

8-1-2008

# Locating Supervision—A Reflective Framework for Negotiating Tensions Within Conceptual and Procedural Foci for Teacher Development

Jennifer L. Snow-Gerono  
*Boise State University*



This is an author-produced, peer-reviewed version of this article. © 2009, Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). The final, definitive version of this document can be found online at *Teaching and Teacher Education*, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2008.02.002

# Locating Supervision—A Reflective Framework for Negotiating Tensions Within Conceptual and Procedural Foci for Teacher Development

**Jennifer L. Snow-Gerono**  
**Boise State University**  
**1910 University Drive**  
**Boise, Idaho 83725-1745**  
**Phone: 208-426-2260**  
**Fax: 208-426-4006**  
**jennifersnow@boisestate.edu**

**ABSTRACT:** This manuscript presents a theoretical construct for analyzing procedural and conceptual tensions within instructional leadership for teacher development. The dynamic, multi-dimensional framework demonstrates possibilities for locating supervision as having procedural and conceptual bases. By employing the questions identified, educators place themselves within the framework focused on specific areas and located along a procedural to conceptual continuum. Identifying tensions in practice guides educators to be more reflective when engaging in professional growth. Ultimately, teachers need to become empowered to engage in reflective supervision in order to guide professional development, teaching *and* learning.

*“A person becomes a clinical supervisor when he/she begins to think and act as if the ‘cycle of supervision’ were a metaphor as well as a method; when observation and analysis are not only procedural phases for actions in classrooms, but also represent the empirical approach inherent in a skilled service; when the notion of conference not only means two people meeting before and after classroom visits, but also suggests dynamic forms of collaboration in educational alliances...”* (Garman, 1982, p. 52)

## ***Introduction: Reflective supervision for teacher development in an era of accountability***

In the current context of high stakes accountability for teachers, teacher educators, and, most importantly, K-12 students, instructional leaders need to be able to guide reflective growth in educators at all levels. But, what does it mean to be an instructional leader? Teacher leadership exists (Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson & Hann, 2002; Lieberman & Miller, 2004); it serves as a powerful means for professional and institutional growth in education. Likewise, teachers as instructional leaders can engage in supervisory processes akin to peer coaching (Gottesman, 2000) in order to engage their own and their peers’ professional development. Clinical, or reflective, supervision has emphasized the simultaneous growth of teacher and supervisor in its brief history (Garman, 1982, Nolan & Huber, 1989). Looking through supervision history and identifying a theoretical construct for analyzing practice according to varied contexts, constraints, and goals for teacher development should empower educators on all levels to determine what is best practice for themselves and for student growth.

The literature on school supervision unveils several distinctive models (Tracy, 1998) and a rich history (Glanz, 1998) indicative of the position in which contemporary supervisors may find themselves. School supervisors should be able to recognize the impact of scientific management in their work as they encounter national standards as well as competency tests and educational language like quality management and excellence. However, more collaborative and postmodern approaches are available within Waite’s (1995) dialogic supervision, Costa and Garmston’s (2002) cognitive coaching, Starratt and Howell’s (1998) moral agency, and Sergivoanni’s (1997) calls for community and collaboration. Postmodern supervision (Holland & Obermiller, 2000), developing professional learning communities (Dufour & Eaker, 1998) or the National School Reform Faculty’s “critical friends groups” (Bambino, 2002), and practitioner inquiry (Dana & Yendol-Silva, 2003), for example, provide avenues for teacher

development within different frameworks for instructional leadership or supervision. However, the multitude of supervisory approaches and models leaves educators in a place in which they may be unsure of specific roles and responsibilities or supervision's place as a field and as a profession, not to mention professional ethics and responsibility in the current age of accountability.

In an effort to be more analytical about supervisory practice(s) geared more toward teacher development than evaluation, educators could learn from Flinders' (1998) questions aimed at bringing supervision as a field of study to a more reflective process:

- 1) How is this activity framed?
- 2) What do others expect of a supervisor, and why?
- 3) How do I go about describing supervision, either as what I do or as a field, especially to those outside of education?
- 4) In other words, how do I account for myself as a supervisor, and what does that account say about my underlying theories of practice? (p. 1124).

In responding to these questions, educators may also benefit from the construct proposed here, designed as an analytical tool for locating supervisory practice. This analytical framework is based on a continuum of conceptual and procedural foci. These foci are based on understandings of reflective supervision (Garman, 1982; Nolan & Huber, 1989). For the purpose of this manuscript and the included analytical framework, a procedural understanding would be akin to checking duties off a list as one goes through the "cycle of supervision:" establishing readiness, developing the relationship, preconference, data collection, analysis and strategy, postconference, cycle evaluation. A conceptual understanding would indicate an appreciation for individual differences and contextual forces on the *process* of reflective supervision. A more conceptual understanding embraces the dynamic interplay of teacher development aspects like leadership, purpose, data, basis, progression, motivation and time (See Figure 1.1). I am not suggesting that all procedures should be seen in a negative light; rather, the *understanding* of supervision for teacher development in light of procedures only may limit the potential of a conceptual framework's possibilities for growth.

In the quest to make supervision for teacher development a more reflective process, school supervision's history is reviewed in this manuscript as well as varied models, methods and perspectives in the field. This article then presents a theoretical construct as a dynamic, multi-dimensional tool and demonstrates its possibilities for locating supervision as having procedural and conceptual bases. The construct is cubed in order to create space for the constant interplay of the tensions between conceptual and procedural understandings. By employing the questions identified (See Table 1.1), educators may be able to place themselves within this construct focused on specific areas and located as primarily procedural and conceptual depending on the circumstances or identified area for growth. In turn, this should enhance personal growth for professional development (Tomlinson, 2004) and enhanced professional practice. Examining supervision as a field from both a historical lens and through this proposed construct next includes investigating other supervisory models and approaches and describing them in light of the framework.

### ***Historical antecedents of supervision***

Looking into the history of school supervision provides insight into roots of more reflective supervision, instructional leadership and teacher development. Although supervision is often considered an evaluative aspect of the role of administration, it has also evolved into means for teacher development (Glanz, 2000) "across the professional life span" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2001, p. 49). The history of school supervision, not surprisingly, is connected to the social and intellectual movements within American society. In his historical analysis of school supervision, Glanz (1998) identifies seven dominant conceptions of supervision: inspection, efficiency, democratic, scientific, leadership, clinical, and "changing concepts." Supervision as inspection prospered in the late 1800s when superintendents recognized a large part of their role as a visitor of schools and an inspector of the performance of teachers. Their supervisory role called for them to enter classrooms and tell teachers "what is acceptable practice and what is not." (Harris, 1892, as cited in Glanz, 1998, p. 49). The premise of supervision as inspection certainly added to schools as top-down bureaucracies designed to produce and control American citizens. Within this

“premodern” (Glanz, 2000) environment, procedures of supervision would be more important than the conceptual basis of supervision for or improvement. Indeed this inspection-oriented environment served the purpose of managing teachers, the majority of whom were only rudimentarily prepared for their jobs.

In a direct response to this hierarchical power structure, the twentieth century began with a turn toward professionalism and progressivism. However, this turn toward the democratization of schools seemed elusive to progressives in dealing with the increasing urbanization of society. With this urbanization, school systems grew more complex and superintendents did not have the time to enter schools as inspectors anymore. Therefore, they appointed proxies or other supervisors (generally expert teachers), and many quickly earned the name “snoopervisor” (Glanz, 1998, p. 52) The legacy of this negative relationship between supervisors and teachers can be recognized today in schools in which teachers are evaluated and controlled in a manner that does not recognize their autonomy or professionalism. Supervision struggled with changing its purpose and approach as teachers became more professionally prepared. Again, such a distrustful relationship between supervisors and teachers indicates that a procedural and evaluative base for supervisory practice was prevalent. In many cases, this procedural understanding of a scientific approach still stifles teacher autonomy, particularly when connected to standardized assessments, as is often an emphasis in current schools working toward *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* compliance.

As supervision became more scientific, a social efficiency movement occurred. During this time, rating scales became popular. Supervisors were attempting to assert their professionalism through the use of scientific methods in this period. However, Glanz (1998) claims

What he [Franklin Bobbitt] called scientific and professional supervisory methods’ were in fact scientific and bureaucratic methods of supervision aimed not at professionalizing but at finding a legitimate and secure niche for control oriented supervision within the school bureaucracy. (p. 53)

With negative reactions from teachers and supervisors finding themselves in a vulnerable position in the bureaucratic school hierarchy, democratic methods began to reemerge in the 1920s. Democratic supervision actually co-existed with other efficiency and scientific trends in supervision. The historical trends in supervision intimate the postmodern condition supervisors later found, indicating that there is more of a simultaneous rather than a linear historical progression (Holland & Obermiller, 2000; Smyth, 1997; 1991; Waite, 1995). According to Glanz, during this democratic turn of school supervision in the 1920s and 1930s, supervisors continued to attempt to cultivate democratic practices with teachers. Democratic supervisory models also led to the conception of scientific supervision.

John Dewey endorsed scientific supervision as being compatible with democratic practices and as being considered distinct from the social efficiency model (Glanz, 1998). Dewey, as a philosopher of democracy and education, gave some legitimization to this movement. Supervisors understood the pressures to assert their professionalism and, in turn, began to develop the “science of instructing teachers.” In their attempts at scientific supervision, they returned to narrow teacher rating scales and failed to implement democratic supervisory practices. Supervision remained steeped in authoritarian methods and found itself with the dilemma of enforcing scientific practice while at the same time recognizing teachers’ varied contexts. Finally, through the 1940s and 1960s democratic leadership slowly replaced supervisor-as-rater in the literature. During the social period of political upheaval, anti-war sentiment, and concerns for justice and equality, supervision as inspection and social efficiency was inappropriate. Supervision’s continual changes and varied attempts at professionalizing the field resulted in ambiguous goals and roles for supervisors; hence, purposes remained unclear and confusion reigned in the field.

By the 1970s, tensions within scientific, democratic and social efficiency movements stimulated the need for alternative notions for guiding theory and practice of supervision in schools. Clinical supervision emerged. According to Glanz (1998),

The premise of clinical supervision was that teaching could be improved by a prescribed, formal process of collaboration between teacher and supervisor. The literature of clinical supervision has been replete with the concepts of collegiality, collaboration, assistance, and improvement of instruction. (p. 63)

Garman (1982) credits Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) with the birth of clinical supervision and maintains in her own work that “clinical supervision as a construct is different from the procedural orientation popularly described in the literature” (p. 35). Nolan and Huber (1989) describe clinical supervision as “reflective supervision” and hold its main purpose as guiding teachers to become more reflective because “as teachers become more reflective, they begin to believe that they do have the power to influence student learning significantly” (p. 144).

During the 1980s, other alternative methods of supervision were proposed and considered. Developmental supervision gained attention (Glickman, 1985, 1981) whereas the 1990s reintroduced peer supervision and cognitive coaching (Costa & Garmston, 2002). Sergiovanni & Starratt (2001) introduced their terms of “Supervision II” as opposed to the inspectorial, efficiency-oriented “Supervision I.” “Supervision II” is based in an increased potential to become more collegial and even informal as colleagues worked together on inquiry-based projects in lieu of formal, authoritarian supervision. This shift is evident in practice today, and even in the changing terms accompanying traditional “supervisory” practice. Educational leaders refer to instructional leadership, peer coaching, and collaborative inquiry for examining and evaluating educational practice. However, the legacy of bureaucratic school supervision, often with a contradictory focus on evaluation, has led to a multitude of models. Likewise, the emphasis on accountability with *NCLB* implementation refocuses supervision into more top-down frameworks once again. However, instructional leaders are not all neglecting the concepts underlying “Supervision II” or postmodern supervision. Teacher leadership remains an emphasis in the importance of teacher development (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). Teacher inquiry and professional learning communities are also still considered promising for teacher development and for demonstrating connections to student learning and development.

#### *A special emphasis on variations of clinical supervision*

Clinical supervision is often mentioned in models, theories, and approaches to supervision (Tracy, 1998). Its “treatment ranges from that of a distinct model of clinical supervision to clinical supervision as a broader concept from which numerous models are derived” (Tracy, 1998, p. 99). Clinical supervision, in its varied definitions, can be located in the procedural tensions of the analytical framework described here with Hunter’s (1982) research-based, evaluative approach or in the middle to tensions of the construct with Garman’s (1982) metaphorical approach to the supervisory process. Tracy and MacNaughton (1989) outline an emerging conflict between neotraditionalists and neo-progressives in defining clinical supervision.

Neo-traditionalists recognize the importance of the relationship between the supervisor and teacher, but they are more means-oriented in their approach than the neoprogressives. Tracy and MacNaughton (1989) state, “The crucial weakness of the traditional approach is its inability to validate many particular traits, techniques, or skills as synonymous with student achievement and effective instruction” (p. 248). The neotraditionalist approach is characterized by checklists for evidence of effective teaching. Hunter’s theories of effective teaching lay the basis for the essential elements of an effective lesson plan. If a teacher implements these elements, then that teacher illustrates proper teaching.

On the other hand, the neo-progressive definition of clinical supervision may be traced to Cogan’s (1973) and Goldhammer’s (1969) descriptions of the concept. Neoprogressives reject a set model of good teaching and embrace the concept of clinical supervision as one geared to help educators together resolve classroom teaching problems. Growth, trust, teacher-direction, context, and collegiality are important aspects of the neo-progressive approach to clinical supervision. The neo-progressives reject evaluation or assessment as an appropriate responsibility for clinical supervisors. This model is inherently flexible, allowing a set of undefined criteria for teacher and supervisory skills. There is a process, however, to guide the steps of clinical supervision: preconferencing, planning lessons cooperatively, observing the classroom, examining classroom data based on a prior agreement, and jointly reviewing the supervisory process

The flexibility of this neo-progressive approach also allows for the emergence of several different versions of this model of clinical supervision. The neo-traditional model would be more rigid with its externally-derived criteria for effective teaching while the neo-progressive model has allowed for several versions following the clinical supervision guidelines (cyclical process). Garman (1982) emphasizes the *process* of clinical supervision. She denies clinical supervision as a model in order to view it as a practice with concepts to guide supervisors. According to Garman (1982), one of the most important parts of this process is to view it as a metaphor as much as a method to guide the steps of clinical supervision.

### ***Models or schema for school supervision***

Tracy (1998) identified six schema around which she organizes various supervisory models. Her first schema includes the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development's scientific, clinical, and artistic models. Schema 2 includes clinical, cooperative professional development, self-directed, and administrative monitoring as its models. Schema 3 includes common law, goal setting, product, clinical supervision, and artistic models. Schema 4 includes original clinical models, humanistic/artistic, technical/didactic, and development reflective models. Schema 5 includes clinical supervision, collegial, self-directed, informal, inquiry, and advisory models. Finally, Schema 6 includes instructional objective, performance objective, traditional, neo-traditional, and teacher-concern models. These schema provide organizational tools for their authors to frame supervisory practices. One can see how difficult it may be to locate supervisory practice, even within distinct models or definitions. Therefore, I introduce this analytical framework for locating supervision. I will then demonstrate where different models may be located along the procedural –conceptual continuum. The framework is designed as an informative tool for all supervisors (whether considered teachers, coaches, instructional leaders or administrators) because no matter what they are called or how the practice is perceived, educators need an analytical tool that will guide their reflection in order to locate themselves and their practice within this multitude of models for supervision. The ultimate goal would be to guide learning for all in education.

### ***Analytical framework: Procedural and conceptual tensions within supervision***

As can be found in a study of the historical antecedents of school supervision, tensions may be noted within models and approaches to supervisory practice. It becomes evident from where an emphasis on a procedural understanding of supervision stems as well as calls for more collegial supervisory relationships and processes. The historical basis of scientific supervision being interpreted solely through its procedures rather than through its conceptual basis of best research and practice highlights the need to address procedural and conceptual tensions within supervision. Additionally, blending supervisory approaches for a conceptual understanding of practice suggests that locating supervision within this proposed analytical framework is more appropriate than naming it. Locating supervisory practice within this framework allows educators to reflect on personal practice rather than match their practice to a particular mold or model. This framework provides instructional leaders with a tool to analyze their practice and enhance opportunities for their growth as well as the growth of the teachers with whom they work.

Supervision has been defined with words like surveillance, regulation, and administration. At the same time, it has been associated with words like guidance instruction, and leadership. These seemingly contradictory terms may add ambiguity and confusion to defining a supervisor's roles and responsibilities. In many school systems, for practical purposes, supervision has been closely connected to assessing the performance of teachers. However, some scholars note that this assessment role often interferes with supervision's purposes of spurring professional growth and development (See, for example, Goldstein & Noguera, 2006; O'Sullivan, 2004; Poglinco & Bach 2004; Nolan et al, 1993; Nolan & Hil Kirk, 1991; Nolan & Huber, 1989).

This practical tension within supervision as a field caused me to further reflect on other tensions based in procedural and conceptual understandings of instructional leadership. Therefore, I created an analytical framework (Figure 1.1) and its connected questions to guide placement of supervisory practice within that framework (See Table 1.1). Locating supervisory practice should also encourage consistent reflection to spur continual professional growth in all educators. Designed as multidimensional, the framework addresses the complexity and interrelatedness of many of the supervisory aspects included. All of these aspects share the tensions of conceptual and procedural understandings. Therefore, procedural understanding and conceptual understanding are important sides surrounding the cubed framework.

Insert figure 1.1

This analytical framework is based on dimensions of supervisory practice, or professional development, and how educators describe their personal practice. The first dimension within the analytical framework has to do with leadership of development experiences. For example, either the supervisor or the teacher may take on leadership roles. When educators answer the question "Who is leading the supervisory experience?" they may identify supervision directed by the supervisor, or coach, through a primarily procedural understanding and supervision directed by the teacher through a primarily conceptual understanding. The rationale behind this is that when a

supervisor has an agenda or plan to follow, that plan is guided by procedures (i.e. observing, conferencing, evaluating). However, if a supervisor allows for teacher direction in the process, the supervisor is acknowledging the teacher's expertise and professional capability for decision-making and professional development. This acknowledgement allows the conceptual process of supervision – as instructional leadership – to focus more on growth for the individuals involved than on the procedures that should be followed to complete a “supervisory process.” Depending on the circumstances and goals for development, either a supervisor-led or teacher-led experience may be appropriate. For example, often novice teachers prefer to have a more supervisor or mentor led process. They can be coached to engage the conceptual aspects of reflective supervision when ready and then begin to lead their own professional development.

Although when acting in a leadership role, teachers may begin with processes with which they are familiar, such as procedural checklists for supervision, the power to direct the experience as they desire provides the opportunity to base it in a conceptual focus. This approach is attending to the dynamic interplay of ideas rather than simply a prescribed list of procedures. Supervisors may also lead within the conceptual base of this framework, but to do so, they must recognize the merit of the teacher's individual values and goals. This conceptual leadership involves a supervisory purpose of growth and an appreciation for a teacher's personal agenda for professional development, rather than procedural stages of data collection. Attention to teacher needs also reflects democratic supervisory practices as described historically. Quite possibly, a supervisory experience may lie at some point in the midst of this tension. A collaborative supervisory experience would be positioned at a point at which procedures are followed (as guided by a supervisor), but the thinking and meaning behind teacher actions are also explored by both educators. Some teachers may also be on improvement plans that demand more supervisor direction than others.

Insert table 1.1

The second dimension included within the analytical framework attends to the question: “What is the purpose of the supervisory experience?” When one responds to this question with a focus on evaluation, the experience is procedurally understood, intended to assess performance and often supervisor-directed. When one responds to this question with a focus on growth or professional development, there are more opportunities for the experience to be conceptually explored. With the focus on growth, again the conceptual basis for a teacher's performance and daily work brings the teacher into the experience more fully and limits the dominance of procedures and checklists. Like collaborative-directed supervision, a supervisory experience may also serve the purpose of both evaluation and growth. A tenured teacher, for example, may have an opportunity to identify an area for growth but a supervisor would be working to support this growth while at the same time potentially conducting an evaluation of teacher performance. This is by no means an ideal situation and goes against the aims of supervision as outlined by Nolan and Huber (1989).

The third question attended to within the analytical framework is “What data do you use to describe the supervisory experience?” When data includes listings of observable behaviors in concrete forms, a supervisory experience may be largely procedure based. It can be directly connected to observable procedures. When data is more abstract, it is experiential. Data can be based in teachers' personal experiences or philosophical orientations to teaching and learning. This data may be difficult to observe as it is not necessarily identifiable. This is an example of more conceptually based supervision. The observable procedures may become lost within the context of the experiences of the teacher. A conceptual understanding of supervision could accept this ambiguity. There may also be a point within this tension in the analytical framework at which supervision is positioned as identifiable but not necessarily directly observable behavior. Examples might include a teacher's expressly written narrative or philosophy statement or a teacher inquiry project that is identifiable but includes behaviors that may not all be directly observable.

The fourth dimension included within the analytical framework attends to the questions “How does one engage in this supervisory experience? Are there rules to follow?” Supervision that is prescriptive has definite procedures to follow. For example, Hunter's (1982) model of clinical supervision is often perceived as prescriptive when it is based in whether or not teachers follow a sequence of steps from the opening to the closing of their lesson. A conceptually based response to this question would be an experience that is completely open-ended. This may be directed by teacher interests and have no set guidelines for collecting data and/or performance assessment. Of course, the experience would be documented and analyzed, but there would be no prescriptive guidelines. An example might be artistic supervision where the supervisor writes a narrative critique of the classroom to share with

the teacher (Barone, 1998) or dialogic supervision (Waite, 1995). There may also be a point at which this tension would be positioned as a guided supervisory experience where it was not freely open-ended, but guided by a few norms such as observations and data collection. Undoubtedly, each dimension has its own tensions from procedural and conceptual understandings that sometimes make it difficult to precisely name supervisory practice.

The fifth dimension included in the analytical framework derives from the question “What does the progression of the supervisory experience look like?” A supervisory experience may range from static to entirely fluid and dynamic. A static experience is strictly based in procedures like collecting data, conferencing and making judgments. In this regard static refers to an experience that is concrete, in which data collection and analysis provide “yes or no” and “black and white” solutions. There may be little growth in this experience as it serves the purpose of evaluation. On the other hand, a fluid experience would be more abstract, open-ended, and guided by teacher beliefs about teaching and learning and not necessarily ground in procedures. For example, teachers may work together to plan and implement a lesson and then share conversations about its strengths and weaknesses. This teaching experience may prove to be quite reflective and growth-oriented but may not fit neatly into a description of accepted school supervision. If an experience is not quite static — strictly adhering to procedures — but not entirely fluid either, it may be described as a more connected view of supervision. This connected view would link procedures in an orderly fashion but may allow for more dynamics within those procedures. An example would be a supervisor supporting a teacher in guiding the progression of procedures based in her conceptual basis for teaching and learning. One phase here might include observations without data collection, for example.

The sixth dimension included in the analytical framework evidences the tensions within the experience being motivated by research and it being motivated by values. This dimension attends to the question “From where does the motivation for this supervisory experience originate?” The word motivation here refers to what pushes the experience. When external research is the impetus for supervision it may be more procedurally based. There are prescriptions for teaching and supervising. When participant values or contexts provide the impetus for the experience, it is much more experiential and open-ended. The teacher and supervisor as people are much more involved in this experience. They value their professional beliefs and experiences more than a plan developed by external or scientific researchers. This is not to denounce external education research in schools. Certainly “best practices” and “scientifically-based research” are the basis for much *NCLB* policy implementation. However, when programs are prescribed without consideration for personal or contextual values, their scientific basis may be undermined by implementation practices. There is also a place on the analytical framework for compromise between research and values. An example of the procedural-conceptual tensions within this dimension might include a teacher who has values based in a social justice perspective. Within a conceptual understanding, this teacher would raise social justice issues to the forefront of the supervision experience, regardless of what research on “best practices” may support. A compromise in this instance would be to employ social justice research in the data, along with the teacher’s personal social justice convictions, for the supervisory experience. For example, a teacher who is following a prescribed curriculum may do so in such a way that she also includes the personal experiences of her diverse students, whether through examples, curriculum extensions, or projects.

The final dimension included in the analytical framework speaks to time. The question guiding this dimension is “What kind of time frame surrounds this supervisory experience?” If there is an absolute “end-in-sight” for the supervisory experience, then it is primarily procedurally based. The procedures are guiding the experience so that it will be finished by an exact date and/or time, often the case when evaluation is an important aspect of supervision. This placement does not allow for the extenuating circumstances an open-ended experience does. An open-ended experience is not guided by time, but by growth or the values of the participants involved. Although this may not be entirely practical in several school systems and their bureaucratic structures, there is a middle tension within this dimension as well, allowing for contextual factors to influence how long a supervisory experience lasts. These contextual factors could be that the experience would be ongoing if it weren’t for the end of a school year or career moves of participants, and the experience would be approached as such. Contextual factors could also include drawing back from the procedurally-based “end-in-sight” in order to allow for certain classroom instances or personal/societal impacts affecting the teaching and learning process.

An important aspect of every dimension within this analytical framework is the pull between a procedural and a conceptual understanding, making the procedural conceptual tension more dominant than simply another dimension included in the analytical framework. This center tension holds the potential for pulling educators in multiple directions, quite possibly answering the six questions at varied ends of the continuum. This dynamic also should



demonstrate that depending on the purposes and extenuating circumstances, sometimes a procedural pull is the right answer and sometimes the conceptual pull is more appropriate for professional development. The tensions here parallel the pull between the democratic and social efficiency movements throughout supervision's history. Perhaps it is Dewey's conceptual understanding of scientific supervision that would best support democratic practices and inform theoretical underpinnings for supervision as a field.

### *Locating various models of school supervision*

At this point, I will employ several of the models identified in Tracy's schema and throughout supervision's history as locatable within the analytic framework proposed here. According to Tracy (1998), scientific supervision consists of "research-derived criteria" for teaching. Therefore, this model is based in the procedural frame of the analytical framework in answering the question "From where does the motivation for this supervisory practice originate?" However, Tracy also includes clinical supervision as defined by Garman in the same schema. Garman (1982) claims

Ultimately, a person becomes a clinical supervisor when he/she can use the method, act through the metaphor, and thereby sort out the nontrivial from the trivial in order to bring meaning to educational endeavors. (p. 52)

Such a definition of clinical supervision follows a more middle-of-the-road or conceptual basis in the construct as it may lie in compromise rather than strictly placing research over values. Eisner's (1982) "artistic supervision" is found in the same schema, and it compares the supervisor to an art critic, a "connoisseur of teaching" (p. 61). Barone (1998) discusses these aesthetic dimensions of supervision as more experiential and values-based in approach toward aesthetic critique rather than scientific authority. In an examination of one schema, then, we can see that procedural and conceptual understandings of supervision may be organized through similar schema, in this case the "derivation of the meaning of teaching" (Tracy, 1998, p. 88). That is to say, Tracy's schema organize supervisory approaches in such a way that supervision with procedural and conceptual bases are found within the same schemata.

Glatthorn (1984) identifies "learning-centered clinical supervision," with the purpose of helping rather than evaluating teachers, a conceptual trend in the analytical framework. However, he follows Hunter's (1982) version of clinical supervision, which is largely based in research on effective teaching, a procedural characteristic in the analytical framework. Likewise, Pajak's (1993) use of clinical supervision as the overarching umbrella for four families of clinical models may be found at different places along the continuum depending on the focus question. Pajak's first family is the original model as described by Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1969), and Mosher and Purpel (1972). The purpose for all three of these clinical supervision models is "to provide support to teachers (to assist) and gradually to increase teachers' abilities to be self-supervising" (Tracy, 1998, p. 92), a focus on teacher development rather than evaluation or assessment. A major unifying principle is collegiality and a trusting relationship. Each version also identifies a different number of stages and varied methodology. This indicates a conceptual basis that maintains a strong appreciation for the procedural aspects of supervision.

Pajak's (1993) second family of clinical supervision is humanistic/didactic. The humanistic side of this family emphasizes the human relationships and emotional dimensions of the supervisor-teacher relationship; hence, it is more conceptual using the tensions within the outlined analytical framework. However, the third family, the technical/rational, is reminiscent of scientific supervision, indicating its procedural basis. Knowledge of effective practice is externally derived, and teaching is a rational practice improved through training in certain techniques. These versions include Hunter's decision-making model, Acheson and Gall's (1997) techniques of clinical supervision and Joyce, Weil, and Showers' (1992) coaching model. The final family in Pajak's categories of models is that of developmental/reflective. Here one finds Glickman's developmental supervision, Costa and Garmston's cognitive coaching, and reflective practice in the work of Schon (1993), Zeichner and Liston (1996), and Smyth (1991). In these approaches the supervisor must be sensitive and non-directive, locating supervision in the conceptual basis of the analytical framework. Smyth (1991), as found in the reflective versions, calls for a critical consciousness recognizing that the technical/didactic version is merely a manner of social control of teachers. He, like Zeichner and Liston (1996), proposes teachers recognize the political dimensions of their teaching and question traditional methods that often go unquestioned. These contextual, values-based models would be located in a conceptual or middle-of-the-road, rather than procedural base.

Tracy and MacNaughton's (1989) means-oriented schema, including traditional and neo-traditional approaches to supervision, is typically used for evaluation and has a set of characteristics that define effective teaching. It would be located more in the procedural frame of the analytical framework. A teacher-concern model in this schema, however, focuses on the teacher's expressed need for assistance. Here, the teacher determines the supervisory focus, placing it in the conceptual basis for understanding. Therefore, once again, there is a schema organizing conceptual and procedural approaches to supervision together. This analysis of the models within similar schema (Tracy, 1998) demonstrates the need for a new organizational framework for supervisors who consider their practice within conceptual and procedural tensions. And, educators should become more comfortable with the ambiguity their analysis may uncover in order to reflect more on their contextual purposes and areas for growth by locating rather than simply naming supervisory practice.

In examining literature in supervision, a few more models or approaches for supervisory practice merit discussion. Sergiovanni (1997) proposes a theory of community supervision. He defines community as "collections of individuals who are bonded together by natural will and who are together bound to a set of shared ideas and ideals" (p. 271). Schools would be restructured around this covenant of ideas and ideals, and leaders and followers would be tied together by this consensual understanding. Teachers are pedagogical leaders in the classroom while supervisors are pedagogical leaders in their support of this teacher development. Educators are accountable, but that is due to their dedication to the community more than any inspectorial sense of evaluation. Sergiovanni's theory would be supported within a conceptual basis for supervision.

Connected to Sergiovanni's community supervision is Starratt and Howells' (1998) supervision as moral agency. In order to build a covenant for a school community, there must be a foundational moral leadership that emphasizes an ethic of caring (Noddings, 1984). If learning and teaching are intrinsically moral actions, then supervision must be restructured as moral action as well.

Supervisors need to converse with teachers about how students are relating their classroom learning to everyday living and to the larger concerns about the community, to their own sense of history and the history of their families, and to the growing intelligibility of the network of relationships that their learning illuminates. (Starratt & Howells, 1998, p. 995)

Such a theory behind supervision indeed appears more values-based, or conceptual, than research-based, but it also runs through the analytical framework so that it could be located from a middle-of-the-road to a conceptual perspective in the procedural conceptual analytical framework.

As schooling, teaching, and learning undergo profound changes, other options for supervisory practice have evolved. Waite (1995) proposes dialogic supervision where supervisors interrogate the meaning behind their own words and the impact they may have on the teacher and the supervisory context. Again, this is contextual and values based supervision. Holland and Obermiller (2000) consider possibilities for postmodern supervision. They state that postmodernism "demands that theory and practice of supervision not be viewed in isolation, but rather be seen as a part of a larger context that includes and gives equal emphasis to teaching and learning" (p. 213). Like Waite's views on supervision, power should be shifted from supervisors and administrators to teachers (teacher-directed, hence conceptually based). Teachers and supervisors recognize knowledge as socially constructed and key into that notion in their teaching and, ultimately, student learning. Supervision is "construed more broadly in terms of the variety of ways that teachers can learn and grow as professionals" (Waite, 1995, p. 223). Coming to an understanding of educational events is an ever-evolving process that requires educators to continually inquire into their meaning. This suggests an ongoing supervisory experience that reinforces postmodern and dialogic supervision within a conceptual basis.

Another approach to supervision is critical inquiry or supervision for liberation as proposed by Smyth (1991). Smyth encourages teachers and supervisors to question current oppressive supervisory tactics and take a proactive stance in revamping supervision for transformation. An "educative" view of supervision would include teachers coming to understand how the

changes necessary for them to overcome social and institutional circumstances of their school lives causes them frustration and how the anxiety ultimately detracts from self-fulfillment. This educative (or 'transformative') perspective rests on the assumption that by assisting

teachers to understand themselves and their world, we make it possible for them to engage in the radical the oppressive conditions that characterize work patterns and social relationships. (Smyth, 1991, p. 77)

Smyth suggests that when teachers adopt this politically informed, reflective pose, they may support one another in reclaiming the classroom. Indeed, this values-based, critical reflection orients supervision more conceptually than procedurally

### ***Implications for professional growth***

The analytical tool for locating supervision provided in this manuscript is intended to provide possibilities for guiding reflection of educators throughout the field. Undoubtedly, scientific management remains prevalent in school supervision and instructional leadership today. However, in order to avoid strictly procedural understandings of scientific arrangements where instructional leaders do not recognize the human and/or ethical presence in teaching and learning, supervisors — and all educators — should reflect on possibilities for a more community-oriented, conceptual understanding of supervision. Supervisors should reflect on power relationships and dialogic supervision in order to create a more collegial atmosphere for collaborative and teacher-directed ventures to succeed. The ultimate beneficiaries of this more collaborative supervision would be the students whose learning is key to instruction and educational growth. By using this framework to locate supervision, educators may focus on both teacher and student growth without losing either in the procedures of supervision. Certainly, depending on contexts and purposes, supervision may fall anywhere on the procedural – conceptual continuum and still be effective.

Educators also need to study a variety of models and approaches to supervision. When supervisors stick with one model or approach they may stagnate and turn that model into a wall, especially if it is intended to spur the professional growth of all teachers with whom they work. It is far more important to recognize a supervisory model as a dynamic process, or a metaphor, for a journey toward professional growth for all educators. One way to do this is to reflect on the tensions within the procedural and conceptual understandings of supervision through this multi-dimensional framework. In particular, clinical supervisors should critically reflect on their practice, whether it is in the neo-traditional (procedurally oriented) or neo-progressive (conceptually oriented) tradition. Have they let their practice become a wall impeding professional growth (procedure) or are they allowing light to shine through the windows of their practice (concepts)? Are they responding to context-bound situations with a conceptual process as a guide or are they reinforcing strictly procedural practice?

Additionally, cross-pollination of models is not a bad thing. Naming a supervisory model is not nearly as important as living a process aimed at professional growth for all involved. Differences in supervisory practice no doubt come about because of instructional leaders' varied philosophical and perspectival bases. These values and beliefs should not be ignored. However, it is important to recognize that certain models and approaches do share similar bases. These bases may be identified within procedural and conceptual frameworks. Educators may engage in professional development by engaging in the reflective process of responding to the questions addressed in locating supervision within this procedural-conceptual analytical framework. When educators continually reflect on who they are and what is their purpose as an educator, they may select from a variety of supervisory models/approaches to create what works best in the situated contexts of teacher and student lives.

Above all, educators need to transcend the steps, stages and procedures of their daily work. In this transcendence they should recognize the dynamic, cyclical, and multidimensional processes of what they do and how their work impacts their professional development, all for the ultimate benefit of K-12 students. When educators come to the realization of the importance of this reflection, they can recognize that accountability and excellence need not only mean standardized rating forms, competency tests and national procedures for supervision of teachers. When aware of the conceptual processes underlying supervision, educators should see the ethical conduct necessary for professional practice and quality education for all contexts. Thus, continued reflection in professional growth and supervision remains appropriate so that educators may cultivate a more dynamic understanding of supervision when necessary and create space for the unlimited possibilities for professional growth.

## References

- Acheson, K.A. & Gall, M. (1997). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.)* New York: Longman.
- Bambino, D. (2002). Redesigning professional development. *Educational Leadership*, 59 (6) pp. 25 – 27.
- Barone, T.E., (1998). Aesthetic dimensions of supervision, in G.R. Firth & E.F. Pajak (eds.) *Handbook of research on school supervision*. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan. pp. 1104 - 1122.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (2001). Beyond certainty: Taking an inquiry stance on practice. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.) *Teachers caught in the action: Professional development that matters*. (pp. 45 – 58). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cogan, M.L. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Costa, A.L. & Garmston, R.J. (2002). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon Publishers.
- Crowther, F., Kaagan, S.S., Ferguson, M., & Hann, L. (2002). *Developing teacher leaders: How teacher leadership enhances school success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Dana, N.F. & Yendol-Silva, D. (2003). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Dufour, R. & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Eisner, E.W. (1982). An artistic approach to supervision, in T.J. Sergiovanni (ed.) *Supervision of Teaching*, Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Flinders, D.J. (1998). Industrial dimensions of supervision, in G.R. Firth & E.F. Pajak (eds.) *Handbook of research on school supervision*. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Garman, N. B. (1982). The clinical approach to supervision, in T.J. Sergiovanni (ed.) *Supervision of teaching*, Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Glanz, J. (2000). Supervision: Don't discount the value of the modern. In J. Glanz & L.S. Behar-Horenstein (eds.), *Paradigm debates in curriculum and supervision: Modern and postmodern perspectives* (Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey) pp. 70 -92.
- Glanz, J. (1998). Histories, antecedents, and legacies of school supervision, in G.R. Firth & E.F. Pajak (eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan) pp. 39 - 79.
- Glatthorn, A.A. (1984). *Differentiated supervision*. Alexandria: VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Glickman, C.D. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glickman, C.D. (1981). *Developmental supervision*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Goldstein, J. & Noguera, P.A. (2006). A thoughtful approach to teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 31 – 37.

- Gottesman, B.L. (2000). *Peer coaching for educators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press/Technomic Books.
- Harris, W.T. (1892). City school supervision. *Educational Review*, 3, 167 – 172.
- Harris, W.T. (1892). City school supervision. *Educational Review*, 3, 167 – 172.
- Holland, P.E. & Obermiller, M. (2000). Possibilities of postmodern supervision, in *Paradigm debates in curriculum and supervision*. (Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey) pp. 212 – 228.
- Hunter, M.C. (1982). *Mastery teaching*. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications.
- Joyce, B., Weil, M. with Showers, B. (1992). *Models of teaching*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Joyce, B., Weil, M. with Showers, B. (1992). *Models of teaching*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (2004). *Teacher leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mosher, R.L. & Purpel, D.E. (1972). *Supervision: The reluctant profession*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Nolan, J.F., Hawkes, B. & Francis, P. (1993). Case studies: Windows onto clinical supervision, *Educational Leadership*, 50, 52 – 56.
- Nolan, J.F. & Hillkirk, K. (1991). The effects of a reflective coaching project for veteran teachers, *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 7, 62 – 76.
- Nolan, J.F. & Huber, T. (1989). Nurturing the reflective practitioner through instructional supervision: A review of the literature, *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 4, 126 - 145.
- O’Sullivan, M.C. (2004). The usefulness of lesson observation in a primary teachers’ INSET programme in Namibia. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 30 (1), 5 – 25.
- Pajak, E.F. (1993). *Approaches to clinical supervision*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon-Publishers.
- Poglinco, S.M. & Bach, A.J. (2004). The heart of the matter: Coaching as a vehicle for professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85 (4), 398 – 400.
- Schon, D.A. (1993). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1997). How can we move toward a community theory of supervision? Wrong theory/wrong practice, in J. Glanz & R.F. Neville (eds.) *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies* (Massachusetts: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, 1997) pp. 264- 280.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starratt, R.J. (2001). *Supervision: A redefinition*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Smyth, J. (1997). Is supervision more than the surveillance of instruction? In J. Glanz & R. F. Neville (Eds.) *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies*. (pp. 286 – 295). Massachusetts: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Smyth, J. (1991). *Teachers as collaborative learners*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Starratt, R.J. & Howells, M.L. (1998). Supervision as moral agency, in G.R. Firth & E.F. Pajak (eds.) *Handbook of research on school supervision*, (New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan), pp. 987-1005.

- Tomlinson, H. (2004). *Educational leadership: Personal growth for professional development*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Tracy, S. J. (1998). Models and approaches, in G.R. Firth & E.F. Pajak (eds.) *Handbook of research on school supervision*. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Tracy, S.J. & MacNaughton, R. (1989). Clinical supervision and the emerging conflict between the neo-traditionalists and the neo-progressives. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 4, 246 – 256.
- Waite, D. (1995). *Rethinking instructional supervision*. Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press. pp. 111-136.
- Zeichner, K.M. & Liston, D.P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

**Figure 1.1: An Analytical Framework for Locating Supervisory Practice: Procedural-Conceptual**

Dynamic Interplay of Multiple Dimensions within Tensions of Supervision			
DIMENSION	TENSIONS		
<b>Leadership</b>	Supervisor - Directed	Collaborative	Teacher - Directed
<b>Purpose</b>	Evaluative	Combination	Growth
<b>Data</b>	Observable	Identifiable	Experiential
<b>Basis</b>	Prescriptive	Guided	Open-ended
<b>Progression</b>	Strict Adherence	Connected	Fluid
<b>Motivation</b>	Research	Compromise	Values
<b>Time</b>	"End-in-sight"	Contextual	Ongoing

**C  
O  
N  
C  
E  
P  
T  
U  
A  
L**  
**P  
R  
O  
C  
E  
D  
U  
R  
A  
L**

**Table 1.1 Guiding Questions for Analytical Framework**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Analytical framework Tensions</b>	<b>Analytical framework Guiding Question</b>
<b>Leadership</b>	Supervisor – Collaborative – Teacher Directed	Who is leading the supervisory experience?
<b>Purpose</b>	Evaluative – Combination – Growth Focus	What is the purpose of the supervisory experience?
<b>Data</b>	Observable – Identifiable - Experiential	What data do you use to describe the supervisory experience?
<b>Basis</b>	Prescriptive – Guided – Open-ended	How does one engage in this supervisory experience? Are there rules to follow?
<b>Progression</b>	Strict Adherence – Connected – Fluid —	What does the progression of the supervisory experience look like?
<b>Motivation</b>	Research – Compromise – Values Based	From where does the motivation for this supervisory experience originate?
<b>Time</b>	“End-in-sight” – Contextual – Ongoing	What kind of time frame surrounds this supervisory experience?