

CHAPTER

1

UNDERSTANDING THE COMPONENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

THIS CHAPTER helps you to build a clear understanding of what a high-quality teacher supervision and evaluation system looks like. To build that understanding, having some idea of the history of instructional supervision and its close connection to teacher evaluation is important. The first section in the chapter focuses on that history. We do not, by any means, try to present a complete history of teacher supervision and evaluation. Instead, we focus on the historical basis for our contemporary confusion about teacher supervision and its relationship to teacher evaluation.

The second section of the chapter builds the case for conceptualizing supervision and evaluation as two separate, complementary, and essential functions of schools as organizations.

The final section of the chapter provides a set of criteria that can be used to assess the quality of any system of teacher supervision and evaluation, including the system in which you presently function. The criteria have been derived from the scholarly literature on teacher supervision and evaluation, but they have also been tested in practice in several school districts.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR PREREADING REFLECTION AND JOURNALING

- As you see it, how do the following terms differ: teacher supervision, teacher evaluation, and teacher observation?
- Given your past experience, what are the most important purposes of teacher evaluation?
- What is the purpose of teacher supervision? Do all teachers need supervision? Why or why not?
- If you were asked to identify an excellent teacher supervision and evaluation system, what characteristics would you look for?

TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION: HISTORICAL ROOTS

Many current systems of teacher supervision and evaluation lack precise descriptions of the relationship between teacher supervision and evaluation. As a result, both teachers and administrators are not clear regarding the purposes of either function. The struggle to understand the relationship between supervision and evaluation is not new. The problem has its roots in the history of school supervision. Over time, competing educational philosophies and movements defined the role of the supervisor in often contradictory ways. The pendulum has swung back and forth throughout the decades from inspector to

2 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

EXERCISE 1.1 Attitudes and Beliefs About Supervision and Evaluation

Introduction This three-part exercise is intended to help you to articulate some of your underlying beliefs and attitudes about teacher supervision and evaluation and to share your perspectives with colleagues. The purpose of the activity is not to find the correct answer, but rather to explore the underlying issues. Completing the activity now should help you to interact more fully with the concepts presented in the remainder of the chapter.

Part 1 Respond to the following nine statements concerning supervision and evaluation with one of the five following responses: SA-strongly agree, A-agree, N-neutral, D-disagree, SD-strongly disagree. Circle your response.

1. The same individual can carry out the roles of supervisor and evaluator effectively.
SA—A—N—D—SD
2. Supervision is best accomplished through a one-on-one relationship between teacher and supervisor.
SA—A—N—D—SD
3. In order to evaluate teaching effectiveness appropriately, the evaluator must possess content knowledge in the subject being observed.
SA—A—N—D—SD
4. The same procedures can be used effectively for both supervision and evaluation.
SA—A—N—D—SD
5. Teachers must be observed at least once a year in order to evaluate their performance effectively.
SA—A—N—D—SD
6. All teachers need to participate in both supervision and evaluation each year.
SA—A—N—D—SD
7. The most valid source of data concerning teacher performance is classroom observation data gathered by a trained observer.
SA—A—N—D—SD
8. Teachers in a single school building are a group who share similar needs for professional development.
SA—A—N—D—SD
9. In order to evaluate teaching performance effectively, the evaluator must have experience teaching at the grade level being observed.
SA—A—N—D—SD

Part 2 Find two or three partners and discuss your responses to the various items. Try to reach consensus on as many items as you can. Identify those items that were the easiest and the most difficult to reach consensus on.

Part 3 Compare your group responses with those of other groups. Discuss which items caused the greatest difficulty for all of the groups. What do those items have in common? What does that say about teacher supervision and evaluation? We express our appreciation to the Pennsylvania ASCD Supervision Committee for allowing us to adapt this exercise for use in this text.

helper to evaluator to counselor. By understanding this history, you will be in a better position to confront the complex issues surrounding the relationship of teacher supervision and evaluation.

Instructional supervision finds its historical roots in the inspectorial function of the school committees of the early eighteenth century. Inspectors were often ministers, selectmen, schoolmasters, and other distinguished citizens. In fact, as Glanz notes, supervision as a function performed by specifically trained professionals

did not exist until after the Civil War. Lay methods of supervision stressed strict control and close inspection of school facilities (Glanz, 1998, p. 47). This inspectorial model continued to flourish even after the role of the professionally trained school superintendent had been established in the early nineteenth century (Pajak, 2000). Supervisors were concerned with the tasks of overseeing the curriculum, improving the efficiency of the methods of instruction used by teachers, and evaluating teacher performance and student achievement

(Bolin, 1987). “Teachers, who were mostly female and disenfranchised, were seen as a bedraggled troop, incompetent and backward in outlook” (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992, p. 33).

Balliet, writing in 1894, suggested that the only way to reform schools was to secure a competent superintendent and allow him to reform the incompetent teachers who could be reformed and to bury the rest who were dead (as cited in Glanz, 1998). Glanz explains how getting rid of teachers was linked to school quality, in the minds of some educational reformers:

The mission of eliminating incompetent teachers, as the central thrust of supervision during this time, does not contradict the essential purpose of supervision that was to achieve quality schooling. In fact, supervisors maintained that the best way to achieve quality schooling was to remove “deficient” teachers. The methods employed by the supervisors were inspectorial and rather impressionistic, but nonetheless served to achieve the stated objective (Glanz, 1998, p. 49).

In the early twentieth century, Frederick Taylor’s efficiency movement had a powerful influence on how administrators saw their tasks (Bolin, 1987; Glanz, 1998). Taylor and his associates conducted time and motion studies with the aim of making the physical movements of laborers in industry more efficient, thus conserving their energy and increasing productivity. This efficiency orientation, as applied to education by Franklin Bobbit and others, was one of the major forces that drove the processes of school supervision in the early portion of the twentieth century.

Social efficiency philosophies, combined with the increasing bureaucratization of school systems and the emergence of a class of midlevel school managers who carried out the task of supervision, led to the vigorous development of rating scales designed to rate teacher effectiveness. The underlying assumptions were that scientists could study those teachers who seemed to be most effective and efficient and develop descriptors of their behaviors. These descriptions could be transformed into scales to rate the efficiency and effectiveness of other teachers. Skilled supervisors could then use the ratings and the descriptions on the rating scales to make teachers more efficient. Edward Elliot and Clifton Boyce were two of the pioneers in development of teacher efficiency rating instruments, whose categories

ranged from physical to moral to social efficiency (Glanz, 1998).

The number of teacher rating scales grew tremendously throughout the first quarter of the twentieth century, resulting in a wide variety of teacher rating instruments, albeit very little agreement as to what constituted effective teaching. Despite rather vigorous opposition from those who saw rating scales as antidemocratic and anti-intellectual, the teacher rating scales were widely used. The role of the supervisor was plainly teacher evaluation. Criticisms of rating scales and of the emphasis on evaluation increased as the Progressives became more prominent, and eventually the social efficiency and inspectorial models of teacher supervision came under heavy attack. Supervisors, who had legitimized their positions by devising better evaluation methods for rating teachers, suddenly found themselves in a very vulnerable position and began to embrace helping teachers to grow as an important function (Glanz, 1998).

The alternative conceptions of supervision were grounded in democratic principles of autonomy and freedom. The Progressive era, with its philosophy of inquiry, democratic processes, and scientific investigation, led to a supervisory process that was seen as helpful, improvement oriented, and collaborative. “Drawing directly on the work of Dewey and other progressives, Barr and Burton’s 1926 text on supervision devoted an entire chapter to encouraging reflective thought among teachers and administrators through experimentation in classrooms and schools” (Pajak, 2000, p. 3).

Progressive supervision, while downplaying teacher evaluation, emphasized collaboration, group processes, inquiry, and experimentation. In marked contrast to the social efficiency model, teachers were seen as part of the solution rather than as the problem. Barr, Brueckner, and Burton (1938) announced in *Supervision* that they were deliberately setting out to replace the old concept of the supervisor as inspector with responsible leadership that would rely on scientific reason and experimentation for enlightenment and direction. Democratic supervision, according to this view, recognized the worth of each individual and emphasized flexibility in organization, free participation by all, and pursuit of the common good (Pajak, 2000, p. 3).

These principles of democratic supervision, however, were not employed universally.

4 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

Democratic supervision processes coexisted with bureaucratic, controlling methods for rating and weeding out incompetent teachers. The Progressives' democratic challenge to the role of supervisor as autocrat and rater of teacher efficiency marked the beginning of an ongoing conflict between the dual role of supervisor as "teacher evaluator" and "helpful colleague."

The remainder of the twentieth century saw a constant tug-of-war between the evaluative and helping functions of the supervisor that has still not been resolved during the first decade of the twenty-first century. Until the mid-1950s, the helping or collegial function was emphasized. Collaborative problem solving, group supervision, and curriculum development were seen as the primary tools used by supervisors to facilitate the development of those with whom they worked. Supervisors were cognizant of the task of developing people and considered human relations an important component of their work (Pajak, 2000). However, following the launching of Sputnik in 1957, the rush to improve student learning—especially in mathematics and science—led to an increasing emphasis on the role of the supervisor as the instrument of school change. Collaboration and cooperation were seen as less important than getting innovations into practice. In some cases, the desire to see innovations put into practice led school districts to develop teacher evaluation systems that monitored implementation and punished those who resisted with lower evaluation ratings. In others, the vehicle for promoting innovation was seen as developing collegial, helpful relationships with teachers. These relationships could then be used to nudge ideas into practice.

From the late 1960s, the field of supervision has been marked by a disconnect between the theoretical literature and the realities of practice. Much of the theoretical literature on teacher supervision has focused on the tradition of clinical supervision as developed by Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969). Their model emphasizes the supervisor as a colleague who develops a trusting relationship with the teacher and provides intellectual service designed to improve the teacher's practice and student learning. Both Cogan and Goldhammer eschew the role of supervisor as evaluator, believing it to be basically incompatible with the supervisory helping function. In the world of practice, however, most of those employed as supervisor find themselves saddled

with the tasks of both teacher evaluation and teacher improvement. Various factors, including inadequate supervisory knowledge and skills, role overload that leads to a lack of time for supervision, and issues related to contractual agreements restricting supervisory activities cause most supervisors to focus their efforts on teacher evaluation and do relatively little in the area of teacher help and improvement. As a consequence, clinical supervision never achieved popularity in the schools.

In the late 1970s, Madeline Hunter, an educational psychologist, developed a model of supervision that made sense to many practitioners (see Hunter, 1984). Although her model also became known as "clinical supervision," it bore little resemblance to Cogan and Goldhammer's conceptions. Hunter's model was much more authoritarian, much more supervisor directed, and entirely compatible with teacher evaluation. Despite many admonitions by its developer, Hunter's model of clinical supervision was turned into a teacher rating checklist in district after district. Its use spread like wildfire, prompting scholars in supervision to ask, is there life after Madeline Hunter? (Garman & Hazi, 1986). For the most part, Hunter's model of clinical "supervision" was really a process of teacher evaluation. Labeling this process of teacher evaluation as clinical supervision further exacerbated the confusion between teacher supervision and evaluation in the minds of many educators.

The late 1980s and the 1990s saw the development of alternative models of teacher supervision that were intended to counteract the impact of Hunter's model on the world of supervisory practice. Developmental supervision (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2010) and reflective supervision (Garman, 1990) were philosophically similar to Cogan and Goldhammer's model in espousing collaborative efforts to improve teaching and insisting that evaluation and supervision be viewed as separate activities. These developmental and reflective approaches still dominate the current landscape of supervisory practice in the field of preservice teacher education, though they currently are often phrased in terms of reflection and inquiry. Though they enjoy growing popularity in inservice teacher supervision, they are still not widely used in that domain. The longstanding tradition of teacher evaluation as an important function of supervisors prevents many school systems from embracing these

collegial supervisory models. This tradition of the dominance of teacher evaluation as the more important function has been strengthened in the early part of the twenty-first century through initiatives such as a “No Child Left Behind” and the recently announced “Race to the Top” program (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Many districts often embrace collegiality in rhetoric, but continue to practice inspectorial evaluation as the predominant mode of interaction between teachers and supervisors.

In short, the continuing failure to resolve the dilemma between teacher supervision and evaluation has created major difficulties in the practice of instructional supervision since the 1920s. As a result, we find a scholarly literature that advocates collegial improvement, and practitioners who find themselves unable to accept the collegial role due to the hierarchical superiority that is implied and, indeed, necessitated by the role of teacher evaluator. Jeffrey Glanz, one of the few scholars in the field of supervision who has focused his work on supervision history, concurs with our assessment of this unresolved conflict.

The evaluative function of supervision is historically rooted in bureaucratic, inspection-type supervision. Maintaining an effective and efficient school organization as well as a sound instructional program mandates that teachers are assessed for competency. In other words, the evaluative aspect of the supervisory function emanates from organizational requirements to measure and assess teaching effectiveness. The origins of the helping or improvement function of supervision can be dated back to early democratic practices in colonial America and later in the twentieth century. In other words helping teachers to improve instruction and promote pupil achievement grew out of the democratic theory of supervision. Supervisors or people concerned with supervision have faced a basic role conflict; namely, the unresolved dilemma between the necessity to evaluate (a bureaucratic function) and the desire to genuinely assist teachers in the instructional process (a professional goal) (Glanz, 1998).

Now that we have examined this long-standing dilemma in the role of school supervisor, we will turn our attention to resolving the dilemma by explicating the separate but complementary functions of teacher supervision and teacher evaluation.

TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION: SEPARATE, ESSENTIAL, COMPLEMENTARY FUNCTIONS

As noted above, the question of whether teacher supervision and teacher evaluation are compatible roles for the same individual has plagued both practice and scholarship for many decades. Individuals who have developed models of teacher supervision are divided on the issue. Some (e.g., Hunter, Acheson, and Gall) see no inherent conflict between the two roles; others (e.g., Cogan, Glickman, and Smyth) believe that the roles should be separated by process and time, if not by person; still others (e.g., Blumberg) suggest that the two are best separated but can be carried out simultaneously, if necessary (Pajak, 2000).

The world of practice is at least as confused as the world of scholarship. Some school districts define teacher supervision and evaluation as the same function both in policy and in practice. Many districts make a distinction between teacher supervision and evaluation in policy but end up practicing what McGreal (1983) called “common law evaluation,” that is, using the exact same procedures for both functions, with the result that teachers end up perceiving the entire process as evaluative. Many of these districts attempt to soften the threat of evaluation by couching evaluation in a language of growth and improvement, but this euphemistic strategy often ends up creating mass confusion and excessive entanglements between supervision and evaluation (Hazi, 1994). Finally, some districts, growing in number over the last decade, have managed to separate the two functions both in policy and in practice.

The world of supervision has also suffered from a failure to develop commonly accepted definitions for important concepts. As commonly accepted definitions for supervision and evaluation do not exist, it is particularly important that we make clear the definitions we are using.

As we define it, teacher evaluation is an organizational function designed to make comprehensive judgments concerning teacher performance and competence for the purposes of personnel decisions such as tenure and continuing employment. Though improvements in the teacher’s performance may result from the process and may be a desired outcome, the process as a whole is aimed primarily at making a summative judgment about

6 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

the quality of the teacher's performance in carrying out both instructional duties and other responsibilities. This is a state-mandated function carried out only by those who are properly certified by the state. Typically, the superintendent of schools is officially responsible for teacher evaluation and chooses to delegate this responsibility to individuals within the school district who are properly certified—administrators and supervisors.

As we define it, teacher supervision is an organizational function concerned with promoting teacher growth, leading to improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning. Supervision is not concerned with making global judgments concerning the teacher's competence and performance. It is a function that can be carried out by multiple individuals who find themselves in multiple roles within the school system: teachers, administrators, supervisors, and so on. Teacher supervision is a broad label that encompasses many different activities designed to enhance teacher growth. Classroom coaching designed to examine and improve specific aspects of teaching performance is a supervisory process, whether carried out by two teaching colleagues or by a teacher and someone designated as a supervisor. In the former case, we refer to it as peer coaching or colleague consultation. In the latter case, we refer to it as classroom supervision. Also included under the broad label of teacher supervision are activities such as self-directed teacher development, action research, and collegial development groups, as they are organizational functions aimed at promoting teacher growth.

Notice the use of the term *function* to refer to both teacher supervision and evaluation. We use function as opposed to role. Our reason is that, while teacher evaluation responsibilities are confined to those in certain organizational roles, supervision is not the sole purview of those who occupy a role known as *supervisor*. As we make explicit in our platform of beliefs, every professional within the

system has the capability and responsibility of contributing to the function of supervision.

One of the most fundamental planks in our platform of beliefs is that teacher supervision and evaluation are two essential functions—each separate from the other, but complementary. Although many school districts attempt to combine the two functions into a single activity, we believe that this approach is doomed to failure, because the two functions are fundamentally different. Teacher supervision and evaluation differ on at least seven dimensions (Figure 1.1).

Though the two functions must be carried out separately from each other, they are key complementary functions of schools as organizations. The two functions complement each other in that teacher evaluation ensures that all teachers function at a satisfactory level of performance as a minimum, whereas teacher supervision provides opportunities for teachers to grow far beyond minimally acceptable levels of performance.

We now turn our attention to explaining the fundamental differences between evaluation and supervision in terms of the seven dimensions.

Basic Purpose

The purpose of teacher evaluation is to make judgments concerning the overall quality of the teacher's performance and the teacher's competence in carrying out assigned duties, as well as to provide a picture of the quality of teaching performance across the professional staff. The process results in some form of summative rating, whether numerical (e.g., 78/80) or qualitative (e.g., outstanding, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory). Developing either a numerical or qualitative rating demands that the evaluator have in mind some explicit or, at the very least, implicit model or standard of desired performance against which the performance of the teacher can be compared. Absent some such explicit standard of

FIGURE 1.1 Dimensions on which Supervision and Evaluation Differ

-
1. Their basic purpose
 2. The rationale for their existence
 3. Their scope
 4. The nature of the relationship between the teacher and the administrator
 5. The focus for data collection procedures
 6. The role of expertise
 7. The teacher's perspective on the entire process
-

TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION: SEPARATE, ESSENTIAL, COMPLEMENTARY FUNCTIONS 7

performance and evaluation data, it is impossible to make and justify a numerical or qualitative rating. In short, the basic purpose of teacher evaluation is to ascertain whether or not all teachers meet at least a minimum standard of competent performance as judged by an evaluator with appropriate expertise. Even though teachers may improve (in a small number of cases) as a result of going through the evaluation process, the primary objective in the mind of the evaluator is to ascertain the quality of the teacher's performance.

Evaluation provides assurance that every teacher in the system will be performing at some minimal level of competence. Though there are huge differences across school districts in the quality of performance that is considered to demonstrate a minimal level of competence, there is some threshold level of minimal competence in every school district's evaluation system. The threshold is clear and explicit in some districts, and it is much more implicit in others. Teachers who are not tenured or whose performance is marginal or worse can be forced to improve by being threatened with an unsatisfactory rating. However, as long as tenured teachers are performing at or above that minimum level of competence, evaluators do not have the power to force them to grow. Although the evaluator often suggests areas for improvement, the satisfactory tenured teacher is free to accept or reject those suggestions. Administrators, school board members, and politicians who would opt to put all of their resources for teacher improvement into teacher evaluation fail to understand the limited power of teacher evaluation for forcing people to grow. Others, who really understand the limits of evaluation, see the need for teacher supervision as a vehicle for promoting (not forcing) growth. The current effort by the Obama Administration to link teacher evaluation to differentiated pay through the "Race to the Top" funds is an attempt to create a teacher evaluation system that will motivate teachers to grow beyond satisfactory performance (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Previous attempts to link teacher evaluation with merit pay have not proven very successful (Miner, 2009).

The purpose of supervision is to promote individual teacher growth beyond the teacher's current level of performance. It is not important in supervision to make a global pronouncement of teacher proficiency. The task is to start where the teacher is, wherever that might be, and reach beyond that level. This involves making sense of the complex world of the classroom and helping

the teacher to become aware of his or her behavior and its consequences for learners.

As opposed to being driven by some externally adopted model of teacher performance, the supervisory process is driven by the teacher's (and school's) platforms of beliefs about teaching and learning. The teacher is motivated to grow by a desire to find ways to better achieve his or her own goals for students. Supervision attempts to capitalize on our knowledge of adults as learners. Adults, in contrast to most children, are likely to change their behavior when they see that there may be a better way to accomplish goals that are important to them as opposed to improving because someone else says that they need to (Knowles, 1990). Teacher ownership over the growth process is an important motivating variable.

Rationale

The rationale for the function of teacher evaluation derives from the legitimate right of the state to protect children from harm through incompetent, immoral, or unprofessional teacher behavior. This right is operationalized through a process of inspection delegated to the local school district by the state. Districts that abandon teacher evaluation or fail to take it seriously do not live up to their moral commitment to ensure that no child is harmed by the instruction that he or she receives. Consequently, teacher evaluation is a legalistic and bureaucratic process that must be carefully articulated to ensure that the rights of the state and its children are protected and also to ensure that the teacher's rights to due process are not violated. Teacher tenure laws further delineate the teacher's due-process rights and shift the burden of proof in a dismissal hearing. School districts must pay close attention to these legal issues and also to the implications of collective bargaining agreements in designing teacher evaluation processes.

The rationale for supervision, on the contrary, derives from the complex nature of the teaching environment itself. Classrooms' environments are marked by simultaneity and multidimensionality, requiring teachers to make hundreds of nontrivial decisions on a daily basis (Doyle, 2001). The task of promoting cognitive, affective, and psychomotor growth for 25 or more students simultaneously is amazingly complex. No other professional works with so many clients at the same time.

For example, suppose that doctors had to see 25 patients at the same time. Some doctors appear to

8 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

schedule multiple patients for the same time slot, but most see only one at a time. Imagine what medicine would be like if the doctor had a limited amount of time, say 30 minutes, to diagnose and treat 25 patients. One might assume that the doctor would take a sampling of symptoms and then prescribe some general treatment that would address the symptoms of as many people as possible. Thus if everyone else in your patient group has a sore throat, you would get penicillin too, even though it probably would not heal your broken wrist.

We might also imagine what it would be like for a trial lawyer to try several cases simultaneously in adjoining courtrooms. We realize that lawyers often work on multiple cases at the same time, but they try only one at a time. If the daily work of lawyers involved multiple cases being tried simultaneously, they might examine a witness in one courtroom and then rush to an adjacent courtroom to cross-examine a witness whose direct testimony the lawyer had not heard.

These examples of doctors and lawyers may sound ludicrous, but we use them to make an important point about teachers' daily lives. A teacher's work is very much like that of a doctor who has to treat 25 patients simultaneously or a lawyer who tries multiple cases at the same time. If you doubt that, think about a teacher who has 25 diverse students with a variety of strengths, needs, and interests and has a limited amount of time and instructional resources with which to meet their varying needs. Does the hypothetical doctor's work seem any more complex? Consider also the teacher who is moving around the room monitoring five groups of students who are working on a cooperative learning activity. She hears Group A answer questions one and two, and then she moves to Group B to listen to their discussion of questions three and four without any inkling of what they said about the first two questions. This example strikes us as being very similar to the lawyer who must cross-examine a witness whose direct testimony has not been heard. Teaching one single individual how to complete a complex task (e.g., knitting a sweater) can seem tremendously overwhelming. How much more complex is the world of the classroom, where teachers attempt to reach two dozen students or more?

Given the complexity of their work environment, teachers benefit tremendously from having a skilled colleague who can act as another set of eyes and ears to capture classroom events, and then talk with the teacher to help to make sense of what is happening in the classroom and what impact it is

having on individual learners. Supervision is not intended as a legalistic or bureaucratic process; rather, it is a professional, community-building activity that recognizes that teachers are motivated by internal drives such as a desire to improve their own professional competence and a desire to maximize student learning.

Scope

By its very nature, teacher evaluation must be very broad in scope. Teacher evaluation examines not only the teacher's classroom teaching performance, but also the teacher's contribution to the school as an organization, including meeting contractual obligations, interacting with professional colleagues, communicating with parents, continuing his or her own professional development, and making a contribution to the total life of the school. In fact, many teachers who are dismissed through the teacher evaluation process are dismissed not for poor classroom performance, but rather for issues and behaviors that are connected to minimal contractual obligations and extra-classroom behavior. Exercise 1.2 provides an opportunity to develop a comprehensive evaluation schedule.

Even in terms of classroom teaching, the evaluation task is broad. Effective teacher evaluation demands that the teacher be observed teaching the entire spectrum of classes that he or she teaches. For elementary teachers, this means observing language arts, math, science, social studies, and so on. There are very few elementary teachers who are equally capable at teaching all of these content areas. In order to state that the process has resulted in a comprehensive evaluation of even the teacher's classroom teaching alone, all of these various subjects must be observed.

For secondary teachers, this means observing the entire spectrum of courses and students that the teacher is assigned. Many secondary teachers teach more than one subject (e.g., algebra and geometry or general science and chemistry), and almost all secondary teachers teach a variety of different types of students with different strengths and needs. Few secondary teachers are equally good at teaching all subjects and all students. If the system is designed to obtain a comprehensive picture of the teacher's classroom teaching performance, all of these various contexts must be observed. Additionally, effective evaluation depends on seeing the teacher over time, rather than only once or twice. Many of us can put our best foot forward for a limited time. However, as someone observes our work more

TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION: SEPARATE, ESSENTIAL, COMPLEMENTARY FUNCTIONS 9

frequently, a much clearer picture of our typical behavior emerges. Unless the evaluator takes the time to develop a comprehensive view of teacher performance, both inside and outside the classroom, it is not possible to make or defend a global judgment of a teacher's effectiveness such as that demanded by most state teacher evaluation systems.

Teacher supervision, on the contrary, can narrow its focus considerably. As improvement in performance rather than a global judgment of competence is the goal, the supervision process can be focused on one class or one type of teaching situation over time. In fact, case studies in clinical supervision indicate that a specified focus in the same environment over time is a critical dimension of supervision that improves teacher performance (Nolan, Hawkes, & Francis, 1993). The best way for most of us to improve is to focus our attention on one or two factors at a time. If we try to focus globally and say we will improve without being specific about exactly what we will improve, nothing ever changes. Thus, if supervision is to be effective in helping teachers grow, it must have a narrow rather than a broad focus.

Nature of the Relationship

The evaluator's role is to make a professional judgment concerning the teacher's overall

performance and competence. As stated earlier, one of the evaluator's major responsibilities is to protect the interests of the state and its children. For that reason, only properly certified personnel can fill the role of teacher evaluator. Although the evaluator may know and like the teacher in question, it is imperative that he or she maintain a certain degree of distance in order to make a fair assessment of the teacher's performance. It is also imperative that the roles remain distinct. The evaluator is always the evaluator; the evaluatee is always the evaluatee. The roles can never be merged or blended. It seems that the most appropriate stance for the evaluator would be what Garman (1982) calls a "neutral observer," and the highest level of collaboration one could hope for would be "working-acceptance involvement." Working acceptance implies that both parties know the rules and their respective roles and agree to live by them. The degree of collaboration is limited to that type of understanding. The evaluator cannot be "on the teacher's side," because in some cases this might imply not being on the student's side.

Establishing an atmosphere of trust in this relationship is also extremely difficult, because the evaluator has all the power and the teacher has all the vulnerability. Additionally, the teacher has no choice about whether to participate in the process or not; it is a state-mandated activity.

EXERCISE 1.2 Developing an Evaluative Observation Schedule

Introduction The purpose of this exercise is to enable you to understand the complex task of attempting to match the scope of teacher evaluation activities to the complex role of the classroom teacher at the various levels of basic education. It should help to make the previous ideas more concrete.

The Teachers

- Cathy is a first-grade teacher in Parkview Elementary School. She teaches a group of 25 first-graders. Four of her students have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), and three additional students receive specialized services of some sort. Cathy teaches all required subjects—math, language arts and reading, science, social studies, technology competencies, and so on.
- Howard is a sixth-grade teacher in Parkview Middle School. Howard has a homeroom of 28 students. He instructs these homeroom students in language arts and social studies. For math, he teaches the top group of sixth graders, who are studying prealgebra and will take algebra in seventh grade. For science, he teaches the lowest group of sixth-graders in his building.
- Kathy is a social studies teacher at Parkview High School. She teaches five periods per day in traditional 45-minute periods. She has two advanced classes of 10th-grade world cultures (30 per class) and two average classes for 11th-grade U.S. history (27 per class). In addition, she teaches one section of rather unmotivated seniors (20 students) in a course called Problems of Democracy.

The Task You and a partner have been assigned the task of developing an observation schedule for each teacher's yearly evaluation. Using the knowledge about their class schedules, identify the minimum number of observations that would be required to gain an accurate picture of each teacher's classroom teaching performance over the course of an entire school year.

10 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

As Blumberg and Jonas (1987) pointed out, it is very unlikely in this type of relationship that the teacher will grant the evaluator access to his or her deepest hopes, fears, and beliefs about the teaching and learning process. Some highly skilled principals are able to establish collegial relationships with teachers even when they are engaged in evaluation. These highly skilled individuals build such good relationships in spite of the system, not because of it.

In supervision, on the contrary, distance is a barrier, and rigid adherence to organizational roles hinders rather than facilitates the process. In the process of supervision, both partners agree to work together as colleagues. Sometimes the teacher takes the lead in the process, and sometimes the supervisor takes the lead. By watching the process of supervision develop over time, we come to realize that leadership is shared and roles are blended and exchanged freely. When the process unfolds as it should, it is possible to reach what Garman (1982) described as organic reciprocity, in which goals, leadership, expertise, respect, and trust are shared mutually among the participants.

In contrast to the neutral stance demanded of the evaluator, the supervisor should be on the teacher's side in helping the teacher to accomplish mutually set goals and objectives. In contrast to evaluation, where the evaluator is all-powerful and the teacher is an all-vulnerable, forced participant, supervision is a voluntary relationship with mutual vulnerability and shared power. The fact that the teacher is allowed to select specific areas of teaching on which to focus the supervision process empowers the teacher and also makes the supervisor accountable for collecting the type of data that the teacher requests. Shared responsibility, trust, and mutual vulnerability are three important characteristics of collegial relationships (Nolan, Hawkes, & Francis, 1993).

The Focus for Data Collection

The process of teacher evaluation is standardized and criteria driven—that is, the process is driven by established criteria that are used to judge the teacher's performance and competence. Because the evaluator's task is to make a global judgment, the evaluation data must take a more global focus, encompassing the teaching-learning environment in its entirety rather than just one or several selected aspects of the teacher's behavior. Failure to maintain this global focus over time risks capturing an

incomplete picture of the teacher's behavior, resulting in an unfair evaluation. Moreover, the outcome of the evaluation process is a summative judgment that is communicated by a written narrative that looks remarkably similar for all teachers. A recent report that is highly critical of current teacher evaluation systems provided some evidence concerning how similar those evaluation reports can be, reporting that 85% of the teachers evaluated in a given year receive the same rating (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern & Keeling, 2009).

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the standards that drive classroom observation for purposes of teacher evaluation must be the same for all teachers. In keeping with due-process rights and contractual agreements, all teachers in the same job category must be evaluated using the same criteria. Issues of fairness across teachers, as well as issues of validity and reliability, take precedence over individual teacher's needs in the arena of teacher evaluation. If the criteria are different for some teachers, charges of arbitrary and capricious behavior will surely be hurled at the evaluators in any type of dismissal hearing.

Data collection for purposes of teacher supervision, by contrast, should be differentiated, individualized, and teacher driven (Nolan & Francis, 1992). The focus on data collection in supervision is typically very narrow, converging on some teacher-selected aspect(s) of teacher and/or student behavior. In addition, this narrow focus is typically captured during several lessons over time in an attempt to document improved teacher or student performance and to capture what Garman (1990) called the "unfolding lesson." The supervisor's role is not to make and communicate judgments, but rather to collect observational and inferential data that can be used to enable the teacher to make better judgments about his or her own teaching performance and its impact on learners. The supervisor may help the teacher in making these judgments, but does not make the judgments for the teacher. As a result, one of the outcomes of the supervision process should be the development of a teacher who is more self-directed and a better decision maker.

We believe that if the supervisory process does not improve the teacher's decision making and self-direction, then the entire process is not very useful at all. We make this claim based on the reality of teacher supervision. Let us take the case of a typical high school teacher, just to make the math easier. The typical high school teacher, in a

TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION: SEPARATE, ESSENTIAL, COMPLEMENTARY FUNCTIONS 11

traditional as opposed to block schedule, teaches five classes per day for 180 days, a total of 900 classes per year. In even the most exemplary teacher supervision system, it is very unlikely that the teacher will be observed nine times during the course of the school year; but for the sake of argument, let us assume that the teacher is observed nine times. This means that observers have seen 1% of the teacher's classes. Ninety-nine percent of the time the teacher will be on his or her own with students. If the supervisor does all the problem solving, all the directing, and all the decision making, and does not enable the teacher to develop those skills, the teacher will be unable to improve the teaching in 99% of his or her classes. So, as you can see, improved teacher decision making and problem solving is a *sine qua non* of good supervision.

The Role of Expertise

Only those who are properly certified by the state are allowed to carry out the process of teacher evaluation. Certification implies that special knowledge and skills are required for this role. Throughout the process, the evaluator maintains the role of expert. The evaluator's responsibility is to make a fair assessment of the teacher's performance and competence using the district standards and the evidence collected during the process. The teacher may be asked for his or her opinion (we will argue in Chapters 3 and 4 that self-evaluation should be an important aspect of teacher evaluation); however, if this opinion conflicts with that of the evaluator, it is the evaluator's opinion that must prevail. Therefore, expertise for making judgments concerning teacher performance and competence resides solely in the evaluator(s).

Further evidence for one-sided expertise is provided by the fact that teachers are often presented with a written text that describes and judges their performance before there has been an opportunity for the teacher and evaluator to discuss what has been observed. This places a heavy burden on the evaluator, who must possess both pedagogical and content expertise in order to make a fair, informed, comprehensive assessment of teacher performance and competence. If the evaluator does not possess content expertise, it is imperative that other properly certified experts in the content area be brought into the process.

We believe that an accurate judgment of poor teacher performance is possible without any

knowledge of the content being taught. For example, classroom management may be so poor that the vast majority of students are completely off-task most of the time. However, we believe making a defensible judgment that someone is a good teacher is not possible without some understanding of the content being taught. An obvious example is a fifth-year foreign-language class in which the evaluator does not speak the language. If the majority or all of the class is conducted in the target language, the evaluator has no basis whatsoever for assessing the teacher's performance. Content expertise is an essential aspect of assessing good teaching performance. The importance of content expertise is very clear in the negative attitudes, expressed or implied, of secondary teachers toward evaluators who do not have expertise in the content areas they teach.

By contrast, teacher supervision relies on shared expertise. The supervisor brings expertise in supervision (data collecting, inquiry, and conferencing), pedagogy, and perhaps content; whereas the teacher contributes expertise in pedagogy, content, and perhaps supervision, as well as intimate knowledge of his or her students and the history of that particular classroom context. If any of these areas of expertise are missing or untapped, it is extremely difficult to make sense of the teaching-learning environment. Because each of the partners recognizes the expertise of the other and its importance, leadership and power are shared. When disagreements about the meaning of classroom events occur, they are resolved through dialog and further hypothesis testing, data collection, and interpretation. Neither partner seeks or accepts the role of resident expert, because neither partner is responsible for making a summative judgment about the quality of teaching.

Teacher Perspective

Teachers see the process of teacher evaluation as a situation in which they are supposed to put their best foot forward for the benefit of the evaluator. It is a "hit me with your best shot" type of approach. The evaluator plays the role of drama critic, whereas the teacher is playwright, actor, producer, and director. Because of the negative consequences that can result from poor performance during an observation for evaluation purposes, teachers take few risks. They do not put on plays that are likely to fold. They are much more likely to put on old favorites that have received

12 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

rave reviews. Showcase lessons that are repeated in whole or in part, year after year, are not unheard of in the realm of teacher evaluation.

One of the authors, a former German teacher, was evaluated by a principal who loved to see lots of classroom interaction. The typical pattern of teaching on nonobservation days, all 178 of them, was to begin the class with a 5-minute oral warmup in which students were questioned about everyday events, their families, the weather, school activities, and so on. On the one or two days of unannounced observation by the principal, the oral warmup continued for about 20–25 min, 50% or more of the class time, because the principal could see lots of student interaction. Though the author is not proud of having behaved in this way, the example does illustrate the “best foot forward” attitude toward teacher evaluation that most teachers possess. Employing the procedures that we suggest in Chapter 4 for increasing the teacher’s responsibility for data collection can diminish this best-foot-forward attitude to some degree, but it can never be eliminated completely.

Supervision, on the contrary, should be an opportunity for risk taking and experimentation. Often supervision is used to enable teachers to try out new behaviors and techniques in a safe, supportive environment. As there is no fear of a negative judgment about competence, the teacher can allow the supervisor to see lessons that are not perfect. In fact, the teacher may ask the supervisor to observe purposely a lesson with which the teacher is struggling in hopes that the supervisor can be helpful in improving it.

Joyce and Showers (2002) have demonstrated the importance of supportive, nonevaluative coaching in helping teachers transfer new teaching models to the classroom. They suggest that without classroom coaching as a followup to training activities, only 15–20% of the teachers are able to transfer the

use of complex teaching techniques to the classroom. With appropriate coaching and supervision, up to 90% of teachers are typically capable of making the transfer. As supervision is aimed at growth over time, experimentation and risk taking are tremendously important characteristics.

Summary

Both teacher evaluation and teacher supervision are essential functions. As Sergiovanni and Starratt (2006) suggest, evaluation establishes an individual teacher’s right to enjoy continuing membership in a given school community, whereas supervision helps that teacher to exercise his or her responsibility to promote continuing growth in that particular community and in the profession of teaching as a whole. Though both functions are important, evaluation and supervision differ significantly from each other in terms of their basic purpose, the rationale for their existence, the nature of the relationship between the participants, the scope of the process, the observation procedures employed, the role of expertise, and the teacher’s perspective on the process. Figure 1.2 summarizes these fundamental differences.

These differences are fundamental, not trivial, and they demand that the two functions be separated. Although we firmly believe that the two processes must be separated, we also assert that the same individual can carry out both functions effectively, as long as the processes are different. If the procedures for supervision and evaluation are not noticeably different, teachers will always see any individual who carries out both roles as an evaluator. The system’s failure to separate teacher evaluation from teacher supervision means that most schools do a very poor job of both processes in most schools.

FIGURE 1.2 Fundamental Differences Between Teacher Supervision and Evaluation

Dimension	Evaluation	Supervision
Purpose	Minimal competence	Growth
Rationale	Protect children	Complexity of teaching
Relationship	Hierarchical	Collegial
Scope	Comprehensive	Focused
Data focus	Standardized	Individualized
Expertise	Evaluator as expert	Shared expertise
Perspective	Best foot forward	Risk taking

Though supervision and evaluation are separate functions, they can be used together as powerful, complementary components of a school district's teacher supervision and evaluation system. The evaluation component of the system allows all stakeholders to be assured that the performance of all professionals is at least at a minimal level of competence. It also provides a mechanism for deciding whether new teachers should be granted tenure and for remediating the performance of (or eventually dismissing) teachers who fail to perform at satisfactory levels. The supervisory component of the system allows teachers to grow in ways that are personally meaningful and compatible with their career stages, learning styles, and general life circumstances. A well-designed supervision component of a teacher evaluation and supervision system helps to establish the norm that teachers are expected to grow continually and that the status quo is not an option. But what does a well-designed system of teacher supervision and evaluation look like? The following section describes the criteria that can be used to assess the quality in this domain.

CRITERIA FOR HIGH-QUALITY SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

The criteria that follow are based on the scholarly literature (e.g., Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Peterson, 2000) and have also been tested, in practice, through the statewide awards process for exemplary practices in teacher supervision and evaluation established by the Pennsylvania Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

1. *The processes for judging competence (evaluation) are clearly differentiated from processes for promoting growth (supervision).* Having built the rationale for this separation of supervision and evaluation, we turn our attention now to the question of how the two functions can be separated in practice. There are two basic ways to separate evaluation from supervision: by people, or by time and procedures.

The most obvious way to separate the two is by using different people to carry out the two different functions. In this model, administrators carry out the process of teacher evaluation, whereas teachers and/or other specialists such as content supervisors carry out the process of supervision. The two

processes remain completely separate. What happens in the supervision process is confidential, with all data and notes being kept by the two participants. In many districts that use this type of arrangement, supervision becomes peer coaching carried out by teachers who have been given the opportunity through staff development to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to engage in effective coaching. This method of separating evaluation from supervision makes an unmistakably clear distinction between the two functions.

Despite its clarity of separation, this model has some drawbacks. The approach requires a significant increase in the resources directed toward teacher supervision and evaluation. Either supervisory personnel must be employed to engage in supervision, or teachers must be provided with staff development and some release time to carry out the process of peer coaching. In addition, many administrators really would like to be involved in helping teachers grow and would find it very difficult to carry out a role that allows them to engage only in making summative judgments about the quality of teacher performance. Those districts that do not have enough resources or do not prefer this type of structure can consider the second alternative.

This alternative is to develop a system of teacher supervision and evaluation that separates the functions by time and procedures. In this model, the same administrator can be engaged in carrying out both functions. However, the functions are carried out at different times with different procedures. When this model is used, teachers are typically placed on differing supervision and evaluation tracks. Figure 1.3 depicts this differentiated model of supervision and evaluation in which the same administrators can be involved in both functions.

Nontenured teachers and teachers who are new to the district are often placed in a probationary track until they successfully complete the typical 3-year period required for earning tenure. Once the probationary period has passed and tenure has been granted, teachers are typically in an evaluative mode once every 3 years and in a supervisory mode the other 2 years. During the evaluative year of the cycle, the teacher participates in the standardized evaluation process. Activities during the supervisory years vary. Teachers may engage in self-directed staff development, goal setting and supervision with the principal, peer coaching, action research, or collegial development groups. Typically, teachers in this track are asked in the

14 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

FIGURE 1.3 A Differentiated System of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation

	Probationary track	Cyclical evaluation and supervision	Intensive assistance
Participants	Novice teachers and teachers new to the district	Veteran teachers whose performance is satisfactory or better	Veteran teachers whose performance is marginal
Evaluation process	Each year until probationary period is over (usually 3 years)	Formal evaluation every 3 years	Each year until performance is satisfactory or teacher is dismissed
Goal of evaluation	Make accurate judgment concerning granting tenure	Assess quality of performance and identify areas for growth	Return to a satisfactory level of performance
Supervision process	Each year. Primarily classroom observation but may include other supervisory modes as well. Focused on growth but related to evaluation	Two nonevaluative years of 3-year cycle. Mode chosen by teacher from classroom supervision, peer coaching, self-directed growth, action research, and collegial development groups	Each year. Administrated directed but augmented by help from intensive assistance team. Tied closely to evaluation process
Goal of supervision	Maximize growth in support of evaluation	Enhance growth toward excellence	Remediate identified deficiencies

spring to select their supervisory option for the following school year.

If the principal engages in supervision with the teacher during the supervision years of the cycle, the procedures used differ substantially from the evaluation procedures used during the evaluation year. For example, observations for the purposes of evaluation are both announced and unannounced, driven by the teacher evaluation criteria and used to communicate observer judgments concerning the effectiveness of the teacher's performance. By contrast, observations for the purpose of supervision are preceded by a preconference in which the teacher selects a focus. Observations are used to collect data that enable the teacher to make collaborative judgments with the supervisor about how to improve his or her teaching.

During the supervisory years of the cycle, the teacher is not formally observed for the purposes of evaluation, although the administrator visits the classroom periodically to keep in touch with what is happening. The teacher (who has already passed through the probationary period) is presumed to be teaching at a satisfactory or better level. State-mandated yearly evaluation ratings for these veteran teachers can be marked legitimately as satisfactory on the basis of three pieces of evidence: the teacher's past performance, the teacher's participation in supervision, and the administrator's

informal observations—unless some evidence to the contrary surfaces. If such evidence does surface, the teacher is immediately moved into an intensive assistance mode where a thorough evaluation of his or her performance is conducted.

A final component of this differentiated system of teacher supervision and evaluation is an intensive assistance mode for teachers whose performance is considered marginal or worse. Typically, the administrator is given the authority to place teachers into the intensive assistance category as a result of a poor evaluation during the evaluation year of the cycle. If the teacher believes that this placement is unfair or inappropriate, he or she is usually given the opportunity to appeal this placement to the superintendent. If the administrator's recommendation is upheld, then a process of intensive remediation begins.

Typically, a team of administrators and teachers is assembled with the purpose of helping the teacher to improve. The goal of the process is not teacher dismissal. Rather, it is to return the teacher's performance to a level of satisfactory or beyond and to allow the teacher to return to the cyclical system of teacher supervision and evaluation. If improvement does not occur, the administrative team must decide whether to give the teacher an unsatisfactory rating or to continue the intensive assistance process. This

decision is a difficult one and will be addressed in greater detail in Chapter 6. You will note that even in this differentiated model depicted in Figure 1.3, the only clear separation between supervision and evaluation occurs for veteran teachers who are performing well. For both novice and marginal teachers, supervision and evaluation are still connected to each other. We believe that this is appropriate. Until teachers have demonstrated the capacity to perform well over time, ongoing evaluation is important. Once that ability has been demonstrated, periodic formal evaluation is sufficient.

In both of these models for separating supervision from evaluation, a strong commitment is made to both teacher evaluation and teacher supervision. Teachers are required to complete a rigorous period of intense evaluation before they are granted full membership in the community and before a district commitment to their long-term growth is made. Once this probationary period has passed, the district makes a long-term commitment to provide the resources necessary to carry out both teacher evaluation and teacher supervision separately and effectively.

2. *Supervision and evaluation are high district priorities.* Developing a high-quality teacher supervision and evaluation system is a very demanding activity. Human and fiscal resources must be devoted to the processes of developing, implementing, maintaining, and evaluating the system. Administrators alone cannot develop a high-quality system of evaluation and supervision. A variety of stakeholders including teachers, school board members, parents, and community members should be involved in the process. School board members play an essential role in the process, because the outcomes of the development process will be new policies for district implementation as well as requirements for more resources committed to teacher supervision and evaluation. The presence of parents and community members in the committee can help to legitimize the process in the eyes of the community at large.

Teacher ownership of the system is critical in order to achieve the desired outcomes of improved teaching and learning. When teachers do not buy into the system, they can find subtle ways of undermining the goals that the system is attempting to achieve. They go through the motions necessary to comply with the letter of the law, but they also make sure to follow the path of least

resistance. They choose to participate in those aspects of the system that will require the least amount of effort on their part and also result in the lowest possible level of improvement. Although some teachers may make these choices because they are uninterested in improvement, others do so because they resent being treated as children who cannot be trusted to play a role in developing systems that are intended to promote their own growth.

In our work with school districts engaged in the process of developing or revising their systems of evaluation and supervision, we have been deeply impressed by two aspects of teacher involvement in the process. First, teachers who participate in development committees are often even more dedicated than administrators and school board members to raising the level of teacher performance across the district. Second, we are impressed by the number of teachers who choose supervisory modes of growth that require much more work on the part of the teacher than the once-a-year visit by the principal for evaluation. They choose more work simply because they believe that it will result in improvement for them and increased learning for their students.

Development of the system is an essential indicator that supervision and evaluation are high district priorities. A second powerful indicator of the importance of the two functions is the attention given by the district to the implementation of the system and its ongoing evaluation and maintenance. Implementing the system will require staff development for all the players in the system, both administrators and teachers. Staff development must be provided concerning the mechanics of the system and participation in it as well as the standards and criteria for teacher evaluation. It is also likely to be needed for particular components of the system—for example, peer coaching and action research.

After the initial training and staff development have been provided and the system is put into operation, a committee of stakeholders should meet on a regular basis to monitor the implementation of the system and troubleshoot problems. Our experience tells us that it is very common to have different administrators implement the system in different ways, even after they have all received the same training. If implementation is not monitored, serious problems can arise in the system as a result of perceived unequal and unfair implementation. Awareness of such problems in

16 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

the early stages of implementation can avoid serious problems later on.

After the system has been implemented successfully, periodic evaluation of the system and its impact is crucial. No system is perfect. There are always minor adjustments that can be made to improve quality. We suggest that a committee of stakeholders solicit feedback from participants at least every 3 years in order to evaluate the efficacy of the system and to refine and improve it. This ongoing evaluation function results in improvements in the system and also models the process of continuous improvement for which everyone in the system should be striving. The degree to which any school district takes seriously the processes of development, implementation, and ongoing maintenance of its teacher supervision and evaluation system is a very strong indicator of the district's commitment to these processes. Chapter 12 contains much more explicit information about the development, implementation, and evaluation processes.

3. *The district provides opportunities for differentiated supervision.* One of the hallmarks of excellent teaching is the ability of the teacher to meet the varying needs of the students with whom he or she is working. As noted in our platform of beliefs, teachers, like students, differ from each other in many respects. Nevertheless, the vast majority of teacher supervision and evaluation systems in the United States do not account for individual differences beyond the first 3 years of teaching. Typically, teachers who have not yet earned tenure are seen as different from tenured teachers and treated differently in terms of both supervision and evaluation. Once tenure has been earned, however, most systems of teacher evaluation and supervision treat everyone the same. A single model of supervision for teachers does not make any more sense than a single model of instruction for children.

The deeper tragedy of this failure to meet individual teacher's needs is the fact that many models of supervision and evaluation are designed with the case of the marginal teacher in mind. The entire system consists of regulations and practices that are designed to force marginal teachers to improve. As a result, the systems are administrator centered, very directive, and sometimes punitive in nature. Although such heavy-handed systems may be necessary for some marginal teachers, they are exactly the opposite of what the vast majority of teachers require. Designing such a

system is analogous to designing a system of instruction that meets the needs of the least cooperative, most unmotivated child in the school and then teaching all students by that method.

High-quality systems of teacher supervision and evaluation provide a variety of options for teacher growth including, but not limited to, classroom supervision, peer coaching, collegial development groups, self-directed professional development, and action research. Chapters 7 to 10 provide detailed information concerning the development, implementation, and evaluation of many of these options for differentiated supervision and growth.

4. *The process for evaluation makes clear the criteria by which performance is judged.* As suggested earlier in this chapter, every system of teacher evaluation is based on some implicit or explicit conception of what satisfactory teaching performance looks like. One of the indicators that differentiates high-quality systems of teacher evaluation from low-quality systems is the presence of a clear and explicit set of standards for describing successful teacher performance. When all of the participants in the evaluation process have a deep understanding of the criteria for successful teaching, it is much more likely that teaching performance across the district will match or exceed the minimal level of competence. When either administrators or teachers are unclear or confused about the standards for satisfactory performance, each individual is free to develop his or her own interpretation. One result of this muddled situation is a tremendous variance in the quality of teaching performance across schools.

The lack of specificity and clarity concerning standards and criteria for satisfactory performance is responsible in many cases for the horrible situation in which a teacher whose performance has been judged to be satisfactory for 20 or more years is suddenly found to be marginal or unsatisfactory. This situation often occurs when a new administrator or evaluator steps onto the scene. This new evaluator sees the act of teaching very differently from the former evaluator. As a result, the same teaching performance is rated satisfactory or even better in May and unsatisfactory in October. Obviously, this situation is unfair for both the teacher and the new administrator.

As we suggest in Chapter 3, there are many sources of help to which a district can turn in developing the standards and criteria for satisfactory teaching performance. There are state-approved formats that can be used, although

some of these are quite broad and not particularly helpful in focusing on the instructional act per se. Other sophisticated and highly developed systems that can be used to assess the teaching act are available. We present five sets of standards in Chapter 3. We suggest that each school district develop its own set of criteria and standards for teaching after examining preexisting standards from external experts. The authors have been involved in the development of teacher supervision and evaluation systems in many districts and have been quite amazed at the commonalities one finds when teachers and administrators are asked to respond to the question of what good teaching looks like.

The development of the standards and criteria does not complete the task of making the standards and criteria clear. Staff development must be provided for all participants, so that each individual has the opportunity to understand the standards and criteria and has a chance to ask questions that will clarify any unclear or confusing areas. In addition, evaluators must participate in both initial and ongoing staff development aimed at helping all evaluators interpret the criteria in the same way and apply them uniformly. Unlike teacher supervision, which is optimized by a differentiated, individualized approach, teacher evaluation demands consistency and uniformity across evaluators. Specific training should be provided so that all evaluators attain a high degree of reliability in assessing teacher performance. After this initial training has been held and the system is operationalized, periodic sessions should be held in which evaluator reliability is reestablished. This will help to prevent what researchers call “observer drift.” Observer drift is a phenomenon in which researchers who are trained initially to achieve a very high degree of reliability gradually drift into their own individualized interpretation once they go out observing on their own.

5. *The organizational climate is conducive to effective supervision and evaluation.* Teacher supervision and evaluation do not occur in a vacuum. They take place within both school and district organizational contexts. There is no doubt that climate varies considerably across school districts—and even within the same school district. The climate in small elementary schools is often very different from the climate that one finds in large high schools that must rely on bureaucracy and standardization to some degree, simply

because of their size. The most well-intentioned and carefully crafted system of teacher supervision and evaluation will sputter and die in an organizational climate marked by distrust, animosity, and cynicism. Because teacher evaluation, as we noted earlier, requires only working acceptance on the part of the teacher and does not imply a collaborative relationship between the teacher and the evaluator, the impact of a negative climate on the evaluation function is rather limited. Teacher supervision, on the contrary, with its emphasis on trust, collaboration, and teacher direction, is extremely dependent on the climate of the school and district in general.

The importance of school climate for successful supervision implies that districts should concern themselves with the readiness of the district as a whole for developing sophisticated systems of teacher supervision and evaluation. When the climate is already fairly open and trusting, the district can forge ahead with establishing a stakeholder group to develop the system. When the climate is cynical or negative, it would be wise to begin very slowly. The district might find particular buildings or even departments in which the climate is more positive and begin to pilot supervisory processes with selected volunteers. Over time, the number of volunteers and the number of school sites can be gradually increased as the successes of the pilot programs are made known to broader constituencies through staff development activities.

It should be obvious that developing a high-quality system of teacher supervision and evaluation in a negative climate requires vision, patience, persistence, and consistency in district leadership over time. When district leadership changes frequently or when stakeholders become too impatient, there is often a push toward accelerated system development and implementation. The result is usually a system that has no chance of being successful in promoting growth, and an increase in the climate of hostility and negativism. We should also point out that the very process of developing, implementing, and evaluating a system of teacher supervision and evaluation can improve the climate of the district as a whole if carried out in accordance with principles such as those outlined in Chapter 12.

6. *The entire system of supervision and evaluation is aimed at enhancing student learning.* As important as teacher supervision and evaluation are, they are not ends in themselves. Both are

18 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

aimed at enhancing the quality of student learning. This improvement in student learning should be the primary purpose of any system of teacher supervision and evaluation, as we assert in our platform of beliefs. One of the questions that we are asked most frequently when we conduct workshops for school board members is whether our notions about teacher supervision and evaluation will improve student test scores. We always answer the question honestly by saying that we have no evidence that student test scores will improve. We also explain that the causal chain from a system of supervision and evaluation to improved test scores on the part of an individual student is a very long chain of events with the opportunity for interference from a very large number of intervening variables (teacher effort, student motivation, test–curriculum match, etc.). Attributing improved test performance to supervision and evaluation is a difficult measurement task.

However, in our work with schools, we have seen many instances of improvement in student learning and performance that we could document and attribute to the process of teacher supervision. One of the authors was involved in a peer-coaching project as part of a district differentiated supervision system in which two peer coaches were able to provide clear documentation of improvement in student writing as a direct result of the peer-coaching process. The other author was involved in a peer-coaching project in another district where increases in student learning resulted from the efforts of a calculus teacher and a physics teacher who joined forces to create an interdisciplinary advanced placement course for their students. In interviewing teachers about teacher supervision, we have heard several well-documented stories of changes in student behavior and learning that resulted from differentiated supervision opportunities. None of these cases

involved standardized test scores; they did involve significant student learning.

The unfortunate aspect of these stories of improved student learning, however, was that none had been documented or recorded beyond the level of the individual teacher. We believe it is very important that districtwide procedures be developed for reporting and recording changes in student learning that occur as a result of differentiated supervision and evaluation. Enhanced learning can be captured through the data collection procedures that are used to evaluate the efficacy of the system. They can also be captured as part of the routine recordkeeping that is used for each of the various supervisory options as suggested in Chapters 7 through 10.

There are several important reasons for developing procedures to document and record enhanced student learning. Such efforts testify to the effectiveness of the system as a whole in meeting its basic purpose, and they also provide opportunities for teachers and administrators to recognize and celebrate their impact on individual students. Finally, such efforts provide parents, community members, and school board members with concrete evidence of the positive impact of the human and fiscal resources devoted to teacher supervision and evaluation. Unfortunately, we have seen a couple of cases in which a few new school board members or a new superintendent were able to undermine and dismantle a high-quality system of teacher supervision and evaluation, simply because the district administrators had not collected any concrete information concerning the impact of the system on students. We believe that if these two districts had collected such data (similar to the vignettes, cases, and examples in Chapters 7 through 10), the systems would have survived.

Figure 1.4 restates the six criteria for high-quality teacher supervision and evaluation systems that have been discussed above.

FIGURE 1.4 Criteria for High-Quality Systems of Teacher Evaluation and Supervision

1. The processes for judging competence (evaluation) are clearly differentiated from processes for promoting growth (supervision).
2. Supervision and evaluation are high district priorities.
3. The district provides opportunities for differentiated supervision.
4. The process for evaluation makes clear the criteria by which performance is judged.
5. The organizational climate is conducive for effective supervision and evaluation.
6. The entire system of supervision and evaluation is aimed at enhancing student learning.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

From the beginning of the twentieth century, school supervisors have been handicapped by an ongoing tension between the roles of supervisor and evaluator. Although most supervisors would like to work with teachers in helpful and supportive ways, they have also been saddled with the duties of teacher evaluation. As most schools have not been able to develop systems of teacher supervision and evaluation that reconcile these two important functions, the vast majority of supervisors have become *de facto* teacher evaluators who do little or no supervision.

We assert that teacher supervision and evaluation are two critically important—but separate—functions for improving the quality of education. In this chapter, we build a case for the separation of teacher supervision from evaluation based on seven dimensions in which the two functions differ. Supervision and evaluation differ in terms of their basic purposes, the rationales for their existence, the scope of the two processes, the relationship established with the

teacher, the observation procedures, the nature of expertise, and the teacher's perspective on the process.

We then used this understanding to describe how the two separate functions can be related to each other in complementary ways in a well-designed system of teacher supervision and evaluation. This differentiated system employs three supervision and evaluation tracks: a probationary track for novice teachers, a cyclical process of evaluation and supervision for veteran teachers, and an intensive assistance mode for marginal teachers.

The final section of the chapter delineated six criteria by which the quality of any system of teacher supervision and evaluation may be assessed. A well-designed system separates evaluation from supervision, promotes differentiated growth opportunities, makes evaluation criteria clear, is a high district priority, aims at enhancing student learning, and exists within and contributes to a collaborative organizational climate.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Look back at Exercise 1.1. Have any of your beliefs and attitudes about supervision and evaluation changed as a result of what you have read in the chapter? If so, what caused them to change? If your attitudes and beliefs differ from those of the authors, what arguments would you use to convince the authors that their beliefs are wrong?
2. Think about the last time you were evaluated by an administrator. What was the relationship between you and the administrator like during the evaluation process? Was your relationship different when you were not being evaluated? If so, how was the relationship different?
3. Thinking solely of performance evaluations that you have received, describe the degree to which they were helpful in improving your performance. What made them helpful or not helpful? How could they have been made more helpful?
4. Describe the process of supervision that was used the last time you were supervised as a professional. What elements of the process made it feel like supervision as opposed to evaluation? What elements made it feel like evaluation and not supervision? What improvement in your performance, if any, resulted from the process? Why did improvement occur or not occur?
5. Consider the six criteria suggested for evaluating the quality of a teacher supervision and evaluation system. Do you agree with each? Why or why not? Would you modify any? Eliminate any? Add any? Why?
6. Consider the effort by the current administration to link teacher evaluation to differentiated pay for teachers. What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of such an approach?

THEORY-INTO-PRACTICE APPLICATIONS

1. Obtain a copy of the written plan for teacher supervision and evaluation in the school where you are currently working or in which you have worked most recently. Apply the six criteria for high-quality teacher supervision and evaluation systems to that plan. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the plan. How

could the weaknesses be improved? Also, identify those criteria on which judgments were readily possible, based on the plan alone, and those criteria that would require more intense study of actual processes before a judgment is possible.

20 CHAPTER 1 COMPREHENSIVE TEACHER SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

2. Obtain a copy of the teacher observation instrument that is used for teacher evaluation in a local school district. What does the instrument tell you, as an observer, about how the district sees teaching competence? Relate it to your own views about good teaching. What changes would you make? Why? Now separate those qualities on the instrument that are directly observable from those that are not. What data sources would be needed to ascertain the presence of those qualities that are not directly observable?

3. Design a survey that could be used to obtain feedback from the teachers in a local school district

concerning the quality of the district's teacher supervision and evaluation system. Now adapt the survey for principals, for central office administrators, for board members. Administer the survey and compare the results across groups.

4. Interview three teachers and three administrators (try to get elementary-, middle-, and high-school teachers and administrators) concerning what they would perceive as high-quality teacher supervision and evaluation. Compare the perceptions of the teachers and administrators. What are the differences? What are the similarities?

REFERENCES

- BARR, A., BURTON, W., & BRUECKNER, L. (1938). *Supervision: Democratic leadership for the improvement of learning* (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Hartley.
- BLUMBERG, A., & JONAS, S. (1987). Permitting access: The teacher's control over supervision. *Educational Leadership*, 44(8), 58–63.
- BOLIN, F. (1987). On defining supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 2(4), 368–380.
- 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, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- COGAN, M. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- DANIELSON, C., & MCGREAL, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- DOYLE, W. (2001). Classroom organization and management. In M. WITTRICK (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 392–431). New York: Macmillan.
- GARMAN, N. (1982). The clinical approach to supervision. In T. J. SERGIOVANNI (Ed.), *Supervision of teaching* (pp. 35–52). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- GARMAN, N. (1990). Theories embedded in the events of clinical supervision: A hermeneutic approach. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 5, 201–213.
- GARMAN, N., & HAZI, H. (1986). Teachers ask: Is there life after Madeline Hunter? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(9), 669–672.
- GLANZ, J. (1998). Histories, antecedents, and legacies of school supervision. In G. FIRTH & E. PAJAK (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 39–79). New York: Macmillan Library Reference.
- GLICKMAN, C. D., GORDON, S. P., ROSS-GORDON, J. M. (2010). *Super Vision and Instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (8th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- GOLDHAMMER, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special techniques for the supervision of teachers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- HAZI, H. (1994). The teacher evaluation-supervision dilemma: A case of entanglements and irreconcilable differences. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 9, 195–216.
- HUNTER, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching and supervising. In P. HOSFORD (Ed.), *Using what we know about teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (pp. 169–192).
- JOYCE, B., & SHOWERS, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- KNOWLES, M. (1990). *The adult learner: A neglected species* (4th ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publication Co.
- MCGREAL, T. (1983). *Successful teacher evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- MINER, B. (2009). The debate over differentiated pay: The devil is in the details. *Rethinking Schools*, 24(1), 20–25.
- NOLAN, J., & FRANCIS, P. (1992). Changing perspectives in curriculum and instruction. In C. GLICKMAN (Ed.), *Supervision in transition* (pp. 44–60). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- NOLAN, J., HAWKES, B., & FRANCIS, P. (1993). Case studies: Windows onto clinical supervision. *Educational Leadership*, 51(2) 52–56.
- PAJAK, E. (2008). *Supervising instruction: Differentiating for teacher success* (3rd ed.). Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon Publishers.
- PETERSON, K. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- SERGIOVANNI, T. J., & STARRATT, R. J. (2006). *Supervision: A redefinition* (8th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- U.S. Department of Education (2010) Race to the Top Fund. <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html>.
- WEISBERG, D., SEXTON, S., MULHERN, J. & KEELING, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness*. The New Teacher Project.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING AND RESEARCH

- FIRTH, E., & PAJAK, E. (Eds.). (1998). *Handbook of research on school supervision*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- NOLAN, J., PALKO, L., BUREAU, E., CLAPPER, J., GOODNACK, J., GOODWIN, S., HEALEY, P., HOOVER, L., & MEISTER, D. (1995). *Teacher Supervision and evaluation: A process for school district self-assessment and improvement*. Lancaster, PA: Pennsylvania Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rethinking Schools. (2010). *Keeping quality teachers teaching: A special collection on teacher recruitment, retention and quality*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- SNOW-GERONO, J. (2008). Locating supervision: A reflective framework for negotiating tensions within conceptual and procedural foci for teacher development. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24, 1502–1515.