A CASE STUDY: THE ISSUES HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ENCOUNTER WITH

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

By

GREGORY CURTIS GENTRY, SR.

(Under the direction of DR. SALLY J. ZEPEDA)

ABSTRACT

This case study explored the perspectives of four high school principals regarding the definition of instructional supervision, the process of instructional supervision, the climate that enhances instructional supervision, what gets in the way of principals supervising teachers, and the structure of the high school. The constant comparative method of data analysis was used in this qualitative study. Drawing from the literature in the areas of the purposes and intents of instructional supervision and the history of the principal as instructional leader, the researcher examined the construct of instructional supervision within the high school setting. Results indicated that principals could not clearly articulate a definition of supervision, but rather, they defined supervision as evaluation. The factors that enhanced supervision included trust and management style. Findings indicate that due to the compartmentalized nature of the high school that the principals in this study were stymied by their inability to set priorities based on work demands and lack of expertise across specialized content areas. Other constraints included role entanglements between assistant principals, department chairs, and instructional coordinators that prevented the principals from emerging as informed

instructional supervisors in their buildings. Discussion and implications are presented for

principals, school systems, and leadership preparation programs in higher education.

INDEX WORDS: Instructional supervision, Supervision, Teacher Evaluation, High

School, Principal, Leadership, Instructional Leadership.

A CASE STUDY: THE ISSUES HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ENCOUNTER WITH

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION


by


GREGORY CURTIS GENTRY, SR.

B.S., Georgia College and State University 1990

M.Ed., Georgia College and State University 1995

Ed.S., The University of Georgia 1996




A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree




DOCTOR OF EDUCATION




ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

A CASE STUDY OF THE ISSUES HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ENCOUNTER

WITH INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

by

GREGORY CURTIS GENTRY, SR.

Approved:

Major Professor:     Dr. Sally J. Zepeda

Committee:          Dr. Kenneth Tanner
                    Dr. C. Thomas Holmes
                    Dr. Julius Scipio
                    Dr. Anthony Strange

Electronic Version Approved:

Gordon L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2002

DEDICATION

This work is lovingly dedicated to my wife, Mary H. Gentry.

This project would not have been without her love, help, and support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The issues surrounding supervision have been debated by K-12 teachers,

administrators, higher education scholars, and legislators (Glanz & Neville, 1997;

Glickman, 1990; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). According to Glickman (1990), "without

a strong, effective, and adequately staffed program of supervision, an effective school is

unlikely to result" (pp. 4-5). The purpose of this study was to examine the perspectives

related to instructional supervision of four high school principals in one public school

system in Georgia. The knowledge discovered through such a study could be beneficial to

principals and other school administrators interested in improving supervision as it relates

to teacher development and growth at the high school level.

Statement of the Problem

If the role of supervision is a vital aspect to the success of education and the

educational process, what gets in the way of supervision serving its purpose? Are the

supervisors at fault? Are the persons being supervised at fault? Is the process itself to

blame? Certainly the answers to these questions would benefit supervisors, those being

supervised, schools, and school systems.

Supervision can be defined as "the glue of a successful school" (Glickman,

Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1998, p. 6). Supervision has become an integral component and

process in the operation of schools (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Despite the

importance of supervision, Glickman et al. (1998) reported:

> The glue is the process by which some person or group of people is responsible for providing a link between individual teacher needs and organizational goals so that individuals within the school can work in harmony toward their vision of what the school should be … Unfortunately, there are more 'glueless' than glued schools. Research findings on the effectiveness of schools paint a dismal picture. Most schools simply do not make much difference in their students' lives … Thus, the primary function of effective supervision is to take responsibility for putting more glue into the school. (p. 6)

Goldhammer (1969) suggested that supervision should increase teachers' willingness and ability to supervise themselves and their colleagues. Zepeda, Wood, and O'Hair (1996) coined the term, "autosupervision," to describe the ability of teachers to supervise themselves, and Joyce and Showers' (1982) research has provided the rationale for collegial, peer coaching.

Supervision can be seen as analogous to teaching in that teachers wish to improve students" behavior, achievement, and attitudes while supervisors wish to improve teachers' behavior, achievement, and attitudes (Glickman et al. 1998). MacKenzie (1983) stated, "schools that link their instruction and classroom management with professional development, direct assistance to teachers, curriculum development, group development, and action research under a common purpose achieve their objectives" (p. 8).

Reports such as A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Education, 1983) and A Study of Schooling (Goodlad, 1984) have brought to the public forefront the need for improvement in our nation's schools. One major characteristic of these reports is that each teacher has a "cause beyond oneself [and in] successful schools, education is a collective rather than an individual enterprise" (Glickman et al. 1998, p. 45).

Theoretical Significance

The word supervision is derived from the two words "superior" and "vision" (Glickman et al. 1998). This origin lends itself to the idea that one party in supervision is

more powerful than the other party (Jonasson, 1993). Reitzug (1997) found in an analysis

of supervision textbooks that supervisors were portrayed as "expert and superior in

relation to teachers while teachers were portrayed as deficient and in need of

improvement and help from experts" (pp. 332-333). From lay committees conducting

school inspections in the 18$^{th}$ Century, to the 1960s "teacher-proof" curricula and right

up to the practices of neoscientific management of the 1990s, instructional supervision in

a majority of schools has focused on inspection and control of teachers (Glanz, 2000;

Gordon, 1992).

Zepeda and Ponticell (1998) conducted a study to determine what teachers "need,

want, and get from supervision" (p. 71). Their findings supported the positional power of

the supervisor dominating over the inferior teacher. Five categories of supervision at its

worst were identified by the participants, 114 teachers across two states, in this study.

Categories included:

> (1) supervision as a dog and pony show;
> (2) supervision as a weapon;
> (3) supervision as a meaningless/invisible routine;
> (4) supervision as a fix-it list; and,
> (5) supervision as an unwelcome intervention. (p. 73)

Blumberg (1980), in Supervision and Teachers: A Private Cold War, described

the negative relationship between supervisors and teachers, describing the resentment

teachers felt toward supervisors, and this resentment continues to be a major barrier in

achieving benefit from the practice of supervision. Teachers' perceptions of supervisors

were negative, and the teachers believed that supervisors were not of any valuable

assistance. Blumberg asserted that supervision was used as a means to control and to

exert power. He concluded that supervision in schools had two main components:

> The first is that much of what occurs in the name of supervision in the schools (the transactions that take place between supervisor and teacher) constitutes a waste of time, as teachers see it. In many instances, the best evaluation that teachers give of their supervision is that it is not harmful. The second is that the character of relationships between teachers as a group and supervisors as a group can be described as a private cold war. Neither side trusts the other, and each side is convinced of the correctness of the process. (p. 5)

For many teachers, supervision is a meaningless exercise that has little value other than completion of the required evaluation form. Sullivan and Glanz (2000) stated, "Historically, the evaluation function of supervision is rooted in bureaucratic inspectional-type supervision. In other words, the evaluative aspect of the supervisory function emanates from organizational requirements to measure and access teaching effectiveness" (p. 22).

Teachers are more than willing to share personal anecdotes relating supervision to evaluation. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) stated, "At best, their encounters with supervisors led directly to evaluative judgements based on the skimpiest of evidence. At worst, they are destructive of autonomy, self-confidence, and personal integrity" (p. 86). Zepeda and Ponticell (1998) reported, "Teachers would even sign off on evaluation reports with little or no discussion with supervisors and, in the worst cases, without the supervisor even having been in the teacher's classroom" (p. 85).

Supervision has evolved as a set of bureaucratic procedures used as a powerful administrative means to control teachers (Foster, 1986). When a supervisor enters a classroom, the teacher is automatically placed in the role of employee and the supervisor enjoys the privileges of being in charge (Glanz & Neville, 1997). Sullivan (1980) cited by Glanz and Neville (1997) summarized the control issue with the label "snoopervision" (p. 156). In Smyth's "prevailing canons of supervision," he stated:

> Supervision is hierarchical in the sense that someone lower on the educational totem pole (a teacher) has something 'done to them' by someone wise and higher up (usually a nonteaching administrator), in a context in which the latter is construed as having some kind of (undisclosed) 'expertise.' (1998, p. 288)

Supervision is not a positive experience for teachers, and Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) concluded, "teachers generally dislike being the object of supervision. They tend to perceive supervision as inherent in the administrative hierarchy and to see the supervisor as being somewhat of a threat" (p. 14).

Teacher Supervision and Evaluation

"Evaluation is a reflective process of gathering data through formal and informal means and then making a decision for action" (Drake & Roe, 1999, p. 280). McGreal (1983) declared that teachers have viewed supervision as being equal to evaluation, which is the determining factor in continued employment. In support of this conclusion, Smyth (1998) in his canons of supervision related that supervision occurs through an isolated classroom visit in which data is collected which results in an objective, nonjudgmental, and nonpolitical appraisal of the teacher focused on improving instruction.

Blumberg (1980) observed that the confusion between the intents and purposes of supervision and evaluation resulted from supervisors being expected to assist teachers who might need help and then asked to make decisions about the same teacher's continued employment on the basis of what was observed. Blumberg further noted that when a supervisor visits a classroom the teacher is "struggling to protect their territory while supervisors struggle to gain further access to it" (p. 6). The impossibility of teachers' ability to distinguish between supervision and evaluation was reported by Hazi (1994) in a case study of a New Jersey school district's court case regarding teacher

evaluation and supervision. Hazi concluded, "no amount of linguistic maneuvering will reconcile the two for teachers" (p. 216).

Waite (1997) contended that the evaluation of teachers is a "homage to the organization, the bureaucracy and not the teacher" (p. 57). Hunter (1984) asserted that there were distinct differences between supervision and evaluation with evaluation requiring only that teachers are assigned to categories indicating success or failure based on accumulated evidence. Gordon as cited by Glanz and Neville (1997) claimed the teacher evaluation process was a distasteful activity for most evaluators and teachers and that, "The evaluation process has had almost no effect on teachers' instructional behavior once the evaluation has been completed" (p. 117).

Teachers view supervision for the sake of evaluation as often being anything other than uplifting. Sergiovanni and Starratt reported:

> Again and again teachers tell of being placed in win-lose situations, of experiencing powerlessness, manipulation, sexual harassment, and racial and ethnic stereotyping. At best, their encounters with supervisors lead directly to evaluative judgements based on the skimpiest of evidence. At worst, they are destructive of autonomy, self-confidence and personal integrity. Unfortunately, supervision as practiced by some supervisors is not only nonprofessional, it is dehumanizing and unethical. (1998, p. 88)

Classroom observations that begin with a preconceived process for what effective teaching is tend not to be helpful (Stoldowsky, 1984). By evaluating one slice of time, supervisors who evaluate teachers cannot be aware of all that occurs in the classroom (Juska, 1991). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) summarized that the "evaluation of teachers is a very complex and imperfect art that, in practice, few have mastered" (p. 86).

Trust

"Nothing can be accomplished in a climate of distrust" (Pajak, 1993, p. 101).

Pajak further points out that low trust, defensiveness, secrecy, and a preoccupation with

winning often characterize the interactions between teachers and supervisors in schools

(Blumberg, 1980). Covey asserted that trust was, "the highest form of human motivation.

It brings out the very best in people" (1989, p. 178). Trust is defined by Covey as "the

emotional bank account between two people that enables them to have a win-win

agreement, and is the root of success or failure in business, industry, education and

government" (1989, p. 31).

Schmuck and Runkel (1994) defined trust as "a quality that is built very slowly

and in small increments, is established more by deeds than by words, and is sustained by

openness in interpersonal relations" (p. 98). Blase and Blase (1994) found that in daily

conversations, colleagues often respond to one another in "binding" not "freeing" ways.

Instead of listening, expressing understanding, and honestly stating feelings and opinions,

people interpret each others behavior, place demands on each other, claim that people

know the true motives of each other, and impose obligations on each other. Blase and

Blase (1994) also contend that "people who believe that others are motivated to protect

and nurture their relationships are apt to be trusting" (p. 19).

Supervisors must work to establish a "trust account" with teachers because

without trust, they are limited as leaders (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). The importance

of trust cannot be overemphasized because, without trust, "neither the supervisor nor the

teacher will grow from classroom experiences" (Arrendondo, Brody, Zimmerman, &

Moffett, 1995, p. 76). Atcheson and Gall (1994) acknowledged that summative

evaluation interferes with the collegiality and trust necessary for growth activities. Goal number one in the supervision model of cognitive coaching is "the creation and management of trust" (Costa & Garnston, 1994, p. 266). "When the trust level is low, group members will be evasive, dishonest and inconsiderate in their communications" (Johnson & Johnson, 2000, p. 420).

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) stated, "Since teachers often will not know how to do what needs to be done, it is important for supervisors to identify their needs and then to 'in-service' them in some way" (p. 39). The result is teachers being given menial tasks because they are not trusted with the ability and discernment required by professional work (Blase & Blase, 1994; Richardson, Short, & Prickett, 1993). From this, motivation becomes necessary (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). With the absence of trust, motivating teachers becomes a series of trades:

> Whereby the supervisors give to teachers things that they want in exchange for compliance with the supervisors requests and requirements. This, in turn, results in the further bureaucratization of the working of teaching, reinforces the supervisors' superior moral standing, places further emphasis of self-interest-oriented motivational strategies and so perpetuates this regressive cycle. (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998 p. 204)

Richardson et al. (1993) declared "without teachers who are motivated to teach, the search for educational excellence will be in vain" (p. 171). The climate that is fostered by mistrust is one that produces an educational environment in which no real progress toward improvement in instruction can be made. Therefore, when teachers cannot trust their supervisors, their ability to deliver quality instruction is seriously impaired (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998).

"Studies based directly upon teachers' perspectives on supervision are few" (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1998, p. 70). Fewer, however, are studies examining the

perspectives of those who supervise high school teachers—principals.  As evidenced by research, supervision impacts the job teachers do and how well they do them; therefore, it would appear logical to examine the perspectives of those responsible for providing supervisory assistance to teachers.

<div align="center">Significance of the Research</div>

From the beginning of education in America, the supervision of teachers has occurred. While early efforts at supervision were much simpler than today's processes, some of the components are essentially the same (Waite, 1995). The process of supervising teachers has evolved from community groups "watching" the one room schoolteacher to the clinical models of implementation of the supervision (Pajak, 1993). The evolution of new models for supervision has reflected the changes in the focus of supervision itself. Supervision is "emerging as a key role and function in the operation of schools" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998, p. 4). The effect of supervision on teachers is evolving as the process itself evolves (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). How teachers perceive supervision is vital to the success of the supervision process (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1998). Yet, there is relatively little research that focuses on the perspective of those who supervise teachers.

Every supervisor uses a method or plan to supervise teachers.  For a supervisor to improve the process, knowledge of supervisors' perspectives would be valuable. Identification of beliefs and practices of principals regarding instructional supervision could serve to improve the supervision process. The benefits of this study could serve to unite superintendents, school boards, principals, and faculty members in their efforts to improve instruction in the classroom.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perspectives of four ($\underline{N}$=4) high school principals regarding the supervision of instruction. The significance of the study lies in the identification of principals' views regarding supervision, how these impact the supervision process, and how, given this information, supervision could, perhaps, be improved.

Given the recent accountability measures placed on school principals by both political bodies and boards of education, now, more than ever, principals must be able to identify important issues that they encounter while trying to supervise classroom instruction. By identifying potential obstacles arising from the perspectives of high school principals and raising the knowledge base of the principal regarding these potential obstacles, it is the researcher's intention that school principals become better equipped at assisting teachers in the instructional setting.

Research Questions

Overall, the purpose of the study was to gather data through interviewing four high school principals in a single school district in order to examine their perspectives and beliefs related to the instructional supervision of teachers.

To direct this process, the following research questions were considered:

1. According to principals, what is supervision?

2. How do principals describe the supervisory process?

3. What type of climate enhances supervision?

4. What gets in the way of principals trying to supervise teachers?

5. How does the structure of the high school relate to supervision?

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they related to this study.

<u>High school</u>: The level of school that includes only grades 9-12.

<u>Instructional supervision</u>: The process of assisting teachers in improving their instruction.

Giving assistance to teachers to improve instruction and to promote personal and

professional growth. The art of assisting others to improve their skills in the classroom

environment.

<u>Evaluation</u>: The process of gathering data through formal and informal means and then to

make a summative judgement on value through a formal rating on performance.

Assumptions

Certain assumptions by the researcher were made throughout this study and

included the following:

1. High school principals were the best source of data for this study.

2. Participants' responses reflect their perspectives honestly and accurately.

3. Principals have opinions on the supervision of instruction.

4. Principals are involved both in the process of supervision and evaluation.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study included the following:

1. The data were gathered from high school principals from four schools within the

same school district. Generalizations may or may not apply to other school districts of

similar description across states.

2. The study sample population lacked racial diversity. Therefore, the results from the sample population data are not applicable to all educators who are in the position of high school principal.

3. The research was limited only to the perspectives of four high school principals and did not include the perspectives of other school personnel such as teachers and guidance counselors.

## Overview of Research Procedures

To develop an accurate and realistic portrayal of the perspectives of high school principals, a qualitative case study approach was chosen. The researcher:

- Interviewed four high school principals three times during the study.

- Kept fieldnotes throughout the study.

- Collected relevant artifacts from each of the four sites.

Each interview was audio recorded and then later transcribed. Themes that emerged from the data were coded. Fieldnotes were used as a complement to the participants' interviews. The participants were afforded the opportunity to examine the transcripts and to extend ideas and/or to provide clarification to the researcher. The present study examined the barriers that principals perceive to exist in supervising teachers. The study's importance lies in the possibility of overcoming those barriers.

## Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter 1 included an introduction to supervision, the purpose of the study, the statement of the problem, and the background which laid the foundation for a study of supervision and the perspectives of high school principals. Chapter 1 also included definition of terms to be used in the study, the significance of the study, the limitations of

the study, and the research questions to be addressed in the study. Chapter 2 provided a review of the literature. This review included research related to instructional supervision, the design and history of the high school, and barriers to instructional supervision. Chapter 3 delineated the methodology used to collect and analyze the data and included a detailed description of the context of the four schools in which the principals in this study worked and a profile of each principal. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 discusses the findings and offers implications for school systems, administrators preparation programs, and for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Literature selected for this chapter served as a background for better understanding the issues related to this study.  This study addressed issues high school principals encountered in the supervision of teachers.  Research related to supervision, the high school, and the principal is examined.

To appreciate supervision, a survey of the history of supervision supplied the changes and transformations that supervision has undergone in the last century. Through this history, the evolution and influences on supervision were explored. Teacher perceptions and responses to supervisory practices were highlighted in an effort to identify the differences between a teacher's definition of supervision and a supervisor's definition of instructional supervision. These differences pointed the researcher to an area requiring further research—namely, what are the perspectives of high school principals regarding supervision.

The research is teeming with definitions, purposes, and intended outcomes of supervision.  Supervision is reported over and over as the most important component in a school, but there is no consensus on who is responsible, what it entails, and how to effectively carry out supervision.  Examination of the perspectives on principals in regard to the supervision of high school teachers is sorely missing from the literature and research on instructional supervision.

History of Supervision

During the late 1800s and the early 1900s, spurred by industrialization, school enrollment increased significantly (Pierce, 1935). As school enrollment increased, many people began to question who would control the school. The district system of organization, which began as the common school movement in Massachusetts, "led to the creation of a school board that was responsible for all of the schools in a local area" (Reinhartz & Beach, 1992, p. 27).

Alfonso, Firth, and Neville (1975) concluded that many of the early school districts failed to raise sufficient revenues to support schools and maintain standards. During this period, state governments began the process of having control over local systems. States began to create systems of education and began passing laws that directed the operation of the schools to the central educational agency or the state (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000).

Accompanying the tremendous growth of cities and schools, the birth of the principalship occurred. The day-to-day operation of school became the responsibility of what is now called the principal (Pierce, 1935). Along with this title, five supervisory duties emerged, as identified by Spain, Drummond, and Goodlad (1956), which consisted of the following:

1. Maintaining discipline in the school;
2. Establishing rules and regulation for the performance of students and teachers;
3. Administering the physical plant;
4. Classifying pupils according to grade level or assignment; and,
5. Scheduling and regulating classes.

Supervision became the responsibility of a single individual, the principal (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). The position became more complex to meet requirements of the new

graded school.  Beach and Reinhart (2000) asserted that it was at this point that teachers began to look to the principal for guidance and direction.

With the advent of scientific management, school supervision emerged based on a set of standards of measurement and units of accomplishments, at the individual, school, and system-wide level (Fine, 1997).  The focus of educational supervision became one of assisting teachers with classroom instruction by "routinizing various instructional activities and standardizing the curriculum" (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000 p. 32). Supervision began to take on the role of "watch dog," and teachers were evaluated for their use of time and implementing and delivering lessons that had to be basically the same (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000).

Following this period, a movement toward providing help and assistance to teachers began to emerge.  Pajak (1993) described the movement by stating, "Dewey's notion of cautiously reasoned cooperation and focus on problem solving, rather than on rules generated by science, became a major guiding principle of supervisory leadership" (p. 164).  Alphonso et al. (1975) earlier reiterated that supervision was not promoting the innovative, creative, and humanizing potential of students. With this approach, supervision was moving from "snooping, monitoring, and enforcing to meeting the needs of teachers as they met the diverse needs of their students" (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000, p. 34).  Yet, throughout this period, there was no documented research on the supervision of instruction from neither the teachers' nor the principals' perspectives (Sergiovanni, 1985; Zepeda & Ponticell, 1998).

With the launching of Sputnik I by the Soviet Union in 1957, supervision underwent numerous changes.  Supervisors became curriculum specialists devoting

extraordinary amounts of time rewriting, redefining, and strengthening the curriculum

(Beach & Reinhartz, 2000).  Much of the redefinement consisted of individualizing

instruction, modifying curriculum, and production of new curriculum guides. Pajak

(1993) concluded that the supervisor was seen as a change agent whose main function

was to bring about social change through curriculum implementation. Bolin ((1986)

further noted, "Instructional supervisors were looking at the curriculum as the focal point

of school improvement and seeing the teacher as instrumental to curriculum

implementation" (p. 27).

Supervision during the 1970s began to take the form of the clinical models.  In

response to inadequate student teaching experiences, Cogan (1973) developed a clinical

model for educational supervision.  Cogan viewed clinical supervision as a process for

developing responsible teachers who were able to evaluate their own instruction, who

were willing to accept criticism and use it for change, and who knew where they were

headed in their own professional growth.  According to Goldhammer, Anderson, and

Krajewski (1980) clinical supervision was:

> That phase of instructional supervision which draws its data from first-hand
> observation of actual teaching events, and involves face-to-face (and other
> associated) interaction between the supervisor and teacher in the analysis of
> teaching behaviors and activities for instructional improvement. (pp. 19-20)

Beach and Reinhartz (2000) indicated "if schools are to improve the quality of

instruction, it will be at the local building level (loose-typed properties) with the teacher

at the heart of the improvement process (productivity through people)" (p. 29).  Business

and industry supervisory practices began to influence the practices of educational

supervisors. The role of the supervisor reversed from that of inspecting, policing, and

inhibiting to helping, coaching, facilitating, and improving people (Shower & Joyce,

1996).

Covey (1989) suggested:

Always treat your employees exactly as you want them to treat your best customers. You can buy a person's hand, but you can't buy his heart; you can buy his back, but you can't buy his brain. (p. 58)

As the practices of supervision moved toward involving teachers in the improvement of

instruction, supervisor's roles had to change. Glickman et al. (1998) noted, "supervisors

who hold formal leadership roles will have to redefine their responsibilities-from

controllers of teachers' instruction to involvers of teachers in decisions about school

instruction" (p. 29).

Poole (1994) explored the nature of the changes in supervision in her research,

and she summarized:

The role of the supervisor and teacher are also changing. The supervisor is no longer the expert, passing along judgments and advice to teacher technicians. Instead the teacher is an equal who contributes valuable expertise and experience to the supervisory process. (p. 287)

According to Beach and Reinhartz (2000):

Successful organizations of the next century will be places of learning, capable of adapting to rapidly changing conditions. Supervisory leaders will be expected to accurately assess instructional programs and classroom instruction, and to make the adjustments required to meet changing circumstances. (p. 40)

Finally, Gordon (1997) believed that supervision had evolved to a point that it

should be called something else. The term "instructional leadership" would be

appropriate for the future. Fullan (1998) suggested, "supervisors will need to develop a

new mind-set, breaking the bonds of dependency created by overload and packaged

solutions and thinking outside the box" (p. 8).

Purposes and Intents of Supervision

A survey of the literature dealing with supervision uncovers many definitions and

purposes, and "these range from a custodial orientation to a humanistic orientation"

(Wanzare & da Costa, 2000, p. 47).  Drake and Roe (1999) described supervision as the

overseeing and controlling, managing, administering, evaluating or any other activity or

process that is a part of running a school.  A more humanistic definition of supervision

was given by Beach and Reinhartz (2000) in which instructional supervision needed to be

viewed as a process that centers on instruction and provides teachers with feedback on

their teaching so as to strengthen instructional skills to improve performance.  Earlier,

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) believed that supervisory activities needed to include

processes that included the teacher's knowledge, skills, and ability to make better

informed decisions or to become active researchers into their own teaching methods as

part of the supervisory process.  Thus, the purpose of instructional supervision is to focus

on teachers' instructional improvement which, in turn, improves student academic

achievement (Wanzare & da Costa, 2000).

Supervision as a Means to Improve Instruction

One of the major components of supervision is the improvement of instruction

(Beach & Reinhartz, 2000; Glickman et al. 1998; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998).  For

instruction to improve, staff development, self-evaluation, and fostering curriculum

development must be included in the supervisory processes. According to Calabrese and

Zepeda (1997) supervision is "linking the facilitation of human growth to that of

achieving goals (p. xiii). A conclusion from the literature is that teachers need to be given

the opportunity to expand their individual teaching and learning base if the organization

is going to succeed.

One way that in which the school as an organization can grow can be achieved

through teacher development. According to Wanzare and da Costa (2000, p. 50), who

cite others, there are four key strategies for enhancing the professional growth of teachers

which include:

> First, the establishment and subsequent administrative support of and provision of guidance for a systematic, ongoing staff development program (Starratt, 1997) supported by modeling, coaching, and collaborative problem solving (Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, 1995) should focus on means of linking new knowledge, on way of thinking, and on practice given existing knowledge, experience, and values (Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, 1997). Time needs to be provided for teachers to undertake professional development as part of their normal teaching responsibilities (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1995).

> Second, Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) argue that teachers need to engage, both individually and in groups, in the concrete tasks of teaching, observation, assessment, experimentation, and pedagogical reflection. In this way they will better understand the learning and development process given their teaching contexts and students.

> Third, given the wide variety of supervisory techniques described in the literature, supervisors should match appropriate supervisory approaches to teachers' level of development needs. The ultimate goal of supervisors should be to enable teachers to be self-directed (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1997).

> Fourth, organizational leaders should work to establish a culture that values professional, collegial interactions among participants (e.g., team planning, sharing, evaluation, and learning to create methods for peer review of practice). In doing so, they promote the spread of ideas and shared learning (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1995).

There exist many different avenues for providing direct assistance to teachers for

the improvement of instruction. According to Zepeda and Ponticell (1998), teachers'

perceptions of supervision were positive when supervision was viewed as coaching.

They reported the value of coaching as such:

What was coaching? The supervisor worked alongside the teacher, providing assistance while the teacher addressed his or her classroom concerns. The supervisor took an interest in the teacher's accomplishments during the process of change and improvement. The supervisor provided evidence of success together with guidance to enable the teacher to build upon success. The supervisor was invested in the individual teacher's success. The supervisor was responsive to the individual teacher's needs and recognized that the supervisor's interactions with the teacher influenced the teacher's success. (p. 76)

Zepeda and Ponticell's work supported the earlier work of Joyce and Showers (1982), who indicated:

Unfortunately, the development of skill by itself does not insure transfer; relatively few teachers, having obtained skill in a new approach will then transfer that skill into their active repertoire and use the new approach regularly and sensibly unless they receive additional information. However, when the coaching component is added and implemented effectively, most teachers will begin to transfer the new model into their active repertoire. Coaching without the study of theory, the observation of demonstrations, and opportunities for practice with feedback will, in fact, accomplish very little. Like athletes, teachers will put newly learned skills to use- if they are coached. (p. 5)

Coaching in its purest form is composed of planning, observing instruction, and reflecting the basic phases of all instructional supervisory models. One can glean that the goal of coaching is to assist teachers in becoming more resourceful, informed, and skillful professionals (McGreal, 1995). Costa and Garmston (1994) stated, "skillful cognitive coaches apply specific strategies to enhance another person's perceptions, decisions, and intellectual functions. Changing these inner thought processes is a prerequisite to improving overt behaviors that, in turn, enhance student learning" (p. 2).

Research has shown that teachers who receive feedback on instructional practices are more satisfied with teaching (Dornbush & Scott, 1975). Lortie (1975) found that teachers in need of assistance would first seek out fellow teachers and then would seek help from supervisory or administrative personnel. Goldhammer (1980) stated, "if supervisors were to spend more of their energy in in-classroom visits followed by helpful

conferences, we believe that teachers would probably have more friendly attitudes toward

supervision" (p. 23).

<u>Supervision as a Means to Promote Group Development</u>

Another intent of supervision is to provide a climate that fosters change through

group development. According to Johnson and Johnson (2000):

> Our personal identity is derived from the way in which we are perceived and treated by other members of our groups. We learn, work, worship and plan in groups. Our life is filled with groups from the moment of our birth to the moment of our death.  (p. 8)

  One can surmise that motivating groups and providing proper training for work within a

group is important to supervision.

Johnson and Johnson (2000) described an effective group as:

> More than a sum of its parts. It is a group whose members commit themselves to the common purposes of maximizing their own and each other's success. Members hold each other accountable for his or her fair share of the work, promote each other's success, appropriately engage in small group skills, and process how effectively they are working together. (p. 23)

Schmuck and Runkel (1994) identified seven highly independent capabilities of an

effective group, and they reported that when one capability is increased, it is easier to

increase the others.  The capabilities include:

1. Clarifying communication
2. Improving group procedures in meetings
3. Establishing goals
4. Uncovering and working with conflict
5. Solving problems
6. Making decisions
7. Assessing change. (pp. 26-27)

Bales (1953) indicated that an effective group consisted of two parts: the task and the

person.  The task stands for the content and purpose of the group meeting or what is to be

accomplished.  The person stands for the interpersonal process and the satisfaction

teachers receive from working with each other.

Little's study (1982) of six urban desegregated schools described these successful

schools in this way:

> Teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise
> talk about teaching practice. By such talk, teachers build up a shared language
> adequate to the complexity of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and
> its virtues from one another, and capable of integrating large bodies of practice
> into distinct and sensible perspectives on the business of teaching. (p. 331)

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) found "groups provide the means to enable

teachers to construct their realities and find meaning and significance. This allows for

teachers to find satisfaction in work and work to full potential" (p. 186). Further, "helping

faculties become effective work groups, is an important purpose of supervision and a

critical part of the school improvement process" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998, p. 186).

Supervision as a Parallel Process to Staff Development

Oliva (1984) defined supervision as "a means of offering to teachers specialized

help in improving instruction" (p. 9) with follow-up assistance after the classroom

observation has occurred.  Supervision and professional development are parallel

processes.  Sullivan (1980) claimed the two processes "can and should overlap as needs

and local preferences dictate" (p. 159).  Edefelt and Johnson (1975) defined staff

development as any "development activity that a teacher undertakes singly or with other

teachers after receiving his or her teaching certificate and after beginning professional

practice" (p. 5).  One can glean from this that professional development has assimilated

into one of the intents of supervision.  Support is given to this according to Fullan (1995)

who believed that "professional development is integral to accomplishing a moral

purpose, central to continuous improvements in professional work cultures, and

embedded in the continuum of initial and career long teacher education" (pp. 264-265).

Kyle (1995) pointed out that professional development encompasses all

educational professionals in the process of change and renewal and summarizes this by

stating:

> Professional development ought to be a process whereby education professionals
> regularly enhance their academic knowledge and pedagogical understandings, as
> well as question the purpose and parameters of what they do. (p. 679)

The expected outcome from supervision according to Kyle's findings is that

student, teacher, school, and system success are interdependent. Thus, the essential

character of successful instruction and of a successful school comes from the thoughts

and actions of the professionals who reflect on their actions and practices. However, a

negative side of staff development exists.

Glickman et al. (1998) concurred that "professional development is often viewed

by supervisors, administrators, and teachers as a number of days contracted for in the

school calendar that simply must be endured" (p. 347). Miles (1995) described the

current state of professional development as:

> Everything that learning shouldn't be: radically undersourced, brief, not sustained,
> designed for 'one size fits all,' imposed rather than owned, lacking any
> intellectual coherence, treated as a special add-on event rather than as a part of a
> natural process and trapped in a bureaucratic system. (p. vii)

Wood and Thompson (1980) referred to staff development as "the slum of American

education, neglected and of little effect" (pp. 374-378). Karst (1987) studied the attitudes

and beliefs of 150 highly competent teachers. Karst's findings suggested:

> They found their avenues of growth outside of the normal in-service and
> professional development routines and these teachers continued to grow despite
> the lack of meaningful school-derived learning experiences. It was amazing how

silently resistant most of them felt about [school and district] philosophy that included no serious organizational plans for dealing with their professional aspirations and development. These are the conditions that create teachers who quit teaching and become dead souls, without vision, without ideals, without hope that things will get better. (pp. 26-28)

Many externally mandated staff development programs serve as a maintenance function (Seyfarth, 1996).  Zepeda (1999) concluded that staff development offered as maintenance signals deficit thinking for both the teachers and the systems in which they work.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) proposed five critical components for staff development: intents, substance, performance expectations, approach and responsibility. Reinhartz, Hadaway, and Trask (1992) provided more of a plan for implementation for staff development.

1. The teacher is central to the process of staff development, serving as a partner or prime mover in implementing change.
2. There is a comprehensive and collaborative focus, which emphasizes the participation of all stakeholders.
3. The focus is on each school or campus as building sites form centers of inquiry for teachers and students.
4. Staff development is context-sensitive to meet local needs.
5. Programs utilize cumulative knowledge on effective teaching and staff development.
6. Staff development is continuous and ongoing, providing a thread of continuity.
7. The staff development process is developmental allowing for passage through personal and professional stages.
8. Staff development encourages teachers to be reflective about planning and teaching. (pp. 294-297)

Beach and Reinhartz (2000) declared "professional development occurs with groups of teachers who continue to grow professionally as they work together to ensure that their school functions effectively and that their students learn" (p. 267). Little (1990) stated, "to the extent that teachers find themselves truly dependent on one another to

manage the tasks and reap the rewards of teaching, joint participation will be worth the

investment of time and other resources" (p. 509). Supervision is responsible for growth

in "the school, the curriculum and the students" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998, p. 267).

Goodlad (1984) found that nearly 90 percent of teaching across all subjects and

grades was lecturing with students listening with an occasional opportunity to answer a

question. Porter (1987) reported that:

> 70 to 75 percent of mathematics instruction was spent teaching skills, essentially
> how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide, and occasionally how to read a graph.
> Our findings of heavy emphasis on skill development and slight attention to
> concepts and applications is consistent with the United States' relatively poor
> standing among other nations on mathematics problem solving. In some ways the
> U. S. curriculum is even more out of balance than the above suggests. As
> troublesome as the lack of emphasis give to problem solving and conceptual
> understanding, a very large percentage of the topics taught receive only brief,
> perhaps cursory coverage. (pp. 10-11)

Sizer (1984) stated "telling is cost effective, far more than coaching. That is why it is so

popular in schools" (p. 109).

Supervision as a Means to Improve the Curriculum

Supervisors can gather from Glickman et al. (1998) that "it makes no difference

how good a curriculum is if teachers will not use it" (p. 384). Frazze and Rudnitski

(1995) observed "curriculum development is a process … like the writing process in that

one retraces one's steps in re-reading, editing and revising the content of what has been

written" (p. 120). Beach and Reinhartz (2000) suggested "by becoming stakeholders in

the curriculum development process, teachers begin to recognize it as one of the vital

ingredients of the instructional life of schools and individual classrooms" (p. 187).

Supervisor's role in curriculum development is to promote teacher reflection on

key components and to select appropriate concepts to be taught and the methods for

implementation. Supervisors and teachers must work to understand the many facets

involved in planning and how these facets impact everyday instruction and student

achievement (Sardo Brown, 1988).

Supervision as a Means to Promote Inquiry

The final intent of supervision is to promote teacher inquiry, and action research

is one such method that can be utilized to promote inquiry. According to Lewin (1948)

"as people plan changes and engage in real activities, fact finding should determine

whether success is being achieved and whether further planning and action are necessary"

(p. 206). Sager (1993) wrote, "by turning to collaborative action research, we can renew

our commitment to thoughtful teaching and also begin developing an active community

of professionals" (p. 10). Action research was defined by Glanz (1999) as:

> A kind of research that has reemerged as a popular way of helping practitioners, teachers, and supervisors to better understand their work. In action research, we apply traditional research approaches to real problems or issues faced by the practitioner. Action research can be as simple as raising a question about some educational practice and collecting information to answer the question, or as complicated as applying a t test to determine whether posttest results from an experimental group are statistically significant. (p. 2)

Hubbard and Power (1993) reported:

> Teachers throughout the world are developing professionally by becoming teacher-researchers, a wonderful new breed of artists-in-residence. Using our own classrooms as laboratories and our students as collaborators, we are changing the way we work with students as we look at our classrooms systematically through research. (p. xiii)

According to Glanz (1999) action research:

1. Creates a systemwide mindset for school improvement, a professional problem-solving ethos;
2. Enhances decision making by promoting feelings of competence in solving problems and making instructional decisions;
3. Promotes reflection and self-assessment;
4. Instills a commitment to continuous improvement;

5. Creates a more positive climate in which teaching and learning are foremost concerns;
6. Has a direct impact on practice; and,
7. Empowers those who participate in the process. (p. 6)

Supervision as a Means to Promote Teacher Autonomy

Autonomy is defined by Mish (1991) as "the quality or state of being self-governing" (p. 77).  As autonomy relates to teaching, "Teacher autonomy rests on freedom from scrutiny and the large unexamined right to exercise personal preference [where] trial and error serves as the principle route to competence" (Little, 1990, p. 513). Blase and Blase (1994) referred to autonomy as "the degree of freedom that teachers have in determining their work processes, and innovation refers to the design and implementation of experimental processes and new content for use in the classroom" (p. 72).  In their 1994 study, Blase and Blase concluded autonomous teachers:

1. Are largely in control of instructional areas of classroom life (e.g., teachers determine the risk they were willing to assume in curriculum and instructional innovations).
2. Generally controlled noninstructional areas of classroom life (such as disciplinary matters).
3. Determine needs for and access to additional but necessary supplies and materials.  (p. 73)

This study further suggested "the teachers' satisfaction with their current level of autonomy was shaped by the apparent contrast in leadership between shared governance principals and the traditional principals for whom they worked in the past. Such principals were often described as 'dictatorial', 'closed', and 'authoritative'" (p. 74).

Another way to eliminate the feeling teachers may have of isolation is for supervisors to visit classrooms often.  Zepeda and Ponticell (1998) found teachers who were visited numerous times by their supervisor felt validated and empowered to take risks without fear of consequences for failure.  Teachers who were willing to take

instructional risks were open to change and flexibility. A positive relationship between

the supervisor and teacher fostered by trust and frequent visits encouraged teacher

autonomy. Cross and Rice (2000) asserted, "trust is an integral component of the

relationship between the instructional leader and his or her teachers. An open, trusting

relationship between the principal and faculty enhances motivation for all to work

together" (p. 64).

<div align="center">The Yuck of Supervision</div>

Reitzug's (1997) study of instructional supervision textbooks found that the

textbooks portrayed "the principal as expert and superior, the teacher as deficient and

voiceless, teaching as fixed technology and supervision as a discrete intervention" (p. 2).

Smyth (1991) noted the incongruencies between rhetoric and application:

> The rhetoric of supervision is compelling enough, couched as it is in terms of
> 'improvement of teaching' through a collaborative process of consultation,
> observation, analysis, and feedback. Terms like 'mutual trust,' 'collegiality,' and
> 'teacher autonomy' are seductive nomenclature. Contradiction becomes apparent
> when we preach collegiality, collaboration, and teacher autonomy, while
> imposing clinical supervision upon teachers. Similarly, using clinical supervision,
> however benevolently, has a method by which a person of superior status is able
> to diagnose and suggest remedies in the teaching of a subordinate, exposes a
> major contradiction that is not always apparent. (p. 47)

It is clear from the literature that the principal is seen as the authority while the teacher is

at the mercy of the principal (Reitzug, 1997; Sizer, 1984; Smyth, 1991).

Sizer (1984) referring to the work between teachers and supervisors, contended

that:

> The system is organized with an eye on the incompetent rather than the
> competent. All are shackled, to 'protect' students from the bad teachers. Many of
> these ablest folk will leave or have left teaching-or will never enter the profession
> in the first place. (p. 196)

Pfeiffer and Dunlap (1982) noted the dilemma of the supervisor being both a helper and a judge when they suggested that supervisors should not be involved in "hiring, firing, or promotion, since a helping relationship is difficult to maintain with a person who makes decisions" (p. 162). Beach and Reinhartz (2000) further noted "teachers are reluctant to express instructional concerns to individuals who could use the information as evidence of ineffective teaching" (p. 233).

Many of the evaluation instruments used in different states and local school districts consist of checklists of teaching behaviors. The use of these paper and pencil instruments has made the evaluation process more objective and rational (Wood, 1992); however, Duke and Stiggins (1986) offered a point-of-view on the inherent danger in utilizing evaluative instruments as a sole measure of evaluating a teacher's performance like this:

> Like so many of life's ironies, they can be the most rewarding experiences, but they also have the potential for being frustrating. They summarize by saying, 'done well, [the system] can lead to improved performance, personal growth, and professional esteem. Done poorly, it can produce anxiety or ennui and drive talented teachers from the profession. (p. 9)

Zepeda and Ponticell (1998) found half the teachers participating in their study viewed supervision as "a fix-it list, a series of items or behaviors on an evaluation checklist that teachers were directed to 'fix' or correct for the next evaluation" (p. 80).

Zepeda and Ponticell's (1998) findings regarding how teachers view supervision are in line with the notion that evaluations require "a performance given during an evaluation visit, demonstrating all the 'right' steps or indicators of the supervisor's checklist" (p. 77). The teachers actually called the evaluation process a "dog and pony show" (Zepeda & Ponticell, p. 77). Waite's (1995) research indicated "The difficulty

seems to be that what started out as a fine ideal and as a way of enabling teachers to share

ideas about what we call today 'best practices' has become a process by which teachers

are converted into 'marionettes'" (p. 5).

Blumberg (1980) characterized the evaluation-supervision process as a game, a

cold war, and a ritual. In an interpretive case study involving a curriculum coordinator,

Hazi (1994) examined teachers' inability to distinguish between supervision and

evaluation. Hazi (1994) claimed without trust, collegiality, and genuine collaboration,

"the supervisor's language is inconsistent with her action, sending mixed messages about

her intent. The supervisor's language is held suspect as merely linguistic maneuvering

and the evaluation ritual remains intact" (p. 207).

With the increased call for accountability measures in the educational arena, many

states have instituted reform acts to improve instruction. The main purpose of these acts

is to provide a vehicle to remove incompetent teachers. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998)

stated "it is not difficult to perceive the subtext of the word 'accountability,' which is

'Get rid of incompetent teachers'" (p. 308).

Hazi (1994) summed up the entanglements and differences in teacher

evaluation/supervision as such:

> Attempts have been made to differentiate the two by purpose, by technique, by
> person, and by rhetoric. The language that once helped us skillfully differentiate
> the two now only entangles us. This is the evaluation/supervision dilemma. As
> long as supervision is about the business of the improvement of instruction, then
> the field entangled with evaluation law and ritual. No amount of linguistic
> maneuvering will reconcile the two for teachers. (p. 209)

History of The Principal and Instructional Supervision

Early schools did not have a principal. The first principals assumed several

different titles and responsibilities. Spain, Drummond, and Goodlad (1956) indicated:

No definite date can be established for the emergence of the principalship, but evidently by around 1800 responsibilities began to be centralized to some extent. Early reports of school systems contained references to the 'headmaster, head-teacher or principal teacher.' These early 'principals' represented an administration convenience rather than positions of recognized leadership. Maintaining of discipline, administration of plant, regulation of classes, classification of pupils and establishment of rules and regulations were the primary duties of these principals. (p. 24)

As cities grew and school districts increased in size, superintendents were no longer able to oversee the many needs of the increasing number of schools. Pierce (1935) reported "the logical step was to turn local management of schools over to the principals … the grading of schools, the consolidation of departments under a single principal, the freeing of the principal from teacher duties" (p. 7). This delegation of powers shifted the power from the superintendent to the principal to act as an extension of the local school system (Alfonso et al. 1975).

Supervision in public education began in the early eighteenth century. Alfonso et al. (1975) indicated that "laymen were given the responsibility of making inspectional tours of the schools in order to evaluate school facilities, upkeep and the progress of pupils" (p. 15). Dickey (1948) summarized this early period by stating that "the first attempts at supervision were characterized by three fundamental approaches:

1. authority and autocratic rule;
2. emphasis upon the inspection and weeding out of weak teachers; and
3. conformity to standards prescribed by the committee of laymen. (p. 8)

As schools began to be formed based on grades and the number of schools and the number of pupils increased, the principal was moved out of the classroom completely (Alfonso et al. 1975). As the Nineteenth Century came to a close, principals found their supervisory authority to be increasing with additional duties and responsibilities, many of which were related to instruction (Alfonso et al. 1975).

Early in the twentieth century, educational supervision was related to industrial management. Toffler explained that the school-factory comparison "was a stroke of industrial genius" (1971, p. 400). The emphasis on industrial logic in education was emphasized by Frederick Taylor's principles of scientific management (Callahan, 1962; Tyack, 1974). During this period, administration and supervision began to be thought of as two separate entities (Worthington, 1940).

John Dewey, like Frederick Taylor, espoused scientific problem solving; however, Dewey did not embrace the view of scientific management (McKernan, 1987). Dewey expected the application of the scientific method to be a guiding principle in problem solving for educational supervisors (McKernan, 1987).

In the 1938 text, *Supervision*, Barr, Burton, and Brueckner announced that they were "deliberately setting out to replace the old concept of the supervisor as an inspector with responsible leadership that would rely on scientific reason and experimentation for enlightenment and direction" (p. 24). This approach was the beginning of the move that "emphasized flexibility in organization, free participation by all, and pursuit of the common good" (Pajak, 1993, p. 4). Supervision was now becoming the process that facilitated the emergence of leadership in others.

According to Pajak (1993), a "drastic redefinition of supervision occurred during the 1960s due to a greater federal role in education, an increase in the size and complexity of schools and school districts, and the institution of collective bargaining in many states" (p. 4). Goldhammer et al. (1980) stated:

> Admittedly, supervision in the 1970s and in the 1980s cannot be neatly categorized; inspection practices of the early 1900s still linger in more than isolated situations, and classroom demonstrations continue to serve exclusively in too many situations. For the most part, however, supervision today – and actually

the past 25 years and longer – embraces a wide variety of activities and personnel directed toward a major goal: the improvement of instruction. (p. 14)

Inclusion of teachers in the process of instructional supervision brings the history to its current status.

## The High School

Since this study examined high school principals and their perspectives on instructional supervision, it was important to understand the configuration of the high school, including the compartmentalization of subject areas departments. "The comprehensive highs school has been neglected in educational research almost as much as it has been slighted during the reform movement" (Wraga, 1998, p. 121). The report by Spear (1950) on *The Cardinal Principles* still serves as the single historical study with regard to the comprehensive high school. Wraga (1998) stated:

> Reform reports portrayed the nation 'at risk' due to shoddy practices and slipping standards in the public schools. Reform proposals would reduce the comprehensive secondary curriculum to a narrow college preparatory program aimed at producing students equipped to deal with scientific and technological developments conducive to promoting business interest. (p. 130)

Cremin (1955) noted, "from an institution conceived for the few, the high school became an institution conceived for all" (p. 307). Wraga (1998) reported:

> The comprehensive high school model sought to achieve two complementary functions: the specializing function of providing diversified programs to serve the needs of a heterogeneous student population (e. g., college preparatory studies, prevocational and vocational studies); and the unifying function of fostering common sympathies, understandings, and discourse among the diverse student population (general education). (p. 124)

> Sizer (1984) opposed the comprehensive model of the high school, and he

claimed:

> High schools cannot be comprehensive and should not try to be comprehensive; there are some aspects of an adolescent's life in which a school has no right to

intrude, and helping students to use their minds as well is a large enough assignment, in any case. (p. 216)

American high schools are divided into departments. Siskin (1994) conducted a study regarding subject departments (English, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science) at three comprehensive high schools. Four key aspects relating to the departments and how the schools work were found:

1. They represent a strong boundary in dividing the school;
2. They provide a primary site for social interaction;
3. They have, as administrative units, considerable discretion over the micro-political decisions affecting what and how teachers teach; and,
4. As knowledge categories they influence the decisions and shape the actions of those who inhabit them. (Siskin, 1994, p. 34)

Given Siskin's findings, this researcher wondered if the configuration of departments and the work achieved by department chairs would be noted by the four principals interviewed in this study.

Within the departments, subjects are taught by specialists, usually in specialized rooms and are physically removed from other departments, resulting in a lack of communication between departments (Siskin, 1994). Johnson (1990) reported, "departments were found to be the key professional groups for teachers and their most frequent professional interactions and regular collegial relationships were with departmental peers, rather than teachers from other departments (p. 169).

While departments serve to segment groups of teachers, their existence serves as a source of identity and protection for teachers. According to Johnson (1990):

Departments could, at their best, be places where staff are protected, encouraged, supported, and given opportunities to be creative and improve their practice, they serve as units through which teachers could initiate change, both inside and outside their classrooms (p. 172).

The role of the department chairman as being the primary instructional leader in the department was investigated by Wettersen (1992) who suggested four factors that appear to strongly contribute to the establishment and fulfillment of the position of the high school department chair:

1. The amount of responsibility and support given to the chair by the principal and other members of the school administration team.
2. The credibility of the chair as a capable and trustworthy leader in the eyes of teachers in the chair's department.
3. The chair's ability to share leadership within the departments by recognizing and utilizing instructional leadership abilities of teachers in a spirit and practice of collegiality.
4. The chairs understanding of the vision and goals of the principal and administrative team, as well as those of department members, and the utilization of these understandings to bridge both groups as a communicator, interpreter, and facilitator. (p. 1)

Bliss, Konet, and Carter (1990) studied leadership styles and effectiveness in secondary school departments. Three practical suggestions emerged from this study in which the principal should:

1. Clarify task structure, the development of goals, means, and indicators of success.
2. Alter the department chairperson's power over rewards and punishments.
3. Improve leadership relations. (p. 45)

The role of the department chair serves an important function of the secondary school. Department chairs are responsible for producing and maintaining their subject environment, while attempting to carry out the wishes of the school administration (Johnson, 1990). Although the work of the department chair has been examined in the literature, and it appears that department chairs certainly assume leadership, the building-level principal in most states have the legal duty and responsibility to conduct teacher evaluation. McGreal's (1983) sentiment, perhaps, can provide perspective on the work of

high school principals and their duty to perform instructional leadership vis-à-vis supervision, "all supervisory roads lead to evaluation" (p. 9).

Chapter Summary

This study sought to uncover the issues high school principals encountered in the supervision of teachers. Research related to supervision, the high school, and the principal was examined to provide a framework of supervision, including its intents and purposes. Teacher perceptions and responses to supervisory practices have not fared well in the research (Hazi, 1994; Waite, 1995; Zepeda & Ponticell, 1998). The coverage of the role of the supervisor and the position most often fulfilling these duties, the principal, has been scant in coverage. Moreover, the "portraits" of those principals supervising teachers has, fared too, in unpopular terms (Reitzug, 1997).

Oddly enough, however, the intents and purposes as reported in the research have been positioned to encourage growth and development. From the very inception of supervision of instruction and the emergence of the clinical models as a means to deliver support and guidance to teachers, the processes of supervision have been clouded by images of "cold wars," with teacher and supervisor on "opposite sides" (Blumberg, 1980). A preponderance of research and the popular literature point to a lack of trust between teachers and their supervisors.

The very structure of schools can impede teachers from working with each other and with supervisors. As reported in the literature, the compartmentalized nature of the high school with separation made by content areas where teachers are "housed" in subject area departments can be both positive and negative. With the rise of the subject-centered

high school emerged the role of the department chairs who often acts as a "buffer"

between teachers and the administration (Johnson, 1990; Siskin, 1994).

The examination of the perspectives on principals in regard to the supervision of high

school teachers is sorely missing from the literature and in the research on instructional

supervision. The purpose of this study was to uncover the perspectives of four ($\underline{N}$=4)

high school principals in order to better understand their thoughts about providing

instructional supervision to the teachers in their buildings.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

The purpose of this study was to examine the perspectives of four ($\underline{N}$=4) high

school principals regarding instructional supervision of the teachers in their schools. To

accomplish this purpose, three sets of interviews were conducted with four high school

principals in one school system in South Georgia. The first interview was designed to

collect data that described the broad concept of instructional supervision from the

perspective of the participants. The next two interviews were designed to pursue

participants' perspectives regarding specific instructional supervisory beliefs and to

identify behaviors that support or inhibit the instructional supervision of high school

teachers. The following research questions guided this study:

1.  According to principals, what is supervision?

2.  How do principals describe the supervisory process?

3.  What type of climate enhances supervision?

4.  What gets in the way of principals trying to supervise teachers?

5.  How does the structure of the high school relate to supervision?

Research Design and Rationale

Due to the study's examination of the participants' individual perspectives, a

qualitative approach was more appropriate than a quantitative approach. The qualitative

approach to data collection "seeks to capture what people have to say in their own words"

(Patton, 1986, p. 22). Qualitative methods "are more adaptable to dealing with multiple

(and less aggregatable) realities" (Lincoln, 1985, p. 40). Since this study sought to capture the perspectives of high school principal's supervisory beliefs, the use of quantitative methods would have limited the participants to selection of predetermined responses thus limiting the expression of beliefs to a measurable instrument. To identify the beliefs and practices of the participants, four high school principals, an open-ended approach, including some structured questions was utilized.

The qualitative approach allowed for the collection of rich descriptions of instructional supervision so that the researcher could " gather first-hand information about processes in a 'naturally occurring' context" (Silverman, 1993, p. 11). Patton (1980) believed that the depth and detail of qualitative data could only be gathered by "getting close, physically and psychologically, to the phenomenon under study" (p. 43).

Qualitative research focuses on understanding through the verbal, the narratives, and the observations of participants rather than on the manipulation of numbers. As such, qualitative research designs do not seek to control or manipulate the behaviors, but rather, to "describe the nature of a belief, attitude, event, or behavior" (Merriam, 1988, p. 68) of the participants who in this study were four ($\underline{N}$=4) high school (grades 9-12) principals from one county in South Georgia.

Quantitative data tells "how many, how much, and how it is distributed" (Merriam, 1988, p. 68). Whereas qualitative data is data that cannot be given numerical values (Yin, 1993). The open-ended questions of a qualitative design lead to more of "an authentic understanding of people's experiences" (Silverman, 1993, p. 10). Although rigorous, qualitative methods offered more flexibility in the data collection and the analyses as was needed in this study. The flexibility in procedures allowed the researcher

to assume a discovery-orientation to data collection and an inductive-orientation to analysis (Patton, 1990). This elasticity provided the freedom to pursue avenues of inquiry such as adding more questions that arose during the research process, namely the three interviews conducted with each of the four high school principals.

The aim of a case study is "not to find the 'correct' or 'true' interpretation of the facts, but rather, to eliminate erroneous conclusions so that one is left with the best possible, the most compelling, interpretation" (Bromley, 1986, p. 38). Case studies are "concerned with understanding and describing processes " (Merriam, 1988, p. 31).

The research questions of this study were designed to explore the *what, how,* and *why* of instructional supervision from the perspectives of the high school principals. The case study method is the preferred research method when *what, how,* and *why* questions are used, and Yin (1994) believed that "such questions deal with operational links needing to be traced over time, rather than mere frequencies or incidence" (p. 6). Further, "the case study is preferred in examining contemporary events " in the setting in which they occur (p. 8).

Case studies vary in type based on number of subjects included, theory used, and end product. Case studies may be written with different purposes in mind, at different analytical levels, and demand different actions from the researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A case study may include a combination of types of designs. For this study, a multiple-subject case study approach was used to gain the perspectives of four high school principals, who were, according to their job descriptions, responsible for the instructional program, including the supervision of teachers. Patton (1986) believed that "by using a combination of observations, interviewing, and document analysis, the

evaluation fieldworker is able to use different data sources to validate and cross-check evaluation findings" (p. 157). For this study, the researcher utilized in-depth interviewing over a structured period of time, artifacts were collected, and the researcher shadowed each principal for one full day-all to add to the case study design.

Interviews were conducted with high school principals who were directly responsible for the instructional supervision of high school teachers. The main purpose of the interviews was to obtain information that was not readily observable or quantifiable and to include descriptions of behaviors, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them (Merriam, 1988). The interview process allowed the researcher to gain through data collection the "richness, complexity, and dimensionality of human experience in a social and cultural context" (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997, p. 3) of how four high school principals perceived instructional supervision.  The type of interview conducted varies with the degree of structure. Highly structured interviews consist of predetermined questions asked in a predetermined order (Merriam, 1988). The general interview guide approach involves outlining a set of issues that are to be explored with each participant (Patton, 1986). The informal conversation or unstructured interview does not use predetermined questions and is essentially exploratory in nature (Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1986).

This study used the highly structured interview in conjunction with a less structured approach. The researcher began by formulating very broad, loosely-connected questions to elicit from the participants their general views about instructional supervision within the context of their own schools. Interview questions such as, tell me about instructional supervision in your building, and what would instructional

supervision look like for your teachers, were predetermined (see Appendix A) to gain

general perspectives. Then, the researcher used the responses of the participants to

structure more context-specific questions. The combination of open-ended and structured

interview questions allowed the researcher to probe the participants more fully to gain a

deeper, more rich description of supervisory practices.

For this study, a general interview guide was used with an open-ended approach.

That is, open-ended questions were written in advance and used in the interviews exactly

as they were written (see Appendix A). Figure 3.1 shows examples of open-ended

questions that were written in advance, and the interview in which they were asked.

| Interview # | Question |
|:---:|:---|
| 1 | Tell me about instructional supervision in your building. |
| 2 | How do you establish and maintain trust while supervising teachers? |
| 3 | Tell me about your reflections since the last time we talked about your work with instructional supervision. |

*Figure 3.1.* Open-ended Questions

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) stated, "The researcher cannot always know the ideal

scope until data collection is underway" (p. 16). For this reason, the researcher asked

both structured and unstructured questions (see Appendix A). However, the interview-

guide approach allowed for exploration and probing for further clarification and thereby

individualizing each participant's responses within the context of the high school in

which they were the principals. For example, one of the principals who participated in

this study was in his first year as a high school principal. During the three interviews with

this participant, his inexperience caused the researcher to use different prompts than

which were needed for the other three participants. To illustrate during interview number

two after being asked, "Has supervision changed since you started as a principal," the

researcher asked specifically if the *A+ Reform Act* had caused in changes in supervision. This prompt was given after the participant faltered in answering the original question. No such prompt was given, nor was any such prompt needed with the other three participants. In interview number three, the principal was asked, "How do you suppose supervision is different at the elementary and middle school levels than from that at the high school level." His response addressed supervision of students at break and lunch. The researcher redirected him with the prompt, "How about with regard to instructional supervision-the supervision of teachers." No such redirection was needed with the other three respondents.

<div align="center">Data Collection</div>

Purposeful sampling is used as a strategy "when one wants to learn something and come to understand something about certain select cases without needing to generalize to all such cases" (Patton, 1986, p. 101). Purposeful sampling allows the researcher to select a sample from which the most can be learned about the research. The importance is not in the size of the sample, but rather in the quality of the knowledge of the participants in the sample.

For purposeful sampling to be effective, a pool of participants must be identified based on qualifications or characteristics they possess related to the study. For this study, the researcher used the typical case method (Merriam, 1998) and Patton's (1990) description of homogeneous sampling along with stratified purposeful sampling. The homogeneous group was high school principals. The number of participants consisted of four high school principals within a single school system.

In determining the sample to be used for the study, the researcher chose a school system that had the following characteristics:

1. A mid-sized school district with approximately 25,000 students.
2. The system included four high schools.
3. Male and female principals were represented (3 males and 1 female princ ipals).
4. The socio-economic and racial make-up of the student population had to closely resembled the population of Georgia.

Permission was sought from the county superintendent to conduct a study of four high school principals and their perspectives about instructional supervision. The location of the district was in close proximity to the researcher and will remain unidentified to maintain confidentiality of the high school principals and the system in which they work.

Context of the Study

The study took place in a rural school district located approximately one hundred miles south of Atlanta, Georgia. The school district provides educational services for over 22,000 students. There are 2,813 full-time employees and of that number, 1740 are certified personnel. The district has thirty-three campuses located throughout the county. Twenty of the schools are elementary schools (grades K-5), seven middle schools (grades 6-8), four high schools (grades 9-12) and one alternative school. Figure 3.2 highlights the demographics of the four high schools.

| Name of High School | # of Students | # of Administrators | # of Counselors | Letter Ranking | # of Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Washington High | 1050 | 4 | 3 | AAA | 64 |
| Lincoln High | 1604 | 5 | 4 | AAAAA | 82 |
| Jefferson High | 1726 | 6 | 4 | AAAAA | 89 |
| Harrison High | 1670 | 6 | 4 | AAAAA | 102 |

*Figure 3.2.* Demographic Information

Many of the schools have been recognized at both the state and national levels for their achievements. Student performance exceeds State and national levels on criterion referenced tests and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). On the Georgia High School Graduation Test, the system average is higher than the State average in all subject areas (English, math, science, social studies). Four of the schools have been awarded the National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence by the United States Department of Education. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) has accredited every school in the district. The district per-pupil expenditure is $6,057.00.

In this school district, technology is a high priority, and state-of-the-art technology labs complete with lasers, computers, and robotics are available at many of the schools. All of the schools have a fully automated media center and high-speed Internet access in each classroom. Each school has its own home web page.

Students in this district have the opportunity to participate in many diverse extra-curricular activities. Sporting activities include major sports such as baseball, basketball, and football, and several minor sports such as soccer, golf, and tennis are offered to students. In addition to the sporting activities, students are able to participate in a variety of activities at the middle and high school levels (e.g., Chess Club, Computer Club,

International Club, National Honor Society, Science Club, Thespians). Other

opportunities for students include, band, chorus, debate, literary events, and student

council. The district has won numerous regional, state and national awards in many of the

extra-curricular areas.

Washington High School

      Washington High fits the profile of a rural school population. The student body

numbers 1050 (see Figure 3.2). Many students move in and out of this school from

around the country with parents who work for industry and government. A large number

of students, born in the county, will spend their adult lives in this county. The student

body represents all socio-economic levels. Housing for this population ranges from rental

farmhouses with outdoor facilities to multi-million dollar dwellings. The mobility rate of

students is 14% per year, and Figure 3.3 highlights demographic information.

| Black | White | Hispanic | Asian | Male | Female |
|-------|-------|----------|-------|------|--------|
| 34.8% | 63.2% | .5% | 1.2% | 48.4% | 51.6% |

*Figure 3.3.* Washington High Racial Composition

      Students at Washington High are served according to their physical and

intellectual needs. The Special Education Program consists of 8.2% of the population,

English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) consists of less than 1%, while remedial

education serves 2% and no Title I services are available at Washington High School.

The Gifted Program serves 6.5% of the student body. Included in this program are honors

classes in English, Math, Science at all grade levels, Social Studies in grades 10-12, and

Advanced Placement Courses in American History, Biology, Calculus, Environmental

Science and English. Students eligible to receive free and reduced lunch account for 42% of the population. The dropout rate is 5%.

A typical school day consists of 6 periods of 55 minutes beginning at 7:52 and ending at 2:47. After first period, students and teachers have a seven-minute homeroom followed by a ten-minute break. Students are provided with the opportunity to take additional classes during a zero period and a seventh period.

From the diverse population many of the students attend state, local, private, and public colleges and universities. A number of the students go into the military after graduation or into the local work force. The programs of study offered by the school prepare students to move on to post graduation work or study. In a typical graduating class, 49% earn a college preparatory seal of endorsement, 41% earn a vocational seal of endorsement, while the remainder earn a special education diploma or a certificate of attendance. The Helping Outstanding Pupils Educationally (HOPE) Scholarship is available to approximately 47% of graduates.

The mission statement of Washington High School is to prepare students, through specific academic and vocational course work targeted to individual student needs, for any post-secondary opportunity. The general philosophy is that the school has a responsibility to every student regardless of his or her abilities or individual educational goals. The student advisement program insures that students receive help with their curricular and career choices.

Many state and national honors have been awarded in the areas of debate, band, cheerleading, and Future Farmers of America (FFA). The Future Farmers of America (FFA) enables students of all academic levels to participate in showing pigs, cows, and

lambs as well as the competitive horticulture, meats, land judging, floriculture and tree identification. Washington High is known nationally for its FFA program, and the accomplishments in FFA competition separate Washington High from the other high schools in the county.

The faculty at Washington High consists of 4 administrators, 6 support personnel and 64 teachers. Table 1 provides information on the gender, certificate, and years of experience of the staff.

Table 1: Faculty of Washington High

|  | # Administrators | # Support Personnel | # Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 3 | 2 | 26 |
| Female | 1 | 5 | 38 |
| 4 Year Bachelor's | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| 5 Year Master's | 2 | 4 | 28 |
| 6 Year Specialist | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| 7 Year Doctoral | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Average Years of Experience | 17 | 12.43 | 9.39 |

The faculty and staff is challenged to continue professional growth through attending workshops and in-services, making presentations, grading advanced placement exams, writing grants, and teaching at local colleges.

Lincoln High School

Lincoln High School has an enrollment of 1604 students. This population is derived from both rural and suburban areas. Housing for this population is in the middle to upper range with the average annual income per family of more than $35,000. The demographics of this high school has changed very little over the past five years, and minority populations within the school have remained steady (see Figure 3.4). Many of

the students have had the opportunity to be exposed to other cultures because a large

government installation is nearby. This installation also causes frequent movement of

students in and out of the school. The annual mobility rate is 14%. Community support

both in time and money is extensive from the manufacturing community and the

parent/school community. The amount of support for this school separates it from the

other high schools in the district.

| Black | White | Hispanic | Asian | American Indian | Male | Female |
|-------|-------|----------|-------|-----------------|------|--------|
| 26.6% | 70% | 1.7% | 1.6% | .1% | 49.8% | 50.2% |

*Figure 3.4.* Lincoln High School Racial Composition

Currently, 9.5% of the student population are served in special education classes.

The gifted program serves 11.5% of the students in courses designed for their individual

needs. Advanced Placement courses are available in all of the core areas as well as art for

both identified gifted and high achieving nongifted students. The Advanced Placement

Calculus BC course (more advanced than AP Calculus AB) is taught only at this school

in the district. Students receiving free and reduced lunch is 22.1%, and the dropout rate is

1%.

A typical school day consists of 6 periods of 55 minutes beginning at 7:45 and

ending at 2:35. Students and teachers have a ten-minute break after first period and a ten-

minute homeroom after second period. Students are provided with the opportunity to take

additional classes during a zero period and a seventh period.

The ninth grade academy has provided freshmen the transition necessary from the

middle school to the high school. Students also attend class, as much as possible, on the

same halls. The academy has led to lower student failures and a lower number of discipline referrals.

Students have a wide variety of courses from which to choose whether they are seeking a college preparatory seal, a vocational seal, or both on their diplomas. Numerous art, drama, and music classes are available. In the vocational field, business, childcare, drafting, graphic communications, as well as others are offered. An array of physical education, foreign language and core courses are available to students. The number of students graduating with a college preparatory seal of endorsement is 62%, while the percentage of students earning a vocational seal is 31%. Special education diplomas comprise 2%, and the other 5% receive certificates of attendance.

Lincoln High has a rich tradition when it comes to athletics. The football program has won several state titles, as well as, national recognition. Several athletes have gone on to participate at both the college and professional ranks. Students at this school understand the importance of belonging to a winning program. The emphasis on other sports pales in comparison to the emphasis placed on football.

The faculty of Lincoln High consists of 5 administrators, 12 support personnel, and 82 teachers. Table 2 provides a representation on the gender, certificate, and years of experience of the staff.

Table 2: Faculty of Lincoln High

|  | # Administrators | # Support Personnel | # Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 2 | 8 | 22 |
| Female | 3 | 7 | 60 |
| 4 Year Bachelor's | 0 | 3 | 29 |
| 5 Year Master's | 0 | 8 | 44 |
| 6 Year Specialist | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| 7 Year Doctoral | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Average Years of Experience | 15 | 15 | 12.13 |

Jefferson High School

Jefferson High School has experienced "white flight." The white population has moved out of the neighborhoods from which the school's population is drawn. Even though there are new subdivisions being built in the school's zone, much of the existing housing was built in the early 1960s for the purpose of housing government employed families. This school takes on characteristics of an inner city school. This school is unique due to it including two municipalities in its zone.

The student body consists of 1726 students (see Figure 3.5). Many students move in and out of the school due to the socio-economics of the school and because a government site is served by the school. The mobility rate is 28%. The school number of free and reduced lunch stands at 36%; however, this number seems low when compared to the two middle schools that feed into this high school with 62% and 42% of their respective student populations receiving free or reduced lunches. The dropout rate for the school is 5%.

| Black | White | Hispanic | Asian | Indian | Multi-racial | Male | Female |
|-------|-------|----------|-------|--------|--------------|------|--------|
| 40.6% | 55% | 2.1% | 1.8% | .3% | .3% | 48.6% | 51.4% |

*Figure 3.5.* Jefferson High School Racial Composition

The Special Education Program at Jefferson High School serves 11% of the student body. Many of these students participate in the workout program of the school. This program helps special needs students secure jobs in the community and grants high school credit to students while they learn valuable job skills. Gifted classes serve 7.6% of the population. Advanced Placement courses are offered in English, Calculus, Statistics, Biology, American History, European History, Human Geography, and Art History.

In a typical graduating class, 52% of the students receive a college preparatory diploma. A vocational seal is awarded to 41% of the students, and 1% earn special education diplomas. Certificates of performance are awarded to the remaining 6% of the graduating students.

The successes that the literary teams from this school have experienced make it different from the other high schools. The one act play has won the region title ten years consistently and has won the state title several times. The performers have been invited to participate in national competitions due to the high quality of the plays presented. Several students have gone to colleges of the performing arts and are now employed within the arts professions. Several Miss Georgia's are graduates of this high school and were members of the literary teams.

Athletics at this school is also important to the school's communities. The football program has experienced tremendous success in the past ten years. Several of the athletes

have gone on to play college ball, and athletes are placed in high regard by the student body.

The faculty at Jefferson High consists of 6 administrators, 9 support personnel, and 89 teachers. The faculty is unique in that 29% have over 20 years of experience (see Table 3).

Table 3: Faculty of Jefferson High School

|  | # Administrators | # Support Personnel | # Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 4 | 3 | 23 |
| Female | 2 | 8 | 66 |
| 4 Year Bachelor's | 0 | 4 | 44 |
| 5 Year Master's | 2 | 3 | 35 |
| 6 Year Specialist | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| 7 Year Doctoral | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Average Years of Experience | 17 | 15.45 | 10.89 |

Harrison High School

Harrison High School is composed of 1670 students (see Figure 3.6), who come from middle to upper class families. Eleven percent of the students receive free and reduced lunches, and most of these students are bused in from the school's zone boundaries reaching several miles north of the school. However, many of the students live in newly built homes that range in price from $100,000 to $1,000,000. While a few of these neighborhoods are in the city limits of a municipality, the school is not.

| Black | White | Hispanic | Asian | Indian | Multi-racial | Male | Female |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20.9% | 73.9% | 2% | 2.6% | .4% | .2% | 50.6% | 49.4% |

*Figure 3.6.* Harrison High Racial Composition

Harrison High School is the only one of the four high schools in which the males out number the females.

The Special Education Program is unique due to having a family living center to serve the profoundly mentally handicapped students from the entire school district. The special education population makes up 9.5% of the student body. There are no ESOL students, and only 6.3% are in remedial programs. The drop out rate is 2%. The gifted program serves 12.1% of the students, marking the highest percentage of gifted students served in the district. Advanced Placement classes are offered in all academic areas and Georgia Statewide Academic Medical Systems (GSAMS) classes are available by parent request.

A largest percentage of students graduate each year having earned a college preparatory seal of endorsement. The percentage of college prep students is 67%. Approximately 27% earn a vocational seal, which represents the lowest number of vocational seals awarded in the district. Four percent of the diplomas are special education, and 2% are certificates of attendance.

Harrison High is the youngest comprehensive high school in the district and consequently does not have athletic, literary or other markers of winning programs; traditions have not been established in any extra-curricular areas.

Academic success stands out at this high school with 61% of the students receiving the HOPE Scholarship. This school has the fewest number of retained students in the district and the highest number of ninth grade enrollment graduating four years later with 90%. The average score is 1014 on the Scholastic Assessment Test, placing this school well above both the district and the state average.

The faculty consists of 6 administrators, 9 support personnel, and 102 teachers (see Table 4). The principal is only the second principal of the school. The faculty has the least number of average years of experience for each of the four high schools in addition to having the most number of teachers.

Table 4: Faculty of Harrison High

|  | # Administrators | # Support Personnel | # Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 4 | 5 | 32 |
| Female | 2 | 4 | 70 |
| 4 Year Bachelor's | 1 | 1 | 47 |
| 5 Year Master's | 0 | 8 | 45 |
| 6 Year Specialist | 5 | 0 | 9 |
| 7 Year Doctoral | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average Years of Experience | 16.67 | 16 | 8.91 |

Profiles of Participants

The participants included the four high school principals that served grades 9-12 of the selected district. Three of the principals were male and one female. The range of time in education was between 15 and 30 years, and the range of time serving as principal was between 1 year and 24 years. Each of the candidates served as an assistant principal in the high school setting before becoming a principal. Serving as a coach was a common experience of each of the candidates. The candidates described the district in which they

work as being rural, suburban, and urban. The number of employees that each supervised

depended on the size of the school with the low being 92 and the high being 165.

According to the district handbook, the assistant principal and instructional coordinator at

each of the schools assisted with teacher supervision and evaluation. Table 5 provides a

breakdown of the background information of each candidate.

Table 5: Background Information of the Participants

|  | Bill Ford Washington High School | Renee Lane Lincoln High School | Mark Ostro Jefferson High School | Ken Lewis Harrison High School | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Years in Education | **30** | **27** | **15** | **21** | **93** |
| Subject Taught | **Soc. St.** | **Special Ed.** | **Science** | **Science** | **NA** |
| Years in Administration | **27** | **16** | **5** | **9** | **57** |
| Served as Assistant Principal | **Yes** | **Yes** | **Yes** | **Yes** | **4** |
| Years as Principal | **24** | **10** | **1** | **5** | **40** |
| Years in Current Position | **2** | **10** | **1** | **5** | **NA** |
| Years in District | **2** | **27** | **15** | **7** | **51** |
| Geographical Area | **Rural** | **Urban** | **Suburban** | **Suburban** | **NA** |
| Number of Employees | **92** | **150** | **140** | **165** | **547** |

Participant's Beliefs about Instructional Supervision

Bill Ford believed that he is ultimately responsible for the supervision of all of the

employees, but he shares the responsibility at different levels with different

administrators. He calls himself "a student's principal" and believes he "is there" for the

students not only educationally but also socially. Bill believes students must be nurtured

before they can be taught. His philosophy of the principalship is centered on attitude. For

the organization to be successful, he believes that "everyone must be happy." The key

element that he feels a principal must possess is patience because, the principal "deals with so many aspects of teachers, parents, and coaches." The biggest issue he has faced when he took over as principal was "creating an open door policy" for teachers. Teachers in the past had been alienated from the previous administration, and they were not allowed to express their views or opinions. Having an open door policy and allowing students, teachers, and parents access to him, is still one of the biggest issues he faces.

Renee Lane believed she must share the responsibility of supervision, but "in the end," she is "responsible for all." She believed that it is the principal's responsibility to provide the best educational setting and to always be aware of the changing demographics. She sees the principal as a "facilitator and a role model." Trust must be ever present to develop relationships between the principal and the staff. Key elements that she believes are essential for a principal are "compassion, integrity, and being forthright." The challenge she faced upon entering the position as principal was to realize "the buck stops here." She stills sees herself being the final authority as the greatest issue she faces.

Mark Ostro believed he must "share the responsibility" of supervision with other administrators. He believed that "every child can learn, even special education students, and it is just how you approach them." He sees the principal as a leader, and that the "organization should run effectively without the principal being present." The principal should lead by example. The elements he believed are essential to the principalship are "flexibility and adapting to change." The challenge he has faced was hiring teachers. He was unable to fill several slots before school began. The issue he faces today is that he must retain the good teachers he has hired.

Ken Lewis believed he is responsible for supervision, but he shares the responsibility with others. His philosophy is to produce productive citizens in our society. He sees his role as that of a "facilitator" and, he must be able to provide teachers with the "resources they need to be successful at their job." Key elements that he believes are central for a principal are "patience, extensive knowledge of the level with which they work, and people skills." The challenge he faced when he first took the job was that he believed he knew everything, and in reality, he "knew very little." The issues he faces today deal with personnel and hiring and retaining effective teachers.

<div align="center">Data Collection Procedures</div>

Upon completion of sampling, potential participants were contacted to ascertain their willingness to participate in the study. Next, participants were given an informed consent form (see Appendix A) describing the purpose of the study, procedures, and potential risks and benefits of participation. The consent form explained the conditions for voluntary participation, confidentiality, and contacts for questions about the research and participants' rights. The consent form further explained that interviews would be audiotaped, transcribed, and kept in the locked possession of the researcher. Of the four potential participants identified, all returned signed consent forms and agreed to participate in the study.

<u>Interviews</u>

Upon return of signed consent forms, interviews were scheduled and conducted. The time and place for the interviews was determined mutually between each respondent and the researcher. Each participant's work site served as the location for the interviews.

Three private, face-to-face interviews were conducted with each participant. Each interview tape was numbered and audiotaped on a separate cassette. The first interviews were conducted early in the second semester of school year 2001-2002. The second and third interviews were conducted late in the second semester of school year 2001-2002. The average duration of the first interviews was 50 minutes; for the second interviews, 30 minutes; and the third, 30 minutes of time was spent for each interview.

The types of interview conducted were the focused interviews. Yin (1994) described a focused interview as one "in which a respondent is interviewed for a short period of time … remain open-ended and assume a conversational manner … following a certain set of questions derived from the case study protocol" (p. 85). An interview guide set the protocol for discussion. Three interview guides, one for each set of interviews, served as instruments. The interview guides (see Appendix A) allowed the researcher to focus on the issues, but follow unexpected leads that arose during the course of the interview.

Questions for the interview guides were examined for clarity and validity. A content validity check helped to ensure that the interview questions were indeed likely to measure what they were intended to measure. The critiquing of the initial elements of the study was done by "gatekeepers, knowledgeable informants, or experts" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 234). To anchor the questions, the researcher asked two principals who had recently retired from secondary schools in the county serving as the research site to review interview questions. These two people, due to their wisdom and years of experience as high school principals, were chosen to help develop and refine the interview questions. The interview questions for the first interview guide were submitted

to these experts. Modifications were made based on their recommendations. Second and third interview questions were treated in the same manner, and moreover, the researcher added additional questions based on information that emerged from prior interviews.

The first interviews sought data that described the broad context of instructional supervision from the perspectives of the participants—how the participants viewed educational instructional supervision, what were their actions, and why. The data gleaned from the first interviews were examined for issues related to instructional supervision and to understand from the participant's perspectives, the intents and purposes of supervision. Questions for the second interviews (see Appendix B) were formed based on the data from the first interviews. Second interview questions sought to uncover the participants' perspectives specific to instructional supervisory beliefs that either supported or inhibited instructional supervision of high school teachers. The third interview questions sought perspective related to what it was like to make classroom observations.

The interviews were audiotaped for later analysis. The researcher made written fieldnotes during each interview to list interesting points and to record observations. After each interview, participants were asked to review transcripts so additions or modifications could be made.

The researcher shadowed each of the four high school principals for one entire school day. The school day began from the time he or she arrived on campus until the end of the contract day. The activities observed included meetings, duties, and conversations with students, parents, and teachers.

<u>Fieldnotes</u>

In addition to interviews with the four high school principals, fieldnotes were taken during each interview. Fieldnotes helped to keep the researcher focused, and these fieldnotes allowed the researcher to keep track of follow-up questions that needed to be asked. The fieldnotes were transcribed after each interview for later analysis.

<u>Artifacts</u>

Relevant artifacts were collected and analyzed. The artifacts included the district high school principal job description, district policy manual, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Report for each school, teacher handbook, student handbook, parent handbook, memos/directives regarding instruction, evaluation, and professional growth. The artifacts were examined and then analyzed as part of the data set from each participant.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

"Data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, or otherwise recombining the evidence to address the initial propositions of the study" (Yin, 1994, p. 102). Data analysis is an ongoing process that begins with the first interview (Merriam, 1988). During the interview, fieldnotes were taken as the participants spoke to assist the researcher in identifying emerging themes and to track follow-up questions. According to Marshall and Rossman (1989):

> Data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure, and interpretation to the mass of collected data. It is a messy, ambiguous, time-consuming, creative, and fascinating process. It does not proceed in a linear fashion; it is not neat. (p. 150)

Management of the data in qualitative analysis includes coding and sorting (Bogden & Biklin, 1998). As fieldnotes were taken during the first interviews, the

researcher recorded observations as well as spoken words. Upon transcription of the

audiotapes while reviewing the fieldnotes, emerging themes were noted and coding of the

data began. Figure 3.7 provides a sample of themes and codes developed by the

researcher. For a complete list of themes and codes, see Appendix C.

| Code | Theme |
|------|-------|
| IC | Issue of Constraints |
| IP | Issue of Priorities |
| EX | Issue of Expert |
| C | Issue of Control |

*Figure 3.7.*  Sample of Themes and Codes

 After the initial coding, new categories were developed and data was divided

further. This process of coding, categorizing, and dividing continued until all data was

dissipated. Figure 3.8 gives examples of how responses were categorized and coded. See

Appendix C for full listing of codes.

| Response | Theme | Code |
|----------|-------|------|
| Conference with the teacher after an observation | Issue of Action Taken | AT |
| Supervision is evaluation | Issue of Definition of Instructional Supervision | DIS |
| The instructional coordinator does not do evaluations | Issue of Role Entanglement | RE |
| I am a democratic leader | Issue of Management Style | MS |

*Figure 3.8.* Categorization of responses

 "The critical task in qualitative research is not to accumulate all the data you can,

but to 'can' most of the data you accumulate. This requires constant winnowing"

(Wolcott, 1990, p. 35). During the coding process, the data was analyzed for patterns and

themes. As patterns and themes were identified, categories began to develop. Figure 3.9

shows the categories that were developed following the first interviews.

| Category | Pattern |
|---|---|
| Supervision is power | Definition |
| Department heads | Role |
| Role of instructional coordinator | Role |
| Role of principal | Role |
| Reaction of teachers | Beliefs of teachers |
| Principal as expert | Expert |
| Constraints | What gets in the way |
| Evaluation | Definition |
| Time | What gets in the way |
| Action taken to improve supervision | Process |

*Figure 3.9.* Categories following first interviews

Since the first interviews were intended to identify the beliefs of the principals regarding

instructional supervision, preliminary themes about supervisory beliefs were noted.

Figure 3.10 lists the themes and codes developed from the preliminary categories

following interview one.

| Theme | Code |
|---|---|
| Issue of Definition of Instructional Supervision | DIS |
| Issue of Role Entanglement | RE |
| Issue of Priority | IP |
| Issue of Perceived Teacher Perception | PTP |
| Issue of Effective Teaching | ET |
| Issue of Action Taken | AT |
| Issue of Expert | EX |
| Issue of Management Style | MS |

*Figure 3.10.* Themes and Codes Developed from Interview 1

Upon reflection on these themes, second interview questions were developed from the

original set. Some examples of the follow-up questions asked in interview 2 are listed in

Figure 3.11.

| Question | Follow-up Question |
|---|---|
| Tell me about instructional supervision in your building. | You mentioned that some of this was just luck, what do you mean by that? |
| Tell me about instructional supervision in your building. | So, it's lucky if you hire a person that doesn't need a lot of supervision? |
| Has supervision changed since you started as a principal? | What does the monitoring entail? |

*Figure 3.11.* Follow-up Questions Asked in Interview 2

Possible questions for the subsequent interviews were discussed between the researcher, the retired high school principals, and the researcher's major professor. Additional or different questions for the follow-up interviews were anticipated based on the data collected from the previous interviews; however, no assumptions were made regarding the exact questions to be used in round two and three of the interviews with the four high school principals in the study.

Before the first interviews, the researcher supplied the participants information regarding the study, a consent form, and telephone number of the researcher. The researcher reviewed measures that would be taken to assure confidentiality of each individual. To whit, the name of the system, schools, and principals were changed to ensure confidentiality. The researcher secured the interview transcripts, audiotapes, and fieldnotes in a locked file cabinet at his residence.

The first interviews occurred late in the first semester of the 2001-2002 school year. Each interview took place on site in the respondents' offices. Upon receipt of the transcripts of the first interviews, the researcher sent a copy of each participant's responses to the participant and asked that corrections be made; however, no corrections were offered by the participants. Following the first interviews, the researcher read the data to familiarize himself with the content. Broad topic headings were written in the

margins of the transcripts. Next, the researcher gleaned common categories from the

margin notes. These common categories were then placed into common themes and

codes were assigned to each theme. Following the coding, the interview questions for the

second interviews were finalized.

The second interviews were scheduled with the four high school principals at the

beginning of the second semester of the 2001-2002 school year. The questions used in

interview two are listed in Appendix C. The second interviews were audiotaped and

fieldnotes were made. The audiotapes were transcribed while fieldnotes were reviewed

for clarification, and emerging patterns were noted in the margins of the transcripts.

Through constant waning, the researcher identified five additional themes from the

second interview data. After the analysis of the first and second interview data was

completed, the researcher's major professor and the researcher discussed the identified

themes. Figure 3.12 contains the themes and codes developed after interview two.

| Theme | Code |
|---|---|
| Issue of Constraints | IC |
| Issue of Change of Instructional Supervision | CIS |
| Issue of Communication Process | CP |
| Issue of Trust | TR |
| Issue of Control | C |

*Figure 3.12.*  Themes and Codes Developed from Interview 2

After the researcher received the transcripts of the second interviews, a copy was sent to

each respondent. Each participant was asked to review the transcripts, note any

corrections, and return the corrected transcripts to the researcher. No corrections were

received.

The researcher scheduled time with each participant to shadow that person.

During the shadowing process, the researcher kept fieldnotes of observed activities.

Following these observations, the researcher reviewed the themes and codes that had

emerged from the first two interviews to compare with the observed activities.

Following the second interviews and the coding of the data, the prescribed set of

questions for the third interviews were analyzed. The questions asked in the third

interviews are listed in Appendix C. The third interviews were scheduled with each

participant for the middle of the second semester of the 2001-2002 school year. The

interviews took place in the offices of the four participants. The data was transcribed and

emerging themes and patterns were coded. Figure 3.13 shows the theme that emerged

from the third set of interview data and the code for that theme.

| Theme | Code |
|---|---|
| Issue of Content Area | CA |

*Figure 3.13.*  Theme and Code Developed from Interview 3

After the transcripts for the third interviews were received by the researcher, the

transcripts were sent to the respondents and the respondents were asked to make

corrections. No corrections were made.

## Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is essential in qualitative research dealing with education

(Merriam, 1998). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), for the researcher to establish

trustworthiness, he must "persuade his or her audiences (including self) that their findings

of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of" (p. 290). There are

four methods identified by Lincoln and Guba (1985) that assist the researcher in securing

trustworthiness: validity, reliability, generalizability, and neutrality.

<u>Validity</u>

"All research is concerned with producing valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner" (Merriam, 1988, p. 163). McMillan (1996) defined validity as "the extent to which inferences are appropriate and meaningful" (p. 118). Silverman (1993) wrote, validation includes, "taking one's findings back to the subjects being studied. Where these people verify one's findings … one can be more confident of their validity" (p. 156). For this study, the researcher used respondent checks for validity. Merriam (1998) described this process as "member checks" (p. 204).

After the second and third interviews, participants were given the themes that had been derived from the data. Participants were then given the opportunity to agree or disagree on the credibility of the themes. Transcripts were sent to each participant one week after each interview was completed, and the participants were asked to make corrections on the transcripts and return them to the researcher. No corrections were reported by the participants.

<u>Reliability</u>

To help reduce the potential for bias that comes from a single person and to strengthen the reliability and validity of the data, triangulation was used. Silverman (1993) stated "triangulation derives from navigation, where different bearings give the correct position of an object" (p. 156). The sources of data included transcription of interviews, fieldnotes, and artifacts from both the district and the four high schools in which the participants served as principals.

Triangulation strengthens the reliability of case studies (Merriam, 1998) and in this study, the researcher sought to further confirm findings through a second form of

triangulation. Having two or more persons independently analyze the same data set and

compare findings is one method of triangulation (Patton, 1986). Reliability in the study

was addressed in two ways. The researcher read the data many times, and after analysis,

the researcher's major professor audited several samples of the data.

Generalizability

According to Bogdan and Biklen (1998), findings are generalizable if they "hold

up beyond the specific research subjects and the setting involved" (p. 32). Merriam

(1998) stated:

> Overall, the issue of generalizability centers on whether or not it is possible to
> generalize from a single case or from qualitative inquiry in general … and offered
> two possible positions on this issue:
> 1.  Generalizability is a limitation of the method; or,
> 2.  The use of many cases as an attempt to strengthen generalizability. (p.
>     208)

In this study, the researcher conceded that generalizability was a limitation of the method.

The researcher intended for the findings of the study to be helpful to other high school

principals by providing data regarding the issues surrounding instructional supervision.

Neutrality

In a qualitative case study, ethical dilemmas may occur during the collection of

the data or the dissemination of the findings (Merriam, 1998). Lincoln and Guba (1985)

stated "respondents are much more likely to be both candid and forthcoming if they

respect the inquirer and believe in his or her integrity" (p. 256). Before the interview is

conducted, the researcher should provide the participants with a form indicating:

1.  Name, address and telephone number of the researcher.
2.  A statement of the purpose of the study.
3.  Specific information regarding consent and participation such as
    confidentiality, anonymity, measures to be taken to prevent data from being
    linked to a specific individual. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 254)

Ethical considerations must be adhered to during the entire research project. Honesty in data collection, reporting of findings and analysis is imperative. An informed consent form was used in this study in order to explain the intent of the study.

Merriam (1998) noted that clarifying the researcher's biases and assumptions at the onset of the study could be an effective strategy to enhance validity. Merriam (1998) further stated, "all observations and analyses are filtered through the human being's worldview, values, and perspectives" (p. 22). In an effort to further ensure the credibility and validity of data, the researcher identified his own experiences and biases by reporting his own perspectives as found in Appendix D, the Researcher's Perspectives. In summary:

1. The researcher was currently employed as a middle school administrator in a district similar to the sample system. The researcher had been a public school teacher for three years and in administration for seven years. The researcher had strong opinions regarding the supervision of teachers due to the nature of his position as principal.

2. The researcher is a white male. He holds a Bachelor of Science degree in middle level education and two advanced degrees in educational leadership. He is pursuing a doctorate in educational leadership.

3. The researcher had served in three different administrative roles in the same middle school.

4. The researcher believed that school principals needed to be proactive in providing supervision in classrooms.

5. The researcher sought out actively additional training in supervision and staff

development.

Having identified his own personal biases, the researcher was able to avoid interjecting

his own feelings and opinions throughout the research process. However, the experience

and opinion of the researcher contributed to the selection of the research method and

analyses of the data.

With a self-awareness of the biases, the researcher was able to check more readily

for biases throughout the processes of collecting, analyzing, and reporting data. To

collect data in an unbiased manner, and to achieve validity, Wolcott (1990) developed

nine steps to collecting and analyzing data that permits the researcher to:

1. talk little, listen a lot;
2. record accurately;
3. begin writing early;
4. let readers "see" for themselves;
5. report information fully;
6. be candid;
7. seek feedback;
8. try to achieve balance; and,
9. write accurately. (pp. 125-135)

Limitations

Qualitative research is not necessarily intended to be replicable (Marshall &

Rossman, 1989). However, reliability can still be strengthened in a qualitative study. Two

outsiders were asked to code samples of transcripts. Comparisons were made between the

researcher's coding and those of the auditors.

There were some definite limitations to this study. This study was limited to the

perspectives of the four principals who participated; teachers' perspectives were not

solicited. Two of the four participants, although experienced administrators, were new to

the school system. The accuracy with which the principals discussed instructional supervision was limited to their willingness to be candid with the researcher.

<p style="text-align:center">Chapter Summary</p>

A case study approach was used to examine what issues high school principals encountered as they provide instructional supervision for high school teachers.  Through such an exploration, it was hoped to yield a better understanding of instructional supervision of high school teachers from the perspective of the principal. The principals were asked to define instructional supervision, to describe the supervisory process, to describe the climate that enhances supervision, to describe what gets in the way of principals supervising teachers, and to describe the structure of the high school.

The researcher chose four ($N$=4) high school principals in South Georgia to interview. These four principals work at high schools in the same school system. These participants were chosen because of proximity to the researcher. The close proximity allowed the researcher to have access to the participants.

A qualitative approach was used for this study. Data was collected from the four participants during three sets of interviews. Questions were predetermined for each set of interviews, but were revised after each set of interview data was analyzed. Fieldnotes were taken during the interviews and observations. Audiotapes were made during the interviews, and transcripts were made after each set of interviews from the audiotapes. Data was read and analyzed following each set of interviews. The analysis began as topics written in the margins that were streamlined into themes. The themes were then assigned codes.

The study began during August, 2001 with the review of the literature. The first interviews took place at the middle of the first semester of the 2001-2002 school year. The second and third interviews took place during the middle and toward the end of the second semester of the 2001-2002 school year. The researcher completed the analysis of the data in April of 2002.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this case study was to examine the perspectives of four ($\underline{N}$=4) high

school principals regarding the supervision of instruction. This research was conducted to

answer the following research questions:

1. According to principals, what is supervision?

2. How do principals describe the supervisory process?

3. What type of climate enhances supervision?

4. What gets in the way of principals trying to supervise teachers?

5. How does the structure of the high school relate to supervision?

The study, conducted in 2001-2002, included three interviews with the four principals

beginning in September and ending in April 2002. Through interviews, artifact analysis,

and time spent observing the participants, data reflected the perspectives of the four high

school principals and their beliefs about instructional supervision.

This chapter reports the findings first as individual cases and then second as data

aggregated across the cases. The findings were categorized and then themes were drawn

from the principal's definition of instructional supervision, the description of the

supervisory process, and the climate factors that either enhanced or hindered supervision

along with the constraints that the principals experienced supervising teachers. The

descriptions of the context of each school and the profiles of each of the four principals

presented in Chapter 3 provided insight during the analysis of data from each case and

then across each case.  The context of supervision at each site and at the overall school

system is presented in this chapter to ready the reader for the presentation of findings and

subsequent analysis.

## School System

The school system is housed in a single county in middle Georgia. The system's

1740 certified employees serve over 22,000 students on thirty-three campuses. There are

four high schools (grades 9-12), which range in size from 1050 students to 1726 students.

These four high schools contain a total of 337 certified teachers with 21 administrators

for a teacher to administrator ratio of approximately 16 to 1. Each high school has its own

principal and several assistant principals, one of which is designated as the assistant

principal in charge of instruction, and whose title is instructional coordinator.   Chapter 3

provides an expanded profile of the Samville County School System along with detailed

profiles of the participants.

## The Context of Supervision in Samville County

The provisions for teacher evaluation in the Samville County School System are

supported by policies established by the local board of education and comply with state

statutes.  Principals and other administrators are mandated by statute to be trained to use

the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI).  In fall 2001, all Samville County

School System employees who evaluate and supervise teachers received one day of

training in the Phi Delta Kappa (PDK) "walk-through method" of conducting classroom

observations. The county provided the PDK walk-through training to add to the

mandated, yearly provisions of the GTOI that specifies teachers in the first three years of

teaching must be evaluated three time a years, and teachers beyond the third year of

teaching must be evaluated once a year, unless they are on the third year of the rotation and then they are evaluated three times.

The county's teacher handbook includes a section on the evaluation of teachers in which the provisions of the GTOI are enumerated. Within the principals' job description, the principal is designated as the "instructional leader of the school." Board policy explicitly states that the principal is also charged with having a vision for the instructional staff and providing training for all staff—both certified and non-certified. Evaluating teachers and other personnel is listed as a separate responsibility from being the instructional leader. In neither the job description nor the board policy was the distinction between providing instructional supervision or evaluation distinguished from each other.

The teacher handbook for the school system stated, "Teacher evaluation is an on-going process designed to improve the quality of instruction. Supervisors are responsible for observing and assessing the performance of staff members and assisting them in improving their professional competencies as may be identified." The system handbook also pointed out that teachers would be evaluated annually using the state-developed instrument.

The purpose of this instrument is to evaluate teachers' behavior in regard to instruction and management of the classroom. In the state of Georgia, the first time an educator is appointed as an administrator, Samville School System provides GTOI training through the local Regional Educational Support Agency (RESA). This training lasts for five days and includes two follow-up meetings. Principals perform between one and three evaluations for each teacher based on the number of years of experience of the teacher. New teachers are evaluated under the standardized format that means they are

evaluated three times in a year. Veteran teachers are included in the standardized format every three years. During the other two years of the veteran teacher cycle, the teachers are evaluated once per school year. The observation period is 20 minutes in length, and the observations are unannounced.

Teachers have the right to request a pre-observation conference and a post-observation conference with the evaluator. The GTOI is composed of three parts in which teachers are evaluated: 1) providing instruction, 2) assessing and encouraging student progress, and 3) managing the learning environment. Teachers are scored in each area with a score of "Satisfactory" (S) or "Needs Improvement" (NI). When a teacher receives more than five NI's the teacher is automatically placed into the extended phase of evaluation in which a professional development plan (PDP) must be formulated. The supervisor writes the PDP for the teacher with no input from the teacher required.

The other form of evaluation used in Samville County is the PDK walk-through evaluation. Principals were trained for one day in the walk-through process by two external consultants. The training provided principals with the tools and skills necessary to analyze instruction. The program also guided principals in prescribing specific actions and activities that will enhance the quality of student learning and achievement. As per the superintendent of the Samville County, all principals across PK-12 are required to do a total of five walk-throughs a day, regardless of the experience level of the teachers in their buildings. During the walk-through training, trainers indicated that observations should last from two to four minutes in length. The PDK walk-throughs are to last no more than 4 minutes each whereas the provisions of the GTOI mandate that supervisors spend no more than 20 minutes in the teacher's classroom.

The walk-through guide to chronicling the events in the classroom consists of five observable components: 1) engagement of students, 2) determination of objective, 3) instructional practices used, 4) observed walls for objectives and practices, and 5) safety of facility. Principals were instructed to base their analysis on cause and effect or teacher behavior related directly to student behavior. Moreover, principals were instructed to provide teachers with one-on-one feedback after each walk-through, and teachers are to be provided with the opportunity to actively question and reflect on their classroom practices as described by the principal. The premise is that reflection should encourage the teacher to analyze on-going practices, to search for new practices, and to improve practices.

## Individual Cases

This first section provides findings across the four participants as individual cases. An overview of the participants, four high school principals, along with other pertinent information is presented in Figure 4.1.

| Principal | High School | Years as Principal at the Research Site | Number of Faculty and Staff Responsible to Supervise |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bill Ford | Washington High School | 2 | 92 |
| Renee Lane | Lincoln High | 10 | 150 |
| Mark Ostro | Jefferson High School | Less than 1 year. | 140 |
| Ken Lewis | Harrison High School | 5 | 165 |

*Figure 4.1* Participant Overview

<u>Bill Ford</u>

Bill Ford has been the principal of Washington High School for two years. He was previously a principal in a South Georgia county for 22 years with a total of 27 years of experience in administration. His three years of teaching experience were in the field of social studies. Currently Mr. Ford supervises 92 employees that consist of both certified and non-certified personnel.

Thirteen themes arose from the interviews with Mr. Ford. While many of the themes were distinctive to a particular research question, there were similar themes that emerged across several of the research questions. Six themes addressed what is supervision, five themes addressed the supervisory process, three themes addressed the climate, three themes addressed what gets in the way of supervision, and four themes addressed the structure of the high school.  Figure 4. 2 portray the themes that emerged from each overall research question during the interviews with Mr. Bill Ford.

| Research Question | Themes |
|---|---|
| According to principals, what is supervision? | Definition of Instructional Supervision, Change in Instructional Supervision, Perceived Teacher Perception, Control, Expert, Priorities |
| How do principals describe the supervisory process? | Communication Process, Effective Teaching, Role Entanglements, Expert, Action Taken |
| What type of climate enhances supervision? | Management Style, Trust, Perceived Teacher Perception |
| What gets in the way of principals trying to supervise teachers? | Constraints, Role Entanglement, Priorities |
| How does the structure of the high school relate to supervision? | Role Entanglement, Content Area, Expert, Definition of Instructional Supervision |

*Figure 4.2* Themes: Bill Ford

Mr. Ford said, "I am responsible for instruction," laying the groundwork that he is in charge of instructional supervision. The setting of goals, which provide direction for the school and its instructional program, is the job of the principal. "I think you have to have a direction that your instructional program is going. I think you have to have a direction that your school is going." His definitions of instructional supervision range from evaluation to goals to a strong athletic program. Due to the length of time he has served as an administrator (27 years), he believes he has seen the definition of instructional supervision change "tremendously over time" during his tenure as an administrator.

In his role as the instructional leader of his school, the hiring of "good people that I feel like are highly trained," and he believes that by hiring good people, he does not have to "closely supervise instruction in their classrooms." By setting parameters of "what we are trying to do," these teachers are allowed "freedom to do what they do best." He expressed, "If you've got the right adults, then you can give them the freedom as long as they're on the same page with you."

Mr. Ford relates the relationship between the athletic program and instructional supervision as "essential." "The stronger your athletics are, the stronger your academics are going to be." Athletics gives students a goal and direction. To reach the goal, "kids must catch the vision," and one of Mr. Ford's beliefs is the strong correlation between academics and athletics.

For Mr. Ford, supervision is linked to evaluation. He stated, "When we supervise people, we are looking for the same things when we go in and do evaluations." The evaluation stands for a "measuring stick" to say "Hey, be sure that you do this and it is

important to do it everyday, if not, I have to give you an NI (needs improvement) for it."

He expressed, "Most people respond to that." He noted that he was not in the classroom

to be difficult, but to be objective, and he indicated, "as long as you correct it and do

what you are supposed to be doing" and that to this end, he can "monitor" teachers better.

According to Mr. Ford, the teaching of the Quality Core Curriculum (QCC)

objectives and lesson plans are components of instructional supervision. "We're going to

teach QCC objectives and local objectives." The Quality Core Curriculum (QCC) is the

uniformly sequenced core curriculum developed in Georgia from the *Quality Basic*

*Education Act of 1986*. He further added:

> We try to help them to understand they've got to do that. If they get back on that
> page, then we get along fine, if not, then at some point in time, we're probably
> going to part ways.

Mr. Ford proposed that teachers see instructional supervision as "teaching their

respective curriculums," and "We basically have curriculum for each department

…they're expected to teach that curriculum." Mr. Ford went on to explain, "A teacher

thinks that you are trying to be too controlling," when the principal sets "parameters and

draws them back in." Ford expressed, "Teachers are sort of like kids." Teachers want to

know there are "parameters and I think sometimes teachers will test you to see if you will

bring them back in line or will they keep me where I should be." Ford added, "I think

they want the security blanket of knowing an administrator will draw lines if he needs to

do so."

The changes in instructional supervision Mr. Ford discussed included, "Principals

were not actually doing evaluations," when he first became a principal. He stated that in

"the late 80s, the state began to work on an evaluation instrument that they finished in the

early 90s to evaluate not only teachers but counselors, administrators." Mr. Ford

recognized the *A+ Reform Act* as "Even more and more technical of what you are looking

for and what you should be doing in the classroom." Ford concluded, "It's grown from a

primitive evaluation in the late 70s to a very sophisticated evaluation process in 2002."

The *A+ Reform Act* was the first step in Georgia's educational reform effort. The

passage of House Bill 1187 in 2000 included the wording and the name A+ Reform. This

bill laid the groundwork for state accountability by creating the Office of Educational

Accountability (OEA). This agency was charged with examining and issuing report

cards, that grade each school on a scale of A-F twice yearly in the areas of achievement

and improvement beginning 2003-2004.

Mr. Ford described the supervisory process in terms of what an effective teacher

does and in terms of the evaluation procedure and its aftermath. He saw the role of the

principal as being, "responsible for instruction," but was quick to admit that his two

assistant principals performed "the actual evaluations." He stated, "In our academic end

of it, I usually depend on my instructional coordinator…she has a lot of background in

instruction." The job description of the instructional coordinator established by the

Samville County Board of Education states:

> The instructional coordinator is the person who assists teachers with classroom
> planning and instruction, coordinate and provide staff development opportunities,
> assist in scheduling of students, serve as test coordinator, assist in developing a
> master schedule, informally observe teachers and provide feedback to them, and
> participate in curriculum development and implementation.

In further explanation of the instructional coordinator's role in the process of

supervision, Mr. Ford said:

The IC provides the leadership to make sure the total instructional program is going on within each discipline and everyone is carrying out the curriculum that we have as well as the QCC objectives for the state.

Mr. Ford has allowed the instructional coordinator to identify instructional problems in the classroom and then, "My IC sits down with me and we talk about it and it becomes my responsibility to sit down with the teacher."

Sitting down with teachers and talking with them one on one, is how Mr. Ford stated his role in the supervisory process as such:

If there are issues that come up that says its not going on in a particular discipline with a particular teacher, then that's where I come in and sit down with that teacher and say we've got to change this or we've got to do this.

As the principal, Mr. Ford has had no problems "correcting" individuals as the need "arises." He stated, "I have no problem doing that, because that is what I am there for." Over the years he has sat down with teachers "and they cry like babies when you tell them they're not doing what they need to be doing." He admitted that these teachers have come back "after we've made some adjustments in what they were doing" and say to him "I realize now what you are trying to say to me…and I appreciate you for that."

Ford described a time when a rating of Needs Improvement (NI) was given to a teacher in one area of the observation instrument. In his words, "The person was scared to death about that NI." Ford reassured the teacher that one NI would "not destroy them, but when I come in the classroom I have to see certain things."

In working with a situation with a science teacher, Mr. Ford described his worst supervisory experience and provided support for his willingness to eliminate problems. Ford butted heads with a veteran science teacher over what he described as her being "just trouble." Her instructional methods were not in question, but her constant "stirring

of the teachers and kids" wreaked havoc in the climate of the school. Teachers in the school were scared of this teacher with Ford concluding, "Four-fifths of the teachers were scared of her." This teacher had taught biology for fifteen years. A decision was made that "Next year, she is going to teach two classes of physical science and three of biology." Ford said, "If nothing else, I am going to let her know that I am not afraid of her and we're going to do it my way and she's not going to run this school any longer as far as I am concerned." This teacher resigned the Friday before in-service started the next school year.

Mr. Ford had a much different situation in working with another veteran teacher. He claimed, "I changed the way we were doing instruction in that school." The teacher sat down with Mr. Ford and said, "I kind of thought you might have lost your mind." Eight months after this incident, the teacher informed Mr. Ford, "I can see now where it is making our school a much better school."

To guide the process in supervision, Ford looked for characteristics of what he deemed an effective classroom to be. He stated, "We're going to teach the QCC objectives, we're going to teach the local objectives, and in most cases those are going to dovetail together." Effective teaching was further defined as, "how the students respond to the teaching, how much they're on track, and the organization of the classroom." Ford reiterated his belief of the importance of organization by stating, "You can pick up pretty quickly the structure of the class-well structured or loose structured. And usually with loose structure, unless there's a very good teacher, you're headed for problems."

Regard to the type of climate facilitated by Mr. Ford's management style, he claimed, "I'm not one of those people who believes in micromanaging." He points out the

importance "that you're dealing with adults" and you can "give them freedom as long as they are on the same page with you." Ford strongly stated, "They want to be respected as professionals and have their opinions respected."

He believed the climate should include goals, but he conceded "I'm not a big one on just writing down goals…I need my goal between my ears and I need to know how I can see that goal and how I'm going to get that goal." Ford described himself as "being very goal oriented." He also believed, "It's important to keep moving forward and not get hung up on your failures." He pointed out that by being "consistent day in and day out and not getting overly excited is the key."

Ford believes that trust in individuals to do their jobs and trust by the teachers in the administrators as a key component in the supervisory climate. Ford's trust in his instructional coordinator (IC) is an example of trusting individuals, "The IC, her job is basically to see that instruction is going on in the classroom." Another example of trusting individuals was described this way, "If they come to me and say, Mr. Ford, I think this will work with my kids, can I try it, I would say yes as long as I know it is not way out in left field." Teachers must know they can rely on the support of the administrator in any situation that may arise. Ford supported this with, "It's important for them to know if you're going to support them in a situation where they're correct and at the same time in a situation when they're wrong you're not going to embarrass them."

He believed that trust is built when one "says what he means and means what he says." From this, teachers "learn they can trust you." Ford provided an example of how he built trust with an employee by sharing:

> I understand where you are coming from, but I need for you to understand that I must respect your point of view, others point of view and look at the whole

process and say, that might be good for you or your situation, but overall it's not the best thing for the total school and I have to make decisions on what's best for the total school.

He admitted, "Trust is extremely hard to gain sometimes and it's one of the easiest things to lose if you're not always truthful." As the leader, he believed that for trust to be maintained one must not "get caught up in making decisions that are best for this little part of the school or another part of the school."

Another aspect that supported a climate conducive to supervision according to Ford is to provide encouragement for teachers. Mr. Ford believed that encouragement can be provided through "a pat on the back, an E-mail, or through recognition at faculty meetings." He believed it was important for "colleagues to see that you're doing a good job and this is probably the most satisfaction you can get out of being a teacher."

In response to the questions probing what gets in the way of principals supervising teachers, Mr. Ford described his job as being "in the limelight" and "it's like running a business." He stated, "You are always dealing with community, not just parents, you're dealing with students, you're dealing with teachers, you're dealing with people who are contacting your system from outside." He added, "The telephone, people, and being a high school principal is one of the most challenging jobs I've ever had." Ford described the challenge this way:

> I can stay out of my office for fifteen minutes and come back in and there'll be three notes on there to call this person, this person, and this person, and then you've got E-mails that are coming in that you've got to respond to from either the Central Office or other people.

He concluded, "If you spend too much time on one aspect of the business, something's going to fall short."

Ford stated with frustration, "You can pretty much come to school with a set agenda, I'm going to do three evaluations today, and this is going to happen. Then, the telephone rings, a parent comes in, a salesman comes by, and a teacher comes in and wants to talk." Ford provided another example of a time taker, "I've got two young ladies who want to discuss something" and he believed, "They don't come to you and talk to you unless they think they can trust you." Ford jokingly related, "A little row between a boyfriend and a girlfriend" took all day to handle. To compensate for these time challenges, Ford explained:

> I can handle situations, maybe a lot quicker than I could fifteen or twenty years ago…over the years having handled maybe similar type things, you know to rule out four of them…but then ultimately this is the way you've got to do it and you just saved yourself about an hours worth of work.

Ford stated earlier that he sees his role as the instructional leader, but, in turn, he stated, "the instructional coordinator and assistant principals are responsible for supervision." In dealing with teachers, these individuals laid the groundwork by "identifying" instructional problems and bringing those problems to his attention. A specific instance was related when, "My IC sat down with me and talked with me about it and it became my responsibility to sit down with that teacher and say…here are some things that I see that are not going on in the classroom, that need to be going on in the classroom." Along with these assistant principals, Ford noted the role of his department heads. "I've got some awfully strong department heads." Ford granted the department heads the inherited power "if they have problems within a department, if it's something they can resolve without causing a big issue, I have no problem with them doing that."

Ford described instructional supervision as encompassing, "Myself and the other three people that are overseeing the instructional program whether it be academic,

vocational, or I like to think of the extracurricular also as an important part of the program." The assistant principals "handle a lot of the discipline" but, in this school system, "They also help with evaluation of teachers." The assistant principal for instruction/IC "provides the leadership to make sure the total instructional program is going on within each discipline." An additional duty granted to the IC by Mr. Ford is "working with the department heads."

Within each discipline in the high school, Mr. Ford has a department head. He stated, "I believe that the department heads are the big keys." Ford empowers the department heads to "resolve" problems within their respective departments. Due to the content specific nature of the high school, Ford uses his content trained department heads as much as possible.

Ford claimed, "In a high school, you specialize more, if you're a math teacher, an English teacher or a science teacher." Ford saw teacher autonomy due to the "teacher being trained just basically to do one particular subject." He believed supervising content area teachers to be easier "because you can look at the lesson plans, the QCC objectives and see if those things are going on."

In dealing with content area supervision, "French or Spanish were the most difficult areas for me to evaluate." Ford found this difficult due to the fact "I don't speak either language." Ford described the supervisory process in these language classrooms as consisting of "looking at lesson plans, looking at QCC objectives, and how the kids respond to what's being said."

Ford admitted that trust must take place within the organization; however, he is quick to point out, "In all high schools, you're going to find some situations that no

matter what the principal knows, the teachers knows a lot more about it. They just haven't gotten their administrative degrees yet."

Related to extracurricular activities, Ford said, "We've got to change a mindset that it's okay to lose." He claimed, "Those kids are beginning to win and, again, to think they can win and when kids believe they can, they don't mind working hard." When this type of winning environment, "Academically, they do better because a lot of the extracurricular things help with self concept in the way a person feels about himself."

<u>Renee Lane</u>

Renee Lane's teaching experience was in the field of special education. Her 27 years of educational experience consists of 11 years of teaching and 16 years in administration. Dr. Lane has been the principal of Lincoln High School for 10 years. She previously served as an instructional coordinator and as an assistant principal. She is the only one of the four principals to have a doctorate degree. Dr. Lane currently supervises 150 certified and non-certified employees.

During the course of the three interviews with Dr. Lane, 16 themes emerged (see Figure 4.3). Nine themes addressed her definition of instructional supervision, five themes addressed the process, three themes addressed the climate, three themes addressed what gets in the way of her supervising teachers, and six themes addressed the structure of the high school. Figure 4.3 portray the themes that emerged from each overall research question during the interviews with Dr. Renee Lane.

| Research Question | Themes |
|---|---|
| According to principals, what is supervision? | Role Entanglement, Communication Process, Definition of Instructional Supervision, Management Style, Perceived Teacher Perceptions, Constraints, Priorities, Change in Instructional Supervision, Control |

| How do principals describe the supervisory process? | Role Entanglement, Communication Process, Effective Teaching, Action Taken, Constraints |
|---|---|
| What type of climate enhances supervision? | Perceived Teacher Perception, Management Style, Trust |
| What gets in the way of principals trying to supervise teachers? | Communication Process, Constraints, Priorities |
| How does the structure of the high school relate to supervision? | Constraints, Trust, Content Area, Expert, Definition of Supervision, Perceived Teacher Perception |

*Figure 4.3*    Themes: Dr. Renee Lane

Dr. Lane described instructional supervision as "very vague." She added that in the present state "teachers feel almost a trepidation" about the evaluation of their instruction. Her reasoning for her beliefs hinged on her statement, "There is a lack of information. I would say that the intent is valuable. I think the intent is honorable, but I don't think the process has been defined."

Lane's definition of instructional supervision was evaluation. At Lincoln High School, "GTOI and walk-throughs" make up "the teacher component to their evaluation." Lane painted a picture of the GTOI process by saying, "You sat there for 20 minutes or so and you pretty much observed what they were doing in that 20 minutes." Following this statement, she added, "It's not the right way. More has to be included in the evaluation of teachers."

Lane preferred "to be out in the wings more and mainly just doing the walk-through type thing." She stated, "I even enjoy the walk-through more than the 20 minute evaluation." Lane defended her answer by stating, "I meet the April 1st deadline" that is required by the State. She believed that by doing "more leisurely walk-throughs and mixing and mingling with the kids and the teachers" would improve instructional

supervision. She reiterated, "Being in the classroom, being in the building, should be my primary focus."

Lane spoke of a facet of supervision as having "luck" in hiring teachers. Lane claimed that any candidate could have "a jam up interview." The interview can give a false sense of what kind of teacher a person is. Lane stated, "You have a good feeling" about the new candidate and "sometimes that person doesn't turn out to be a great teacher." She pointed out, "That's what I mean by luck." She believed that this luck-factor enhances the probability of finding a good teacher. She related the "old cliché, 'You need to hire the best people you can possibly hire because that will make your job a whole lot easier.'"

During this current school year (2001), Lane added, "I feel very fortunate." Lane believed that Lincoln High School has "had a good recruiting year." With these employees Lane responded, "That's correct" when she responded to the statement, "You have new employees but you haven't had to provide a whole lot of supervision.

Lane described her idea of being a "good supervisor…is how we interact with people." Within this interaction with people, she included, "We should mentor, monitor, and those kind of things with our staff." Lane stated, "Our goals are to improve student achievement." By being the "instructional leader" she believed that the principal should always be in a "monitoring mode."

Within her definition of instructional supervision, Lane claimed, "It [supervision] has changed, " and she pointed out, "There is a different type of person going into teaching than, say, sixteen years ago or ten years ago when I became principal." Lane discovered, "I find myself having to have a more of a hands-on kind of approach." She

allowed teachers the freedom "to teach" but believed, "I've got to monitor it more than I used to have to."

Pivotal to Lane's definition of supervision are the "monitoring" aspects, and she admitted, "I think the accountability issue has forced us to go in that direction." Dr. Lane stated, "I think accountability is definitely something we need to hold teachers accountable for." Teachers are told, "that they will be held accountable." Lane pointed out that in the future "student achievement is going to be the main factor in evaluating them."

In describing the process for supervising instruction and the use of others in the process, Lane "utilizes my assistant principals to help me evaluate our teachers." She "divides that responsibility according to how many teachers there are in the building." She believed that it is important to "rotate the names of those teachers every year so that a teacher and an administrator cannot have the same person year in and year out."

Lane allowed her assistant principals the latitude and trust in their competence to evaluate instruction, but when weaknesses are detected, she wants "to be informed." Lane expects that, "They come to me when they do see some discrepancies that need to be addressed." Lane further made it clear that when dealing with these individuals that she is the person who should handle these observations. She supported this by saying, "They're not in the role to deal with those discrepancies except on their report." Lane pointed out, "I take further steps with these problems."

Within the process of supervision, Lane stated, "We look at what areas may be weak, and we conference with that teacher." During the conference, "I allow that teacher to establish some ground rules, some more specific goals." Dr. Lane also included "tasks

that they need to accomplish" and provided "a mentor or facilitator to help them reach that point." Other specific requirements she listed were "recommending them going to a conference, recommending reading a certain book, and you might direct them to a web site." Lane believed that evaluation of these tasks is critical and that "monitoring" takes place "as time goes on."

Dr. Lane claimed when working with this process it "becomes very cumbersome." In certain circumstances, she related, "Sometimes that kind of stalls you in doing what's best for kids because you really need to get that person out of the classroom." Lane concluded that the process also interferes in the fact that it gives teachers "a line that they can hang on to and maybe a false sense of hope that this is all going to work out, when in reality, it's not." Lane summed up the whole process "some teachers feel it is too long and too many things have happened and too many kids have been impacted."

In describing her best supervisory experience, Lane related, "I thoroughly enjoy walking into a classroom when there's that interaction between a student and a teacher and you can see those light bulbs going off." She added, "It's not just regurgitation of facts and knowledge. It's more of a critical thinking, problem solving, and looking at scenarios." By observing these situations, Lane believed her "expectations" are being met.

The worst supervisory experience for Lane involved "a person who believed she was a good teacher and bottom line, she was not." Lane had a conference with this teacher "to establish some ground rules." She provided a "mentor" to help the teacher to

improve instructional delivery. In the end, Lane explained to the teacher "this is not a good situation, and you need to move forward."

Dr. Lane described herself as "a democratic leader, a fair person." She went on to state, "I'm not of a dictatorial nature." Lane admitted that in most situations "I am a situational leader." Lane used her experiences to draw from when making decisions and added, "I deal with situations as I see fit." In making supervisory decisions, she has learned "not to hold one person accountable for another person's behavior."

Lane believed that to establish and to maintain a climate conducive for supervision, one must be "honest and forthright." Teachers must know what an administrator expects and if the administrator is true to his or her word. She said, "When I say something, they know I mean it and it's not skewed or they're not misinformed. I am straightforward."

To have an effective supervisory climate, Lane believed that an administrator must "have expectations." She provided an example of her expectations by stating, "I would like to see us achieve or continue to achieve, never to bring the curriculum down but to raise the students up." Lane believed that along with these expectations, "one must offer what you need to offer to them, whether it be a directive, advice, or recommendations or suggestions."

Lane said, "I am very visible." Her goal in being so visible is, "I hope my teachers know that what they do is important to me, that I care about them as individuals." Taking care of basic needs, was viewed by Lane as necessary for a positive climate. She said, "I'm compassionate when they have issues arise privately, whether it be family, children,

or those kinds of things. That I understand." Lane's understanding of being a teacher was revealed when she stated, "Sometimes they have a hard day."

Regarding trust, Dr. Lane stated, "I don't know if it is a trust issue as much as it is a dependency issue." She defined dependency as being "when they bring things to me that they want attended to or voiced, I will do that. I will follow through." Many times she explained, "I may not come back with an answer that is satisfactory to them, but they know that I'll go to bat for them." Lane believed that teachers must "know I put the faith in them and I believe they think I trust them and I do."

Another area related to trust is that teachers want "someone they can come to, bounce ideas off of, be respected, someone they know will listen sincerely." She further added, "not just give them the time, but to listen to them." Lane summarized, "you need to be honest. They know that they can depend on you. Depend on you in the way you act, in what you say."

Lane believes in supporting her teachers, and she said, "I think teachers have a lot of pride in not only what they do as individuals, but in what we do as a school." She believed that a main function of supervision "is what you instill in them." She stated the process must start with "praise, I praise them a lot as a group and as individuals."

To support team building at her school, Dr. Lane takes the entire school on "a school improvement retreat each year." She stated, "We go to a nice place, and the agenda for the retreat is to work real hard and intense and to work on school goals." Her belief was that each employee "can voice their concerns and their feelings without censorship." Thumping her hands on her desk, Dr. Lane excitedly added, "We come up with some good things!"

Lane admitted that there are several constraints to providing quality supervision for her teachers and staff at Harrison High School, and she spoke of the intents of supervision and the work that she and the administrative team try to achieve through the use of instructional supervision. Lane asserted, "Our intent is to be good supervisors when there are times when we may not feel that way because we are so distracted by other events and other situations." She believed that it is the administrator's responsibility to provide support for the work that teachers do in the classroom, but she admitted, "This would not be difficult if it weren't for other requests, responsibilities, and requirements that are placed upon us." Lane concluded in frustration, "Those things interfere" with supervision.

What gets in the way of Dr. Lane supervising her teachers? Lane listed things such as "paperwork, too many fingers in the pie, not enough emphasis and focus on certain things, and meeting with parents who don't make appointments." Lane went on to include "having to be there on a moment's notice when they walk in and need requests answered and paperwork outside the evaluation process." She added, "I do not know if the Board is aware of all that. I'm not sure they are."

Dr. Lane pointed out that she has "been doing this for ten years." She felt strongly that paperwork "has escalated and increased over time." She personalized the issue of paperwork by stating, "If I had it my way, I would love not to have to attend to some of the paperwork that comes across this desk."

Lane provided, "A prime example, and this is not to point a finger at anybody, is accountability." She stated:

Our accounting procedures have definitely become more finite." In other words, "I's need to be dotted, T's need to be crossed. In the past, the financial staff at the Central Office corrected minor mistakes in county purchase orders.

Lane gave her explanation of the root of the problem and indicated, "A lot of the stuff that comes down can be attributed to state regulations, to county system regulations." Lane jokingly summarized the current situation with, "We want to be sure we're covering ourselves, so therefore we're signing more things and generating more paperwork to do."

"My focus is being in the classroom, being in the building." This statement is indicative of Lane's belief that as principal, she is the supervisor; however, Lane pointed out, "I utilize my assistant principals to help me evaluate our teachers." Lane noted, "We rotate the names of those teachers every year." This revealed that Lane does not perform a formal evaluation on each teacher every year.

At the high school level, Dr. Lane believed that principals must "depend on our teachers to do their jobs in the classrooms." She stated, "Teachers are subject oriented, content oriented," and Lane admitted, "With that comes more autonomy." Lane attributed this to the make up of the high school and supported this by saying, "The high school is a more autonomous situation."

In her comparison of high schools to elementary and middle schools, Lane offered that at the "elementary level, teachers teach all the subjects and [at the] middle school, you're in a team mentality." Teachers at the high school level deal directly with "knowledge of the subject matter." One advantage Lane mentioned that elementary and middle schools have over high schools was, "They have in place specific criteria to measure them at each level." Lane asserted, "Until we implement the end of the course tests where we can specifically pin-point who the teacher was who taught that class" the

lower grades have the advantage. Lane noted certain problems that will still exist even with these tests in place, "Who taught them in the previous class, who taught them the pre-requisites, who taught them first semester versus second semester." Lane was very concerned, "There's a lot of issues that are very vague and cloudy right now" with end of course testing.

Lane felt adequate when observing teachers at the high school level. She stated, "I always feel comfortable observing." She admitted there are times when she enters a classroom that she is not familiar with "knowledge of the subject matter." She acknowledged that a, "high-level math course" is one such course that she has little knowledge of the content; however, Lane was confidant that her teachers believe in her ability to supervise them even if she is "unfamiliar with the content." She stated, "They feel pretty comfortable. We're all looking for the same best practices."

Within these best practices in mind, Lane supervises by looking at "qualities that make an effective lesson." She maintained, "You can separate that from content." One of the main qualities she looked for was "the pedagogy that they're utilizing." Lane was quick to point out that to stay abreast of the "qualities" she relied on her experiences of "being a principal, research, reading all the journals that come my way, and going to workshops."

Lane re-emphasized that when she does not know or understand the content of the classroom, "I look for the teaching techniques, the opportunity for student interaction, and questioning." She stated, "I look for those types of things that make a teacher a good teacher, and:

> When I have trouble with content, I pretty much will mention it to the teacher later and sometimes they'll explain it to me, but really it's a moot point when you think about it, you're in there to look at teaching methods.

Mark Ostro

Relative to the three other participants in this study, Mark Ostro has the least number of years of educational experience, a total of 15 years, and he also has the least number of years of administrative experience, 5 years. Mr. Ostro is in his first year as principal of Jefferson High School with 140 employees who he is responsible to supervise. He served 5 years as an assistant principal and taught science for 10 years.

Sixteen themes emerged during the interviews with Mr. Ostro. Nine themes addressed his definition of instructional supervision, seven themes addressed the process, four themes addressed climate, three themes addressed what gets in the way of him supervising teachers, and three themes addressed the structure of the high school that has influence on his supervisory practices. Figure 4.4 portray the themes that emerged from each overall research question during the interviews with Mark Ostro.

| Research Question | Themes |
|---|---|
| According to principals, what is supervision? | Role Entanglement, Communication Process, Definition of Instructional Supervision, Management Style, Perceived Teacher Perceptions, Constraints, Priorities, Change in Instructional Supervision, Control, Action Taken, Expert |
| How do principals describe the supervisory process? | Role Entanglement, Perceived Teacher Perception, Communication Process, Effective Teaching, Action Taken, Definition of Instructional Supervision, Management Style |
| What type of climate enhances supervision? | Definition of Instructional Supervision, Management Style, Perceived Teacher Perception, Trust |

| What gets in the way of principals trying to supervise teachers? | Priorities, Constraints, Definition of Instructional Supervision |
| How does the structure of the high school relate to supervision? | Definition of Instructional Supervision, Content Area, Role Entanglement |

*Figure 4.4* Themes: Mark Ostro

During the first interview, Mr. Ostro was quick to point out that he has only been at his job as principal "a few months." He described supervision as being very "visible and moving to evaluation." According to Ostro, the evaluations at his school consist of the "GTOI evaluation or the walk-through evaluations" that his county had just adopted.

"I evaluate them along with the other three assistant principals," Ostro admitted. The instructional coordinator is also involved "on an unofficial basis, just to help teachers." Ostro stated that teachers "were told up front that the instructional coordinator would come down to the classroom to help." Ostro believed by explaining to teachers that the instructional coordinator was there to assist with classroom instruction, he has created an environment in which teachers are "relaxed when she comes in."

According to Ostro, "Instructional supervision is basically walking around the building, in and out of classrooms, not only observing the teacher, but also observing how the students behave in the classroom." To further this definition, Ostro said, "I have four assistant principals. Three of them assist me…they're out visible so we can have the proper supervision." At Jefferson High School, Ostro saw a need for "some staff to help with supervision during heavy traffic times such as break and lunch." This statement was offered as a response to a question regarding anything new happening with supervision since the last time Ostro was interviewed by the researcher. Ostro provided an example of

a teacher criticizing his supervision by stating, "Teachers…wish you were more visible or out more."

Ostro defined instructional supervision as evaluation. He stated, "I evaluate them." He further stated, "I feel they see the GTOI as my evaluation of their job." Ostro emphatically related, "We're hired to teach. We have to teach them all…that's our job." He went on to add that under the supervision umbrella "I put a little pressure on them. It's a pressure job and a lot of them don't like that."

Evaluations take the form of a formal evaluation consisting of a small period of time or of a walk-through evaluation, which takes "two or three minutes." Ostro related his idea of teacher beliefs regarding the walk-through by stating, "They know when I walk in there I expect to see instruction going on and I can gauge when I walk in the door what kind of instruction is going on."

In addition to the two types of evaluation, Ostro described other types of indicators he uses in supervision. He stated, "I check failure rates." Ostro strongly affirmed, "We're hired to teach. We have to teach all of them. No matter what kind of child they put in front of us, we have to teach that child." He believed, "Some of them don't like it a whole lot because when a child fails they don't want to say they didn't get the job done." Ostro related, "To me when a child fails, then we as teachers didn't get the job done."

Two components defining instructional supervision are high expectations and feedback to teachers. Ostro stated, "Teachers understand that I have high expectations of them and that they have to carry on their lesson to meet the material." The feedback component is a result of meeting or failing to meet these expectations Ostro places on the

teachers. He said, "When I'm in and of the classroom, a lot of times, they'll come by and ask me what I thought or how did I like it or something." He concluded from this, "I think they look for feedback especially when I'm in and out of their classrooms."

High expectations placed on teachers is "essential" for Ostro, and he asserted that, "If they don't do it right, they want to give me a reason why they couldn't do it right." Teachers are sometimes on the defense when it comes to evaluation, and Ostro claimed, "They're that way when you walk in the classroom." Teachers have said in the past 'Mr. Ostro, today is not a good day,' and I say, 'life's tough, I'm here today.'" He stated, "A lot of times they stay mad at you a while." Ostro's response to teachers' anger was, "I *smile* and say, '*hey*' to them because you know none of this is personal. They're my staff, and I want them to become the best teacher…it's nothing personal with me."

Ostro described the supervisory process as "helping a teacher by sitting down with them to discuss how you can improve things." Ostro contended that this is done after both "informal evaluations and formal evaluations." After some evaluations, Ostro did not feel the need to speak with an individual teacher; however, he stated:

> When they come to me, I make sure to make time to talk to them even if I don't really need to, even if they have a really good lesson. A lot of times, they just want to hear they had a good lesson.

While in the classroom observing, Ostro reflected, "I don't make a whole lot of comments to them while I'm in the classroom, but afterwards, one-on-one in private, I do talk to them." During the post-observation conference, Ostro indicated that he offered strategies and suggestions when meeting with the teacher. He related:

Why don't you try this method or that method…that was a good lesson you had and a good way to introduce it or teach it, but why don't you reteach it in a different direction and try to get the students you missed.

While relating an example of a good supervisory experience, Ostro basically described a lesson that would receive a satisfactory score on the GTOI evaluation. He stated:

She had a big bag of Reese's Cups and a certain amount of Tootsie Rolls…it was a special education math class. She related that to going in the store and buying some things-you know, you get three of these and five of that.

Following this lesson, Ostro claimed, "We sat down and went over everything and I pointed out what I liked, and the things I thought she could improve on." Ostro contended, "We grow and grow."

Ostro believed that when working with some individuals "it never clicked with them." He described a supervisory experience in which "he sat down and went over with this individual what they did wrong and talked to them about how, maybe, they could improve." In the course of the conversation, he pointed out, "They never did see that they weren't supervising the students." Ostro became quite frustrated in that "they would give you a reason why they couldn't do it and provided an excuse almost every time you said something."

Ostro and three of the four assistant principals conduct the process of supervision at Jefferson High. This group of individuals is responsible for the "GTOI evaluations or the walk-through evaluations." The instructional coordinator working with Ostro shares the responsibility of supervision. Ostro stated, "I rely heavily on my instructional coordinator." The instructional coordinator, according to Ostro, "is in there and helps

them to achieve they goals they may have." Ostro described this environment as "an administrative team."

Ostro also consults with Central Office personnel if he or the instructional coordinator, "need any detailed information or further help with the content of the subject area." He provided an example of calling in the math coordinator for the county. He elaborated, "In math, I'll call her and ask her about a topic or subject where I've taken notes in that classroom and let her kind of clarify for me what's going on."

One of the consequences regarding a poor performance in instruction required a meeting with the administrative team. During the meeting Ostro provided "a letter of correction for that teacher." Further consequences that he used for "not getting the job done in the classroom…is a PDP (professional development plan)." Another area involved is "when we look at test scores and see how we did on some things." Ostro stated, "If we didn't accomplish some things, then we may have to change some stuff."

The climate that fosters instructional supervision at Jefferson High School is one of "guidelines and expectations." Mr. Ostro stated, "I make sure they know the guidelines before they get started." He is quite frank and stated, "This is what I expect of you and this is what's got to be done." Ostro strove to make clear his expectations in regard to instruction. Ostro demanded that employees must be "open and up front from the very start. I have a hard time with people that can't look me in the eye and tell me the truth."

For Ostro, expectations were related to the "little pressure" on teachers he could apply. Ostro communicated to the staff "that I have very high expectations and I won't settle for anything other than that." From this he believed that many teachers "want to be left alone in their own little world and not be bothered." Related to his idea of teachers'

beliefs on instructional supervision, "many times they say, 'well, it's the student's responsibility'. My answer to them is, 'No matter what kind of child they put in front of us, we have to teach that child'." He believed when individuals "can't meet expectations that creates problems with trust."

Ostro pointed out, "I'm not an expert in all of the areas. I have to trust them." He allowed himself to step back and reflect and allow the teacher to "do what they feel is necessary." He stated, "Many times it means that I must sit back and watch for a little while and see what the results will be." As an example, Ostro described a supervisory situation in a chemistry class. The teacher's child was sick, and she was out on a Friday. She had fallen behind in completing a lab experiment. When Ostro entered her classroom on Monday, she explained the situation, and he believed "it is not an ideal situation, but she has got to get it finished." Ostro relied on logic and common sense in this case. This example illustrates Ostro's claim, "I am truly there to try to help you and not to try to get you."

Another component surrounding the climate is the recognition of employees. Ostro saw himself as a "personal kind of person." He believed that you must "recognize them for good things as well as bad things" and he goes on to say, "That's important." Ostro not only recognizes his employees "in writing, but I'm more of a recognizing them publicly." "Gifts and rewards" provided from the larger community recognize individuals, and he believed, "I'm more of that kind of person than I am just sending a little note."

As a first year principal, Mr. Ostro found many activities and duties that prevented him from supervising instruction as much as he would have liked. He stated,

"It stays real busy with the daily tasks we have to take on within this position." He

described his philosophy regarding these tasks like this:

> I want to go ahead and take care of issues that sometimes gets me out of kilter…if
> I'm headed to a classroom or going to see someone and I get a phone call and it is
> a situation that I need to go ahead and handle I handle the situation.

Relating daily tasks, Ostro listed "a lot of discipline, handling of parents,

scheduling issues, county meetings, and a lot of other things." To summarize, he put

these activities in the category of "time." He revealed, "My time is definitely an issue

because of a lot of other things." Ostro confessed, "Many times you put it off til…hey,

I've got to be in the classroom, I've got to be out and not just making phone calls,

planning, and that kind of stuff."

Ostro placed a high emphasis on the importance of parent conferences. He said,

"Some colleagues will not see a parent without them having a scheduled appointment."

He was quick to point out, "I'm not that way. If they come in, I see them." Ostro made a

commitment to himself to see parents no matter what to diffuse situations and to assist

students. He said, "I never want to tell a parent, 'You'll have to come back and come

another time'." His beliefs toward seeing parents stemmed from his philosophy on

instructional supervision, "Sometimes it may be a situation where the student is not in the

classroom and we need to solve that and get them back in the environment of instruction

as soon as possible." If a parent who comes in to Jefferson High is "upset," Ostro

claimed, "I need to go ahead and handle that situation so that the instruction for the

student is not interrupted."

The number of meetings Ostro had to attend was a bit overwhelming to him. He

listed, "principal meetings, new principal meetings, department chair meetings, own staff

meetings, and athletic events" as "time stealers." He expressed frustration in that many of his teachers said, "You're always gone." In response to the complaint, Ostro stated, "Being a first year principal, I feel like I have to be at all of the meetings." Ostro followed this by saying, "I guess I could send an assistant principal, but I feel like that I need to be there because I am a first year principal." By being a first year principal, "there are many facets of the job that must be learned while on the job."

Mr. Ostro "feels that it is important to build a rapport with my students." He spends time with his students "at break and lunch." He stated, "I have a lot of students that come to me. If they want to come talk to me as the principal, I feel that's important." He allowed students to come and talk with him "at lunch time…at your next break…or when you get out of your next class."

At the high school level, Ostro stated, "When the bell rings, classes start." Jefferson High School is an open campus "so students can go just about anywhere they want to." He believed that at the high school more time must be spent supervising students when they are not in their classes. Mr. Ostro has hired additional support personnel to help during heavy traffic hours and he stated, "My staff has to be on their duty posts and it makes my job easier to make sure they're out visible so we can have the proper supervision."

Another component of the structure of the high school is the number of content areas that are involved. Ostro stated, "I find it real difficult. I don't know everything. I'm not the expert on every subject. That's kind of tough sometimes." He believed that teachers must "really know" their students. He stressed the importance of this by stating,

"We try to prepare our students for post-secondary to make sure they are up to date in their field."

Ostro described a situation in which he did not feel comfortable observing a teacher's class. "I observed a French class where from the time I walked in there until the time I left, no English was spoken at all." He asked the question, "How am I to tell what's going on." He further indicated that he also has difficulty in the "Spanish II or III classes." In this example, he was "trying to look and make sure students are on task." He also used strategies of "I get a book and try to follow along in the book to see where they're at." He admitted, "Some of those are kind of tough." Calling in the Central Office staff to assist in subject areas has also been done in regard to "math or science."

Mr. Ostro indicated that an advantage in the high school is that you have "an administrative team." Within the supervisory cadre, "We have areas that are stronger than others so we can learn on each other." He added, "Support is the same" which indicated that each member of the team helped the others.

Ken Lewis

Ken Lewis has been the principal of Harrison High School for 5 years. He served as an assistant principal for 4 years and taught science for 12 years. Mr. Lewis has taught longer than any of the four principals interviewed. He has been in this school district for seven years. Mr. Lewis is responsible for the largest number of employees of any of the participating principals with 165.

During the interviews with Mr. Lewis, 13 themes came to light. There were several themes that pertained to more than one research question. Eight themes addressed the definition of instructional supervision, nine themes addressed the supervisory process,

two themes addressed the climate, three themes addressed what gets in the way of supervision, and five themes addressed the structure of the high school. Figure 4.5 portrays the themes that emerged from each overall research question during the interviews with Ken Lewis.

| Research Question | Themes |
|---|---|
| According to principals, what is supervision? | Definition of Instructional Supervision, Management Style, Priorities, Change in Instructional Supervision, Constraints, Effective Teaching, Role Entanglements, Action Taken |
| How do principals describe the supervisory process? | Role Entanglements, Definition of Instructional Supervision, Action Taken, Effective Teaching, Perceived Teacher Perception, Expert, Change in Instructional Supervision, Management Style, Communication Process |
| What type of climate enhances supervision? | Management Style, Trust |
| What gets in the way of principals trying to supervise teachers? | Priorities, Definition of Instructional Supervision, Constraints |
| How does the structure of the high school relate to supervision? | Content Area, Definition of Instructional Supervision, Perceived Teacher Perception, Action Taken, Role Entanglements |

*Figure 4.5*  Themes: Ken Lewis

Ken Lewis asserted, "To be real honest with you, instruction is the reason that we're here." He believed, "Instruction is my number one priority for this school." As an example of the strength of his conviction, Lewis offered, "If something has to be neglected, it would be one of the other areas. It certainly wouldn't be instruction."

Mr. Lewis described an ideal world as one in which "you could truly separate supervision and evaluation." His ideal world would "have someone who could do nothing but just try to strictly, individually improve instruction in every classroom." He strongly stated, "The person who is doing supervision, in my opinion, should not be involved in

the evaluation process." Lewis passionately communicated, "In a school this size with

117 teachers, unfortunately, supervision and evaluation overlap some. That is not a good

idea."

Lewis described supervision as "one formal observation a year and walk-through

observations" and "data based decisions." He further iterated, "We use a lot of different

strategies to evaluate teachers, to look at what's going on in the classroom." Lewis and

three assistant principals do all of the "regular teacher observations." Assistant principals

are required by Lewis to do "five walk-throughs a day." Walk-through evaluations were

described as "Great. Wonderful. A great way to collect data." He emphasized that walk-

throughs should not be used "for evaluation, but a way to collect data that could be used

in evaluations."

For Mr. Lewis, instructional supervision begins during the process of interviewing

prospective teachers for his school. Lewis stated:

> I really feel like the number one ingredient that a teacher has and when I listen in
> an interview, I have to hear teachers say, 'I love kids'. I think if they have that,
> then you can work with all of the instructional strategies.

Mr. Lewis reiterated, "I don't hire anyone unless I hear them say, 'I love kids'."

Another component of the definition of instructional supervision involves parent

concerns. Lewis stated, "A parent concern equates to an instructional problem." He has

supported the instructional program by "meeting with parents over instructional issues."

Lewis claimed, "I am supporting the teacher." In retrospect, Lewis added, "I want to

know if there's something in the classroom that's not beneficial to the students."

Supervising instruction has become "much more data based" according to Lewis.

He contended, "We must do a better job of planning within the individual academic

areas." The example Lewis offered involved the teaching of Algebra I. He stated, "They spend a great deal of time preparing and looking at the objectives and testing similarly and getting to the same point." Lewis submitted, "End of course tests is going to be real important in the evaluation of teachers."

According to Mr. Lewis, the supervisory process is essentially the procedure used for evaluations, remediation for teachers performing poorly, and data accumulation. As for the importance of the supervisory process, Lewis stated, "Instruction is my number one priority for the school." Harrison High School has "four assistant principals" and of the four, "three…handle discipline and evaluations." As for first year teachers, Lewis explained his plan for evaluating the faculty with, "I do all the new teachers at least once."

The assistant principal for instruction/IC also plays a role in the supervisory process. Lewis contended, "I could not survive without a strong person to do instruction," referring to his instructional coordinator. Dealing with instructional problems is the main focus of the instructional coordinator. Lewis explained, "I spend a great deal more time working with the instructional person than I do working with the individuals that handle mainly discipline." The main responsibility of the IC is to "improve instruction," but Lewis stated specifically, "I try not to use her as an evaluator." While her main duty is to improve instruction, her other duties include "working on schedules, working on personnel issues, working on doing things to offer certain classes or to help kids meet the needs that they have." When instructional problems with a teacher are noticed, the IC meets with Lewis and he "immediately sits down with her and we write professional

development plans or any type of improvement plans that we might need to help a teacher."

Lewis described the process as "evaluating what's taught in the classroom by evaluating the data that we have." Deficiencies are identified and "within each discipline we try to implement strategies that specifically address the deficiencies to try to improve test scores." Lewis added, "discipline referrals and teacher attendance" have "a big impact on what happens in the classroom." Since the introduction of walk-through evaluations, these "mini observations" allow for "trying to put together a lot of data as opposed to one long show-type evaluation."

During the evaluation process, Lewis claimed, "I'm not trying to get anybody." He mentioned situations in the past when he has "gone in and the teacher had a bad lesson." Lewis contended, "I always give them another opportunity to do the lesson, I want to have the best teachers I possibly can." He further explained, "It's certainly possible for anyone to have a bad day on any given day." Lewis saw the process as on going and supported this by stating, "I try to give them lots of opportunities to show through the course of the year that they're doing the things that they need to do."

Another component of the supervisory process was for "teachers to establish goals for themselves" at the beginning of the school year. Lewis added, "The goals of the teacher must be linked directly to school goals." At the end of the school year, Lewis required, "they have to turn in a form giving examples of how they reached those goals and what they thought about those goals." This component allowed teachers to have input into the supervisory process.

Help for teachers who are found to be deficient in instruction is provided by the use of other teachers. "We use buddies and we use mentors" as support personnel to assist struggling teachers. Lewis emphasized, "None of those people do evaluations, so they are used strictly to improve instruction."

Lewis described one particular situation in which the teacher experienced success after receiving help with instruction. He claimed, "She was the worst teacher I ever saw. I thought there was no way this person would make it." Lewis and the IC met with this teacher and formulated a plan. He described her willingness to improve in that she "sucked up everything that she could get." Other teachers "on the faculty" also provided assistance to this teacher. Lewis concluded that after two years of hard work, "She is one of the best teachers I had."

In another experience with a teacher, Lewis believed that a teacher "didn't like kids." He claimed that the teacher "had a reason why they couldn't do this…why they couldn't do that." He intervened with this teacher and showed her "example after example of other people that were using that strategy." He stated that this person "did not want to be successful." His theory was, "Until they want to be helped, you cannot help them."

Lewis believed that the climate plays an integral part in the success of a school. He stated, "I've always felt like a happy teacher does a better job." The degree to which Lewis demonstrated his philosophy is supported by his statement, "I do as much as I possibly can to make our teachers happy." Lewis saw his role as "a person that can help the teacher achieve the goals that they have."

At Harrison High, teachers are encouraged to implement " new ideas" and are allowed "freedom to make their own decisions." Lewis stated, "I try to encourage them by trying new ideas and trying to implement new ideas." He gave as a specific example,

> Right now I've got one teacher that is trying a new interactive board that has just come out where she tests students in the class…we're just piloting it in one class and if that works, then we'll look at going to another area.

Lewis' philosophy on trying new ideas was "I want someone that's going to tell me I need a building for this purpose over here and go for it. That's my type of style."

Teachers at Harrison High are allowed "the freedom to make up the schedule within their departments." Teachers also play an active role "when it comes to the instructional budget." Lewis believed the budget must be built "from the individual people." He granted each department a certain amount of money, and individual teachers "spend it totally on their own and directly into the classroom."

With freedom comes a certain amount of trust. Lewis contended, "I think you have to show the teachers that you care about what you do and I think you have to show the teachers you care about the school." He further stated, "When they become involved in the process of making decisions in the school and they realize that they're part of the team" trust occurs naturally. To help build trust, the staff of Harrison High, take "retreats at the end of the year." During the retreat, "teachers get involved in everything from budgeting to scheduling and everything that we do."

Lewis also believed that his actions help to set the climate of the school. He stated, "I try to lead by example. I would never ask a faculty member to do something that I was not willing to do myself." By establishing "an atmosphere of success" and by

setting "expectations for myself and for the school that are high," Lewis builds morale and support.

When addressing what gets in the way of supervising instruction, Mr. Lewis replied, "In a school this size with 117 teachers and 40 non-certified staff, it's tough to make all 165 people happy." Mr. Lewis admitted, "The faculty is so large, I have a difficult time remembering all of their names—let alone forming relationships." Even though the three assistant principals help with the formal evaluation process, Lewis still feels overwhelmed by the number of certified employees.

Mr. Lewis provided a list of daily activities that he felt got in the way of supervising instruction. He was emphatic that the largest problem he encountered was "just the daily management tasks that go with the job." Within the daily grind, Lewis listed "dealing with parents, dealing with problems, putting out fires, going to meetings, phone calls, and kids." Lewis noted that the daily problems he listed were not unique to his school, but "it's very easy for a problem to come up and you spend all day dealing with that problem and then it's hard to get out."

Among the daily responsibilities Lewis has, are some activities he chooses to give top priority. Lewis stated, "I have certain times that I spend with the students." Within the course of a busy day, Lewis valued this time over other responsibilities. He said, "I choose to go to the lunchroom every day for an hour and a half and spend my time in the lunchroom and that's how I get to talk to the students." Lewis places time spent with students in the same arena as time spent with teachers. He explained, "The same thing is true with teachers. In order for me to see the teachers, I just have to absolutely say, I'm going to do 5 walk-throughs today just to get out in the building." To accomplish this

task, Lewis has to "put things aside and the secretary has to schedule appointments and do those kind of things."

Lewis believed the pressure to perform the daily duties is not of his own making. He pointedly stated, "I think that pressure comes from somewhere else. I think it goes with the job." These statements confirm the idea that the constraints come from a source higher than the school level. According to Lewis, "Our job is to put out as many fires as we possibly can and to run this school." With the pressure he feels he believed, "There are a lot more management tasks than there are leadership tasks." Fieldnotes indicate that Lewis spoke passionately regarding his wish to do other things, and he stated, "There are a lot of things that I'd love to be able to do and a lot of programs I'd love to be able to start and finish and be able to do all the evaluations." When pressed about things that prevent supervision, Lewis answered, "The management tasks just keep you from doing those things."

Harrison High School has many people involved in the evaluation process. While Mr. Lewis performs evaluations on all of the new teachers, the "three assistant principals perform evaluations" on the new and other teachers. Lewis said the instructional coordinator is "a person to improve instruction" however, "I do not use her as an evaluator." Department heads assist in informal evaluations and "they keep in contact with their individual people." With a large number of people involved in the supervisory process, Lewis still contended, "Unfortunately, the principal handles evaluations." He stated, "I'll be honest with you, it's very difficult because people see me coming and its part of their evaluation every time."

Mr. Lewis expressed his use of the structure of a high school faculty in the instructional supervision process. He stated, "The department head would be the first level and then we would go through the instructional coordinator and then would go to me." Within Harrison High School, the principal, the assistant principals, instructional coordinator, and department heads all play a role in supervision. Lewis said, "If you polled the teachers they would tell you that instruction is the number one priority of this school."

Department chairs "play a very important role" in the supervisory process. Department heads report back to Lewis if they are having problems within their departments. Lewis stated, "I trust my department heads. If there is a specific concern in math, then I can count on my math department head to come to me with the facts and we make decisions together." Lewis reiterated the importance of these department heads by saying, "I depend on them very heavily." Department heads at Harrison High not only deal with instruction, but also "make up the schedule within their department, build the budget, and make proposals to me regarding their department."

Lewis contended, "The content is more specific in the high school." This statement was made in comparing a high school to a middle or elementary school. Within the make up of the personnel at Harrison High School, "Every person is a content specific person." Lewis claimed, "I hire people to do specific jobs and I expect them to do that."

When entering a classroom in which he is not familiar with the content, Lewis said, "There are not times when I feel uncomfortable…I think you're looking for the same types of behaviors." He provided an example of a French classroom in which the teacher "speaks French during the entire lesson and I don't have a clue what she said."

Following this example, he said, "It's hard for me to determine what's going on." "Presenting the materials" and observing "facial expressions and how the teacher responded to the students" was the criteria Lewis used when evaluating a content area he knows little about.

The struggle of evaluating content specific teachers as suggested by Lewis is "more of a problem with the teacher than with the administrator." Lewis believed, "The teacher feels like the person should be qualified in their area to make a judgment on what they're doing." There exists in this situation role entanglements or lack of understanding of what is expected from evaluation. Lewis explained, "Sometimes the teachers don't understand that you're not spending a whole lot of time specifically evaluating the content." He believed in these situations "you should be evaluating the practices that the teacher is using to present the material." Lewis calls for an evaluation conference "to sit down with the teacher and have them explain the lesson…and how that relates to the objectives."

<center>Common Themes</center>

Thus far, data from each of the four participants have been presented as individual cases. From these individual perspectives of the issues the four principals encountered in instructional supervision, the researcher examined the data across cases to find the common themes to further delimit the participant's perspectives. Overall, examination of data yielded four major areas in which the findings will be framed and then analyzed. The major areas in which themes emerged included 1) the participants' definitions of supervision, 2) the supervising process, 3) the climate that enhances supervision, and 4) what gets in the way of high school principals supervising teachers.

Defining Supervision

Each of the four participants provided a definition of instructional supervision. While their definitions were not all the same, each participant had similar ideas as to what instructional supervision was and looked like in his or her respective school. Embedded in each respondent's definition was evaluation whether it was through the GTOI, walk-through, or other data collection methods. The definitions of supervision were embedded in the context of their schools, and as such, manifestations in the practices of the principals were examined through these definitions. It is through these practices that the attributes of the supervisory definitions bring a more complete understanding to the meanings that these definitions had for the principals who participated in this research.

Bill Ford defined instructional supervision as, "When we supervise people we are looking for the same things when we go in and do evaluations." He further stated,

> I think you have to have a direction that your instructional program is going. I think you have to have a direction that your school is going. And I think everybody has to catch that vision.

Ford expressed the direct link between instructional supervision and evaluation by saying, "We're going through the final process now with instructional supervision. We're getting ready to do our summary evaluations. We have to have those done by April 15." Ford also believed the success of athletics affected instructional supervision, and he indicated:

> I heard a long time ago, you're never defeated until you refuse to get up. So I think you get up and you keep walking towards that goal. And your kids can catch that vision also. One of the biggest things I've found since I've been at Washington High School, because I'm a big believer that the stronger your athletics are, the stronger your academics are going to be because kids will work harder to be a part of it.

Renee Lane defined instructional supervision by stating, "We utilize the GTOI that the county utilizes. This year I have implemented walk-throughs and I'm getting ready, we hope, to implement a teacher component to their evaluation." Lane said, "I'd rather do more leisurely walk-throughs and mixing and mingling with the kids and the teachers than the twenty minute sit-down evaluations." She included the importance of being with students in her definition. Lane stated:

> I get out when I can-to see the students, to talk with them. Every time one little good thing happens, it's a reminder to me why I am here. Why I wanted to be here.

Mark Ostro defined instructional supervision by saying, "Instructional supervision is basically administration walking around the building, in and out of classrooms, not only observing the teachers but also observing how the students behave in the classroom." In response to what type of evaluation did you use, he said, "Yes, we did a GTOI evaluation. We sat down and we went over everything and talked about it." He stated, "I feel teachers see the GTOI as my evaluation of their job." He also said the teachers stated, "I wish you were visible and out more." In addition to the instruments, Ostro stated, "I'm checking failure rates, checking test scores. Those types of things are also indicators of what's going on in the classroom." Ostro stressed, "We're very visible." To support his visibility, he said, "We try to stay real busy and make sure we are around the young people."

Ken Lewis defined instructional supervision by stating how his staff performs teacher evaluations. He said, "We do all the regular teacher observations using the GTOI instrument." He also has added to this "walk-through evaluations, and they are required to do five per day." In describing walk-through evaluations, he said, "Great, wonderful.

A great way to collect data. A way to collect data that can be used in evaluations." Lewis

summed up his definition by asserting:

> In an ideal world where you could truly separate supervision and evaluation, it
> would be wonderful to have someone who could do nothing but just try to strictly,
> individually improve instruction in every classroom. The person who is doing
> supervision, in my opinion, should not be involved in the evaluation process;
> however, supervision and evaluation overlap.

He believed another facet to evaluation was that:

> Decisions have become much more data based. We use a lot of different strategies
> to evaluate teacher, to look at what's going on in the classroom…like the number
> of days that the employee missed and all of that.

Attributes of Supervisory Definitions

Change

Three of the four respondents asserted that instructional supervision has changed

since they became administrators, and that the changes in supervision were "due to more

accountability" for teachers. Bill Ford noted that some of the changes he had experienced

were "drastic" in that the evaluation of teachers had gone from "nonexistent to very

formal evaluation," and Ford described the change like this:

> When I started, believe it or not, principals were not actually, at least in the
> system I was in nor I did not know another where they were doing evaluations.
> Teachers were not evaluated by administrators. I'm sure they did some sort of
> informal evaluations, but there were no formal evaluations that were done. I know
> we started our first formal evaluations around 1979 and that's when we began to
> do formal evaluations with teachers. It evolved from there to the new *A+ Reform
> Act* with what the governor has us doing is now even more and more technical of
> what you're looking for and what you should be doing in the classroom. So, it's
> grown from a primitive evaluation in the late 70s to a very sophisticated
> evaluation process in 2002.

Renee Lane attributed some of the changes in supervision to the type of people

who were going into teaching as opposed to the type when she first became an

administrator:

I think the reason I would say it has changed is that there is a different type of person going into teaching than, say, sixteen years ago or ten years ago when I became principal. I think society has changed in ten years. So therefore, I find myself having to have more of a hands-on kind of approach. I pretty much try to allow teachers to teach, but I feel now that there is a different kind of person going into the field and therefore, I've got to monitor it more than I used to have.

With respect to accountability, she indicated:

I think the accountability issue has forced us to go in that direction. I don't say that in a negative sense. I think that accountability if definitely something we need to hold teachers accountable for. I feel the role of the principal, especially as an instructional leader, and the fact that our goals are to improve student achievement, we now have that accountability on our shoulders, therefore, and it puts us in that type of position, to be in a more monitoring mode.

Ken Lewis believed that the changes in supervision and evaluation have been for the better due to the variety of data now used in framing instructional supervision in that:

Decisions have become much more data based. We use a lot of different strategies to evaluate teachers…we do a better job of evaluating what's taught in the classroom by evaluating the test scores that we have. We look at the deficiencies that we have within each discipline and we try to implement strategies that specifically address those deficiencies to try to improve test scores. We look at teacher attendance…discipline referrals…many evaluations…as opposed to one long show-type evaluation.

Teacher Perceptions

Three of the four participants offered what they believed was the perceptions of how their teachers viewed instructional supervision. None of the three believed teachers viewed supervision as a positive process, and the perceptions ranged from fear and anxiety to a need for principal approval. Bill Ford believed that teachers do not see supervision as a process that helps them to do a better job. Ford asserted throughout his interviews that his teachers equaled supervision and evaluation with power and that:

A lot of times, a teacher thinks that you're trying to be too controlling. You're trying to control the situation too much rather than understanding that they are really getting out in left field or off the page or not doing the things that need to be done in the classroom.

Ford also compared teachers to children in how they wish to be treated, and he believed

that teachers are:

> Sort of, like kids. Kids want to feel safe, know there are parameters, and that they
> can't pass over those. I think sometimes teachers will test you to see if you'll
> bring them back in line or will they keep me where I should be here. I think they
> want that security blanket of knowing an administrator will draw lines if he needs
> to do so.

Renee Lane believed that teachers see supervision as a 20 minute evaluation, and

that they believe supervision is a "shot in the dark." Lane further believed that teachers

have a "simplistic" view of the process of supervision and that teachers believe:

> You walk in, you sit there for 20 minutes or so, and you pretty much observe what
> they are doing in those 20 minutes. I'm not saying that's the right way. Because,
> I'm not sure it is the right way. More has to be included in evaluating teachers.
> Now, I think our teachers feel almost trepidation about it because they're not sure
> what direction the state or even our county is going in.

Mark Ostro thought teachers equated instructional supervision with evaluation.

He stated, "I feel they see the GTOI as my evaluation of their job." He also believed that

teachers looked for feedback after an evaluation. Ostro explained the value of feedback

like this:

> I think they enjoy the feedback on the lesson. When I'm in and out of the
> classroom, a lot of times, even if I'm not in a formal observation, they'll come by
> and ask me what I thought or how did I like it or something. I think they look for
> feedback especially when I'm in and out of their classroom.

Control

Three of the four participants described instructional supervision as being in the

"control" of the administrator. They believed that the evaluation process gave them

authority to force teachers to make corrections and to expect that teachers would comply

with the corrections they suggested. This control was viewed as being a responsibility of the job of being principal.

Mr. Ford saw the GTOI process as integral to his definition of instructional supervision. This tool gave him the leverage to make teachers make corrections and for personnel to respond in the manner he prescribed. Mr. Ford used the state approved process and its instrument of evaluation as a measuring sticks to gauge teacher growth. He asserted:

> Evaluation is kind of a measuring stick to say, 'Hey, be sure that you do this and it is important to do it every day, if not I have to give you and NI for it.' Most people respond to that. I let them know that if they are aware of a particular thing and correct it, it's not something that 's going to be a problem with me in the future as long as you correct it and do what you're supposed to be doing.

Dr. Lane believed that for the school to be effective everyone must do their part and that at some point, a decision had to be made based on what is best for the students. Lane stated, "As a school we're only as strong as the spokes in our wheel. If a spoke is weak and bent, then the rest of the wheel is not as strong as it needs to be." However, Dr. Lane works with teachers who are weak, and she related an example where a teacher needed assistance-and the assistance she could offer was not enough to remediate a teacher's weaknesses:

> Student's needs are not being met. You'll have some situations that will work out, but then you have some individuals who don't ever get to that point. You need to be able to say, 'You know, this is not a good situation and you need to move forward.'

Mr. Ostro believed that instructional supervision was an issue of control, and he had little "tolerance for excuses when teachers do not 'hit the mark;'" he stated, "If they don't do it right, they want to give me a reason why they couldn't do it right." He believed that administrative control placed teachers on the defensive, "They're even that

way when you walk in the classroom a lot of times. They may say, 'Mr. Ostro, today's not a good day.' And I say, 'Life's tough, I'm here today.'" Mr. Ostro "controls" when evaluation observations will occur, and he believes teachers resent his authority to observe them. He asserted:

> A lot of times they stay mad at you a while. I smile and say 'hey' to them because you know none of this is personal. They're my staff and I want them to become the best teacher they possibly can. I want to have the very best school we can possibly have. It is nothing personal with me.

Role Entanglement

Three of the four principals defined instructional supervision through the role they played, and the roles their assistant principals played in the process of supervision. The role of the instructional coordinator in supervising instruction was discussed, and all three principals used the instructional coordinator as an in instructional support.

Renee Lane used her assistant principals in the evaluation of instruction. She stated:

> Basically I utilize my assistant principals to help me evaluate my teachers. I divide that responsibility according to how many teachers there are in the building as far as certified. We rotate the names of those teachers every year so that a teacher and an administrator cannot have the same person year in and year out.

Mark Ostro also used his assistant principals in the evaluation of instruction. He also included the instructional coordinator in the supervisory process. He noted, "I evaluate them along with the other three assistant principals. We do the actual evaluations and the walk-through evaluations." Regarding to the instructional coordinator, he stated,

> Instructional supervision is shared with the instructional coordinator. She is in and out of the classrooms on an unofficial basis, just to help teachers. My instructional coordinator does not evaluate teachers in an official capacity but is in there and helps them achieve goals they may have.

Ken Lewis uses his three assistant principals and the instructional coordinator to handle instruction. He said:

> The three assistant principals who handle mainly discipline and myself do all of the regular teacher observations using the GTOI instrument. I do all new teachers at least once and then most of the veteran teachers only get one formal observation a year. Now, we do the walk-through observations, and they are required to do five walk-through observations a day.

The role of the instructional coordinator is different than that of the assistant principals, and Lewis asserted that the instructional coordinator was the support specialist for the school. Further, Lewis explained:

> I could not survive without a strong person to do instruction. I spend a great deal more time working with the instructional person than I do with the individuals who handle mainly discipline. I try not to use her as an evaluator. I try to use her strictly as a person to improve instruction.

Expertise

Two of the four participants addressed the definition of instructional supervision from the standpoint of the principal as the "expert." Instructional supervision sometimes involves dealing with students and their parents. The principal as the instructional leader must know how to guide teachers in these situations as well as how to evaluate classroom instruction.

Bill Ford believed that the principal must be the expert in certain situations regarding classroom delivery or instruction, and he said:

> In a situation when they're wrong you're going to come in and say you've got to correct this particular situation, it would have been better in dealing with this child and parent if you had handled it differently. Give them ways that you suggest they should have handled it. It might help them in the future to make it easier.

> Mark Ostro described his ability to evaluate instructional supervision in a short period of time:

They know when I walk in there I expect to see instruction going on. And I can gauge when I walk in the door, in that two or three minutes that I'm there, what kind of instruction is going on. The whole process might take thirty or forty minutes, but I catch the first of a period and the end of a period and I know what they're doing.

Accountability

Two of the four respondents used the communication process to define instructional supervision. Both principals related the evaluation procedure to their teachers. Both principals related their expectations to their teachers.

Dr. Lane communicates and has a process of sharing her supervisory responsibilities with her assistant principals. She said:

I divide the responsibility according to how many teachers there are in the building as far as certified, and as far as classified employees, we divide that responsibility. We rotate the names of those teachers every year so that a teacher and an administrator cannot have the same person year in and year out.

Lane makes it clear to her teachers that she holds them responsible for their classroom instruction. She told them, "You will be held accountable."

Mr. Ostro believed that it is important that teachers should know who would be involved in the evaluation process. He claimed that he informed them that he along with the other assistant principals would do the actual GTOI evaluation or the walk-through evaluation. In regard to the role of the instructional coordinator, he stated, "Oh, absolutely, they know and they were told up front that the instructional coordinator would come down to your classroom to help." He followed this statement with an emphatic, "Oh, yes. I told them exactly what we would be doing."

The Supervisory Process

Each of the four principals in this study described the supervisory process from their perspectives and understandings of supervision that they practiced in their buildings. In addition to describing the processes of observing and conferencing with teachers, the participants also detailed what they look for while conducting classroom observations, and how and when they conduct post-observation conferences.

It is interesting to note that each of the four participants first wanted to qualify who was responsible for the supervision of instruction in their buildings. This finding aligns to the context variable that each school shared—each of the principals was responsible for supervising an average of 137 certified and non-certified staff members at their respective sites.

Supervision in the Context of the Four Schools

Board policy and state statute position the principal as the person with final responsibility for both supervising and evaluating teachers. The principals related their strategies for ensuring that teachers were supervised, and which administrator (assistant principal, instructional coordinator) would supervise and evaluate teachers. Bill Ford related:

> So actually there're myself and three other people who oversee the entire instructional program. But I think the important thing is to make sure that myself and the other three people that are overseeing the instructional program whether it be academic or vocational, that we are all on the same page moving the same way. If you can be on the same page, everyone doesn't have to read that page the same way. But they have to have the same goals, same direction, and trying to move the school in that particular direction.

Renee Lane indicated that, "We divide that responsibility. We rotate the names of those teachers every year so that a teacher and administrator cannot have the same person

year in and year out." Similarly, Mark Ostro said, "Oh, yes, I told them exactly what we

would all be doing. I gave them a list on who was evaluating who," and if his assistant

principals believed that a problem existed within a classroom, "they report back to me."

Ostro also reported that if his assistant principals would say something like, "Mr. Ostro,

how about you doing the next one because I saw some things I'm concerned about" he

would take over working with a teacher.

What Principals Look for When They Observe Teaching

Each of the four participants defined the supervisory process in terms of effective

teaching. Effective teaching ranged from reaching QCC objectives to using manipulatives

in math. The classroom management structures as well as number of discipline referrals

were mentioned as indicators of effective teaching by each of the four principals.

Bill Ford described an effective classroom as one that is structured. He also

pointed out the importance of management within the classroom. He stated:

> We look at lesson plans and QCC objectives and get a general feel for the
> structure in the classroom. Determine if the objectives are being met and how
> much they're on track, the organization of the classroom. You can pick up pretty
> quickly the structure of the class-well-structured or loose structured. And usually
> with loose structured, unless there's a very good teacher, you're headed for
> problems. The teacher has to manage the class well in a particular situation. I
> think trust does come between administrators and teachers.

Dr. Lane believed that effective teaching was having the students involved in the

lesson, and she related:

> I thoroughly enjoy walking into a classroom and I can really pinpoint a specific
> example when there's that interaction between a student and a teacher and you
> can see those light bulbs going off and it is truly a learning experience. It's not
> just regurgitation of facts and knowledge. It's more of a critical thinking, problem
> solving, looking at scenarios presented.

Mr. Lewis indicated that he "just knows" when he sees good teaching, and he explained, "And the behaviors are-are you presenting the material…I can tell by facial expressions, how she responds to the students, and those kinds of things."  However, Ken Lewis related that effective teaching is more than the delivery of instruction. He felt that teachers who like kids would meet his expectations. He said, "I think it would have to go back to somebody that I felt like didn't like kids. I think that in this business if you don't love kids, you don't need to do it."

Similar to the other participants, Mark Ostro pointed out that students should be actively learning, and he explained:

> We had a situation where we went in the classroom where they were working on ratios. She had a big bag of candy. There was a certain amount of Reese's Cups, a certain amount of Tootsie Rolls, and they were able to do the lesson. I thought the kids picked up on it real good. It was a special education math class.

The Post-observation Conference

Each of the four respondents addressed the supervisory process through the issue of action taken after classroom observations, commonly known in the supervision literature as the post-observation conference.  The participants believed that the need for feedback was due to the anxiety associated with evaluation, and each principal mentioned this reason.  Following an evaluation, Mark Ostro believed that teachers not only expect to be "talked to," but also, "they await eagerly the results." He indicated that after a classroom evaluation:

> Whenever they come to me, I make sure to make time to talk to them even if I don't really need to, even if they have a really good lesson. A lot of times, they just want to hear they had a good lesson.

Ostro also stated, "They kind of get a little tight, because they know we're in a lot of time, not every time, but when we come in, they expect an evaluation."

Ken Lewis offered he believed everyone wants to do a good job, but some

individuals insist on being left alone. He said:

> I think everybody wants to do a good job. I think some do…there are some people
> that really want direct instructions on what they're going to be doing and there are
> other people who just want to be left alone. Although, sometimes with some of
> those people that you just leave alone, they kind of veer off in another direction.

Lewis indicated teachers see the principal as the "hit man" no matter what the situation.

He commented, "I'll be honest with you, it's very difficult because people see

administrators coming in as it's part of their evaluation and every time you deal with an

individual, it's not a part of their evaluation."

Talking with teachers after an instructional problem had occurred and had been

observed in the classroom was mentioned as a motivator for conducting the post-

observation conference.  No contact was reported as having taken place prior to the

identification of a problem. Bill Ford began the supervisory post-observation conference

by sitting down with teachers and providing feedback from the observation. He began:

> I try to sit down with that individual and help them understand that if they want to
> continue to work with us they've got to stay on the same page. I'll help them
> develop some strategies if they want me to for meeting the needs of those kids.
> We're going to teach the QCC objectives, we're going to teach the local
> objectives. We try to help them understand that they've got to do that.

Renee Lane believed meeting with the teacher is essential following the evaluation, and

she described:

> Basically, we look at what areas may be weak and we conference with that
> teacher and allow that teacher to establish some ground rules; some specific goals,
> some tasks that they need to accomplish and you as a mentor or facilitator help
> them reach that point. You might recommend them going to a conference. You
> might recommend reading a certain book. You might direct them to a web site.
> Monitoring that as time goes on.

Mark Ostro's supervisory style was to observe first and then to give feedback. He described his work with teachers this way:

> I want to observe what's going on and I don't make a whole lot of comments to them while I'm in the classroom, but afterwards, one on one, in private, I do talk to them. I ask them to try different things. A lot of times I'll suggest things, even when a lesson was pretty good, I'll say why don't you try this method or that method. I always talk to them and ask them, how many people passed or what percentage of your students did well. If they had a certain percentage that didn't do well, I may say, 'That was a good lesson you had and a good way to introduce it or teach it. But then I'd also say, 'Why don't you reteach it in a different direction and try to get the students you missed.'

Ken Lewis stated, "I like to sit down with the teacher and have them explain the lesson." When Lewis had a teacher who did not meet the expectations of the staff, "I immediately sit down with her and we write professional development plans or any type of improvement plans that we might need to help a teacher." He related a situation with a young teacher and he stated, "I thought she was the worst teacher I ever saw." With the assistance of the instructional coordinator, this person became an excellent teacher. He explained:

> This person just really sucked up everything that she could get. She took advice from me. She took it from the instructional coordinator. She took it from other people on the faculty and within two years she was one of the best teachers I had. To me, that's what it's all about.

<div align="center">The Climate that Enhances Supervision</div>

The findings included issues related to climate and its relationship to the supervision among the four high school principals in this study. The themes that emerged from within the data related to climate include trust, the management style of the principal, and the relationships between the principals and their teachers.

<u>Trust</u>

All four of the participants found the issue of trust to be important to establish a climate that enhances supervision. Honesty was key to establishing a climate of trust for each principal, and each placed establishing trust as a high priority. Bill Ford asserted that it is essential to establish and to maintain trust while supervising teachers:

> I think the easiest way is to say what you mean, and mean what you say. If teachers know you do that, they learn they can trust you. Some of them learn to trust you quicker than others. Some will learn that they can come to you quicker than others and if they disagree with you, you don't go off the deep end or whatever because it's their right to disagree…most of the time if people learn that you try to be fair in the process of making decisions, they learn to trust you.

Ford also believed:

> Trust is extremely hard to gain sometimes and it's one of the easiest things to lose if you're not always truthful with them and always making decisions that are best for everybody. You don't need to get caught up in making decisions that are best for this little part of the school or another part of the school.

He further stated, regarding trust, "I think being consistent day in and day out. Not to get overly excited about one thing-consistency day in and day out is the key and to have a vision of where you're going is essential."

Renee Lane noted that even though trust is important, teachers "must believe in what you do." She concluded, "You must be honest and forthright with them. When I say something, they know I mean it and it's not skewed or they're not misinformed. I'm straightforward." Lane added:

> I don't know if it is a trust issue as much as it is a dependency issue. I think when they bring things to me that they want attended to or voiced, I will do that. I will follow through. I may not come back with the answer that is satisfactory to them, but they know that I'll go to bat for them.

Lane also pointed out that teachers within the high school setting are more isolated and subject oriented. With this isolation, "we need to be to trust that teachers will do their jobs." Another component Lane mentioned in regard to trust was honesty. She said,

"You need to be honest. They need to know that they can depend on you. Depend on you in the way you act in what you say. I believe that's very important." To build trust with the faculty, Lane takes her staff on a school improvement retreat. She described the retreat this way:

> We go to a nice place. We work real hard and intense and we work on school goals. Everyone, I believe, truly feels they can voice their concerns and their feelings without censorship. We come up with some good things.

> Mark Ostro believed that trusting teachers is the main component to maintaining a

healthy "supervisory" climate, and he stated:

> A lot of times I let them do what they feel are necessary. I don't always make immediate feedback on it even if I'm not really sure about it or I don't really like it. A lot of times they have ideas, of course, at the high school there are a lot of different subject areas. I'm not an expert on all of the areas. A lot of times I have to trust them. Many times, it means that I sit back and watch for a little while and see what the results will be.

Another aspect of trust is being honest and according to Ostro:

> We need to be open and up front from the very start. I have a hard time with people that can't look me in the eye to tell me the truth. Sometimes, when you have high expectations for people and they can't meet those expectations that create problems with trust.

Although wandering from the issue of supervision, Ken Lewis contended that teachers should be involved in the decision making process, and said:

> I think you earn trust. I think you have to show the teachers that you care about what you do and I think you have to show the teachers that you care about the school and you care about them. When they see that and when they become involved in the process of making decisions in the school and they realize that they're a part of the team, then I think that trust occurs naturally. I really don't believe that you just dictate that someone will trust you or that you will trust him or her. I think that you have to earn that and that only comes from them looking at the job you do and looking at the job they do.

Similar to Dr. Lane, Lewis took his staff "on planning retreats at the end of the year. I let the teachers get involved in everything from budgeting to scheduling and everything that

we do." He sought input from the staff and set an environment that had high expectations, explaining:

> They have some input in everything we do at this school. I try to lead by example. I would never ask a faculty member to do something that I was not willing to do myself. I try to establish an atmosphere of success. I try to set expectations for myself and for the school that are high.

Lewis described a situation in which he felt that trust was difficult if not impossible to establish. "For instance, if you have to get onto a teacher that you don't know. Immediately that establishes a negative connotation right there and from that point on it becomes more difficult to establish trust."

Management Style

All four of the participants indicated that their management style was essential in building a climate that enhances supervision. Allowing teachers to make decisions about new ideas or about an aspect of school business was mentioned by the respondents as being key factors of their management style. Praise and recognition were also mentioned as effective in "managing teachers."

Bill Ford described supervision as giving teachers the freedom to do their job and to provide supervision only when necessary. He also believed that trust and honesty were key elements for a principal to be effective with supervision. He stated, "It's my responsibility to sort of keep everybody on the same page with certain parameters, but give them the freedom to do what they do best and not micromanage." He provided an example in which a teacher came to him and said, "I think this will work with my kids, can I try it? I said yes as long as I know it's not way out in left field." Ford also pointed out that you must praise teachers and provide assurance that they are doing a good job, and he did this often by:

Patting them on the back as much as I can. Catching them doing the right thing; you can do it through emails. I've done that with teachers when I've seen good things going on, email them, say, 'keep up the good work, I like what I say in your classroom.' You can pat them on the back. You can recognize them at faculty meetings. When your colleagues see that you're doing a good job, that's probably the most satisfaction you can get out of being a teacher is when your colleagues recognize that you're doing an outstanding job.

Ford believed the principal must be straightforward in his decisions, and he claimed:

I think they must know where that administrator stands. I think it's important for them to know if you're going to support them in a situation where they're correct, but at the same time, in a situation where they're wrong, you're not going to embarrass them but at the same time you're going to come in and say, 'You've got to correct this particular situation.'

Ford also pointed out there "reaches a point when some teachers need to be removed." He related an incident in which a teacher criticized a program. He stated to the teacher, "I'm sorry you feel that way, but I'm happy with that and if you're not, then you can find a place that doesn't expect quite as much. At this school, that's what we're going to do."

Renee Lane was a self-reported "teacher's principal." She believed in her teachers, and Lane tried to deal with each one as an individual. She saw the importance of praise and recognition as important aspects of supervision. Lane stated:

I have a lot of faith in them. They know I have faith in them and I believe they think I trust them and I do. So I place a lot of trust in them to do the job that they need to do. I'm not of a dictatorial nature. I'm probably a situational leader. I deal with situations as I see fit. I do not hold one person accountable for another person's behavior. Each individual is treated as they need to be treated. And praised, I praise them a lot as a group and as individuals.

Lane further commented on her management style, and she asserted:

I'm very visible. I hope my teachers know that what they do is important to me, that I care about them as individuals, that I'm compassionate when they have issues arise privately, whether it be family, children, those kinds of things. That I understand. Sometimes when they're having a hard day, but still they know what I expect of them.

Mark Ostro believed that the style of the principal could only be perceived as credible if he "means what he says and recognizes teachers for the good things they do." He contended:

> I think sincerity is the big thing. I think people have to understand that you truly mean what you say, that you truly are there to try to help them and not try to get them. A lot of times, workers tend to be a little bit skeptical about why you're coming in there and they see you as someone who is there to only see negative things and not necessarily positive things. I think that a lot of that comes in with the type of reinforcement that you give to your people.

Ostro believed that the principal must set expectations and then expect employees to meet those expectations. Ostro uses "pressure" to set expectations, and he reported:

> I put a little pressure on them some times because I have very high expectations and I let them know that I have very high expectations and I won't settle for anything other than that. Many times they say, 'Well, it's the students responsibility.' My answer to them is, 'We're hired to teach, period.' We have to teach all of them.

With respect to the recognition of teachers, Ostro said:

> When you recognize them for good things as well as bad things, then that's important. I'm more of a personal kind of person. I do some things in writing but I'm more of a recognizing them publicly, recognizing them to themselves, recognizing them through gifts and rewards and all of those different things. I'm more of that kind of person than I am just sending a little note. Sometimes I send a little note, but that's not my personality.

Mr. Lewis saw himself as a "helper" in that he wanted to "encourage teachers to achieve their goals." He revealed:

> I believe that a happy teacher does a good job. I see my role as a person that can help the teacher to achieve the goals that they have. We insist that teachers establish goals for themselves that are directly linked to the school goals. I try to encourage them by bringing in new ideas by trying to get them to implement new ideas.

Lewis believed that teachers must take an active part in instructional supervision. Lewis

found it difficult to work with individuals who lack initiative, and that he has little

tolerance for teachers who want someone else to "do the work for them," and he said:

> I can't work in an environment where I have someone that says, 'I want you to do this and I want to do this and then I want you to do this.' I want somebody that's going to tell me, 'I need a task done for this purpose over here and go for it.'

Relationships Between the Principals and Their Teachers

Three of the four principals described the climate that *they believed* enhanced

supervision from the perceptions of their teachers. The perceptions generally were in

regard to the type of person or leader the principal was. Words such as fair, decisive, and

supportive permeated the responses of the principals when asked about what traits of

theirs that supported teachers.

Mr. Ford felt strongly that his teachers wanted in him as principal "to stand

behind the decisions he has made," and Ford stated:

> One thing is they've got to feel like the administrators have a plan. And that plan is directed at making the school better. That person must have a listening ear. I think they have to know that you'll listen, that you can make decisions. Once you make a decision, you will stand on that decision.

Dr. Lane believed that teachers want a supervisor who is a fair person and

someone who will listen. She responded:

> I hope they see me as a democratic leader, a fair person. I think one of the main things they want is someone they can come to, bounce ideas off of, be respected, someone they know will listen to sincerely, not just give them the time, but listen to them. I think respect plays a large role here.

Mr. Ostro believed that teachers want to know that they will be supported when it

comes to discipline, and he believes:

> First of all, as far as students are concerned, we have to back the teacher. When they send a referral to the office, we have to do what's outlined that we said we

would do. We have to support that teacher. We have to back them so they'll learn they can trust us to do what we said we were going to do.

## What Gets in the Way of Principals Supervising Teachers

Each of the four participants related constraints that get in the way of them being able to supervise teachers. Each participant had his or her own list of constraints; however, the principals consistently identified similar tasks that competed with their work involved in supervising teachers at their respective schools.

<u>Tasks That Get in the Way of Principals Supervising Teachers</u>

Bill Ford mentioned several tasks that prevent him from supervising teachers. These tasks ranged from small in nature to very large in nature, but each prevented him from participating in teacher supervision. He stated:

> The phone, conferences, unexpected little situations. For example, today a little row between a boyfriend and a girlfriend. They couldn't wait until they got home or after school to do it, they had to do it in front of the gym and we got involved in it.

In addition to the tasks listed above, Ford also described his job as "what I call the limelight and your dealing with community not just parents, you're dealing with students, you're dealing with teachers, you're dealing with people who are contacting your system from outside maybe wanting this or that, salesmen." He went on to say, "the telephone, people, being a high school principal makes this the most challenging job I've ever had."

To get the job done, Ford indicated:

> You usually have to put in time after hours to make up for it. For example, email. If you don't get it read on time, so it's something you get around to reading late in the afternoon. Sometimes, you can't allow that. You just have to turn it over to someone. For example, we have a principal's meeting on the eighth. Unless I have someone who can deal with a situation that might come up, I just have to find an assistant principal and say, 'Handle it, I've got a meeting.'

Renee Lane is quick to point out that paperwork is one of her biggest constraints. She said, "I think we are distracted. Distracted by things such as paperwork. Too many fingers in the pie, so to speak, not enough emphasis on certain, particular things. We're going in too many directions." She next asserted, "Providing for teachers would not be difficult if it weren't for other requests, responsibilities, requirements that are placed upon us to ask them to do." She described the time constraints involved in being a principal, "The time constraints in reference to meeting with parents who don't make appointments, having to be there on a moment's notice when they walk in and need requests answered, paperwork outside the evaluation process." She mentioned the pressure that comes from either the outside or just pressure she placed upon herself as a principal. She stated:

> If I had it my way, I would love not to have some of the paperwork that comes across this desk. I think that its just part of the job, but it has escalated. It has increased over time…we always want to be sure we're covering ourselves so therefore we're signing more things and generating more paperwork to do that.

Mark Ostro saw things from a different perspective when compared to the other principals. One of his biggest constraints is being a first year principal. He noted:

> Going to meetings, especially this year being a first year principal, I feel like I have to be at all of them. We have our principal's meetings, then we have our high school principal's meetings, then I have new principal's meetings that meet each month to go over stuff.

Ostro went on to conclude:

> I guess I could send an assistant principal to some if I needed to, but I feel like that I need to as a first year principal, I need to be there because I don't need to send an assistant principal in my place. Nor would I want to right now.

He also included a list of daily tasks such as "seeing parents, seeing teachers. A lot of it is the daily tasks." Ostro believed, "That's all part of the job of being a principal."

Ken Lewis said up front, "In a school this size, with 117 and 40 non-certified staff, unfortunately supervision and evaluation overlap." Lewis saw his job:

> As trying to put out as many fires as we possibly can and to run this school, but unfortunately with the number of people that you have there are lots more management tasks than there are leadership tasks. There are a lot of things that I'd love to be able to do and a lot of programs I'd love to be able to start and finish all the way through and to be able to do all the evaluations. Many times the management tasks just keep you from doing those things.

Issue of Priorities

Each of the four respondents included the issue of priorities when addressing what gets in the way of principals supervising teachers. While priorities are highly individual, the principals felt pressure to perform certain tasks or take care of certain types of situations first. Each placed high priority on time spent with students and parents. Mr. Ford stated that many things take priority over supervision, and he said:

> All those things, sometimes can, it should not interfere, but there's so much that goes on that you've got to be a part of that which can interfere with where you want to be, doing what you want to do, it's just all part of it.

He listed several duties that take priority over instructional supervision, and he elaborated:

> Telephones, E-mails, especially in a high school principal's day, you have no idea what's going to happen. You can pretty much come to school with a set agenda. Then that telephone rings, a parent comes in, a salesman comes by, and a teacher comes in and wants to talk. As a matter of fact, I've got two young ladies sometime today who want to discuss something.

Ford approached these priorities with a business-like attitude, and he proclaimed:

> It's like running a business, to be honest with you. And you have to, in my opinion, know a little bit about all aspects of the business. But if you spend too much time on one aspect of the business, something's going to fall short.

Renee Lane insisted, "Our intent is to be good supervisors but there are times when we may not feel that way because we are so distracted by other events and other

situations." Lane had several other priorities other than supervision, the largest of which was time. She said, "The time it takes to complete tasks other than classroom visits and observations." Lane pointed out her primary priority is "being in the classroom, being in the building, and everyday I make it a desperate attempt, especially at lunch, to get out and see my kids, but there are many, many days when things interfere with that."

Ostro listed "discipline, handling of parents, scheduling issues, and students" as top priorities. When it comes to parents, Ostro believed they take first priority, and he related:

> There are a lot of times when a mad parent comes in and you can't schedule that. My philosophy on that is I want to go ahead and see them and try to take care of the issue rather than say, 'I'm sorry. Make an appointment. I'll see you tomorrow.' When a parent comes in who is upset, I feel like I need to go ahead and handle that situation so that the instruction for that student is not interrupted, because, sometimes it may be a situation where that student is not in the classroom. They may have been placed somewhere else and we need to solve that and get them back in the environment of instruction as soon as possible.

Another priority of Ostro was meeting with "athletic directors about events that are going on."

Relative to priorities, Ken Lewis stated, "No question, just the daily management tasks that go with this job, dealing with parents, dealing with problems, going to meetings, all of those kind of things." Another priority that he mentioned was spending time with the students, and he developed a strategy to achieve this priority:

> I have certain times that I spend with the students. For instance, I choose to go to the lunchroom every day for an hour and a half and spend my time in the lunchroom and that's how I get to talk to the students and do those kinds of things.

Lewis said, "The same thing is true with the teachers. In order for me to see the teachers, I just have to absolutely say, 'I'm going to do five walk-throughs today' just to get out in the building."

Content Area Specialization and Expertise Across Content Areas

Each of the four principals described the structure of the high school in terms of content areas. High schools are designed for teachers to be trained and to deliver one, particular content. With this specificity comes teacher autonomy. Also with this specificity, supervisors are many times not only unfamiliar, but also are totally at a "loss" when it comes to evaluating some classes due to the specialization (e.g., foreign languages, mathematics, science).

Bill Ford defined the structure of the high school as being "specialized more" than elementary and middle schools. He believed this specialization was due to the fact that teachers are trained in "one specific subject area." He stated, "In high school, you specialize more, if you're a math teacher, an English teacher, or a science teacher. More specialization because of the teacher being trained just basically to do one particular subject in the high school." Ford contended that due to the specialization there are times that he feels "uncomfortable observing a teacher's classroom." He said:

> Yes, when I go into a French or Spanish class since I don't speak either language. A lot of times you only hear them speaking the language so when I'm doing that, I have to go look at the lesson plans and I have to look at the QCC objectives. Also, how the kids respond to what's being said that I don't understand because they may be talking about me and I don't even know it.

Renee Lane stated, "I think I would say that the high school is a more autonomous situation. Being that they're subject oriented and content oriented." She is quick to point

out, "I feel inadequate sometimes in my knowledge of the subject matter, especially in a high level math course and such as that but that's all."

Mark Ostro believed, "At the high school basically the subject matter is different. I have one that teaches science and that's all they teach." Ostro deemed it important that teachers must be experts in their fields, and he stated:

I feel they have to really know. One while we supervise instructionally we try to prepare our students for post secondary to make sure they are up to date in their field because many of them want to go into the medical field. They need to know the most they can about chemistry.

Ostro admitted there are times when he feels "uncomfortable observing" in a teacher's class. He stated:

Yes, I observe French class where from the time I walked in there until the time I left, no English was spoken at all. How am I to tell what's going on? Also, my Spanish II classes or III classes are the same way. You walk in the class and there's not a word of English spoken from the time I walk in that door to the time that class period is over. Everything is in a language that I am not familiar with.

Ostro further stated, "I'm not the expert on every subject. That's kind of tough sometimes."

Ken Lewis stated, "The content is more specific in the high school than it is in the elementary and middle schools. Every person is a content specific person." He admitted to feeling uncomfortable in certain classrooms that were not in his primary certification field, but he still believed he was qualified to do the evaluation. He said, "Now, yes, if I go into a French classroom and she speaks French during the entire lesson and I don't have a clue what she said, it's hard for me to determine…I think you're looking for the same type of behaviors."

Although Lane acknowledged that the high school curriculum could be daunting, she believes there are behaviors every teacher should possess:

We're all looking for the same best practices. We're looking for those kinds of qualities. You can separate that from content. You're looking for the pedagogy they are utilizing. I look for the teaching techniques, the opportunity for student interaction and questioning. I look for those types of things that make a teacher a good teacher.

Mark Ostro shared a strategy he used to compensate for his lack of knowledge in a content area. He indicated that when he enters a classroom in which he is not familiar with the content, he "reverts back to what his definition of instructional supervision," and he said, "I try to look and make sure the students are on task."

Ken Lewis related his definition of instructional supervision to the high school's structure by stating, "I think you're looking for the same types of behaviors. And the behaviors are: you presenting the material…I can tell by facial expressions how she responded to the student and those kinds of things."

Each principal addressed the structure of the high school through the issue of expertise. Due to the fact that high schools are specialized, there are instances when principals are not familiar with the content being taught. In these instances, the principals reported that they "seek out help from the teacher, another teacher, or central office personnel."

With this specialization in certification, situations arise in which the teacher is more qualified within a particular subject than the principal. Ford claimed, "In all high schools, you're going to find some situations that no matter what the principal knows, the teacher knows a lot more about it. They just haven't gotten their administrative degree yet." Ford also used the guidance of the system-wide Vocational Director. He stated, "We also have a system-wide Vocational Director who comes over, and I get input from him

as well as in trying to make decisions for that particular instructional end of our program

for the kids."

When asked the question regarding her expertise on observing classrooms and if

she had ever felt uncomfortable, Renee Lane stated, "I always feel comfortable

observing," and she believed:

> When background content of the teachers is different from that of the individual who is supervising, teachers in some situations, support the evaluator and in other situations, do not trust the evaluator. When observing the process of evaluation, teachers fail to realize that content is what supervisors are looking for.

Renee Lane believed teachers whose content background was different from hers

supported the type of supervision and instructional support she provided. She said, "You

probably have to ask them as individuals, but I guess to make a general comment, I think

they feel pretty comfortable. We're all looking for the same best practices."

Ken Lewis maintained that when dealing with teachers whose background content

is different:

> I think it's more of a problem with the teacher than with the administrator. I think that the teacher feels like the person should be qualified in their area to make a judgment on what they're doing. I think sometimes the teachers don't understand that you're not spending a whole lot of time specifically evaluating the content; you're spending more time evaluating the practices that the teacher is using to present the material.

Dr. Lane felt that a major constraint placed on high school principals is that supervision

"at this level" as a process "is very vague" and there exists a lack of criteria for

evaluation. She stated:

> They don't have in place specific criteria to measure them at the high school level. In the elementary school, you have that opportunity. Even at the middle school, you have that opportunity. But at the high school level, until we implement the end of the course tests where we can specifically pinpoint whom the teacher was who taught them that class that would help. So there's a lot of issues that are very vague and cloudy right now.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND DISCUSSION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study sought to examine issues that high school principals encounter with instructional supervision. The perspectives of principals were solicited to describe the conditions surrounding instructional supervision within the high school setting. Data were examined and analyzed to ascertain specific practices and issues relating to high school principals' supervision of teachers.

A review of the study, an overview of the research questions, and procedures used regarding instructional supervision are included within this chapter. Following these areas, why this study differs from previous studies, the major findings from the study are discussed, and implications and recommendations are offered for school systems that include high schools, for further research, and for higher education.

Summary of the Study

A qualitative research design and methods were used to collect and to analyze data relating to the issues high school principals encounter in instructional supervision. Questions used to direct this study sought to uncover specific data regarding the principals' perspectives on the definition of instructional supervision, how the principals describe the supervisory process, what type of climate enhances supervision, what gets in the way of principals trying to supervise teachers, and how the structure of the high school relates to supervision.

<u>Procedures</u>

Through the process of purposeful sampling, a school district, which included four high school principals, was selected. Permission was obtained from the school district and the participants signed consent forms. Interview questions for the high school principals (see Appendix A) were utilized. Data collection, which consisted of in-depth interviews with each participant, as well as, a review of available artifacts, began in October of 2001.

Each interview with the participants was audiotaped and transcribed. Fieldnotes were made during the interviews as well as the observations. Following each interview, the data were read to gain insight to the content of the interviews. Analysis of the data revealed overall themes relating to the issues principals encounter with instructional supervision at the high school level.

<u>Previous Studies</u>

The distinction between this study and previous studies has to do with the subjects who participated--four high school principals. Previous research has directed its attention to textbook instructional supervision (Reitzug, 1997), teachers' perspectives of supervision (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1998), and legal entanglements (Hazi, 1994). Other studies researching instructional supervision were Blumberg's (1980) study, which revealed the on-going battle between teachers and supervisors and Sizer's (1984) study describing the structure of the high school. None of these studies were written focusing on the principals' perspectives on instructional supervision. Research has also been done on the purposes of instructional supervision such as Beach and Reinhartz (2000) Drake and Roe (1999) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998).

This study involved a qualitative method, which focused on principals who were defined as the instructional leaders of their schools. Previous research has largely failed to account for the role of the principal in instructional supervision within the high school setting. The difficulties the principal faced due to the specialization of the teachers' content areas were addressed in this study.

In regard to what gets in the way of principals supervising teachers, other studies have looked extensively at how teachers see the supervisory or evaluation processes (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1998). This study attempted to gain insight into what the principals saw as what got in the way of them supervising or evaluating their teachers.

The principal is generally accepted to be the instructional leader of the school. With the current focus in Georgia and the nation on accountability for teachers and improving student achievement, the work of the principal as the instructional leader has become increasingly more important. This study attempted to analyze the perspectives and issues principals encounter in their positions as instructional leaders responsible for the supervision and evaluation of teachers.

## Discussion

### Defining Supervision

The principals participating in this study defined instructional supervision in a variety of ways. The definitions ranged from "luck" to "evaluation." The principals saw instructional supervision as evaluation of teachers and as a means to achieve principal-established goals. The goals established by the principals were described as "the vision, being on the same page, and going in the same direction."

Bill Ford equated instructional supervision to "a strong athletic program." In Ford's view, a winning athletic program "increased student achievement." The hiring of "good teachers" was viewed by Ford, Lewis, and Lane as part of instructional supervision. Lewis added that he would not "hire a teacher who did not express a love for kids." Lane believed that hiring good teachers involved a great deal of "luck." Ostro, the new principal, defined supervision as "basically walking around the building in and out of classrooms." Ostro and Lane likened instructional supervision to "being visible."

Each of the four participants defined instructional supervision as the evaluation of teachers. While Ford thought, "Supervision is linked to evaluation," Lane's and Ostro's definitions were simply, "evaluation." Lewis was the only one of the principals who expressed that "instructional supervision should be more than evaluation, but with the size of his school, he was unable to do more than evaluate." The literature discussed the lack of distinction between evaluation and supervision.

Another aspect of the principals' definitions of instructional supervision was that instructional supervision is effective teaching. Ford believed that a teacher who "teaches the QCC objectives and local objectives" is an effective teacher. Ostro found effective teaching to involve the use of "manipulatives" to teach math. Lane equated effective teaching to promoting "problem solving which involved critical thinking and looking at scenarios." Lewis provided the theory that an effective teacher is one who does not need much supervision after being told to "go for it."

Instructional supervision according to the principals was directly related to goals established for the school by the principals. Some of the individuals believed teacher goal setting should be part of the evaluation and some planned to use this the next school year.

Beach and Reinhartz (2000) believed when teachers become stakeholders, they begin to recognize the significance that the curriculum has on the classroom. Missing from the goals was a plan of action for achieving the goals. While each principal stated the need for goals and direction, none stated the need or existence of a plan for reaching the goals. Staff development, self-evaluation, and fostering curriculum development in an effort to attain the goals were not mentioned. Perhaps what was missing is as significant as what was said.

<div align="center">The Process</div>

The four high school principals described the evaluation process as having two forms: the formal 20-minute GTOI observation and the less formal walk-through evaluation. The process of each of these evaluations consisted of "observing teachers and conferencing with the individual." Lane stated, "We look at what areas may be weak, and we conference with that teacher." Ostro said the supervisory process is "helping a teacher by sitting down with them to discuss how you can improve things." Lewis and Ostro added to the current evaluation process the collection of data such as "the number of discipline referrals and teacher attendance."

While the principals displayed knowledge of the GTOI process, no principal expressed how the process was conveyed to teachers, and no one expressed the communication of the opportunity teachers have to schedule a pre-observation conference. Cogan (1973) described the process of clinical supervision as including a pre-observation conference, an observation, and a post-observation conference. According to the four principals interviewed for this study, all were still using clinical supervision; yet, none of the participants spoke about using all the components of the

model. The frequency of the formal 20-minute evaluations varied from teacher to teacher and from year to year. Every teacher was evaluated using the same procedure no matter how many times in a school year the evaluation occurred. The number of evaluations per year depended on the number of years of experience the teacher had, where the teacher fell in the "rotation process," and if there were identified problems. Lane stated, "We rotate the names of those teachers every year." Similar to what has been reported in the literature about one size fits all approaches to supervision (Glanz, 2000), teachers who were rated a satisfactory their entire careers were evaluated using the same instruments and in the same manner as teachers who were found to be deficient. The literature was quite clear on the worth of using a "preconceived process for what effective teaching is-not helpful." (Glanz & Neville, 1997, p. 117)

The Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) evaluation used set criteria or pre-set beliefs in regard to best practices. The principals described what they considered effective teaching to be and best practices that were used within the classroom. The items mentioned were "the relationship of the lesson to a specific QCC objective, interaction with the students, reaction of the students, and behavior of the students." These preset expectations gave the teacher the ability to perform "the dog and pony show." The evaluation was merely a checklist to be sure that for that period of time the teacher performed certain tasks as perceived by the evaluator. Ford and Lane stated, "When I come into the classroom, I have to see certain things." Blumberg (1980) described the evaluation process as a game, a cold war, and a ritual.

Following a formal observation, teachers were judged either "Satisfactory" or "Needs Improvement" according the checklist provided by the GTOI. If a poor

performance was noted by the principals, the principals "conferenced, provided written letters of improvement, provided strategies for correction, provided mentors, staff development, trips to conferences, and reading of certain books" as means to help the teacher. Ostro described that if teachers were not getting the job done in the classroom, the teachers would be "placed on a professional development plan (PDP)" drawn up by the principal.

Part of instructional process was the control the principals had. The principals plainly saw themselves as "over the teachers" even though several of them expressed the desire to have a teacher-friendly process. Lane expressed her desire to "add a teacher component to the process," but it had not been done yet. Lewis exercised his control of the supervisory process by allowing teachers to "have another opportunity" if deficiencies were identified during an observation. Foster (1986) described this scenario as supervision being a set of bureaucratic procedures used as a powerful administrative means to control a teacher.

Each principal considered himself or herself to be the expert in all situations and each was confident in his or her ability to evaluate teachers and to supply teachers with strategies and advice to "fix" their problems. While the principals might seek some help with certain content areas, they still believed in their abilities to judge the teachers' deliveries. Lane explained, "I look for the teaching techniques, the opportunity for student interaction, and questioning." Lewis admitted, "looking at the facial expressions of the students and how the teacher responded to the students" when unfamiliar with the content.

While the principals saw themselves as the instructional leaders of their schools, they each admitted that the assistant principals and instructional coordinators played roles in the evaluation process. Each of the four principals explained how the "assistant principals who handled discipline also formally and informally evaluated teachers." The instructional coordinators' roles were seen as providing the "leadership to make sure the total instructional program is going on and everyone is carrying out the curriculum." Lewis stated, "I try not to use her as an evaluator, her main duty is to improve instruction." Each of the participants required both the assistant principals and the instructional coordinators to report instructional problems to the them. Lane stated, "They're not in the role to deal with those discrepancies, except on the report." Each principal expressed the belief that his or her responsibility was to "confront teachers with instructional problems."

The walk-through observation was used by three of the four principals. Ostro stated, "When I walk in there, I expect to see instruction going on and I can gauge when I walk in the door what kind of instruction is going on." Lane expressed that by doing "more leisurely walk-throughs would improve instructional supervision." Lewis used the walk-throughs not as a means of evaluation, but rather as a way "to collect data." Each of these three principals had admonished their assistant principals to perform walk-through observations; however, none of the assistant principals had received the training on performing such a procedure. There was no mention of the purpose and training regarding the walk-through process or what was the intent of the walk-through process. This would lead one to believe that there was a purpose in this process that teachers should not know.

The growth process that even effective teachers need was totally ignored by these evaluators. One can glean that as long as a teacher does the job there is no need to grow, improve, or change instructional strategies. Along with this lack of growth comes the idea that as long as a teacher has satisfactory evaluations, no discipline referrals, is not frequently absent, and does not upset the status quo then the teacher is effective.

<div align="center">Climate</div>

The four principals described the climates that they believed enhanced supervision. The climate components ranged from honesty of the administrator to trust. Lane believed that to establish and to maintain a climate conducive to supervision the principal must be "honest and forthright." Lewis set the climate by "doing as much as I can to make a happy teacher." He believed, "A happy teacher does a better job." Ostro tried to be "open and up front from the very start."

Trust creates an environment in which everyone wants to participate (Cross & Rice, 2000). All of the principals described the importance of trust between teachers and supervisors. Ford believed trust was built when one "says what he means and means what he says." Lane defined this trust as a developed dependency in that, "when they bring things to me, they know I will listen." In agreement with Lane, Ford expressed that trust can be built while listening to teachers' opinions. He related a conversation with a teacher in which he said, "I understand where you are coming from and I respect your point of view." Ford further emphasized the importance of trust with, "Trust is extremely hard to gain sometimes and it's one of the easiest things to lose if you're not always truthful." Ford and Ostro expressed the need for principals to trust in the teachers to do their jobs.

Another area of the climate that fosters instructional supervision according to the participants is the establishment of guidelines and goals. Ostro stated, "I make sure they know the guidelines before they get started." Lane expressed that teachers must "have expectations" if they are going to be successful. Ford also expressed the importance of goals "to keep moving forward and not get hung up on your failures." Lewis "leads by example." By setting "expectations and goals for myself and the school that are high," Lewis builds morale and support. Lewis provides his teachers the opportunity to "set their own goals" and at the end of the year has them "return a form stating how those goals were met."

Ford allowed teachers to try new ideas, "If they come to me and say, Mr. Ford, I think this will work with my kids, can I try it, I would say yes as long as I know it is not way out in left field." Two of the four principals sponsored beginning of the year school improvement retreats for the purpose of allowing teachers to "develop school goals."

Each of the four participants expressed the need to provide the teachers with support and encouragement. Lane stated, "I put the faith in them." Each principal provided praise either through "a pat on the back, E-mail, written letters, gifts, and rewards." Ford believed that recognition at faculty meetings was important, because "colleagues see that you're doing a good job, and this is probably the most satisfaction you can get out of being a teacher."

<center>What Gets in the Way of Supervision</center>

Each of the four principals listed several daily maintenance tasks of the school as preventing them from supervising teachers. This list included the "phone, conferences, E-mail, paperwork, meetings, parent meetings, principal meetings, salesmen, discipline

problems, and extra curricular activities." Ford described his job like "running a business." He realized that by "spending too much time in one area, another area was being slighted." By spending time with the principals, the researcher was able to verify that much of the day of the high school principal was absorbed by this list. Meetings with parents took top priority.

Within the teachers' handbook for the county, the importance of reporting to parents and parent relations take up more page space of the manual than the policies and procedures for evaluating teachers. Within these two areas on parents, it was pointed out that parents should take high priority and that parents have the right to request a conference when needed. By spending time with the principals, the researcher was able to discover that parents take number one priority regarding instruction and discipline within all four schools.

The four principals were in agreement that "time or the lack of time" got in the way of them supervising teachers. Lane revealed that "the intent of supervision was good, but that many other events and situations distracted her from supervising the teachers." Unexpected interruptions proved the most frustrating to all of the principals. Each expressed having had agendas "disrupted by fights, angry parents, and the like." In their estimation, providing for teachers would not be as difficult if it were not for "other requests, responsibilities, and requirements" placed on them and their time.

The first year principal, Ostro, noted the number of meetings he was required to attend and his belief that "as a first year principal, he should be the one in attendance and not one of his assistants." The teachers at his school expressed resentment over his being

"out of the building so much." Ostro expressed his own frustration at "wishing he could be more visible" in his school.

By observing and interviewing, the researcher has identified that daily tasks are important tasks for the principal and are necessary for the school to function. However, prioritization of these tasks takes place on a moment-by-moment basis. For example, Ostro stated that he "does not require parents to have an appointment." If parents need to see him, he would see them "at a moment's notice." Ostro also stressed "being visible during breaks and lunch." He even hired "extra help" during these times of the day. Lane and Lewis discussed being "in the lunchroom during student lunch times in order to spend time with the students." Ostro and Ford also mentioned the amount of time they spent "talking with the athletic director."

Each principal used his or her assistant principals and instructional coordinator for various tasks. However, the principals felt it necessary that in certain areas, he or she should be the one "handling the situation." In other words, these four principals were very effective at handling the menial job tasks that are associated with being principals. When supervision was thrown into the mix, supervision did not come out as the top priority. The researcher questions whether or not the priorities of the principals were based on areas in which they felt most comfortable supervising their teachers for more than the required four minute walk-through.

Another area that got in the way of principals supervising teachers was the evaluation process itself. The principals saw the process as "cumbersome and vague" and that in many situations the "students are being subjected to poor teaching while the lengthiness of the process runs its course." All the participants agreed that using the

current Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) evaluation process was not the "best method" for evaluation; however, the process had been tested and was found to be a fair tool for dismissal. Lane stated a drawback to the current evaluation process was that "teachers hang on to a false sense of reality" in that they always have an opportunity for improvement based on the judgment of the principal. The principals do not believe they need a "20 minute formal evaluation" procedure to accurately evaluate teachers. Lane said that she enjoyed the "two or three minute walk-throughs" because it made her "more visible." Ostro stated that he could "determine the effectiveness of the teacher in a couple of minutes by observing the students."

Both the assistant principals and the instructional coordinators are involved in the supervisory process. While the principals do not allow the IC's to perform formal "evaluations," they were assigned the responsibility of "collecting data" for the principals on teachers with instructional problems. Lewis stated that when instructional problems with a teacher are noticed, "The IC meets with me." Ostro explained to his teachers that the "instructional coordinator is there to assist with classroom instruction," but Ostro was quick to point out that the IC "shares the responsibility of supervision." Due to the "informant" responsibility of the instructional coordinator, they appeared to be in the "undercover cop" or "internal affairs" role in the school. Informing on teachers was the directive the instructional coordinators were given by the principal, so thus a pure entanglement existed for teachers as to who is the evaluator, who is the helper, and who they are supposed to be trusted.

Structure of the High School

The research in the literature revealed that research related to the comprehensive high school has been neglected (Wraga, 1998). Siskin (1991) conducted a study regarding departments and department heads. Siskin's study identified four key aspects relating to the departments and how the schools worked. Within the departments, subjects were taught by specialists usually, in specialized rooms and are isolated from other departments (Siskin, 1991).

Two of the four principals emphasized the role of the department chairs in their schools. Ford and Lewis relied on the department chairs to "solve problems or come to them when problems could not be solved." Thus, the entanglement included not only the instructional coordinators but also the department chairs. The principals pointed out that they "depended on" and "trusted" their department chairs and expected them to report back when there were problems.

Teacher autonomy was fostered by the structure of the high school. Teachers were separated into departments by subjects taught and further isolated within their departments. Each principal agreed that teachers were hired to do a "specific job" and that as long as they did that job, the teachers were left alone. Lewis expressed his desire to "hire teachers who did not want to be told how to do everything." Regarding teacher autonomy, Lane stated, "teachers must be allowed the freedom to teach."

Each of the principals expressed concern when evaluating teachers who teach subjects unfamiliar to the principal. Ostro stated, "I find it real difficult. I don't know everything. I'm not the expert on every subject." Strategies such as "calling on central office personnel and sitting down with the teacher later were described". Other strategies

included "looking at lesson plans and QCC objectives." As far as student interaction during the observation time, Lewis relied on "facial expressions and student behavior" as indicators. Even though principals saw these as "uncomfortable positions," they were quick to point out that they were "still capable of evaluating the teacher." This type evaluation looked only at delivery and could not possibly evaluate the quality of the content. This type evaluation also does not meet with Sizer's definition (1984) that evaluation should measure how a teacher inspires students to use their minds.

The checklist-type evaluation protected principals when evaluating unfamiliar content areas. The principals specifically mentioned being able to recognize "best practices" in any setting regardless of their knowledge or lack of knowledge of the content. If supervision was so simple, a lot of time is wasted in leadership preparation.

Implications for School Systems that Include High Schools

The role of the supervisor is vital to the success of education. Supervision has been defined as "the glue of a successful school" (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1998, p. 6). Supervision is seen as an integral component and process in the operation of a school. Findings from this study regarding Samville County School System imply the need for training and assistance for administrators.

The school district could provide training and on-going staff development for high school administrators in instructional supervision. Training regarding the many facets of supervision of teachers would be beneficial. In addition to the initial Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument training, further training in best practices, regardless of the content area, is needed. Follow-up training in the walk-through observational method appears to be needed as well. Training in differentiated models of supervision (e.g., peer

coaching, portfolio development, video-tape analysis) and such processes as reflection

are needed for the principals, assistant principals, and instructional coordinators, and

department chairs.

The principals were clear in their role in evaluation; however, the roles of the

assistant principals, the instructional coordinator, and the department chairs were not as

clearly defined. The assistant principals within Samville County are responsible for

discipline and evaluations. The majority of their training and experience is in the safety

and discipline areas of the school. More training and involvement of the assistant

principals in instructional supervision would better prepare them for their current duties

and for eventually becoming principals of their own schools. The duties and

responsibilities of the instructional coordinator need to be precisely delineated for each

person holding that position. Clearly stating what the instructional coordinator should not

do is as important as what the instructional coordinator can do. Principals need to be

instructed on how to most effectively use the instructional coordinator. Teachers within

this system must be given a helping person, such as the instructional coordinator, who is

not part of the evaluation process or a data collector for instructional problems. The role

of the department chair also needs to be clearly defined. If the department chair is to be

part of the supervisory process, then training must also be provided

The importance of instruction and instructional supervision must be stated

explicitly in the Samville County Teacher Handbook and the handbook of each high

school. The evidence of the importance of instructional supervision must be manifested

in the priority it is given by each administrator. Secretaries, counselors, and assistant

principals must absorb some of the daily responsibilities of the principals if they are to be

the instructional leader. The district must decide what the priorities are and operate in a manner that supports those priorities (minimize number of meetings, streamline paperwork, think before mandating the need for a principal to supply information that can be taken from the district's computer system by anyone).

<p style="text-align: center;">Implications for Higher Education</p>

Courses in instructional supervision might assist future administrators in discovering that instructional supervision in practice is not one-dimensional. Programs at the university level could include units of study to prepare supervisors for the often complex and confusing work of the principal and how this work often "gets in the way" of getting to the important work of assisting teachers. Course content should explore more in detail evaluation methods, including the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument, and the relationship between the instrument and current research on instructional supervision. The limitations of a checklist-type observation and alternative, individualized, growth-type processes should be stressed.

Another avenue of help for high school supervisors would be for principal preparation programs to include courses that introduce prospective administrators to the teacher leadership literature, and more specifically, the literature concerning department chairs. An awareness of the issues facing department chairs and the role they play in supervising teachers could assist principals in better supporting the work of the department chairs. Universities need to keep pace with the emerging roles that other school personnel assume—the instructional coordinator, the lead teacher, and grade-level leaders.

Implications for Further Research

Given the scarcity of the research on the issues high school principals encounter in supervising teachers, this study provides a base line of information that can perhaps guide future research in this area. The findings of this study provided new avenues of research in regard to instructional supervision at the high school level. What emerged from this study was a need to examine a larger population of high school principals who work in urban and suburban settings. Given the press for accountability in the state of Georgia and others, the perspectives of principals whose schools are not performing need to be examined. Beyond replication, research using quantitative methods need to be designed to examine principal's supervisory practices and beliefs.

Final Commentary

The purpose of the study was to examine the issues high school principals encounter in the supervision of teachers. Although the findings from this study provide a more solid base line of information on the supervision of teachers from the perspectives of high school principals, much more work in this area needs to be done. The position of high school principal places many demands on individuals; the job of leading schools must be shared. Therefore, it is necessary to further explore supervision that can make a difference in the lives of teachers and by extension the students they teach.

REFERENCES

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G. R., & Neville, R. F. (1975). Instructional Supervision: A behavior system. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Arrendondo, D. E., Brody, J. E., Zimmerman, D. P., & Moffett, C. A. (1995). Pushing the envelope in supervision. Educational Leadership, 53(3), 74-78.

Atcheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1994). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Bales, R. F. (1953). The equilibrium problem in small groups. In T. Parsons, R. F. Bales, & E. A. Shils (Eds.), Working papers in the theory of action (pp. 60-77). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Barr, A. S., Burton, W. H., & Brueckner, L. J. (1938). Supervision: Principles and practices in the improvement of instruction. New York, NY: Appleton-Century.

Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. (2000). Supervisory leadership: Focus on instruction. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. R. (1994). Empowering teachers: What successful principals do. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Bliss, J. R., Konet, R. J., & Carter, C. J. (1990). Leadership style and effectiveness in secondary school departments. The High School Journal, 74(1), 38-46.

Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods (3rd ed). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolin, F. (1986). Perspectives on the definition of supervision. Wingspan, 3(2), 22-29.

Bromley, D. B. (1986). The case-study method in psychology and related disciplines. New York, NY: Wiley and Sons.

Calabrese, R. L., & Zepeda, S. J. (1997). The reflective supervisor: A practical guide for educators. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). <u>Education and the cult of efficiency</u>. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). <u>Clinical supervision</u>. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (1994). <u>Cognitive coaching : A foundation for Renaissance Schools</u>. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon.

Covey, S. K. (1989). <u>The 7 habits of highly effective people</u>. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Covey, S. K. (1989). <u>Principle-centered leadership</u>. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Cremin, L. A. (1955). The revolution in American secondary education 1893-1918. <u>Teachers College Record, 56</u>(8), 295-308.

Cross, C. T., & Rice, R. C. (2000). The role of the principal as instructional leader in a standards-driven system. <u>NASSP Bulletin, 84</u>(620), 61-65.

Dickey, F. G. (1948). Developing supervision in Kentucky. <u>Bulletin of the Bureau of School Services, 20</u>(5), 8.

Dornbush, S. M., & Scott, R. J. (1975). <u>Evaluation and the exercise of authority</u>. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Drake, T. L., & Roe, W. H. (1999). <u>The principalship</u> (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Duke, D. L., & Stiggins, R. J. (1986). <u>Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth</u>. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Edefelt, R. A., & Johnson, M. (Eds.). (1975). <u>Rethinking in-service education</u>. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Fine, G. (1979). The Pinkston settlement: An history and social psychological investigation of the contact hypothesis. <u>Phylon, 40</u>(5), 229-242.

Foster, W. (1986). <u>Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration</u>. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Frazze, B., & Rudnitski, R. A. (1995). <u>Integrated teaching methods: Theory, classroom applications, and field-based connections</u>. Albany, NY: Delmar Publishers.

Fullan, M. G. (1995). The limits and the potential of professional development. In <u>Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices</u>. T. R. Gusky & M. Huberman (eds.) New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1998). Leadership for the 21st century: Breaking the bonds of dependency. Educational Leadership, 55(5), 6-10.

Glanz, J. (1999). A primer on action research for the school administrator. Clearing House, 72(5), 301-305.

Glanz, J. (2000). Paradigm debates in curriculum and supervision: Modern and postmodern perspectives. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Glanz, J., & Neville, R. F. (1997). Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Glensne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Right question, wrong extrapolation: A response to Duffey's 'Supervision for Results'. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 6 (1), 39-40.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (1998). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R., & Krajewski, R. (1980). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gordon, S. P. (1997). Has the field evolved to a point that it should be called something else? Yes. In J. Glanz, & R. F. Neville (Eds.), Educational supervision: Perspective, issues, and controversies (pp. 114-123). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Gordon, S. P. (1992). Paradigms, transitions, and the new supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 8(1), 62-76.

Hazi, H. N. (1994). The teacher evaluation-supervision dilemma: A case of entanglements and irreconcilable differences. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9(2), 195-216.

Hubbard, R. S., & Power, B. M. (1993). The art of classroom inquiry: A handbook for teacher-researchers. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching, and supervising, in <u>Using what we know about teaching.</u> P. Hosford (Ed.) Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (2000). <u>Joining together: group theory and group skills</u> (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Johnson, S. N. (1990). The primacy and potential of high school departments. In McLaughin, M. W., Talber, J. E., & Bascia, N. (Eds). <u>The context of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities</u> (pp. 167-184). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Jonasson, H. G. (1993). Effective schools link professional development, teacher supervision and student learning. <u>Canadian School Executive, 12</u>(4), 18-21.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. <u>Educational Leadership, 40</u>(8), 4-10.

Juska, J. (1991). Observations. <u>Phi Delta Kappa, 72</u>(6), 468-470.

Karst, R. R. (1987, April). <u>New policy implications for in-service and professional development</u> programs for the public schools. Presentation to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, DC.

Kyle, W. C., Jr. (1995). Professional development: the growth and learning of teachers over time. <u>The Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32</u>(5), 679-681.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J. H. (1997). <u>The art and science of portraiture.</u> San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lewin, K. (1948). <u>Resolving social conflicts</u>. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). <u>Naturalistic inquiry.</u> Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. <u>American Educational Research Journal, 19</u>(3), 325-340.

Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: autonomy an initiative in teachers' professional relations. <u>Teacher College Record, 91</u>(14) 509-536.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). <u>School teacher: A sociological study</u>. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

MacKenzie, D. E. (1983). Research for school improvement: An appraisal of some recent trends. Educational Researcher, 12(4), 8.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McGreal, T. L. (1983). Successful teacher evaluation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGreal, T. L. (1995). The impact of new evaluation process on teacher involvement and teacher reflection. A report to the Illinois Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Champaign, IL: The University of Illinois.

McKernan, J. (1987). Action research and curriculum development. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(2), 6-19.

McMillan, J. H. (1996). Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B. (1995). Foreward. In Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices. T. R. Guskey, & M. Huberman (Eds.) New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Mish, F. C. (Ed.). (1991). Webster's new collegiate dictionary. (9th ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam Company.

National Commission on Education. (1983). An open letter to the American people. A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Education Week, 2 (31), 12.

Oliva, P. F. (1984). Supervision for today's schools (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Pajak, E. (1993). Conceptions of supervision and leadership: Change and continuity. In G. Cawelti (Ed.). Challenges and Achievements of American Education, 1993 ASCD Yearbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Pajak, E. (1993). Approaches to clinical supervision: Alternatives for improving instruction. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (1986). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Pfeiffer, I. L., & Dunlap, J. B. (1982). Supervision of teachers: A guide to improving instruction. Phoenix, AZ: Ornyx Press.

Pierce, P. R. (1935). The origin and development of the public school principalship. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Poole, W. L. (1994). Removing the "super" from supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9(5), 284-309.

Porter, A. (1987, April). A curriculum out of balance: The case of elementary school mathematics. Presentation to the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Washington, DC.

Reinhartz, J., & Beach, D. M. (1992). Secondary education: Focus on curriculum. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Reinhartz, J., Hadaway, N., & Trask, J. A. (1992). Teacher preparation programs and educational change. Contemporary education, 63(23) 294-297.

Reitzug, U. C. (1997). Images of principal instructional leadership: From super-vision to collaborative inquiry. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12 (4), 324-343.

Richardson, M. D., Short, P. M., & Prickett, R. L. (1993). School principals and change. New York, NY: Garland Publishing.

Sager, R. (1993). How to conduct collaborative action research. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sardo Brown, D. (1988). Twelve middle-school teachers' planning. The Elementary School Journal, 86(35), 69-87.

Schmuck, R. A., & Runkel, P. J. (1994). The handbook of organization development in schools and colleges (4th ed.) . Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1985). Landscapes, mindscapes, and reflective practice in supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 1(1), 11.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1998). Supervision: A redefinition. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Seyfarth, J. T. (1996). Personnel management for effective schools (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. <u>Educational Leadership, 53</u>(3), 12-16.

Silverman, D. (1993). <u>Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Siskin, L. S. (1991). Departments as different worlds: Subject subcultures in secondary schools. <u>Educational Administration Quarterly, 27</u>(2), 134-160.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). <u>Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school.</u> Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Smyth, J. (1991). <u>Teachers as collaborative learners.</u> Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Smyth, J. (1998). Is supervision more than the surveillance of instruction. In J. Glanz, & R. F. Neville (Eds.), <u>Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies</u> (pp. 286-295). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Smyth, J. (1995). <u>Some possible candidates for classroom observation by socially critical teachers and colleagues.</u> Adelaide: Flinders Institute for the Study of Teaching.

Spain, C., Drummond, H. D., & Goodlad, J. I. (1956). <u>Educational leadership and the elementary school principal.</u> New York, NY: Rinehart and Co.

Spears, H. (1950). <u>The high school for today.</u> New York, NY: American Book.

Stoldowsky, S. (1984). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. <u>Educational Researcher, 13</u>(9), 11-18.

Sullivan, C. G. (1980). <u>Clinical supervision: A state of the art review.</u> Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). <u>Supervision that improves teaching.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Toffler, A. (1971). <u>Future shock.</u> New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Tyack, D. (1974). <u>The one best system: A history of American urban education.</u> Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waite, D. (1995). <u>Rethinking instructional supervision: Notes on its language and structure.</u> London: Falmer Press.

Waite, D. (1997). Do teachers benefit from supervision? No. In J. Glanz, & R. F. Neville (Eds.), <u>Educational supervision: Perspective, issues, and controversies</u> (pp. 56-65). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Wanzare, Z., & da Costa, J. L. (2000). Supervision and staff development: Overview of the literature. <u>NASSP Bulletin, 84</u>(618), 47-54.

Wettersten, J. A. (1992, April) <u>High school department chairs as instructional leaders: Four case studies.</u> Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Wolcott, H. (1990). <u>Writing up qualitative research</u>, Qualitative Research Method Series No. 20, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wood, C. J. (1992). Toward more effective teacher evaluation: Lessons from naturalistic inquiry. <u>NASSP Bulletin, 76,</u> 52-59.

Wood, F. W., & Thompson, S. R. (1980). Guidelines for better staff development. <u>Educational Leadership. 37</u>(5), 374-378.

Worthington, J. E. (1940). Promising efforts for the educationally neglected. <u>Proceedings 74</u>(24), 36-45.

Wraga, W. G. (1998). The comprehensive high school in educational reform in the United States: Retrospect and prospect. <u>The High School Journal, 81</u>(3)_, 121-134.

Yin, R. K. (1993). <u>Applications of case study research</u>, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. K. (1994). <u>Case study research designs and methods</u> (2$^{nd}$ ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Zepeda, S. J. (1999). <u>Staff development: Practices that promote leadership in learning communities.</u> Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S. J., & Ponticell, J. A. (1998). At cross-purposes: What do teachers need, want, and get from supervision? <u>Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 14</u>(1), 68-87.

Zepeda, S. J., Wood, F. H., & O'Hair, M. J. (1996). A vision of supervision for 21$^{st}$ Century schooling. Wingspan, 11(2), 26-30.

APPENDIX A

Interview Guide

Interview 1

1) Tell me about instructional supervision in your building.

2) What would instructional supervision look like for your teachers?

3) Who supervises classroom instruction in addition to yourself?

4) What gets in the way of you being able to supervise teachers?

5) How do you compensate for "what gets in the way'?

6) Tell me about the best supervisory experience you have had with a teacher.

7) Tell me about the worst supervisory experience you have had with a teacher.

8) What were the tough issues in the worst supervisory experience?

9) How did other teachers respond to this experience?

10) What is the climate in your building as far as teacher receptivity to instructional supervision?

Interview 2

1) Anything new with the supervision of teachers since our last interview?

2) Has supervision changed since you started as a principal? If so, tell me about some of the changes in supervision and what has served to cause these changes.

3) Describe your "supervisory style with working with teachers.

4) How do you think teachers would describe the way you supervise them?

5) Think of what you think teachers want from supervision—what is it that teachers want from supervision, and;

6) How do you provide for these wants? What gets in the way of you providing for teachers' needs?

7) How do you establish and maintain trust while supervising teachers?

8) Tell me what trust issues have surfaced over the past few years and how you have dealt with the issues.

9) What is involved in building trust in regard to the supervision of teachers?

Interview 3

1) Tell me about your reflections since the last time we talked about your work with instructional supervision.

2) How do you suppose supervision is different at the elementary and middle school levels than from that at the high school level.

3) Are there any times you do not feel comfortable observing a teacher's classroom if you are not certified to teach in a particular area?

4) How do you believe teachers whose content background is different from yours think about the type of supervision and instructional support that you can offer to that person?

5) What do you do if you do not know or understand the content of a classroom you are entering to observe?

6) Have you ever been criticized for the type of supervision you either provide or do not provide?

7) How did you deal with these criticisms?

8) What gets in the way of you being able to supervise teachers?

9) How do you compensate for "what gets in the way'?

APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in the research entitled "What Issues High School Principals Encounter as They Provide Instructional Supervision for High School Teachers: A Case Study," which is being conducted by Gregory C. Gentry, a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Georgia, 706-369-7844. I understand that this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and have the results of my participation, to the extent that it can be identified as mine, returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The instructional supervision of high school teachers is an important task of the principal. Research describing the perspectives of high school principals on instructional supervision is sparse. The reason for this research is to examine how high school principals view instructional supervision and their role.

The researcher will "shadow" the participant (the high school principal) one day and conduct three interviews with the participant during the 2001-2002 school year. No discomforts or stresses are foreseen. Any information the researcher obtains about me as a participant in this study, including my identity, will be held confidential. My identity will be coded, and all data will be kept in a secured, limited access location. My identity will not be revealed in any publication of the results of this research. The results of this participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior consent unless otherwise required by law. The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and be reached by telephone at 364-252-5491. Dr. Sally J. Zepeda, assistant professor of educational leadership is directing this research project and can be reached at 706-613-5245.

My signature below indicates that the researcher has answered all of my questions to my satisfaction and that I consent to volunteer for this study. I have been given a copy of this form. Please sign both copies of this form. Keep one and return the other to the researcher.

_____

Signature of Researcher:                    Date:

_____

Signature of Participant:                    Date:

Note: Research at the University of Georgia that involves human participants is overseen by the Institutional Review Board. For questions or problems about your rights, please call or write Dr. Christina Joseph, Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, GA, 30602. Telephone (706) 542-6514. E-mail Address: IRB@uga.edu

CODING

|     | 1-1 | 2-1 | 3-1 | 1-2 | 2-2 | 3-2 | 1-3 | 2-3 | 3-3 | 1-4 | 2-4 | 3-4 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| IC  |     | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   |
| DIS | X   | X   | X   | X   |     | X   | X   |     | X   | X   | X   | X   |
| CIS |     | X   |     |     | X   |     |     | X   | X   |     | X   |     |
| RE  | X   |     | X   | X   | X   |     | X   |     |     | X   | X   |     |
| IP  | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   |     | X   |
| MS  |     | X   |     | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   |
| PTP | X   | X   |     |     | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   |
| CP  | X   |     |     |     |     |     | X   |     |     |     | X   |     |
| ET  | X   | X   |     |     | X   |     | X   |     |     | X   | X   |     |
| TR  |     | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   |     | X   | X   | X   | X   |     |
| C   | X   |     |     | X   | X   | X   |     | X   |     |     |     |     |
| EX  | X   |     | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   |     | X   | X   |     |     |
| AT  | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   | X   |     | X   | X   | X   | X   |
| CA  |     |     | X   |     |     | X   |     |     | X   |     |     | X   |

Issue of Constraints (IC)

Issue of Communication Process (CP)

Issue of Definition of Instructional Supervision (DIS)

Issue of Effective Teaching (ET)

Issue of Change of Instructional Supervision (CIS)

Issue of Trust (TR)

Issue of Role Entanglement (RE)

Issue of Control (C)

Issue of Priorities (IP)

Issue of Expert (EX)

Issue of Management Styles (MS)

Issue of Actions Taken (AT)

Issue of Perceived Teacher Perceptions (PTP)

APPENDIX D

Researcher's Perspective

As an instructional supervisor in a school in Georgia, I am often perplexed as to why some schools raise student achievement and others fail. All administrators attend similar training programs in leadership and must pass some type of required test for certification. One would assume that all supervisors have the same repertoire of tools to make their school successful.

I find that when I talk with other colleagues that their ideas on supervising teachers runs the gamut. These conversations often turn to the area of evaluation of teachers. Are we still locked in the mode that evaluation is the main goal of supervision? In my present job, I am forced to use the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI) as the tool for supervision. When I enter teachers' classrooms, I hear the magic words guaranteeing satisfactory scores. Words like "Let's review what we did yesterday" or "Good job, Johnny" or "Let's link this idea to a life experience." While I agree that this model provides for role clarification and tools for a successful lesson, I do not believe the teacher grows professionally under this process.

The main goal that I am challenged with each day is to improve student achievement within the building. Ideally, improving supervision would improve instruction, which would in turn, improve student achievement.

The present situation places staff development, coaching, and mentoring out of the realm of supervision. I have the opportunity to provide individual staff development, but this is seen as a teacher being deficient and needing remediation. This carries a

negative connotation, which I believe stifles teachers' professional growth. Once again, I have given teachers another educational term or phrase to use during the annual evaluation.

The principal's job continues to be a demanding, thankless, and never-ending task. For achievement to improve, someone in the school building must be the administrator. This may require some job duties and responsibilities to be passed on to other