AN EMPOWERING SUPERVISION MODEL

BY

Janette Sears

Department of Education

A Thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements

for the degree of Masters of Arts in Education

Saint Mary's University

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

Approved: _____
                Faculty Advisor

Approved: _____
                Dean of Education

Author Notes

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

This project explores the development of a supervision model which empowers teachers to be in charge of their own professional development. The work recounts the experiences of two teachers individually collaborating with a supervisor to develop solutions to questions each has identified from their own classroom and teaching practices. The project is based on the belief that teachers are active participants in their own learning. Once the active nature of the teacher-learner is recognized, teachers participating in the supervision process may use personal, practical knowledge, information from research, and information from other professionals to build knowledge. From various discursive fields, information is selected, brought to a conscious level, and it then becomes part of a personal and subjective understanding.

The empowering supervision model uses a process of dialoguing, problem posing, devising solutions, acting and reflecting on the actions taken. The teacher is actively engaged in making meaning of the actions taken and the results evidenced. Once teachers are familiar with the process, they may become independent in developing their own professional

knowledge and reflective about teaching practices.

This supervision model is contrasted to a supervision policy outlined in "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District" which is based on a clinical supervision model. The clinical supervision process outlined in this document stresses goal setting and data collection based on an understanding of effective teaching supported by empirical research. In the proposed empowering supervision, the emphasis is placed on the teacher's awareness of personal value systems and understandings about educational practices. These educational practices reflect thoughts and understandings which merit examination in a broad social context. Once teachers are familiar with accessing these value systems, they are empowered to be more critically aware of the implications of their practices. Issues relating to social injustices and social problems can be addressed through an examination of educational practices. In turn, thoughtful teachers are in a position to lead students in explorations of social issues and to encourage them to propose actions that address these concerns.

PREFACE

Teachers and administrators work together in school settings to meet the everchanging demands on education and educational practices. It is most important to consider the type of administrative support which is given to those teachers in the classroom who are on the front lines of these demands. One of the most important tasks of an administrator, is to help teachers with their continued professional growth. While there are many ways in which this support is given, the clinical supervision process, a structured process for analyzing teaching, allows for a close working relationship between the teacher and the administrator and focuses on concerns found within the teacher and in the classrooms.

Supervision is a word which scares many teachers. In many instances it refers to an accountability system, one which connotes a passing or failing. It also serves as a reminder of the power relations between the administrator and the teacher whereby the administrator often controls information and working conditions. In clinical supervision, or formative supervision, there is no intent to make evaluations; it focuses, instead on supporting teachers' professional growth efforts.

Such support for teachers is the intent of a support and

1

supervision process set up by the Pictou District School Board. This intent, outlined in a document "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness", was written and edited by educators and school board officials in the Pictou District School Board. It is within this support and supervision process that I find myself working and questioning.

Reflections On My Experiences

The relationship between language and thinking, language and learning, has been, for me, the most interesting question in education. My early teaching experiences were based in an elementary language arts program, both as a classroom teacher and as a language arts coordinator in an elementary school. I looked forward to discussing my work and ideas with supervisors and other professionals who shared interests, be it in formal supervision or informal discussions. In this latter position, I found time to work with teachers, to help them with students and to share information on new ideas and materials. There seemed always to be something new in language arts and, as the years went on, curriculum implementation became an important part of my job. I began to plan implementation strategies, some of the three-year variety, while others would take five years. Included in these were inservicing schedules, curriculum meetings, and guest lectures. Despite careful and calculated planning, there was still a question as to how all this information was used in the teaching that was taking place in the classrooms.

So-called 'teacher proof' materials from the great publishing houses were no match for the teacher's interpretations. On more than one occasion, I left discussions with teachers, frustrated by their inability to arrive at the same interpretations that I had reached on a topic. Recognizing the need for more information on how teachers/people understood, I returned to study. I had accepted the challenge of curriculum implementation seriously, and felt there must be a better way of doing it. It was during this time that I came to understand and value the active role played by the teacher/learner in making meaning and interpretations. It was time to recognize this active role, this autonomy, and try new methods to promote curriculum changes.

Upon returning to work,as a language arts coordinator I tried to establish closer working relationship with teachers. We shared students' problems, which often resulted in my trying of new techniques, ideas and materials. I researched information and shared it with teachers. I wrote about my insights. Work took on a new enjoyment, but I recognized problems. I was the one motivated to try new ideas and teaching methods. I was the one expressing the ideas. Teachers were still choosing to do their own thing, and were not choosing to experiment. Information was still travelling one way, from me to the teacher. The teachers often showed little motivation to try some of my ideas.

Life took on a different dimension when I began a new job as an administrator. I found myself interested in this

3

position when the school board adopted a clinical supervision model, which was to work toward effective instruction. The most appealing part of this supervision process lay in the opportunity for teachers to work toward goals "they" established. Finally, there seemed to be an opportunity for teachers to become actively involved in their own growth and to develop a sense of ownership in their own professionalism. Through a relationship with the administrator, teachers would be given help to work out problems, to get needed information, and to receive feedback from data collected. Finally, there appeared to be the opportunity for teachers to be autonomous, entering into conversations concerning their teaching, and entering into negotiations about what action to take. Real teacher growth could be facilitated in such a process.

The adoption of clinical supervision as a method of supporting teachers' professional growth reflected the Pictou District School Board's interest in being part of an overall plan by the Nova Scotia Provincial Department of Education. Along with representatives from the Nova Scotia Teachers' Union, the provincial committee made plans to support local districts in the establishment of supervision policies. Through the Inspection Services of the Department of Education, personnel were made available to act as consultants for the district, and workshops were made available to representatives from each school district. The Pictou District School Board, using these resources, and taking the lead, wrote a policy document describing the rationale and

4

methodologies to be used in teacher supervision. This document also defined effective instruction, using empirical research completed by Madeline Hunter (1977). This choice signified an interest in a clinical supervision format and reflected the belief in empirical research studies linking student outcomes to teacher behaviours in the classroom. The adoption of this research allows the administrator and teacher to study their behaviours in comparison to teacher-behaviours that have proven to be successful in research studies. Essentially, this research serves as a model for teachers.

The implementation of these policies and beliefs involved inservicing and sharing of experiences through dialogue. Inservicing occurred for teachers and administrators on both topics of supervision and effective instruction. The intent of the administrative inservicing and training was to help administrators become effective instructional leaders. At the same time, the growth purposes of clinical supervision were given a high priority. Administrators were trained to be less judgemental, and were encouraged to let teachers make decisions about their goals, their work and their effectiveness. Essentially, administrators were encouraged to let teachers take ownership in the process. The intent of inservicing teachers included an attempt to build trust in a collegial relationship with the administrator. There was great emphasis placed on the argument that clinical supervision was to promote growth, and not to be used in making judgements about the quality of instruction. This

5

emphasis was placed on growth, away from accountability, so that teachers would experiment with new instructional techniques and have support in their efforts from the administrator. Appropriate feedback from data collected would serve as the guide to success, and thus professional growth would occur. Another reason for inservicing teachers lay with the belief in establishing a common language about instruction that could be shared between the administrator and the teacher in the ensuing dialogue. The rationale for this decision is best described by McGreal (1983):

> Those districts whose evaluation systems have been viewed as effective have, in most cases, decided to adopt some narrowed focus on teaching. In other words, some particular perspective on teaching, complete with a set of definitions and language, is presented in a training format to all teachers and supervisors at the same time and in the same manner. Everyone is provided with a starting place, a common ground for looking at and talking about teaching, that is consistent throughout the staff. The concept of developing a consistent view of teaching is perhaps the major innovation to occur in teaching evaluation.... The existence of this commonality is a credit to the tremendous increase in the study of teaching that has occurred since the mid 1960's. (p.71).

Using this shared background information, teachers and

6

supervisors could openly discuss teaching technologies and old barriers would be broken down. The dialogue was to focus on behaviours, the teaching model, and quantitative measurements made through data collection. The teacher's goal choice was directed by the understandings and interpretations of the selected model of teaching. While teachers were encouraged to try new teaching practices, their choices were to be within the definitions and interpretations of effective instruction.

As an administrator within this system, I soon found myself amidst supervisions, observing such things as time on task and traffic patterns. The collegial relationships seemed to develop with work and with restraints from value judging. The discussions I held with teachers in our conferences centred on what we did and not on what we thought. On one occasion, I was very frustrated by a teacher who had me analyze traffic patterns of students during five different data-collection sessions, and who then expected me to tell her what this meant for her instruction. She waited for my interpretation, my information. She was not involved in making these decisions that were critical to her instruction. She was not actively involved in her own learning. She had accepted a power relationship which left her in a weakened position in her profession.

There were many supervision goal-setting conferences that were frustrating for me. While I was very familiar with each teacher's instructional practices, I believed in having the teachers take control and choose an issue that was of

7

importance to them and their classroom. This supervision process was offered as an opportunity to improve upon something that was valued by them in their classroom. On many occasions, I felt the goals reflected items the teachers believed were easy to correct, easy to see results in and, on more than one occasion, perhaps unnecessary in their situation. These were common frustrations among administrators who shared stories of experiences with supervision. Essentially, we administrators felt we were going through the motions, and were not convinced of the real value to teachers of these supervision experiences. We did not, however, want to jeopardize our relationships with teachers and this opportunity for them to take control of their professional growth. We hoped for better results next time around.

It was not long before I missed the opportunity to talk with teachers about curriculum strategies and ideas to foster student involvement in their learning. My ideas of child-centredness in language arts instruction, in math, and in all curricular areas, were replaced with information on teachers' behaviours in the classroom. This was an outside view of what good teaching should look like, a definition outlined by empirical research. How actively involved were the teachers in making decisions, in making interpretations, in coming to understand their work? I soon felt the teacher and I were limiting our professional development to one dimension, that dimension outlined in the chosen teaching model. Along with

8

a sense of inadequacy, I soon came to realize that teachers were looking to me to provide information about this chosen model. I had the information because of access and experience with other teachers. Old power barriers remained. While this may be considered a positive thing by some, it also had its drawbacks. I found myself in the same position as I had been in when working on curriculum implementation. Teachers were still waiting for me to provide the answers. Reflecting on one experience, I recall being worried that I was making all the decisions. In goal setting, I waited and finally offered some suggestions. In working out a solution or course of action, I waited and finally offered some suggestions. In conferencing after data collection, I waited again. Once more I offered some insights and, as with all other instances, I received approval for my ideas. The teacher felt the supervision was successful and she gained something from the experience. Essentially, her role had been passive. She must have had experiences and information to share. Why did this not happen? Was this partly due to the traditional power-barriers between administrator and teacher? Were teachers viewing supervision as an opportunity to merely please the administrator? How do teachers become active in problem-posing and problem-solving? If the goal of clinical supervision is indeed to foster professional growth, then teacher-learning must be defined in some manner which addresses the active or passive role played by the teacher. If one chooses to define learning as an active process, the

teacher must make more use of personal, practical knowledge built from experiences. How is this made possible in a clinical supervision process? How is the problem of teacher-motivation addressed in this model of supervision?

How important is it to have teachers become more involved in their own learning? It is generally accepted that education has problems defending its role in society. Are teachers to assume responsibility for reproduction of society as we now know it, or are teachers to lead their students into an awareness of the world around them, and thereby enabling them to become critical thinkers and solvers of the world problems? Are teachers to lead students in a passive search for "truth", which is defined and biased, promoting the status quo? For those who view the problems of the inequalities of race/ethnicity, sex, and class structures, there is an urgency for teachers and students to become critical thinkers, able to perceive and analyze problems in our society. Teachers cannot lead students, or our society, towards a more humanistic world, if they are left to be passive consumers of someone else's information. It appears that teachers must be considered active learners in their own professional development.

My spirits were raised upon reading an article, "Why Curriculum Fixing Doesn't Work", by Dianne Common (1988), who writes about a power-struggle between the experts who regarded teachers as agents and consumers of curriculum innovations. My assessment of my position, both as a curriculum leader and

10

as an administrator, placed me in the position of being one of those experts who thought they had all the answers. Most importantly, however, she pointed out that teachers have a much different view of themselves. They see themselves as active, thinking individuals who best know the needs of their students. They also know their own teaching practices and their classroom situation. Having this information puts teachers in a position of power. Common foresaw a power struggle between the teacher and the expert over the type of information that was put to use in the classroom. This view held by teachers might account for the feeling that I and other administrators had, that teachers, despite our efforts at professional development, including clinical supervision, would return to their classrooms, close their doors, and return to doing what they had always d ne. Perhaps part of the reason this was happening to us administrators is that we were not using enough of the information held by the teacher. What types of information does the teacher use in the classroom to make decisions? Where does the theoretical knowledge administrators carry fit into this scheme? Is there one party, in the relationship between administrator and teacher, who is not sharing information? Are we administrators perpetuating the problem in our approaches to clinical supervision? Are there enough opportunities for teachers to use their practical knowledge accumulated through their experiences? Is this information truly valued in the supervision process?

11

Besides these questions, I had other concerns. How was I to encourage teachers to become independent learners of professional expertise, beyond their involvement in the supervision process? How could administrators keep teachers from returning to their classrooms, closing their doors, and returning to their old practices? As a professional, I feel we must be involved in an ongoing process of learning. It is through a continuing effort to connect what is known with what is unknown that can lead to possibilities for risk taking. Through reflecting on actions taken, the teacher is continually revising and editing teaching practices. This kind of activity should not be limited to times when a supervisor is available. Are there any techniques that might be useful in clinical supervision that would encourage teachers to pose and to solve their own problems? Joyce and Showers (1982) referred to the development of 'executive control', which enables a teacher to think about his or her work and modify it as necessary. Teachers can decide what information and skills are of value in their situation, thereby transforming theory into practices. Such control allows the teacher an active role in posing problems, proposing solutions, and reflecting on successes and failures. This thinking about teaching, this 'executive control', should be in use every day. How can this be switched on in clinical supervision?

This research is a result of these questions that have arisen from my experiences with the scientific clinical

12

supervision model outlined in the document "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District" and my experience with language arts instructional methodologies. I want to use these methodologies to develop a perspective on supervision. I also want to close the gap between myself and the teachers when we discuss our work. I want them to take an active role in assessing their practices, an active role in deciding on new actions, and an active role in reflecting on their practices. I want there to have an open, honest relationship between myself and the teacher when discussing teaching practices. Forget the need for closed doors. Most of all I want to help teachers become empowered to take control over their own professional development, and to motivate them to do so. I want them to become critical thinkers. I want to use a supervision model as part of the means to accomplish these goals.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This project is designed to propose a model of supervision which may be used to empower teachers to produce knowledge about their profession. This empowering supervision model is a process through which supervisor and teacher dialogue about an identified educational question arising from the teacher's classroom experiences. This question is posed by the teacher, attempting to ensure an interest and motivation for a solution. The supervision process allows for gathering of information by both parties in a collaborative relationship. Together teacher and supervisor work out possible solutions and actions that can be carried out in the classroom. Through this process of identifying and acting, teachers and supervisors build information upon which to reflect and evaluate educational practices. A cycle of identifying, discussing, acting, and reflecting emerges and allows teachers an active role in professional knowledge production. Understanding the use of this process to produce knowledge places teachers in a position whereby they can be in charge of their own professional development and be life-long learners of educational practices in their own classrooms.

The empowering supervision model is based on information

14

on supervision practices relating to growth purposes, and on information from poststructuralist theory.

Poststructuralism is a mode of knowledge production which uses poststructuralist theories of language, subjectivity, social processes and institutions to understand existing power relations and to identify areas and strategies of change. Through a concept of discourse, which is seen as a structuring principle of society, in social institutions, modes of thought and individual subjectivity, (poststructuralism) is able in detailed, historically specific analysis, to explain the working of power on behalf of specific interests and to analyze the opportunities of resistance to it. It is a theory which decenters the rational, self present subject of humanism, seeing subjective and consciousness, as socially produced in language, as a site of struggle and potential change. (Weedon, 1987, p. 40-41).

This theory base allows one to examine the thinking processes of an active learner, taking into account the specific context and societal conditions which help shape knowledge. There has also been considerable reliance on the use of dialogue and the dialogical method outlined by Freire. (In Shor, 1987).

The most important premise behind the project is that teachers are active learners and need an active role in knowledge production. The empowering supervision model

15

attempts to honour and use teachers' knowledge and supports their knowledge growth through using their interpretations and understandings. A second premise framing this project is the relationship between thought and action. Using the concept of discursive field found in poststructuralist theory and the concept of subjective understandings, the supervision process honours the role played by the individual and the specific context in determining what is accepted as being important to understand and value. Through a process of dialoguing, these values we hold in discursive fields and our subjective understandings are articulated. The empowering supervision process is designed to allow articulation of these understandings and to create tensions that allow us to examine these beliefs, which will eventually determine the actions taken in practice. Through articulation, we understand our values and ideas more clearly. Through the process of adding information to create tensions, trying actions, which reflect possible solutions, and reflecting on the possible implications of actions taken, teachers and supervisors are, together, able to build knowledge which is important to teachers, supervisors and students, in that specific situation.

The empowering supervision model proposed is considered only a beginning point in which a school climate should develop to support an interest and attitude which values a search for knowledge about teaching. Through careful listening and dialoguing, teachers and supervisors support

16

other professionals in their building of professional knowledge and, consequently, acquire knowledge of each other professionally. This empowering supervision process would allow critical-thinking teachers an opportunity to emerge, becoming aware of and challenging their own teaching practices. In turn, teachers may be better prepared to assist students in becoming more critically aware of their programs and their possible implications. This prevents the education system from continuing to perpetuate the inequalities of the status quo, and opens possibilities for important societal changes.

The project was conducted using participatory research with the completion of two case studies. This participatory research "aims to develop critical consciousness, to improve the lives of those involved in the research process, and to transform fundamental societal structures and relationships". (Maguire, 1987, p.3). Supervisions were carried out using the proposed empowering supervision model with two teachers. As researcher, I acted as a participant in the process and assumed the role of supervisor.

Teachers were selected for this project through their expression of interest in the topic. I met with several administrators in Pictou District Schools and outlined the purposes and intentions of the project. These administrators approached teachers on their staffs who were reflective about their work, were not intimidated by a supervision process, and were interested in their professional development. I chose

17

two teachers who expressed a willingness to participate, based on the above criteria, and based on their job descriptions. I chose one teacher whom I felt I knew professionally and who taught in a lower elementary classroom. I was very familiar with the school context, having worked with this teacher for several years. I chose the other teacher because I knew her interest in professional development, but I did not know her professionally, did not know her school context, and was relatively unfamiliar with a junior high educational setting. These choices allowed for, and indeed demanded, variations in a supervision process which considers individual differences. These differences exist and are considered part of the process of getting to know each other professionally.

Administrators of the school buildings were invited to be part of the project in that they were kept aware of the progress of each supervision and were asked to comment on the present supervision policy outlined in "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District". They were asked for reactions to a critique I prepared on this supervision process outlined in the document. As well, the original committee members who drafted the document were asked to respond to the ideas found in the critique. Their ideas and experiences with the clinical supervision model and policy were noted and included, if appropriate to the critique.

Data collected on several occasions was considered to be the teacher's involved in the project and to be mine for the purposes of analysis. I made extensive field notes at the end

18

of each session, and at the end of each conference. We researched and read several articles related to the educational question raised by the teacher. All this information was used in our discussions which reflected on, and questioned further, the implications of our actions. These discussions directed the supervision process.

An attempt was made to encourage teacher-independence of thought and growth. The most important goal of these supervisions was to allow teachers to be active in knowledge production. The supervisions were carried out through a series of invitations to express their understandings and values about their work. Invitations were issued as to a number of possible actions and implications, always encouraging a sharing of ideas and information between the two partners. These case studies are intended to be an initial experience with such a process of knowledre production, and will reflect differences brought about by individuals in the process, the context, knowledge of each teacher professionally, and the different expectations of programming. The supervision process has potential for developing critical thing about teaching practices, but due to this beginning step, the need to develop reflective thinking was an important first stage, in a long-term project. The empowering supervision model provides a framework within which to begin the process.

CHAPTER 2

A CRITIQUE OF THE PRESENT SUPERVISION POLICY

Several years have passed since a group of administrators, teachers, school board members and central office personnel sat down together to formulate a policy for supervision in Pictou District Schools. Such a policy document frames our beliefs and how we think about teaching, learning, and supervision. We use such documents to make decisions about what problems are worth our attention, about defective practices, and about how inquiry should proceed.

The policy statement entitled "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District", formulated by this group, reflects their reliance on information found in "Successful Teacher Evaluation" (McGreal, 1983). This critique is directed toward the implicit theories of learning, instruction and supervision found in the policy document written by the Pictou District committee members and those ideas adopted from "Successful Teacher Evaluation".

Teacher supervision has two generally accepted purposes: as an accountability system and as a growth system. The two purposes are reflections of different sources of responsibility. Accountability purposes reflect the need for personnel to be accountable to the district school board and

the community served. Growth purposes reflect the need for personnel to be responsible to the students for providing high quality instruction. The latter purpose has received the greater emphasis in the policy document.

A supervision policy is written to enable the realization of the purpose of education. The first issue for clarification is one of ascertaining these purposes and then discerning how we are to realize these purposes through the supervision process. The long-term goals for education have not been articulated as part of the document to be analyzed. This critique, however, reflects the belief that the purposes of education form the underlying assumptions behind the approach taken to teacher growth, instruction and teacher supervision.

Why are we educating our youth? While this may appear to be a simple, even redundant, question to many, it is an important one to consider, especially in light of current social and political issues. During the last ten years, there has been a growing movement to the right in issues related to education. Efficiency, effectiveness and accountability schemes are growing in popularity in educational circles. The 'back to the basics' movement received positive reviews. In society, there has been a growing realization of prejudices toward minorities, and a move toward a strictly defined right and wrong. Schools have been asked to expand their roles into family situations bringing about a new involvement and opportunities for judging the 'correctness' of behaviours.

21

Morality is taking on a new importance and becoming a predominant issue. As a result of these factors and many other social and political issues, education and academic success is defined almost exclusively in terms of capital accumulation and how the marketplace works. Our students are being educated to compete for far too few jobs, and academic marks are determinants for interviews and possible hirings. Such an approach, answering the demands of the marketplace, creates individuals who operate in the interests of the state, a situation which and leaves education in a position of having a social function, primarily to sustain and legitimate the status quo. In fact, education is characterized as being without a social conscience and social consciousness (McLaren, 1989). Educators, who become busy with having the students they teach fit into a marketplace, easily overlook the need to consider those issues which reproduce the existing injustices of our society, leaving those students of a specific class, race or gender in a continued disadvantaged position.

This approach to education is difficult to change. Part of the problem is accentuated by the approach taken to teacher education and staff development. McLaren (1989) writes:

> When teachers, in their acceptance of the role of technicians, fail to challenge the ways in which educational curricula correspond to the demands of industry or the means by which schooling reproduces existing class, race, and gender relations in our society, they run the risk of transmitting to

disadvantaged students the message that their subordinate roles in the social order are justified and inviolable. (p.2)

When professional growth and professional development activities resemble those which have the potential for creating teacher technicians, we must be extremely cautious. In addition, pedagogues can limit the potentials for teachers to become involved in developing a social consciousness with their students. McLaren (1989) writes:

Furthermore the increasing adoption of management type pedagogues have resulted in policy proposals that promote a deskilling of teachers and the creation of a technocratic rationality in which planning and conception are removed from implementation, and the dominant model of the teacher becomes that of the technician or white-collar clerk. (p.5)

What is sadly lacking in this approach to education is any recognition of schooling in the process of social transformation and emancipation. Students need to become critical thinkers, and come to view the world as a place where their ideas may make a difference. This critical thinking and pedagogy comes through a curriculum that moves beyond a predesigned body of knowledge delivered in a technical delivery system. Lambert (1988) states:

The curriculum for the next century will require adults and children to think and care passionately

23

for we have moved past the age of implementation by receipt, or the educational two-step. Passionate commitment comes with the emancipation of our minds and our reattachment to purposes worth working for. Restrictive environments confine and smother creativity and purpose. (p. 668)

Teacher growth and professional development activities must free teachers to use their own minds, allowing and encouraging curricula which enable a redesigning of schooling.

A: Effective Instruction

Effective instruction and how it is perceived determine the directions for professional growth. From the long-term goals for schooling, which include building a social consciousness, it is evident that teachers and effective instruction are not to be interpreted as a technical function. The policy document "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness" reflects a reliance on research completed by Madeline Hunter (1976) which defines instructional effectiveness. This research is to provide the basis for goal setting, in the supervision process, thereby determining the approach to teaching and learning to be used in Pictou District.

Definitions for effective instruction, while complex and controversial, generally fall within two camps: those that focus on teacher behaviours, and those that focus on the

24

inter-relationships between teacher-thought and action. That camp concerned with teacher behaviours defines actions which lead to effective instruction, thus prescribing a technical interpretation of the teaching process. This 'correct' technical application of teacher behaviours leads students to achieve higher scores on standardized test results.

The policy document "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness" outlines support for focusing on teacher behaviours in the supervision process. This support is based on a belief in empirical scientific research, which explores the relationship between particular classroom instructional and management behaviours, and gains made in student achievement. Such research is based on the premise that students who receive their instruction directly from the teacher achieve more than those expected to learn material on their own or from each other (Rosenshine, 1983, p. 336).

Effective instruction is characterized in the policy document by the phrase "instructional delivery system". This metaphor was used by Sergiovanni in his article "Landscapes, Mindscapes and Reflective Practices" (1985), used to describe the research premises underlying the work completed by Madeline Hunter:

> This is an instructional delivery system through
> which knowledge and information must travel.
> Student outcomes are at one end of the line,
> teaching inputs at the other end. Care must be
> taken to keep the pipeline running smoothly,

obstructions being eliminated, and the line itself must be shaped to avoid blockages. Inputs must be properly sized to fit the pipeline, and a system of monitoring must be established to ensure every movement of this input through the line. Student outcomes need to be carefully checked to ensure they fit input intents. Improvements need to be made in composition and arrangement of the pipeline itself in an effort to maximize even further student outcomes at the lowest cost (p.8).

This metaphor clearly depicts teachers as technicians delivering a highly mechanical curriculum through direct instruction. Students are receptors of information. Teachers are receptors of a prescription of teaching behaviours. The relationship between teaching and learning is a result of what the teacher does, not what the teacher is. When we accept this view of teaching and learning, and define this as instructional effectiveness, teachers are viewed as weak links in the educational process, someone to be circumvented, or as technicians to be programmed. (Brophy, 1988, p. 74). Instructional effectiveness is so defined by "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District".

Effective instruction, which recognizes a relationship between teacher-thought and action, has a much different perspective on learning and teaching. Teachers' behaviours are not considered ends in themselves, but means toward ends. Context and specific circumstances surrounding instruction, a

26

teacher's objectives, his or her knowledge of methods, are part of an interpretative process found in effective instruction. This effectiveness is also influenced by the teacher's knowledge of subject matter, pedagogy, students, values and power relationship (Porter and Brophy, 1988). The teachers' ability and freedom to use this information is critical in effective instruction. Brophy, in his article entitled "Research on Teacher Effects: Uses and Abuses" (1988), states:

> Any effort that in effect imposes a single lesson format on all teachers in all teaching situations is simply invalid and cannot be justified by claiming it is supported by research on teaching effects (p. 16).

"The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District" indeed proposes that teachers use such a lesson format, effectively ruling out the possibility of exploring, in the supervision process, the relationship between teacher-thought and action in effective instruction. This has important implications for our students. If we accept the long-term goals of education to include developing critical thinkers, and a social consciousness-building, then we must have more thoughtful students. As Glickman and Gordon (1987) state: "Thoughtful teachers promote thoughtful students" (p. 64). It is imperative that a supervision policy include a definition of instructional effectiveness which allows the opportunity for teachers to use their own interpretations of

practices and experiences, their own valuing systems, and information from a variety of sources, to develop a relationship between teacher-thought and action. As it is presently written, the supervision policy document makes no allowance for developing this relationship.

B: The Question of Empowerment

Throughout the articulation of the purposes of education, and throughout the defining of effective instruction, it becomes evident that teachers should not be encouraged to become technicians but, instead, to develop critical thinking abilities, critical pedagogues and an involvement with developing curriculum and implementation strategies best suited to the needs of their students. This would become the 'recipe' for staff development activities. Part of such a plan would include the supervision process which has a growth purpose. This supervision process should propose methods which would enable such a growth process. Therefore it is appropriate to critique the availability of this 'recipe' in the policy document "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness."

Knowledge is power. Empowerment is a recognition of knowledge held and the sources of knowledge. In the present century, the highest rated form of knowledge is scientific knowledge, or that knowledge found through a rigorous empirical research methodology. Empowering teachers means a

critique of the superiority of this form of knowledge production, and an acceptance of the teacher's involvement in knowledge production. Encouraging and allowing teachers to use their personal practical knowledge and to develop the ability to critically analyze ones' educational practices and understandings empowers teachers. Allowing people to use their knowledge produced to take charge of their lives is the ultimate test of empowerment. Schulman, in his article "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth In Teaching" (1986) put this in perspective by writing:

> Reinforcement and conditioning guarantees behaviour, and training produces predictable outcomes: knowledge guarantees only freedom, only the flexibility to judge to weigh alternatives, to reason both ends and means, and then to act while reflecting on one's actions. Knowledge guarantees only grounded unpredictability, the exercise of reasoned judgement rather than the display of correct behaviour. If this vision constitutes a serious challenge to those who use a fixed behavioral criteria (e.g., the five step lesson plan), so much the worse for evaluators (p. 13).

Who holds and controls the knowledge in the supervision process which purports growth purposes?

Traditionally, knowledge production, which is used in staff development, professional development, and instructional

29

effectiveness projects, has been in the hands of researchers and experts who hand the information along to practitioners. According to this tradition, teachers are perceived as passive recipients of knowledge imported from the outside. Supporters of this approach believe the more teacher-proofed the package of information, the more likely the intended outcomes will be achieved. The underlying assumption behind this is perhaps best expressed by Sirotnik and Clark (1988) in their article "School-Centred Decision Making and Renewal" when they state:

> Educators in schools are not seen as professionals who can reflect on ways in which they might do their best work, but as workers deficient in one or more skills and in need of retraining. Schools are viewed as places in need of repair rather than as imperfect institutions that are continually changing. They are looked upon as objects to be changed, not as centres of change (p. 661).

Current research and thinking are challenging this tradition. According to an empowering perspective, teachers can control knowledge production. There is an acceptance of the personal nature of knowledge, whereby teachers, instead of focusing on implementing the given solution to a predetermined problem, can place the focus of inquiry on a problem defined by themselves. As educators, teachers can become actively involved in reflecting on a problem and its potential solution.

30

Lambert (1988), in her article "Staff Development Redesigned", speaks about the necessity of accepting this personal nature of knowledge in any professional-growth projects:

> Professional development requires access to multiple learning opportunities within an environment that fosters learning. The roles of leaders in the process - staff developers, principals, mentors, and other teacher leaders
>
> - must be facilitators who assist professionals in:
>
> - inquiring into and reflecting on practices
>
> - bringing to the surface and sharing knowledge of the craft
>
> - identifying and creating options
>
> - leading and working collaboratively
>
> - learning more about the state-of-the-art in the profession and
>
> - designing school and district systems that open opportunities and participation (p. 668).

The production of knowledge about instructional effectiveness, which is used as a 'curriculum' for teacher growth as outlined in "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District", is controlled by empirical scientific research which has been adopted and set as policy to be used in the supervision process. As this document is now written, there are few allowances made for teachers to produce and use their own information in setting goals, or in

31

developing strategies to realize these goals. As this document is now written, teachers are to become technicians, able to use specific teaching strategies outlined by the chosen model, and are to ask questions of their teaching according to current teacher-effectiveness research (The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, p. 10). Such research, regretfully, does not consider the active involvement of teachers in knowledge production.

The supervision process as outlined in this policy document sets a relationship between the supervisor and the teacher. Can power be shared in this relationship?

Clinical supervision is defined as an intensive process undertaken by a supervisor and teacher with the purpose of improving instruction. This process is divided into several activities which require a close collaborative relationship between teacher and supervisor. The activities include setting a goal for improvement of instruction, observing the lesson being taught, analyzing the collected data, and giving the teacher feedback about the observation. Clinical supervision, as described, centres around the supervisor and teacher analyzing teaching in terms defined by the teaching model. After analysis, prescribed behaviours can be applied by the teacher. Such a focus on teacher behaviours reflects one approach to clinical supervision, "scientific" clinical supervision. (Glatthorn, 1984).

Sergiovanni (1982) did not share the belief in a focus on teacher behaviour in clinical supervision. Instead, the focus

was placed on opportunities to build collegial relationships between supervisors and teachers. This focus would allow for a greater control by the teacher in their own growth, minimizing the emphasis on the predetermined goal-setting process found in the scientific clinical supervision process. Sergiovanni felt this would lead to greater teacher motivation. By using this approach, teachers receive assistance in modifying existing patterns of teaching in ways the teacher desires. Using information available to the teacher, perhaps from experience and prior knowledge, the teacher and supervisor work together to frame the question, solve the problem and reflect on its effectiveness. The ultimate goal is to be have effective clinical supervision provide opportunities to have the teacher want to self-improve, and have the skills to do just that (McGreal, 1983, p.27).

The policy document "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District" uses the "scientific" clinical supervision model and supports teacher growth through a "cooperative, constructive and continuous process that takes place in a atmosphere of mutual trust and respect" (p.1). It is, however, highly questionable if the supervision process, as outlined, motivates teachers to self-improve, especially beyond the specific supervision experience. Part of my scepticism here is due to the nature of power sharing possible in the proposed collegial relationship between teacher and supervisor.

Smyth (1985), in an article entitled "An Educative and Empowering Notion of Leadership" (1985), came close to describing the attitude which is conveyed by the choice of definition for instructional effectiveness found in the policy document, and to be the basis of the collegial relationship in supervision:

> Staff development amounted to experts providing how to do it prescriptions for the presumed defects of others. The problem with this approach it that it entrenches existing feelings of powerlessness, docility and subservience, features that have long characterized the relationship between rich and poor, young and old, those who have problems and others who are trained to assess and provide remedies... [They are] strategies that treat teachers in such demeaning ways as [being] passive consumers of someone else's knowledge (p. 181).

This feeling of powerlessness is maintained by the control of knowledge production being somewhere outside the person oi the teacher. Frymier (1987) saw the importance of an internal locus of control. He felt that many teachers believed the course of events was determined by phenomena which they cannot control. As a result, they "lack enthusiasm for what they do [and]... are not inspired to work hard, to learn, or to change. The reform of education doesn't even enter their minds" (p. 12).

The policies toward supervision and teacher growth
effectively rob teachers of the possibility to become active
in producing their own knowledge, and submit them to a feeling
of powerlessness, as they are once again given a prescription
of effective instruction. There is little doubt that many
teachers may experience a lack of enthusiasm, and the goals
for education, which include the raising of a social
consciousness, are indeed far from their minds.

Empowering teachers, which allows for active
participation in knowledge production, assumes there will be
individual differences which must be considered. Although the
policy document, as written, allows for no such differences,
beyond those who meet minimum competence requirements and
those tenured and non-tenured teachers who do not (p. 5-9), it
is abundantly clear there are different levels of professional
development. Teachers have varied backgrounds and
professional experiences, and teachers vary in the way in
which they relate among themselves, to their students and to
others. Differences are expected and accepted. Glickman and
Gordon (1987), in an article "Clarifying Developmental
Supervision", urged the acceptance of these differences in
supervision practices. They proposed these underlying
assumptions to supervision:

> Teachers differ in their ability to analyze
> instructional problems, to use a repertoire of
> problem solving strategies, and to match certain
> strategies to situations. Furthermore there are

variations within the same teacher depending on the particular instructional topic or timing of life events.

Second, because teachers operate at differing levels of thought, ability and effectiveness, they need to be supervised in different ways. Teachers at a lower development level need more structure and direction: teachers at a higher development level need less structure and a more active role in decision making.

The third proposition is that the long range goal of supervision should be to increase every teacher's ability to grow toward higher levels of thought. More reflective, self-directed teachers will be better able to solve their instructional problems and meet their student's needs. (p. 64).

The supervision policy would be greatly strengthened if the document would promote active involvement in knowledge production by teachers, and provide opportunities to accept professional development differences that go beyond minimum expectations. Recognizing those teachers who require directed supervision, and those who need a more active participation in the supervision process, would aid the goal of encouraging higher levels of thought among staff. The goals of schooling and education, producing critical and thoughtful students able to recognize and work through critical social and political

36

problems, should come into focus and become possible. Teachers need empowerment in a supervision model with the intended purpose of teacher growth. They do not receive this from the present supervision policy document.

It should be recognized that the policy document does allow goals to be set outside of the effective teaching criteria outlined by the selected teaching model. This practical goal setting approach, outlined in "Successful Teacher Evaluation" (McGreal, 1983, p. 58-69) suggests that teachers can choose from four categories of goals: organizational or administrative goals, program goals, learner goals, and teacher goals. As outlined, each goal is listed in increasing importance as to the effect of student learning. Each type of goal is expected to conform to some criteria laid down by someone other than the teacher. The administrative and organizational goal may be one chosen from the minimum expectations information. Program goals may be selected from the implementation strategies expected from a new program, or from the provincial guides, where specifics are outlined. Learner goals can be selected from the effective instructional model, or selected from information available on specific learning problems. As the teacher selects one of these goal types, neither the policy document nor "Successful Teacher Evaluation" takes into consideration the role played by the teacher in knowledge production. Indeed, they classify and rank in importance the types of goals they may choose, effectively eliminating the need for teacher thought in this

37

process. Once a goal is chosen a teacher can perceive how important the goal is ranked in the process. Once again, teachers find themselves in a judged position, one in which their powerlessness is accentuated.

C: The Question Of Accountability

A system to keep teachers accountable is contained in the policy document "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness". Accountability is perceived as an administrative function which ensures personnel meet minimum requirements related to school policies, appearance, professional attitudes, relationship with staff, students, community, etc. (McGreal, p. 37). Such minimum standards are outlined in the policy document in the section "Expectations" (p. 5). The sole purpose of this system is to have personnel departments maintain control over the dismissal of incompetent teachers. Teachers who fail to meet these minimum expectations receive help from a minimum of two supervisors, are issued warnings in writing, and will loose their position unless improvements are noted. The underlying assumption of such an accountability system is that, with rare exceptions, teachers are competent beyond the level of minimum expectations. This assumption has potential for creating difficulties. Points of concern about teaching competence above the level of minimum expectations, a very basic level of competence, may go unaddressed. While

38

"an ongoing and continuous appraisal of his/her success... is done during the administrator's daily contact and interactions with staff members" (p. 5), the value statements about a teacher's competence may differ from supervisor to supervisor. How a supervisor values certain professional attributes may be beneficial to those making decisions about staff placements. Indeed, once tenure is attained, personnel will receive no quantitative statements about a teacher provided they continue to meet minimum expectations. This could result in an information void if changes in job descriptions become necessary. As it now is written, the document needs to include the possibility for requesting a written supervisor's report on those teachers wishing job transfers, when the need arises. A third difficulty could result from the lack of opportunities for making value statements about the quality of a teacher's work. While this may be done verbally in the daily supervision visits to the classrooms, recognition and reinforcement of what is perceived as excellent teaching becomes unfocused and is not directly encouraged. In summary, the potential for difficulties in this accountability system arises from the lack of an ongoing valuing system, a lack which could result in inadequate information being available to those making personnel decisions.

Stiggens (1986), in an article entitled "Teacher Evaluation" Accountability and Growth Systems - Different Purposes" states:

Most school districts ask one evaluation system to

39

serve two purposes. In my opinion this cannot work. Accountability needs may be served. Unfortunately, however, teacher improvement needs are not. In fact, one could argue that teachers's growth has been suppressed through a fear of trying anything new, especially if expectations and the cost of improving are not well defined (p. 53).

The policy outlined in "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness" makes this separation clear and concise. Supervisors are directed never to use information gathered in formative supervision (supervision used to promote professional growth) for the purposes of accountability. Neither are supervisors to make value judgements about a teacher's work when using formative supervision. The district policy outlined has accepted Stiggens' opinion that one evaluation system cannot serve two purposes, and has greatly strengthened the potential for the professional development or growth purposes of this supervision system.

D: Summary

The greatest strength of the policy document "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness" lies in the opportunity provided for teachers and supervisors to work together on issues concerning instruction and professional development. By using these opportunities appropriately, a renewed focus on teaching and learning may resurface.

The contributors to this policy document made a wise decision by separating the accountability system of supervision from that system designed to promote growth. This separation enables both systems to be true to their purposes.

This document was written several years ago, using current research information available at that time. Since that time, educational purposes have changed and new demands for developing a social conscience are being made on education and educators. There is a new need for having thoughtful teachers, and in turn, thoughtful students who are able to critically analyze and process information. New information about teacher growth and learning enables teachers to become empowered in knowledge production and take charge of their own work. This new information must be reflected in an updated policy of supervision.

Necessary changes include:

- Going beyond considering instructional effectiveness as an issue to be decided only by teacher behaviours and

predefined sets of criteria. Effective instruction must take into consideration teacher thought, experiences, and specific situations.

- Not limiting supervision topics to those available from a predetermined priority list. Teachers have topics of interest and concern that can be used and should be considered of top priority because it is their concern. This provides opportunity for motivation and thus, growth.

- Considering different levels of development when supervising teachers, beyond those of tenure and non-tenure. Allow those who are independent to make their own decisions and provide a more structured supervision for those who are not.

- Articulating accountability procedures, so as to provide adequate information to those making staffing decisions.

By choosing to make these adaptations to the clinical supervision model, and by empowering teachers in knowledge production about their work, the full potential for teacher growth could be realized.

CHAPTER 3

A CASE FOR AN EMPOWERING SUPERVISION MODEL

What working relationship between education administrators and teachers best promotes professional growth?

This has been the single, most critical and controversial question arising since I began to work with teachers in the supervision process. How could I be most effective in helping teachers with their professional growth? This question becomes even more critical as we administrators attempt to meet the education challenges of the nineties. Two concepts, 'relationships' and 'growth', found in the question, will help frame my search for an answer.

A: Relationships

How can the existing relationships between administrators and teachers be characterized? Much of this characterization is based on experience, perceptions of what has happened historically and what we as administrators and teachers expect from the relationship.

Historically, administrators and teachers have relationships where the two are separate and distinct, because of their job descriptions. Administrators are given roles which relate to administrative duties and curriculum

43

responsibilities. Management concerns keep us busy with bureaucratic business. Administrators have a predefined position of power because their role calls for keeping teachers accountable and because the education system is hierarchical. In keeping teachers accountable, administrators must make value judgements about the worth of a teacher's work. This task, in itself, separates the teacher and administrator. Curriculum responsibilities provide us administrators with sources of information which will involve implementation plans and strategies. In the meantime, teachers are kept busy with their own concerns, those related to the everyday management of their classrooms, their programs, and their students. Teachers and administrators have different foci, and thereby approach the relationship quite differently, each carrying their own understandings of what is important and their own interpretations of the educational process.

While we have different perceptions of the educational process, we do have common concerns about instruction and curriculum. This is the place where our minds meet. Teachers come to meetings with understandings about the curriculum, about the students and about the instruction in their classrooms. I, in my role as administrator, come to the meetings with information gathered from my experiences, my readings, and from curriculum experts and 'outside' authorities. The relationship formed centres around sharing this information. Our information sources are quite

44

different.   Does this difference in knowledge production affect the relationship?

Knowledge is a source of power and control (Garrison, 1988).   Who has hegemonic control of knowledge and its production?   In other words, whose knowledge is dominant and sustained as dominant through the present clinical supervision process?   If the potential of the relationship is to be realized, this question must receive clarification.

Certain specialized knowledge has become the single most important basis of power and control in today's world (Tandon, 1981b in Maguire, 1987 p.2).   Administrators, including myself, have built up bodies of 'expert' knowledge about curriculum and instruction.   This knowledge, available to us in administrative training programs and continual inservices usually originates in research.   The "scientific" form of knowledge is the most powerful form of knowledge in the late twentieth century (Garrison, 1988).   Through the writing and wide-spread distribution of such "scientific" research, it is perceived as the "only valid way of knowing".   Research is conducted in a manner which reflects underlying assumptions about how knowledge can be produced, and reflects the purposes intended for knowledge production.   As an administrator, there is a very high probability that the knowledge I have to share in a supervisory relationship with a teacher is based on "scientific" research findings and knowledge production, since my practical information is limited by my job description, and my experiences with information come from writings and

speakers from outside the classroom. What does this mean about the relationship that can be formed?

"Scientific" research, which is often referred to as empirical-analytical research, is grounded in a positivist view of the world. Positivism is a form of inquiry in which social phenomena are understood as being 'out there', ready for observation, and quite separate from the knower. This assumes that social reality exists externally to human consciousness and human creation. Under this premise, knowledge production is objective and value free (Maguire, 1987 p.15). Knowledge is produced so that laws and theories can be generated to account for the regularities in observable social behaviour (Maguire, p. 14). The information that is generated by research based in positivism is factual and kept separate from personal feelings. Once this separation is made, theory is considered quite apart from, and different than, practice. This separation is made once there is an adherence to the formal methodological requirements of the scientific method of knowledge production (Popowitz, 1984; Fay, 1975; in Maguire, p.15). Facts produced can be ordered into laws and from these laws, predictability is possible. "Once we can predict events, we can control them" (Bachead, 1972:52 in Maguire, p.23). Thus predictability and control are closely related to the positivist approach. With this control comes a support for unity, cohesiveness and evolutionary change of the status quo.

Information that I, as an administrator, carry to a

meeting with a teacher is based on such research findings that I have read or been lectured on in inservices, conferences, etc. Through having a position of power because of job description, and through having such legitimate knowledge based in positivism, I have had a superior position in the relationship. But through my desire to have teachers take a more active role in these meetings and in their own professional development, I am left with questions. Is this, in fact, the view that most teachers have of their relationships with administrators? Are teachers given a role to play, a power position, by administrators who consider that teachers have a role in knowledge production in the relationship?

There has been considerable research into how teachers are viewed by administrators and experts. Their role in knowledge production has also been explored. Teachers are effectively eliminated from the active process of discovering knowledge and are assigned passive roles as consumers of a final scientific product (Freire, 1987; Garrison, 1988; Glickman, 1989; McNeil, 1988; Smyth, 1985). Teachers are assigned passive roles in curriculum development and innovations (Abbot, 1965; House, 1954; Auki, 1977; Young, 1977). But it is not just in knowledge production that teachers are viewed and treated as passive. The same attitude applies to their involvement in curriculum delivery. Perhaps Clandinin (1988) best describes the attitude when she writes:

Teachers are viewed as mere conduits of theoretical

47

and cultural knowledge embodied in various curricula, teaching approaches and policies. The teacher is viewed as merely an agent fulfilling someone else's intentions, a transmitter of external knowledge. (p. 3).

Although teachers are actively producing information and knowledge as they teach, and have the power to do this within the confines of their classrooms, they receive little recognition, if any, of this knowledge production and power in meetings where information is to be shared. Knowledge production is considered a nearly monopolized industry (Garrison, 1988). Teachers are set up to be consumers and are kept in that position. Yes, it is most conceivable that teachers would understand the concepts uncovered by this approach to knowledge production. But, they are kept in a position of not being able to discuss the concept because they lack the terminology. Greenfield (1982) spoke about this power of language:

It literally makes reality appear and disappear. Those who control language, control thought - and thereby themselves and others. We build categories to dominate the world and its organization." (In Sergiovanni, 1985,p. 8).

How many times I have had teachers tell me about experiences with teaching, were they have been left surprised

by a result, only to have me respond by imposing an explanation from a theory, using terminology which reflected information from a positivist perspective. Teachers could explain the phenomena, but often administrators and curriculum experts are anxious to explain using an outside framework from research. This explanation is often given to legitimate the teacher's experience. But was it not legitimate before this explanation? This kind of reaction places the teacher in a position of subservience and powerlessness, even docility. Why should teachers not expect explanations about their work, answers to questions which might arise in their classroom, if we, as administrators and curriculum experts, have all the explanations from research? Essentially, I, as an administrator and curriculum person, have led the teachers to believe that I could do this, leaving them in a position where their own information and explanations are not valued. Why should they put effort into such knowledge production?

How must teachers feel about their profession and their role in knowledge production? Teachers are finding themselves in a profession which is intellectually limiting to them, where they are often able to make few, if any, decisions about content and methods (Wildman and Niles, 1987; Freire, 1987). The "scientific" approach to knowledge creation has provided them with a way to view reality in their classrooms, and has also provided the questions and the answers. The kind of knowledge teachers have acquired from their experiences in teaching and their practices counts for little. Garrison

49

(1988) expressed the predominant view of experiential knowledge:

> "Of course teachers have a great deal of practitioner knowledge, but because only scientific knowledge is considered legitimate, their practical knowledge is devalued to a point where it imparts little if any power to the practitioners who possess it." (p. 446).

Is there room for practical knowledge in the relationships I share with teachers? Can it be accepted that "we both know something, neither of us knows everything, working together we will both know more, and we will both learn more about how to know"? (Maguire, 1987, p. 37-38). As an administrator who wants to move away from putting the teacher in a powerless and subservient role, as an administrator who wants teachers to have more power and control in producing information which will inform their work, I must have the teacher assume a more active role in knowledge production. No longer can I pass out treatments, solutions and analyses which place teachers in passive, docile roles. The partnership must allow for a sharing of information. This means that, as an administrator, I must forfeit power found in knowledge, which I have gathered outside classroom experiences, and work toward a balancing of power through acceptance of teachers' practical experiential knowledge. In this manner, I can enable teachers to become active in their own professional development, using subjective realities to

analyze their experiences, posing questions about their practices, proposing actions to be followed, and after implementing these solutions, reflecting on their effectiveness. Teachers must receive this empowerment to produce their own information if they are to become active in their own professional growth.

How do I, as an administrator, have teachers become more active in knowledge production, and thus gain control and power in their profession?

The dominance of the positivist approach to knowledge production may provide the key to change. The positivist view of reality separates reality from the human consciousness and human creation. There is a dehumanization of knowledge which has separated the known from the knower. This approach suggests that people are passive spectators rather than active subjects in the world (Maguire, 1987, p. 18). An alternative to this view can be found in research which "stresses the importance of human subjectivity and consciousness in knowledge creation" (Maguire, p. 18). The teacher is an active participant in knowledge production when subjectivity and consciousness are considered. This consideration is based on the view that outlined by Patton (1975):

> "... it is not possible for us to view the complexities of the real world without somehow filtering and simplifying those complexities. The act of filtering and simplifying effects what the observer sees because it necessarily brings into

play the observer's past experiences of the world. In
the final analysis, this position means we are always
dealing with perceptions, not facts in some absolute
sense..."(before In Maguire, p. 19).

This approach to understanding the creation of knowledge
places the teacher in a position whereby reality is linked
with experiences and actions taken in the classroom. The
traditional separation between knowing and doing is broken
down and the teacher's practical knowledge is accepted.
Subjectivity and consciousness form the basis of knowing. In
this manner, teachers are recognized as active and autonomous
agents in their classrooms.

As an administrator who wants to motivate teachers to be
involved in their own professional growth beyond a specific
supervision experience, and as an administrator who wants to
promote a relationship which will facilitate this independent
growth, I want teachers to be empowered in creating knowledge
about their work. Our relationship must develop a new
closeness. Patton (1985) argues that:

> without a close emphatic interpersonal interchange and
> relationship, researchers (administrators) will find it
> impossible to gain meaningful insights into human
> interaction or to understand the meaning people give to
> their own behaviour" (before In Maguire, p. 21).

Teachers and I discuss issues that, from their

perspective, are important to their work, and discuss that reality experienced in their classrooms. What they think is important has as much value as the knowledge I bring to the relationship. Smyth (1988) advocates this approach:

> What I am talking about involves working intimately with teachers on their own terms, on their own turf, on issues that are genuinely theirs. This necessitates starting from where they are, not from where we think they should be. It involves accepting their problems and concerns are the really important ones. (p. 189).

I need, as administrator, to downplay the power inherent in the position, and abandon my position behind my desk and find a new position beside the teacher, developing a feeling of "withness". Smyth (1985) described the relationship that allows for exchanging meanings:

> Work with people rather than on them, so they can focus on the dailiness of teaching, extracting meaning from it, and in the process communicate about the nature of these meanings. What it really amounts to is generating knowledge about teaching in a social and cultural way. Generating knowledge about teaching and professional practice in this manner, enables meanings to be exchanged, talked about, but above all, to be modified and changed (p. 180).

Why is allowing the teacher to have more power in knowledge production so important to me? From my experiences with teachers, both as an administrator and as a curriculum leader, and yes, as a teacher, too, I have come to have a firm belief in the need for professionals to be in a constant process of learning about their profession. The demands on our students and on ourselves by the society of the nineties means we must be critically conscious of social problems and concerns. We can no longer accept the status quo and continue reproducing society as it now exists, with inequalities found in race, sex and class, to name but a few. We must allow teachers to have power in relationships with administrators, especially where it concerns their analysis and work, for it is teachers who are to stimulate and lead our students into solving society's problems. Teachers who are not finding their profession intellectually stimulating will have great difficulty making the necessary alternations to their teaching. Freire (1987), in an attempt to perceive methods to provide effective change - agents in education, wrote:

> Equality is excellence because inequality leads to alienation. Excellence without equality only produces more inequality. Inequality leads to learning deficits and to alienation... as one solution, equality empowers people and raises the aspirations in school and society. Power and hope are sources of motivation to learn and to do (p. 13).

B: Professional Growth

As an administrator in partnership with teachers, I am attempting to provide opportunities for teachers to take charge of their own professional growth through their active role in knowledge production. Empowering teachers in this manner is dependent on two understandings: that we can produce knowledge in a social context, and that there is a relationship between what we think and what we do as professionals.

The first understanding necessary for accepting that knowledge can be produced in a social context or dialogue, depends on our willingness to accept that human consciousness has a role to play in creating knowledge. Essentially this means that the teacher's individual consciousness is placed at the centre of meaning creation and allows for their subjectivity and uniqueness. If we administrators can accept such an active role for teachers, then we must also realize the vital role played by specific contexts which set up the opportunities for teachers to create meaning. This means that teachers will relate what they know to what is done in the classroom, and indeed, what the teachers experience will be related to what is known.

The idea that meanings flow back and forth between what we think and what we do is critical to my argument for empowering teachers in the relationship between administrators

and teachers. This relationship between thinking and doing, between theory and action and between reflection and action, reflects "praxis" or a dynamic interplay between the two (Maguire, 1987, p. 3). The nature of this interplay is described as dialectical, with theory and practice being viewed as inseparable and practice is seen as theory in action. Clandinin (1988) describes this interplay: "The essential task of the dialectical is to resolve oppositions in theory, oppositions in practice and oppositions between theory and practice." (p. 20). Teachers are in a constant process of taking actions based on what they know, and, in turn, devising actions based on what they think about. As professionals, we are continually trying to make sense of our world and our work in this manner. Elbaz wrote of the practical knowledge formed in this way: ".. the world of practice continually shapes the teacher's knowledge and, conversely, how the teacher herself structures the practical situation in accordance with her knowledge and her purposes." (In Clandinin, 1988, p. 20). Our knowledge as professionals is shaped and re-shaped as we think and take actions in our classrooms. We are active creators of information and knowledge.

The interplay between theory and actions is mediated by the professionals' use of language. Language, considered in concrete terms, is referred to as an utterance. The utterance is considered concrete, and thus requires the context of both the speaker and listener. Through this relationship between speaker and listener, or teacher and teacher, or administrator

56

and teacher, language and knowledge production become a social process (Quantz and O'Conner, 1988, p. 97). Language is the tool for the analysis of such social processes, and it is also the link between what we say and do. Language, or speech, which is internalized, works with the individuals consciousness to form our ideas and thoughts. Thus, how professionals use language is critical to understanding how administrators can facilitate teacher's professional growth.

Language used by professionals in establishing the relationship between theory and practice may be considered passive or active. Using language in a passive relationship between theory and practice means that it is used as representational of existing normative beliefs and power structures.

Theoretical knowledge, traditionally considered superior to practical knowledge, has this status primarily due to the fact that it can be articulated, and that it is believed to be systematic, scientific, objective, and it is used to make generalizations about educational practices. The kind of language used in such a theoretical description of an educational practice is representational of existing conditions or of the status quo. In this way, the language used in theoretical statements may be considered passive. Cherryholmes (1988) describes the relationship thus:

> "A theory or explanation is educational only if it accounts for what is educational about phenomena. Insofar as activities, rules, commitments,

57

interests, ideologies, and power structures constitute educational practice; insofar as theories or explanations are attempts to represent practice; it necessarily follows that constitutive elements of practice are represented in some way in these theories and explanations... When it comes to empirically based theories of social practice, the theory/practice distinction erodes, because normative commitments and power structures that constitute practice must be found in theoretical representations of practice, otherwise they do not describe the phenomena" (p. 82).

Through using only the language of a theoretical construct, teachers and administrators are buying into a passive view of the relationship between theory and practice, making it difficult to move beyond this 'given' knowledge.

Practical knowledge is tacit, subjective, less systematic, non-scientific and is most interested in teachers' values, ideologies and commitments made in specific contexts. Practical knowledge used in educational practices is constituted by certain rules, activities, commitments, ideologies and power structures. With practical knowledge there is an active role for language. Cherryholmes (1988) describes this active role:

"A theoretical formulation is a speech act and a description and explanation. Several things are done with theoretical formulations and

58

explanations. First, a description is given which
may be true or false. Second, the description
refers only to brute (concrete) movements or
objects, but to constitutive rules, commitments,
interests, ideologies and power structures. Third,
insofar as utterances can reproduce practices, they
do. Theoretical statements and explanation then,
as speech acts reproduce the phenomena: (p. 82).

This active view of language used in describing the
relationship between theory and practice can be used in making
changes through considering those aspects of practical
knowledge which are personal and context specific. Knowledge
can be produced through considering and accepting practical
knowledge. Administrators, who hope to facilitate changes in
education which are responsive to the needs of society in the
nineties, must help teachers become aware of theoretical
constraints and help teachers use their practical experiences
as a source of information which can effect changes in their
practices. This active view of language is critical.

While communication is characterized by a continual flow
of interactions and responses, we seldom relate this process
to a dialogue which operates within an individual. Our
consciousness begins to operate with this dialogue. Bakhtin,
in his writings on individual consciousness, suggested that
individuals first acquire language as part of their social
interactions This speech is internalized and becomes part of

our inward speech process. Through this inner speech, using the language we have discovered in social relations with others, our inner speech and thoughts are related to the social world. Administrators and teachers who can accept this view of our consciousness, can not consider inner thought to be mechanical. Instead we are free to understand our thoughts as being a part of a dynamic process of internalized dialogue (Quantz and O'Conner, 1988, p. 97).

Our internalized dialogues use language based on our experiences with the social world. These thoughts, which we develop through our use of language, reflect our conscious and unconscious thoughts. "Subjectivity is used to refer to the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding the world" (Weedon, 1987, p. 32). Our subjectivities are sites for conflicts. It is here that we must decide what to value, what to understand and how to understand. This very active role for individuals in knowledge production is described by Weedon (1987):

> As we acquire language, we learn to give voice - meaning - to our experiences and understand it according to particular ways of thinking, particular discourses, which pre-date our entry into language. These ways of thinking constitute our consciousness, and the positions with which we identify, structure our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity . Having grown up in particular

systems of meanings and values, which may well be contradictory, we find ourselves resisting alternatives. Or, we may move out of familiar circles, through education and politics, for example, we may be exposed to alternative ways of constituting the meaning of our experiences which seem to address our interests more directly (p. 33).

Each teacher and each administrator has unique thoughts on education issues. For instance, research about effective instruction has given particular meanings about their work. Information about process learning contradicts the premise that direct instruction, as outlined in effective instruction research, is the most valid approach to teaching. Teachers and administrators face conflicts between their sources of information. Perhaps more conflicts arise from their practical knowledge and experiences when weighed against this information. Such conflicts receive resolutions in the individuals' subjectivities when they think about the issues. While some professionals, either administrator or teacher, may remain resolute on the information, or their interpretation of the information, about effective instruction, such as that found in "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District", others may look for more information which will enable them to interpret and understand issues and their experiences quite differently. The purpose of the proposed supervision model is to empower teachers to access information

which will bring about conflicts in their subjectivity that must receive resolution and therefore, possibly, change.

The resulting conflicts between meanings arising in our subjectivities mean there are contradictions in what should be valued, or how one should understand. Meaning is precarious, not set in stone. In fact, each time we think or speak, meaning is in the constant process of being reconstituted. Our subjectivities are the centre for meaning-making and negotiating new meanings. Our subjectivities are formed in the dynamic internalized dialogues begun through interactions with the social world, the dialogues we have with each other. For this reason, the dialogues we have with each other in the teaching profession become the single most critical activity in determining professional development potentials. The clinical supervision model accepts goal setting as the most important activity in the process. The empowering supervision model intends to stimulate subjective conflicts so new meanings can be created through dialogues. In the empowering supervision model, conferencing and discussions become the most important activities.

"Subjectivity is a synonym for motivation" (Freire, 1987, p. 24). By definition, material that has gained recognition in the subjective or is of subjective concern, must be important to those studying it. Subjectivity connects experiences with critical thought, and demonstrates that intellectual work has tangible purposes in our lives. It also ce· :res on the concrete circumstances of the living, that part

of educational practices that critical learning may help to recreate (Freire, 1987, p. 24). Teachers allowed to raise their own issues will have a personal investment in the topic. Administrators have worried that teachers may choose goals without that personal investment. Goals chosen may appear to be legitimate in that they are found in the outlined criteria. Experienced teachers sometimes choose goals which are easy to attain. Others choose goals that do not reflect perceived needs in the classrooms. Thus teacher motivation to participate in the supervision process is suspect and a concern for administrators. By allowing teachers the right to choose issues arising from conflicts originating from their understandings of educational issues and allowing teachers to use their subjective understandings of educational issues, the concern over motivation may be alleviated.

Discourse, as a concept, acts as a structuring principle of society in social institutions, modes of thought and in individual subjectivity. Discourses become ways to think about our world, thus constituting our consciousness, our subjectivity, and our sense of ourselves (Weedon, 1987). The concept of discursive field was produced by Foucault, in an attempt to understand the relationship between language, social institutions, subjectivity and power.

> Discursive fields consist of competing ways of
> giving meaning to the world and/or organizing
> social institutions and processes. They offer the
> individual a range of modes of subjectivity.

63

Within a discursive field, for instance that of law or family, not all discourses will carry equal weight or power. Some will account for and justify the appropriateness of the status quo. Others will give rise to challenge existing practices from within or will contest the very basis of current organization and the selective interests it represents (Weedon, 1987, p. 365).

The concept of discursive field allows us, as administrators, to understand that teachers, and indeed ourselves, may be and often are operating, making decisions, and understanding, using quite different subjectivities. These differences are brought about by our interests and what we choose to attend to in a discourse. Teachers and administrators alike will value practical experience differently. Each individual will value and interpret theoretical knowledge, based on research, differently, although each has been exposed to the pressures of the predominant form of knowledge production. In the supervision role, administrators may have concerns about instructional issues that are of little interest to the teacher. The empowering supervision model attempts to allow opportunities for each partner in the relationship to have time to understand and articulate what they value in their work. They also have an opportunity to discuss why they have these values and understandings. By bringing such issues to the subjective conscious level, the issues can be confronted

the subjective conscious level, the issues can be confronted and better understood. This ongoing process of talking and listening extends beyond the specific experience of supervision. This is essentially a process of getting to know each other professionally. This requires time, effort and acceptance of differing interpretations, ideas and values, by each party. Each individual has discursive fields which must be better understood, so that our theories and beliefs, upon which we base our actions, can be brought into the open, and possible negotiations with ourselves and others, whether teacher or administrator, can begin.

If the supervisor is able to accept that teachers, supervisors and students bring their own beliefs, assumptions, values, opinions and preferences to the classroom, then meaning is bound to a specific context. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to have objective and value-free supervision. The ideas of objectivity and logic in supervision are dispelled by Schon (1984): "... though one may be comfortable in viewing supervision as a logical process of problem solving, a more accurate view may be a process of "managing messes" (Sergiovanni, 1985, p. 11). These "messes" are part of a particular context and each context has its own language and teaching events. "Since reality in practice does not exist separate from the persons involved in the process of teaching and supervising, knowing cannot be separated from what is to be known." (Sergiovanni, 1985, p. 12). Experience, practical knowledge and the teacher's active role in knowledge

creation is inherent in this view of reality. Glickman (1989) applies this view to supervision:

.   "Supervision must shift decision making about instruction from external authority to internal control. This is the only way, on a large and long-term scale, that supervision will improve instruction.   As long as decisions come down from authorities far away from those who teach, we will have dormant, unattractive work environments that will stymie the intellectual growth of teachers and the intellectual growth of students (p. 8).

The concept of discursive field is also important in considering the working environment. Again, supervision is a small part of the opportunity for working professionally with others.   The discursive field concept accepts that the surrounding context of the worker will influence how one thinks about what one does. This has incredible value when administrators want to create a positive learning environment for teachers. Through administrators' abilities to articulate their own interpretations and values about how children learn, how teachers facilitate that learning, and through encouraging a dialogue whereby other professionals do likewise, an interest in professional growth is stimulated. In this manner the supervision process becomes a felt process which goes beyond 'doing it' for supervision's sake.

"Learners enter into the process of learning not by

66

acquiring facts, but by constructing their reality in social exchange with others" (Freire, 1987, p. 34). Realities are created through dialogues. Information from these dialogues acts upon our inward dialogues, giving rise to our subjectivity. Freire proposes an education that uses this principle of social exchange and urges both parties to act as co-learners. The empowering supervision model is based on these principles and ideas proposed by Freire. In the supervision process, the social exchange is carried out in the conference. The goal of this dialogue is to promote critical thinking and action. Through this kind of learning, teachers will gain more control over their lives, and what they think and do within those lives. Freire writes:

> Critical thinking starts from perceiving the root causes
> for one's place in society - the socio-economic,
> political, cultural, and historical context of our
> personal lives. But critical thinking continues beyond
> perception - toward the actions and decisions people make
> to gain control over their lives. True knowledge evolves
> from the interaction of reflection and action (or praxis)
> and occurs when human beings participate in a
> transforming act (In Shor, 1987, p. 34).

This is the intent of the empowering supervision process. Teachers are placed in a position whereby they can explore their professional practices in an effort to understand and

67

perceive implications. But in an effort to develop critical thinking, there is a move beyond mere reflection. There is an effort to design professional actions which can transform the nature of educational practices. This leads to the true empowerment of teachers.

While Freire wrote about students, the methods he proposes are just as applicable for stimulating professional growth with teachers. Teachers can indeed critically analyze information, become aware of their position, and make judgements about what action to take based on that information. It is through the analysis of these actions and their results through their reflections that true growth can be realized.

In this project and in the empowering supervision model, I have adopted the problem posing process developed by Freire. The process draws on personal experiences to create a social connectedness and to develop a sense of responsibility in ones own learning. The problem posing methodology involves three phases: listening (for teachers, investigating the issues in the classroom), dialogue (or codifying issues into discussion starters for critical thinking), and action (or strategizing the changes teachers envision following their reflections). (In Shor, 1987, p. 85).

Empowerment is social (Shor, 1987) and along with subjectivity becomes a powerful motivating factor. As teachers learn methodologies that promote professional growth, they assume the responsibility for learning, and hopefully

68

will continue the process long after the support of the supervision process has left. This may mean that teachers will look to other professionals for a social forum to explore and mediate new meanings and build new knowledge about their profession.

CHAPTER 4

AN EMPOWERING MODEL OF SUPERVISION

The scientific clinical model of supervision which is outlined in "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in the Pictou District" is but one form of clinical supervision. Clinical supervision has as its goal the continuing professional growth and development of teachers. This goal is realized through the collegial relationship between supervisor and teacher. The proposed empowering model of supervision also claims the goal of promoting and assisting professional growth, and attempts to accomplish this through a collegial relationship between the teacher and the supervisor. As well, both the clinical supervision model and the proposed empowering model base information used for growth in a practical situation, related to the experiences of the teacher and supervisor. The empowering model of supervision proposes several variations from the outlined clinical supervision model, as a means of developing an active role for teachers in their own professional growth and in the partnership between themselves and the supervisor. As well, this empowering model of supervision has the potential for meeting the long-term goals of supervision, that of promoting the teacher's desire for and skills of self-improvement.

In order to examine the empowering model of supervision,

70

It is important to make the connections between the present clinical model and the proposed model. Clinical supervision has been defined in various statements. Many of these statements focus on the collegial nature of the relationship between the supervisor and the teacher. Cogan (1973, p. 54) defines clinical supervision as:

> the rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance. It takes its principal data from the events of the classroom. The analysis of these data and the relationships between the teacher and the supervisor form the basis of the program, procedures, and strategies designed to improve the student's learning by improving the teacher's classroom behaviour.

(McGreal, 1983, p. 25).

The focus of the empowering model of supervision remains on the opportunity to take information from the classroom, but in addition to this, information is elicited from the teacher's practical experience. This surfacing of experiences and classroom activities allows for a collegial relationship between the teacher and supervisor where each party brings information of equal value. No one party in the partnership has superior knowledge. The teacher is placed in a position where he or she can bring subjective meanings and interpretations of real-life experiences and, in dialogue with the supervisor, both can weigh information in light of all available information on the subject.

71

There are several differences between the clinical supervision model, as defined by Cogan, and the proposed empowering model. The teacher's classroom performance, and data collected on classroom events, focus discussions on the teacher's behaviours. While the empowering model accepts those behaviours as being extremely important, there is also an emphasis on the teacher's understandings, insights and values, which are ultimately reflected in his or her behaviours. The empowering model proposes to access these underlying assumptions and meanings which determine overt actions. Through both the teacher and supervisor surfacing and focusing on these meanings in a collegial relationship, and through dialogue, real professional growth for both partners may be realized.

In clinical supervision, the major activity of evaluation is goal setting (McGreal, p. 44). This selection of goals is an effort to focus the teacher's and supervisor's activities, and to place the spotlight on teacher performance. The emphasis is on what the teacher is doing in the classroom, the teacher's behaviours. Data are collected around these specific performances and judged on criteria that relate to student performances and/or on information from research on teaching. The empowering model accepts that goals may be set in the process of supervision, but it is not considered the major activity of evaluation. Goals define a desired behaviour. If teacher-understanding is the major concern, then behaviours in the classroom, while important, take on a

72

secondary role. It is just as possible that specific goals for desired behaviours are not set. Instead, actions, brought about through a renewed understanding of a professional concept, may provide data which will continually direct and re-direct the actions of that teacher, as a reflection-action cycle is set in motion. One single desired behaviour may not meet the needs or interpretations necessary to understanding.

In order to successfully implement a supervision process, McGreal (1983) suggests a narrowed focus on teaching. He also suggests a supervision process must focus on teaching information which meets the following minimum criteria:

1. A strong empirical base

2. A close approximation to standard practice

3. A "common sense" orientation

4. Perspectives and skills that are potentially generalizable across subject areas and grade levels

These minimum criteria outline expectations for instruction which are to be applied to instruction and are dependent on information found "outside" a specific classroom. They are ambiguous at best. Current teacher effectiveness research is based on empirical studies. These studies focus on an observed reality, which is outside the teacher, based in positivist traditions, and which largely ignores the active role played by teachers in making meaning and understandings brought about through their practical experiences. The empowering model for supervision does not use the narrowed

73

focus on teaching, nor the minimum criteria on teaching information outlined by McGreal. Instead, it is based on a process approach to learning, one which is not necessarily based on empirical research. The teacher is active in creating meaning. Yes, there will be approximations to standard practices, because the practices and concepts explored in the empowering model are found in the everyday practices of the teacher involved. Yes, it is considered a "common sense" orientation because it is based in the understandings of the teacher and supervisor. And yes, it has perspectives and skills which are potentially generalizable across subject areas and grade levels, because new information on learning and instruction is emphasizing such a process approach to instruction. Student-centredness may be compared to teacher-centredness in the learning process. The active role of the learner may be compared to the active role of the teacher in his or her professional "learning". The perspectives of empowering supervision methods are very much in agreement with current approaches advocated for instruction across the curriculum and grades.

By not accepting a narrowed focus on teaching, because supervisors are now interested in what the teacher has as a concern, the door is opened for discussions on curriculum, values, belief systems, parent relationships, etcetera. While this may serve as a challenge for supervisors, the topics are still part of the educational milieu, and therefore are important to understand. What the teacher understands to be

74

important and of concern is of importance and "is" of concern.

The goal-setting process, as the major activity of evaluation, has been replaced by the conference, that opportunity available to teachers and supervisors for discussion, dialogue and negotiation for meaning and understanding. Wherever possible, these negotiations will lead to some action, because it is between reflection and action that knowing occurs. Teachers' behaviours are not limited to classroom behaviours which need observation. If the teacher has a concern about new curriculum, the actions may involve reading, discussing and writing understandings. While there should always be a translation between theory and practice, this may not always be possible. The goals for empowering supervision must always take top priority. Teacher learning and teacher independence in this process, the ultimate goal, must be respected. If, at this time, an action is not feasible, then teacher-learning, and supervisor-learning, must be assessed in a alternate manner. This entitles the supervisor to ask for and seek other means of establishing that growth has occurred. It is through "praxis", or the established relationship between thinking and doing, that thinking and coming to understand an issue will help frame future actions. At this point in supervision, we establish information which will be later used in reflection.

The conference is a time for planning, for surfacing subjective understandings, and finding the sources of these understandings, a time for negotiating with the partner in the

supervision relationship for new understandings. The conference, the dialogue, is the real focus of the empowering model of supervision.

The empowering supervision model demands a long-term commitment on the part of the supervisor. This commitment of time is defined differently in this model, from that commitment of time required in the clinical supervision model. The critics of clinical supervision see the time required to complete clinical supervision as one of the major weaknesses of the model. The time-factor may come to be one of the major concerns with the empowering model of supervision as well. Time required before the actual supervision period begins would be a part of the supervisor's regular job description. This time, as required in the empowering model, should be considered listening time.

The first step for both the teacher and the supervisor is for both to become good listeners, always listening for a deeper understanding of the situation. Initially, the supervisor must assume a leading role in this process. Listening, in this case, is not to be considered a sinister plot for collecting information to be used against a teacher at a later time. It is, rather, a method of coming to understand the teacher and his or her values, beliefs and concerns, with regard to his or her work. The supervisor is expected to avoid critical judgements, to try to divorce himself or herself from the judgemental stance, and to really listen to what is being said. It does not mean listening in on

confidential discussions or eavesdropping on intercoms. At the same time, it is a systematic gathering of information. Listening, in this context, refers to hearing and trying to understand what the teacher is saying. Through careful listening for a deeper understanding the supervisor will hear emotions and 'hidden voices' often kept from view in a supervision process. These 'hidden voices' and emotions may not even be available at the conscious level for the teacher to use and articulate, causing blocks to understanding and consideration of new approaches to their work. Through careful listening the supervisor may be able to identify low self-esteem, low self-confidence, values and beliefs about teaching and learning, or views of student that might influence the teacher's attitudes and behaviours in the classroom. The teacher may have difficulty discussing his or her work, or sharing information with others. By understanding through listening, the supervisor may be able to help the teacher articulate his or her 'hidden voices', and thereby move beyond the possible blocks.

Opportunities for the supervisor to listen to teachers must become part of the everyday work experience. A supervisor may listen to teachers in staff rooms, where teachers may be expressing concerns over students, over work, over their relations with parents, over problems at home. Perhaps they are concerned with pressures from work, or from working-relations. Other opportunities for a supervisor to really listen to teachers include staff meetings, curriculum

77

meetings, and daily visits to the classrooms. Discussions of
individual students are also of critical importance, since it
is especially in this forum that teachers are able to share
their beliefs, values and understandings about teaching and
learning. A supervisor must understand teachers. It must in
no way threaten teachers, only serve as a basis for
establishing an equal and understanding relationship in the
supervision process.

Stages In The Empowering Supervision Model

Acheson and Gall (In McGreal, 1983) attempt to simplify
the suggested steps or stages of clinical supervision. At the
practical level, they identify three steps: the planning
conference, classroom observations, and the feedback
conference. The empowering model also suggests three stages,
which will draw on some of the activities and strategies used
in the above-listed stages. The empowering supervision model
outlines a planning stage, an action stage, and an evaluation
stage.

Table #1

Clinical Supervision	Empowering Supervision
1. Planning Stage	1. Planning Stage
- Goal setting	- Identification of issues

- Choosing indicators of
    success
	- Finding a focus through
	    - observations

- Choosing behaviours designed
    by research that lead to a
	- interviews
	    - document analysis

defined "effective instruction"	- data collection - dialogues - listening - researching - Questioning - Journal writing - Proposing an action

2. Classroom Observations

- Data collections
- Measurements of behaviour

2. Action Stage

- Carrying out the
  proposed action
- Collecting data
- Bringing the issue to
  conscious level
- Solving the issue

3. Feedback Conference

- Review of data
- A measurement against
  the indicators of success

3. Evaluation Stage

- Articulate issues
- Generate insights into
  teaching practices
- Dialogues
- Self-analysis
- Journal writing

These three stages are be defined here.

Stage One: Planning

This is perhaps the most difficult, and important, stage
of the empowering supervision model. It involves an ongoing
interest in the business of teaching and education by both the
teacher and the supervisor. It also involves an interest
which allows for questioning the what, the why and the how of
teaching. The type of listening described in the previous
section reflects a practical approach to gathering
information, which mirrors this interest in understanding.

Teachers and supervisors share an active role in this
stage. This first step is to focus the discussion. Whereas
this was done for the teacher and supervisor in the clinical

supervision process (the focus being on teaching), this is not the case in the empowering supervision model. The teacher and supervisor take an active role, using many sources of information available. Teachers may employ many different methods to help them focus on a part of their teaching profession which they wish to examine and understand more fully. In the instance in which teachers have not focused on a concern before the supervisor meets to discuss the supervision process, the teacher may use research methods as a guide to identification. Methods which may be of help include observations, interviews and document analysis.

Observations may be varied, according to teacher interest. Teachers may wish to make observations of their students whereby topics such as behaviour, learning styles or work products may surface as a concern. Other observations made might include text book usage in the classroom or the amount of student discussion-time in the classroom. Whatever the choice, teachers must observe the situation using their own frame of reference, ensuring that what is observed is of importance to them.

Teachers might wish to use an interview strategy to focus the supervision process. Interviews with students could focus on work assignments, instructional techniques or course contents. They could also focus on concerns over class organization or extra-help times. Interviews with other teachers could focus on curriculum, programming or school organization. Again, whichever focus is taken, teachers will

have a personal involvement.

Document analysis is another method whereby teachers may find a focus for supervision. Documents such as curriculum edicts from central office, or from provincial Departments of Education, may provide material or information of concern. Other documents, such as program manuals, students' work, or professional journal entries could serve to focus supervision. The issues are selected by teachers and should be of some interest and concern. These concerns are in most cases, already identified through careful listening to teachers by the supervisor. There should be few surprises in the planning stage. If there are, it is most appropriate and important for the supervisor to be honest and express his or her surprise, while accepting the concern.

While teachers focus the topic for exploration, the supervisor must be supporting the search, and guiding the process, through suggestions and alternatives. Teachers must know where he or she stands in this supervision process. The first meeting between teacher and supervisor must set the stage for planning, and the expectations of the teacher must be made clear. The role of the supervisor must also be clarified. The supervisor is to act as a support, guide and partner in coming to understand some aspect of the teaching profession more fully. The choice of topic will, however, be up to the teacher and, in most cases. will be a familiar topic already discussed at some point in time.

The second major meeting should involve a preliminary

discussion of the chosen topic. This discussion will centre around what is known about the topic by both partners. After this meeting, whatever the results, it is important for the supervisor and, perhaps, the teacher, if time permits, to write down what was discussed, adding any additional insights that might have occurred in this writing process. This should be shared with the partner and will form the basis of the next meeting.

It may become evident in any of the above steps that more information is necessary. This information or evidence should in some way reflect, in practical terms, what is happening in the classroom. Additional data may be collected using charting, graphing, verbatim or selective verbatim data, peer evaluating, artifact collecting, etcetera. (For a brief overview of data collection and its uses refer to Appendix B). While the supervisor is collecting this information for the teacher, he or she may observe departures from the expected, or from a set plan, and consequently will monitor his or her own understandings. From a subjective level of consciousness, the supervisor is identifying with the teacher's situation, and relating this information to his or her own experiences. The supervisor's knowledge is in a process of surfacing to a conscious level, and being made ready to share in a later dialogue.

At this point in the planning stage, the issues have been identified. These issues are ones that are the concern of the teacher, and therefore have an emotional investment attached

to it. Usually, the teacher has no clear-cut solution, so an emotional investment is made in proposing an action to answer these concerns. In other words, the teacher should be motivated to be actively involved in a supervision process with the main goal of teacher growth.

"By using discussion objects called 'codes' ('Codification' in Freire's terms), followed by an inductive questioning strategy, [teachers] can ground their discussion in personal experience and integrate that experience into the broad social context, and together evolve alternatives" (Freire, 1983, p. 37). While Freire speaks of students' learning, these discussion codes can also be used in teachers' learning. These codes should be concrete, whether they be the data collected, documents to be analyzed, readings on the issue of concern, the interview responses and/or a combination of the above. While the codes should not be so broad as to be over-whelming, they should represent various sides or contradictions to the issue (Readings on the issues are especially good for this purpose and are highly recommended.) These codes should not provide the answers, but be open-ended to allow for action-strategies to arise from the dialogue. The codes should address the identified issues and essentially form the basis for the discussion between teacher and supervisor in the next meeting. These codes are considered neutral. In this way, if the discussion becomes too personal, the supervisor or the teacher may switch the issue back to the neutral code.

In order to move the discussion in the meeting from a concrete level of understanding to the analytical level, a step questioning strategy has been proposed by Freire:

1. Describe what is

2. Define the problem

3. Share similar experiences

4. Question why there is a problem

5. Strategize what they can do about the problem (Shor, 1987, p. 88-89).

This questioning strategy may help frame questions so that the discussion will not get grounded in the more analytical level first. These questions begin with a concrete description. Later, the teacher and the supervisor can address the "why" and "but why" questions. These discussions will serve to have the partners surface meanings, negotiate understandings and bring about new meanings. It is extremely valuable to keep a journal or log of the ideas discussed. Either the teacher and/or the supervisor may be responsible for this recommended activity. This writing provides a concrete reference for later reflections.

This discussion should bring the partners to a stage where they may propose positive action.

Stage Two: Action

Action, or following through to the consequences of reflection, is essential for learning. As teachers test out their analysis in the real world, they begin a deeper cycle of

reflection that includes input from their new experiential base. This recurrent cycle of reflection and action is the praxis of knowing. As teachers understand this cycle, they can celebrate successes, analyze mistakes or failures, and formulate other approaches to the problem (Freire, p. 43).

The action stage in the empowering supervision model allows the teacher to test out his or her analysis of the teaching concern in the classroom. Through carefully examining this experience, the teacher finds himself or herself reflecting on what has happened in light of what was "known". New understandings and new knowledge can be the result of this reflecting and acting.

The action stage may require a number of re-assessments as teachers and supervisors analyze mistakes and failures, or celebrate successes. Different strategies may be necessary. Whatever is necessary, the most important aspect of this action stage is the fact that teachers are in a position where they can analyze, hypothesize, and reflect, after the action has been taken. This is the "praxis of knowing" which firmly establishes the relationship between thinking and doing. As with the students described by Freire, this action stage creates a situation whereby both the teacher and the supervisor are in a constant process of trying to solve a problem, continually bringing the issue to a conscious level, continually making subjective judgements about its value as a solution, and getting ready to share this information in dialogue.

The presence of a supervisor and the fact that an issue has been identified, heightens the teachers' awareness of interactive decision-making. The teacher begins to monitor words and actions as he or she proceeds through proposed action. Questions that may be asked include "What am I doing as I do it?" and "How am I doing it?" "Why?" "What outcome might result?" "Who benefits?" "Who loses?" At this same time, the supervisor is collecting information or monitoring progress. He or she will be assessing and relating the information to his or her own experiences. The supervisor may ask the same questions of him or her self as those asked by the teacher. In addition, the supervisor may ask, "Would I do it another way?"

Depending on the issue addressed, data collection may be necessary in this action stage. In most cases, actions in the teaching profession involve classroom activities. Therefore, data collection is to be expected. Approaches to data collection would be similar to those approaches found in the planning stage. The choice of data-collection techniques should be made in the partnership between the teacher and the supervisor. The supervisor may be more aware of the methods available, but it is crucial that the teacher be involved. This allows the teacher to have information on how to collect his or her own information, once this supervision is complete, making the possibility for independent learning even more possible. The second reason for the teacher to have this information is that he or she is completely comfortable in the

86

knowledge of what the supervisor will be looking for and recording, in the classroom situation. All the attention can be focused on the issue.

The information collected should be shared immediately with the teacher. This may include photocopying, clarifying statements being added, and then sharing with the teacher. It is useful to prepare a file for the teacher so that all information connected with the issue is organized and available when needed. The supervisor will have a similar file with the same information included. These data and information should receive attention from both parties before sitting down together in the final evaluation stage. This attention requires that the teacher and the supervisor to be familiar with the content and have some cursory analysis completed before this meeting.

Stage Three: Evaluation

The evaluation stage in the empowering supervision model concerns itself with the ability of the teacher to articulate identified issues, generate insights into the teaching process, redefine understandings of practices, and take risks to try new actions in everyday work. Such evaluation may begin with the information collected from the action stage, and continue over a period of time. Evaluation is not a product in this definition, but a process. This process should be considered an empowering tool for teachers. Teachers can learn to evaluate their own teaching, their own

learning, and reflect with the supervisor on the growth realized. As the supervisor listens carefully to the teacher talk, this growth should be reflected in discussion. Again, the opportunity for the supervisor and the teacher to listen and to discuss is critical to ongoing growth and evaluation. These discussions and talk-opportunities are found in everyday school life, the supervisor's daily rounds, staff-room discussions, staff meetings, curriculum meetings, and in discussions on individual students. Such is the long-term process of evaluation.

The supervisor may be interested in evaluation of the teacher's growth in this supervision process. The supervisor should be able to make a value judgement as to the value and worth of this particular supervision. Since the underlying goal of this empowering supervision model is teacher-growth, it is important to look for indicators that growth has occurred. These indicators are not necessarily measured by changes in a behaviour, but may also be indicated by how the teacher is thinking about the issue, or the work being done. Supervisors may wish to ask themselves if the codes were successful in stimulating discussions. Was the teacher anxious to share stories from experiences? Did the discussion get to the root causes of the problem and/or the issue? Was appropriate action taken? What self understanding did the teacher reach? What was the result of the action? Would the teacher proceed differently next time? What new problems were uncovered? Did the teacher recognize and identify these new

problems?   Information the supervisor gains from this evaluation of the process will provide information for future empowering supervisions.

Teachers and supervisors work together in the evaluation stage to work out an assessment of the actions taken. Questions that are important to ask in this stage include: "Why didn't that work?" "What should I have done here?" These questions are posed in an effort to link the action with the knowledge about teaching. Each partner, the teacher and the supervisor, addresses these types of questions so that there is an expansion of knowledge in the negotiating process. The supervisor's role is to elicit personal critiques from the teacher, to share his or her own critiques and, perhaps together, to develop other plans of action. The supervisor may wish to offer the teacher possibilities and alternatives, but it is ultimately the teacher's decision which plan is best and which is to be implemented.

While it is imperative for the supervisor to evaluate the growth and involvement of the teacher in the process (as a means for making the empowering supervision ongoing and successful), and while it is important for the teacher and supervisor to work out understandings about particular issues through reflecting on actions taken, it is just as important that teachers reflect on the effectiveness of this procedure. The kinds of questions teachers ask of themselves should go beyond "How well did I do this?" Self-analysis questions should include questions such as "Has my contribution been

effective?", "Was I critical?", "Was I receptive?", "Did I synthesize?", "How can I improve this exercise?" The participants may wish to keep a journal, or write about their understandings in a report to be shared between the partners. This writing again adds to a more articulate understanding of the issue raised and will help the teacher become more independent in monitoring his or her own teaching and professional growth. This writing also assists the supervisor in coming to understand and to articulate the issue, and to better prepare for the next supervision process.

The requirements of a written report for the teacher's personal file, kept in the school, may be met by having the supervisor use information collected, and information from the teachers' involvement with the empowering supervision. Methods used in the process, insights gained, and reflections on the process are recorded for future reference and as a record of the teacher's growth. This report should not include value statements, or judgements made about the teacher. There should be nothing of surprise for the teacher in this report, but an offering only of an approved recollection of what has happened during the supervision. The report (shared with the teacher) should serve as an encouragement to the teacher to continue professional growth efforts.

CHAPTER 5

CASE STUDIES

For the purposes of this study two teachers were chosen to work with me, the researcher-supervisor, through the empowering supervision model. These teachers, selected because of an evident interest in professional development, and an interest in talking about their work, were asked to participate by their school administration.

Data was collected during visits to the two classrooms over a period of two months. Data collection techniques were recommended for use to supervisors carrying out clinical supervision. These were specific to the problem posed by the teachers. Data was also collected during teacher conferences. Reflective field notes on dialogues were written at the end of each session. This data directed the research and was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed model.

These case studies were conducted within the schools of Pictou District, and with teachers who had varying experiences

with the supervision process outlined in "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District". The teacher teaching junior high was exposed to the process through inservicing. The elementary teacher had a number of experiences using the outlined procedure. Both had a positive attitude toward supervision.

Several differences between the teachers and school contexts dictated variations in the empowering supervision model, and may also have influenced the outcomes of the experience. Every attempt was made to accommodate individual differences.

The teachers have different educational backgrounds and teaching experiences. Team teaching in the elementary school dictated that teachers meet daily to discuss their work, and their students. In junior high, the teacher was on her own with few opportunities to discuss her work other than with her administration. In elementary, the teacher is required to discuss individual students and learning styles. The junior high teacher focuses on a class. As well, differences in the supervision are evident because of my 'knowing' one teacher professionally, having worked together for several years and having experienced the same school context. I did not know the other teacher or the school context in the same manner. In the latter case, it took longer to conference, to focus, and to reflect on actions. Our values and understandings about teaching were quite different and our work together reflects these differences.

Case Study #1

Jean is a junior high teacher with fewer than ten years teaching experience. This supervision provides us with the first opportunity to work together. We have known each other over a period of several years through sharing common interests and university courses, but we have not shared our experiences, our attitudes nor our values about education.

Jean has a continuing interest in professional development. She has two undergraduate degrees and has recently completed the Master of Education degree with an emphasis on curriculum. She intends to continue her studying in a Master of Arts degree program. Jean has also studied a foreign language and has taught in a foreign country. While she is bilingual, she has chosen to teach alternative junior high subjects and thus diversify her experiences. Jean is keenly interested in various aspects of education including integration, mainstreaming and student behavioral patterns and has followed this interest through being enroled in workshops and conferences throughout the country.

Jean's school is a combined elementary-junior high school with approximately five hundred students. This school serves both urban and rural students. Most of the students are bussed. Consequently, a long day is created for both teachers and students. Many students arrive and stay up to one hour before and after classes, requiring teacher supervision.

Students remain in this school all day with a short break at noon for cafeteria and outside if weather permits. Noon hours for Jean and other teachers are often spent with students, either through supervision activities or through extra-help classes.

As with most junior high schools in the district, teachers are provided with a schedule outlining classes to conduct. Jean has six fifty minute periods per day, with three scheduled in the morning and three in the after-noon. One of the most difficult classes to handle is scheduled in the last period several days in the cycle. This scheduling has made it difficult for both Jean and the students. Discipline and attention decrease with the time of day. Jean is concerned about the amount of learning happening during this period.

Jean feels she has excellent support from her administration. This support is realized through approaches to discipline and efforts made to provide supplies. Both administrators, principal and vice-principal, have spent time talking with Jean about her concerns and they visit the class regularly. They offer advice about both the students and about her instructional practices. They have given feedback about student learning in her classroom when she has expressed concerns about this learning. They have an open door policy whereby Jean can approach them at any time. Jean openly and freely expresses her appreciation for this support.

This junior high, as is the case with most schools, has

94

closed classrooms. This has led Jean to be a bit hesitant of having other professionals to visit with her. She shared her anxiety with me before we began. She has gained confidence in the past few years. Both administrators visit frequently and she has found herself getting more comfortable. She has a resource teacher coming into her classroom during one period to help students who are experiencing difficulty. Jean has come to appreciate this help and the two teachers talk about the students and the help they need. Jean has realized this has made a difference for these students and appreciates the information shared in these sessions.

While I am uncertain about professional development activities that are an ongoing part of the school context, I found several indicators of professional discussions and opportunities for discussions throughout our conversations. Jean did not mention curriculum meetings as such. We did discuss her concern over mainstreaming of special education students into regular classes. We also discussed integration of subject areas. In these conversations there was no mention of staff level concerns which have been topics of discussions with her administrators. Work on instructional techniques did occur in staff meetings where video-tapes of Madeline Hunter's teaching model were shown. These video-tapes are considered training tapes, used to promote instructional techniques found through empirical research to be effective in teaching students. Jean, on one occasion, used an example of these techniques as a way of involving students in the lesson.

95

While she was able to refer directly to the tape, she chose to use an alternative action. These tapes promote focusing on teacher's behaviours. Jean also focused on teacher's behaviours in many of our conversations leading me to believe this may have been a predominant view of teaching found in the school context.

While much of the conversations held during this supervision centred around what the teacher could do, I was also interested in how the student's role was perceived. While I am uncertain about regular and organized forums used to discuss individual students, their learning strengthc, difficulties and styles, I was led to believe most discussions about students occurred in the staff room, and with administrators and/or support staff when problems arose. There were also discussions over exam marks and results. At this time, I suspect expectations for grade subjects would receive much attention. Student behaviours and attitudes, as well as their achievement, would also receive attention.

This supervision is the first "formative" supervision Jean has experienced. She has had other summative supervisions completed. One which she remembers being very positive, left her with many suggestions as to how she could improve instructional techniques. Working together as required by the empowering supervision model would mean necessarily concentrating on instructional techniques but, rather, would be more concerned with Jean's understanding of her educational practices. This supervision would be a

relatively new experience for Jean.

The pre-requisite to the empowering supervision model is an opportunity to "listen" to teachers talk about their work, their students and their ideas about teaching. Because I have not worked in this school previously, nor have I taught a junior high class, I have not had the opportunity to "listen" to Jean talk about her profession with others in this setting. Beginning this supervision, I was at a disadvantage since I did not "know" Jean professionally, nor did I know the school context well. In the effort made to "know" Jean professionally, I had to consider her educational background, her experiences and the school context. Throughout our time together, I found that Jean highly valued her education and the information gained through university courses. She often referred to bits of information found in texts or from professors. Much of the information valued focused on teacher behaviours, and not teacher thought. She seldom referred to her practical experiences. It may be possible there is little sharing of practical experiences in this school setting.

The scientific clinical supervision model does not require the "knowing" of the teacher professionally before beginning. Following this supervision model, knowing a teacher is confined to knowing what a teacher is doing in the classroom and in instruction. Through establishing this focus, the two professionals can analyze the actions through using the teaching model's framework of understanding, choose an appropriate teacher behaviour from those suggested, set

indicators of success, and proceed with action. The teacher's behaviour is the focus for study, not what the teacher values, understands or interprets professionally. Teacher thoughts and values are incidental. This approach reaffirms the positivist tradition of making meaning from an outside, defined framework for viewing the situation. The teacher is left in a passive and receptive role. The empowering supervision model, on the other hand, seeks to create an active role for teachers in making and bringing information to the classroom. Getting to "know" the teacher, their understandings, values and ideas, is a critical first step in accepting the teacher's active role.

There is little doubt that I began this supervision at a disadvantage. Jean and I spent many hours talking about our insights and work. My "knowing" Jean, while still incomplete at the end of the supervision, had grown throughout our dialoguing/conferencing.

A: The Planning Stage

It is important to note that in the empowering supervision model there are no clear cut steps to follow. There is a continual movement between planning, acting and evaluating through dialogues between teacher and supervisor. There is much movement between stages, and time may be necessary in order to achieve satisfactory evaluations.

This first stage, planning, seeks to establish a focus of

concern in this specific teaching context. Through focusing, there will be an attempt to share, through dialogue, the teacher's and the supervisor's interpretations more fully, and propose some possible actions.

Our planning stage involved much discussion over topics which were of concern to Jean. One of her main concerns centred around the student's sense of responsibility and accountability. Through our conversation, Jean's value system began to surface. Jean's frustrations had surfaced recently when students' demonstrated lack of concern about coming to class prepared for work. They had forgotten to do homework, bring texts, or bring tools for work. They seemed to care less about her admonitions. They tore paper from their scribblers, took walks to garbage cans, and generally wasted time. Student talk during class annoyed her, and she wished "for them to listen quietly and carefully to instruction". They chose not to listen, later asking questions about what was just explained, or simply saying they did not understand.

These were important concerns for Jean. In our planning session, she told me about going to the administration and talking to them about these behaviours. She told me how the administration had spent some time in her classes studying the situation. Both administrators felt that much learning was indeed occurring. They had offered encouragement and a few suggestions. Still, Jean felt frustrated. During this planning session, I asked Jean to record all those student behaviours which frustrated her. I suggested she do this for

a period of several days. I also requested that she try to find a rational for her frustration with these behaviours. Then, after considering her value system, perhaps we could look for the students' value system, and try to find some common ground between the two. She was willing to do this.

Planning sessions usually do not find an immediate focus. As with most initial meetings, Jean and I discussed several areas which Jean felt she might wish to consider. We discussed behaviours of several students in her "hard to handle" class. She showed me a text which outlined many types of behaviour problems and offered suggestions as to what could be done once the problem had been identified. As well the information in this text, she had other information about her students collected through an interest inventory. She felt that with these sources of information, some action could be proposed.

Understandings of ways to approach problems concerning teaching and learning are expected to surface in the planning session. There may be differences between the teacher and the supervisor based on their understandings and valuing systems. This was the case in this instance. My beliefs and valuing of the student's active role in learning would have indicated the need to gather background information on specific students, to search for ways individual students processed information, and to try to understand specific learning styles of the students. Perhaps then I would look for social interactions within the class and try to understand the individuals' motivation for

100

learning. However, these values must not become predominant in a situation where the teacher is being allowed an active role in decision making. At the same time, supervisors must give up power traditionally found in the position and approach sharing of information as part of a partnership. This sharing may come through question posing. It will be Jean's responsibility to select one of these questions which will merit further exploration. Differences in understandings and valuing systems are healthy in an empowering supervision model. Differences allow for open discussions where both parties can re-examine their belief systems and being new meanings to bear upon the situation. Differences result in a tension which demands resolution. This kind of differing would be irrelevant in the scientific clinical supervision model. Such differences would not exist, primarily because there is an 'accurate' definition and description of the teaching act and of instructional techniques. This is supported by research, and teachers and supervisors are expected to accept and conform to the prescribed behaviours. To differ from this definition is to err. In the positivist tradition, both parties are placed in passive roles dependant on information constructed by outside sources of knowledge. In the case of empowering supervision, differences are exciting and open many possibilities for growth and changes in understandings about our profession which can then be translated into actions through reflections and evaluations of proposed actions.

The planning stage may surface many topics for discussion and exploration. Jean expressed concern over possible mainstreaming and over integration of subject areas. While these were important to her, they did not receive as high a priority as student involvement in her class.

The planning stage is not usually completed in one session. Jean was left to record student behaviours and to begin the process of note taking in the class. She was to begin the process of valuing behaviours bringing her own value system to a conscious level of understanding. In the meantime, I clarified my thoughts and understandings about our first planning session by writing in summary form a recollection of topics and understandings shared in our first conference. I wrote Jean's thoughts and shared my interpretations. The next day I returned to Jean with my summary of the meeting, providing her with these notes in a folder. Both of us retained these notes and together we collected pieces of information to have in identical folders. In this way we shared the same information. We set up another planning session, allowing her time to record behaviours and to read my interpretations of our first session. Through this process, each party brought articulated ideas to the next session, a reflection or our values and thoughts about our professional practices.

My experiences with language arts methodologies has shown the writing process to be of great assistance in articulating and bringing meaning to the world around us. This supervision

process encourages both partners to write when the opportunity arises.

Our second planning session, held a few days later, used the results of our first meeting for focusing. Jean brought her four pages of observed behaviours that annoyed her. She had categorized them in regards to student desks, chairs, belongings, homeroom, attitudes, hallways and excuses offered. Her reflections on why these were important to her referred to teacher behaviours. She blamed herself for "not being observant enough", and "nagging the students". Through my questioning, I used the opportunity to redirect the focus from teacher behaviours to "why" she considered these important negative behaviours. Generally she felt, that students should "respect teachers and schools". Students should come to school prepared and be responsible for their learning because this was their task. She felt that parents should be encouraging their children, perhaps even demanding behaviours and attitudes which placed a high value on education. These were behaviours expected of herself as a student, and her home played an extremely important role in supporting this attitude toward schooling. In this particular school community, she was not sure that parents felt this way.

These values toward education are an important part of Jean's experience and they have become expectations of students who come to her classes. She has become frustrated with the students not sharing this same respect for their teacher and school. We talked about this difference in our

103

second planning session. Through our discussions, Jean's valuing system was brought to the conscious level and was articulated. My beliefs about student attitudes, while much different than Jean's, also had time to be articulated. Yes, I, too, expected respect, but it was something I felt I earned from the students. I attempted to understand their perspective. I was interested in a give and take, and directed my thoughts toward specific students rather than whole groups. I talked with her about my beliefs in providing students opportunities to be responsible and, in turn, offering pay-offs such as less homework or special assignments. I was not interested in imposing these ideas on Jean, only in offering them in a dialogue to bring my understandings to the forum for possible further consideration and discussion.

During this second planning session we reviewed the thoughts I had summarized from our first meeting. We talked briefly again about all her concerns, checked for accuracy of interpretation, and I asked her to priorize her concerns. While each could be a focus, one must be chosen to direct our work. Through Jean having the choice, and through her initially raising these concerns, she had developed a motivation to resolve an issue important to her. She chose to look at student attitudes and responsibilities. This topic was as exciting and interesting to me as it was to her. We were ready to begin planning some actions.

The empowering supervision model puts more demands on

104

intellectual activity by both the teacher and the supervisor. There is no definition as to what should happen next; there is, instead, a vision of learning. The decisions must come from the two parties discussing possibilities. Our topic, that of encouraging student's attitudes and responsibilities toward school, was not one to be resolved easily. It took negotiation and re-negotiation. Jean and I had different methods from which to approach the question. Over time, Jean was able to understand her approach to be one of control by the teacher. While she wanted students to be responsible for their learning, she wanted them to listen during direct instruction lessons and, when questions arose, she wanted them to read the directions first and then ask if necessary. Jean retained these values throughout the supervision process. Her proposed actions reflected these beliefs. As for my position, one of sharing responsibility with students, my proposed actions reflected my beliefs throughout the supervision as well. The differences created a tension which began to disrupt her positivism toward the end our work.

The goal setting process, considered of most importance in the clinical supervision model, takes a back seat to the importance of dialogue in the empowering supervision model. Jean and I had different interpretations of teaching, of our approaches to students. We knew our approaches were different but this was not a cause for concern. Planning and talking about these differences allowed both of us to develop new meanings and insights. We were able to access and to

articulate these values and were free to choose from the alternatives.

Interestingly, Jean chose actions which held the students accountable for their actions and behaviours in the classroom. I chose actions which would reflect their responsibility for learning.

B: Action Stage

As with the planning stage, there was a series of actions, followed by reflections and evaluations, followed by yet another planning session. Our first set of planned actions was one in which Jean took full control and made physical changes in the classroom. As the first part of our action plans, we wanted to address the physical organization of the room, making changes which would encourage students to be neat and organized, and to take pride in their classroom. Jean chose from several alternatives offered in our dialogues. She decided to approach the administration with her concern about chairs which could not be stacked for efficient cleaning. A new set of chairs, ones with a different style that could be stacked, were brought into the room. In addition to this, Jean re-arranged the tables, giving both the students and the teacher more room for movement and storage. By placing two tables together, the tables tended to stay together in one place, and a more orderly appearance was evident. As well, Jean moved students' lockers to a place in the room where the students did not bypass desks or storage

106

areas where books and coats could be easily discarded. The new traffic pattern showed a marked improvement in the general order of the room. Jean also went to the janitor and made arrangements for cleaning the classroom. This included cleaning the tops of the desks and the chalkboard ledges in return for students cleaning the floor once a week.

The first set of actions chosen by Jean was one which required no data collection as such. Teacher behaviours were evident through the actions taken. The evidence of Jean's growth professionally was found in her sense of pride and excitement with the new arrangement found in her classroom. On my next visit she was anxious for me to share in the excitement. The indicator of success was found within Jean, and through observing a well organized learning environment. Perhaps the best indicator of success for the supervision was Jean's attitude toward the actions she initiated and her sense of satisfaction with her self-sufficiency. This is a major departure from the scientific supervision model. Teacher behaviours in the classroom as they effect learning are the foci with the scientific supervision model. With the empowering supervision model, however, teacher understandings and responsibility for this growth are the main objectives. Data collection, as it is usually recognized, is irrelevant in this specific instance because it is evident that Jean has assumed control, and the objective of organization is realized.

Jean and I had other planning sessions after the initial

107

re-arrangements of the room had been completed. Her concerns now centred around having the students more responsible for their learning. At this point in the supervision process it was evident that we had a different valuing system and a different understanding of responsibility. Jean's concern centred around students coming prepared for work, including having their completed homework, books and pencils. I was more concerned with how they were processing information and their involvement with the concepts. Through our discussions, we accepted each other position¯, talked about our differences and went about planning actions. These differences would not be accepted in the scientific clinical supervision model. For those following this latter model, there was only one right way to view the question, that prescribed and tested by empirical research. As it was, Jean and I were able to understand each others point of view and reach a reasonable compromise. Jean designed a chart whereby students would be assigned points for correct behaviours which demonstrated responsibility in preparing for class. These points would be reflected in their class mark. The chart would be circulated daily and points assigned. As for my interpretation of responsibility in learning, I was able to collect data on how students understood their work. Each student would be responsible to explain how a math problem could be solved. They would prepare this explanation the night previous as part of their homework. I was able to collect data through a selective verbatim collection technique reflecting the types

of language used to explain their work. At the end of several sessions, Jean and I analyzed the collected data. This information was collected in our folders after each observation.

During this action stage I was continually asking myself questions. I listened to Jean's questioning and explanations as to what should be done in putting the math problems on the chalkboard. I listened to her questions about explanations. During this entire process, I was continually asking myself if I would do this any differently or was there a more effective way to get a thorough explanation. I asked myself what I thought a good explanation would be and how this compared with what the students were saying. Sometimes I read articles which talked about mathematical understandings, and I read information on the Standards Project in Mathematics. I used the information found as a springboard into thinking about what these students were doing in their work. How involved were they in processing information mathematically?

This action stage is a continual cycle of action and reflection. Thinking about what is happening is critical. It is here that the teacher's active role in knowledge production is realized. There is a continual surfacing of understandings, weighed against what is happening. These ideas are in the process of preparation for articulation, the opportunity for which will follow in the evaluation stage.

The same opportunity for involvement and active knowledge production is not an integral part of the clinical supervision

model. Once a prescribed behaviour has been realized, the specific research is proven and the issue is finalized. There are no built in opportunities for reflection and thought. There are no opportunities for accessing underlying assumptions and matching them with those activities in the classroom. Goal setting as the predominant activity in this model precludes the active role in meaning making by both teacher and supervisor.

C: The Evaluation Stage

Jean and I made our appointments to meet and to discuss our findings. We each brought our understandings and interpretations to the meeting. We explored together the meanings of each piece of information. For her, we were able to pinpoint those who were having the most difficulty and appeared to be the most irresponsible in bringing their work to school and those who were inadequately prepared for class. We then took each situation and looked for ways to help the student. This included meetings with parents and guardians and meetings with the administration. New actions for these students were proposed. As for the information I collected reflecting students involvement in their learning, we examined the language used by the students in explaining. This language was mainly procedural, with students telling what

should be done first, second and so on. There were no explanations as to why some procedure should be followed. Students also began to use some technical language, although this became confused over a period of days as new concepts were introduced. Jean brought several insights to our meeting. These insights were the result of her analyzing her work and the collected data as she proceeded. She felt her directions and questioning techniques were effecting what the students were explaining in the exercise. She pointed out several other activities which I had not noticed. Each of these factors she felt could be changed so to make the exercise more effective. She was bringing her own insights into the analysis, and being critical of her own actions. This type of critical reflection was especially evident in our discussions of the development of technical language. We both came to realize that technical language acquisition went through several stages before usage and understanding were confirmed. Jean was able to give several examples where students used technical language, were introduced to new concepts, misused the language, and gradually developed a more thorough understanding of the terms they were using. Such information regarding the stages in developing technical understandings are important for Jean to realize, they provide her with insights required to help students as they pass through these stages, and they help her to recognize when the students understand the concept well enough to discuss confidently.

Jean, as is intended in the empowering supervision model, was learning to evaluate her own teaching. She was able to design and to gather information about the issues of most concern to her in this specific context. She was able to devise methods to change the identified concerns and she was able to reflect on the effectiveness of these actions.

Was the supervision successful? This question is answered primarily by looking for evidence of teacher growth. Jean began to take control of her own professional learning. While Jean may still highly value information from research, she has now had experiences with looking at her own work and using the information found to come to new understandings about her teaching practices. She has had the opportunity to take control over the concerns which effect her most in her teaching. Jean used each of these opportunities to reflect on how she controlled the class and instruction despite a desire to let go of such a tight control. She also was pleased with the re-arrangement of her classrcom, with this reflected in her eagerness to share her experiences with me. Jean came to understand her own practices better, signifying teacher growth.

The effectiveness of the supervision model was also part of our evaluation discussion. Jean felt that by establishing a focus, and through our conversations, many things were done in her classroom. While Jean and I come from different educational backgrounds and experiences, we recognized our differences and were able to discuss these differences. We

were both able to realize that there are different views of teaching and learning, which require understandings and acceptances from both parties. Each of us was richer for our experience.

A final report was written for Jean's school file and a record of the supervision was forwarded to Central Office personnel as required. This report was a reflection of some of the activities we were involved in, and was a summarization of insights gained about how students learned.

D: Conclusion

This supervision was an example of the difficulties encountered by a teacher and supervisor who have a limited shared background and few opportunities to get to know each other professionally. I was left with the desire as a supervisor to be able to return to Jean and discuss frequently her work and her students. We had just begun to explore several alternatives, but time for discussion is essential, as is time for the supervisor to know the specific classroom and its concerns. This "getting to know" one another is essential in the empowering supervision model. Yet much of this knowing comes from being together, discussing and listening, and not in just the formal supervision process.

Case Study #2

Dawn teaches a grade one class in an open area school.

The open area classroom accommodates three grade one classes. Three teachers work together as a team. While this teaming does not have the teachers teach all students, they do work together to discuss programming and students' learning. Each of the three teachers is responsible for their own class, only rarely sharing lessons with the whole group. Dawn has been a member of such a team since she began teaching over ten years ago. The teams change regularly, this being Dawn's first year with this particular team of teachers. Dawn's experience has primarily been with primary and grade one students.

Dawn has had many opportunities to talk about her profession. I have had many opportunities to come to "know" Dawn professionally. As a regular part of her teaching time, Dawn and her team-mates share a planning time when the students are in their specialist classes. One entire morning every six teaching days is set aside for the teachers to discuss their students and programming. I have worked with Dawn for as many years as she has been teaching, first as a language arts coordinator, then as an administrator. I have had many opportunities to "listen" to Dawn talk about her work, be it in the team planning sessions, in referral meetings on students of concern, in curriculum meetings, in staff meetings, in programming meetings, in placement meetings and in informal discussions about her class and students. We have talked daily about the business of teaching although we have not been involved in a formal supervision process before

this experience. Dawn knows me professionally as well, and over our years working together we have built up a sense of trust between two professionals. We value this trust highly.

Dawn is very interested in growing professionally. While she sometimes expresses an interest in taking professional courses, she has continued to grow through her relations with other teachers, and through her membership in professional organizations. She is now at a point in her profession where she can clearly articulate her values about learning and teaching. In our first planning session Dawn made these values known through a story about one of her students. Jolene was a student who was experiencing difficulty in learning to use her reading strategies. Dawn had spoken to her mother and together the school and home were working to help Jolene. One day, as her group was working with the teacher, Jolene was asked to read orally. As expected, Jolene came across an unknown word. As she waited, Dawn saw the girl look at the pictures, re-run or go back over the sentence and try two or three words to herself. Finally she read the sentence correctly. She went on figuring out several words using pictures and re-runs. Dawn was ecstatic. She praised Jolene and told her how pleased she was with her work, and wondered if she could tell the others what she had done to identify the unknown words. Jolene could not tell her, but was willing to read more. Dawn watched again later in the lesson and, after more successful identifications, Dawn announced she now knew what Jolene was doing. She knew her

115

secret. The other students were anxious to know, too. Everyone was excited for Jolene, and excited that the puzzle was solved. Jolene excitedly went home and had her mother listen to what she could read. Before Dawn left for the day, Jolene's mother phoned Dawn and told her how happy Jolene was, and how grateful she was for Jolene's progress. Jolene has gained a sense of pride and confidence in her ability, and has begun to feel the joys of learning, a prerequisite to independence in learning. This Dawn wanted for each of her students. Dawn wanted active, participating learners.

As a professional, Dawn values the individual student, expecting each student to be unique and bring their own special learning styles and behaviours to the classroom. Knowing Dawn professionally, I was not surprised throughout our supervision experience to have this valuing appear and re-appear. As we looked for answers to the questions she posed, Dawn never generalized to the whole group. She looked at individual learning behaviours, individual reactions, and then looked at the sum of the information to ascertain the commonalities. She rarely spoke of the group as one whole; rather she chose to speak of Jillian, George, Anne or Laura. The discussions centred around each student and their unique ways of processing information. Dawn was always concerned about how this learning style might influence their future success, and she was anxious to make professional decisions which would help the students become efficient processors of information. Her valuing of independent learning and her

acceptance of individual learning characteristics always shaped her planning for the following days'lesson.

Dawn teaches in a large elementary school which serves an urban and rural area of the school district. All the students are bussed to school. The first busses arrive about one-half hour before school begins, and the last bus leaves about one-half hour after dismissal. Dawn has duties supervising students for a short period in the morning and after school, and has daily responsibilities of a lunch hour supervision with her class. She is left with approximately one-half hour break mid day. The teachers in this school are requested to be available for a one hour period after student dismissal. Dawn and the other thirty staff members use their before and after school times to talk about their work and their students. Many formal meetings are called to discuss curriculum and specific students needs. As this supervision was progressing, Dawn was also involved with team meetings between teachers of the previous year and teachers of the following year's students to discuss grade expectations and programming. There were also "referral" meetings to discuss special needs of students. The referral team made up of resource, guidance, reading and administration personnel was always available to talk with the teacher about concerns. This team worked out possible solutions, action plans and/or found help for these students. Towards the end of the year, placement and programming meetings would again offer more opportunities for Dawn to talk about her students and her

117

work. Perhaps her most important sharing of information comes with her professional discussions held with her team. They work together as a unit, sharing ideas and values. Dawn works in an environment rich in opportunity to grow professionally, especially through sharing practical information.

While Dawn plans with her team mates how time will be generally used, and is tied to a specialist schedule for her own planning times, she is otherwise relatively free to schedule. Teachers as a team plan noisy activities to coincide so that other classes will not be interrupted. Some large group activities may be planned to involve all students in the area. Generally, however, scheduling and planning are the concerns of the individual teacher.

Dawn, as evidenced in her initial story about Jolene, receives excellent parent support. Dawn is in constant communication with the homes of her students. If extra help is required, Dawn calls home, writes a quick note, or has a parent conference to offer practical suggestions and keep the parent informed. In addition, reports are antidotal, offering insights into how the student is progressing as an individual, and in comparison to their peers. Much of Dawn's extra time is spent in such communication. She is also quick to look for parent volunteers to help those students who may not receive enough time and academic attention from home. Needless to say, parent support for Dawn and the school is very positive.

A: The Planning Stage

As Dawn and I began to our first planning session, I tried to assure her that this supervision was intended to find answers to some educational question she felt to be of importance in her teaching. I wanted to have her feel that her questions were most important and those to be addressed through this time we had to work together. I told her of my support in finding possible answers, and how the project was to be considered a joint effort. After a brief outlining of the supervision process, we were ready to begin our first planning discussion.

From knowing Dawn professionally and having listened to her over a period of time, I was not surprised by the topic she chose to explore. Dawn's present class is experiencing difficulty in picking up their reading strategies. This class generally is having more difficulty than those she had previously, and Dawn was anxious to find ways of helping them. She used specific children as examples, some of whom were exhibiting different learning behaviours with which she was unfamiliar. She was not confident in their ability to become independent learners. She had confidence in her intentions to teach phonetics through their writing program, but she was not as confident in her ability to teach re-reading and picture clue strategies. These students remained dependent on her instructions as to what to do. We talked about this sense of independence and confidence in knowing what to do. She used the Jolene story as a method of explaining the attitude she

119

wanted. We talked about comprehension, and being able to know what it is you are doing. As we talked, Dawn made a statement which would come back to later haunt her: "I'm not sure of comprehension and reading strategies at this low a level. Would it really do any good to push for this?" In the course of our conversation, I spoke about metacognition and the ability to articulate how one knows. This ability to articulate depends on the students bringing their thoughts and strategies to the conscious level, and having this information readily accessible for future problems. Dawn was interested in this idea and questioned me further. It had been some time since I had read information on this topic, so I asked her if she might read some information I had on the topic and, if so, I would review it also. Dawn readily agreed.

This first meeting was summarized and along with the articles on metacognition were returned to Dawn. We set a time for our next planning conference in which we would review the information received.

The empowering supervision model expects the teacher to take charge of choosing a topic of concern which may be studied. This involvement with the topic infers that the teacher is motivated and will be interested in finding a solution or more information about the topic. As well, rather than rely on only information from research, or only information from the practical experience of the participants, articles from research provide an unbiased sounding board for ideas. These third opinions found in such articles can

120

provide reinforcement of ideas, material to be questioned, practical action plans and information from varied sources to be critically analyzed. Professional articles in the empowering supervision model provide food for thought and discussion. These "codes" are an important part of the process and should be used whenever possible. (See Appendix B).

Dawn came prepared for our second planning session. We discussed the articles and we both agreed there was little information pertaining to grade one specifically, but the concept of metacognition was important to every student. We talked about students articulating their problem solving techniques after a careful analysis of their actions. This articulation, we felt, would help them understand and become more efficient problem solvers and learners. While the articles were not addressing reading strategies, we explored ways in which these ideas might be applied to Dawn's situation. We decided to have students articulate how they were able to identify an unknown word despite initial problems with the task. Dawn decided to ask the simple question, "How did you know that word?" We made predictions about the student's ability and felt that initially this would be extremely difficult for the students, but over time we expected to find improvements. We talked about how we could see improvements through data collections. We chose to use selective verbatim techniques, writing down the teacher's questions and the student's response.

121

Through our use of the empowering supervision model, Dawn and I were able to explore some possibilities through these proposed actions. At the end of each action cycle we evaluated our data and went on to further planning. The empowering supervision model allows for a continuous cycle of planning, action and evaluation. Dawn and I proposed several actions, each devised after a careful evaluation of our plans and results from proposed actions. Our plans were based on our practical information and information from research. We became the researchers, applying information to what we knew and to our specific classroom situation. We were free to assimilate information and teacher and supervisor became partners in a search for answers to the question that was of concern to the teacher and the supervisor. We were active participants in the learning process.

B: The Action Stage

Dawn asked me to come and collect data after she had a chance to experiment a few days with the question. We both expected little at first and were pleasantly surprised. After only a few days, the students anticipated the question and attempted to respond. Initially, they made responses which mimicked what the teacher had been directing. "Look at the picture", and "Try the sentence again" were two of the familiar responses. As well, Dawn and I were surprised by the number of students who gave the response, "Sound it out". This was not one of the strategies taught in the reading task but received instruction through writing. This information

required further analysis.

Dawn made adjustments as she responded to the students. The proposed actions did not address the issue of prompting and when students should be left to problem solve on their own. As the actions we proposed were followed, Dawn and I were involved with questioning the actions and the results. I became another pair of eyes and ears for our work. I collected data and thought about the meanings of what I was finding, and questioned if I would do things differently. At the same time, Dawn was busy analyzing her actions, and making changes as necessary. At the end of each teaching session I left the data with Dawn after making a copy for myself. I tried to write down some of my ideas in note form so that I would be able to share my ideas with Dawn in our next evaluation session. It was difficult for Dawn and I not to talk immediately after our data collection session, since we were both excited about our findings. She had many ideas and proposals as she worked through the action. It became difficult for us not to talk about the findings. Our excitement about this professional learning was no different than the learning Jolene experienced in Dawn's class just two weeks previous.

Dawn and I were experiencing learning based on analyzing, hypothesizing and reflecting on action. This relationship between thinking and doing, referred to as the praxis of knowing (Maguire, 1987, p.3), is made possible through ideas being brought to the conscious level. Our subjective

judgements are made as to the value and meaning of these ideas, and new understandings and/or interpretations are made. Dawn is free to value her own consciousness, and to use her subjective judgements about the information found in this action stage. She is influenced by the context of the school and what ideas have been stressed or have received attention over time. I, too, am a product of the same context, making our valuing and subjective judgements somewhat similar and creating similar discourses. (We have often discussed learning and teaching). Despite the possible similarities, this praxis of knowing through the actions we have taken will have differences, and will be unique to each partner. As we get ready to discuss our findings, understandings, and interpretations, we get ready to make further professional growth through sharing these insights with each other.

Perhaps the most interesting day for Dawn and I occurred when everything went wrong. The students were restless, the lesson was long and the responses the students gave had no relationship to what they had done. They seemed to mimic something another student said, or gave responses they felt the teacher wanted to hear. Through analyzing the responses, we were able to find new insights into the importance of comprehension to the development of reading strategies. Dawn and I were able to find value in the fact that everything went wrong and make this a positive experience. With other forms of supervision, Dawn's teaching effectiveness might be rated very low. However, the empowering supervision model made it

124

possible to explore the specific contextual factors that might influence the students' ability to comprehend. We made great gains in gathering additional practical information which could influence future learning and teaching practices. Teachers do not need to feel threatened by the empowering supervision when things go wrong. Instead, this situation provides a challenge for analyzing and finding a new understanding, thus growing professionally. Dawn and I were able to use the problems to find important information, thus passing the ultimate test of trust between the supervisor and teacher.

C: The Evaluation Stage

Dawn and I were in a constant process of reflection and evaluation. Dawn reflects constantly, thinking carefully about her teaching practices, how the students are learning, and then discussing this information with other professionals. She relies on her practical knowledge which is in a constant stage of growth. During our time together, she seldom referred to research for help. In conversation she does refer to some ideas in journals or those of researchers, but her constant use of her experiences and interpretations dominates.

In our supervision I could rely on her for insights into her work. While these insights came easily, she was always anxious to hear additional interpretations and understandings. She used any additional information to build her practical

knowledge. She questioned and analyzed each bit of information.

Her analysis covered each player in the teaching-learning context. She analyzed individual students' learning, being concerned with Laura's lack of attention to details, her inability to go beyond a superficial level of understanding. She analyzed Jonathan's great ability to comprehend which enabled him to read but rendered him unable to apply strategies when required. She analyzed the whole group as needing more instruction in reading pictures and as needing more intensive instruction than classes previously taught. And she analyzed herself. On one occasion when I had just finished data collection, she rushed over and said, "You know, I talk too much. I do far too much prompting. That is no way to make them see that they are doing." After a moment of thinking, I had to agree.

The empowering supervision model has as its main goal enabling teachers to learn through planning an action, acting, and reflecting on or evaluating this action. Some teachers will have difficulty in this analysis and will need guidance and direction. It is imperative that there develops a sense of reflection on their actions, making this aspect of the supervision model perhaps the most important aspect of the process. In evaluating the success of the supervision, this becomes a critical factor.

Our evaluations of our actions were positive times for Dawn and me. We poured over the data, analyzed the data and

126

laughed at ourselves. We came to realize reading strategies depended on active involvement with ideas. Each evaluation session created more questions that needed answers. Only once did Dawn think we might need a researcher to help. She maintained an attitude that we could answer our own questions. There was an involvement in the topic that created an energy difficult to explain. It was akin to that energy felt in classes where students are actively involved in their learning.

Our last formal evaluation session summarized how much we had learned together. We each came to the meeting with our conclusions written. Referring to my notes I repeated her initial statement, "I'm not sure as to how important comprehension is at this young an age level." She was shocked that she had actually said that, but could remember the statement. At this point she knew she had learned so much about the way students learn to read. She enjoyed this so much she expressed her regrets that she had not kept a personal journal. She remarked, "You know I feel I have really missed something by not having written about our experiences."

During this session, Dawn reflected on the process of her own learning through this supervision. She felt that she had learned more about her work through her experimentation. She trusted me and knew my presence in the room was not a threat. If something went wrong, it would provide an occasion to analyze what the problem implied for her work. She talked

about her self-confidence which she felt received a boost. She was now considering taking courses as a means to keep thinking about the ideas we have explored. She thought ahead to possible implications for her work. She wanted to keep notes on her daily reflections, and thought of the possibility of planning differently, using her plan book more as a journal.

I asked her to write a summary of what she had learned and how she felt about this process of supervision. This writing is an opportunity for the teacher to take time to further reflect and clearly articulate thoughts and is a recommended activity at the conclusion of the empowering supervision. Dawn was very willing. She wrote:

> "It didn't take long for me to learn I had to talk less and let them do the thinking. I had to remember to give them time; it's so easy to jump in and just feed them. I'm beginning to know what to expect from myself, and what to look for from the children. It's becoming more comfortable to me and, hopefully, I can keep it comfortable for the children but at the same time challenge them to think for themselves."

Dawn continued to reflect on the supervision process:

> "The supervision was very easy for me. I felt comfortable talking to [the supervisor] and it was a relaxed experience all the way through. I'm glad you had the confidence in me... This will continue

128

to be an on-going goal for me. I believe it is an important process."

As is required, a final summary of the supervision process was written and forwarded to the personnel department in central office giving the dates and duration of each meeting. I was able to use Dawn's summary to write a summary of events and information learned in the process to be placed in Dawn's school file. While this signified the end of a formal supervision process, it did not mean the end of Dawn and I working together on this and other topics as we continue to grow together professionally.

D: Conclusion

This was a very successful supervision made possible by a number of important factors. First, Dawn and I knew each other professionally. We had worked together for some time in the same context, and had come to value similar education approaches to teaching and learning. Second, Dawn valued her practical knowledge, having confidence in this information and making it accessible in our discussions. At the same time, Dawn was also interested in information coming from research, and from discussions with other professionals. This openness to ideas, combined with her confidence in her own experiential knowledge, offered her the opportunity to develop many new

129

insights into learning and teaching. Third, Dawn was willing to take a risk and try new actions with her class. She was not afraid to make mistakes and have difficulties with a lesson. In part, this willingness to take risks is related to the relationship between the teacher and supervisor. In this case, trust was evident, and it made risk-taking possible. Dawn's confidence in her ability to teach is also an important factor in this risk-taking. Fourth, Dawn became involved with the topic and felt this question she posed to be of importance to the success of her students. She willingly read the articles, thought about her work and genuinely wanted to find some answers. This internal motivation is critical to a successful supervision. Dawn was given the role of active participant in her own professional learning and she willingly participated. Lastly, Dawn was a reflective teacher, always ready to bring ideas to the conscious level, articulate them, listen to others and weigh them against her own previous experiences. She willingly devised a proposed action and, then continually asked herself to evaluate the actions in light of all her previous information. She evaluated actions as they affected each participant in the process, being exceptionally thorough and leaving few ideas unexplored. She always looked for the next question, and where the search may next lead. She did not look for closure.

The characteristics Dawn exemplified are not always present with each teacher supervised. The process of empowering supervision allows the supervisor to examine the

teacher in light of the above characteristics. The
supervision process also allows for the possibility to develop
these important characteristics which are in fact tools for
becoming an active professional learner.

Summary To Case Studies

As mentioned in the introduction, several differences
were noted between the teachers and their school contexts.
These differences made the supervision process somewhat
different for each.

Tensions which were created by the supervisor in an
effort to bring about new understandings were reacted to more
quickly with Dawn. While this may reflect an individual
trait, it may also indicate an environment which uses this
interactive forum to stimulate thought. Invitations were
reacted to quickly with Dawn, whereby she read several
articles and indicated her desire to write. These same type
of invitations were issued to Jean, but she did not indicate
an interest. Dawn continually self-evaluated, remarking on
her actions and behaviours. This was not always the case with
Jean. She preferred to refer her focus to how the students
responded to her, and how they should respond. Reading and
writing are important parts of the empowering supervision
process which are issued as invitations. I did not require
these actions. I considered time factors, and my working
relationship with the teacher in making such demands This

single supervision experience allowed for select activities, chosen by the individual. Future supervisions would develop more activities and make more demands for involvement.

One of my most difficult decisions as supervisor came in deciding how and to what extent should tensions between understandings and values be created between a teacher and me. This became a judgement made while in dialogue, and in my reflections. There is knowledge which has a higher value than others. This is knowledge which frees individuals to become more critically aware, and enables them to make decisions about actions which can better their situation. In these cases, the teachers and I were exploring a very fundamental level of this critical awareness and were not able to achieve the long-term vision for this model of supervision. With Jean, I became most interested in her developing reflective thinking behaviours which she could use in her daily work. With Dawn, who reflected constantly on her work, it was important to understand how she used this process as a means to get more information about her practices. She was also so interested in accepting any invitation offered, it became important to limit the number to ensure her success. In the future, it is likely that we will explore critical analysis more deeply.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Social injustices and questions inherent in our society put new demands on our educational system. We can no longer be content with an educational system which reproduces current inequalities and the status quo. Students must be prepared to critically analyze and think about the world around them and possible social injustices. Through developing such an understanding, they will be in a position where they may propose and take actions to make necessary changes. This processing of information necessary to critically analyze and to think requires active involvement in the learning process.

Teachers must develop new teaching techniques and strategies which will encourage this active involvement. In turn, those professionals interested in teacher growth and development must find approaches for working with teachers which will support these new educational demands.

One of the most common and direct methods for working with teachers individually is through a supervision process which maintains a sole purpose of growth. For this reason, and for the purposes of this project, I have taken the scientific clinical supervision model outlined in "The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Pictou District" as a beginning point to look at possible changes. The result has been a proposal for an empowering supervision model. This

model of supervision promotes the active involvement of teachers in their own professional development with hopefully the eventual development of their critical awareness.

The proposed supervision model has several differences from other supervision models. Because it recognizes individual differences, there are no set formulae, or step by step agenda to follow. This supervision model responds to the needs of the individual and the needs of the specific situation. A second major difference involves the importance placed on teachers' understandings and value systems. This importance is found in the premise that what we do reflects in some part what we think. A third difference is in the focus on conferencing and dialogue as the most important activity. Because of the importance placed on teacher thought, language is used as the tool for analysis. This language is used in the articulation of subjective thoughts and in renegotiation of meaning between two professionals.

While this supervision model is unique and has important differences from other supervision models, I recognize that adoption requires consideration and planning. With careful implementation strategies, such a supervision model could greatly enhance the professional intellectual challenges of teachers in their professional growth.

Not all teachers are equally reflective. Supervisors encountering teachers who either lack this kind of thinking or who are unaccustomed to reflecting on their work and their student's responses, need to be understanding and patient.

134

This is the value of supervision viewed as more than a one-time, short-term involvement between teacher and supervisor. It is crucially important to develop such reflective thought, so that teachers can assess the success or the concerns in their approaches to students and their learning. Some teachers may rely on research, or on the supervisor, to give them assessments or answers to educational problems. They tend not to become actively involved and they use information from their experiences to make decisions. They may rely on texts and teacher manuals for curriculum decisions. Each instance of a teacher relying on such 'outside' sources keeps that teacher from being actively involved in knowledge production. Therefore, this dependency becomes a focus for working with teachers, taking each from where they are in their ability to think reflectively.

Supervisors may be uncomfortable without a set formula and step by step directions for supervision. The lack of such a prescription is due to the need for supervisors to be responsive to the needs of the individual teacher and the specific context. Much of the decision making about supervision has been handed over to teachers in partnership with supervisors. Each teacher and each supervision experience will determine directions and activities. The success of the supervision process has two dimensions.

The first consideration for the supervisor is the amount of professional growth made by the teacher. This may be evidenced in reflective thinking, in taking charge of the

process, or in the extent of the involvement in the process. This process enables the teacher to become a life-long learner of their profession, therefore their involvement is critical for independence in professional development. These are the tools teachers will continue to use long after the supervision has been completed.

The second consideration for the supervisor is to have evidence of the effects of the proposed action on student learning. This student learning is always of paramount importance and is the reward of a good professional development plan. These are the rewards for both teachers and supervisors, and the successes and failures can be shared equally. Once supervisors become comfortable in understanding the purposes and considerations made in the empowering supervision model, they might gain a directed focus and a purpose for their work. This will provide the necessary security replacing that security formerly given by a set prescription of supervision activities.

A third consideration which should be made before adoption of the empowering supervision model refers to the existing relationship between the supervisor and the teacher. There is a traditional separation between these two professionals based on their job descriptions. As supervisors charged with the responsibility of making decisions about the quality of instruction and to the tenure of teachers, a power barrier exists. Each relationship is determined, in part, by this traditional separation and, in part, by the supervisors'

136

and teacher's personalities. While the personalities need addressing in each supervision situation, regardless of which model is adopted, the adoption of the empowering supervision model requires work to break down the traditional power barriers. Supervisors must begin, through daily planned and unplanned dialogues, focusing on the professional interests of both the teachers and themselves. Supervisors need to give up the need to have an answer for each problem. They no longer should feel required to be the authority on every concern regarding instruction. Instead, supervisors need to adopt the approach of a partner in inquiry, perhaps suggesting places to find information, other professionals from whom to request help, or possibilities taken from personal practical experiences. Constant and frequent conversations about the topic of concern occur in daily visits, or in time put aside for discussions with teachers. Through this process of coming from behind the office desk, a feeling of togetherness and partnership can and must be fostered. The school context develops into one whereby supervisors and teachers are continually dialoguing about professional issues. Such a school context encourages new understandings about teaching and learning and encourages an articulated value system which will frame the school climate and learning environment. Teachers and supervisors involved in an empowering supervision model must feel free to talk about educational issues usually kept unspoken and behind the closed doors of classrooms.

School districts interested in implementing the

137

empowering model of supervision must make a commitment to the schools to have a well developed professional library. Teachers and supervisors will require information sources outside those found through sharing practical knowledge. Those articles and books found in a professional library will provide codes which can serve as a basis for discussion and now provide possible suggestions for actions. Findings from theoretical articles can be compared with findings from experiences in the classrooms where actions have been tried. Together, supervisors and teachers will become researchers, producing and refining knowledge to suit the specific needs of their classrooms and schools. Centres for teachers in which such professional literature is stored is critical for empowering teachers in the supervision process.

A fifth consideration necessary to implementing the empowering supervision model in a given school district is support for the supervisor in the supervision process. Respecting the individual supervisor and their interpretations of teaching and learning is important, and each must be actively involved in developing the empowering supervision model. As with the teachers in their professional development initiatives, supervisors need to use dialogue and discuss their experiences and how they solve various educational and supervision problems. This dialoguing is perhaps best accomplished in two forums. Individual supervisors may meet with individual support people, depending on the supervisors' area of expertise. There must be an

outside support person there for the supervisor who is becoming familiar with the empowering supervision process. The second forum for discussion would exist if a team approach to supervision is possible. A number of supervisors could meet regularly and discuss their experiences and findings with the supervision process. This forum will depend on the ability of supervisors to meet and to discuss such issues and the feeling of collegiality within the group. If sharing of information can be judgement free, then this can be a most beneficial forum for professional development in the area of supervision.

School districts interested in implementing an empowering supervision model must realize that learning is an active process for teachers. It is not a series of specific prescribed actions but rather, it is teachers going through a process of identifying a question or concern, gathering information about that question, proposing a specific action, carrying out the action and reflecting on the results of that action. This can be an ongoing process. Teachers who become comfortable with the process are in a position of taking charge of their own learning, having both the tools to do so, and the motivation to want to answer their own questions. Such involvement with their own professional growth is not tied to a short-term experience with their supervisor. Dialoguing and talking about teaching occurs between teachers.

Unfortunately, due to the limits of this study, few examples of the process in different contexts are available.

This work can be important, however, because if forms a framework for supervisors to work with teachers to allow teachers to take control of their own practices and become critically aware of the implications of their work. While this model is important for supervisors actively engaged in the process, it is also important for instructors in graduate courses in administration to become familiar with the concepts and ideas behind the empowering supervision model. It is this empowering supervision model and process which is based on a theory of learning that links thinking and doing to the production of knowledge. Through this link, teachers are considered and can be given an active role in their professional growth. This growth will be supported by a supervisor interested in helping a teacher become an independent learner, and in promoting a strong education program in the classroom.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX "A"

DATA

What Is Data?

- Descriptive information on a pre-determined aspect of teacher's performance.

Where Does It Fit In Process?

- Provides information base for objective evaluation of progress toward goal

- Subsequent to goal-setting and identification of indicators

Types Of Data

- Observational

- Artifacts

- Student Evaluation

Who Collects?

- Depends On Goal

- Primarily The Supervisor

Why Collect?

- Provide Concrete Feedback To Teacher

How Much?

- Keep It Simple

- Only That Which Is Necessary And Relevant

DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

1. Verbatim

    - Script Writing

    - Selective Verbatim

    - Listening

    - Anecdotal

2. Mapping

    - Charting

    - Sociograms

    - Traffic Patterns

    - Categorization

3. Time

    - Time-On-Task

    - Time-Line

    - Time Sampling

4. Frequency

    - Tallying

    - Frequency Profile

    - Checklists

5. Artifact Collecting

6. Feedback

    - Students

    - Parents

    - Collegial

METHODS OF FOCUSING OBSERVATIONS

TYPE	SPECIFIC ACTIVITY	USE
GROUP A "Verbatim"	Script-Writing Selective Verbatim Listing	...Analyze the dialogue ...Sequence ...Analyze language activity

GROUP B
"Mapping"
	Charting
	Socio-grams
	
	Categorize
		...Comparisons/factors
		...Group dynamics
		...Social patterns in
		   class
		...Movement of teachers
		   or students
		...Grouping like factors

GROUP C
"Time"
	Time-on-Task
	Time-line
	
	Time sampling
		...Decide how a long
		   period fits your
		   purposes and
		   how often you wish to
		   use that period

GROUP D "Frequency"	Tallying Frequency profile Checklists	...To find out how much? or specifically what?

Codes, as described, is a concept adopted from Shor and Freire (1987) and is a part of a problem posing education.

Codes can be considered a physical representation of a particular issue of interest which has been raised in dialogues and in listening situations. Initially, administrators may wish to introduce specific codes, but as teachers learn the process, both teachers and administrators can develop these codes.

Codes can take many forms, a piece of research, gathered data, video-tapes, curriculum materials or artifacts from the classroom. Regardless of the form the code takes, it should be something familiar which allows responses that reflect understandings and values held by the teacher about an educational issue. This code serves to focus such responses.

Freire (In Shor, 1987) proposes several characteristics which each code should possess. These code characteristics have been adapted to serve the needs of teachers in search for professional growth experiences:

1. The code should represent a familiar problem situation that is immediately recognized.

2. The code present a problem that has multiple possibilities for solutions rather than only one correct response or action.

3. The code should focus on only one issue at a time.

This focus should not be fragmented and should allow
for a balanced view of teaching and learning.

4. The code should be open-ended and should allow for
several strategies to emerge.

5. The problem and code presented should not be
overwhelming and should offer possibilities for
actions and changes.

A code is considered an object and as such is used to
mediate discussions. This object removes the personal aspect
from the issue. The teacher is not "judged" on either the
work completed nor on the ideas expressed. The code removes
such personal threatening situations. The code becomes a
structured language experience which promotes critical
thinking and action.

Problem posing with a code involves a five-step
questioning strategy, as outlined by Nina Wallerstein (In
Shor, 1987, p. 38-39) which moves discussions from the
concrete to the analytical level. Teachers may be asked to:

1. Describe what they see

2. Define the problem

3. Share a similar experience

4. Question why there is a problem

5. Strategize what they might do about the problem

REFERENCES

Abbot, G. (1969). Hierarchical impediments to innovations in educational organizations. In Carver, F. and Sergiovanni, T. (Eds.), <u>Organizations and Human Behaviour Focus On Schools.</u> New York: McGraw Hill.

Auki, T. T. (1977). Theoretic dimensions of curriculum; Reflections from a microprespective. <u>Canadian Journal of Education.</u> <u>2</u> (11), 49-56.

Brophy, J. (1988). Research on teachers effects: Uses and abuses. <u>The Elementary School Journal.</u> <u>89</u> (1), 3-21.

Cherryholmes, C. (1988). <u>Power and Criticism: Poststructural Investigations in Education.</u> New York: Teachers' College Press.

Clandinin, D. (1986). <u>Classroom practice: Teacher images in action.</u> London: Falmer Press.

Cogan, M.L. (1973). <u>Clinical supervision.</u> Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Common, (1988). Why curriculum fixing doesn't work. <u>The Canadian School Executive.</u> 3-7.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness in Pictou District. A support and supervision system (1984). Pictou District School Board, Nova Scotia.

Frymier, J. (1987, September). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan. 9-14.

Garrison, J. (1988). Democracy, scientific knowledge, and teacher empowerment. Teachers' College Record. 89, 487-503.

Glatthorn, A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. (1989, May). Has Sam and Samantha's time come at last? Educational Leadership. 4-9.

Glickman, C. and Gordon, S. (1987, May). Clarifying developmental supervision. Educational Leadership. 67-68.

Greenfield, T. (1982, Winter). Against group mind: An anarchistic theory of education. McGill Journal of Education. 17, 8.

House, E. (1974). The politics of educational innovation. Berkley: McCutchan.

Hunter, M. (1976). Rx Improved Instruction. El Segundo, Ca: TIP Publications.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership. 40, 4-8.

Lambert, L. (1988, May). Staff development redesigned. Phi Delta Kappan. 665-668.

Maguire, P. (1987). Doing participatory research: A feminist approach. Amherst, Mass.: Center for International Education, Univ. of Mass.

McGreal, T. (1983). Successful teacher evaluation. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McLaren, P. (1989). Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in foundations of education. Toronto: Irwin

McNeil, L. (1988). Contradictions of control, part 1: Administrators and teachers. Phi Delta Kappan. 69 (5), 333-339.

Peat, D. and Mulcahy, R.F. (1990). Doing more to develop children's thinking processes. The Canadian School Executive. 9 (8) 9-10.

Porter, P. and Brophy, J. (1988, May). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the Institute for Research on Teaching. Educational Leadership . 67-85.

Quantz, R. and O'Conner, T. (1988). Writing critical ethnography: Dialogue, multivoicedness, and carnival cultural texts. Educational Theory. 38 (1), 95-109.

Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. The Elementary School Journal. 83 (4), 335-350.

Sanacore, J. (1984). Metacognition and the improvement of reading: Some important links. Journal of Reading. 27, (8), 706-712.

Sergiovanni, T. (1982). Clinical supervision and teacher evaluation. Urbana University, Ill.

Sergiovanni, T. (1985). Landscapes. mindscapes, and reflective practices in supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 1 (1), 5-17.

Shor, I. (Ed.). (1987). Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching, Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Shulman, L. (1986, February). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational researcher. 4-14.

Sirotnik, K. and Clark, R. (1988 May). School-centered decision making and renewal. Phi Delta Kappan. 660-664.

Smyth, John (1985). An educative empowering notion of leadership. Educational management and administration. 13, 179-186.

Stewart, O. and Tei, E. (1983). Some implication of metacognition for reading instruction. Journal of Reading. 27 (8), 36-42.

Stiggens, R. (1986, May). Teacher evaluation: Accountability and growth systems - Different purposes. NASSP Bulletin. 51-58.

Weedon, C. (1987). Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Wildman, T. and Niles, J. (1987). Reflective teachers:

   Tensions between abstractions and realities. Journal of

   Teacher Education. 38, 25-31.

Young, J. H. (1977). The curriculum decision-making

   preference of Alberta school personnel. Mimeograph,

   University of Alberta.