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ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS REGARDING TEACHER SUPERVISION

by

Pamela L. Clark

University of New Hampshire, May 1998

This study examined the perceptions of New Hampshire teachers and supervisors regarding teacher present and ideal systems for teacher supervision. Teacher supervision was defined as being inclusive of district practices which promote teacher growth and development and those which are used to make evaluative judgments about teachers' performance. The study sample included 73 supervisors and 305 teachers randomly selected from 45 school districts. The sample districts were selected using a stratified random sampling process in which the stratification variables were district wealth as reflected in the district's equalized valuation per pupil and geographic region.

Data were collected through the use of two matched surveys, one for supervisors and one for teachers. The surveys contained 37 Likert scale items and 3 open-response questions designed to measure participants perceptions regarding the structural (practices) and cultural (characteristics) and effectiveness of their present teacher supervision system and those of a system they would consider ideal.

Data from the survey were segregated first into three sub-divisions - items relating to the structural dimension, items relating to the cultural...
dimension, and items regarding effectiveness. Within each of the dimensions, data were further sorted by role (supervisor, teacher) and by scale (present, ideal) into four subscales. Effectiveness data were sorted by role into two subscales. Differences between supervisors and teachers on the present and ideal scales of the structural and cultural dimensions were evaluated using a repeated measures ANOVA and t-test. The analysis revealed a significant difference between supervisors and teachers on present scales but not on the ideal scales. A one-way ANOVA was used to examine differences between supervisors and teachers regarding teacher supervision system effectiveness. Supervisors and teachers again differed significantly at the $p < .01$ level on the present scale but not on the ideal scale.

These results suggest that New Hampshire supervisors and teachers share a common perception of the practices and characteristic of an ideal teacher supervision system, but differ in their perceptions of their present teacher supervision systems. Supervisors perceived their present systems as being more reflective of the ideal and more effective in achieving its intended purposes. Implications of these findings are discussed.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Public systems of education began to emerge in the United States during the early to mid 1800's and have evolved into the extensive, complex, public education systems which exist today. Over time, increased authority for the schools was granted to state and local governments gradually placing much of the responsibility for the education of the nation's children in government hands. Expanded state and local government authority and responsibility diminished the role of parents in the education of their children, distanced parents from the formal education process, and left parents with less direct control over their children's educational experiences. This expansion of government responsibility and the corresponding decrease in direct parent control gave birth to demands from both government and parents for the supervision and evaluation of teachers as means for establishing accountability and insuring competent teaching, demands which continue to be heard today (Karier, 1982).

In light of these demands, by the year 1994, 47 states had issued some form of recommendations or requirements regarding teacher supervision, either through legislative action or state department regulatory policies. Of these 47 states, 15 developed state systems of teacher supervision and mandated their use in all districts, 14 required local districts to develop supervision systems at the local level which
complied with state criteria or were approved by the state department of education. 15 required that districts develop supervision plans but did not hold them accountable to any state criteria or approval process, 3 only recommended that districts develop systems for teacher supervision but offered no guidelines or criteria, and 3 had no teacher supervision requirements or recommendations at all (Sclan, 1994).

Parent, community, and government demands for teacher accountability are somewhat at odds with the emerging view of educational improvement theorists and educators (e.g., Acheson & Gall, 1992; Brandt, 1987, 1996; Grimmett, Rostad, & Ford, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1992) who argue the need for teacher supervision practices which foster teachers' professional growth. While accountability measures place supervisors in an inspector role, define supervision as something supervisors do to teachers, and require rigid, standardized procedures; professional development methods cast supervisors as coaches, fashion supervision as a collaborative effort between supervisors and teachers, and call for flexible, individualized methods (Glickman, 1992). In her 1994 study, Sclan found that among the 29 states which either mandated specific teacher supervision systems or set specific criteria for supervision system approval, the accountability model of teacher supervision predominated. She further found that in the three states which only recommended that districts establish teacher supervision systems and the three states which made no recommendations regarding teacher supervision, the professional development approach to teacher supervision was more prevalent.
At the present time, New Hampshire is among the three states (Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont) which have only recommended that districts develop a teacher supervision system. In the absence of specific state directives and guidelines, teacher supervision practices emanate from the diverse beliefs, values, and norms of the individual school districts and the teachers and supervisors who work within them and vary considerably from one school district to another. New Hampshire, thus provides an ideal setting for examining teacher supervision practices and teacher and supervisor beliefs and values regarding teacher supervision which have not been molded or shaped by state directives or requirements.

Organizational theorists Covey (1989, 1991), Fullan (1993), Schlechty (1997), and Senge (1990) describe organizations as consisting of two dimensions—the structural dimension and the cultural dimension. The first dimension includes the formal practices, procedures, and policies of the organization while the latter encompasses the informal beliefs, values, and norms which shape and guide the implementation of the former. They point to the components, characteristics, and interaction of these dimensions as contributors to the effectiveness of an organization in achieving its expressed purposes and they encourage understanding of both dimensions as a means to gaining a fuller understanding of the organization. In an effort to gain a fuller understanding of teacher supervision, this study examined the structural and cultural dimensions and the effectiveness of teacher supervision.
This study sought to provide a description of supervisors' and teachers' perceptions of teacher supervision. The description was created from data gained through a survey of the perceptions of New Hampshire supervisors and teachers regarding present and ideal teacher supervision. More specifically, this study sought to respond to the following questions in the context contemporary theory and research:

1. What are the perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding the structural (practices) and cultural (beliefs, values, and norms) dimensions and effectiveness of their present teacher supervision system?

2. What are the perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding structural practices and culture characteristics they would consider ideal?

3. To what extent do teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of their present system match their perceptions of the ideal;

4. What variation exists between the perceptions of teachers and the perceptions of supervisors with respect to teacher supervision.

The results of this study provide a description of present and ideal supervision practices, beliefs, values, and norms as they are perceived by supervisors and teachers in a state where teacher supervision is relatively free of state-level influence. This description may be used to compare/contrast the perceptions of New Hampshire supervisors and teachers with those of supervisors and teachers in other states. Whether accomplished through replications of this study or the use of the results of other studies, such comparisons would contribute to understanding of
the effects of the presence or absence of state involvement in local
district development of teacher supervision. Additionally, the description
may be used to further examine supervisors' and teachers' perceptions in
the context of theory and research on teacher supervision. Finally, the
results of this study may have utility for organizations and individuals in
New Hampshire who are involved in supervision design and
implementation, or related reform efforts.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

I use the ensuing literature review to define terminology and to establish the direction and parameters of this study. More specifically, I use the literature review to construct an operational definition of teacher supervision; to develop a description of teacher supervision practices, beliefs, values, and norms through the analysis and synthesis of the writings of educational theorists; supervision specialists, and researchers, and to examine the scope, purpose, and methods of other research efforts.

Through the process of this literature review, I define teacher "supervision" as a process inclusive of the practices which promote teacher growth and development as well as the practices which are used to make evaluative judgments about a teacher's performance. I interpret the term "supervisors" to mean those individuals who bear formal responsibility for supervising and evaluating teachers. I further define teacher supervision as a process comprised of two dimensions, one structural and the other cultural. The structural dimension is the formal system for teacher supervision and encompasses the following components: clear standards for teacher performance; teacher goal setting; observation cycles which include the use of pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, and post observation conferences; a
total performance evaluation; and differentiated supervision processes for competent and incompetent or unsatisfactory teachers. The cultural dimension is comprised of the beliefs, values, and norms which shape the supervision practices and particularly, the supervisor-teacher relationship. This dimension includes beliefs about the purposes of supervision, the nature of teaching, and the nature of teacher learning; values which recognize the worth of teachers as human resources; and norms of collaboration, shared commitment to professional growth, openness, and trust in the relationships of supervisors and teachers.

I also use the literature review to distinguish factors which have been highlighted by researchers as fundamental to the effectiveness of supervision systems in achieving their intended purposes. These factors include: training for both teachers and supervisors, high levels of commitment and resource investment in the process of teacher supervision, high visibility to teachers and supervisors of the utility of the teacher supervision process, a level of flexibility which enables the supervisor to match the supervision to the teacher's needs, the involvement of teachers in planning, implementing, and monitoring the process, the joining of teacher supervision and professional development, and a close match between the system and its intended purposes.

Throughout the literature review, I explore the scope, purpose, and methodology of research studies of teacher supervision. I use this examination as a means for delineating the scope, purpose, and methodology for this study and for clarifying the role of this study in the context of other studies of teacher supervision.
Definition of Terms

**Supervision**

The terms teacher supervision and teacher evaluation are used almost interchangeably in the literature to name the process by which teachers and their supervisors work together to effect performance improvement and professional growth in the teachers and the process through which the supervisor makes evaluative judgments of the teachers' performance. The Association for Curriculum and Supervision (ASCD), a leading organization in the study and advancement of educational practices has used both terms in its widely read and respected journal *Educational Leadership*. The April, 1987 issue carried the organizing title "Progress in Evaluating Teachers," while the April, 1984 issue, which contained similar articles and addressed some of the same components of teacher improvement and evaluation, was entitled "The Realities of Supervision". Of three books published by the ASCD on the subject, two bore the word "supervision" in their titles (Glickman, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1982) while the word "evaluation" appeared in the third (McGreal, 1983). Even a single author employed both terms (McGreal, 1983; McGreal, Broderick, & Joyce, 1984.). The terms supervision and evaluation appeared frequently throughout the literature which was reviewed in preparation for this study. The terms were sometimes used separately and at other times in combination.

Some theorists and practitioners (Acheson & Gall, 1992; Brandt, 1987; Sergiovanni, 1982) see supervision and evaluation as separate processes with conflicting or even incompatible ends. They define
supervision as a process of collaborative effort between a supervisor and a teacher which facilitates the teacher's growth and leads to the improvement of teaching and learning. In contrast, they view evaluation as a process in which the supervisor rates or makes judgments about the teacher's performance and in which these ratings or judgments are used to inform decisions about contract renewal, promotion, compensation or other similar matters. At the same time that these authors see supervision and evaluation as different processes, they admit the necessity for both processes in schools, and reconcile the two processes in an integrated approach in which supervision is the process for fostering professional improvement and growth and evaluation is a summative act at the end of supervision cycle (Acheson & Gall, 1992; Brandt, 1987; Sergiovanni, 1982). Similarly, Patrick and Dawson (1985), in their case study of five teacher supervision systems conceptualized supervision as a cycle of activities focused upon the improvement of teaching and evaluation as the culminating act of making evaluative judgments about the teacher's performance.

The variation in the uses of the terms supervision and evaluation found within theory and research literature suggests that one can expect to find a corresponding variation in the use of the terms by practitioners. In an attempt to avoid confusion over the terms and to create the most inclusive framework for this study, the combination term "supervision/evaluation" was used on the survey instruments. To alleviate the writing and reading awkwardness this combined term induces, the single term "supervision" has been used throughout this
document. The term "supervision" should be interpreted as encompassing both the process for effecting professional growth and improvement and the process for making evaluative judgments about teaching performance, whether these processes exist in a district as a single integrated process or as separate processes, or whether only one or the other of the processes exists alone. A more distinct delineation of what is encompassed by the term "supervision" evolves through the ensuing discussion of its component dimensions.

**Supervisor**

Throughout the literature reviewed, the term supervisor predominated over the use of the term evaluator. Within the context of this study, the term supervisor is used to denote the individual within the school system who is formally responsible for supervising and evaluating teachers. In all of the studies and writings cited in this literature review, the supervisor was either a school principal or an assistant principal. In their studies of the 100 largest school districts in the United States Ellett and Garland (1987) and Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt (1996) found that principals and assistant principals were the individuals primarily responsible for and involved in performing teacher supervision. In New Hampshire, supervision is generally the responsibility of principals and assistant principals. Occasionally, department heads, a special education director, or central office administrator (pupil personnel director, assistant superintendent) may also serve as supervisors of teachers.
Dimensions of Supervision

In this study, teacher supervision is presented, discussed, and examined as consisting of two dimensions, one structural and one cultural. The structural dimension is the formal system for teacher evaluation, the procedures to be followed and the instruments to be used. The cultural dimension involves the beliefs, values, and norms which guide and shape the interactions of teachers and supervisors throughout the evaluation process. In combination, the structural and the cultural dimensions of teacher evaluation contribute to the effectiveness of the evaluation system in achieving the desired goals.

Structural Dimension

An analysis and synthesis of writings and research on effective teacher supervision practices, yields a set of common structural components for effective teacher supervision systems. Characteristically, the supervision system is formally developed and described in writing and includes the following components: clear standards for teacher performance; teacher goal setting; observation cycles which include the use of pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, and post observation conferences; a total performance evaluation; and differentiated supervision processes for competent and incompetent or unsatisfactory teachers.

Standards for Teacher Performance

Standards for teacher performance serve several important functions including: communicating to teachers what is expected of them, making clear to teachers the criteria by which their performance
will be assessed, enabling teachers and supervisors to differentiate between competent and incompetent performance, and providing a reference point for teacher goal setting for growth and improvement (Acheson and Gall, 1992; Conley, 1987; Danielson, 1996; George, 1987; Harris, 1987; Holdzkom, 1987; Manatt, 1987; Brandt, 1987; Smith et al., 1987). In developing performance standards, educators have considered both the results of research on teaching and student learning and the opinions of supervisors and teachers (Acheson and Gall, 1992; Conley, 1987; Danielson, 1996; George, 1987; Holdzkom, 1987; Manatt, 1987; Brandt, 1987; Smith, Peterson, & Micceri, 1987) viewing the use of research as the best means for identifying valid criteria for describing and evaluating competent teaching (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Conley, 1987; George, 1987; Manatt, 1987). Two examples of standards based upon teacher and learning research are reflected in the work of Charlotte Danielson and the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Following an extensive analysis and synthesis of the research on effective teaching, Danielson (1996) published a framework for teaching which divides teaching into four component parts—planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. Planning and preparation involves demonstrating knowledge of content, pedagogy, students, and resources; selecting instructional goals; designing coherent instruction; and assessing student learning. The classroom environment incorporates creating an environment of respect and rapport, establishing a culture for learning,
managing classroom procedures, managing student behavior, and organizing physical space. Instruction includes communicating clearly and accurately, using questioning and discussion techniques, engaging students in learning and providing feedback to them, demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness. Professional responsibilities includes reflecting on teaching, maintaining accurate records, communicating with families, contributing to school and district, growing and developing professionally, and demonstrating professionalism.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1994) likewise used effective teaching research in developing the standards by which it would determine a teacher's eligibility for National Board Certification. It identified similar performance knowledge, skills, and qualities but organized them under five core propositions: first, that teachers are committed to students and their learning; second, that teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students; third, that teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning; fourth, that teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience; and fifth, that teachers are members of learning communities.

Theorists and practitioners assert that the effectiveness of the district standards is enhanced when teachers are included in the process of developing the standards and when the standards are published in printed form and disseminated to all supervisors and teachers (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Conley, 1987; Danielson, 1996; George, 1987; Harris, 1987; Holdzkom, 1987; Manatt, 1987; Brandt, 1987; Smith et al., 1987).
Thomas McGreal (1982), who has conducted extensive examinations of teacher supervision systems identified the use of standards as one of nine characteristics of effective supervision systems. He explains that standards contribute to the effectiveness and cooperative nature of teacher supervision by creating a shared way of looking at teaching. In a study of five Pennsylvania school districts, Patrick and Dawson (1985) found evidence to support McGreal's identification of standards as an essential component of supervision systems which are effective in the purpose of improving instruction.

Three studies offer indications of the extent to which standards are utilized by school districts as a component of their teacher supervision systems. In their preliminary survey of 32 school districts from various states, Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984), found only one district which utilized established standards for teacher competency. In 1987, Ellett and Garland surveyed the superintendents of the 100 largest districts and reported that 48 (70.7%) of the 68 superintendents who responded indicated their district had some form of written standards for acceptable teaching. When Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt replicated the Ellett and Garland study in 1996, they found that 52 (84.6%) of the 62 districts had written standards. In combination, these studies suggest that the use of standards may be increasing among at least some districts.

Goal Setting

Goal setting is a process, wherein, teachers establish goals for their own professional growth and performance improvement, design
strategies to achieve their goals, and identify criteria and methods for assessing their progress on the goals (Acheson, & Gall, 1993; Brandt, 1996; Brandt, 1987; George, 1982). Goal setting moves teacher professional growth and performance improvement in the direction of the district’s desired ends when teacher goals are aligned with the district’s mission, vision, and goals and based upon the district’s teacher performance standards (Brandt, 1992). McGreal (1982) identified goal setting as essential to an effectively functioning teacher supervision system and emphasizes its importance in establishing between the supervisor and the teacher, a mutually agreed upon focus for the supervision process. Patrick and Dawson (1985) also identified teacher goal setting as a factor contributing to the success of the five supervision systems they studied.

The Three Part Cycle

The three part cycle of pre-observation conference, classroom observation, and post observation conference is the process through which data about the teacher’s classroom performance is collected and used to assess and inform the teacher’s professional growth and improvement efforts (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1982). The three parts of the cycle work in concert to achieve the desired ends of teacher growth and improvement. Both the supervisor and the teacher are active participants in this process with the supervisor assuming the role of “coach” in the first and third parts of the process and the role of “observer” in the second part (Acheson, & Gall, 1992). Researchers have identified the presence of this three part cycle in successful teacher

**Pre-observation conference.** The supervisor and teacher use the pre-observation conference to plan for the observation (Acheson, & Gall, 1991; Thorson, Miller, & Bellon, 1987). The effectiveness of the planning is enhanced when the supervisor and teacher use the conference time to identify a particular aspect of the teacher’s performance as the focus for the observation and to determine what observation methods the supervisor will use to collect data about the teacher’s performance (Acheson, & Gall, 1992). Theorists and researchers have identified a number of observation methods which can yield useful data. Acheson and Gall (1992) divide the methods into wide-lens techniques, charting techniques, selective verbatim techniques, and checklist techniques. Wide-lens techniques are broad observation methods which include recording anecdotal notes during the observation or making audiotapes or videotapes of the lesson. Charting techniques involve the use of seating charts and are used to record the incidence, frequency, and/or patterns of specific behaviors including student on-task behaviors, verbal flow between the teacher and students, movement patterns of the teacher and/or the students. Selective verbatim techniques are used to record the nature, incidence, and patterns of teacher’s verbal behaviors including teacher questioning of students, teacher feedback to students, and teacher structuring statements for classroom management.
Checklists are used to record the occurrence and/or incidence of particular teaching strategies and can include Likert scales which add a rating component. McGreal, Broderick, and Jones (1984) recommend collecting and analyzing teaching artifacts as another method. They propose that such artifacts as teaching texts, teacher-made instructional materials, lesson and unit plans, student assignments, student work samples, quizzes, tests, and other concrete evidence of the teaching and learning process be collected and analyzed for the quality of their content, design, and presentation.

**Classroom observation.** During the classroom observation, the supervisor uses the agreed upon observation methods to collect data about the teacher's performance (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Brandt, 1987; Thorson et al., 1987). Theorists and practitioners also recommend the collection and use of multiple forms of data as means for assuring a more accurate portrayal of the teacher's performance (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Brandt, 1987; Thorson et al., 1987). Through his study of supervision systems which effectively improved instructions, McGreal (1982) has identified three means of data collection as practical and useful: classroom observation, student evaluation, and artifact collection. Conclusions reached by Patrick and Dawson (1985) further support McGreal's findings and recommendations.

**Post observation conference.** Soon after the observation, the supervisor and teacher meet in a post observation conference to analyze and interpret the data, to identify performance strengths and areas for improvement, to discuss and develop improvement goals and strategies.
(Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Thorson, et al., 1987). Analyzing the data is a process of organizing the data in order to describe the events, activities, and interactions which occurred in the lesson and to prepare the data for interpretation by revealing patterns or relationships in the data (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Garman, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1982). The process of interpreting the data involves deriving and inferring meaning from the descriptions generated through the analysis and from the patterns and relationships revealed during the analysis (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Eisner, 1982; Garman, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1982). The next step in the conference involves the process of evaluating these interpretations against the district performance standards and the teachers' own goals to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Garman, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1982). The final step in the conference process consists of the development of improvement goals and strategies for the teacher (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Holdzkom, 1987). This three-part process is most effective in effecting teacher improvement when viewed as a cyclical process and repeated at least two or more times during the school year (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Garman, 1982; Goldsberry, 1984). The results of this cyclical process, which some identify as the normative evaluation process (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Brandt, 1987; Conley, 1987; Holdzkom, 1987), become a portion of the information base used to evaluate the teacher's total performance (McGreal, 1982).

Total Performance Evaluation

The total performance evaluation, referred to by some as the

Theory and research favor the use of a variety of data and evidence in completing this evaluation. They recommend that data include teaching artifacts (McGreal, 1982; McGreal et al., 1984), student performance data (Buttram, & Wilson, 1987), the information from the cycles of classroom observations (Acheson, & Gall, 1982; Furtwengler, 1987; McGreal, 1982), and evidence of progress toward professional growth and performance improvement goals (Brandt, 1987). They also favor teacher input through the use of a portfolio compiled by the teacher (Furtwengler, 1987; Wheeler, 1993; Wolf, 1996) or a teacher self-assessment (Tesch, Nyland, & Kernutt, 1987; Wise, 1984). They further advocate the collection of feedback from others including formal parent
and/or student feedback (Furtwengler, 1987; Harris, 1987) and observations by or feedback of colleagues (Gitlin, & Price, 1992; Grimmett, Rostad, & Ford, 1992; James, Heller, & Ellis, 1992; Zimpher, & Grossman, 1992). Tesch et al. (1987) recommend that the total performance evaluation be developed through the joint efforts of the supervisor and the teacher. Together, the supervisor and teacher develop an evaluation summary which both feel accurately reflects the teacher's performance. Total performance evaluations may consist of rating scales, a narrative, or both (Acheson, & Gall, 1982; Ellett, & Garland, 1986; George, 1987; Loup, Garland, Ellett, & Rugutt, 1996; Smith et al., 1987).

Two related studies, offer a look at the sources of information used to formulate total performance evaluations. In 1987, Ellett and Garland found that among the 100 largest school districts in the United States, the most commonly used sources of data for teacher total performance evaluation were direct systematic observation of teaching and informal observations of teachers. Used to some extent were teacher self-evaluations and used to a slightly lesser extent were student achievement data, peer ratings of teacher performance, paper and pencil exams, and student ratings of teacher's performance. In 1996, when Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt replicated the Ellett and Garland study, they found that direct systematic observation and informal observations were still the predominant sources. They found increases in the use of teacher self-evaluation, peer ratings, and student ratings, and decreases in the use of paper and pencil examinations. They also found
that teacher portfolio assessments were used in nearly a quarter of the districts, a source of data not examined by Ellett and Garland. In another study, Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein produced somewhat similar findings as a result of their examination of the teacher supervision systems of 32 school districts. They found that all of the districts used systematic observation (including pre-observation conference, observation, and post observation conference) as their primary source of total performance evaluation information. They further found a high use of the districts used teacher self-evaluation and a moderate use of peer review, and considered student achievement data. In combination, the findings of these studies suggest that among the largest school districts, systematic and informal observations are the primary sources of total performance evaluation data while various other sources are used to a moderate or lesser extent.

Differentiated Supervision

A supervision system must serve multiple functions including facilitating the growth of teachers who meet the district's performance standards, assisting the performance improvement of teachers having difficulty meeting the standards, and expediting the non-renewal of teachers who after having been given assistance, fail to meet the standards (Brandt, 1987; McGreal, 1982; Wise et al., 1984). Supervision systems which effectively serve these functions provide differentiated supervision processes, for teachers who are considered competent and for teachers who are at-risk for non-renewal or are in line for non-renewal (Brandt, 1987; Glatthorn, & Holler, 1987; Tesch et al., 1987).
Additionally, supervision is different for tenured teachers than for those who are non-tenured (McGreal, 1982). Such differentiation is generally accomplished through the use of multiple tracks with different levels of supervision intensity and detail. The track for tenured, competent teachers is considered to be the growth track and focuses more heavily on goal setting and professional development. While the focus for non-tenured teachers is also growth oriented, there exists simultaneously the need to use the supervision process to inform renewal/non-renewal decisions. In response to these dual concerns, supervision for non-tenured teachers generally involves more frequent observations and more intense interaction between the supervisor and teacher. Ellett and Garland (1987) reported differences in the number of observations required for tenured and nontenured teachers. They noted that the most common cited number of observations for tenured teachers was 1 to 2 observations, while for nontenured teachers it was 2 to 3 observations. Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt (1996) found similar results in the districts they examined in their replication of the study.

The track for teacher whose performance is determined to be less than competent, is a remedial track involving intense and specific focus on improvement. As outlined by Acheson & Gall (1992), Harris & Pillsbury (1987), Sweeney, & Manatt (1984); Tesch, Nyland, & Kernutt (1987), a teacher in this track is placed on detailed improvement plan often called an assistance plan. The assistance plan specifies the improvement objectives, the strategies for reaching the objectives, the criteria for successful fulfillment of the objectives, and the evidence
which will be accepted as proof of successful attainment of the objectives. Additionally, the assistance plan defines the responsibilities of the teacher, the supervisor, and any other professional who may be a part of the assistance team. The teacher's responsibilities may include required readings, training, course work, visitations to observe other teachers, or other forms of professional development activities. The supervisor's obligations may include providing reading materials and release time for improvement activities, observing the teacher at prescribed times and conferencing with the teacher at specifically scheduled dates. The other members of the assistance team may include a colleague of the teacher who serves as a coach or mentor, a curriculum and instruction consultant, a representative of the teacher's union who monitors the plan from a contractual perspective, and/or the district superintendent who also monitors the plan. Through his examination of three instances where plans of assistance were being used, Herman (1993) concluded that plans of assistance were most effective in producing teacher improvement when the teacher was motivated to participate in the process, the principal and the teacher's union worked together on the team, and when improvement rather than recrimination was the focus of the plan. In 1987, Ellett and Garland reported that the development of remediation plans was required in 85% of the 68 school districts they studied. When Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt replicated this study in 1996, they found that remediation plans were required by 91.2% of the 62 districts they studied.
Cultural Dimension

The cultural dimension of supervision is comprised of the beliefs, values, and norms which guide the supervision practices and shape the experiences of the participants. Beliefs about the purposes of supervision, the nature of teaching, and the nature of teacher learning generate corresponding supervision practices and teacher-supervisor relationships. What educators value also becomes reflected in these practices and relationships. While formal supervision policies stipulate procedures, they do not specify the actual behaviors of participants, most particularly not the behaviors which comprise the nature and quality of supervisor-teacher interactions. These interactions are most often guided by behavioral norms. The cultural dimension is influenced by factors both within and external to the educational arena. Most recently, the cultural dimension is being influenced by the ideas of organizational and educational change theorists and those of adult development theorists and specialists. The nature and impact of these ideas will be explored in the ensuing segments on beliefs, values, and norms.

Beliefs

Purposes of teacher supervision. In the past, the strongest force in shaping beliefs about the purposes of teacher supervision was public demand for accountability and quality assurance (Acheson, & Gall, 1982; Bolin, & Panaritis, 1992; Karier, 1982 Darling-Hammond, & Sclan, 1992; Wise et al., 1994). This force led to the conceptualization and use of supervision as a means for judging teacher performance in order to
insure teacher competence and to make employment decisions (promotion, retention, termination) (Acheson, & Gall, 1982; Bolin, & Panaritis, 1992; Karier, 1982; Darling-Hammond, & Sclan, 1992). More recently, other needs and perspectives have begun to influence beliefs about the purposes for supervision and are beginning to change conceptions and uses of teacher supervision. A growing awareness of the need to restructure and continuously improve schools, coupled with the work of change theorists including Covey (1989), Fullan (1993), Senge (1990), Schlechty (1997, and Sergiovanni (1992) has led to the development of the view that a purpose of teacher supervision is the facilitation of school improvement efforts (Dreyfuss, Cistone, and Divita, 1992; King, & Ericson, 1992) and provided new conceptions of how to help teachers improve their classroom performance by facilitating and encouraging self-examination of their thinking and decisions. An improved understanding of teaching and student learning and the recognition of the need for teachers to improve continuously is leading to the conceptualization of teacher supervision as a process for improving classroom instruction (Alfonso, & Goldsberry, 1982; Harris, 1987; Holdzkom, 1987; Manatt, 1987, Thorson et al., 1987) and improving student learning (Manatt, 1987) and a growing emphasis on these ends. An expanding body of knowledge and theory regarding adult development and adult learning is leading to the emergence of the view that teacher supervision is a process for assisting teacher professional development (Acheson, & Gall, 1982; Buttram, & Wilson, 1987) and for fostering and facilitating teacher cognitive development (Costa, & Garmston, 1985 &
Organizational change theorists identify the interrelated and interdependent nature of the processes of individual and organizational growth and improvement (Covey, Fullan, Schlechty, Senge, McLaughlin, & Pfeifer, 1986). Individual and organizational growth and improvement are interwoven cycles which continuously advance the individual and the organization toward a shared vision. Senge identifies the tension created by the disparity between the individual's and the organization's present reality and the desired vision as the motivating force for change. As schools are engaging in restructuring and improvement efforts, administrators are recognizing that teachers are an important source of knowledge, skill, and energy for their change efforts (Alfonso, & Goldsberry, 1982; Dreyfuss, Cistone, and Divita, 1992; Fullan, 1993; Schlechty, 1997). By facilitating the development of a shared vision and goals and encouraging the alignment of teacher's professional growth and improvement goals with the shared vision and goals, school administrators are able to mobilize the collective efforts and abilities of the teachers in the direction of the school's desired ends (Dreyfuss, Cistone, and Divita, 1992; McLaughlin, & Pfeifer, 1986).

More recently, educators have begun to identify supervision as a means for guiding teacher professional development at both the individual and the organizational level. At the individual level, the supervision process helps to focus the individual's professional development efforts on the pursuit of the individual's growth goals or
upon the remediation of identified deficiencies. Information about teacher growth goals and improvement needs derived through the supervision process is used to guide the planning and provision of professional development opportunities within the organization (Brandt, 1987; Buttram, & Wilson, 1987). Through his involvement in the study of four school districts recognized as having effective teacher supervision systems, Pfeifer (1986) came to see supervision and professional development as inter-related, mutually enhancing processes. In his view, supervision was and can be used to facilitate the selection and planning of appropriate professional development activities while professional development activities were and can be used to enhance the participation of teachers and supervisors in the supervision process. In the former sense, information from the supervision process was and can be used to assist in the identification of areas or targets for professional development. These professional development needs were and can be assessed and prioritized in light of district resources of time and money. In the latter sense, professional development activities were and can be used to foster a clearer understanding of the supervision process among teachers and supervisors, to enhance the capacity of teachers and supervisors to maximize the benefits of the supervision process, and to create a climate conducive to effective collaborative supervision.

As more is being discovered about how students learn and as new and improved instructional methods are being developed to address student learning needs, theorists and educators are recognizing the need for teachers continuously to expand and to upgrade their classroom.
instructional skills and knowledge (Darling-Hammond, & Falk, 1997). They believe teacher supervision can and should facilitate and support this form of teacher improvement by assisting teachers in the implementation of new and innovative instructional practices in their classrooms (Alfonso, & Goldsberry, 1982) and in the refinement and enhancement of their teaching skills and knowledge (Acheson, & Gall, 1992).

Instructional improvement is about changing how teachers work with students in the classroom. Covey (1989), Fullan (1993), Senge (1990), Schlechty (1997), and Sergiovanni (1992) emphasize the notion that true and meaningful changes in individual or organizational behavior are necessarily preceded by changes in thinking. They posit that individuals hold within sets of assumptions, beliefs, values, generalizations, and images which together form paradigms (Covey, 1989), mindsets (Fullan, 1993), mental models (Senge, 1990), or mindscapes (Sergiovanni, 1992) which act as a maps or guiding strategies for approaching the world. Individuals’ mental models are generally deeply ingrained and often, the individuals are not consciously aware of them or the power and nature of their influence on their perceptions, understandings, interpretations, and actions. Mental models are formed through learning derived from previous experiences and their accuracy and adequacy are dependent to a large extent upon the nature and the quality of these experiences and this learning. As individuals cannot experience and learn everything at the beginning, or even at any given point in time, their mental models are necessarily unique, incomplete.
and sometimes inaccurate. Improving mental models is accomplished by bringing the mental models to a conscious level, critically examining them to discover their incompleteness and inaccuracies, and making the necessary modifications in them (Covey, 1989, 1991; Fullan, 1993; Senge, 1990). In education, it is the teachers' mental models which shape and color their understandings and actions. For teacher supervision to lead to meaningful and true changes in a teachers' instructional behaviors, the process must necessarily lead first to changes in the teachers' mental models.

In its most rudimentary form, clinical supervision is a process intended to stimulate and facilitate changes in teachers' classroom behaviors (Acheson, & Gall, 1992; Garman, 1982). The clinical supervision process includes the three-part observation cycle discussed earlier in this literature review. The focus of the process is on the collection, analysis, and interpretation of teacher and/or student performance data, the observable behaviors of the teacher and/or the students. Through the analysis and interpretation of the data, the teachers, assisted and supported by the supervisor, identify performance areas in need of change or improvement and develops goals and strategies for accomplishing the necessary changes or enhancements.

Costa's and Garmston's view of supervision is congruent with the change theories of Covey (1989), Fullan (1993), Senge (1990), Schlechty (1997), and Sergiovanni (1992). Costa and Garmston (1985) believe that behavioral changes as induced or facilitated by clinical supervision are only part of what supervision should accomplish and criticize the clinical
supervision model as insufficient and inadequate. They believe that supervision should facilitate teachers' exploration of the thinking which shapes and guides their practices (Costa, & Garmston, 1994; Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993) and should assist teachers in making better decisions about instructional methods and approaches (Costa, & Garmston, 1985). They have developed the cognitive coaching model of teacher supervision, a model which like clinical supervision includes repeated cycles of pre-observation conference, observation, and post observation conference but which focuses on enhancing teacher effectiveness through the development of the teachers' capacity for reflecting on teaching. Costa and Garmston recognize the existence of mental maps which they call cognitive maps (1994, p. 86) and view cognitive coaching as means for engaging teachers in dialogues which help them to become consciously aware of and able to change their cognitive maps. Through interactions with their supervisors, teachers examine the assumptions, rationale, and thinking behind their instructional decisions and actions, make changes in their thinking, and make corollary changes in their teaching behaviors. Two teachers with whom Garmston had used cognitive coaching reported that as a result of the experiences and understandings they had gained through the cognitive coaching process, they had made changes in their teaching styles, expanded their teaching repertoire, become more effective in planning lessons, achieved greater student accountability, and arrived at a greater consciousness of teacher behaviors and options (Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993, p. 59).
The findings of a study by Nolan, Hawkes, and Francis (1993) suggest that under particular conditions, clinical supervision can achieve the same ends advocated by Costa and Garmston. Nolan, Hawkes, and Francis conducted an analysis of six case studies of clinical supervision. Each case study examined the interaction between a supervisor and a teacher and the outcomes of the clinical supervision process. Through their analysis, Nolan, Hawkes, and Francis found that clinical supervision, when characterized by collegial relationships, teacher control of products, continuity over time, focused data for reflection, and reflection by both partners, led to changes in teachers' thinking about instruction and students which in turn, resulted in changes in teacher behavior. The findings of Thorlacius (1984) and Jerich (1990) suggest that the effectiveness of clinical supervision in achieving these ends is enhanced when supervisors are provided with training in the necessary processes and techniques of clinical supervision.

Covey (1989, 1990) and Senge (1990) identify as the source of motivation for change, the tension which occurs when individuals become aware of the gap between their vision (image of how they would like things to be) and reality (the actual conditions and events of the present). In an effort to reduce the tension, the individual establishes goals and takes actions designed to bring the reality closer to the vision. Teachers visions include images of the teachers they want to be, the impact they wish to have on their students, and the actions and responses they hope to engender in their students. The disparity the teachers see between their vision and the reality of their present
performance, their present impact on students, and the actual actions and responses they engender in students becomes the motivating force for the teachers to change their beliefs and instructional behaviors. This present reality is visible through the observation data collected by the supervisor, teacher artifacts (lesson plans, materials, etc.) and student performance data (work samples, exam results, etc.) and is made available to the teacher for analysis and interpretation through the observation process. The supervisor's role is to facilitate the teachers' analysis and interpretation through questions posed in the post conference dialogue with the teachers. In their analysis of the six case studies of clinical supervision, Nolan, Hawkes, and Francis found that teachers' reflections on their teaching focused on three particular areas: the match between their desired practices and their actual practices as revealed through the data, the match between their thinking about students and the actual student behaviors reflected in the data, and the match between their desired impact and the impact the data suggested they had actually had on the students. "The cognitive dissonance that arose when teachers did not see a match between their thinking and actual events seemed to be the most powerful impetus to teacher reflection and change" (1993, p. 56).

As teaching is a task intended to promote learning in students, educators and theorists believe teacher supervision should ultimately result in improved learning for students (Anderson, 1982). In light of the many intervening variables which affect student learning, researchers have found it difficult to prove a direct causal relationship between
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teacher supervision and student learning performance. Despite this lack of proof, an assumption implicit in supervision is the notion that supervisor behavior impacts teacher behavior, which in turn impacts student behavior. In 1989, Pajak and Glickman cited a correlational relationship between supervisory support and student achievement. They investigated three school districts in which student achievement, as measured by a state criterion-referenced test administered to fourth and eighth graders, had risen steadily over a three-year period. In their effort to identify the factors which contributed to these achievement gains, they interviewed superintendents, central office personnel, principals, lead teachers, and teachers within each of the districts. In analyzing the interviews, they found that in two of the districts, none of the interviewees cited formal teacher evaluation as a contributor to the improvement in student achievement. What they also found, however, was that those interviewed shared the perception that continuous instructional dialogue, a strong foundation of supervisory support, and varied sources of instructional leadership were among the significant factors which had facilitated the improvement. These three factors in combination led to an increase in teacher-teacher and teacher-supervisor dialogue about instructional improvement, to increases in the presence of supervisors in the classroom, and to an increase in the level of instruction leadership provided through assistant principals for instruction, lead teachers and department or grade-level heads. In effect, those interviewed identified components and characteristics of the supervision dimension of supervision as instrumental to improving
teacher performance, district curriculum, and ultimately student achievement.

Currently, theorists and researchers are identifying and describing another purpose for teacher supervision—the facilitation and enhancement of teacher cognitive development (add sources). The focus on this new purpose is emerging out of synthesis of new perceptions of the nature of teaching and the application of theories of adult development to the development of teachers. The particulars of this new purpose will be detailed in the ensuing discussion of the nature of teaching and the nature of teacher learning.

Ellett's and Garland's (1987) study of teacher supervision in the 100 largest school districts in the United States and Loup's, Garland's, Ellett's, and Garland's 1996 replication of this study offer some information regarding the stated purposes and uses of contemporary teacher supervision. In the former study, Ellett and Garland found that among eight possible purposes for teacher supervision, professional development for teachers was rated the highest, followed by accountability, then by personnel decisions, and lastly by instructional leadership for administrators. In the latter study, Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Garland examined ten possible uses and found that both professional development for teachers and accountability had increased in importance and shared equal ratings, while personnel decisions had stayed about the same and instructional leadership for administrators had declined in importance. Examination of the actual reported uses of teacher supervision highlights the focus of teacher supervision within
these areas. Ellett and Garland (1987) found that the development of remediation plans for teachers identified with deficiencies and teacher dismissal were the most frequently cited uses of teacher supervision. Among more moderate uses were renewal of teachers contracts and tenure decisions. Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt (1996) produced similar findings with respect to the development of remediation plans and teacher dismissal. In conducting their study, Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt added two uses not examined by Ellett and Garland (evaluation of instruction and teacher growth and professional development) and found that these uses each were cited with high frequency. Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt found increases in the use of supervision for renewal of teacher contract decisions and tenure decisions.

The nature of teaching. In the past, two different paradigms of thought have defined the nature of teaching: the first, viewed teaching as a science and the second, viewed it as an art. Within the scientific paradigm, teaching was believed to be an act made of discrete, predictable, observable, standardizable skills and teacher supervision was perceived as a process of assessing the skills of teachers and helping them to acquiring and master specific skills (McNeil, 1982). In contrast, within the artistic paradigm, teaching was believed to be a highly differentiated and uniquely different process for each teacher and teacher supervisions was viewed as an individualized process of enhancing the teacher's unique talents (Eisner, 1982). Efforts to synthesize the two former paradigms resulted in a paradigm in which elements of the
objective character of the scientific paradigm and the subjective qualities of the artistic paradigm were combined to form a two-dimensional view of teaching (Sergiovanni, 1982). This paradigm envisions teacher supervision as a function which includes gathering, analyzing, and interpreting both objective and subjective data. More recently, the growing body of knowledge about teaching and learning is lending its influence to the expansion of this two-dimension paradigm into one which is multi-dimensional.

While not denying either the scientific or artistic aspects of teaching, this multi-dimensional paradigm presents teaching as a sophisticated function requiring the ability to make judgments and decisions on highly complex matters (Nolan, & Francis, 1992). It notes that within the classroom, teachers are required to make numerous judgments on complex matters in order to successfully match instructional techniques to varied levels of student development, diverse sets of prior knowledge, and a plurality of learning needs, in order to satisfy school requirements and parent concerns, and to balance or reconcile conflicting moral and ethical demands (Danielson, 1996; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994). It further observes that within the larger school community, teachers are regularly called upon to make judgments on complex problems involving colleagues, parents, students, policies, procedures, moral and ethical issues, external and internal events and forces, and numerous other variables and forces (Senge, 1990). Senge labels these kinds of complex problems "divergent problems" (1990, p. 283) and describes them as
problems for which there are multiple, sometimes conflicting solutions; problems which defy logical solutions; problems which create tension and anxiety; and problems which require a tolerance for ambiguity and lack of certainty. In the context of this paradigm, teacher supervision is believed to involve the development and enhancement of teachers’ cognitive development and capabilities for making judgments (Costa, & Garmston, 1985 & 1994; Garmston, Linder, & Whitaker, 1993).

The nature of teacher learning. The new paradigm of teaching and corresponding perception of teacher supervision as a process of enhancing teacher’s intellectual development has led to an interest in the study of teacher learning. Theorists and researchers are generating new knowledge and understandings with respect to how teachers learn, how they develop, how their development affects their learning and performance, and how their learning and development can be facilitated. The origins of this knowledge reside in a variety of theories of adult development and the applicability and utility of this knowledge for teacher supervision is being demonstrated through the work of researchers.

Theories of adult development can generally categorized as either stage theories or phase theories (Levine, 1995). Stage theories represent individual development as progressing through a sequentially ordered progression of stages with movement through these stages occurring independently of the individual’s chronological age. Phase theories, in contrast, depict development as progressing through age-related phases. Stage and phase theories play complimentary roles in describing adult
development. While stage theories focus on the cognitive models (mental models) adults construct and use to understand themselves and their world, phase theories highlight the major life tasks, conflicts, preoccupations, and transitions which shape adult behaviors at various points in the adult life cycle (Levine, 1995).

Examples of stage theories include the adult development theories of King and Kitchener (1994), Hunt (Hunt, Butler, Noy, & Rosser, 1978), and Kegan (1994). King's and Kitchener's, Hunt's and Kegan's theories provide frameworks for understanding and assessing cognitive development. Kitchener's, Hunts' and Kegan's theories define and describe the development of an individuals concepts of knowledge, learning processes, problem-solving approaches, and tolerance for ambiguity. As illustrated by these theories, individuals' concepts of knowledge progress from a view of knowledge as concrete, certain, and discoverable to a view of knowledge as abstract, uncertain, and constructed. In the beginning stages of knowledge development, individuals discover knowledge through their senses, in the final stages the individuals construct knowledge through dialogue with others and through reflection. Individuals at the earliest stages of knowledge development attempt to solve divergent problems by looking for the right answer while individuals at the very latest stage of development create synergistic and transformative solutions through dialogue and reflection. In the initial stages of development, individuals have little to no tolerance for ambiguity or uncertainty, while in the final stages, they have a high degree of tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty.
Hunt (Hunt et al., 1978) and Kegan (1994) include perspectives on how cognitive development shapes the individuals’ interpersonal behaviors. They posit that as individuals mature cognitively, they progress through three major stages of interacting with others--dependence, independence, and interdependence and that their processes for resolving differences of opinion evolve from insisting on one-side solutions, through the ability to compromise, to the capacity to participate in creating synergistic or transformation solutions. Initially, individuals actions are dependent upon their own inner needs and then dependent upon social conventions and expectations; individuals are able to resolve differences only by proving or conceding their opinion. At the middle stage, individuals are able to act independently of both their inner needs and social conventions and expectations and are able to resolve differences through compromise. At the final stage, individuals act interdependently with others, are able to engage in dialogue and reflection, and are able to resolve differences through the creation of synergistic solutions (newly created solutions) or transformative solutions (solutions which involve changes in themselves).

Kegan (1994) also describes how cognitive development shapes and individuals’ intrapersonal development. He theorizes that as individuals mature cognitively, they evolve from individuals who are motivated by and subject to their internal, biological impulses to individuals with the capacity to stand apart from themselves to the extent that they can engage in critical reflection and make changes in their own mental models and behaviors.
In combination, these theorists (Hunt et al., 1978; Kegan, 1994; King, & Kitchener, 1994;) portray adult learning as an active process in which the individuals construct meaning from their experiences. The process involves alternating periods of action (inquiry and participation) and self-reflection. Inquiry involves examining new ideas through such means as research, reading, and dialogue. Participation is the act of trying new behaviors based upon the ideas gained through inquiry. Self-reflection is a process of introspection, of assessing the experience gained through participation and deriving meaning and learning from the experience. Learning is stored in mental models and individuals learn by assimilating information which is compatible with their mental models and by changing their mental model to accommodate information which differs from their original mental model. Additionally, these theorist maintain that individuals' capacities to engage in the process of inquiry, participation, and reflection and the meaning individuals construct through the process are determined by the individuals' level of cognitive development. Individuals at the lower end of the development continuum, for example, would likely seek to find the "right" answers, experience anxiety in trying new strategies, and have difficulty critically examining themselves. In contrast, individuals at the higher end of the continuum would be more likely to create answers through dialogue with others, find enjoyment and challenge in trying new strategies, and be able to engage in critical self-reflection.

King and Kitchener (1994) and Kegan (1994) suggest that adult cognitive development can be fostered and facilitated through the
provision of appropriate challenges and supports. They define appropriate challenges as those which place new and higher demands upon individuals and/or which cause individuals to examine and transform themselves and appropriate supports as those which provide the elements which are necessary to sustain individuals' growth. King and Kitchener caution that the level of challenge provided must be carefully selected and determined on the basis of the individuals' existing level of development. Challenges which are inappropriately matched to individuals' developmental needs will generally not result in growth. Kegan (1994) illustrates through numerous anecdotal examples the negative consequences of challenges which are too extreme. In his examples, individuals who experience demands which are too far above their present developmental capabilities respond to these demands with all variety of emotional and behavioral responses including anger, hurt, depression, confusion, fear, frustration, resistance, avoidance, or withdrawal. Appropriate supports may include physical, emotional, or intellectual assistance; the provision of time; the investment of financial resources, or necessary services or materials. King and Kitchener also make the point that individuals' perceptions of what constitutes challenge and what constitutes support vary from one developmental level to another (1994, p. 245).

Representative of phase theories are the developmental theories of Erikson, Levinson, and Gould (Levine, 1995). These theorists portray development as a sequential, lifelong, process stimulated by certain major life tasks, conflicts, preoccupations, assumptions, or transition
periods and involving the interaction of individuals with their environment. They describe age-related, distinguishable periods of development from young adulthood (roughly age 20 to 40), middle adulthood (40 to 60), and late adulthood (age 60 and beyond). At each developmental phase, individuals are confronted with different demands and issues, new conditions and contexts, and new perspectives on matters of life. In young adulthood, individuals are separating from their families, pursuing careers, establishing families of their own the, and experiencing conflicts between intimacy and isolation. In middle adulthood, individuals are concerned with balancing career and family and the needs of others with the needs of self. They experience conflict between their desire for generativity and their self-absorption. In late adulthood, individuals strive to integrate past experience with the present realities and develop wisdom through the resolution of the conflict between integrity and despair and disgust. How individuals resolve these demands and issues, respond to the new conditions and contexts, and interpret the new perspectives, shape individuals’ views of themselves and their interactions and relationships with others.

Levine (1995), suggests that stage theories and phase theories offer new ways for viewing and understanding adult learning, abilities and behaviors and have significance for those who are involved in fostering the professional growth of teachers. She stresses that among the most valuable contributions of these theories is notion that the onset of adulthood does not mark the end of development, that instead, development continues throughout adulthood even until death. In
applying stage theories to teachers, Levine, explains that the teachers' stages of cognitive development affect their ability to conduct inquiry and to derive meaning from experience and influence the kind of meaning teachers derive. It also influences how teachers are able to interact with students, colleagues, and supervisors and their ability to engage in productive, critical, self-reflection. Further, Levine supports the notion that fostering teachers' development is a responsibility of the school and offers the belief that teachers and administrators should be made aware of and become knowledgeable about adult development theories. Using a case study of a principal involved in dismissing a veteran teacher, Levine demonstrates the important role developmental theories can play in this highly stressful process. Through another case study, she offers evidence of the utility of adult development theory as a catalyst and support for improvements in staff morale, curriculum development, and student learning.

Levine argues, that to be most effective, efforts to challenge and support teachers' professional growth must be compatible with teachers' stages of development and take into account the the context of teachers' life phase. She notes that challenges and supports for teachers' development can take many forms and identifies workshops, seminars, courses, and professional literature as some of the most traditional forms. She identifies a variety of other forms including: independent learning which enable a teacher or teachers to engage in self-designed projects, release time and sabbaticals which provide a teacher or teachers with time to interact with others and to pursue new learning, peer-
assisted partnerships which provide a teacher with the on-going assistance and support of another teacher, mentor programs which pair a teacher with a more experienced teacher who can serve as a guide, and coaching which provides a teacher with a qualified professional who observes the teacher in the classroom and coaches his/her performance (p. 259-263). Levine also identifies as *forms of challenge and support* team teaching which may involve pairs or multi-person teams of teachers who share a common group of students and who teach together throughout a year or over multiple years (p. 19) and support groups which are comprised of teachers who have common needs or goals and who come together regularly to share experiences, ideas, and support for one another (p. 266). Levine also identifies role-taking as a form of challenge and support. She defines role-taking as “the experience of assuming real tasks and responsibilities for a role somewhat more demanding and complex than the job a person has already performed” (p. 265). Reiman and Thies-Sprinthall (1993) and Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprintall (1993) experienced success in fostering teacher conceptual growth through the role-taking experiences of mentoring and supervising teachers.

Oja and Smulyan (1989) illustrate the utility of collaborative action research as a form of challenge and support. Collaborative action research is a process in which a group of teachers and/or administrators work with a university faculty member or members on a project which is intended to create individual and organizational improvements, to provide professional development, and to contribute to the body of
educational research knowledge. Collaborative action research is characterized by a collaboration between participants and a focus on problems in educational practice as identified by practitioners.

These various forms of challenges and supports (and there are others) have in common the elements which are necessary for advancing teacher development—participation, inquiry, and reflection. Each requires and encourages teachers to express themselves through thought and action and to receive feedback or responses to their expression, to actively seek out and develop an understanding of the ideas of others, and to reflect upon their own expressions and understandings. Through these processes the teachers are able to create the self-transformations which move them forward in their development.

When supervision is viewed as encompassing the purposes of promoting adult development and fostering professional development, theories of adult development clearly have application to supervision practices. Levine's illustrates this point as she links theories of adult development to an expanded view of supervision. The application of adult development theory to teacher supervision can be found in the work of Carl Glickman. Glickman (Glickman, & Gordon, 1987) advocates a development model for supervision in which supervisor efforts to assist teacher improvement are matched to the conceptual levels of teachers. He bases his model on three propositions: first, that teachers levels of development vary in response to their personal backgrounds and experiences; second, that different levels of development require different forms of supervision; and third, that
promoting teacher conceptual development should be a goal of supervision. He describes the supervisor’s job as diagnosing the teacher’s developmental level, matching supervision to the identified level, and accelerating the growth of the teacher’s conceptual development and offers examples of supervisory strategies to be used.

Application of developmental theory to teacher supervision can also be seen in the work of Zimpher and Howey (1987). Zimpher and Howey identify four types of teacher competence—technical, clinical, personal, and critical—each possessing a continuum of levels of complexity. As does Glickman, Zimpher and Howey recognize that teachers’ function at different levels of complexity and believe that assisting teacher movement toward greater levels of complexity is a goal of supervision. Likewise, they also advocate matching supervision strategies to teacher competence levels and provide suggestions for strategies to be used.

Oja and Smulyan (1989) describe the influence of adult development on the learning achieved by teachers involved in a collaborative action research project. Collaborative action research is a process involving inquiry, participation, and self-reflection designed to foster teacher growth, instructional and organizational improvement, as well as, to inform research. Oja and Smulyan demonstrate that the nature and level of learning achieved by each teacher varied in relation to the teachers’s stages and phases of development.

Robert Evans (1989) draws upon the developmental phase theory of Levinson and the work of Levine, to identify the developmental
characteristics and corresponding developmental needs of midcareer teachers. Evans identifies midcareer as a critical juncture for teachers' and maintains that supervision practices do little to motivate veteran teachers to improve their performance. He recommends that midcareer teachers be given opportunities to experience more variety and new challenges in their careers through such options as job sharing, leadership roles, voluntary transfers, and the like, believing that these options better meet the needs of the teachers and provide more stimulation for teacher growth.

The new understandings emanating from developmental theories and those who are applying the theories to teacher supervision suggest that teacher learning is an active, individualized, idiosyncratic process influenced by the teacher's levels and stages of development and occurring through the processes of inquiry, participation, and reflection. Correspondingly, they are giving rise to the belief that teacher supervision should be a developmentally-based, individualized process of guiding and assisting teacher inquiry, participation, and reflection and a process in which teachers are active participants, not passive recipients. These new understandings and beliefs are operationalized through the work of Costa and Garmston (1994), Schon (1988), Canning (1991), Reiman and Thies-Sprintall (1993), Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprinthall (1993), and Sparks-Langer and Colton (1991 who have focused their attention on the inquiry, participation, reflection process and most particularly, on the reflection component.

Costa and Garmston (1994) and Schon (1988) believe that teachers
develop and improve through continually reflecting upon their teaching experiences and envision teacher supervision as a process in which the supervisor (acting as a coach) stimulates and encourages the teachers' reflections. The coaches' job is to help teachers make sense of what they are seeing, to assist teachers in examining their own ways of thinking and making decisions, and to enable teachers to apply the understandings gained. Costa and Garmston refer to the post conference portion of the observation cycle as the "reflecting conference" (1994, p. 2). They describe the purpose and function of this reflecting conference as assisting the teacher through questioning and dialogue in reflecting upon the differences between the lesson envisioned and the lesson performed and in projecting how future lessons might be taught. Through this process, the teacher builds a teaching repertoire (Schon, 1988).

Using a collaborative action research model, Christine Canning (1991) examined what teachers had to say about the effects or outcomes of reflection. She discovered that reflection helped teachers to develop voices of their own, internalize the reflection questions, and create changes in themselves. In developing their own voices, teachers integrated learning with experience to create their own profession positions and in internalizing the reflection questions, teachers learned to ask themselves the questions normally posed by their supervisors. The teachers reported that reflection gave them insights into themselves and in consequence, enabled them to make changes in themselves.

Through their work with mentors and supervising teachers,
Reiman and Thies-Sprintall (1993) and Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprintall (1993) examined the effectiveness of pairing role-taking and reflection in fostering the conceptual growth in teachers. Using journal writing as the reflective medium, they identified stages of reflective expression and supervisor responses which supported and facilitated teacher conceptual growth and found evidence to suggest that when used in concert, role-taking and reflection facilitated conceptual growth.

In (1991) Sparks-Langer and Colton published a synthesis of research on teacher reflective thinking. Through this synthesis, they highlighted three key components or dimensions of teacher reflection---cognitive reflection, critical reflection, and teachers' narratives. They present cognitive reflection as the process by which teachers construct meaning through reflection on their experiences and explain that teachers organize learning into cognitive structures called schemata and continuously expand and revise these structures through the processes of assimilation and accommodation. They report that researchers have found that expert teachers have developed more complex and advanced schemata than novice teachers. They state that in the process of critical reflection, teachers examine the moral and ethical dimensions of their decisions and when making decisions, take into consideration the desired social outcomes of education. They identify teacher narratives as a means for helping teachers' to make explicit and visible their own interpretations of experiences and of the context in which they work. In combining these three components or dimension, Sparks-Langer and Colton characterize teacher reflection as a process of specific teacher
actions which help to make visible to the teachers the knowledge upon which they base decisions, the processes they use for making decisions, the guiding beliefs and values which shape their decisions, and the role of their perceptions of their experiences and their environment in their understandings and decision making.

Values

Teacher development. In recent years, educational and organizational theorists leaders have illuminated the value of teachers as resources within the educational organization and taught that these resources only become true assets through investment and development (Covey, 1989, 1991; Fullan, 1993; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992). They maintain that maximization of the talents of each individual within the organization requires the investment of time, effort, and money in development activities (Fullan, 1993, Levine, 1995). Their position is strengthened by the work of Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein ((1984) who examined factors which enhance the effectiveness of teacher supervision, identified a high level of district commitment and resource investment as one of five contributing factors. They particularly emphasized the need to invest money and to provide adequate time for teacher supervision activities. Through the influence of this value, teacher supervision has taken on new worth as a medium for effecting the development of the organization's human resources. Increasingly, supervision is being linked to and used to inform the organization's efforts to provide professional training and professional development opportunities for teachers and is being viewed as a medium for fostering
teacher personal and professional development (Brandt, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1996; Grimmett, Rostad, & Ford, 1992; Levine, 1995).

Norms

The supervisor-teacher relationship. Theorists have stressed the need for supervisor-teacher interaction behaviors and attitudinal norms which are compatible with the beliefs and values previously described (Acheson, & Gall, 1994; Brandt, 1996; Grimmett et al., 1992; Sergiovanni, 1982). The norms they advocate as necessary to the supervisor-teacher relationship and include: collaborative effort, a shared commitment to the teacher's professional growth, open and honest communication, and high levels of interpersonal trust.

Collaborative effort and a shared commitment to professional growth make supervisors and teachers partners who work in concert throughout the supervision process, open and honest communication facilitates individualizing supervision, and trust is critical to creating the professional exchange and collaboration necessary to promote teacher development and improvement.

In describing and defining cognitive coaching, Costa and Garmston focus considerable attention on the issue of trust and its critical function in the coaching process. In one study, Costa and Garmston asked people to describe how they develop trust in relationships and received the following responses: "maintaining confidentiality, being visible and accessible, behaving consistently, keeping commitments, sharing personal information about out-of school activities, revealing feelings, expressing personal interest in people, acting nonjudgmentally,
listening reflectively, admitting mistakes, and demonstrating professional knowledge and skills" (1994, p. 36). These behaviors are, in effect, the characteristics of collaboration, shared commitment, and open and honest communication in action. Costa and Garmston emphasize that the coaching process rests on a necessary foundation of trust and place responsibility for developing trust in the hands of the coach. They maintain that coaches who are most successful in establishing trust exhibit the behaviors just described, trust in themselves, express personal regard for each individual teacher, and by always making known the purposes of their actions and communications. They advise that principals who perform the dual roles of coaching and evaluating, communicate clearly and openly at each interaction, which role they are fulfilling. Nolan, who is a proponent of Costa and Garmston’s model, notes that teacher development is a process which unfolds slowly and stresses the importance of commitment between the coach and the teacher to a long and enduring relationship of continuous interaction (Nolan, 1989). Nolan also takes issue with educators continued use of the term reflective supervision, arguing that the word supervision connotes a hierarchical relationship between the supervisor and the teacher when the relationship actually desired is one "of equality, of mutual vulnerability, of mutual leadership" (1989, p.38) and urges the use of the term coach or consultant.

Studies and descriptions of current supervision practices reveal the emergence of these relationship norms and affirm their enhancement of the effectiveness of teacher supervision in promoting teacher
improvement and development. Poole (1995) studied the changing relationship between supervisors and teachers as a new and more collaborative model of teacher supervision was being implemented in a central New York school district. She investigated teachers’ and supervisors’ perceptions of the changing relationship on such dimensions as trust, trustworthiness, honesty, and risk-taking and found slow but positive changes developing in the perceptions of both teachers and supervisors on each of these dimensions. Through the case study of a supervisory relationship, Bureau (1993) found evidence to support the conclusion that a collaborative supervisor-teacher relationship, characterized by trust, collegiality, and open expression facilitated change in the beliefs and classroom practices of a veteran teacher.

Through their examination and analysis of Bureau’s case study and four similar case studies of clinical supervision, Nolan, Hawkes, and Francis (1993) identified a relationship of collegiality as one of five factors, common to each of the studies, which maximized the benefits of the supervision process for the teacher. They described collegial supervisor-teacher relationships as relationships characterized by mutual respect and trust, as relationships in which the supervisor acts and is perceived as acting in a non-threatening and helpful manner, and as relationships in which there is equality of efforts, a sense of humility, and mutual vulnerability (1993, p. 55). McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1986) identified mutual trust and open communication between teachers and administrators and a commitment to both individual and institutional learning as qualities which enabled school districts to successfully
implement new systems for teacher supervision. Through his analysis of recordings of supervisor-teacher conferences, Waite (1991, 1993) noted that the teachers' role in the conferences ranged from passive to collaborative to adversarial and that either party in the relationship had the capacity to take the relationship in any one of these three directions. His findings led him to conclude that both the supervisor and the teacher bear responsibility for establishing and nurturing a collaborative relationship and suggested that through focusing on the specifics of the supervisory contexts rather than the teacher's behavior, supervisors and teachers could become co-researchers in their particular situations.

Effectiveness of Teacher Supervision

Throughout the literature on supervision effectiveness, frequent reference is made to a nationally conducted, effectiveness study undertaken and completed by Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984). Due to the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of this study in dealing with multiple dimensions of teacher supervision, it has already been cited at various points in this literature review. Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein used a two-phase research process to study the effectiveness of teacher supervision systems and to identify the characteristics or elements which contributed to effectiveness in achieving the dual ends of helping teachers to improve and providing information for making personnel decisions (p. vi). In the first phase, they examined the teacher supervision systems of 32 school districts (nationally distributed) reputed to have highly developed systems and in the second phase, they conducted a more in depth study.
of the systems of four districts whose supervision systems they had 
judged to be highly effective in the dual purposes of informing 
employment decisions and improving teacher classroom performance--
Salt Lake City, Utah; Lake Washington, Washington; Greenwich, 
Connecticut; and Toledo, Ohio. They noted that in each of these 
districts, the teacher supervision system had been implemented as 
planned, that everyone in the district understood the system, and that 
the districts actually used the results of the supervision process. In 
conducting their research, Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and 
Bernstein reviewed documentation pertaining to district personnel and 
evaluation policies and interviewed superintendents and other central 
office personnel. They also interviewed officers of the teachers’ unions, 
school board members, parents, and community representatives. They 
visited six schools in each district and interviewed principals, other 
specialized personnel, and a minimum of six teachers including building 
level union representatives (1984, v). From their research, they drew five 
conclusions about the characteristics necessary to the success of a 
teacher evaluation system: the system must be compatible with district’s 
goals, beliefs, and values; the system must be supported by a high level 
of commitment and resource investment; the system should match 
closely with its intended purposes; the system must be seen by teachers 
and supervisors as having utility; and the system must involve and give 
responsibility to teachers. To insure compatibility between the district’s 
goals, beliefs, and values and the teacher supervision system, Wise, 
Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein recommend that districts
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examine and clarify their educational goals, management style, conception of teaching, and community values and then select or develop a teacher supervision system which is compatible with these (1984, p. 67). Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein noted that successful teacher supervision systems were “distinguished by the seriousness of purpose and intensity of implementation” (p. 67) and recommended that districts provide adequate funding and sufficient time for the fulfillment of the supervision activities, that districts regularly review and assess the quality of the teacher supervision practices, and that they provide continuous training for district supervisors in the necessary supervisory skills. Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein determined that the objectives of improving teacher performance and informing personnel decisions create conflicting demands with the first objective requiring a highly individualized and flexible process and the second necessitating a standardized and uniformly applied process. They reason that a single supervision system cannot optimally serve both purposes and recommend that districts either establish more than one process or that districts clarify their primary purpose and design a compatible process. Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein stressed that to be perceived and valued as having utility a supervision system must meet the needs of the teachers and produce results which justify the financial and human investment in the process. They recommend that districts expend adequate levels of funding on teacher supervision, target their expenditures to achieve beneficial outcomes, and make clearly visible the
outcomes of the process. Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein found that all four of the districts examined in phase two of their study used master teachers in some segments or components of the teacher supervision process. They noted that the use of master teachers strengthened the districts' capacities to supervise teachers effectively and promoted the development and dissemination of professional standards of practice (p. 76). They also observed that in all four districts, the teacher organization (union) was involved in designing and overseeing the teacher supervision system and that their involvement helped to address issues of credibility, due process, and fairness. They recommend that districts involve expert teachers in the supervision of other teachers, particularly novice teachers and teachers in need of remedial assistance. They also recommend that districts involve their teacher organizations in developing and monitoring the teacher supervision system. Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein observed a new level of labor relations in one of the districts, a level which they referred to as a level of "negotiated responsibility" (p. 79). They explain that negotiated responsibility yields a collective professionalism among the faculty and administration which is more powerful than a single teacher's sense of professionalism and facilitates collaboration between teachers and administrators. They identify this collective professionalism as a means for enforcing professional standards of practice and recommend that districts develop standards of practice which compel teachers to make appropriate instructional decisions on behalf of their students and to hold the teachers accountable to these standards (p. 80).
While Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein focused their study on well-developed systems of teacher supervision, McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1986) studied four school districts (three in California and one in North Carolina) in which new teacher supervision systems had recently and successfully been initiated. McLaughlin and Pfeifer identified as successful teacher supervision systems, those which had been implemented in the manner which had been planned. In conducting their study, they interviewed central office staff, administrators and/or trainers, and teachers. They analyzed district records and made follow-up contact with some district officials. Based upon their research, McLaughlin and Pfeifer identified four conditions which enabled these districts to successfully implement new teacher supervision systems: mutual trust between teachers and administrators, open communication, commitment to both individual and institutional learning, and the visibility of evaluation and related learning activities. Additionally, McLaughlin and Pfeifer identified six design considerations which were critical to the success of the new teacher supervision systems: joint training for administrators and teachers, a system of checks and balances for reliability and validity, an accountability structure for evaluators and evaluations, effective feedback procedures, flexible implementation, and the integration of resources for evaluation and professional development. McLaughlin and Pfeifer identified joint training of the supervisors (principals and assistant principals) as a critical factor in gaining teacher approval and acceptance. They found that joint training helped to create a common language and build a
common understanding of the teacher supervision system, helped to
break down old barriers between supervisors and teachers, clarified roles,
rules, and criteria, and enhanced the credibility of supervisors by
legitimizing their expertise. They found that a system of checks and
balances were necessary to address concerns of reliability, validity, and
fairness. These systems of checks and balances included the use of
multiple sources of performance information, a remediation process for
teachers identified as needing improvement, and levels of review
including an advisory team, a district review committee, and
superintendent review. McLaughlin and Pfeifer found that each district
held supervisors accountable for performing their supervisory/evaluative
functions and for the quality of their performance. In one district, they
learned that some principals had been placed on remediation plans for
producing poor evaluations. McLaughlin and Pfeifer determined that the
form and timeliness of feedback were of critical importance. They
describe as most useful, feedback which is specific, credible, perceived as
non punitive, and provided soon after the observation. McLaughlin and
Pfeifer found that supervision was most effective when the instrument
used was dictated by the goals of the each teacher's individual growth
plan rather than a standardized form which was applied to everyone.
They identified the integration of evaluation and staff development
resources as the means through which teachers and supervisors were
able to act upon the teachers growth goals or remediate identified
weaknesses.

Patrick and Dawson (1985) conducted a study in which they
examined the teacher supervision systems of five school districts in the state of Pennsylvania to identify elements critical to the design and implementation of teacher supervision systems. In selecting the districts for their study, Patrick and Dawson chose three districts which used Madeline Hunter-based models and two which had alternative systems. They collected data through a multilayered process of interviews with central office staff, administrators, and teachers, document analysis, site visits, and follow-up interviews. Many of their findings were similar to those of Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1984) and/or to those of McLaughlin and Pfeifer, (1986). In particular, three of their findings were similar to those of Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein and McLaughlin and Pfeifer. The first of these findings was the presence of a strong commitment to teacher supervision as a long term improvement effort as demonstrated through leadership, the provision of adequate time, and the investment of adequate levels of funding. The second finding involved making visible the utility of the teacher supervision system by accurately and adequately portraying the intended and real impacts of the system on teacher behavior. The third finding pointed to the importance of initial and ongoing training for both teachers and supervisors. In common with Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein, Patrick and Dawson identified concerns involving the potential conflict between supervision and evaluation and teacher involvement. While Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein concluded that the ends of supervision and evaluation could not be achieved through a single
process, Patrick and Dawson suggested that the formative phase (supervision) and the summative phase (evaluation) could be joined if the criteria used during the classroom observations were incorporated as the criteria used for the summative evaluation and if the relationship between the formative phase and summative phase were made clear to teachers at the outset. Like Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein, Patrick and Dawson identified teacher involvement in the planning and oversight of the teacher supervision system as a critical component for success, but they did not extend teacher involvement in the actual teacher supervision system to the level suggested by Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein. Rather, they saw a role for teachers in the formation of support groups, organized by grade level or subject area which met a few times a year. With respect to feedback procedures and the integration of supervision with staff development, Patrick and Dawson produced findings which were similar to those of McLaughlin and Pfeifer. As did, McLaughlin and Pfeifer, Patrick and Dawson found that effective feedback procedures were those which were flexible enough to enable supervisors to match the feedback form and process to the needs of the individual teachers and that effective teacher supervision systems were those which integrated the district functions of supervision and staff development thereby enabling the two functions to inform and enhance one another.

In combination, these three studies reveal a number of characteristics which contribute to the effectiveness of teacher supervision. In particular, they establish the importance of a strong
commitment to teacher supervision as a teacher improvement process, the necessity for making visible the utility of the supervision process, and the importance of training for both supervisors and teachers. Additionally, they highlight the need for a level of flexibility which enables supervisors to match the supervision process to the needs of the teachers and the value in joining supervision with staff development. They also highlight the importance of teacher involvement in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the supervision system and underscore the importance of examining closely the processes and outcomes of supervision and evaluation and determining whether a single system can serve both ends, whether multiple systems should be developed in order to achieve both ends, or whether a decision should be made regarding the relative priority of these ends.

The findings of these three studies affirm and add to the structural components and cultural characteristics discussed previously in this review. The establishment of the importance of a strong commitment to teacher supervision as a teacher improvement process provides affirms the importance of valuing teacher development previously discussed. The identification of the need for flexibility affirms earlier discussions of the need for differentiated levels and forms of supervision which can be matched to the needs and developmental phases and stages of the teacher. The recognition of the importance of joining supervision with staff development affirms the previously explored belief that professional development is an important and intended purpose of teacher supervision and suggests that these two practices should be linked
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structurally. The spotlighting of the importance of teacher involvement in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the supervision system affirm earlier discussions of the importance of teacher involvement in developing and implementing the various structural components of the system and the necessity for teacher supervision to be a collaborative process between teachers and supervisors in order for maximum teacher learning and improvement to take place. The emphasis on the importance of matching the teacher supervision system to its intended purposes, highlights and affirms earlier exploration of the numerous purposes teacher supervision can serve and signals the necessity for specifying the purposes and structurally aligning the system with its intended ends. The identification of the necessity for making visible the utility of the supervision process suggests not only the need for specifying the purposes of teacher supervision and aligning the structure, but also the importance of demonstrating clearly and regularly how the results of the process contribute to these ends. In highlighting the importance of training for both supervisors and teachers, the findings suggests the addition of this practice within the design and implementation of the system.

In their studies of the 100 largest school districts, Ellett and Garland (1987) and Loup, Garland, Ellett, and Rugutt (1996) examined three of the characteristics identified by the previously cited studies as contributors to the effectiveness of teacher supervision—training, teacher involvement, and linking teacher supervision with staff development. In combination, these two studies revealed that slightly more than half of
the districts studied required comprehensive training for supervisors, that nearly all (greater than 90%) of the districts involved teachers in the development of the teacher supervision system, and that many districts (greater than 80%) used supervision results as documentation or support for teacher growth and professional development. The studies did not examine the incidence of teacher training.

Summary

I have used the preceding literature review to synthesize the ideas of various theorists and researchers whose writings either directly address teacher supervision or indirectly offer implications for it and the findings of researchers. In conducting this synthesis, I have endeavored to construct a contemporary, perhaps even futuristic, description of the structural and cultural dimensions of best practice in teacher supervision. Further, I have attempted to highlight the contributions of the components of these dimensions to the effectiveness of teacher supervision. The description developed herein helped to shape this study and provided a context for the discussion of the study results.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to develop a description of the perceptions of New Hampshire teachers and supervisors regarding present and ideal teacher supervision. Specifically, the study sought to describe:

1. The perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding the structural (practices) and cultural (beliefs, values, and norms) dimensions and effectiveness of their present teacher supervision system;

2. The perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding structural practices and culture characteristics they would consider ideal;

3. The extent to which teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of their present system match their perceptions of the ideal;

4. Any variation which exists between the perceptions of teachers and the perceptions of supervisors with respect to teacher supervision.

Instrumentation

Data for this study were collected through the use of two surveys, one for teachers (Appendix A) and one for supervisors (Appendix B) which I developed specifically for this study. The first drafts of the surveys contained 79 closed response items, 3 open response items, and 7 (teacher form) and 8 (supervisor form) demographic items. I piloted these drafts with six teachers (two elementary, two middle level, two high
school) and one administrator. Based upon discussions with the individuals involved in the pilot, I revised the wording of some items in order to make their intended meaning clearer. Feedback from the participants suggested quite strongly that the surveys be reduced in length as completion of the surveys required 45 to 50 minutes. I reduced the number of closed response items from 79 to 62 by combining some items and eliminating others.

I also submitted the original drafts to the New Hampshire Joint Education Council Executive Board for review and feedback. The executive board is comprised of the executive directors of each of its member organizations and one representative from each organization. The member organizations include the New Hampshire School Boards Association, the New Hampshire School Administrators Association, the New Hampshire Association of School Principals, and the New Hampshire affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. I used the feedback from the members of the board in combination with the feedback of the pilot participants in the first revision of the surveys.

The revised surveys were examined by two additional teachers. While the teachers found the wording of the items to be clear, they indicated that the survey was still quite long requiring at least 30 minutes to complete. Again through combining and eliminating items, I reduced the number of closed response items from 62 to 38. This version of the surveys was reviewed by another teacher for final clarification of wording and consideration of length. Based on conversations with this
teacher, I made a few final wording changes. The time estimated for
completion of the survey was 15 to 20 minutes.

The final forms of the survey instruments used in this study
included 38 closed response items and 3 open response items. The
teacher survey contained 7 demographic items and the supervisor survey,
9 demographic items. The closed response items on each of the surveys
were presented in two separate, titled sections: Section 1. Teacher
Supervision/Evaluation Practices, Beliefs, and Values; Section 2.
Effectiveness of the Teacher Supervision/Evaluation System. For the
items in sections one, respondents were asked to provide two responses
for each item, one response expressed the their perceptions of their
present teacher supervision system and the second reflected their view of
the ideal supervision system. Individuals were asked to identify their
responses on a Likert scale which included: (1) Strongly disagree, (2)
Disagree, (3) Disagree somewhat, (4) Agree somewhat, (5) Agree, (6)
Strongly agree. In section two, respondents were asked to express their
perceptions of the effectiveness of their present supervision system. They
were asked to convey their responses on a Likert scale which included:
(1) Highly ineffective, (2) Ineffective, (3) Somewhat ineffective, (4)
Somewhat effective, (5) Effective, (6) Highly effective. In section three
respondents were given the opportunity to express general comments
about the strengths, weaknesses, and improvement needs of their present
teacher supervision systems in response to three open-ended questions.
Section four sought demographic data including: total number of years
as a teacher or supervisor, the number of years of teaching or supervising
in the present district, the subjects taught or the number of teachers supervised, the grade levels of the school, the gender of the respondent, and for supervisors only, the title of their positions and sources of training in teacher supervision. Items on the teacher survey and the supervisor survey were matched item for item to facilitate comparison between the responses of teachers and those of the supervisors.

As this study was intended to assess teachers' and supervisors' attitudes towards their present teacher supervision system and one they would consider ideal, I sought a survey format which would yield both forms of information. The format I used was drawn from two sources--a study conducted by Burke and Kray (1985) and a dissertation study completed by John Pike (1996) at the University of New Hampshire. Both studies utilized a dual Likert scale response format to assess respondent attitudes towards their actual experiences with supervision and regarding what they preferred or viewed as preferred practices. On one scale the respondents were asked to rate their agreement with the statement in terms of their present, real experiences and on the second scale, they were asked to rate their agreement with respect to what they would envision as ideal. Burke and Kray utilized a 5-point Likert scale which allowed respondents to choose a neutral response, while Pike employed a 6-point Likert scale which provided no neutral point. Following upon the format of the surveys in these studies, I used a dual Likert scale response format and a six point, forced choice (no neutral point) scale for this study.

I developed the survey items primarily on the basis of information
gained through the literature review. An additional source of assistance in the development were the Personnel Evaluation Standards (1988) published by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, a sixteen member committee comprised of representatives from 14 national education associations including the: American Association of School Administrators, American Association of School Personnel Administration, American Educational Research Association, American Evaluation Association, American Federation of Teachers, American Psychological Association, Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Education Commission of the States, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Council on Measurement in Education, National Education Association, and National School Boards Association. As the Joint Committee based its development of the Standards upon the analysis and synthesis of both theory and research in teacher evaluation, the Standards reflect many of the elements and characteristics of teacher supervision identified and described in the preceding literature review. The Joint Committee developed 21 standards for sound teacher evaluation systems and organized these standards into four general attribute categories—propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy. The proprietary category is concerned with the legal and ethical aspects of teacher evaluation and includes five standards focused upon the topics of Service Orientation, Formal Evaluation Guidelines, Conflict of Interest, Access to Personnel...
Evaluation Reports, and Interaction with Evaluatees. The utility category is comprised of five standards which emphasize the need for evaluations to be informative, timely, and influential in improving teacher performance and include the following topics: Constructive Orientation, Defined Uses, Evaluator Credibility, Functional Reporting, and Follow-up and Impact. The feasibility category includes three standards focusing on the topics of Practical Procedures, Political Viability, and Fiscal Viability which stress the need for efficient, doable, and viable evaluation procedures. The accuracy category encompasses eight standards on the topics of Defined Role, Work Environment, Documentation Procedures, Valid Measurement, Reliable Measurement, Systematic Data Control, Bias Control, and Monitoring Evaluation Systems.

The Study Population

Within the state of New Hampshire, there are 171 school districts organized into 72 single or multi-district school administrative units, each of which is administered by a superintendent. These school districts employ a total of approximately 13,500 teachers and 450 principals and assistant principals (referred to jointly as “supervisors”). The goal of this study was to obtain a broadly-based description of teacher supervision in the state. Toward this end, I selected a total of 45 school districts and from those school districts, I surveyed 305 teachers (approximately 7 per district) and 73 supervisors (approximately 2 per district).
Sampling Procedures

I used a process of stratified random selection to identify school districts for the study using two stratification variables: geographic region and district wealth as measured by the equalized valuation per pupil. The 175 school districts in New Hampshire are organized into five geographic regions. The “Lakes Region” includes 28 school districts; the “North Country Region,” 39 school districts; the “Southcentral Region,” 21 school districts; the “Southeast Region,” 35 school districts; and the “Southwest Region,” 52 school districts. In identifying the 45 school districts for the study, I selected 9 districts from each geographic region. The equalized valuation per pupil is a measure of property wealth, specifically, it is the full market value of property within the school district per resident pupil. Using the equalized valuation per pupil of the districts as reported in the 1997 report New Hampshire School Districts and Municipalities: Summary of Selected Data on Ability to Pay, Effort and Fiscal Characteristics, published by the New Hampshire School Boards Association, I created three economic strata: districts whose equalized valuation per pupil was in the top third ($384,066 - $5,815,974), those whose equalized valuation per pupil was in the middle third ($261,048 - $383,529), and those whose equalized valuation per pupil was in the bottom third ($119,186 - $259,029). The portion of the 9 districts allocated to each wealth level were proportional to the size of the wealth level within the region and I randomly selected the districts from within each strata. I personally contacted, by telephone, the superintendent in charge of each district to explain the survey, secure
permission for participation in the study, and to obtain lists of the district's teachers and supervisors. I randomly selected to be surveyed, 7 teachers and 2 supervisors from each district list. In districts where there were fewer than seven teachers, I surveyed all of the teachers. In some districts, I was only able to survey one individual as there was only one supervisor responsible for supervision.

Data Collection Procedures

I mailed a survey, a cover letter (letter to teachers, Appendix C; letter to supervisors, Appendix D), and a letter of endorsement from the president of the New Hampshire Joint Education Council (Appendix E) to all members of the selected study sample and enclosed a pre-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the survey. I numbered each survey in order to identify respondents and non-respondents for follow-up purposes. The directions I included with the survey asked respondents to return the surveys within a two week period. At the conclusion of the two week period, I mailed a printed post card reminder to non-respondents (teacher-Appendix F, supervisor-Appendix G). The approach of the winter holiday break diminished the advisability and utility of an immediate second follow-up. I mailed a follow-up letter (teacher-Appendix H, supervisor Appendix I), second copy of the surveys, and return envelope and postage to the non-respondents when schools reopened in January. I asked respondents to return the surveys within a two week period. After three weeks had lapsed, I made follow-up telephone calls to all non-respondents. I made three attempts to directly speak with each non-respondent. If I was not able to make direct
contact with the individual on the third call, I left a message detailing the reason for my call and leaving my telephone number in the event the individual had concerns or needed another copy of the survey. Of the 73 supervisors surveyed, 59 responded (80% response rate), yielding 58 usable surveys (79% usable rate). Of the 305 teachers surveyed, 215 responded (70% response rate), yielding 197 usable surveys (65% usable response).

Data Analysis

I organized the data obtained through the 37 closed-response items of the survey into three categories--structural dimension, cultural dimension, and effectiveness. Within the structural and cultural dimensions, I further organized the data into four subscales--supervisor-present, supervisor-ideal, teacher-present, and teacher-ideal. I organized the data for the effectiveness items into two subscales--supervisor-present and teacher-present.

I conducted the statistical analysis of the data through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. I calculated means and standard deviations for each subscale and for each item within the subscales. Instances of non response, I coded as missing data to eliminate them from mean calculations. I calculated the reliability of each of the subscales using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, a measure of internal consistency among subscale items. I evaluated differences between supervisors and teachers on the present and ideal scales of the structural and cultural dimensions through a repeated measures analysis of variance and subsequent t-tests of the subscale.
means and selected item means. I utilized a one-way analysis of variance to examine the differences between supervisors and teachers with respect to perceptions of effectiveness. I present the results of this analysis in the following chapter.

I summarized responses to the open response questions regarding strengths and weaknesses of the teacher supervision system and recommendations for its improvement and used them to extend my discussion of the results of the analysis of the closed response items in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The sample for this study was comprised of 73 supervisors and 305 from 45 New Hampshire School Districts. Of the 73 supervisors, 59 supervisors responded, yielding 58 usable surveys. Of the 305 teachers, 215 responded, yielding 197 usable surveys. For the purposes of analysis, supervisor responses were aggregated across all school districts as were the responses of the teachers.

Demographic Characteristics of the Survey Respondents

Demographic data collected regarding the survey participants is presented in Table 1. The data include: total years of experience, years in their present district, school level, gender, highest degree earned, title of position, number of teachers supervised, and teacher subject areas.

Supervisors' total years of supervisory experience ranged from 0 to 3 years, to more than 30 years. The number of years supervisors had served as supervisors in their present districts ranged from 0 to 3 years, to 21 to 30 years. Teachers' total years of teaching experience and years of teaching in their present districts ranged from 0 to 3, to 30 or more years.

Supervisors and teachers represented all levels of education from elementary through high school. The largest portion of representation was from elementary schools followed by junior/senior high schools, middle schools, junior highs, and K-12 schools. This distribution is
closely reflective of the distribution of schools within the state which is
30% elementary, 10% middle school, 5% junior high schools, and 17%
high schools.

Among the supervisors, there were more males than females while
among the teachers, there were more females than males. Approximately
two thirds of the supervisors were male and one third, female; while
among teachers, approximately three quarters of the respondents were
female and one quarter were male.

Among the supervisors, the highest degree earned was a doctorate
with the highest percentage of respondents holding a master’s degree as
their highest degree. The highest degree earned among the teachers was
a certificate of advanced study. Slightly more than half of the teachers
reported their highest degree as a bachelor’s degree, while slightly fewer
than half reported holding a master’s degree.

Supervisors represented 7 administrative positions. The largest
number of supervisors were principals. The second largest number were
assistant principal.

The number of teachers supervisors were responsible for
supervising ranged from fewer than 10 to 100. The most common
number ranged between 26 and 50.

Teachers’ subject areas spanned all instructional disciplines.
Some teachers taught within one discipline while others taught across
two or more disciplines. Teachers who taught across “all” disciplines
generally taught English, Reading, Mathematics, Social Studies, and
Science.
Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Supervisor (N=58)</th>
<th>Teacher (N=197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in District</th>
<th>Supervisor (N=58)</th>
<th>Teacher (N=197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Supervisor (N=58)</th>
<th>Teacher (N=197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. high/High</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Supervisor (N=58)</th>
<th>Teacher (N=197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Continued: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Supervisor (N=58)</th>
<th>Teacher (N=197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS or BA</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGS or CAS</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD or EdD</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal degree</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Position</th>
<th>Supervisor (N=58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Principal</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Prin/SpEd Coord</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prin/SpEd Coord</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Teachers Supervised</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 Continued: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP/MATH/SCIEN/SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP/ENG/SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULINARY ARTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG/READING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG/SCIENCE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG/SOC STUD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG/MATH/SOC STUD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG/MATH/SCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG/READ/SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG/READ/SCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM &amp; CONSUM SCI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN LANG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDANCE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDANCE/HEALTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH/MATH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH/PE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH/READING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH/SCIENCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH/SOC STUDIES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING/SOC STUD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE/SOC STUD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL STUDIES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEC ED</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEECH/LANG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Supervisor and Teacher Perceptions

The surveys I used in this study were designed to examine teachers' and supervisors' perceptions on two dimensions of teacher supervision—the structural dimension and the cultural dimension—and their perceptions of the effectiveness of their teacher supervision system in fulfilling a variety of specified purposes. I conducted the data analysis within the framework of these three categories.

Structural Dimension

The "Structural Dimension" included 18 items (1 through 16) which dealt with the practices of the teacher supervision system. Specifically these practices included teacher performance standards, goal setting, 3-part observation cycle, total performance evaluation, training, differentiated supervision, and teacher involvement. For each of the 18 items, supervisors and teachers were asked to express their level of disagreement/agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) basing their first response on their present teacher supervision system and their second response on what they would consider an ideal teacher supervision system.

I organized the data for the structural dimension into four subscales—supervisor-present, teacher-present, supervisor-ideal, and teacher ideal and calculated the reliability of each of the four structural dimension subscales using Cronbach's alpha coefficient a measure of internal consistency that estimates reliability among subscale items. The alpha coefficients for the supervisor-present subscale and the supervisor-ideal subscale were both 0.81. The alpha coefficients for the
teacher-present subscale and the teacher-ideal subscale were 0.90 and 0.82, respectively. These four alpha levels reflect a high degree of internal consistency for each of the structural dimension subscales.

The mean and standard deviation for each item of each of the structural dimension subscales are presented in Table 2. The means for supervisors-present items ranged from 2.98 to 5.55 indicating variation in levels of agreement from disagree somewhat to agree/strongly agree and the means for teacher-present items ranged from 2.54 to 5.64 indicating levels of agreement ranging from disagree/disagree somewhat to agree/strongly agree. The means for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sup Pres M</th>
<th>Sup Pres SD</th>
<th>Tchr Pres M</th>
<th>Tchr Pres SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sup Ideal M</th>
<th>Sup Ideal SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tchr Ideal M</th>
<th>Tchr Ideal SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.95 1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3.82 1.59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.24 1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5.24 1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.78 1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4.34 1.92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.52 1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5.38 0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.79 1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.56 2.06</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.34 1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.99 1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.98 1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3.44 2.14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.93 1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.61 1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.74 1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.80 1.87</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.57 0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>5.35 1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q6a</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.03 1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4.11 1.86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.62 0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5.43 0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q6b</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.29 0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4.47 1.67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.81 0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5.54 0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.91 1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.21 1.95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.34 1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>5.24 1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.31 2.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4.40 2.20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.78 2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4.89 1.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.86 1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3.98 1.83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.66 0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5.28 1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.07 1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4.07 1.84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.47 0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>5.48 0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.72 1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.35 1.61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.59 0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5.46 0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q12a</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.98 2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.12 2.33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.53 2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.85 2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q12b</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.55 1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5.13 1.43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.72 0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>5.60 0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.02 1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2.54 1.78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.64 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4.96 1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.84 1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.79 1.98</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.67 0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5.64 0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.34 1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.75 1.62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.62 5.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5.29 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.40 2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.07 2.29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.66 1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.53 1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervisor-ideal items ranged from 3.53 to 5.81 indicating a range of levels of agreement from disagree somewhat/agree somewhat to strongly agree and the means for teacher-ideal items ranged from 3.85 to 5.64 indicating levels of agreement ranging from agree somewhat/agree to agree. Levels of agreement with the survey items reflect the extent to which supervisors and teachers perceived the presence of the practices of the structural dimension in their present teacher supervision system and their preference for them in their ideal. The general pattern of these responses suggests that supervisors and teachers had high preference for these practices but perceived a lower than ideal presence of them in their present system.

The mean and standard deviation of the total subscale for each of the structural dimension subscales are displayed in Table 3 and graphically represented in Figure 1. The means of the supervisor subscales were higher than the means of the corresponding teacher subscales.

Table 3: Structural Dimension Subscales-Subscale Means & Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pres M</th>
<th>Pres SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ideal M</th>
<th>Ideal SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79.62</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94.79</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>67.83</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>91.15</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I used a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) to evaluate these differences. The specific analysis used the role of the respondents (supervisor or teacher) as the between factor and the scale on which they responded (present or ideal) as the within factor. Table 4 contains the
results of the ANOVA. (I completed all analyses using only the data for respondents who completed the subscale, or in the cases of item analyses, those who responded to the item. Inspection of the data suggested that these data were representative of the study sample.)

The results showed that the difference between supervisors and teachers was significant at the \( p \leq .0001 \) level and that the difference between present and ideal was significant at the \( p \leq .0001 \) level. The results also showed a significant interaction (F=7.98, \( p \leq .005 \)) between role and scale.

Subsequently, I used a two-tailed t-test to examine the interaction of role and scale through the further analysis of the differences between supervisors and teachers for the present and ideal scales. The results, presented in Table 5 showed that at the \( p < .01 \) level, supervisors and teachers differed significantly with respect to the present but not with regard to the ideal. These results indicate that while supervisors and teachers shared similarly high preference for the practices of the structural dimension in their perceptions of the ideal, supervisors perceived a higher presence of the practices of the structural dimension in the present teacher supervision system than did the teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Supervisor Mean n=42</th>
<th>Supervisor SD</th>
<th>Teacher Mean n=126</th>
<th>Teacher SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>79.619</td>
<td>11.028</td>
<td>67.833</td>
<td>17.051</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>94.786</td>
<td>8.062</td>
<td>91.151</td>
<td>8.983</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Indicates significance at the \( p < .01 \) level.
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I conducted a second level of analysis to examine the means of the items on the supervisor-present (SP) and teacher-present (TP) subscales.

Figure 2: Structural Dimension Item Means for Supervisor Present (SP) and Teacher Present (TP)

Figure 2 provides a graphic comparison of these means and illustrates that in general, the finding that supervisors perceived a higher presence of the structural dimension in the present system than did the teachers persisted across the items. The one exception to this pattern seemed to occur with respect to supervisors' and teachers' ratings of agreement regarding the inclusion of rating scales in the total performance evaluation (q12a). While the data suggest that teachers expressed a higher agreement rating than supervisors, the results of a t-test (Table 6) for the item revealed a non significant difference ($t=.254, p<.8$) suggesting that supervisors and teachers shared a similar perception of the
frequency of use of ratings scales. The four largest differences (differences ≥ 1.00) between supervisors and teachers involved (in descending size of difference): training for effective participation in the supervision system (q13), pre-observation conference (q3), assistance and support for teachers whose performance has been judged to be unsatisfactory (q14), and teacher input in formulating the total performance evaluation (q10). The results of a t-test of each of these pairs of means are presented in Table 6. The results revealed that differences between supervisors and teachers for each of the items were significant at the p level < .001.

Table 6: Results of t-test for Selected Structural Subscale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Supervisor Mean</th>
<th>Supervisor SD</th>
<th>Teacher Mean</th>
<th>Teacher SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q3</td>
<td>4.793</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>3.564</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q10</td>
<td>5.069</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>4.066</td>
<td>1.844</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q12a</td>
<td>2.983</td>
<td>2.065</td>
<td>3.117</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>&lt; .8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13</td>
<td>4.017</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q14</td>
<td>4.845</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>1.981</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings suggest that supervisors perceived a significantly higher presence of these practices in the present system than did the teachers.

Cultural Dimension

The "Cultural Dimension" was comprised of 13 items (17a-19) which relate to the beliefs, values, and norms which shape the supervision practices and particularly, the supervisor-teacher relationship. This dimension included beliefs about the purposes of
supervision, the nature of teaching, and the nature of teacher learning; a high district priority for teacher development; and norms of collaboration, shared commitment to professional growth, openness, and trust in the relationships of supervisors and teachers. For each of the 13 items, supervisors and teachers were asked to express their level of disagreement/agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) basing their first response on the beliefs, values, and norms of their present teacher supervision experience and their second response on those they would view as ideal.

I organized the data for the cultural dimension into four subscales—supervisor-present, teacher-present, supervisor-ideal, teacher-ideal. I calculated the reliability of each of the subscales using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The alpha coefficient for the supervisor-present subscale was 0.94 and for the supervisor-ideal subscale was 0.90. The alpha coefficients for the teacher-present subscale and the teacher-ideal subscale were 0.94 and 0.93, respectively. These four alpha levels reflect a high degree of internal consistency for each of the cultural dimension subscales.

The mean and standard deviation for each item of each of the cultural subscales are presented in Table 7. The means for supervisor-present items ranged from 4.21 to 5.33 indicating variation in levels of agreement ranging from agree somewhat to agree and the means for teacher-present items ranged from 3.68 to 4.90 indicating levels of agreement ranging from disagree somewhat/agree somewhat to agree.
Table 7: Cultural Dimension Subscales-Item Means & Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sup</th>
<th>Pres</th>
<th>Tchr</th>
<th>Pres</th>
<th>Sup</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Tchr</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17a</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17b</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17c</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17d</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17e</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17f</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17g</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q18a</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q18b</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q18c</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q18d</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q18e</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean and standard deviation of the total subscale for each of the cultural dimension subscales are displayed in Table 8 and graphically.
represented in Figure 3. The means of the supervisor subscales were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pres M</th>
<th>Pres SD</th>
<th>Ideal N</th>
<th>Ideal M</th>
<th>Ideal SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73.63</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>56.40</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>71.29</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

higher than the means of the corresponding teacher subscales.

Following the same procedure used with the previous dimension, I conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) to evaluate differences between supervisors and teachers on the present and ideal cultural dimension subscales. Again, the specific analysis used the role of the respondents (supervisor or teacher) as the between factor and the
scale present or ideal) as the within factor. Table 9 contains the results of the ANOVA. The results revealed a significant difference \((F=16.17, p≤.0001)\) in the responses of supervisors and teachers and a significant difference \((F=195.62, p≤.0001)\) in present and ideal responses. The results also showed a significant interaction \((F=6.24, p=≤.013)\) between role and scale.

Table 9: Analysis of Variance for Cultural Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1765.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1765.26</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>≤.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>24012.73</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>109.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>13359.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13359.75</td>
<td>195.62</td>
<td>≤.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role x Scale</td>
<td>425.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>425.96</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>≤.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15024.98</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I again used \(t\)-tests to examine the interaction. The results of the \(t\)-test (Table 10) revealed that supervisors and teachers differed significantly at the \(p ≤ .01\) on the present scale but did not differ significantly at the \(p ≤ .01\) level on the ideal scale. These findings suggest that supervisors perceived a higher presence of the characteristics of the cultural dimension in the present teacher supervision system than did the teachers, while supervisors and teachers expressed similar and very high preference for them in their ideal.
Table 10: Results of t-test for Cultural Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Supervisor Mean</th>
<th>Supervisor SD</th>
<th>Teacher Mean</th>
<th>Teacher SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=56</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>63.250</td>
<td>10.991</td>
<td>56.404</td>
<td>12.154</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>73.625</td>
<td>5.266</td>
<td>71.289</td>
<td>6.275</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Indicates significance at the $p < .01$ level.

A second level of analysis revealed that the results of the previous analysis generally persisted across the items of the cultural present subscales. As shown in Figure 4, an exception to this pattern occurred with respect to item q18c which involved perceptions of the extent to

Figure 4: Cultural Dimension- Means for Supervisor Present (SP) and Teacher Present (TP)
which the supervision system reflected the belief that teachers learn from reflecting on their own experience. On this item, supervisors and teachers expressed similar ratings which suggests that they both perceived evidence of a high presence of this belief. The two largest differences between supervisors and teachers involved items q18d and item q19. The first of these items involved perceptions of the extent to which the teacher supervision system reflected the belief that supervisors and teachers should collaborate in the supervision process and the second, involved perceptions of the extent to which the supervisor-teacher relationship throughout the supervision process was characterized by collaboration, honesty, trust, openness, and a shared commitment to the teacher’s professional growth. The results of t-tests of the means of these items (Table 11) revealed a non significant difference (t=0.295, p<.5) for the former item and a significant difference at the p < .01 for the latter. These findings indicate that supervisors' and teachers' perceptions of the presence of the belief that supervisors and teachers should collaborate in the supervision process were similar; while supervisors perceived a significantly higher level of collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Supervisor Mean</th>
<th>Supervisor SD</th>
<th>Teacher Mean</th>
<th>Teacher SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q18d</td>
<td>5.035</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>4.4975</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>&lt; .5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q19</td>
<td>5.293</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>4.716</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
honesty, trust, openness, and shared commitment in the actual relationships than did the teachers.

Effectiveness of Teacher Supervision

The "Effectiveness" portion of the survey encompassed items 20a through 20g and asked supervisors and teachers to rate the effectiveness of their present teacher supervision system in achieving seven purposes. Respondents were asked to make their ratings on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from highly ineffective (1) to highly effective (6). I organized the data for this dimension into two subscales: supervisor and teacher. I calculated the reliability of each of the two subscales using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The alpha coefficient for the supervisor subscale was .089 and for the teacher subscale was 0.90. These two alpha levels reflect a high degree of internal consistency for each of the effectiveness subscales.

The mean and standard deviation for each item of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sup N</th>
<th>Sup M</th>
<th>Sup SD</th>
<th>Tchr N</th>
<th>Tchr M</th>
<th>Tchr SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q20a</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20b</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20c</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20d</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20e</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20f</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20g</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effectiveness subscales are presented in Table 12. The means for the supervisor subscale items ranged from 3.52 to 4.59 indicating variation in perceptions of effectiveness ranging from somewhat ineffective/somewhat effective to somewhat effective/effective and the means for the teacher subscale items ranged from 3.52 to 4.53 also indicating a range in perceptions of effectiveness ranging from somewhat ineffective/somewhat effective to somewhat effective/effective.

The mean and standard deviation of the total subscale for each of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Effectiveness-Means of Subscales
the two effectiveness subscales are displayed in Table 13 and graphically represented in Figure 5. The mean of the supervisor subscales was higher than the mean of the teacher subscale.

I employed a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to evaluate differences between supervisors and teachers on the effectiveness subscales. In the analysis, the role of the respondents (supervisor or teacher) was used as the between factor and effectiveness was used as the within factor. The results of the ANOVA (Table 14), revealed a significant difference ($F=9.83, p<.002$) in the responses of supervisors and teachers indicating that supervisors perceived present teacher supervision system as significantly more effective than did the teachers.

Table 14: Analysis of Variance for Effectiveness Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>495.7666</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>495.7666</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>&lt;.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>10945.3932</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>50.4396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the item means of the subscales revealed a relatively consistent discrepancy between supervisors and teachers (Figure 6) across the subscale items with the exception of 2 items for which there was little or no discrepancy between supervisors and teachers. These items involved the effectiveness of teacher supervision in encouraging teachers to self-reflect about their teaching and in removing incompetent teachers from the district. With respect to the former end,
supervisors and teachers perceived a moderately high level of effectiveness while with regard to the latter, they perceived a moderately low level of effectiveness.

Figure 6: Effectiveness-Item Means for Supervisor Present (SP) and Teacher Present (TP)

Summary

The preceding analysis of survey responses, indicates that the supervisors and teachers share a common perception of the structural and cultural dimensions of an ideal system of teacher supervision but differ significantly in their perceptions of the practices, characteristics, and effectiveness of present systems. In comparison to the teachers, supervisors perceive a closer match between the present and ideal and a higher level of effectiveness. In the following chapter, I provide a discussion of these findings.
 CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction and Overview of Study

Parent, community, and government demands for accountability and quality assurance of teacher performance have led many states to issue mandates or to adopt guidelines which regulate teacher supervision at the local school level. Sclan (1994) found that in the 29 states which issued either mandates or specific criteria for teacher supervision, these actions generally resulted in accountability models of teacher supervision. Accountability models tend to place supervisors in the role of inspector, define supervision as something supervisors do to teachers, and require rigid, standardized procedures. As evidenced through the literature review, contemporary theorists and researchers offer a model of teacher supervision which is oriented towards multiple growth and improvement ends. In contrast to the accountability model, this model casts supervisors as coaches, fashions supervision as a collaborative effort between supervisors and teachers, and calls for flexible, individualized methods. Sclan (1994) found that models of this type were more prevalent in states where there was little to no state influence over local teacher supervision. As a state which promulgates no directives or guidelines for teacher supervision, New Hampshire provided an excellent setting for examining supervisors' and teachers' perceptions which are relatively free of state influence.
The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of supervisors and teachers regarding teacher supervision. Specifically, the study sought to describe:

1. The perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding the structural (practices) and cultural (beliefs, values, and norms) dimensions and effectiveness of their present teacher supervision system;

2. The perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding the structural practices and culture characteristics they would consider ideal;

3. The extent to which teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of their present system match their perceptions of the ideal;

4. Any variation which exists between the perceptions of teachers and the perceptions of supervisors with respect to teacher supervision.

I used the literature review presented in the second chapter of this report to synthesize the ideas and findings of theorists and researchers in order to construct a contemporary description of “best practice” in teacher supervision. The description defined the practices of the structural dimension and the characteristics of the cultural dimension and elucidated the contributions of these practices and characteristics to the effectiveness of teacher supervision in achieving its desired ends. This description portrayed the structural dimension of the teacher supervision as including the following components: written standards for teacher performance, goal setting, the 3-part observation cycle, a total performance evaluation, differentiated supervision, teacher
involvement in the development and implementation of the system, and training for teachers and supervisors to increase the effectiveness of their participation in the system. It presented the cultural component as encompassing beliefs about the purposes of teacher supervision, the nature of teaching, and the nature of teacher learning; a valuing of teacher development; and supervisor-teacher relationships characterized by norms of collaboration, trust, honesty, openness, and a shared commitment to the teacher’s professional growth. Further, the description defined “effectiveness” as the extent to which the teacher supervision system achieved its intended purposes and included seven purposes: facilitating school improvement, improving classroom performance, improving learning for students, insuring students receive competent instruction, providing direction for professional development, encouraging teacher self-reflection about teaching, and removing incompetent teachers. I used the description developed in the literature as the basis for the development of the survey items.

I developed matching surveys for supervisors and teachers, each containing 37 items (with 6-point Likert scales) designed to measure perceptions of present and ideal teacher supervision and three open response questions seeking comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the system as well as recommendations for its improvement.

Participants in this study included supervisors and teachers from 45 geographically distributed and economically stratified school districts. The supervisors and teachers were of mixed gender, varied years of experience, and represented all school levels (elementary through high
Supervisors were building level administrators and teachers represented all academic areas.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study, indicate that supervisors and teachers share common perceptions of the ideal teachers supervision system. Their ideal teacher supervision system encompasses the structural practices and cultural characteristics contained in the description of teacher supervision yielded through the synthesis of theory and research presented in the literature review. Structurally, the ideal includes clearly articulated and written standards for teacher performance which are known to both supervisors and teachers and used as a rubric for assessing teacher performance. It involves establishing annual growth and improvement goals in relation to these standards. The classroom observation cycle is present and is a collaborative process in which the supervisor and teacher work together analyzing and interpreting a variety of observation data to identify performance strengths and to target areas for improvement. In the ideal system, the total performance evaluation provides a narrative description of the teacher's performance, is based upon a variety of information in order to afford a comprehensive picture of the teacher's performance, and is developed with teacher input and involvement. Supervision, in the ideal system, is differentiated to meet the varied needs of the teacher population. Assistance in the form of mentors, training, or other supports is provided to teachers whose performance is found to be unsatisfactory and more intense supervision is provided for first year and non-tenured teachers. In the ideal, teachers
are participants in the development and implementation of the system. The ideal supervision system provides training for teachers and supervisors to facilitate and enhance their participation in the system and the level of growth and improvement which results.

Culturally, supervisors' and teachers' ideal reflects the belief that teacher supervision serves a variety of interrelated purposes including: facilitating school improvement efforts, improving teacher performance, improving learning for students, insuring students receive competent instruction, providing direction for professional development, encouraging teacher self-reflection about teaching, and removing incompetent teachers from the district. The ideal is grounded in understanding and appreciation for the complexity of the matters which confront teachers and the view that teaching is a task which requires the ability to make sound judgments and decisions on these matters. In the ideal teacher supervision system, teachers are viewed as reflective learners who come to the supervision process with varied experience, individual levels of development, and different needs and their professional growth is a high priority of the school district. In the ideal, supervisors and teachers collaborate throughout the supervision process, trust one another, are honest and open in their communication with one another, and a share a mutual commitment to the teacher's professional growth.

That supervisors and teachers favor these structural practices and cultural characteristics is affirmed through their comments regarding the strengths of present teacher supervision. Supervisors and teachers cited
as strengths, the presence of any of these various practices in their present system. When taken in combination, the comments of supervisors and teachers covered all of the practices. Of particular preference to both supervisors and teachers were opportunities to dialogue about the performance data and to collaborate in problem-solving and improvement efforts. Teachers' preference for these practices is exemplified in comments which identified the strength of the system as the "open relationship of trust between supervisor and teacher," "working in partnership with the administration," and the "ability to discuss evaluation with supervisor." Supervisors commented that "the system encourages collaboration," there is "positive collaboration between staff and administration," and "that we are willing to work together to help in any area when needed."

Supervisors and teachers differ in their perceptions of present teacher supervision. While both view present supervision as something short of the ideal, supervisors perceive it as structurally and culturally closer to the ideal and as more effective in accomplishing its purposes than do the teachers. An interesting exception emerges in the alignment of supervisors' and teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher supervision in removing incompetent teachers. Supervisors and teachers share the perception that teacher supervision is least effective in achieving this end.

In commenting on the weaknesses of their present teacher supervision systems and in making recommendations for improvement, supervisors and teachers cited the absence or minimal presence of
various practices and characteristics of the ideal or the need for the
addition or enhancement of them. They also both identified time and
the supervisor-to-teacher ratio as variables influencing the effectiveness
of the systems and in need of attention. Supervisors, in particular,
voiced the concern that conflicting demands and administrative duties
often left them with insufficient time for teacher supervision and that in
some instances, the number of teachers they supervised also precluded
them from performing effective supervision. Illustrative of these
comments is this supervisor’s response that the greatest weakness of the
supervision system is the “lack of administrative time to properly
conduct the process” and another supervisor’s comment that there are
“too many teachers for so few to evaluate.” Teachers’ comments
acknowledged these factors and described the effects of too little time
and large supervision loads. They portrayed present supervision as
sometimes inconsistent, periodic rather than ongoing, proforma, lacking
in depth and breadth, providing too little opportunity for collaboration
and dialogue, and of limited utility to them. In the context of the
finding cited above regarding the perception of the limited effectiveness of
teacher supervision in removing incompetent teachers, it is interesting
that a few teachers (9 out of 218 who responded) cited this concern in
their comments. Their statements ranged from “I’m not sure the
evaluation process really weeds out the incompetent teachers as it
should,” to “Some teachers are getting away with murder. They
shouldn’t be teaching.”
Generalizability and Limitations of the Study

The accuracy of these findings in representing the perceptions of New Hampshire supervisors and teachers is dependent upon the candidness of the participants in their responses and the degree of match between the characteristics of the study sample and the target population. By guaranteeing confidential protection of responses and insuring that only aggregated data would be reported, I tried to assuage participant concerns about disclosure of their responses or possible reprisal for their expressed opinions and to encourage participants to provide their most candid responses. High return rates and the nature of the responses received suggest that participants were comfortable stating their opinions. In designing this study, I made the assumption that the sampling procedures used would yield a sample of supervisors and teachers which was representative of the total population within the state. Specifically, I assumed that the study sample would include representative numbers of men and women from proportionate numbers of elementary, middle, junior high, and high schools. I used a stratified selection process to ensure inclusion of supervisors and teachers from the five geographic regions of the state and from the three district wealth strata.

Actual participants in the study included supervisors and teachers from each of the sample school districts and thus provided representation from the five geographic regions and the three district wealth strata. While specific data regarding the distribution of male and female supervisors and teachers within the state were not available for
comparison, I believe the proportion of men and women in the study sample generally reflect their distributions in the state. Participants in the study did proportionally represent elementary, middle, junior high and high schools levels. Other demographic data suggest that the study population included supervisors and teachers with varied levels of experience and post secondary education, supervisors from a variety of building level positions, and teachers from all academic areas. Similarities in characteristics between the study sample and the target population and usable survey return rates of 79% for supervisors and 65% for teachers suggest that the findings of this study can be reasonably generalized to the total population of New Hampshire supervisors and teachers. The generalizability of these findings to populations of supervisors and teachers outside New Hampshire is dependent upon the degree of match between the outside population and the New Hampshire population. The findings would be most generalizable to similar populations of supervisors and teachers in states where teacher supervision is locally developed and relatively free of state influence.

The surveys used in this study provide some limitations as well. The practicality of survey length limited the number of items and consequently, the depth of the examination of the practices, characteristics, and effectiveness of teacher supervision. These limitations could be addressed through follow-up studies designed to explore these variables in greater detail and with greater intensity. While the surveys were piloted prior to use in the study as a means for
examining content validity, they have not been tested over time for stability.

Teacher Supervision in New Hampshire

Conclusions

The generalizability of the findings of this study to the total population of New Hampshire supervisors and teachers supports the conclusion that New Hampshire supervisors and teachers hold similar perceptions of both the structural and cultural dimensions of an ideal teacher supervision system and that their perceptions of this ideal are closely aligned with the description of best practice in teacher supervision yielded through the synthesis of the ideas and findings of contemporary theorists and researchers. Supervisors' and teachers' perceptions of ideal teacher supervision constitutes a vision for teacher the future of teacher supervision in New Hampshire.

Discussion of Conclusions and Recommendations

Supervisors and Teachers

In the context of the change theories of Covey (1989, 1991), Fullan (1993), Schlechty (1997), and Senge (1990), such a vision is an essential element in meaningful, effective, and enduring planned change. The vision becomes the standard against which the reality of the present is compared and when this comparison reveals a disparity between the vision and the reality, the dissonance or tension which arises from this awareness motivates individuals and organizations to change. In this study, the current reality of teacher supervision is reflected in supervisors' and teachers' perceptions of their present teacher
supervision systems. As perceived by supervisors and teachers, this reality falls short of the vision and there is thus the potential for the awareness of this disparity to create the dissonance which will motivate supervisors and teachers to want to change teacher supervision. Covey, Fullan, Schlechty, and Senge maintain that the details of the disparity provide the basis for establishing goals and determining strategies for the attainment of the goals. It is in the details that the picture for change in New Hampshire becomes less clear and clean.

The findings of this study reveal that supervisors and teachers differ with respect to their perceptions of the magnitude of the short fall between the vision and the reality. Supervisors generally, perceive the gap as smaller than teachers perceive it. As supervisors have more often had some role in the development of the present supervision system, have born the primary responsibility for implementing the system, and have been the “doers” in the system, it is not surprising that they have a more positive view of the system than teachers who have had little or no involvement in developing the system, have had little or no responsibility for its implementation, and have been the ones to whom the process has been done. Covey (1989, 1991), Fullan (1993), Schlechty (1997), and Senge (1990) maintain that the synthesis of multiple perspectives provides a more accurate picture of reality and thus the views of both groups merit attention in gaining a more total picture of the current reality of teacher supervision.

Covey (1989, 1991), Fullan (1993), Schlechty (1997), and Senge (1990) argue that if the vision is to be a source of inspiration and provide
a unity of purpose and forward direction for the members of an organization, it must be truly shared by the members. They believe that members need to be committed to the vision and compelled by it. They further posit, that ownership of the vision, achieved through the collaborative development of the vision, forges the highest commitment and sense of calling. In considering the vision of teacher supervision identified through this study, questions arise regarding whether supervisors and teachers are aware they share a common vision and regarding the extent to which they are commitment to the vision? Absent their awareness of their common vision, supervisors and teachers will be less likely (and possibly unlikely) to join together in their efforts to improve teacher supervision and miss the advantage collaboration could bring in pooling and leveraging their efforts. Additionally, Covey, Fullan, Schlechty, and Senge envision change as a journey in which the vision is the destination and the reality is the starting point. In the context of this metaphor, the findings of this study suggest that while supervisors and teachers seek the same destination, they identify different points of departure. In order for the vision revealed through this study to become compelling for others, it must ultimately be owned by them and the gap between this vision and the reality must clearly be recognized by them. Further, in order for the disparities between the vision and the reality to provide a solid basis for collaborative goal setting and strategic planning, a consensus view of the reality needs to be developed. Whether the organization under discussion is the New Hampshire education community as a whole or the local school district,
these needs are the same and a primary means for addressing these needs is through the sharing the findings of this study and the subsequent promotion of dialogue and collaboration. Dialogue and collaboration between supervisors and teachers can be the medium for re-creating the vision, for engendering ownership and commitment to it, and for creating a consensus view of reality. Further, dialogue and collaboration can provide the mechanism for contrasting the vision and reality, for consensually establishing goals and planning strategies, and for collaboratively implementing the strategies in pursuit of these ends.

The Larger Constituency

While supervisors and teachers play primary roles in the teacher supervision process, interest in and concern for teacher supervision is shared by other constituent groups including school boards, superintendents, government, parents, community members, and students. Sharing the findings of this study with these constituents and involving representatives of these constituents in state level and local discussions of teacher supervision would help to expand the ownership and commitment to the vision, to provide a more complete view of the reality of present supervision, and to generate more assistance in the development and implementation of goals and strategies.

Improving Teacher Supervision: Efforts, Impediments, and Solutions

Some dialogue and collaboration around improving teacher supervision and related components including curriculum, instruction, teaching standards, and professional development are already underway at the state level and in some school districts, offering some basis for
optimism about the potential for meaningful change in teacher supervision. These improvement efforts have their origins in a more profound and fundamental change which has gradually been evolving in the dimension of our beliefs about our students and our perceptions of our responsibility to them.

Until recently, our view of students and our conduct towards them have been shaped to a marked degree by the notion of a bell curve distribution of student ability and an industrial-based model of schooling designed ultimately to sort students by these ability groups. This education model which served us seemingly well during the industrial era, now fails to prepare students with the knowledge and skills necessary for successful living in the already present and ever changing information age. At the same time that our society is changing, new information about how students learn and the nature of intelligence is calling into question our bell curve assumption and is causing us to consider that what we previously considered to be a natural distribution of abilities may in fact be the result of what we do and do not do for our students in our role as educators. We are beginning to recognize that we, perhaps more often than nature, control the conditions which determine student success. Now, because we are beginning to believe it's possible and because our societal needs demand it, we are striving to help "all" students achieve at high levels. This paradigmatic change is driving changes in curriculum standards, instructional practices, and assessment methods at national, state, and local levels. These changes, in turn, are calling on teachers to teach a
new curriculum, to use new instructional practices, and to employ new assessment methods. Teacher responses to these new demands, shaped by the beliefs of their paradigms and the characteristics of their developmental levels and phases, range from excitement and enthusiasm to fear and anger and from eager acceptance to steadfast rejection and resistance. Whatever the form of their response, teachers are in need of assistance and support in meeting these new challenges and a teacher supervision model focused on growth and improvement is emerging as a medium for providing that assistance and support.

The particulars of this new model for teacher supervision are represented in the vision for future teacher supervision detailed through the findings of this study. The new model is intended to serve multiple purposes including fostering teacher growth and development, improving classroom instruction, and enhancing learning for students. It is rooted in contemporary theories of teaching, learning, and development. It involves and gives responsibility to teachers for their own growth and development and for that of their colleagues. Within the model, supervision is differentiated to address the unique needs of the members of the teaching force.

Though state-wide and local efforts to improve teacher supervision are being driven by the powerful force of changing beliefs, they are also facing numerous challenges and obstacles. Not everyone in each of the constituent groups has made the paradigmatic shift. Among the constituents are individuals and groups of individuals whose primary concerns are their own special interests. Differences of opinion with
respect to curriculum, instruction, and assessment continue to exist not only between those with different paradigms but even among those who share the new paradigm and similarly, differences of opinion exist with respect to the knowledge and skills teachers need and the kind of supervision which will best enable them to achieve these ends.

Dialogue and collaboration remain the most desirable and effective mediums for fostering understanding and achieving consensus, but efforts at such dialogue and collaboration are haunted by past experiences and prior misunderstandings which severely damaged or destroyed trust between and within constituent groups and which now diminish the openness and the honesty of communication and limit the willingness to collaborate. Dialogue and collaboration which can build consensus, require individuals who are prepared to meet the cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal demands of this kind of interaction and exchange. While some individuals are ready to do so, others are not. Those who are not, often find the experience overwhelming and even threatening and respond by passively withdrawing or actively resisting. Theories of adult development assert that preparedness for this kind of exchange emerges developmentally in individuals and suggest that those who are developmentally unready can be assisted and supported in their development of the necessary capacities.

Efforts to achieve consensus of ideas through dialogue and collaboration can be assisted and enhanced through the use of facilitators. These facilitators would ideally possess a knowledge of individual and group development, group process, and communication
theory and possess the skills necessary to facilitate development of the group and its members, to facilitate collaboration, and to facilitate open, honest, productive communication.

At the local district level, efforts to improve teacher supervision face the obstacles of limited resources—particularly people and time. Data collected through this study strongly suggests that impediments to effective teacher supervision include large teacher to supervisor ratios and limited time for completion of the supervisory process, most particularly opportunities to engage in meaningful dialogue and reflection. Funding to provide additional supervisors and to pay for added hours or days in the school schedule is often not available and thus school districts must look to existing personnel and time for resolution of these issues. Inherent in the new model for teacher supervision are solutions to these problems.

In the new model for teacher supervision, teacher growth and improvement is no longer the responsibility of the supervisors alone but is the collective responsibility of everyone within the organization. In the new model, teachers will play a more active role in their own growth and improvement and through mentoring, peer coaching, and the like, will actively facilitate the growth and improvement of their colleagues. As teachers improve their capacity to be effective users of data for examining their present performance, they will be able to make use of data sources such as student and parent feedback, colleague observations, video and audio recordings, assessment results, and other forms of student performance data to identify and direct their own
improvement efforts and to assist those of others. Increased teacher involvement in the supervision process will decrease the supervisory demands on the principals and assistant principals who serve as supervisors enabling them to redistribute their time. Additionally, in the new model, the intensity and nature of supervision is differentiated to meet the varied needs and developmental levels and phases of the teachers. Traditionally, supervision has tended to treat all teachers the same with some minimal distinctions made between non-tenured and tenured teachers. In the new model, supervision is tailored more closely to teachers’ needs and includes a variety of forms of challenges and supports designed to meet the needs of teachers who are just beginning their careers, those who are in the middle of their careers, and those who are nearing the end of their teaching days. It differentiates challenges and supports for non-tenured teachers, competent tenured teachers, and teachers whose performance is viewed as in need of substantial improvement. Differentiating supervision enables districts to allocate resources of time and people in a manner proportional to the needs of the teachers. Involving teachers and reallocating time though seemingly promising as solutions will require commitment and effort to achieve. As with any change, these changes will be endorsed by some and resisted by others. Dialogue and collaboration will be necessary to resolve differences and convert resistance. Absent the capacity to add personnel or time, school districts will need to consider the approaches of teacher involvement and differentiated supervision as means for more effectively investing the personnel and time they have presently toward
the growth and improvement of all teachers and ultimately toward the provision of successful learning experiences for all students.

Change efforts in education have sometimes had the tendency to falter in achieving their desired ends or to fail in sustaining them once they have been achieved. Schlechty (1997) maintains, "if substantial, purposeful, change is to occur and be sustained over time, the organization that is the subject of the change must possess three critical capacities" (p. 83). These include the capacity: "to establish and maintain a focus on the future, to maintain a constant direction, and to act strategically" (p. 83). Fundamental to the development of these capacities is the creation of a compelling shared vision, a clear view of the present reality, and an awareness of the discrepancies between the reality and the vision and the formulation and implementation of a strategic plan encompassing goals and specific actions. The findings of this study provide the rudiments of a vision for teacher supervision and the beginnings of a picture of reality. The vision and the picture will need development and refinement through dialogue and collaboration among concerned constituent groups. Dialogue and collaboration will also be necessary to build an awareness of the discrepancy between the reality and the vision and to construct and set in motion a strategic plan for the improvement of teacher supervision at the district level and throughout the state.

Teacher Supervision in New Hampshire and in Other States

In her study of teacher supervision in the fifty states (1994), Sclan identified the existence of two primary forms of teacher supervision, one
a model for growth and improvement and the other oriented toward accountability. New Hampshire supervisor and teachers have expressed their preference for a growth and improvement-oriented model of teacher supervision and while they indicate that present teacher supervision systems fall short of this ideal, they also reveal that present teacher supervision systems fall closer to the growth and improvement model than to the accountability model. In so doing, they affirm Sclan's (1994) findings that in states where teacher supervision systems are locally developed and relatively free of state influence, teacher supervision tends towards the contemporary growth and improvement model rather than the accountability model. Replication of this study in other states would help to further evaluate this finding.
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Teacher Supervision/Evaluation in New Hampshire

Teacher Survey

Please respond to the questions contained in this survey and return the survey to:

Pamela L. Clark
326 Hopkinton Road
Concord, NH 03301-7915

For your convenience in returning the survey, a pre-addressed, stamped envelope has been provided. If you prefer, you may fax your completed survey to me. My fax number is 603 223-6946. Thank you for your assistance in responding to and returning this survey.

Please return the survey on or before:

Please be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidentiality. Your answers will be combined with those of teachers throughout the state of New Hampshire and only total responses and averaged ratings will be reported. No school district or individual respondent will be identified in the reporting of the survey results.

For the purposes of this survey:

the term "teacher supervision/evaluation" should be construed to include all practices which promote teacher growth and development and which are used to make evaluative judgments about a teacher's performance;

the term "supervisor" should be interpreted to mean the individual who bears formal responsibility for supervising and evaluating you.

This survey is 4 pages in length and contains 4 sections:

SECTION 1: TEACHER SUPERVISION/EVALUATION PRACTICES, BELIEFS, VALUES

SECTION 2: EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TEACHER SUPERVISION/EVALUATION SYSTEM

SECTION 3: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

SECTION 4: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please call me at 603 228-1979 if you have any questions or concerns.
### SECTION 1: TEACHER SUPERVISION/EVALUATION PRACTICES, BELIEFS, VALUES

Please respond **twice** to each of the items in this section.

In the **left hand column**, circle the response which most accurately reflects your perceptions of your **present** supervision/evaluation system.

In the **right hand column**, circle the response which most accurately represents your view of the **ideal** supervision/evaluation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PRESENT

**Performance standards**
- 1. My performance is assessed against a clearly articulated and written set of district teacher performance standards.

#### IDEAL

**Performance standards**
- 1. My performance is assessed against a clearly articulated and written set of district teacher performance standards.

#### Goal setting
- 1. My supervisor and I meet once each year to establish goals for my professional growth and performance improvement.

#### Pre-observation conference
- 1. Prior to the classroom observation, my supervisor and I meet to plan the observation.

#### Observation
- 1. My supervisor formally observes my teaching two or more times a year.
- 2. My supervisor uses a variety of observation methods to gather data about my classroom performance.

#### Post observation conference
- 1. During the post observation conference, my supervisor and I:
  - a. analyze and interpret the data he/she collected during the observation
  - b. identify performance strengths and areas for improvement

#### Total performance evaluation
- 1. My supervisor evaluates my total performance (planning & preparation, classroom environment, instruction, professional responsibilities) once each year.
- 2. My supervisor evaluates my total performance (planning & preparation, classroom environment, instruction, professional responsibilities) at least once in 3 years.
- 3. My supervisor examines a variety of information (e.g., lesson plans, teaching materials, student performance, etc.) to evaluate my total performance.
- 4. My input helps to formulate my total performance evaluation.

---
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### Present vs. Ideal

12. My total performance evaluation includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. a rating scale</td>
<td>a. a rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. a narrative description</td>
<td>b. a narrative description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Training

13. I received training in how to participate effectively in my school district's teacher supervision/evaluation system.

#### Differentiated Supervision/evaluation

14. Teachers whose performance is judged to be unsatisfactory, receive assistance in the form of a mentor, training, or other support.

15. First year and non-tenured teachers receive more intense supervision/evaluation than tenured teachers.

#### Teacher Involvement

16. Teachers were actively involved in the development of the teacher supervision/evaluation system.

### Purposes of Teacher Supervision/evaluation

17. The supervision/evaluation system is intended to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. facilitate school improvement efforts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. improve teacher classroom performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. result in improved learning for students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. insure students receive competent instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. provide direction for the district's professional development program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. encourage teacher self-reflection about teaching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. remove incompetent teachers from the district</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District Beliefs

18. The supervision/evaluation system reflects the following district beliefs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. teachers are adult learners with varied experiences, needs, and levels of development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. teaching requires the ability to make judgments and decisions on complex matters</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. teachers learn from reflecting on their own teaching experiences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. teachers and supervisors should collaborate in the supervision/evaluation process</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. teacher professional growth is a priority</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page...
Strongly Agree
Disagree
Somewhat Agree
Disagree
Somewhat Agree
Strongly Agree
Strongly Agree
Disagree
Somewhat Agree
Disagree
Somewhat Agree
Strongly Agree

PRESENT

Relationship with supervisor

1 2 3 4 5 6

19. Throughout the supervision/evaluation process, my relationship with my supervisor is characterized by collaboration, honesty, trust, openness, and a shared commitment to my professional growth.

SECTION 2: EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TEACHER SUPERVISION/EVALUATION SYSTEM

Please rate the effectiveness of your present supervision/evaluation system in achieving the results listed. Please circle the most appropriate response.

Highly Ineffective Ineffective Somewhat Ineffective Somewhat Effective Effective Highly Effective
1 2 3 4 5 6

20. During the past two years, the supervision/evaluation system has

a. facilitated my ability to contribute to school improvement efforts
b. improved my classroom performance
c. resulted in improved learning for my students
d. insured that my students receive competent instruction
e. provided direction for my professional development activities
f. encouraged me to self-reflect about my teaching
g. resulted in the removal of incompetent teachers from the district

SECTION 3: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

Please provide a response to each of the following questions:

21. What do you feel are the greatest strengths of your school district’s present teacher supervision/evaluation system?

22. What do you feel are the greatest weaknesses of your school district’s present teacher supervision/evaluation system?

Continued on back→
23. What recommendations do you have for improving the district's present teacher supervision/evaluation system?

SECTION 4: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please respond to the following questions:

1. How many years have you been a teacher? ________

2. How many years have you been a teacher in the present school district? ________

3. What subject(s) do you presently teach? __________________________________________

4. What grade level(s) do you teach? _____________________________________________

5. Gender: 1. Female
               2. Male

6. How many years of post secondary education have you completed? _________________

7. What degrees do you hold? ____________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this survey.
Teacher Supervision/Evaluation in New Hampshire

Supervisor Survey

Please respond to the questions contained in this survey and return the survey to:

Pamela L. Clark
326 Hopkinton Road
Concord, NH 03301-7915

For your convenience in returning the survey, a pre-addressed, stamped envelope has been provided. If you prefer, you may fax your completed survey to me. My fax number is 603 223-6946. Thank you for your assistance in responding to and returning this survey.

Please return the survey on or before:

Please be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidentiality. Your answers will be combined with those of supervisors throughout the state of New Hampshire and only total responses and average ratings will be reported. No school district or individual respondent will be identified in the reporting of the survey results.

For the purposes of this survey:

the term "teacher supervision/evaluation" should be construed to include all practices which promote teacher growth and development and which are used to make evaluative judgments about a teacher's performance;

the term "supervisor" should be interpreted to mean the individual who bears formal responsibility for supervising and evaluating teachers.

This survey is 4 pages in length and contains 4 sections:

SECTION 1: TEACHER SUPERVISION/EVALUATION PRACTICES, BELIEFS, VALUES

SECTION 2: EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TEACHER SUPERVISION/EVALUATION SYSTEM

SECTION 3: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

SECTION 4: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please call me at 603 228-1979 if you have any questions or concerns.
SECTION 1: TEACHER SUPERVISION/EVALUATION PRACTICES, BELIEFS, VALUES

Please respond *twice* to each of the items in this section.

In the *left-hand column*, circle the response which most accurately reflects your perceptions of your present supervision/evaluation system.

In the *right-hand column*, circle the response which most accurately represents your view of the Ideal supervision/evaluation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRESENT**

**Performance standards**

1 2 3 4 5 6 1. I assess the teacher's performance against a clearly articulated and written set of district teacher performance standards.

**Goal setting**

1 2 3 4 5 6 2. The teacher and I meet once each year to establish goals for the teacher's professional growth and performance improvement.

**Pre-observation conference**

1 2 3 4 5 6 3. Prior to the classroom observation, the teacher and I meet to plan the observation.

**Observation**

1 2 3 4 5 6 4. I formally observe the teacher in the classroom two or more times a year.

1 2 3 4 5 6 5. I use a variety of observation methods to gather data about the teacher's classroom performance.

**Post-observation conference**

6. During the post-observation conference, the teacher and I:

1 2 3 4 5 6 a. analyze and interpret the data I collected during the observation

1 2 3 4 5 6 b. identify performance strengths and areas for improvement

**Total performance evaluation**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7. I evaluate the teacher's total performance (planning & preparation, classroom environment, instruction, professional responsibilities) once each year.

1 2 3 4 5 6 8. I evaluate the teacher's total performance (planning & preparation, classroom environment, instruction, professional responsibilities) at least once in 3 years.

1 2 3 4 5 6 9. I examine a variety of information (e.g., lesson plans, teaching materials, student performance, etc.) to evaluate the teacher's total performance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 10. The teacher's input helps to formulate the total performance evaluation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 11. The teacher's total performance evaluation accurately reflects his/her performance.

*Continued on back...*
12. The total performance evaluation includes:

- a rating scale
- a narrative description

Training

13. I received training in how to supervise/evaluate effectively in my school district's teacher supervision/evaluation system.

Differentiated supervision/evaluation

14. Teachers whose performance is judged to be unsatisfactory, receive assistance in the form of a mentor, training, or other support.

15. First year and non-tenured teachers receive more intense supervision/evaluation than tenured teachers.

Teacher involvement

16. Teachers were actively involved in the development of the teacher supervision/evaluation system.

Purposes of teacher supervision/evaluation

17. The supervision/evaluation system is intended to:

- facilitate school improvement efforts
- improve teacher classroom performance
- result in improved learning for students
- insure students receive competent instruction
- provide direction for the district's professional development program
- encourage teacher self-reflection about teaching
- remove incompetent teachers from the district

District beliefs

18. The supervision/evaluation system reflects the following district beliefs:

- teachers are adult learners with varied experiences, needs, and levels of development
- teaching requires the ability to make judgments and decisions on complex matters
- teachers learn from reflecting on their own teaching experiences
- teachers and supervisors should collaborate in the supervision/evaluation process
- teacher professional growth is a priority
19. Throughout the supervision/evaluation process, my relationship with the teacher is characterized by collaboration, honesty, trust, openness, and a shared commitment to the teacher's professional growth.

SECTION 2: EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TEACHER SUPERVISION/EVALUATION SYSTEM

Please rate the effectiveness of your present supervision/evaluation system in achieving the results listed. Please circle the most appropriate response.

20. During the past two years, the supervision/evaluation process has:
   a. facilitated school improvement efforts_____________________________ 1 2 3 4 5 6
   b. improved teacher classroom performance_____________________________ 1 2 3 4 5 6
   c. resulted in improved learning for students___________________________ 1 2 3 4 5 6
   d. insured that students receive competent instruction___________________ 1 2 3 4 5 6
   e. provided direction for teacher professional development activities_________ 1 2 3 4 5 6
   f. encouraged teachers to self-reflect about their teaching_________________ 1 2 3 4 5 6
   g. resulted in the removal of incompetent teachers from the district___________ 1 2 3 4 5 6

SECTION 3: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

Please provide a response to each of the following questions:

21. What do you feel are the greatest strengths of your school district's present teacher supervision/evaluation system?

22. What do you feel are the greatest weaknesses of your school district's present teacher supervision/evaluation system?
23. What recommendations do you have for improving the district's present teacher supervision/evaluation system?

SECTION 4: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please respond to the following questions:

1. How many years have you been a supervisor? ____________

2. How many years have you been a supervisor in the present school district? ____________

3. How many teachers do you presently supervise/evaluate? ____________

4. At what grade level(s) do you supervise/evaluate? ______________________________________

5. Gender: 1. Female  
               2. Male

6. How many years of post secondary education have you completed? ____________________________

7. What degrees do you hold? ____________________________________________________________

8. Title of your position: ______________________________________________________________

9. If you have received formal training in teacher supervision/evaluation, please indicate where you received your training (please check all that apply)
   _____ through workshops or seminars offered within your school district
   _____ through workshops or seminars offered outside your district
   _____ through university/college courses
   _____ other, please specify ____________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this survey.
APPENDIX C
November 20, 1997

Dear [Salutation]:

I am a doctoral student in the Ph.D. program in Education at the University of New Hampshire and I am seeking your assistance with my dissertation study of teacher supervision/evaluation practices in New Hampshire. The study is sponsored by the New Hampshire Joint Education Council (NHJEC) (Please see the enclosed letter from the NHJEC president) and the results of the study will be used to inform efforts to improve and enhance teacher supervision/evaluation practices in New Hampshire. Your participation in this survey will provide a voice for teachers in this state-wide improvement effort.

The study is being conducted through the use of two survey instruments, one for teachers and one for supervisors. The enclosed survey seeks your perceptions of your district's present teacher supervision/evaluation system as well as your perceptions of what would constitute an ideal teacher supervision/evaluation system.

Your school district was among those randomly chosen for the study and your name was selected at random from among the teachers in your district. The enclosed survey should require approximately 20 minutes to complete. I would ask you to complete the survey and return it to me in the enclosed pre-addressed, stamped envelope by December 5, 1997.

Please be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidence. Your answers will be combined with those of teachers throughout the state and only total responses and averaged ratings will be reported. No school district or individual respondent will be identified in the reporting of the survey results.

Should you have any questions concerning the survey, please feel free to contact me at 603-228-1979. A copy of the survey results will be made available to you at the completion of the study. I appreciate your assistance with this study.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela L. Clark
November 20, 1997

•Name*
•School*
•Address 1*
•Address 2*

Dear «Salutation»:

I am a doctoral student in the Ph.D. program in Education at the University of New Hampshire and I am seeking your assistance with my dissertation study of teacher supervision/evaluation practices in New Hampshire. The study is sponsored by the New Hampshire Joint Education Council (NHJEC) (Please see the enclosed letter from the NHJEC president) and the results of the study will be used to inform efforts to improve and enhance teacher supervision/evaluation practices in New Hampshire. Your participation in this survey will provide a voice for supervisors (principals, assistant principals, and others) in this state-wide improvement effort.

The study is being conducted through the use of two survey instruments, one for teachers and one for supervisors. The enclosed survey seeks your perceptions of your district's present teacher supervision/evaluation system as well as your perceptions of what would constitute an ideal teacher supervision/evaluation system.

Your school district was among those randomly chosen for the study and your name was selected at random from among the supervisors in your district. The enclosed survey should require approximately 20 minutes to complete. I would ask you to complete the survey and return it to me in the enclosed pre-addressed, stamped envelope by December 5, 1997.

Please be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidence. Your answers will be combined with those of supervisors throughout the state and only total responses and averaged ratings will be reported. No school district or individual respondent will be identified in the reporting of the survey results.

Should you have any questions concerning the survey, please feel free to contact me at 603-228-1979. A copy of the survey results will be made available to you at the completion of the study. I appreciate your assistance with this study.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela L. Clark

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
November 6, 1997

Dear New Hampshire Educator;

As the President of the New Hampshire Joint Education Council (NHJEC), I urge you to participate in the teacher supervision/evaluation survey being conducted by Pamela Clark. The NHJEC is an organization whose purpose is to promote and facilitate collaboration among its five member organizations: the National Education Association of New Hampshire (NEA-NH), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the New Hampshire Association of School Principals (NHASP), the New Hampshire School Administrators Association (NHSAA) and the New Hampshire School Boards Association (NHSBA). The NHJEC is sponsoring this research effort and has reviewed and approved the survey.

Recent legislative attempts to mandate both state-wide teacher testing and teacher supervision/evaluation methods have raised considerable concern among the members of all five constituent organizations. In response to these concerns, the NHJEC has selected teacher supervision/evaluation as a focal point for its efforts. Working together, the five constituent groups hope to foster a shared understanding of effective practices in teacher supervision/evaluation and to promote their use throughout the state. Toward that end, we need your input to know which current practices are working for you and which are not, and to learn from you what changes in teacher supervision/evaluation you would wish to see. Please share your perceptions and opinions with us through your response to the survey. The results of this survey will be shared with all member organizations and will inform our efforts.

In anticipation of your participation in this important endeavor, I thank you for your interest, time, and effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marjorie Chiafery, President
New Hampshire Joint Education Council

Summer Street School, 12 Cross Street • Penacook, NH 03303
Tel: (603) 753-4479 • Fax: (603) 753-4611
December 4, 1997

Within the past two weeks, I sent to you a survey about teacher supervision/evaluation. If you have already returned your survey, please accept my sincere appreciation. If you have not, I would urge you to please complete the survey and return it to me on, or before, December 12, 1997. As the surveys were sent to only a small number of teachers, I need your response to help insure the results accurately represent the opinions and experiences of New Hampshire teachers.

If you did not receive the survey, or would like a new copy, please contact me at 603-228-1979, as I would be happy to mail you another immediately. I thank you for your assistance with this study.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela L. Clark
December 4, 1997

Within the past two weeks, I sent to you a survey about teacher supervision/evaluation. If you have already returned your survey, please accept my sincere appreciation. If you have not, I would urge you to please complete the survey and return it to me on, or before, December 12, 1997. As the surveys were sent to only a small number of supervisors (principals, assistant principals, etc.), I need your response to help insure the results accurately represent the opinions and experiences of New Hampshire supervisors.

If you did not receive the survey, or would like a new copy, please contact me at 603-228-1979, as I would be happy to mail you another immediately. I thank you for your assistance with this study.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela L. Clark
Dear «Salutation»:

I am writing to you once more to seek your participation in the study of teacher supervision/evaluation practices in New Hampshire. I recognize that the press of the approaching holidays and school demands made it difficult for many teachers to respond when the surveys were originally mailed and I am contacting you now in the hope that the start of a new year might find you with the time to complete the survey.

As the results of this survey will be used by the New Hampshire Joint Education Council to inform its efforts to improve and enhance teacher supervision/evaluation practices in New Hampshire, I am concerned that the experiences and opinions of teachers be adequately and accurately represented in my report. To date, I have received a higher percentage of responses from principals and assistant principals than from teachers and I am anxious to obtain more teacher responses in order to present a balance of perspectives. I would, therefore, urge you to please complete the enclosed survey and return it to me on or before January 16, 1998.

Please be assured that I will hold your responses in strict confidence. I will combine your answers with those of teachers throughout the state and will report only total responses and averaged ratings. I will not identify any school district or individual respondent in the reporting of the survey results.

Should you have any questions concerning the survey, please feel free to contact me at 603-228-1979. A copy of the survey results will be made available to you at the completion of the study. I truly appreciate your assistance with this study.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela L. Clark
Dear «Salutation»:

I am writing to you once more to seek your participation in the study of teacher supervision/evaluation practices in New Hampshire. I recognize that the press of the approaching holidays and school demands made it difficult for some to respond when the surveys were originally mailed and I am contacting you now in the hope that the start of a new year might find you with the time to complete the survey.

As the results of this survey will be used by the New Hampshire Joint Education Council to inform its efforts to improve and enhance teacher supervision/evaluation practices in New Hampshire, I am concerned that the experiences and opinions of supervisors (principals, assistant principals, and others) be adequately and accurately represented in my report. I would, therefore, urge you to please complete the enclosed survey and return it to me on or before January 16, 1998.

Please be assured that I will hold your responses in strict confidence. I will combine your answers with those of supervisors throughout the state and will report only total responses and averaged ratings. I will not identify any school district or individual respondent in the reporting of the survey results.

Should you have any questions concerning the survey, please feel free to contact me at 603-228-1979. A copy of the survey results will be made available to you at the completion of the study. I truly appreciate your assistance with this study.

Sincerely yours,

Pamela L. Clark