

Teaching Supervision

Chapter 37

Bernard J. Badiali

"We teach to change the world. "
Brookfield

Introduction

It has been almost thirty years since the publication of *Supervision: Emerging Profession* (Leeper, 1969), an anthology which compiled a decade of writing by educational scholars in the field of supervision. The decade of the sixties was a time in which the continued existence of the supervisor as an instructional leader was at issue, and a time when the future existence of educational supervision as a field was in doubt. Leeper's anthology is an important work, a revealing collection of essays in which writers of that era address various aspects, motivation, techniques and goals of supervision. The articles range widely in scope revealing a period in which scholars were actively struggling to define, justify, promote and professionalize a practice they referred to as supervision.

It is debatable as to whether substantial progress has been made during the last 30 years to come to terms with the problems and issues that faced supervision in the 1960's. An analysis of the sixty five articles in Leeper's anthology suggests that many of the difficulties facing the field remain unmitigated. How supervision is defined, what functions it includes, what supervisors envision to be their role, what research informs the field, how supervisors are selected and prepared, and how supervision is actually taught are

just a few of the unanswered questions still facing the field today. If it is fair to say that supervision has made little progress with regard to emerging as a profession since 1960, then unresolved dilemmas about purpose, definition, role, function and preparation are among the main reasons.

There has been less discussion in this decade regarding the professionalization of supervision than there was in 1969, and more discussion about the transformation of supervision as a field (Glickman, 1992; Gordon, 1992; ; Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1993). The role and functions of supervision may be less clear in the 1990's than they were in the 1960's. Shrinking resources, teacher empowerment, advances in technology, and new conceptualizations of how schools should be organized are factors which call into further question what supervision will mean in the future.

This chapter addresses one of the issues mentioned above, namely how supervision is taught. This chapter explores the teaching of supervision by providing some historical context and contemporary perspective. The way in which supervision has been taught is nested in the milieu of history, including a thicket of concepts, some complementary, some competing with regard to how one views the practice. The chapter begins by problematizing supervision through discussing its traditions, definitions, undergirding philosophies, theories, practices, contexts, and world views. It concludes with some ideas about how supervision might be taught in the future to accommodate adult learning, critical reflection and collaboration within the changing circumstances of schooling.

The Dilemma of Definition

To those outside the field, defining supervision is not difficult. Supervision is defined in the American Heritage dictionary as "to oversee and direct." Indeed the dominate mode of supervision 50 years ago was oversight or inspection of schools and teachers. [In England educators continue to refer to supervision as "inspection."] Many teachers continue to have an emotional aversion to the term supervision because it conjures up notions of authoritarian directiveness. Mosher and Purpel (1972) used the term "snoopervision" to indicate teachers' discomfort and resistance to the practice. However a shrinking number of educators would find this definition of supervision acceptable today. During the last thirty years, defining supervision has been an exercise in variety and perspective. Supervision in education has come to mean something more and something different from supervision in the past and supervision in other fields. One issue that persists since before 1960, is that the term supervision is subject to many different interpretations. There seems to remain little consensus about its meaning.

Different definitions of supervision abound in the literature (Bolin and Panaritis, 1992; Oliva, 1993; Wiles and Bondi, 1980). To further complicate matters, a plethora of synonyms and modifiers have been used to describe supervision. Searching the literature since 1969, one finds terms like administrative supervision, clinical supervision, consultative supervision, developmental supervision, differentiated supervision, instructional supervision, and peer supervision (Oliva, 1993). Other terms such as coordinator, coach,

consultant, mentor, staff developer, and teacher-leader have emerged as accepted synonyms for supervisor.

What makes defining supervision even more complex is that it is a subject to be taught at the university as well as a field in which practitioners work. While practitioners describe supervision in terms of "what is," professors often define supervision more in terms of what "should be." Supervisory functions vary widely from one school system to the next and one state certification program to the next. As a further complication, the functions performed by supervisors are distributed over a wide range of educational specialties which have been ascribed other identifications. When Harris (1963) described supervision decades ago as a "distributive function", he could have been describing the status of supervision in 1996.

The fact that there are many definitions of supervision, make it difficult to describe how supervision is taught. (As an advanced certification or degree, one would assume that studies in supervision occur at the graduate level where not much is known about how professors teach generally.) Is it taught as a role or a function or both? Is supervision taught as a discrete set of tasks or a way of thinking? Is supervision taught as both a field of study and a craft practice? As can be seen by the array of definitions presented in this Handbook, individuals who write about it are hardly of one mind regarding the exact nature of supervision.

But scholars in supervision are no different in this respect from scholars in curriculum, in that they find the field of supervision to be illusive and fragmentary (Ornstein & Hunkins,

1988). Ornstein suggests that supervision, curriculum and instruction are so tightly interwoven that they interact in ways that are impossible to determine. He argues further that the relationship between supervision and administration has intensified in the 1990's because of the dramatic decline in supervisory personnel (1995). As the numbers of supervisors have been reduced, their duties and responsibilities have been added to those of the principal.

Paucity of Research

There is little empirical research on supervision either in the decade of the 1960's or in the 1990's. According to MacDonald (1965), in the ASCD Yearbook Research and Development in Supervision, little mention was made of any research studies in the field. Lamenting the lack of research evidence to be found regarding the impact of supervision, MacDonald wrote: "We are left with the still unanswered question of whether supervision has any value at all (p. 161)." Mosher and Purpel reiterate MacDonald's assertion: "But the inescapable conclusion to be drawn from any review of the literature is that there is virtually no research suggesting that supervision of teaching, however defined or undertaken, makes any difference." (1972, p. 50) The problem of little research in the field continues in the 1990's with very few exceptions (Nolan, Hawkes, & Francis, 1993).

If there has been a dearth of research on the general field of supervision there is even less research on the "teaching" of supervision. Rarely is there mention in the literature as to how supervisors are taught and with what consequences. A persistent

problem has been that there is very little reliable research done on who supervises and on what supervisors do to fulfill their responsibilities in schools. Research on the teaching of supervision is almost non-existent.

There is no lack of writing on the practice of supervision however. Dozens of articles have been published on supervisors and supervision during the last thirty years. According to Ornstein (1995), discussion about supervision has declined considerably in recent times. There are scores of textbooks on the topic however, which suggests that there is a body of knowledge to which we can refer. We may even infer from these writings that there is a "curriculum of supervision" or more accurately, numerous curricula of supervision. Unfortunately, texts relate little about how a "curriculum" is taught or what approaches to instruction are popular or effective. Neither do we know what occurs to students who experience the curriculum and instruction of supervision in terms of the consequences of their work as supervisors.

At least part of the reason that there appears to be little research on supervision is because it is such a diffused discipline. Activities associated with it range from observing teachers and group dynamics, to organizing curriculum and orchestrating systemic change. There is research associated with many of the activities associated with supervision in schools, depending upon how the practice is defined, but few studies which use supervision as the object. Studies in leadership, group dynamics, curriculum development, interpersonal relations, etc., exist in the literature, but these areas are not the exclusive domain of supervisors.

Supervision has not been defined in such a way as to distinguish it from other leadership positions such as administration and curriculum coordination. Specific characteristics have not been identified which set the supervisor apart from the principal, department chair, curriculum coordinator, mentor, or lead teacher.

Persistent Unresolved Issues

There are numerous issues that complicate any exploration of how supervision has been, or will be, taught. Specifying the role and function of the supervisor has been a conundrum (see Oliva, 1993, chapter 2). Different conceptions of schools, teachers, teaching, and learning affect the way in which supervisors are taught. Differing perceptions of the purpose schools serve influence the teaching of supervision. Whether supervisors are being prepared to work in preservice or inservice settings has also influenced the ways in which supervisors are taught.

Teacher education or school leadership?

The fact that supervision has had two different identities further complicates our understanding of how supervision is taught. Supervision may be thought of within the context of teacher preparation or school-based practice. It might be argued that supervisors serve two related, but different purposes when the clients, expectations, power relationships, and responsibilities shift from working in preservice education to working with school-wide responsibilities. In teacher education, the emphasis is on providing a skilled service to aspiring teachers as they endeavor to enter the

teaching profession. The focus is almost always on instructional issues. But college supervisors are instructors, performance evaluators, and part of a university community. Student teachers are in a highly dependent relationship with them. Because of the power differential, supervising student teachers is very different from supervising veteran teachers. Is it reasonable to believe that preparation of student teacher supervisors is, or should be different from preparing inservice supervisors?

Supervisors in schools are also intensely concerned with instruction, but also with the organizational conditions which affect the school community. Their duties often include community relations, strategic planning, staff development, budgeting, and a variety of other responsibilities. Most certainly inservice supervisors have a great deal in common with student teacher supervisors, but the term supervision takes on a somewhat different meaning depending on which reference point is used. In the past, the context for these two forms of supervision has been markedly different. With the advent of professional development schools and school/university partnerships, supervisors of student teachers may have more in common with inservice supervisors in the future.

Supervision in Transition

A dilemma of supervision in education is not simply that many definitions exist, but also that its meaning has changed and evolved with the changing times. This section of the chapter will briefly discuss the history of the nature of supervision before going on to teaching supervision in the future.

According to Wiles and Bondi (1980), the evolution of supervisory roles can be described as follows:

- 1750-1910 Inspection and enforcement
- 1910-1920 Scientific supervision
- 1920-1930 Bureaucratic supervision
- 1930-1955 Cooperative supervision
- 1955-1965 Supervision as curriculum development
- 1965-1970 Clinical supervision
- 1970-1980 Supervision as management

Since 1980, approaches to supervision have included remnants of those identified in the list above, but many new forms of supervision have been popularized during the last twenty years. From 1980 to present, supervision has been characterized as human relations, human resources, democratic, collaborative/collegial, artistic, interpretive and ecological (Oliva, 1993).

In a recent description of supervision, Tracy (1995) describes seven phases in the evolution of supervisory practice. She frames supervision as the act of assisting and assessing teachers and suggests that each historical phase of supervision has had a somewhat different emphasis and focus. Different skills were required in order to implement supervision at different times in history. As the purpose of supervision varied, so did its focus, assumptions, skills and personnel.

put figure about here

Rapid changes in supervision since 1980 have made clear delineation's such as the one above very difficult. According to Pajak, "the mid to late 1970's witnessed the culmination of one era and the beginning of another in the study of supervisory leadership

in education." (1989, p. 10). Pajak's assertion is supported throughout subsequent literature on supervision. The 1982 ASCD Yearbook, *Supervision of Teaching* (Sergiovanni) for example, attempted to provide a current benchmark of the thinking of the times. The yearbook chapters defined "three faces of supervision: the artistic, the clinical, and the scientific." (p. v). In a very comprehensive study of supervision sponsored by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Pajak (1989) identified and verified twelve dimensions of supervisory behavior. Collecting data from a national sample of university professors, school superintendents, principals, teachers, and other educational personnel, the following dimensions were identified:

1. Community relations
2. Staff development
3. Planning and change
4. Communication
5. Curriculum
6. Instructional program
7. Service to teachers
8. Observing and conferring
9. Problem solving and decision making
10. Research and program evaluation
11. Organizing and motivating
12. Personal development

As part of a comprehensive review of the literature from 1975 to 1989, Pajak and his colleagues linked the Dimensions to the leading textbooks in the field (see figure 1). According to Pajak, a high degree of consensus appears to exist among outstanding practitioners concerning the knowledge, attitudes, and skills that are most important to effective supervisory practice (1989).

Furthermore, the study suggests that there is strong agreement between practitioners and scholars. "No serious gap seems to exist, in other words, between those who study and write about supervision in education and those who actually practice it" (p. 149).

Put Figure About Here

What Pajak and his colleagues seem to make clear about consensus is later called into question. In their chapter for, *Supervision in Transition*, Bolin and Panaritis describe in detail the historical dilemma of defining supervision since before the turn of the 19th century (1992). They argue that there has been only a loose consensus built over the years. Their conclusion is that the only points of consensus about supervision were:

1. The function of supervision is an important one whether it is carried out by a superintendent, supervisor, curriculum worker, or peer.

2. Supervision is primarily concerned with the improvement of classroom practice for the benefit of students, regardless of what else may be entailed (p. 31). These authors go on to suggest that even this level of consensus is an illusion. Indeed there are many definitions of supervision offered in the literature.

Less conventional definitions of supervision have begun to appear later in this decade. Sergiovanni and Starratt for example, published the fifth edition of their popular supervision text and re-entitled it, Supervision: a Redefinition (1989). Their definition

disconnects supervision from traditional, hierarchical roles in the school organization and redefines supervision more in terms of democratic and professional processes. The new supervision they describe embraces peer clinical supervision, mentoring, action research, program evaluation, translations of school mission, and other configurations of teachers as colleagues working together to increase understanding their practice. Further they contend, that staff development and supervision are now joined in such a way that they are often indistinguishable. Teachers and supervisors are not viewed primarily as independent decision makers who calculate individually the costs and benefits of their actions, but rather as members of an educating community who respond to shared norms and values. Changing the metaphor of school as organization to school as community, Sergiovanni and Starratt assert that the context for supervision has changed. The supervisor emerges as an advocate, developer, and linking pin in relationship to the teachers' efforts to improve the process of teaching and learning (pp. xviii-xix).

Glickman (1992) has suggested that the term "instructional supervision" has outlived its usefulness. He seems to agree with Sergiovanni and Starratt that educators are thinking more democratically, dismantling long-standing hierarchies. "When schools become decentralized, engage in shared governance, and see themselves as the center of action research, the term supervisor or supervision has little meaning to staff members" (p.2). In this new paradigm Glickman suggests, educators use terms such as

coaching, collegiality, reflective practitioners, professional development, critical inquiry, and study or research groups.

Teaching Supervision

How supervision is actually learned depends heavily on the learners', as well as the teachers', orientation, perspective and philosophy of education itself. Any person's approach to supervision reflects her world view, how she perceives reality, what she values or deems important, and what amount of knowledge and experience she has about the field. Theoretical and practical principles of supervision are derived in part by having a perspective on the purpose for schools. How supervision is taught is "problematic" to use Dewey's (1938) term. According to Schon (1989), when a practitioner [teacher of supervision] sets a problem, she chooses and names the things that she will notice; she selects things for attention and organizes them guided by her background, interests and perspectives. Given the array of definitions, the wide possibilities in understanding supervisory tasks and functions, and the numerous perspectives on the purpose of school, teaching supervision can take many avenues.

Theory, Philosophy and Approach

According to McCutchen (1995), theories in education are integrated clusters, bundles, or sets of interpretations, analyses, and understandings about educational phenomena. They are about the action we take when we teach as well as when we supervise.

Theories have an empirical as well as an ethical dimension.

Teaching, any teaching, has a moral basis from which decisions are

made. Supervision scholars like scholars in other fields have a wide range of theoretical positions and opinions. Because those theories and opinions vary, we must speculate that approaches to teaching supervision in the past have varied as well.

A person's philosophy reflects her life experiences, common sense, social and economic background, education and general beliefs about people. Philosophy is a description, explanation, and evaluation of the world, or what social scientists call a "social lens" (Ornstein, 1995). Philosophy determines principles for guiding action by serving as the foundation for educational decisions. Educators' values, attitudes and beliefs spring from their philosophies, so do various approaches to supervision, and how to teach it.

McNeil (1982) has argued that supervision should rely on a scientific approach to supervision. This approach holds to the theory that teaching is a science and, as such could be examined and improved using the scientific method. An underlying assumption to this approach is that the efficiency of teachers would be increased through the guidance of a supervisor who would translate aims of the school into terms which the teachers understand. Tracing the progress of research on teaching effectiveness, McNeil concluded that, "There is little hope that (scientific) research will bring authoritativeness to supervision. Research does not cover the whole terrain of the classroom. Also many of the scientific findings will be rejected on other grounds -- political, economic. Further, teachers and supervisors will not agree that any finding is sufficiently established to serve as the final word of authority." (p. 32).

Eisner (1992) offers a competing theory which conceptualizes teaching as an art. According to Eisner, "One of the great ironies of contemporary education is that although teaching is often regarded as an art or a craft, it is most often studied as if it were, or aspired to be, a science. Almost any teacher will tell you that teaching is far from scientific. Yet the study of teaching and the conduct of supervision has, in general, been undertaken using scientific -- some would say scientific -- assumptions and methods" (p. 53)

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1995) suggest that different theories of supervision and teaching compete with one another. Traditional scientific management, human relations and neoscientific management represent three general theories of supervision. Each theory makes different assumptions about human nature, about authority, and about decision making which result in different expectations for the functions of supervision.

There are differences in theoretical and philosophical perspectives regarding supervision. Competing ideas are contextualized by beliefs about school curriculum and purpose. Ornstein and Hunkins (1988) have identified five distinct approaches to curriculum which illustrate diverse positions on how individuals view schools. These approaches are: (1) Behavioral-Rational; (2) Systems managerial; (3) Intellectual-Academic; (4) Humanistic-Ascetic; and (5) Reconceptualist. Most supervisory orientations fall into one or more of these approaches as can be inferred when they are interpreted in light of the evolution of supervisory roles.

Given the dilemma of the definition of supervision, it seems appropriate to inquire about how individuals come to understand this concept. How one "knows" supervision it stands to reason, will influence the way in which one "does" supervision; and more importantly, how one teaches supervision. How does one learn to supervise? Does how one knows and does supervision have anything to do with how one was taught supervision? How is supervision taught? Are there programs of study for supervision?

Looking back on the field and practice of supervision, it is apparent that there is a rich tradition filled with the best of intentions for lifting teachers and schools closer to their ideals. It seems that the tasks of supervision have been specified in each era to respond to the perceived needs of the times. The role of supervisor has evolved and transformed during the last century and with its evolution, the functions of supervision shifted to align with the roles. There is reason to believe that this evolution will continue.

One common thread running through the definition of supervision from age to age has been the idea that it is an "enabling activity". Supervisors aim to enable teachers to do a better job in helping students learn. They aim to enable schools to fulfill their purposes as organizations or as communities. While not much is written on this topic, supervisors have also attempted to enable administrators to keep their very busy eyes on the quality and equity of education for all students.

Having suggested that "enabling" is the common thread which carries through from age to age in supervision, I also feel

responsible for being more specific about enabling for what?

Enabling is a means to an end -- fulfilling the purpose(s) of schooling. According to Glickman. "All of our supervisory actions need to be taken in congruence with the higher principles of our American democracy" (p. 435). Answers to the following questions posed by Goodlad, Soder, and Sirotnik (1990), represent the ends.

What are public schools for in a democratic society? What should they be for, and for whom? Whose interests are served and whose should be served in a system of compulsory education? What is the nature and relationship between the interests of the individual, the family, the community, the state, and the society? Are there reasoned answers to these and like questions, or are there just an assortment of value positions, each as 'good' as the other? Or, put another way, are there not fundamental normative positions derived from moral and ethical argument that serve to ground appropriate answers to crucial educational questions such as these? (p. ix)

According to Goodlad et al (1990), schools exist to prepare and enculturate future voting citizens so they may take part in a democracy. Glickman (1995) elaborates on this idea:

All students are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights; that among these are an education that will accord them Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness; that whenever any public school becomes destructive of preparing students for these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it (p. 438).

In short, supervisors because of their enabling focus are vitally important school leaders and supervision should be thought of in terms of leadership. In Sirotnik's (1995) terms, leaders "...exercise significant and responsible influence." Supervision, like leadership itself, is a concept which requires a good deal of contextual interpretation and constructed meanings in particular settings; at particular times; for particular purposes, issues and actions. It may not be sensible to define supervision in any more specific terms. Three key words in the brief definition are "influence," the power to affect, sway, and persuade people; "exercise," a word which conveys deliberate, decision-oriented, action-taking; and "significant," a word which means not without substance (pedagogical leadership). A fourth key word in the definition is "responsible," According to Sirotnik (1995), embedded in the word responsible is the moral code that derives from the tacit agreement entered into by educators by virtue of an occupation directed at significantly and profoundly influencing the lives of children.

In order for us to better understand supervision as a field and as a practice, it is necessary to make the teaching of supervision more explicit and more public. How can we understand the curriculum of supervision, the instruction of supervision, and the consequences of supervision if we have only a vague picture of how the practice is learned? For a field so long preoccupied with the instructional improvement of teachers, it is ironic that there is little explication of the instruction which goes on within the field itself. One reason that there is a lack of description of how supervision is

taught may be the lingering concept that supervisors must be master teachers, experts in the art and science of pedagogy. This concept suggests that "teachers of supervisors" need to be extraordinary teachers themselves, an intimidating thought. Yet if this is so, the curriculum and instruction of supervisors should stand as exemplars.

Little is known about how individuals learn to supervise. Since most formal experiences occur in graduate schools, it is necessary to explore not only the program of studies for supervision, but also the design and dynamics of the courses. Various textbook authors have staked out ideological territory to be sure, but understanding how those ideologies are conveyed in the classroom and in the field would be enlightening. Obviously there is a limit as to what can be learned about supervision in a college classroom. Supervision, after all, is not a spectator sport. Any explication of teaching supervision would need to include a description of what field and practical experiences are used, what activities are performed and with what consequences?

Knowing more clearly how supervision is taught can do nothing but help the field. Research about teaching supervision should be conducted and reported to the educational community regularly so we can bring to light the teaching of supervision the way we bring to light teaching in other disciplines, for the purpose of enabling the teachers to examine and reflect upon the effects of their own teaching.

The balance of this chapter will be devoted to how supervisors might be taught to enable teachers, groups and schools. It is

impossible to discuss teaching supervision without discussing supervision itself. I have struggled to separate "teaching supervision" from supervision, but at times it has been difficult to separate one from another.

Two views of teaching

Perhaps a key to understanding how supervision is taught lies in the conception of teaching itself. Where the instructor of supervision resides ideologically most probably has implications for the content and processes used to prepare supervisors. Darling-Hammond (1992) summarized two identifiably different views about teaching which influence supervision (and therefore the preparation of supervisors).

One view of teaching emphasizes the production of specific teacher behaviors thought to represent "effective teaching" (Hunter, 1984). Tracy and MacNaughten (1989) call this a "neo-traditionalist" approach and link its intellectual heritage to behavioral psychologists such as E. L. Thorndike. This view is concerned with specifying and producing teacher behaviors thought to increase those student behaviors thought to be associated with learning.

The neo traditional view of teaching illustrates an epistemology derived from positivist philosophy. Technical rationality holds that practitioners are (at best) instrumental problem solvers (Schon, 1987). This view of teaching can be equated with the "effective schools" movement, proficiency testing, and other activities which attempt to reduce teaching to a set of controlled behaviors. In the struggle to define effective teaching

using a technical rational approach, teaching has been reduced to a series of behaviors supported by "scientific" research. Such research has been almost always predicated on didactic methods used in elementary settings which seemed to produce high scores on tests of basic skills. One example of technical rationality in supervision is the Florida Performance Measurement System (Darling-Hammond, 1992). The FPMS specifies an extensive list of teaching behaviors to be enacted by a classroom teacher and tallied by an evaluator, thus reducing teaching to a set of technical operations.

When the role of teacher is depicted in technical-rational terms, supervision is concerned with translating research for teachers and monitoring its implementation in the classroom. Teaching supervision then, becomes a matter of acquainting aspiring supervisors with the research on effective teaching, and making them proficient in the skills necessary to verify that research is being implemented in the classroom. The traditional view of teaching has been described by Nolan & Francis (1992) as follows:

1. Learning is a process of accumulating bits of information and isolated skills.
2. The teacher's primary responsibility is to transfer his (her) knowledge directly to students.
3. Changing student behavior is the teacher's primary goal.
4. The process of teaching and learning focuses primarily on the interactions between the teacher and individual students.
5. Thinking and learning skills are viewed as transferable across all content areas. (p. 45)

Nolan & Francis have also described the way in which technical rational supervisors and teachers conceptualize teaching and learning in basic education. Can that be extended? When

supervisors conceptualize teaching and learning from a technical rational perspective, do they also hold the expectation that these principles apply to their own learning? If so, teaching supervision has much in common with teaching other subjects in elementary and secondary schools. Nolan & Francis refer to these beliefs and related activities as teacher-centered (p. 46). In this approach, the supervisor and teacher come together to examine a teacher's observable behavior and to discuss it in light of generalizable teaching behaviors that have been identified by research as promoting student learning.

To be consistent with the technical rational orientation, the teacher of supervision would:

- (1.) have clear and specific objectives for student learning. These objectives would relate to the perceived tasks and functions of supervision as described earlier in the chapter.
- (2.) organize and structure tasks and skills appropriate to supervision;
- (3.) use examples and illustrations of this type of supervision;
- (4.) model the appropriate application of the desired skills;
- (5.) have students practice those skills so that they will be retained and eventually transferred to practice;
- (6.) assess students by requiring them to reproduce the desired knowledge and skill through some demonstration or test.

The format of numerous texts in the field of supervision suggest that the technical rational approach has been used to prepare supervisors (Boyan & Copeland, 1978; Oliva, 1993). Brookfield (1995) has criticized teachers of adults with a reductionist cast of mind who believe that the dynamics and contradictions of teaching can be reduced to something linear and quantifiable as being "epistemologically challenged".

A second view of teaching is assumed when supervision focuses on the development of a reflective teaching orientation stimulated by the teachers' individual contexts and felt needs. Tracy and MacNaughton (1989) have characterized this approach to supervision as "neo-progressive" because it can be traced to approaches advocated by Dewey, Piaget and Bruner. According to Darling-Hammond (1992), "neo-progressives" are concerned with developing deliberative classrooms that support both teachers and students in constructing meaning from their interactions with each other and with the world they study" (1992, p. 15).

In his book *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* (1987), Schon draws the contrast between a neo-progressive approach and a neo-traditional approach this way:

In the varied topography of professional practice, there is a high, hard ground overlooking a swamp. On the high ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the application of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowland, messy, confusing problems defy technical, solution. The irony of this situation is that the problems on the high ground tend to be relatively unimportant to individuals or society at large, however great their technical interest may be, while in the swamp lie the problems of greatest human concern. The practitioner must choose. Shall he remain on the high ground where he can solve relatively unimportant problems according to prevailing standards of rigor, or shall he descend into the swamp of important problems and non rigorous inquiry? (p. 3)

Schon refers to this second conceptualization of teaching and learning as springing from an "epistemology of practice". By contrast to the technical approach which values conformity and reductionist thinking about teaching and learning, the neo-

progressive view is that teachers are thoughtful, creative persons who use a set of principles and strategies derived from an informed personal philosophy of education and the multiple demands of learning contexts (Darling-Hammond, 1992). In this view, the dispositions, skills, and knowledge required for teaching include, but aren't limited to, dispositions to reflect on one's own teaching and its effects on learners, to respect and value cultural differences, and to engage in critical and divergent thinking and problem-solving with students (Darling-Hammond, 1992). Schon argues that the relationship between practice competence and professional knowledge needs to be turned upside down. That is to say that educators need to focus on the artistry of practice competence first, not professional knowledge first.

Interestingly the knowledge base for such an approach includes a knowledge of scientific inquiry and epistemology, as well as knowledge about behavior and cognition, cultures, human growth and development, social organizations, ethics, communication and language, learning contexts, and subject matter. (Darling-Hammond referring to the Minnesota Internship Program [MBOT]) Schon (1987) describes this alternative epistemology as teacher artistry understood in terms of "reflection in action." He describes this form of professional artistry this way:

On this view, we would recognize as a limiting case situations in which it is possible to make a routine application of existing rules and procedures to the fact of particular problematic situations. Beyond these situations familiar rules, theories, and techniques are put to work in concrete instances through ... a limited form of reflection in action. And beyond these, we would

recognize cases of problematic diagnosis in which practitioners not only follow rules of inquiry but also sometimes respond to findings by inventing new rules, on the spot. (p. 35)

Nolan and Francis (1992) offer principles of teaching and learning associated with this view:

1. All learning, except rote memorization, requires the learner to actively construct meaning.
2. Student's' prior understandings of and thoughts about a topic or concept before instruction exert tremendous influence on what they learn during instruction.
3. The teachers primary goal is to generate a change in the learner's cognitive structure or way of viewing and organizing the world.
4. Because learning is a process of active construction by the learner, the teacher cannot do the work of learning.
5. Learning in cooperation with others is an important source of motivation, support, modeling, and coaching.

There are at least two implications for teachers of supervision in this approach to teaching and learning. First they need to embrace an epistemology of practice and reflection; and second, the new epistemology would need to be manifest in their own teaching. For teachers of supervision who have been long immersed in the tradition of positivism, moving toward a different set of educational assumptions will not be easy. Changing one's world view never is.

Since Schon coined the term "reflective practitioner" in 1987, reflection has been coopted to mean almost any retrospective thought about teaching. Smyth (1992) and Zeichner (1994) have both pointed out the term reflective practice becomes meaningless if people use it to describe any teaching they happen to like.

Brookfield has noted that everyone, regardless of their ideological orientation, has jumped on the bandwagon in using the term.

Artistry in teaching as described by Schon should not be confused with unexamined common sense. According to Brookfield, "unexamined common sense is a notoriously unreliable guide to action" (p. 4). Brookfield argues that teachers need to exercise "critical reflection," a concept which has two distinctive purposes. The first purpose is for teachers to understand how considerations of power influence and distort educational processes and interactions. A common example that most teachers recognize occurs when a principal or supervisor comes in to observe a lesson. Suddenly the teacher's behavior alters, students react to the change in predictable ways -- those who want to help the teacher look good become more active and attentive; those who want to embarrass the teacher become more unruly or lethargic. Because of the underlying influence of the observer's power, the climate of the classroom is distorted. Critical reflection requires the teacher to acknowledge and understand classrooms as places of some ideological conflict. According to Brookfield (1995), teachers become aware of the pervasiveness of power, they start to notice the oppressive dimensions of practices which they thought were neutral or even benevolent. They start to explore how power over learners can become power with learners (p. 9).

The second purpose of critical reflection is for teachers to uncover assumptions that they believe are in their own best interest, but that have actually been designed by more powerful others to work against them in the long term. The process by which ideas,

structures and actions come to be seen by the majority of people as wholly natural, preordained, and working for their own good, when they are acutely constructed and transmitted by powerful minority interests to protect the status quo that serves those interests is hegemony (Gramsci, 1978). Examples of hegemonic practices abound, but the most harmful may be commercialized products or programs that promise to solve all manner of instructional problems for teachers. Teacher proof curricula, canned discipline programs, and other commercially advertised techniques which promise to solve classroom dilemmas only serve to limit reflective practice and distort the way teachers see their role.

To be consistent with an epistemology of practice, a teacher of supervision would:

- (1.) Honor the expansive reservoir of experiences of students and use it in any learning situation (Knowles, 1984)
- (2.) Help students inquire and problem-solve and cope with their own emotional needs and tensions as well as the needs and tensions of those around them.
- (3.) Foster critical reflection
- (4.) Facilitate self assessment with regard to the impact on the learning of others
- (5.) Rouse cognitive tensions and disequilibria in students without threatening their sense of self worth and security.
- (6.) Model principles 1 -- 5.

Two Metaphors for Teaching Supervision

Good teaching is second only to good parenting in its complexity. It can't be reduced to a formula. Teaching supervision carries with it a special responsibility since the potential impact of preparing educational leaders is profound. Although good teaching

is complex and sometimes mysterious, it can and should be understood by those who do it.

I conclude the chapter by offering two metaphors for teaching supervision. These two models for teaching supervision combine various concepts of research and practice and should be applied metaphorically as well as literally. The models are not designed for mechanical application, but should be considered thought frames that have the potential to enhance the future supervisor's reflective practice. As Sergiovanni and Starratt explain, "Informed intuition and reflective practice are key concepts in understanding the link between knowledge and use. Neither is directly dependent upon models of teaching, but neither can evolve separately from such models" (1993, p.130).

Teachers of supervision are concerned with conceptual rather than instrumental knowledge. They strive to develop a reflective, professional knowledge which is an accumulation of the referentially based decisions that supervisors make as they practice. The two approaches that follow are not the only approaches to teaching supervision by any stretch of the imagination, but they can be useful and powerful ways to think about preparing supervisors in the future.

Clinical Supervision

I was reluctant to label this subsection of the chapter "clinical supervision" because, like reflection, the term has come to mean many different things to many different people. If one goal of teaching supervision is to enable the supervisor to work individually

with teachers, then clinical supervision is an indispensable process. Developed in the 1970's by Morris Cogan and Robert Goldhammer (Garman, 1982), this approach to supervision has been interpreted, reinterpreted, and often misinterpreted by supervisors since its inception. The clinical supervision to which I refer here has been clearly described in the literature (Garmen, 1982; Nolan, Hawkes & Francis, 1993; and Pajak, 1993;). Clinical supervision as a concept differs from the procedural orientation most often referred to in the literature. It is meant here as a metaphor for reflective practice very consistent with the notions of Schon and Brookfield. It is not only a form of direct assistance to teachers (Glickman, Gordan, & Ross-Gordon, 1995), but also an approach to schooling that influences school culture.

Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1993) describe the procedure of clinical supervision as follows:

1. Preconference with teacher
2. Observation of classroom
3. Analyzing and interpreting observation
4. Postconference with teacher
5. Critique of previous four steps

This procedural approach was criticized by Garmen after analyzing hundreds of conferences this way:

- Supervisor officiates
- Teacher confesses his/her transgressions
- Supervisors suggest ways to repent
- Teacher agrees to recant
- Supervisor assists in penance
- Teacher makes "Acts of Contrition"
- Supervisor gives absolution
- Both go away feeling better

Garman (1982) eschews the procedural approach. She argues that clinical supervision is more conceptual and reflective. She describes the process as a metaphor consistent with reflective practice:

A person becomes a clinical supervisor when he/she begins to think and act as if the "cycle of supervision" were a metaphor as well as a method; when observation and analysis are not only procedural phases for actions in classrooms, but also represent the empirical approach inherent in a skilled service; when the notion of conference not only means two people meeting before and after classroom visits, but also suggests dynamic forms of collaboration in educational alliances; when the image of "cycle" not only guarantees repeated performance, but also refers to high levels of involvement and commitment that press participants toward the "connectedness" of collegiality; when the teacher-supervisor relationship stands for ethical conduct as it is lived out in important choices. The specificity of the method can inform us about the unbounding qualities of the metaphor. (p.52)

Viewing clinical supervision as a metaphor, Garmen describes the concepts of collegiality, collaboration, skilled service and ethical conduct which must become the supervisors' habits of mind. These concepts represent principles through which supervision can be taught and learned. (For an explication of these concepts see *The Clinical Approach to Supervision in Supervision of Teaching*, ASCD Yearbook, 1982)

Problem Based Learning as a Metaphor

Problem Based Learning has been described as a promising approach to professional development for educational leaders (Bridges and Hallinger, 1995). However, a growing number of

professors of educational leadership have come to share the view that PBL may be more than simply a new teaching tool for preparing future educational leaders. They believe that PBL may also be a promising metaphor for supervision. This approach to professional preparation may undo the tradition and belief that knowledge is created at the university and passed down to practitioners. Problem based learning, Murphy suggests, may help to solve one of the profession's most knotty problems--"that of the breach between the academic and practice arms of the profession" (in Bridges and Hallinger, 1995, p. x). PBL provides an approach to learning that recognizes and honors the array of beliefs, skills and understandings needed to be a successful school supervisor. For teachers of supervision, PBL provides students an opportunity to work collegially in groups on and with complex problems relevant to practice. Problem based learning is an approach to leadership preparation based on principles of adult learning and strategies of integrated curriculum.

Programs which prepare and certify supervisors need to use an integrated approach to learning which deals with the problems of practice. Supervision cannot be learned as a series of discreet subjects to be studied and mastered. Problems and dilemmas are rarely separated into content areas in schools, rather they are multidimensional and interrelated -- "swampy". Fractionalization of subject matter does little to illustrate how supervision works in reality.

While traditional preparation programs could be described as "content centered", Problem Based Learning is an integrated

approach which can be described as “problem-centered”. In contrast to a traditionally content centered curriculum, PBL removes the emphasis on discreet subject areas and focuses on authentic educational problems, complex enough to draw a variety of content knowledge into play. Subject areas are drawn upon, but only insofar as they relate to a contextualized educational dilemma. Course work then is organized in seminars centered around themes which use problems found in the field.

PBL's come in as many varieties as there are problems in practice. They usually begin with a scenario and end with a charge to the group who is solving the problem. A good PBL is one in which learners can only succeed when they think, problem solve, and justify their solution. Problem based learning has the following characteristics:

- The starting point for learning is a [school-related, contextualized] problem for which an individual lacks a ready response.
- The problem is one that students are apt to encounter as future educational leaders.
- Knowledge that students are expected to acquire during their professional training is organized around problems rather than disciplines.
- Students, individually and collectively, assume a major responsibility for their own learning.
- Most of the learning occurs within the context of small group activity rather than in lectures (Bridges, 1992).

According to Bridges (1992) there are four propositions as a rationale for using PBL in place of a traditional curriculum. (1) Students retain little of what they learn when taught in a traditional lecture format. (2) Students often do not use the knowledge they have learned appropriately. (3) Since students forget much of what is learned or use knowledge inappropriately, instructors should create conditions that optimize retrieval and appropriate use of the knowledge in future professional practice. (4) PBL creates the three conditions that information theory links to subsequent retrieval and appropriate use of new information: activation of prior knowledge, similarity of context in which information is learned and later applied; and opportunity to elaborate on that information (p. 8).

Bridges (1992) discusses the cognitive, motivational, and functional grounds for using the problem based approach. This approach to curriculum is not new. In fact it is similar to the problem-solving method John Dewey described as early as 1916 (Tanner and Tanner, 1995). Dewey argued that intellectual ability is the outcome of opportunity. He suggested that curriculum should link the individual with the environment -- real world -- and not depend on either memory or empty tradition. The underlying assumptions of problem based learning about knowledge are consistent with Deweyan philosophy. PBL proponents assume that both knowing and doing are of equal value and importance.

Recently, curriculum developers and program designers are actively promoting integrated curricula and teaming (Jacobs, 1989; Drake, 1993; and Beane, 1995). They point to several reasons for taking an integrated approach to the preparation of supervisors.

First, there has been unprecedented growth of knowledge in , organizational development, and leadership theory. (What is the basic information needed for supervisors in the twenty first century?) Second, traditional preparation programs have been too fragmented. Students are often left on their own to make connections from one content course to another. Third, some students complain that course content is not relevant. Information seems too obscure to be helpful in practice. Problem-based learning has the potential to transcend these difficulties. It is relevant since the problems themselves come from practice. It is authentic because students must draw upon numerous areas of study to resolve a problem. Finally, the knowledge students use through PBL is more readily retained since it is introduced in context.

Dewey's problem solving method rests on the principle that educational opportunity means shared knowledge and concerns: the problem is one of learning together as well as what is learned. Learning together fosters the development of individual interests and talents as well as a sense of social responsibility. PBL requires that supervisors learn to work collaboratively with others in groups or teams. The hope is that students of supervision will extend the practice of collaboration in the work place. A strong theme in problem-based teaching is that educational supervisors share a moral responsibility for creating a culture in school that contributes to the principles of democracy. In emphasizing team work and collaboration teachers of supervision model what must be done in order to create democratic schools.

Enough can't be said about the benefits of dealing with real problems as a means of preparing supervisors. The act of finding and setting problems is important. Attention to the human and moral dimensions of schools is crucial. Working collaboratively in teams is more in step with the contemporary thinking which characterizes schools as communities.

Conclusion

Problem Based Learning is a powerful approach to teaching supervisors. The use of this approach has enabled professors to reexamine their own teaching. It is an approach that allows us to draw upon the wisdom and craft knowledge of practitioners. It provides opportunities to model collaborative problem solving and democratic processes. PBL helps to address issues of power ethics on which a preparation program for supervision might rest. It enables students and professors alike to integrate subjects and disciplines within the fields of supervision, curriculum and leadership.

Beyond the classroom, Problem Based Learning can provide a connection to practice as teachers of supervision work with schools. It has the potential to be a tool for mutual renewal between public school programs and university preparation programs. It contributes to co-reform which strengthens a growing network of educators in the field. Problem Based Learning is more than a new or revisited instructional methodology, it can be the means by which educational community is constructed.

In this chapter I have tried to present a profile of the troubled history of supervision. I have argued that teaching supervision

depends on the contexts and referents that one uses as well as the ascription to a technical rational epistemology, or an epistemology of practice. I have suggested that teaching supervision should include critical reflection through the use of two metaphors -- Clinical Supervision and Problem-based Learning. Hopefully the principles embedded in these two metaphors will assist those who teach supervision in the future.

References

- Acheson, K., & Gall, M. (1987). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman.
- Alfonso, R., Firth, G. , & Neville, R. (1981). Instructional supervision: a behavior system. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Beane, J. (1995). Toward a Coherent Curriculum. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. (1989). Supervision: Focus on Instruction. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bolin, F., & Panaritis, P. (1992). Searching for a Common Purpose: A Perspective on the History of Supervision. In C. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in Transition, (pp. 30 - 43). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Boyan, N. a., & Copeland, W. (1978). Instructional Supervision Training Program. Columbus: Charles Merrill Publishing Company.
- Bridges, E. a., & Hallinger, P. (1995). Implementing Problem-Based Learning in Leadership Development. Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1995). Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher. San Francisco: The Jossey-Bass.
- Corey, S. M. (1963). A More Wholesome Balance. Educational Leadership, 21 (November), 67-68.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Sclan, E. (1992). Policy and Supervision. In C. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in Transition, (pp. 7 - 29). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Drake, S. (1993). Planning Integrated Curriculum. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum development.
- Eash, M. J. (1969). Is Systems Analysis for Supervisors? Educational Leadership, 26(5), 482-89.
- Eisner, E. W. (1979). The educational imagination of the design and evaluation of school programs. (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Eisner, E. W. (1982). An Artistic Approach to Supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of Teaching, (pp. 53-66). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Garman, N. B. (1986). Reflection, the heart of clinical supervision: A modern rationale for professional practice. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2(1), 1-24.

Garmen, N. (1982). The Clinical Approach to Supervision. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of Teaching, (pp. 35 -52). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. D. (1993). Renewing America's Schools: A Guide for School-Based Action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glickman, C. D. (Ed.). (1992). Supervision in Transition. Alexandria: ASCD.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon S. et al. (1995). Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for Our Nation's Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. a., & Krajewski, R. (1980). Clinical Supervision. (Second ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gordon, S. (1992). Paradigms, transitions, and the new supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 8, 62 - 76.

Gramsci, A. (1978). Selection from the prison notebooks. London: Lawrence and Wishhart.

Harris, B. M. (1985). Supervisory behavior in education. (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Jacobs, H. (1989). Interdisciplinary Curriculum: Design and Implementation. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Leeper, R. R. (Ed.). (1969). Supervision: Emerging Profession. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA.

MacDonald, J. B. (1965). Knowledge About Supervision: Rationalization or Rationale. Educational Leadership, 23(2), 161-163.

McCutchen, G. (1995). Curriculum Theory and Practice for the 1990's. In Ornstein, A. & Behar, L. (Ed.), Contemporary Issues in Curriculum, (pp. 3-9). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McNeil, J. D. (1982). A Scientific Approach to Supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of Teaching, (pp. 18-34). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McNeil, W. H. L. a. J. D. (1962). Supervision: A synthesis of thought and action. New York: McGraw Hill.

Mosher, R., & Purpel, D. (1972). Supervision: the reluctant profession. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Murphy, J. (1995). Foreward, Implementing Problem-Based Learning in Leadership Development, (pp. ix - xiii). Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational management.

Nolan, J. , & Francis, P. (1992). Changing Perspectives in Curriculum and Instruction. In C. D. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in Transition, (pp. 44-60). Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Oliva, P. (1993). Supervision for Today's Schools. (Fourth ed.). New York: Longman.

Ornstein, A., & Behar, L. (1995). Contemporary Issues in Curriculum. (first ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ornstein, A., & Hunkins, F. (1988). Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Ornstein, A. C. (1995). Curriculum, Instruction, and Supervision: Their Relationship and the role of the principal. In A. C. O. a. L. S. Behar (Ed.), Contemporary Issues in Curriculum, (pp. 281-287). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ornstein, A. C. (1995). Philosophy as a Basis for Curriculum Decisions. In Ornstein, A., & Behar, L. (Ed.), Contemporary Issues in Curriculum, (pp. 10-17). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Pajak, e. (1989). Identification of Supervisory Proficiencies Project : Association for Supervision and Curriculum development.

Schon, D. A. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (Ed.). (1982). Supervision of Teaching. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sirotnik, K. A. (1995). Curriculum: Overview and Framework. In O'Hair, M. & Odell, S. (Ed.), Educating Teachers for Leadership and Change: Teacher Education Yearbook III, (pp. 235-242). Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.

Smyth, W. J. (1992). Teachers' Work and the Politics of Reflection. American Educational Research Journal, 29(2), 267-300.

Starratt, T. J. S. a. R. J. (1993). Supervision: a redefinition. (Fifth ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Tanner, D. and Tanner, L. (1995). Curriculum Development. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Tracy, S. J. (1995). How Historical Concepts of Supervision Relate to Supervisory Practices Today. The clearing house, 68(may/june), 320-325.

Wiles, J. , & Bondi, J. (1980). Supervision: a guide to practice. (first ed.). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

Zeichner, K. M. (1994). Research on Teacher Thinking and Thinking and Different Views of Reflective Practice in Teaching and Teacher Education. In G. H. I. Carlgren, and S. Vaage (Ed.), Teachers' Minds and Actions: Research on Teachers' Thinking and Practice, . Bristol: Falmer Press.

1. Supervision by a School of Education supervisor (who may be a full-time academic staff member or a qualified teacher appointed on a part-time basis for teaching practice supervision). Students normally do three periods of teaching practice, usually 1. in three different schools.* The history of supervision as a formal activity exercised by educational administrators within a system of schools did not begin until the formation of the common school in the late 1830s. During the first half of the nineteenth century, population growth in the major cities of the United States necessitated the formation of city school systems. Supervision can also be defined in terms of function and purposes for which it shall be used as a) skills in leadership, b) skills in human relation, c) skill in group process, d) skill in personnel administration and e) skill in evaluation. Scope of School Supervision The major functions logically under school supervision can be cited as: Inspection. The teaching personnel referred to are those school administrators, supervisors, and classroom teachers and school librarian. Third, as descriptive studies of teaching and supervision become increasingly sophisticated in purpose, design and outcomes, prescriptive studies of what needs to be changed or emphasized can be made with greater assurance. Present studies tend to rule out many variables because of the subjectivity involved in data gathering. Yet, in studies of both teaching and supervision, interim means need to be devised to include data which are not easily categorized or quantified.