic supervision should be excised. Supervision to improve instruction and promote pupil learning, instructional leadership, and democratic practices remained as prominent goals throughout the 1970s (see Table 1.1, Model 6).

### Reflection

What are the chief characteristics of clinical supervision that distinguish it from other models of supervision? Have you ever used or been involved with clinical supervision? What obstacles might impede successful implementation of a clinical model in your school or district?
DEMOCRATIC METHODS AND SUPERVISION

During the early 1980s, public education continued to receive voluminous criticism for being bureaucratic and unresponsive to the needs of teachers, parents, and children (see, e.g., Johnson, 1990). One of the prominent proposals for disenfranchising bureaucracy was the dissolution of autocratic administrative practices where overbearing supervisors ruled by fiat. Favored was greater and more meaningful decision making at the grassroots level (Dunlap & Goldman, 1991). This idea translated into giving teachers more formal responsibility for setting school policies, thus enhancing democratic governance in schools (Glanz, 1992; Kirby, 1991). Johnson (1990) observed that “although schools have long been under the control of administrators, local districts are increasingly granting teachers more formal responsibility for setting school policies” (p. 337).

Criticism leveled at the educational bureaucracy has had consequences for school supervision (Firth & Eiken, 1982). Throughout this period, educators continued to consider alternative methods of supervision. In the early 1980s, developmental supervision, in which varied levels of teaching abilities were acknowledged, gained attention (Glickman, 1981). By the end of the decade, transformational leadership, which advocated that supervisors serve as change agents, became popular (e.g., Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990). Other writers advanced their notions of supervision as well (e.g., Bowers & Flinders, 1991). Teacher empowerment (e.g., Darling-Hammond & Goodwin, 1993) gained attention as teachers became active participants in decision-making processes in schools. Pajak (2000) reviewed the literature on the “teacher as leader” during the previous five years. Peer supervision (e.g., Willerman, McNeely, & Koffman Cooper, 1991) appeared in the literature as an alternative to traditional supervision by “professionally trained supervisors,” as did cognitive coaching (Costa & Garmston, 1997). Other collegial and democratic supervisory methods continued to receive notice (e.g., Smyth, 1991).

The publication of Supervision in Transition (Glickman, 1992) by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development marked a refinement in the changing conception of supervision as a democratic enterprise. Glickman, editor of the yearbook, clearly set the tone by stating emphatically that the very term supervision connoted a distasteful, even “disgusting” metaphor for school improvement. Instead of using the words supervision or supervisor; educators, or what Glickman called “risk-taking practitioners,” were more comfortable with terms such as instructional leadership and instructional leader. The transition that Glickman and the authors of this comprehensive account of supervision envisioned was one that valued collegiality. Supervision, in the words of Sergiovanni (1992), was viewed as “professional and moral.”

Other models and conceptions of supervision emerged in an attempt to extend democratic methods and to dissociate from bureaucratic and inspectional supervision. Clinical, developmental, and transformational supervision, among other models, had a common bond in that they emerged to counter the ill effects of supervision’s bureaucratic legacy (see Table 1.1, Model 7).

Reflection/Microlab

From your experience, are collegiality and democratic supervision viable options for your school or district? Explain. Are you familiar with the implementation of any existing collegial or democratic processes? If so, which ones? How have staff and administration responded to them?
STANDARDS-BASED SUPERVISION

Although the democratic methods “changing concepts” model had an impact on supervision in the 1990s, over the past several years, especially since the turn of the new century, supervisory practice has been shaped and influenced by the general movement toward standards-based reform. Standards-based reform has affected supervision so greatly that we have identified a new and current model of supervision that has impacted and will in all likelihood continue to impact supervision as a field of study and practice. We call that model “Standards-Based Supervision” (see Table 1.1).

Although they are not new, standards-based teaching and learning have influenced curriculum, supervision, and teacher education in significant ways. Supervisors and those concerned with supervision have been particularly challenged in the past several years to implement supervisory practices that ensure the technical competence of teachers. Receiving strong political backing from both state and national agencies, standards-based supervision has, in some quarters, relegated supervisors to relying on checklists to ascertain the extent to which teachers are meeting various curricular and instructional objectives embedded in core curriculum standards at various grade levels. Such supervisory practices thwart meaningful supervision aimed at fostering closer collaboration and instructional dialogue to improve teaching and learning. Pajak (2000) points to the compatibility problem of trying to use standards-based supervision with clinical supervision. He warns, “If we fail to provide empathy-based supervision, the current standards-based environment will ultimately prove stultifying for both teachers and their students” (p. 241).

To best understand standards-based supervision, some background knowledge on standards-based reform is necessary. The national movement toward standards-based education, including high-stakes testing, has served to legitimize and bolster local reform proposals that have influenced supervisory practices. Raising standards and promoting uniformity of curricular offerings to raise academic achievement has been an established reform proposal since the 1890s (Seguel, 1966).

During the first half of the 20th century, the College Entrance Examination Board (formed in the 1890s), the Scholastic Aptitude Test (the first SAT was administered in 1926), and the American College Testing Program (established in 1959) were the guardians of standards, as applied to the academic curriculum. As a result of the Russian launch of the first artificial satellite (Sputnik) in 1957, American education was attacked vociferously. Only months after the Sputnik launching, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), which poured millions of dollars into mathematics, sciences, and engineering. For several years following Sputnik, the postwar baby boom increased enrollments dramatically in high schools, and achievement scores in many academic areas also improved. Academic standards, up until this time, continued to be driven by levels of student achievement and assessed by national standardized tests (Ravitch, 1995).

After a lull in the tumultuous mid-1960s, the publication of the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s 1983 report, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, drew attention to the assertion that schools had lowered their standards too much and that American students were not competitive with their international counterparts. The authors of this 1983...
report were perturbed by the fact that American schoolchildren lagged behind students in other industrialized nations. The National Commission on Excellence in Education reported that among students from various industrialized nations, U.S. students scored lowest on 7 of 19 academic tests and failed to score first or second on any test. Similar results were reported by the Educational Testing Service (1992). Moreover, the study found that nearly 40% of U.S. 17-year-olds couldn’t perform tasks requiring higher-order thinking skills.

Pressure to improve the quality of American education by articulating concrete standards for performance increased. Consequently, a spate of national and state reports continued through the 1980s, each advocating fundamental educational change. Commitment to democratic ideals and the influence of public education was reinforced once again in 1986 with the publication of the report, sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986) and the Holmes Group (1986) report. The national curriculum reform movement was catapulted into prominence and action with the Education Summit held in 1989 by then President George Bush and state governors. A year later, in his State of the Union Address, President Bush affirmed his commitment to excellence in education by establishing six national education goals to be achieved by the year 2000. Signed into law by Congress during the Clinton administration on March 31, 1994, *Goals 2000* proclaimed, in part, that by the year 2000 “U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement” and “Every school will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning” (http://www.nd.edu/~rbarger/and www7/goals200.html).

The adoption of national goals has been a major impetus for the increased attention to standards at the state level. More than 40 states have revised their curricula to reflect the standards they established.

Continuing in the tradition of standards-based education, President George W. Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Legislation of 1965. The purpose of the new legislation was to redefine the federal role in K–12 education and to help raise student achievement, especially for disadvantaged and minority students. Four basic principles were evident: (1) stronger accountability for results, (2) increased flexibility and local control, (3) expanded options for parents, and (4) an emphasis on teaching methods that presumably have been proven to work.

What can the history of standards-based education teach us about the practice of supervision? Pajak (2000) maintains that the “use of clinical supervision in standards-based environments is so recent that no clear consensus has yet emerged about whether this marriage is either desirable or successful” (p. 238). Our experiences and view of what is happening in the field tell us that a clear consensus is indeed apparent. The movement of standards-based education is indeed shaping supervisory practice by frequently compelling supervisors to incorporate a checklist approach to supervision. The pressure practitioners face to raise student achievement as measured on high-stakes tests is enormous. Principals and assistant principals are more accountable than ever to address prescribed core curriculum standards, promote teaching to the standards, and ensure higher student academic performance on standardized tests. Consequently, those concerned with
supervision have been more inclined to incorporate supervisory practices that are a throwback to the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s (Table 1.1, Model 4). Directive approaches of supervision find justification within a standards-based educational milieu.

UNDERSTANDING THE HISTORY OF SUPERVISION

Historically, the function and conception of supervision have changed. The earliest notions of supervision addressed the need for selectmen, committees, or clergymen to inspect the physical plant of schools and to ensure that children were receiving instruction as required by law. The legacy of inspectional supervision from the colonial period continued into the late 19th century as supervision became little more than an inspectional function local and city superintendents performed attempting to bureaucratize urban education. In the early 1900s, supervision as bureaucratic inspection was reinforced and strengthened as “social efficiency” became the watchword. Influenced by social and economic forces as well as by opposition to inspectional bureaucratic methods, supervision in the 1920s and 1930s embraced democratic theory; this trend would continue throughout the century, albeit in different forms.

What can we learn from this excursion into history? For some theorists and practitioners, a lesson learned is that authoritarian supervision aimed at faultfinding and suspecting the competence of teachers should not be compatible with the modern practice of supervision. Some view the evolution of the practice of supervision as a progression from crude, unsophisticated bureaucratic inspectional approaches to more refined democratic participatory techniques and methodologies.

For some theorists and practitioners, the legacy of inspectional supervision lives on in the form of evaluation. Democratic supervision is viewed as helping teachers improve instruction, whereas bureaucratic supervision is associated with accountability and judgments about teachers’ efficiency. This conflict between the helping and evaluative functions of supervision is long standing. Tanner and Tanner (1987) asserted that this dilemma presents an almost insurmountable problem for supervisors: “The basic conflict between these functions is probably the most serious and, up until now, unresolved problem in the field of supervision” (p. 106).

Historically, the evaluative function of supervision is rooted in bureaucratic inspectional-type supervision. Maintaining an efficient and effective school organization as well as a sound instructional program mandates that teacher competency be evaluated. In other words, the evaluative aspect of the supervisory function emanates from organizational requirements to measure and assess teaching effectiveness. The origins of the helping or improvement function of supervision date back to democratic practices in the early 20th century. That is, helping teachers improve instruction and promote pupil achievement grew out of the democratic theory of supervision.

Supervisors or people concerned with supervision, however, have faced a basic role conflict, namely, the unresolved dilemma between the necessity to evaluate (a bureaucratic function) and the desire to genuinely assist teachers in the instructional process (a democratic and professional goal).
### Table 1.1 Timeline

| 1893–1897 | Grover Cleveland |
| 1897–1901 | William McKinley |
| Pre-1900 |  |
| • Debates about the Spanish-American War, territorial acquisitions, and the economy dominated thought and literature. |
| • Thorstein Veblen’s *Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899) attacked predatory wealth and conspicuous consumption of the new rich. |
| • Jacob Riis in *How the Other Half Lives* (1890) documented gnawing poverty, illness, crime, and despair of New York’s slums. |
| • Frank Norris’s *The Octopus* (1901) condemned monopoly. |

**From REA U.S. History Review Book:**
Teachers as the factory workers and the students as the raw material to be turned into the product that was to meet the specifications of the needs of the 20th century. ([http://www.ux1.etu.edu/~cfrnb/impbusin.html](http://www.ux1.etu.edu/~cfrnb/impbusin.html))

Education was conducted with military-like schedules and discipline, and emphasized farming and other manual skills. The daily schedule was split between academics and vocational training. ([lcweb2.loc.gov/learn/community/NA_toolkit/overview.pdf](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/learn/community/NA_toolkit/overview.pdf))

| 1900–1919 |  |
| 1901–1909 | Theodor Roosevelt |
| 1909–1913 | William H. Taft |
| 1906: Upton Sinclair writes *The Jungle*, which depicts the poverty, absence of social programs, unpleasant living and working conditions, and hopelessness prevalent among have-nots in contrast with the corruption on the part of the haves. ([wiki](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Jungle)) |
| 1909: NAACP formed. |
| 1914: World War I begins. |
| 1917: United States declares war on Germany. |
| 1917: Russian Revolution. |
| 1919: Over 20% of U.S. labor force goes on strike. |

Purpose of education was to prepare youth for jobs in factories. ([http://tiger.towson.edu/users/rturnb1/Education%20Presentation_files/frame.htm](http://tiger.towson.edu/users/rturnb1/Education%20Presentation_files/frame.htm))

**20th Century Models of Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-1900</th>
<th>Models of Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: Supervision as Inspection, Payne-Greenwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne (1875), author of the first published textbook on supervision. Greeneewood’s supervisory methods (1891), which relied on inspection based on intuition rather than technical or scientific knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balliet (1894), a superintendent from Massachusetts, insisted that there were only two types of teachers: the efficient and the inefficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1900–1919</th>
<th>Model 2: Supervision as Social Efficiency, Taylor-Bobbitt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor—author of <em>The Principles of Scientific Management</em>. Main point of management was to promote the efficiency of the worker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbitt—professor, University of Chicago, control-oriented supervision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Social/Cultural Markers of the Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1913–1921 Woodrow Wilson | • 1920: 19th Amendment—Women’s Suffrage ratified.  
• Literary Trends—reflected disgust with hypocrisy and materialism of American society: Hemingway’s *The Sun Also Rises*; F. Scott Fitzgerald’s *The Great Gatsby*; John Dos Passos’s *Three Soldiers*.  
• Popular Culture—Movies—Introduction of Sound—*The Jazz Singer*; Major League Baseball—Babe Ruth; Boxing—Jack Dempsey.  
• Social Conflicts—the automobile, the revolution in morals, rapid urbanization with immigrants, and blacks inhabiting the cities.  
• 1920–1929: Roaring Twenties.  
• 1929: Stock market crashes in October. | Model 3: Democracy in Supervision, Dewey-Hosic-Newlon  
Teachers, curriculum specialists, and supervisors would cooperate to improve instruction. |
| 1921–1923 Warren G. Harding | **During the 1920s, when education turned increasingly to “scientific” techniques such as intelligence testing and cost-benefit management, progressive educators insisted on the importance of the emotional, artistic, and creative aspects of human development.** (http://www.uvm.edu/~dewey/articles/proged.html) |
| 1923–1929 Calvin Coolidge | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1930–1950s</th>
<th>Social/Cultural Markers of the Times</th>
<th>Models of Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1929–1933 Herbert C. Hoover | • 1929–1933: Depression. Literary trends depicted the crushing poverty in America: James T. Farrell’s trilogy *Studs Lonigan* about the struggles of lower-middle-class Irish Catholics in Chicago; Erskine Caldwell’s *Tobacco Road* about impoverished Georgia sharecroppers; John Steinbeck’s *The Grapes of Wrath* depicts “Okies” migrating to California in the midst of the Depression.  
• 1939–1945: World War II.  
• 1949: NATO formed.  
• 1954: *Brown vs. Board of Education* challenged the doctrine of separate but equal.  
• 1957: The launching of Soviet space satellite Sputnik created fear that America was falling behind technologically.  
Burton—writer.  
Barr—proponent of science in education—supervisors must possess expertise in instructing pupils and teachers.  
Stevens—professor, Teachers Coll., Columbia University: classroom observation through recording verbatim accounts of lessons was the first systematic study of classroom behavior. |
| 1933–1945 Franklin D. Roosevelt | **1930s: Child-centered (progressive) education** (http://www.brillion.k12.wi.us/hswebpage/Schools%20of%20the%201930's%20Lesson/index.htm) |
| 1945–1953 Harry S. Truman | |
| 1953–1961 Dwight D. Eisenhower | |
### Table 1.1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social/Cultural Markers of the Times</th>
<th>Models of Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1940s</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s: Progressive educational philosophy, influenced by John Dewey and New Deal liberalism predominant among educators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s: New emphasis on science and technology emerges after 1957.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<a href="http://www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/research/res_chronology1944.shtml">http://www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/research/res_chronology1944.shtml</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1960s</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961–1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963–1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndon B. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political and social upheavals resulting from urban plight, concerns for justice and equality, and antiwar sentiments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• American school curriculum shifted from academic to nonacademic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1964: President Johnson announces war on poverty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1965: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provided $1.5 billion to school districts to improve the education of the poor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s: “Activity learning” (versus passive students and active teachers). Led to Jerome Bruner’s <em>Man: A Course of Study (MACOS)</em> in 1962, calling for research-based curriculum stressing critical thinking, collaboration, and questioning of traditional thought and values. Met strong resistance and was never implemented. (<a href="http://www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/research/res_chronology1960.shtml">http://www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/research/res_chronology1960.shtml</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1970–1980s</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969–1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard M. Nixon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974–1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977–1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Carter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981–1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Reagan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political corruption: Watergate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feminism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmentalism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1983: <em>A Nation at Risk: The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education</em>. President Reagan’s Department of Education report finds inadequate or declining achievement scores, graduation rates, expectations of students, and focus on academics. Criticizes absence of standards and calls for major reforms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 5: Supervision as Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 6: Clinical Supervision, Goldhammer-Cogan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal process of collaboration between teacher and supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Cultural Markers of the Times</td>
<td>Models of Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **1990s** | Model 7: Changing Concepts Model of Supervision<br>Glickman’s (1992) *Supervision in Transition*—set the tone by changing the word *supervision* to *instructional leadership* and *supervisor* to *instructional leader*.<br>Sergiovanni (1992) viewed supervision as professional and moral. |


| **2000–Present** | Model 8: Standards-Based Supervision<br>Includes high-stakes testing.<br>Accountability based on high-stakes testing and quantitative data thrives and influences supervision. |

| **2001–2009**<br>George W. Bush<br>2009–Barack Obama | • President George W. Bush—No Child Left Behind—2001: a reauthorization of the El. and Sec. Ed. Act Leg. of 1965. Stronger accountability for results, increased flexibility and local control, expanded options for parents, emphasis on teaching methods that have been proven to work.<br>• 2001: Requires: All students to be “proficient” in reading, mathematics, and science by 2014, with *Adequate Yearly Progress* measures to determine school success; annual standardized tests (developed by the states) in Grades 3–8 in reading and mathematics. ([http://www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/research/res_chronology2000.shtml](http://www.archives.nysed.gov/edpolicy/research/res_chronology2000.shtml))<br>• 2003–2010: War in Iraq.<br>• 2009: Barack Obama appoints Arne Duncan, CEO of Chicago schools, to lead U.S. schools as Secretary of Education during troubled economic times.<br>• Mayoral control and charter schools proliferate in urban centers. |
Catherine Marshall (1992), in a comprehensive study of assistant principals, described such role conflicts:

An assistant principal might be required to help teachers develop coordinated curricula—a “teacher support” function. But this function conflicts with the monitoring, supervising, and evaluating functions. . . . The assistant may be working with a teacher as a colleague in one meeting and, perhaps one hour later, the same assistant may be meeting to chastise the same teacher for noncompliance with the district’s new homework policy. . . . When they must monitor teachers’ compliance, assistants have difficulty maintaining equal collegial and professional relationships with them. (pp. 6–7)

The field of supervision has attempted to resolve this basic conflict between evaluation and improvement (e.g., Hazi, 1994; Poole, 1994; Tsui, 1995). It clearly is evident throughout the history of supervision that efforts have been made to extricate supervision from its bureaucratic heritage. Nonetheless, advances in theory are not necessarily reflected in practice. Many, if not most, studies still conclude that teachers do not find supervision helpful (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1998).

We present, in brief, the rationales of the two camps and challenge you to take a stance. We definitely have an opinion on this issue, as you might discover with a careful read of this book. Still, we prefer not to indicate our view, but rather encourage you, especially in developing your vision, to address the issue in ways that make sense to you. Please e-mail us with your view, and we’d be happy, if asked, to indicate our own conception of the relationship between supervision and evaluation.

Camp 1 views supervision as a process that engages teachers as professional colleagues for the purpose of encouraging instructional dialogue so as to improve teaching practices. Judgments as to the competence of the teacher are eschewed during the supervision process. Supervisors serve, among other ways, as another set of eyes to help the teacher reflect on her teaching behaviors, for instance, in the classroom during instruction. Supervisors provide teachers with descriptions of what transpired during a lesson and then encourage teachers to make some observations and draw conclusions from the data presented. Supervisors function as a mirror for teachers. Through instructional dialogue teachers decide a course of action on their own, with facilitation by the supervisor. Maria, a fourth-grade teacher, for instance, might realize that she is asking questions that may be too complicated for her students. After examining Bloom’s Taxonomy, she, in working with her supervisor, develops more appropriate lower-level questions for implementation next time. Evaluation, as opposed to supervision, is the process in which decisions are made about the competencies of a teacher and functions as an accountability measure. It is usually performed, in formal observation fashion, several times a year, with a summative evaluation report for the teacher’s file at the end of the school year. Reappointment and tenure decisions are made as a result of such evaluations. Camp 1 adherents believe that the two processes are distinct and serve different purposes and should be kept separate for a variety of reasons. One such reason, according to adherents, is that teachers are unlikely to indicate any willingness to change teaching behaviors in a supervisory
process when they know that disclosures may influence negatively on their formative or summative evaluative reports. “Supervision and evaluation are like oil and water; they don’t mix,” stated a supervisor who adheres to such a division between the processes.

Camp 2, on the other hand, maintains that the two processes, if implemented properly, are compatible and that a distinction or separation is artificial and impractical. Adherents maintain that trust is a necessary condition that must be established if supervision and evaluation are to work properly. Once established (that is, supervisors establish legitimacy in the eyes of teachers), a supervisor can easily work with teachers, wearing one hat, so to speak, in terms of working with them as colleagues to examine teaching in the classroom, and then, at some other point in time, serve as evaluator, when specified by legal mandates. Teachers are professionals who understand their role and importance in schools and should readily accept and expect that supervision and evaluation are employed to improve teacher performance so as to promote student learning and achievement.

We presented both views in caricature form for purposes of analysis. Finer distinctions exist as well as other rationales for their use and function. In addition, a good number of evaluation systems or approaches have been advocated in the literature that support each camp (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Goldstein, 2007). We encourage you to consider this issue by reading some sources on the subject.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PRACTICE OF SUPERVISION**

**Present Context and Future Necessities**

For most of the 20th century, schools retained features of the factory organizational model, a legacy of 19th-century industrial society. Schools relied on hierarchical supervisory control and representative democracy. We are now, however, undergoing major societal transformations into a postindustrial era (Ambrose & Cohen, 1997) characterized “by exponential information growth, fast-paced innovation, organizational change, and participatory democracy” (p. 20). As a result of these technological, political, economic, and social changes, schools (teachers and supervisors) are “being called on today to rethink and restructure how schools operate and how teachers relate to students. . . . We sorely need new ways of thinking about educational supervision and leadership” (Pajak, 1993, p. 159).

Attempts to restructure schools, classrooms, and practices (both teaching and supervisory) abound (see, e.g., Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Over the past several years, alternative models or approaches to school and instructional improvement and teacher evaluation have gained prominence. Among these innovative ideas are site-based management, union-sponsored peer coaching, professional partnerships, reflective practice, and teacher self-evaluation. Based on our brief discussion of the history of supervision in this chapter, these innovations can be seen as ways to extend participatory democracy in supervision.

The changing context of supervision necessitates that both prospective and practicing supervisors remain responsive to unprecedented demands and
opportunities. Supervisors will need specialized knowledge and skills to meet organizational challenges in the 21st century. They will need to base their practice of supervision on a foundation of dispositions and beliefs. Supervisors will have to place a premium on initiative, flexibility, tolerance for ambiguity, collaboration, and an ethical mind-set. In the future, supervisors will be expected more and more to be collaborative and assist teachers in reflecting about classroom instruction in meaningful ways.

As we saw earlier in this chapter, with a firmly entrenched bureaucratic heritage, people have tried to reshape the image of supervision into a democratic enterprise aimed at instructional improvement. We maintain that your ability to facilitate teaching and learning depends as much on your belief system, because it requires knowledge and skills about instructional improvement. Much of this book is devoted to knowledge and skill development. The remainder of this chapter, however, is aimed at indicating how your beliefs might affect your response to daily instructional challenges. Are you more inclined to conceive of supervision as an inspectional, bureaucratic process, are you genuinely more concerned with developing collaborative relationships with teachers in an effort to improve instruction, or are you inclined to follow a path somewhere in the middle?

We make a bold assertion in this chapter: Bureaucratic inspectional supervision should have no place in schools in the 21st century. We must prepare supervisors who truly espouse participatory democratic values. We have found that some supervisors espouse collaboration when, in practice, they operate in rather autocratic ways. These supervisors are probably influenced very much by the traditional conceptions of supervision described earlier.

---

**Case Study**

Dr. William Jones believes that teachers need close scrutiny. “Many of the new teachers,” explains Jones, “are generally weak. They have just been certified and need close supervision.” He continues, “In fact, even experienced teachers continually need the guidance of an expert who can provide the needed instructional and managerial assistance.”

Other supervisors are genuinely interested in working with teachers collaboratively, as evidenced by Elizabeth Gonzalez, a vice principal in Elmsville Elementary School, a suburban district in the Midwest.

Elizabeth Gonzalez believes in forging collaborative relationships with teacher professionals. “I think that every teacher should develop a unique style of teaching that is right for her or him,” explains Gonzalez. “As a supervisor, I am really most effective as facilitator and guide, rather than an overseer.”

Why does William Jones rely only on inspectional practices, yet Elizabeth Gonzalez acts in a much more collaborative way? We believe that each of these supervisors operates from a different belief system that inevitably affects how he or she approaches supervisory responsibilities.

---

**ASSESSING BELIEF SYSTEMS**

The bureaucratic model of schooling is based on what we believe are erroneous assumptions about how people work together most efficiently in schools. There is a growing awareness that the key to successfully shifting to a collaborative educational paradigm is dependent on the degree to which we alter our thinking patterns, belief systems, and mind-sets, or as Sergiovanni calls them,
“mindscapes” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 41). Our belief systems are intimately connected to the language we use to articulate and communicate meanings. The needed transformation in education requires a realignment of educational phraseology with an entirely different set of definitions, meanings, and purposes. For example, a reexamination of the metaphors we use is essential. Using supervision or reflective coaching not only clearly indicates “where we’re coming from” but also defines human interactions in the workplace.

Yet a caveat about beliefs and actions or behaviors is in order. Reflective practice (see Osterman & Kottkamp, 2004) posits that our actions often are inconsistent with our intentions (or beliefs) and that new ideas do not necessarily lead to new behaviors. Espoused theories represent our conscious ideas, intentions, and beliefs. Following exposure to new ideas in graduate courses and workshops, we often believe that this information and the beliefs acquired through experience and formal education will guide our actions. Espoused theories, however, do not influence behavior directly. How many times have you thought after a leader’s speech, “Why doesn’t he or she practice what he or she preaches?” How many impressive workshops have we all attended with the best of intentions to implement our new knowledge, only to return to our old practices? How many supervisors preach active learning for all students and then conduct a feedback conference where they tell the teacher everything he or she must do without even thinking of asking for the teacher’s input?

Although we may consciously adopt new ideas, these action theories are ingrained so deeply in our consciousness that we cannot change them easily. Theories-in-use build and crystallize over a long period of time and become such an integral part of our beings that we are unaware of the discrepancies between our beliefs and actions or between our actions and intended outcomes. Actual change in our behaviors will take place only when we become aware of the discrepancy between a predominant theory-in-use and an unacceptable practice or outcome. Figure 1.1 shows how theories-in-use directly impact behavior. Espoused theories do not directly influence behavior and may or may not be consistent with theories-in-use.

Nonetheless, we believe that it is essential to articulate our espoused theories in the form of vision statements. It is, however, through the use of reflective practice (which is presented in more detail in Chapter 2) that the new ideas we will be learning in this book and the beliefs we will develop will become theories-in-use.

Philosophy, at least indirectly, influences actions, which in turn affect behavior. How we think shapes the world in which we live. For example, our values and beliefs shape the kinds of experiences we want young children to have in classrooms. They also affect what adults do in schools and define role relationships among members of a school system. If our attitudes about how best to organize large groups of people focus on hierarchical notions of differentiation and classification, then we will tend to conceptualize supervision as, for example, didactic and evaluative. Conversely, if our view of school management stresses collaboration and shared leadership, we will not be willing to construct an educational environment where disempowered individuals become spectators of, rather than participants in, their own work. This worldview will define supervision as collegial and interactive.

**Reflection**

Compose a list of your beliefs about teaching and learning, about teachers, about supervision, and about yourself.
Supervisory Beliefs Questionnaire

What are the qualities or dispositions we want future supervisors to possess? Are you willing and able to meet new supervisory challenges in the 21st century? The questionnaire in Figure 1.2 is designed to help you sort out your beliefs. More specifically, the survey is designed to assess your preference to function along the bureaucratic, inspectional, democratic, collegial continuum. You should have completed this questionnaire before you read this chapter. Make sure you retake the questionnaire when you have completed reading the book to assess whether any of your beliefs have changed.

Interpreting Answers to the Questionnaire

The following responses to each statement indicate that your supervisory preferences or inclinations operate along bureaucratic, authoritarian lines:


The following responses to each statement indicate that your supervisory preferences or inclinations operate along democratic, collaborative lines:


As we stated earlier, bureaucratic inspectional supervision should have no place in schools in the 21st century. For the future, we must prepare supervisors who truly espouse and practice participatory democratic values. Supervision that assumes that supervisors are experts and superior to teachers represents vestiges of control-oriented, inspectional practices. Although these kinds of practices were prevalent in early supervision, we argue that they should no longer be accorded attention.

(Note: In the ensuing discussion, statement numbers refer to the questionnaire in Figure 1.2.)

Bureaucratic thought essentially suggests that

- Supervision is inspectional (Statements 1 and 14).
- Hierarchy is necessary for organizational efficiency (Statements 5 and 6).
- Supervisors are experts and teachers are not (Statements 12, 18, 27, 29, 37, and 40).
- Teachers and supervisors are not equal partners (Statement 7).
- Teachers will not improve instruction on their own (Statements 16 and 33).

That hierarchy equals expertise and supervisors know more than teachers is axiomatic according to the bureaucratic belief system.

Furthermore, the following assumptions that, at first glance, might appear unproblematic also represent bureaucratic conceptions of supervision:

- Supervision is primarily about helping teachers improve instruction (Statements 8 and 9). This belief subtly implies that teachers are deficient, need help, and could not or would not seek improvement on their own.
- Supervisors help teachers change, as if teachers are deficient and necessarily need to change (Statements 15, 23, and 35). This belief implies that something is wrong with a teacher’s teaching.
- Teachers at low levels need assistance (Statement 2). This belief implies that supervisors can identify with certainty that a teacher is deficient. It also implies that supervisors should help teachers because they cannot improve through collaboration or self-reflection.
- Supervisors are agents of improved instruction (Statement 21). This belief implies that supervisors, not teachers, are agents of improved instruction.

The aforementioned conceptions of supervision underscore the superordinate-subordinate relationship between teachers and supervisors. Bureaucratic conceptions of supervision imply that teachers don’t know as much about teaching as do supervisors and, conversely, that supervisors possess greater teaching expertise than do teachers.

Democratic thought essentially suggests that

- Teaching is complex and not easily defined or understood (Statements 3 and 17).
- Individuals are more important than the organizations (Statements 4 and 32).
### Figure 1.2 Questionnaire Beliefs About Supervision

Please answer true (T) or false (F) to each of the following statements. Be honest: Answer true if the statement generally describes a belief you once held or currently hold. If a statement represents a belief that holds true in most situations, although not in all, answer true. Answer false if the statement in no way describes a belief you once held or currently hold. If a statement represents a belief that is false in most situations, although not in all, answer false. There is no need to share your responses with anyone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1. When it comes down to it, supervision, as I conceive of it, is essentially about looking for errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2. Guided directed approaches to supervision are most appropriate for teachers at low levels of personal and professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3. Teaching is a highly complex, context-specific, interactive activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4. Organizational concerns are almost always secondary to individual needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5. The supervisor's position in the hierarchy, as compared to the teacher's, is unproblematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6. Hierarchy of offices is necessary for organizational efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7. I am not comfortable participating with teachers as partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8. Supervision is about offering teachers specialized help in improving instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9. Supervision is about examining and analyzing classroom teaching behaviors so that recommendations can be made with regard to the course of action teachers should take instructionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10. Teachers can help supervisors improve their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11. Most teachers are self-directed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12. Supervisors should be expert diagnosticians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13. Supervision is primarily a collaborative process in which teachers and supervisors talk about ways to improve instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14. Supervision is about looking for errors and then engaging teachers in dialogue so that they realize these deficiencies on their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15. The focus of supervision should be about helping teachers change and improve instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16. Without assistance, teachers generally will not make changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17. Reality in classrooms is essentially subjective, not objective, and teaching is a complex endeavor that requires continual study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18. Although supervisor-teacher collaboration is important, a supervisor's judgment must ultimately hold sway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19. Schools are centers of inquiry in which teachers themselves must assume responsibility for instructional excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20. Teacher self-evaluation plays a prominent role in instructional improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21. The supervisor is the agent of improved instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22. Qualitative approaches to instructional improvement are just as valid as quantitative approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23. Supervisors help teachers change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24. Reflective dialogue is an integral component of supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25. Instructional improvement activities include peer coaching, action research projects, and problem-solving groups, as well as more traditional development activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26. Supervision is primarily about asking questions that facilitate the examination of teacher practice in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27. When I offer teachers constructive criticisms, I expect they will consider them carefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28. Experienced, high-functioning teachers should have complete control over their professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29. The supervisor ultimately should determine what and how a teacher should teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30. Teachers should be encouraged to carry out their own educational goals and curricular decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31. Teachers should be given options on how they want to teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32. Teachers should disobey official regulations if they feel that they interfere with the welfare of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33. Teachers don't spend enough time thinking about ways to improve instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34. Supervisors should create opportunities for teachers to make professional and personal choices, not shape their behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35. Supervisors should attentively listen to the teachers' concerns and offer critical assessment and constructive ideas for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36. Schools will improve primarily when a norm of collegiality exists in which shared discussion and shared work among all staff members exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37. The knowledge base of a supervisor is generally superior to that of a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38. Supervisors actively should seek input from teachers, parents, and students about ways to improve instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39. Most teachers don't need specific instructions on what to teach and how to teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40. Supervisors should have more expertise than teachers with respect to teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Most teachers are self-directed, responsible, and competent (Statements 10, 11, 19, 20, 28, 30, 31, and 39).
• Supervision is a truly collaborative process (Statements 13, 34, 36, and 38).
• Qualitative approaches to classroom improvement are just as valid as quantitative ones (Statements 22 and 24).
• Alternative approaches to traditional supervision are viable (Statement 25).
• Supervisors function at their best when they pose questions for critical analysis by teachers (Statement 26).

The aforementioned conceptions of supervision underscore the empowering nature of supervisor-teacher relationships. Teachers and supervisors work as collaborative inquirers for the benefit of students. The telling-and-prescribing nature of traditional supervision has no place in such a paradigm for school improvement.

Developing a Personal Vision Statement

Examining your beliefs about supervision and related areas is crucial if you are to function effectively as a supervisor in the 21st century. We think that developing a personal vision statement that articulates your beliefs about teachers and supervision is critical (Osterman & Kottkamp, 1993). This section challenges you to begin this process, which will be refined continually throughout this book. Now that we understand how supervision has evolved and realize that our beliefs are influenced, in part, by that history, our challenge will be to construct a personal supervisory vision statement that supports the view that supervision remains a potent process for facilitating instructional improvement.

What are your beliefs about teaching and learning, about teachers, about supervision, and about yourselves as supervisors?

In courses that we teach, we expect our prospective supervisors to develop such a vision statement. We, of course, review the contents of this chapter with them and have them take and interpret the Beliefs About Supervision questionnaire. We also expose them to other theories and surveys that help them to uncover their often hidden assumptions about supervisory work. Although we advocate a participatory democratic orientation to supervision, we believe that traditional types of supervision such as directive informational approaches (see Chapter 2) are useful. These practices should be employed with teachers who need substantial support. Use of this form of directive informational supervision “does not necessarily mean that the supervisor acts in an authoritative or arbitrary fashion” (Daresh & Playko, 1995, p. 333). Offering some direct assistance to teachers in need is necessary only when the situation calls for it. In our questionnaire, Statement 2 is indicative of a generalization often made by supervisors without input and agreement from other parties, including perhaps lead teachers. Therefore, this book does include one traditional, directive approach that should be used judiciously.

• Let’s begin to develop your personal vision statement. This vision statement is a personal statement that allows you to present your views regarding education and educational administration, your philosophy,
your values, your beliefs, your vision of the way schools should be, and your view about what you as a school leader would do to realize this vision. In short, the vision statement that will lead to a supervisory platform is a way for you to say what you stand for as an educational leader.

Guidelines and Questions for Writing Your Vision Statement

Writing a position statement is a powerful way to reflect. It’s a way to purposely articulate a leadership stance that can guide one’s practice as a leader. Reflection leads to more reflection as we refine our position or vision for leadership and school improvement.

As you are about to frame your vision statement, simply follow these general guidelines:

• Think deeply about the factors that have influenced your professional work and view of leadership.
• Keep in mind that the vision statement you’re about to frame is a personal statement that allows you to present your views regarding education and educational leadership, your philosophy, your values, your beliefs, your vision of the way schools should be, and your view about what you as a school leader would do to realize this vision. In short, the vision statement is a way for you to say what you stand for as an educational leader.

We offer specific questions to stimulate your thinking. We include questions based in part on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards that can also help frame your statement. For a complete listing of the current ISLLC Standards, consult http://www.ccsso.org/publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=365. Where possible,

• Support your ideas with examples and theories from the literature on leadership.
• Use examples that have inspired or influenced you.

Please remember that this activity is intended to help you articulate your own personal feelings and ideas. It is not a test of what you know, and there are no right answers. The guiding questions that follow are meant to stimulate thought. Although your statement should address the “big” ideas implied in these questions, you do not have to answer each one in sequence or at all. Allow them to guide your thoughts. Read them all and then start writing.

Guiding Questions:

1. What has influenced your vision of leadership? (ISLLC Standard 1)
2. What are your goals or hopes for your students? (ISLLC Standard 1)
3. What are the types of skills, attitudes, and feelings you want students to possess? (ISLLC Standard 1)
4. What type of climate is needed to support the student outcomes you identified above? (ISLLC Standard 2)
5. What can you do to help establish that climate? (ISLLC Standard 2)
6. What are your views about teaching and learning? (ISLLC Standard 2)
7. How should instruction be organized and delivered to support the type of climate and student outcomes you desire? (ISLLC Standard 2)

(Continued)
Three sample vision statements developed by our students appear at the end of this chapter; you can use these as a guide to inspire you in developing your own. These statements vary in length and style as well as content. Two pages may suffice to elucidate one person’s ideas, whereas another may require ten. These differences illustrate the idiosyncratic and essentially personal nature of visioning.

Class Practice

Bring three copies of the first draft of your vision statement to class. In groups of three, read each other’s vision statements, one at a time.

Please note that as you read others’ statements, do not be critical or judgmental. Simply raise questions for discussion as there is no one “right” response. The purpose of these sharings is to stimulate discussion, reflection, and personal refinement of vision statements. Therefore, offer descriptive, not evaluative, feedback to others. Here are a few guidelines to consider as you read others’ statements:

- What are the underlying assumptions?
- Are the statements in the platform internally consistent? For instance, if one attributes her or his current emphasis on nontraditional teaching methods to progressive teaching methods in the 1970s and 1980s, does she or he indicate similar inclinations in individual learning styles?
- Are there apparent inconsistencies? For instance, problematic is one who advocates constructivist teaching and then relies on directive methods in
one’s personal classroom. Remember, don’t criticize but merely ask, “I’ve noticed you said such and such, how does _____ relate to what you’ve said earlier?”

- Take notes on the writer’s perspective and value orientation to clarify your own positions and values.⁵

Realize, of course, that as you share your statements with others, revisions are inevitable. Incorporate your colleagues’ feedback and further reflections into your revisions. Share your draft with your supervisor(s) and ask them for feedback. We have found that we can also test our vision statements through simulated role plays (Osterman & Kottkamp, 1993, pp. 95–99). In these situations, we provide students with realistic situations or case studies and have them role-play.⁶ The following section outlines three examples.

### Case Studies

In each of the following situations, put yourself into the role of a supervisor who makes sense to you in your particular situation. It may be the role of building principal or assistant principal, department chairperson, or some other kind of district supervisor. Write down what you hope to accomplish in the role play. The class can divide into pairs, or volunteers can present each scenario. On completion of the role play, you reveal your intentions by reading your planning notes and sharing what you think you have achieved. The supervisee then describes how he or she felt, tells what he or she is going to do as a result of the interchange, and reflects on his or her perceptions of the supervisor’s perspective.

1. You have been invited into Mrs. Sanchez’s classroom to observe a high school social studies lesson on censorship in the media. You’ve spent 40 minutes observing the lesson and taking detailed descriptive data. At the feedback conference, Mrs. Sanchez feels the lesson was great. You have some reservations, however.

2. You are new to your supervisory position, and teachers are eager to find out more about you. At a grade or faculty conference, you are introduced to the faculty, at which time you make a 2-minute introductory statement. After the meeting, several teachers warmly welcome you to the school, but two teachers in particular inform you that your “lofty” ideas will fail “in our school.”

3. A teacher has been late to school and to homeroom. The situation first came to your attention when you observed students standing by the classroom doorway after the last bell had rung. You questioned the students and discovered that there was a pattern to the teacher’s late arrival. You have left a note in the teacher’s mailbox requesting that he or she see you after school. In the current situation, the teacher has just arrived.

### Reflection

How did you respond to these situations?

What do you think is the value of a personal vision statement in handling difficult supervisory situations?

---

### EXAMPLES OF PERSONAL VISION STATEMENTS⁷

#### Sample 1

The education of children is the most important job a country undertakes, and the one most crucial for its growth. The investment in education reaps
untold rewards as the nation forges ahead as a global leader in technology, the arts, industry, and in the development of humanity itself. In the 21st century, the schooling of children has become the single most important job America does, and those who engage in this crucial profession—teachers and administrators alike—are the innovators of our time. A school leader, then, is a facilitator who efficiently organizes the many resources necessary for a comprehensive and sustained learning environment. As a prospective school leader, I will strive to nurture the growth of students into becoming thoughtful human beings who care about America, ready at a future time to work for its betterment.

Educating the whole child—mind and body—into becoming a kind scholar concerned with the welfare of people will be the centerpiece of my vision. Social justice, then, will be the overarching goal with which our school will concern itself. Our school’s purpose will be to educate the child not just for the purpose of getting a good job, but to gain, through an intellectually rigorous curriculum, an appreciation for the delightful diversity and amazing structure of the world itself—and by appreciating it, the child will be troubled by the many difficulties afflicting it. We will ask this crucial question: How can we bring knowledge of English, mathematics, history, science, and the arts to bear on the problems within our community and our great country? Our learning community will strive to create rich, engaging lessons that will answer this question, and, in the process, not only comply with the standards but go beyond them in encouraging thoughtful scholars who can think critically, analyze rigorously, and synthesize usefully.

Junior high school students need stability in order to grow, indeed, to flourish. Therefore, whenever possible I will implement teacher looping from sixth to eighth grade as a means of ensuring that each class feels it has a concerned adult who oversees its middle school experience. Done properly, looping has the potential to foster a bedrock foundation of trust between student and teacher—an important component of any type of learning process—leading to new heights of learning and expectations in the classroom. I believe students and adults will rise to the challenges presented to them once confidence is established among all participants.

The principal leads by example and must derive forward-thinking ideas based on data and research gleaned directly from classroom practice. My vision includes myself as teacher and learner. To gain legitimacy as a school leader, I plan to conduct constant professional development, modeling successful instruction through time-tested and research-backed methodologies that encourage student interest. Furthermore, when time is available, I aim to model these lessons in the classroom, teaching the most “at risk” students, those who may be seen as unteachable.

Through this, I will promote and encourage a learning culture where the question is not, “Why isn’t this child learning?” but, rather, “What can we do to have this child learn?” Every child has enormous potential for learning, potential that may at times be largely untapped until he or she meets the right teacher in the right school. I aim to model this philosophy by jumping right into the midst of instruction, bridging the gap that so often divides administrator from teacher. The principal as teacher, then, does a number of things: She or he (1) combats the perception that administrators are ex-teachers who grow tired of the classroom; (2) leads through collaboration among teachers, but as an equal, practicing and understanding effective instruction; and (3) shows
commitment to his or her firmly held belief that all students can learn by teaching those who are too often left along the wayside.

The instructional climate is one where teachers are partners, not just participants, in the planning of curriculum, the development of new instructional programs, and the creation of a school culture that has high standards for its children as well as its adults. My vision includes collaborative teams where decisions are made democratically so that every faculty member feels vested in the process and the outcome. This includes, but is not limited to, teams that analyze data and use them to guide instructional decisions, school leadership teams that assess the effectiveness of schoolwide instruction, and community outreach teams that identify segments of the community that can benefit from student involvement.

My vision of leadership includes a large technological component. Teaching in the 21st century must embrace what technology has to offer in the form of engaging subject lessons, student collaboration, teacher-parent communication, streamlining of organizational procedures, and much more. The role of a school leader will be to keep abreast of new technologies, share them with the staff, model their efficiencies, and put into action ongoing and effective professional development to sustain implementation. Learning new technology can be daunting for many people, and it is crucial that the school leader show the kindness of technology in making the job of a teacher much more exciting and efficient. Therefore, a school leader needs to model standards-based lessons where technology plays a central role in eliciting and encouraging student interest. Furthermore, the school leader must show how technology endows student assessment with laserlike focus, enabling teachers to plan lessons around the instructional needs of their classes.

Parental support is crucial if a child and, by extension, a school are to succeed. Parents are partners in the education process and must be brought into the equation of student learning if there is to be continued student growth and success. A mutual relationship—the central purpose of which is our students' intellectual, social, and moral growth—must be based on respect, trust, and the development of our children. A school leader must act in the highest ethical manner with integrity and sensitivity to the needs of parents. Once trust is established, a school leader can foster a culture where everyone, parents and teachers alike, are focused on student achievement. Rapid and plentiful communication, then, is central to creating this plan. My vision for effective parent-school communication would entail creating a Web site that would function as a platform for extensive and up-to-date school information. Additionally, every class will have a Web site account in which to facilitate teacher-student-parent interaction and information. Fast and efficient communication is the hallmark of the 21st century. My vision for a school will have that as a cornerstone.

The role of the community in strengthening the school both financially and socially is essential for the growth of a successful learning institution. As a school leader, I will facilitate community relationships, solicit private and nonprofit services, and engage and invite parent volunteers. My vision includes encouraging members of the community to feel a vested interest in the welfare of the school and the children attending it and, thus, look out for those children when they aren’t in school. This would include working with local government and community organizations to create fun, educational afterschool activities to sustain student development.
A school leader bears a sacred trust, one not to be taken lightly. Thus, my vision statement aims to incorporate the ideas necessary for what I see as a successful, vibrant school where teaching and learning flourish, and where, through education, children’s and adults’ possibilities become filled with new and ever-widening horizons. Surely the position of a school leader, then, is the greatest job in the world!

**Sample 2**

One hundred years from now it will not matter what kind of car I drove, what kind of house I lived in, how much money I had in my bank account, or what my clothes looked like. But one hundred years from now the world may be a little better because I was important in the life of a child.

—Dr. Forest E. Witcraft

(http://www.pgcps.pg.k12.md.us/~kworth/1046/within.html)

October 1950 issue of *Scouting* magazine (p. 2)

In crafting a personal vision, it is important to reflect on what matters most in one’s life. What matters to me is that I make a difference in this world, hopefully one child at a time. Children are the future of our country, and as such, there is no job more important than educating them. As educators, we play a critical role in molding the world in which we live. We get to leave our mark on society through our development of minds. There is no other profession in society that has been entrusted with this responsibility, and I can think of no greater honor I shall receive in my lifetime.

If you give a man a fish, he eats for a day; if you teach a man to fish, he will be able to eat for a lifetime. When thinking about my philosophy of education, this saying often comes to mind. It has long been my goal to develop independence in my students. I perceive my role as an educator as one that gradually decreases over time. Initially, I provide strong guidance to students, then over time, scaffolding. In a sense, I am like the training wheels on a bicycle that can be removed when no longer needed. A job well done should leave my students ready to drive away, not with a road map, but rather with a compass they can use to navigate their way through life.

All children have the right to an education. This education should develop the child socially, emotionally, academically, and ethically. Recognizing that each member of the school community possesses unique gifts and talents will enable us to build on strengths rather than focus on weaknesses. Using Stephen Covey’s *7 Habits of Highly Effective People* will enable the school community to create an environment that allows every individual to feel valued. Recently Covey (2005) revised his work to add an eighth habit, and one that fits particularly well with my educational values—“Find your voice, and inspire others to find theirs.” It is my hope that as an educational leader, I can help people find their voices and use them to have a positive impact on society. My vision will be to embed Dr. Covey’s principles into the culture of the school, and use them to guide the faculty and students as they create a shared vision. In addition, as part of this collaboration, I would invite the PTA, community members, and families to participate in this process. Through
establishment of these cooperative relationships, I hope to develop a strong community of learners.

As the school’s leader, I have the responsibility of creating an effective learning environment. This environment will include several crucial team members—students, teachers, and parents. Students come to school to learn and should be engaged and excited about their learning. Teachers come to school to teach and should be given administrative support to meet the needs of the students in their care. Parents send their children to school with the hope that we will educate, mold, and care for them, and should find comfort in the knowledge that their child is in good hands. Peter Senge states that “A shared vision is not an idea. . . . It is, rather, a force in people’s hearts. . . . At its simplest level, a shared vision is the answer to the question ‘What do we want to create?’” (http://www.leading-learning.co.nz/famous-quotes.html#culture).

I believe that this question can be the focal point for all team members in the learning community. Given this opportunity, what is it that we want to create, and how will we go about creating it? The infusion of Covey’s habits can give us an organizational structure and a starting point for our work.

Using the habit begin with the end in mind will lead to reflection about school goals. The overall goal of the school will be to provide a safe, engaging learning environment that meets the needs of all participants. The curriculum will be rigorous and will provide opportunities to discover and build on individual strengths. Integrated into our academic curriculum will be strong character development, using Covey’s model by which we will teach leadership skills, tolerance, respect, and responsibility. Developing leadership in students empowers teachers to provide individualized instruction that meets diverse needs. Further, it empowers students to construct their learning in the manner that best suits their individual learning style. Moving away from a one-size-fits-all model, I would like to empower all stakeholders, our children, our teachers, and our parents, to construct a learning community that will challenge them all to reach their potential.

In order to accomplish these ideals, we will need to have strong professional development for all the stakeholders. Covey’s habit seek first to understand, then to be understood fosters the idea that the stakeholders first have to understand themselves what they are trying to accomplish. Training everyone involved about Covey’s leadership model will enable us to develop consistency in our mission, build community, and develop strong links between home and school.

In developing a strong leadership curriculum, it will be important for teachers and students to meet with and understand common characteristics of strong leaders. These characteristics will be embraced by all: strong work ethic, perseverance, hard work, and being goal oriented. Modeling how leaders work together collaboratively with diverse members of our population will be critical to developing tolerance and respect for others. Classrooms will be structured so that teamwork can occur daily. Curriculum developed will foster collaborative learning activities that teach the value of others’ opinions and the idea that you are working for the betterment of a group. No longer will students hold themselves accountable to only themselves, but rather they will now be accountable to others as well. It will be through creation of synergy that great ideas will be born.

Being proactive will enable us to tie leadership training into our efforts to strengthen academic performance. Using data, we can set attainable goals for all members of our school community. I will meet with all teachers at the
beginning of the school year to discuss their personal goals for the year. What is it that they would like to accomplish, and how can I support them in achieving their goal? Follow-up meetings will occur throughout the year to monitor progress in reaching individual goals and to discuss any additional support they feel is needed. In the same manner, students will set individual goals based on personal needs. For example, if students achieved a Level 4 (the highest level) on the state exam, we can discuss scale scores and help them set personal goals. Using the scale score, we can determine how much room they have to grow within the year and ask them what they think is an attainable goal. All students will set personal and academic goals quarterly, enabling us to monitor their progress over time. Goal setting will also take place at the classroom level with each class creating a mission statement. Students will construct collaboratively with their teacher a mission statement for the work they will do throughout the year. In addition, older students will be taught to write personal vision statements and reflect on them as the year progresses. Action plans such as goal setting will enable us to grow as professionals and learners because we have systems in place that provide ongoing support to all involved. These are also life skills that will support each participant in his or her personal development.

While we will strive to meet the learning standards of our state, I do not foresee these as boundary setting. Rather, I believe we can go beyond the basic competency levels outlined in the state and city standards through implementation of a rigorous curriculum. Integrating curriculum using the differentiation model created by Carol Tomlinson (1999) will allow us to deliver instruction that is standard and concept based, student centered, and relevant to the world. As a school leader, I will support the development of concept-based units in grade-level teams. The figure below illustrates the organizational structure we will use as we develop our units of study.

From What Students Need to Know, Understand, and Do by Carol Tomlinson, an unpublished PowerPoint presentation.
In breaking down planning like this, we are *beginning with the end in mind.* Reflecting on key understandings we begin by asking, What is it the students need to understand and/or be able to do, and what broader concept is that learning a part of? This dialogue will lead to development of an essential understanding, or essential question, that will guide the learning. Instruction will be differentiated to meet the needs of all learners, and teachers will be provided with strong professional development to ensure that they understand this process.

Schools should be the hub of the community, or the place people gather. It is my hope that I can partner with community-based organizations to open the school beyond normal school hours. I envision a school that offers programs after school and on weekends, providing students with a safe haven. By offering organized activities, we will provide additional means by which students can develop leadership qualities. Students will be offered opportunities to work collaboratively for social action on causes they select. In addition, participation in team sports can afford students the opportunity to foster identified leadership characteristics such as hard work, perseverance, and working toward betterment of the group. Funding for such activities will likely be needed, and I plan to reach out to community-based organizations through grant writing to achieve this goal.

Any worthwhile goals require sacrifice and hard work; however, when you love what you do, the work is easy. Becoming an educational leader is something I have wanted for a long time. I have strived to learn as much as I could in my field and now feel ready to take those next steps. It is my hope that I will get to make a difference in the lives of the teachers, children, and families in my care. I believe I will be a true constructivist leader who, to paraphrase John Dewey, will seek to make my school fit the child.

**Sample 3**

*Leadership Platform*

A school is a community of individuals who are committed to a set of guiding principles, and who take personal responsibility for the success of each member of the community. As the educational leader of this school community, my mission is to support the development of an educational environment that addresses the intellectual and developmental needs of the middle school child, that acknowledges individual variability while maintaining a high level of expectations for all, and that provides a variety of forums for individual and collective reflection and self-assessment.

Central to the creation of a school culture that reflects my vision are four interrelated components: student outcomes, instructional climate, philosophy of instruction, and governance and leadership. Culture is defined as the habits, routines, and behaviors (conscious and unconscious) that reveal the beliefs, norms, and values that build up over time within a school. Within this definition are four subcategories: (1) interpersonal culture, or the philosophy and level of collegiality among members of the school community; (2) organizational culture, or the philosophy and level of internal support for practices and programs; (3) teaching culture, or the philosophy and level of belief in student achievement; and (4) external culture, or the philosophy and level of external support for practices and programs. The art of the principal lies in her ability to orchestrate each element in the environment into a unified culture of shared expectations and
accountability. To better understand my vision of leadership, it is necessary to define each component and demonstrate how each is integrated into the overarching school culture.

**Student Outcomes**

The cornerstone of any educational vision is student outcomes. Viewed holistically, students need to develop the academic, social, and personal levels of competence that will prepare them to be productive members of society and contributors to the workforce. All children have the potential to reach high standards of personal competence. My vision is to create a culture that supports all students in realizing their potential by creating an instructional program that supports high academic achievement and that encourages the development of self-discipline, positive self-image, strong personal values, and unilateral respect for all school community members.

Academically, students would develop literacy skills in written and spoken English and apply these skills to the mastery of content-area material. This is critical in light of the implementation of the performance standards and the new promotional policy. They would have access to technology and develop the skills necessary to locate, utilize, and evaluate electronic information. Students would have extensive exposure to the arts, so as to develop an appreciation for the richness and diversity of cultures. Learning would be interactive, with ample opportunities for students to experience “real world” applications of knowledge, so as to see the connections between content-area materials and between the classroom and life.

Concurrently, students would develop social consciousness and civic responsibility. They would have opportunities to participate in school and community-based service projects whose focus is the development of student awareness of social and political issues, and the relevance of these issues to their lives, the lives of their families, and the life of their community. Ideally, these opportunities would be intergenerational and multicultural, so as to engage students in meaningful and sustained relationships with adults and younger children from all cultural and economic groups, as well as with their peers. In this way, students would be able to develop sensitivity to the needs of others, recognize their similarities, appreciate their differences, and thereby develop a sense of mutual respect. Integral to these service projects should be connections to their classroom content-area learning to reinforce the connections between school and life.

Academic and service-learning outcomes are intrinsically connected to the developmental outcomes for students. These are crucial for all students, but particularly for adolescents who are grappling with issues of identity and self-worth. Integrated into student outcomes for academic and social learning would be outcomes for personal development and growth. Students should have multiple opportunities to develop self-awareness, self-competence, and self-esteem. Educational experiences would be varied and allow for individual differences, learning styles, and rates of development. Opportunities for student self-expression would abound within the context of social and personal accountability. Character education would be a key component of the educational program and support the development of students who strive to achieve their personal best.
Instructional Climate

The realization of student outcomes is inextricably tied to the instructional climate. My vision is of the school as a safe harbor or sanctuary in which students, staff, and parents feel safe and nurtured, and in which there is an atmosphere of personal responsibility and mutual respect. The culture of the school would support collaboration, foster reflection, and celebrate accomplishment. Multiple opportunities for celebration of individual and schoolwide success in all areas of achievement would be developed. Student work would be prominently displayed throughout the building, and efforts to acknowledge each student’s strengths would be encouraged. Classrooms would be print and material rich, and students would have daily access to technology. A code of appropriate behavior would be developed, agreed on, and modeled by all. Consequences for inappropriate behavior would be clear and consistently enforced by all members of the school community.

The school climate would also support professional development that is an outgrowth of self-assessment and reflection and that supports collaboration and collegiality. All staff have the capacity for professional growth. My vision is to create a culture that supports teachers in fulfilling this capacity by providing new-teacher training, leadership opportunities, meaningful staff development, and experience in innovative educational practices and strategies. Opportunities for staff to develop and refine their instruction would be organic, teacher directed, and sustained throughout the year. Flexible programming would provide time for teachers to participate in weekly study groups to examine student work and teacher practice in the context of the standards. Each study group would follow specific protocols and be facilitated by a peer coach, teachers would participate in weekly peer observations, and classrooms would serve as demonstration sites for specific organizational and instructional practices. Structured opportunities for daily interaction among staff around instructional issues, and ongoing reflection among colleagues about student work and outcomes, would replace one-day trainings and workshops. Ample professional resources would be housed in the professional library so as to support all aspects of the professional development program.

Time and funding for teachers to participate in professional conferences would be provided, with the expectation that they would turnkey this training. In this way, a cadre of in-house specialists would be developed to build schoolwide capacity and foster the development of a community of learners.

Parents would also have ample opportunities to develop the capacity to be partners in their children’s education. All parents have the responsibility to be active members in their children’s educational experience. My vision is to create a culture that supports parents in exercising this responsibility by fostering a dynamic school-family partnership whose focus is active parental involvement in the educational decision-making process and shared, constructive evaluation of learning policies. A parent center with extensive resources in multiple languages would be established. Parent workshops on a wide spectrum of topics, ranging from parenting skills, to literacy strategies, to leadership teams, would be offered throughout the day, as well as in the evening and on weekends to encourage participation. Translators would be provided to facilitate interaction. Parents would be encouraged to participate in the daily activities of the school, to serve on committees and leadership...
teams, to become volunteers and tutors, and to participate, with teachers and administrators, in study groups around student work. They would be viewed as full and equal partners in the educational process and in the daily life of the school.

**Instructional Program**

The instructional climate is the framework that supports the instructional program. Students would have a variety of learning experiences within and outside of the classroom that focus on the development of the habits of mind of the lifelong learner. The schedule would be divided into instructional blocks that are interdisciplinary in focus and that are taught by a team of teachers. These teachers would be a combination of generalists and specialists, and they would develop curriculum that explores the connection between content areas and between the classroom and the world. This curriculum would reflect multiple instructional strategies, so as to accommodate diverse student learning needs and styles. Students would be grouped heterogeneously, and teachers would follow their classes from grade to grade to support instructional and interpersonal continuity. Curriculum would include authentic, project-based learning, and opportunities for community mentorships. Class groupings and scheduling would be flexible to allow for reconfiguration of students and blocks of time as needed. Each student would have an adult adviser and a minimum of 20 minutes of advisory per day.

Opportunities for enrichment, intervention, and extracurricular activities would be offered before and after the school day. Parents and members of the community would be encouraged to offer courses during the extended day, as well as to serve as tutors and mentors. The assessment model would incorporate a spectrum of tools to support a holistic approach to evaluation. Foremost among these tools would be student portfolios and student exhibitions. Rubrics for assessing student growth toward the standard, and the tools to assess this growth, would be developed by students and their teachers with the input of the school community. Every aspect of the instructional program would focus on the diverse needs of the students; on their academic, social, and personal growth; and on high standards for student achievement. The school community would be committed to maintaining the same high level of expectations for all students, while acknowledging the individual differences among students in meeting the standards and encouraging and nurturing student enthusiasm for learning.

**Governance and Leadership**

Essential to the realization of my educational vision is a model of governance and leadership that supports collaboration and a sense of personal accountability to a set of guiding principles, and that includes and encourages multiple perspectives. In this model, the principal would be responsible for providing the time and the structure for students, staff, parents, and other school community members to openly participate in some aspect of the governance process. This would require identifying specific issues and constituencies and creating multiple governance forums, as well as ensuring that all stakeholders are involved at some point, as appropriate. This includes not only teachers, parents, and students but also custodial and cafeteria staff,
health providers, and members of community-based organizations. The principal would also create an environment that fosters open dialogue among the various stakeholders and that provides training in the new paradigm of the shared decision-making process. In this environment, the goals of the school would be developed collaboratively with student achievement as the focus, and the progress toward the goals would be assessed through a process of ongoing reflection. The specific structure of the assessment component would be developed by the school community and would incorporate multiple assessment models, both formal and informal. Responsibility for student achievement would be shared by all stakeholders, and finger-pointing and blaming would be replaced by an atmosphere of collegiality and collaboration in which each member of the school community would take responsibility for the successes and the failures.

As the leader in this school culture, I would model the values, beliefs, and behavior I sought to engender. My leadership style would be proactive, flexible, and reflective. I would be genuine in my commitment to a collaborative approach to leadership and sustain a constant focus on the fundamental belief that student achievement must drive all aspects of the educational process. I would maintain an open-door policy, seeking input from members of the school community and participating in the reflective process. I would actively work to secure the resources needed to support the instructional process and to develop and sustain a supportive and open relationship with the district and the community. I would lead by example and demonstrate those qualities of integrity, focus, and mutual respect that are fundamental to my vision of a school community. I would share in both the joys of our successes and in the struggles of our setbacks. I would be coach, facilitator, and exemplar, sustaining the vision and holding the guiding principles continually in the forefront of all our endeavors.

CONCLUSION

The supervisory landscape has evolved since the early inspectional practices of supervisors in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Supervision in a postindustrial society requires a new breed of supervisor, one who advocates and affirms participatory democratic practices. Who are these supervisors? What kind of supervisors do we want to attract into the field? Are you more inclined to encourage teachers in ongoing, meaningful dialogue about instructional improvement, or do you feel more comfortable suggesting to teachers ways to improve their teaching?

We have suggested in this chapter that supervision in postindustrial times requires that supervisors develop a personal vision statement so that they begin to consciously affirm their beliefs about teaching and supervision. Such reflective practice is a powerful way to enhance professional development.

Confronted by complex and seemingly perplexing social, political, technological, and moral issues, educational supervisors, perhaps more than ever before, play a crucial role in developing sound educational programming that is both educative and meaningfully relevant. Considering these awesome and challenging responsibilities, we believe educational supervision can play a vital role in promoting excellent instruction.
NOTES

1. Although the special supervisor as a specific title disappeared, a host of other supervisors later emerged, such as supervisors of curriculum, instruction, and reading, among others.
2. For a more in-depth historical analysis, see Glanz (1998).
3. This section is informed by the work of Reitzug (1997).
4. Favorite surveys that we use include the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Personal Values Questionnaire and Managerial Style Questionnaire from McBer and Company (1994), the Let Me Learn Learning Combination Inventory Professional Form (Johnston & Dainton, 1997), Assessing Your Natural Leadership Qualities (Glanz, 2002), and the Natural Life Energy Survey (Null, 1996). We also encourage our students to read The Reflective Supervisor by Calabrese and Zepeda (1997).
5. For a more in-depth discussion of descriptive feedback, see Osterman and Kottkamp (1993), pp. 91–95.
6. This exercise has been adapted from Osterman and Kottkamp (1993), p. 96. See pp. 96–99 for a more detailed discussion of the process.
7. Special thanks to Laura Kump (Sample 2) and Fran Macko (Sample 3) for giving us permission to share their vision statements. The first one is the vision statement of a leadership candidate.