

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF ATTITUDES
in the
MEDICINE HAT
TEACHER SUPERVISION
and
EVALUATION PROJECT**

SANDRA UMPLEBY

A One-Course Project
Submitted to the Faculty of Education
of the University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF EDUCATION

LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA
March, 1989

Professional Staff Attitudes

If prediction is out, we will have to settle for description.
J. Henri Poincaré

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Teacher Evaluation Supervision Project	1
Background to the Proposal	2
Statement of the Problem	3
Significance of the Study	4
RELATED LITERATURE	4
A Historical Perspective	4
Definition of Clinical Supervision	5
Problems and Issues	7
Recent Trends in Supervision	9
Summary	10
PROCEDURE	11
The Selection	12
The Instrument	12
Expectations	14
Results	14
General Conclusions	15
VERBATIM RESPONSES OF PARTICIPANTS	16
Initial Reactions	16
Defining the Terms	18
Relating Past Experiences	19
Contrasting Past Practices with Present	21
Thinking About the Future	22
Student Performance	25
Trust	26
Qualifications, Methods of Supervisory Personnel	28
Summary Comments by Participants	30
SUMMARY STATEMENT	32
REFERENCES	
APPENDIX A Letter	
APPENDIX B Letter	
APPENDIX C Questionnaire	
APPENDIX D Questionnaire	

Introduction

Background to the Teacher Evaluation and Supervision Project

In 1983, Alberta Education, with the publication of the Management Finance Plan, announced its intention of becoming more involved with teacher evaluation policy development. In 1984-85, the Medicine Hat School District #76 reviewed and revised an evaluation policy that had been in place in the district since the mid-seventies. The revised policy encouraged positive professional relationships between supervisor and teacher. It also stressed the clear communication of the district policy to its staff members in the hope of reducing stress levels and improving the effectiveness of instruction. During the process of revision, the system requested input from all employees into the implementation of the policy.

Due to the democratic nature of the evaluation policy developed by the district, a model was sought that would foster the stated criteria and goals. Dr. David Townsend, a member of the Lethbridge Regional office was approached for assistance in setting up a suitable evaluation model for the district. By June of 1985, Dr. Townsend, by now a member of the Faculty of Education, University of Lethbridge, had addressed the administrators of the district about a modified clinical supervision model. In September, 1985, a Steering Committee was struck to guide the Project through its first year, with plans for the future already inherent in its mandate.

Plans for the collection of data regarding the project were made at its inception. Teachers and administrators answered questionnaires after the early introductory sessions. At the end of each training session, participants were asked to take part in five minutes of free writing encapsulating their thoughts and feelings

about the day's events. Participants were also asked to videotape their supervisory practices and these were collected for analysis.

When, in the Spring of 1986, the Medicine Hat Model for Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Project received approval and financing for a three year research grant from the Department of Planning Services, some of the data was therefore already in place.

Proponents of the supervision model are anxious to verify that their model results in happier teachers, improvement of instruction and a concomitant improvement in the performance and attitude of students. The Medicine Hat Model for Teacher Supervision and Evaluation would like to supply the data which would prove or disprove these theories.

Background to the Proposal

As a teacher in Medicine Hat School District #76, I chose to conduct one aspect of the research in the Medicine Hat Supervision Project. The task required that I interview approximately fifteen to twenty teachers and administrators, both involved and uninvolved in the Supervision project in the year 1985-86. The interviews were to elicit personal perceptions and opinions of those chosen by random sample, who then volunteered to submit to an interview. It was hoped that the participants would be open and honest enough about their experiences in the Project so that a broad cross section of personal observations from district personnel could be obtained.

Statement of the Problem

An abundance of theory has been written over the past three decades, pertaining to the benefits of supervision in the educational workplace. Rarely, however, has an entire school district committed time, money and personnel in the wholehearted way that in the Medicine Hat School district is attempting. With few precedents, therefore, Medicine Hat is facing certain questions, the answers to which will only be derived from the personnel involved and then only via their personal experiences.

Because change and innovation is notoriously slow in the educational system, we must ask relevant questions and then respond to the answers. Failure to do so will likely doom this and any innovative attempt. Thus the questions to be addressed in this study concern the effects of implementation of the model on the people involved. These questions pertain to perceptions of district staff about the model and include the issues of time, teacher performance and student performance.

The methodology used included:

- 1) gathering data through personal interviews of the teachers directly involved in the Medicine Hat Model for Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Project.
- 2) gathering data through personal interviews of administrators directly involved with the Medicine Hat Supervision Project.
- 3) gathering data through personal interviews of teachers not directly involved with the Medicine Hat Supervision Project.

Significance of the Study

Because the interviews took place when the initial year of training was just completed, perceptions should have been fresh in the minds of participants. Also, since a full two-thirds of teaching staff had not participated in the Supervision and Evaluation model, there is the opportunity to assess the perceptions of these teachers towards increased supervision by replicating the study in future years.

Related Literature

A Historical Perspective

Evaluative practices have long exerted influences, most of them apparently negative or non-productive, as Arth, Cave and Johnston, (1980) point out:

Alert teachers and administrators are facing the reality that past practices of teacher appraisal have apparently only stifled creativity and innovation and thereby have doomed the school district to timeworn safe practices, old answers and solutions to new problems that have, in general, had the tone of mediocrity (p.220).

Since traditional, externally imposed evaluation models included a component related to salary and status, it is not surprising that prejudice towards them existed. Feldvebel (1980) notes that; "Teacher evaluation and educational accountability both suffer from a legacy of anxiety and distrust that have been associated with them" (p. 145).

In 1974, Dunken and Biddle produced what has since become the classic review of research on teaching. Grimmett (1981) notes that; "It is not surprising that MacKay and Osoba (1978) and Clark (1979) describe Dunken and Biddle's work as a significant landmark in the study of teaching" (p.25). As a component of their research, Dunken and Biddle linked various teacher behaviours to student learning gains. In recent years, a model of teacher supervision has been developed to

capitalize on the new research and to attempt to overcome the anxieties felt by teachers. This new model of supervision, designed to support and coach teachers was called clinical supervision because of its emphasis on the use of data derived from the first hand observation of actual teaching events.

Definition of Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision represents a redesign of the entire supervisory process. This model is based on the notion that professionals must work together as colleagues, whether they are supervisor and subordinate, or peers. The model encourages self-analysis and self-evaluation using specific analytical skills. Contrary to traditional summative evaluation practices, clinical supervision has as its goal the improvement of instructional behaviours to enhance student learning.

As Grimmer (1981) states:

Clinical supervision is a methodology designed to help teachers improve instruction. It is 'supervision up close' (Goldhammer, 1969, p.54) in the 'clinic of the classroom' (Wilhelms in Cogan, 1973, p.ix), where teachers and clinical supervisor work together productively in 'colleagueship' bound by the common purpose of enhancing student learning through improving teacher's instruction (Cogan, 1973, p.68). It represents an approach to supervision that is "basically analytical and whose principal mode of analysis comprises highly detailed examination of teaching behaviour" (Goldhammer, p.368). The emphasis in clinical supervision has tended away from summative evaluation towards the analysis of teaching materials and practices based on the view that the analysis of teaching can be rigorous and systematic, that it should be ongoing, that it requires specific analytical skills and that the professional teacher should be a careful critic of his own practice (Mosher and Purpel, 1972, p.79) (p.23).

Several different cycles have been proposed for the model by such proponents as Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1969) and Reavis (1978). The model proposed for Medicine Hat School District #76 by Dr. David Townsend of the University of Lethbridge, consists of three basic stages:

- 1) Pre Conference. The teacher orients the supervisor to the students, objectives of the lesson and special circumstances. The supervisor and teacher decide on the purposes of the observation and the data collection instruments to be used.
- 2) Observation. The supervisor observes the lesson, using the instruments previously chosen.
- 3) Post Conference. The supervisor and teacher, having analyzed the data collected, jointly discuss a strategy for maintaining and enhancing the quality of instruction. This strategy may vary widely, determined as it will be by the teacher's experience, self-confidence, level of trust, self-awareness and so on. Plans may be made for a future supervision cycle incorporating agreed-upon changes.

The role of the supervisor in this model is very different from general supervisory behaviours. Rather than occupy themselves with such diverse tasks as curriculum development and teacher evaluation, clinical supervisors find themselves in a collegial role. Grimmer (1981) notes that "supervisors may well be held accountable during the 1980's for completing the professional preparation of teachers" (p.27). Koehn and Goens (1977) comment that the relationship between teacher and supervisor does not have to be one of superordinate and subordinate:

My authority as a supervisor will come only from competence and skill. If I am a capable supervisor who can provide sound analyses and observations to teachers based on their identified needs then I will become significant to that person. (p.587).

Bishop and Firth (1977) state that supervisors require "such competencies as observing, assessing, diagnosing, consulting, communicating and training" (p.574).

Ian Dow (1981) in his investigations of collaborative management styles, notes that teachers expect their supervisors to supervise, and respect them for it. However, "related literature indicates that administrators are reluctant to supervise since it may jeopardize their relationships with their teachers" (p.383).

Dow provides research to show that an objectives-oriented process of supervision results in overwhelming votes of confidence in the model by both administrators and teachers. Also "fifty percent of the principals stated that the process was providing measurable benefit to students". Dow insists that "participatory supervision is a must for the Eighties" (p.383).

It must be stated at this stage that the terms clinical supervision and evaluation are not synonymous in this paper. In a synthesis on teacher evaluation, Rath and Preskill (1982) note that researchers like McGreal (1982) believe that "effective practice in evaluation calls for reducing the judgmental components of the process for optimal impact on teaching improvement" still realistically, "summative evaluation is not necessarily intended to be helpful to the teacher...since teachers are evaluated mainly on the basis of criteria without standards" (p.310).

Thus in this proposal, the term evaluation shall be considered that formal practice undertaken for the purposes of written judgment of the quality of teaching under review; supervision has been previously defined in this paper.

Problems and Issues

There has been, to this date, very little research on teacher' or supervisors' perceptions of clinical supervision, Denham (1977) noted that Goldhammer's view of clinical supervision as a discipline in its adolescence was an overly optimistic one; "since the appearance of Goldhammer's book, only two significant pieces have been

added to the literature of the discipline: Cogan's Clinical Supervision and a thematic issue of the *Journal of Research and Development in Education*" (p.33). Alphonso (1975) in a discussion of peer supervision, commented that "available literature on peer supervision as a formal concept is pretty thin . . ." (p. 594).

According to Townsend (1987), there have been only few long-range studies on the effects of clinical supervision, most of them in the United States, and only two of them exceeding two years in duration. Thus, while the theories behind clinical supervision are well-defined, and appear to be sound, there is almost no hard evidence to support these views.

Many researchers do agree on the need to change current evaluation practices, since current methodologies provoke teacher resistance and do not have as their goals improved instruction. Clinical supervision may be able to alleviate both of these concerns.

There are some criticisms of the clinical supervision model. The practicality of the model is a concern of many since, for correct implementation, a lengthy training period is required as well as time during the regular teaching day.

Some see the use of various instruments for collection of observational data as mechanical, and potentially stifling. Others like Sergiovanni (1977) caution against 'false scientism' in the practice of supervision (p.607). Grimmett (1981) expresses concerns related to the static conception underlying the analysis of teaching by clinical supervisors.

Indeed I would argue that the work of MacKay and Marland (1978) exposes a potential gap in the clinical model because the supervisor evaluates the teaching strategy used in terms of preactively set objectives rather than in terms of complex, interactively negotiated modifications of objectives and consequent methods. Supervisory feedback may therefore be misplaced and teaching effectiveness evaluation inappropriately based (p.35).

The successful implementation of the model requires at its foundation the acceptance, trust and support of both teachers and administrators. Supervisory personnel must be clearly seen to be fully informed of the model in order for teacher trust levels to rise. Since this has not been the case in traditional supervisory procedures, much groundwork must be done to overcome these legitimate perceptions.

The clinical model is not used as extensively as it might be. It is possible that the aforementioned problems contribute to this fact.

Recent Trends in Supervision

Recent trends in the use of the clinical supervision model have attempted to alleviate its weaknesses while capitalizing on the model's strengths. One of the greatest factors in the changing roles of supervision is the increased awareness of teachers. Clinical supervision is inherently a democratic model; as teachers learn more about the model and their role in it, two changes occur:

- 1) they demand more of their own supervisors
- 2) they develop competencies which allow them to supervise each other, that is, they move to a 'peer coaching' or 'collegial' model.

Recent trends are capitalizing on these changes. While it is true as Alfonso (1977) notes that; "teachers for generations have maintained a colossal and almost studied ignorance about the classroom behaviour of their peers" (p. 595), this professional isolation is beginning to break down under the kind of supervision that is highly personal. Says Alfonso;

If supervision is primarily a process of observation, analysis, and feedback, then it can lead to the proposition that teachers might, in fact, be their own best supervisors. Who knows best what goes on in a classroom and how it can be made better than teachers themselves? (p.595).

McGee (1977) suggests that there now exist four trends which make collegial supervision models realistic and promising:

- 1) the increased use of teaming situations
- 2) the increased popularity of clinical assumptions and approaches to classroom supervision
- 3) the general upgrading in advanced training among all teachers
- 4) the growing stability in teaching staffs (p.25).

Some researchers have suggested a shift to a business oriented approach. Dow (1981) supports a management by objectives (MBO) approach. In summarizing a study conducted by the University of Ottawa on the Carleton, Ontario Board of Education's results-oriented-system (ROS), Dow (1981) maintains that "by emphasizing the formative evaluation component and de-emphasizing the summative evaluation aspect, a climate of trust and cooperation can be developed. The basic purpose of ROS is to improve the teaching and learning process in the schools" (p.380).

Summary

The purpose of this literature review has been to create a context for the study on teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the supervision model as implemented in 1985 by the Medicine Hat School District #76.

The sections entitled 'historical perspective' and 'definition of clinical supervision' put into perspective the need for a supervision policy in Medicine Hat School District #76.

Traditional concerns with the processes of supervision and evaluation are defined within the section entitled 'historical perspective.' These concerns include:

- 1) the anxieties surrounding traditional evaluation practices
- 2) negative teacher perceptions and teacher resistance to supervision

Current problems facing the clinical supervision model are summed up in the section 'problems and issues.' These include:

- 1) the lack of research on any long term clinical supervision model
- 2) the practicality of the model in a classroom setting
- 3) the potential for a mechanical or static approach to the model
- 4) the need for full support and involvement on the part of all administrative personnel.

The final section 'recent trends in supervision' reviews the literature pertaining to the evolution of the clinical model to a truly collegial model, involving peer supervision. Another alternative shows a shift to a traditional business approach, showing that the clinical supervision model is not considered by all to be the answer.

Procedure

In the absence of a formal plan for research in 1985-86, Medicine Hat School District #76 officials arranged that I interview approximately fifteen to twenty teachers in order to ascertain their perceptions and concerns about the supervision project. The Task required two preliminary assignments:

- 1) select school district personnel for the interviews
- 2) create an instrument with which to interview them

The Selection

A volunteer group was chosen for the interviews since forcing teachers to give up their time might introduce a negative variable into the responses. The individuals were selected by stratified random sample from each of three lists -- administrators, involved teachers and uninvolved teachers. Administrators were required to be involved in the project. They were each asked to select a teacher willing to be involved as a partner for the 1985 - 86 school years. All other professional staff were 'uninvolved' for the purposes of this study. The selected individuals were sent a letter of introduction (Appendix B) from the Assistant Superintendent, Dr. Harold Storlien. Of the fifty letters sent, twenty-one positive responses were received by the due date requested. Two further acceptances were returned after this date but these were not entered into the project since the required numbers had been achieved.

The Instrument

A questionnaire was created by members of the Project Steering Committee. (Appendices C, D, & E) Because one of the groups was not involved in the project in 1985-86, some of the questions for these participants differed with respect to knowledge of the project and willingness to participate. Otherwise, the questions in each of the three groupings were consistent. Generally, the questions attempted to assess the perceived effects of the model on district staff and students. As part of the interview strategy interviewees were given an opportunity to comment freely. Since, as stated earlier, the successful implementation of the model requires the trust and support of teachers and administrators, it was decided that evidence of such positive indicators would indicate an acceptance of the model. Each volunteer was sent a

copy of the questions ahead of time in order that anxiety about the interview might be reduced. As well, it was hoped that this procedure would result in a more comprehensive interview. The interview instrument was tested by using the twenty-first volunteer as a pilot. As a result of this procedure, certain questions were changed somewhat. For example, a definition of the term evaluation as well as a definition of the term supervision was added because, in the pilot interview, I learned that this distinction might be important to some individuals.

Participants were asked certain demographic information such as grades taught, experience, length of tenure and the number of times they had been evaluated in the past. The term supervision was defined by each person and perceptions were elicited about the particular model of supervision utilized in the school district in the past year. The participants were also asked if they thought that the new model would result in any changes in student behaviour or attitude. As well as comments about the methods and qualifications of district supervisory personnel, participants were encouraged to give their suggestions for an ideal supervisory situation. An open-ended request for comments or concerns gave each person an opportunity to express any thoughts that the interviewer had not identified.

The interviews were audio-taped so that the interviewer could focus on the subject and encourage a stronger interpersonal relationship during the actual session. It was felt that there would be less chance of missing important comments using this method and less concern over the use of verbatim comments in the written report.

Time for the interviews was set up at the convenience of the participants in their own schools . Most of the interviews were scheduled after school, usually in the

volunteer's classroom office or staffroom. Each individual was contacted personally by the interviewer in order to further encourage a positive contact.

Expectations

It was hoped that this study would result in a wide cross section of perceptions of the project as they existed among School District #76 personnel, in 1985 - 86. A study of this nature offers insight into the prevailing attitudes of participants towards supervision and evaluation. It might also offer a benchmark against which other studies may be judged

Results

This study has resulted in a descriptive analysis of the perceptions, opinions and preferences of three groups of individuals in Medicine Hat School District #76 - administrators, involved teachers and uninvolved teachers participating in the Medicine Hat Model for Teachers Supervision and Evaluation. The interviewees comprised eight females and seven males, nine elementary and six secondary personnel. The sample ranged from first year teachers to those with 35 years of experience. Of particular interest is the teacher intern who was required to be involved. Specifically, of the six involved teachers who offered to be interviewed, five completed their interviews. Of the nine uninvolved teachers who responded to the original request, six participated. Four administrators submitted to interviews from the original six who agreed to do so. In the case of each missed interview, original schedules were preempted by school matters and could not be rescheduled before the end of June. The problems were thus logistic and probably did not

represent a change of heart. Of interest was the number of uninvolved teachers who volunteered to participate.

The interviews took place between May 21 and June 12, 1986, on school days only. All interviews were conducted on the interviewee's home ground, either in their classroom, office or staff room, as was originally intended. They had earlier received a copy of the questions to be asked along with a formal letter from the interviewer and the assistant superintendent of personnel. The interviewer also attached a personal handwritten note to better explain the project. It was felt by the interviewer that these efforts contributed to the comfort level and the trust level of the participants. Many of the interviewees' responses ranged widely and openly within the questions asked, resulting in interviews taking more time than expected. This may have been enhanced by my professional acquaintance with twelve of the fifteen participants. Ten Medicine Hat schools were represented by the sample.

General Conclusions

If, as hypothesized earlier, one of the most important aspects of any innovative educational endeavour is the development in stakeholders of a positive regard for that endeavour, then the project begun by the Medicine Hat School District is already successful.

All persons interviewed spoke affirmatively of the changes actual or possible that the project was promulgating for them, their colleagues and their pupils. While many revealed an initial wariness or hesitancy toward the model, due perhaps to a traditional teacher conservatism towards innovation, they gave evidence of perceptions that had changed in a positive way. No one interviewed thought that the

project should be dropped altogether although many had reservations about its costs in time and human resources.

This consistent response deserves to be followed up after the project has become more solidly entrenched in the school district's culture. Will the valued attributes of the model continue to outweigh the constraints of time and human energy? Will the model shift from its clinical supervision roots to acquire a vitality and character that is Medicine Hat's own? Will this 'character' ingratiate itself into the very ethos of the school district in such a way as to become a tacit part of every decision made?

Verbatim Responses of Participants

It is useful to examine directly statements made by the participants in this study that have led to such conclusions.

Initial Reactions

Administrators admitted to having certain concerns about the project introduced to them in June, 1985 by David Townsend.

I was quite apprehensive when I started because I didn't know what this was all about.

Past experience with evaluators has been terrible . . . I had taken a course once before so I didn't feel too bad about it.

I read about it in the newspaper. I agree with it but I would have hoped that the school district would have touched bases with us first. We were not consulted. At the beginning of the school year, a few feathers got ruffled. I remember one teacher flew off the handle and said, 'you aren't going to tape me'. I'm quite sure today she feels different about it.

I was one of the original instigators -- I took my first course fifteen years ago. So it is a good review but I'm not sure how productive it is for me.

Teachers involved in their first year of training offered similar reservations.

I was volunteered. I was worried. A guy has to wonder, not knowing what it was all about, going in. I was kind of wary.

I had done some team teaching so the potential was obvious. So I'm favourably disposed but I'm concerned it's going to be limited. If everyone has access to the same skills, guidelines and ground rules, then it will be ideal.

This last quote alludes to the importance for all staff, teachers, and administrators, to have access to the necessary training. Townsend (1987) describes training as one of the components which must be in place for a model of supervision and evaluation to be effective. (p.26)

Not surprisingly, several of the uninvolved teachers admitted that their initial feelings included a sense of being left out.

I know about the project through my principal. I was excluded because this is my year for a formal evaluation. I felt a little bit hurt but I have been told that the project would continue. I was at the fall meeting - I was excited at the non-judgmental approach.

I went to the fall meeting but I feel hesitant. I have not had much feedback from the involved teachers, so I don't know the specifics. I do know that one has to videotape.

I've heard a little bit about their feelings but not terribly much about exactly what they are doing when they go off for a holiday.

All the uninvolved teachers interviewed were aware of the project, either because they had attended a district-wide informational meeting called by the school superintendent in the fall of 1985 or through informal conversations with friends and colleagues.

I was aware because of the fall meeting with Dr. Townsend. I also talked with two close colleagues who are involved. I sensed some reluctance at first - what does this project mean?

I knew about it through round table discussions, particularly with the intern at our school.

Thus while a number of interviewees had prior knowledge of the concept of supervision through course work and through David Townsend's activities in the

school district, all showed initial reluctance to engage in the model. The intern and the administrators were all 'volunteered', due to the top down imposition of the model on staff. Reactions to that reality ranged from wariness to weariness as in the case of an involved teacher who said, "It is a good thing but will probably be redundant for me."

All teachers knew about the model through their principals or colleagues, or through a district meeting which they had voluntarily attended. The gap between knowing about the model and knowing the model itself produced feelings of hesitancy, reluctance, worry and some cynicism.

Basically, I sense a resignation that this is the way it is going to be and if we are going to move in this direction, this is the best way.

Despite these concerns, several teachers expressed optimism about what they did know, using terms such as 'favourably disposed' 'excited' and 'aware of obvious potential'. Two teachers, one involved and one uninvolved, expressed no personal reactions to the model.

Defining the terms

During the pilot interview, it became clear that terms had to be defined. The words 'supervision' and 'evaluation' appear in the title of the Medicine Hat model. At the time of the interviews, the district had not defined these terms in print. For several of the interviewees, semantics were critically important.

There is a power relationship implicit in both terms. Both terms leave me uncomfortable. We should use the most neutral term possible. I'd prefer 'collegial interaction' for what we're trying to do. Considerable time has been spent getting people on a certain emotional tack, therefore the terms used are important. 'Semantics' are not irrelevant.

There is no difference between the terms. It's semantics. If someone comes in and he's an administrator, as far as I'm concerned that's summative. There will be a written report somewhere.

I think there is definitely a difference. I see evaluation as someone coming in and assessing your capabilities for tenure purposes or for a job. Whereas supervision is a remedial sort of thing, peers helping out peers, to try and improve the quality of their teaching. I haven't received a lot of quality supervision.

All other interviewees essentially agreed with the last person quoted; several of them alluded to the fact that administrators do not need to be involved in supervision. This reference to practices known as peer coaching or collegial supervision actually predicted a shift in direction for the Medicine Hat model from that of clinical supervision. The notion of teachers helping teachers has become a basic tenet in the implementation of the model.

Relating past experiences

One of the possible reasons for the reluctance of district staff to involve themselves wholeheartedly in the model was stated by the teacher who said:

"I haven't received a lot of quality supervision".

Evidently most of them haven't experienced a lot of quality evaluation either. And instead of seeing this new model as a way of improving their lot, district staff were apparently afraid of receiving more of the same under a different guise. These negative feelings were typical of responses about past experiences with supervisory practices:

I had a couple of people say they just wanted to come in and visit fast. That they'd be in some time this morning. I felt quite tense. And they'd just drop in and I really didn't feel I got any feedback. They'd say 'it was a good lesson'. But I felt that it wasn't specific feedback so I didn't find it helpful. I have also had the chance to ask someone to come in. I felt happier with that because there was something specific I wanted them to observe. It helps when you focus on something (an uninvolved teacher).

I have had no supervision in the past in my definition of what supervision is [a helping process] (a teacher with 10 years experience).

I've been supervised on numerous occasions in the past. I didn't get any feedback and I didn't ask. It was forced on me. I've asked about the model and I found out that I could tell the person what I wanted them to observe. That would help a lot more.

I've never been supervised by anyone with experience at the primary level (involved grade one teacher).

Past experience with evaluators has been terrible (administrator with 15 years experience).

There's been ambiguity on the part of supervisors about what they're doing, supervision or evaluation.

About four years ago I went through an evaluation. I was uptight. I wasn't asked to get involved at all and I wasn't very happy with the situation (teacher with 11 years experience).

I've been formally evaluated once and had informal drop ins by department heads or principals maybe three or four times. The visits were regular in the sense that everybody was being visited but there was no regular agenda. There was no briefing or debriefing and there was no report being compiled, as far as I know. These were not supervisory (teacher with 15 years experience).

Assuming my definition [supervision and evaluation synonymous], reports in the past have been fair (teacher with 19 years experience).

I have never received supervision, only evaluation, and none of my evaluators ever told me that I needed to improve in this or that. It was always very positive. But I often didn't feel very good about some things and I think I would have liked a more accurate evaluation of myself. It was always a one shot thing. In many cases, I didn't even know they were coming. It really didn't make an awful lot of difference whether they were coming or not; I wouldn't have changed my tactics anyway (teacher with 35 years experience).

This last quote probably elucidates the experiences of most long term teachers regarding evaluations. Evaluation practices were not formulated to encourage professional growth and, as this teacher states firmly, no changes were about to happen just because of an evaluation.

Administrators were not quite so vehement when describing their former supervisory practices.

Over the years I've been a principal, I've developed my own philosophy. Work with teachers to improve and only then, if improvement is not forthcoming, then it should appear in an evaluation report. I have done three courses on clinical supervision so I'm quite comfortable with that. This new model is ideal but my personal feeling is that it will never be implementable.

I've had a couple of half courses on this kind of thing. I thought I could do the pre observation conferences pretty well. I'm now more goal-directed. I guess this teacher supervision and evaluation has always been an area I've been interested in. I have always collected information on it and read a little bit about it (principal with 14 years experience).

I'm still a student, still learning. I see positive changes now in my handling of teacher supervision. I am getting more and more confident (department head with 19 years experience).

Contrasting Past Practices with Present

As the department head indirectly revealed his former supervisory practices, many interviewees commented on the model by contrasting present practices with past ones.

The evaluation policy was basically a very subjective thing. People would visit your room and make an opinion and end up with some type of report. Whereas now some informative type of report will be done but over several visits and over quite a length of time. I like what's happened.

Interestingly, the evaluation policy alluded to has not changed. Practices used in its implementation have changed.

I was quite apprehensive when I started because I didn't know what this was all about. But having gone through the exercises, I feel quite comfortable and I think maybe something positive may come out of it as far as the teachers are concerned. Working with my colleagues, I find it very gratifying that we don't have these barriers that I'm going into their classrooms as an administrator. Now we can have a free flow of ideas (department head).

Everyone thought that the big axe was going to fall on their heads. I think they're seeing now that that is not the case at all. I don't know whether it is trust or just being aware of what is involved - seeing what another person is going through and seeing that it is not stressful or damaging or threatening.

At the beginning of the year, I had a supervisor who didn't really know (and I didn't really know), if he was there to evaluate me for school board purposes or whether he was there to give me some help and suggestions. Towards the end of the year, there was more positive input as to how the lesson went and what could possibly be done to improve. It was a more give and take situation. In the long run, that will be very useful, and there would be a snowball effect. I think it is important to get everyone involved.

There has been a fair bit of sharing of nuts and bolts. It has been good in terms of observation. What has developed out of these observations has been the more important thing for us. And I don't think that it would have happened otherwise, [without the model].

I am going through an evaluation right now and I must say that I love the approach the principal is now using. I commented to him that I am very pleased with the approach because it is different from in the past. I have never once felt that he was sitting there judging my situation because he sat with me prior and we discussed what I wanted him to look for. He was very non-threatening and I was totally relaxed and I could get him involved and he wasn't upset by it. Four years ago, I went through an evaluation and it was entirely different. I wasn't asked to get involved at all and I wasn't very happy with the situation.

This teacher, while not yet involved in the model has clearly felt what are for her, positive affects of the implementation of the model through her principal's new practices. He was also her evaluator four years ago.

Thinking About the Future

When asked about continuing in the project in the coming years, or joining the project in the case of uninvolved teachers, every person interviewed spoke in the affirmative but many raised the questions of time. There were several unique ideas for solving the 'time' problem.

I think if [the model] is going to get off the ground they have got to keep it going. The [involved] teachers are much more in favour of this. The uninvolved teachers have a pretty good feeling about it. But you need enough time to do it. It will be five years before you see the effects. We're trying to get professional development funds to get this year's project teachers working with other teachers. We haven't got them paired as yet. That's what we'll do if we get the funds. I have it written up. Really what we are trying to do is set it up in a way that people won't see this as just more

work piled on them. If you're going to put in the work, you're going to get time (administrator).

I think we have done the good soft sell to most teachers. You have to give this time and I think the schools have the time to do it. But it's going to be a real time consumer. We've got to do the best we can to borrow time, not only for administrators to do it but for teachers, too. We have applied for an intern and we'd like to use the intern part of the time to free teachers up so that they can work with another teacher. Another thing we talked about was making a time spot on the timetable a couple of times per week when the principal and vice principal would be available for that kind of thing. Another idea might be if the district really believed in it, they could hire a couple of subs full time and just share them around (administrator).

The [involved teachers] love it. They think there is a lot of good in it. [Uninvolved teachers] are fearful - of the unknown, I guess. No matter how much I encourage them and say there is nothing to worry about, I hear through the grapevine that the teachers who haven't been involved are concerned. That's a problem I hadn't foreseen. I thought my staff felt pretty easy about it but you see, my perceptions in that area were wrong. At this school we could use a half-time teacher involved as a supervisor of instruction. It has to be a master teacher - one who coaches and helps teachers along - a friend of the teachers, someone they could go to with their problems. I think we are long overdue to have an instructional supervisor - a foreman if you will. There's not the time in administration, as much as I'd like to do it. So somebody should be there to do it but I don't think it will come. In education we try to get something for nothing all the time (administrator).

I think this project is quite positive because we exchange ideas and learn from each other. But there's one condition. If we as administrators do not have adequate time to go and supervise the work that's going on and then you try a makeshift arrangement where you bring subs into the classroom, then I'm a little doubtful of the project. If I have a period [in the timetable] in which I can do supervision and my teachers are teaching in that period...that would work. I'm not comfortable requesting one of the vice-principals to supervise. If I'm going to do supervision and I've got fourteen or fifteen teachers in my department, and if I'm going to see them two or three times a year, then you can see the mathematical numbers. I like the project. Give me time and I'll do it (department head).

Teachers were also very concerned about time, though from a different perspective than administrators. Interestingly, one teacher saw the expansion of

supervisory practices on her part as being detrimental rather than beneficial to her curricular requirements:

I am not willing to be involved to any greater extent that right now. I have a new reading series and I'm planning to teach my Math without the benefit of a specific text. I'm still bogged down in the theory more that the practical aspects of the model (involved teacher).

When building the timetable, priority must be given for supervisory practices. Something else must be taken off. Substitutes are not the answer (involved teacher).

It's going to take a lot of time and dedication to get to that point [peer coaching]. It will have to be an ongoing thing. Let's face it, to have a sub come in is twice as much work for you to prepare . . . but I think the way around that is to get some good positive results from this thing (involved teacher).

I know I'm going to get directly involved regardless. I can see it as an inevitable thing. So it is a matter of when I get involved. The only drawback that I see and the feelings I get from people involved in it, is the time element. I see a lot of frustration around me - trying to arrange classes to go for training - trying to arrange times that they are videotaped. Somehow if they could separate it - take it out of the school setting, whether it is in-service days, or on weekends or before school begins or something. I just see the frustration coming from the fact that it is another thing to worry about. It is certainly worthwhile and as I said it's inevitable so it is something that I'd like to be trained in (uninvolved teacher).

I know it's a very expensive thing right now but in the long run, we are going to save money. I think student behaviour changes with teacher attitudes (uninvolved teacher).

This last quote is taken from a teacher who was hired as a 'helping teacher' in Saskatchewan in the 1960's and saw her role at that time as an instructional supervisor and peer coach. She alluded to the fact that a confident, well-prepared teacher couldn't help but have an effect on her students' behaviours. Thus any 'helping' we can give one another in the classroom setting has to be of value to both teacher and student. The issue of student performance was raised by several other participants in their responses.

Student Performance

It is not necessary to gauge improvements in student performance for a successful project. If the project is indexed to student performance, it is doomed to failure.

[Regarding changes in student behaviour] - there's nothing. Except that they are getting used to seeing me in their classrooms. If you were to start a class on time, for example, without wasting time, then you'd get everyone in high gear and start working. But that's administrative. That's a small thing really - insignificant impact.

I think that the better the teaching is done in the classroom, the better the reaction the kids are going to have. I haven't seen anything yet. But I hope there will be that outcome. If it doesn't, there isn't much it's doing.

If this is making teachers teach better, more effectively, then we will get results. I wouldn't worry about measuring student progress. If teachers feel happier in their teaching or are aware of more things about their teaching, then that is what really counts.

I am talking about something that I witnessed this year. There was this student in one particular class who was causing a problem and somebody else went in to observe the classroom and provided feedback on how this child could be helped with her specific problem. I have seen some change because I also teach this student. I guess in a way it was because of supervisory training. I think it would be quite positive in helping specific students.

[Regarding observable students outcomes] there is no question [that they will be affected]. Generally you find it much better organized. At least when I took the course [on supervision] two years ago, I found I was much better organized. I knew what I was doing. Things just seemed to go a lot more smoothly which translates into improved student performance. No question.

I don't think that it has been going on long enough in our school where I can actually see this change [in student behaviour]. I find this model will bring out a different attitude towards students through not making value judgments, spending time with students when they are in trouble. It is worth the effort because you can see the joy in their faces.

While most teachers addressed this issue from the perspective of the model's effect on student marks and behaviour, this teacher commented on a more personal impact. The other interviewees were decidedly split on the importance or relevance

of student performance to the success of the model. This is indeed an issue worthy of specific focus at another time. The relationship of student attitudes, and student behaviours to student performance on academic tests is being documented elsewhere. These respondents were clearly raising several different issues in their comments on this topic. Whether improved student outcomes will be an indicator of the success of the model or not is an unresolved issue. These respondents are clearly divided in opinion.

Trust

Another theme that is clear throughout these interviews is that of trust. Even the nineteen year veteran who stated perhaps cynically that supervision is synonymous with evaluation, spoke of trusting his superiors to do their job fairly. This person also spoke of a notion of collegiality, that does after all, fit the Medicine Hat model:

It has to be a small group of people who have developed that trust situation. Then I can see that coaching model - yes.

[Regarding the qualifications district personnel], the only person I have dealt with is my department head and he's involved in training right now. I have full confidence in his ability to look at those areas [in which he feels qualified]. He's commented that this year he'll look at these things and then, as he's trained and more experienced, he'll be able to look at other things on the next go-round.

This teacher then reaffirmed that she trusts what her department head is saying, because of his honesty about his own training and experience:

I trust the person coming into my room. I don't know what the training procedures are but if I didn't trust him, that would certainly change things.

This teacher related the importance of trust in her future dealings with district personnel:

I would be a lot more uncomfortable having one of these gentlemen in my classroom. I guess it's that personal trust - it's that one to one. Coming in from the outside is different. It would strike me more as an evaluation than a helping. I think the best helper that I could have is somebody within my school. Even a better helper than my department head would be someone at my grade level, my subject area so that it gets closer and closer to home. The closer it gets, the more trust I guess I have

This comment appears to offer a potential explanation for the primary teacher's comment noted earlier that she had never been supervised by a primary specialist.

Other participants who mentioned trust seemed to echo this teacher's sentiments.

My supervision has been very open, very frank, very honest. That's the only way you develop trust. I feel that if you have a sense of trust with one another, the world is open to you (administrator).

I guess there is a trust thing there (regarding the teachers' good acceptance of the model) and I don't know whether it is trust or just being aware of what is involved (administrator).

The helping teacher from Saskatchewan elaborated on her role and how important the development of trust had been between her and her clients:

I never sensed that [trust] was not there after they realized that I was not in an evaluative role. [There were] no judgments. It was a totally non-judgmental type of thing.

A trusting view was expressed by the intern:

Until someone does something that would make me feel otherwise, I tend to trust them.

The opposite perspective was described by the teacher who said:

I have difficulty seeing, for example, how I could be comfortable in an evaluative setting if I were not comfortable on a colleague to colleague basis. I think it works up rather than down.

One department head described different scenarios when teachers do and do not trust one another:

[My partner] is a very positive, hard working person - the type of person who won't sit back and criticize. He is really a delight and a pleasure to work with. I'm learning from him and he's learning from me. But I know of other teachers in the department of whom one must be very careful because they are quick to snap back at you. They become defensive. They think that they have taught for so many years that they know it all. So it becomes a different ball game altogether. There is no form of interaction

Qualifications and Methods of Supervisory Personnel

Teacher interviewees were asked to comment on their perceptions of the qualifications and methods of their supervisory personnel, both district and school based. Comments were generally positive about their in-school supervisors but decidedly more reserved regarding central office administrators.

My principal is good generally - non-judgmental and positive in approach but he does not have any teaching experience at the grades one, two and three levels in the main subject areas. So I feel that he isn't able to see whether I'm teaching effectively. There is no primary expert in Central Office. One person is excellent but I found others who are on the judgmental side (primary teacher).

School administrators try to be global but things aren't specific enough. When attention is focused [on specific subject areas] then it's more fruitful. I know so little about the qualifications and methods of district staff but in this model, everyone appears to be on the same footing. Everyone has access to the same skills, guidelines and ground rules. That's the only way to create change (secondary school teacher).

[About the principal and vice-principal], yes, [I'm comfortable with their qualifications] but I still feel that I could be getting more specific feedback. I feel that they are qualified but [supervision] still could be done in a better way. [Central office administrators] have been quite helpful anytime somebody has been in to see me. They have been positive but they have always provided something I can work on. I think that is a key point. You are always feeling within yourself that there is something you could do to change, to make things better and it's nice when someone gives you an idea you can work on. So even though I always feel a little anxious when someone comes into my room, I felt quite comfortable in the way they went about it because they discussed what they had seen and what they were going to look for (elementary teacher).

The uninvolved elementary teacher who was delighted with the changes in her principal's supervisory behaviours had this to say about district personnel:

I must say that I am very grateful to the Superintendent, Dr. Sauer, and his initiative to go ahead and get this [project] going. He's a progressive fellow who gets things done.

[School based administrators] have been helpful; they've always provided something I could work on. I've been anxious whenever district people have been in but quite comfortable about how they went about it (elementary teacher).

Another elementary teacher became concerned about semantics:

I sometimes get confused a bit with qualifications. Because if qualifications also mean experience, do we qualify? Or does it mean degrees held? I think if a teacher needs some advice then that teacher should have the prerogative to make his or her own selection of whom they wish to get help from -- regardless of how many degrees someone has in a particular area. [About Central Office people], I really don't think they are with it as much as the teachers right in the classroom. And I really don't think that they know what really goes on in the classroom. Of course, all that is left for them to do is to make assumptions and assumptions aren't always accurate. They are not directly involved with students enough that they should have an ultimate say. The superintendents, they see you maybe at a one shot type of thing and that may not be your best time. I feel that if it has to come to more [supervisory practices], a principal or vice-principal are with it day to day. And I like the idea of having teachers involved.

This uninvolved teacher gave clear evidence of typical supervisory practices that Medicine Hat is seeking to replace.

[Regarding in-school administration], I'm old fashioned enough to believe that [supervision] is their function. That's what they are there for. If I disagree with what they say, then I will have a talk with them. But as far as their qualifications are concerned, given the context of the situation, then it is fine. [Regarding district administrators], they're fine, given what they are trying to do. I believe that this is as good as it's going to get with what they've got right now. And I'm not talking about [Bruce] Joyce. I think what they have is fine. I can live with it (19 year secondary school teacher).

The administrators in this survey were asked how they felt about Central Office involvement in the year 1985-86. As well as commenting favourably on this matter, general comments about their colleagues were also often included.

I think [Central Office] involvement really isn't necessary at this stage of training. But I think they are going to have to become pretty involved to keep things going and there is going to have to be a fair amount of encouragement. Supervision of the supervisors maybe. I think maybe that [teachers] hope that those people will work on the same wavelength as everybody else. The people doing the supervising [the principals and vice-principals] have got to have the right attitude towards [the project] too. Most [administrators] are pretty positive towards it. I can see a difference from September 'til now. The first classes we sat in, they were so negative.

I think the Central administration could be more involved than they are. I mean, the coaching model says that they should come around to the schools and touch base with us. Principals and vice-principals need to be available for that kind of thing.

To tell you the truth, [district personnel] are more involved than I expected them to be. They've got a lot of work to do and if they involve themselves in all of this, that's a lot of time. But of course, if they are going to motivate others, they have to show up. I'm pleased. I know for a fact that some administrators don't believe in [their need to supervise for improvement of teaching]. It is not [the administrator's] responsibility to work on improvement. Professionals should seek self-improvement and if they can't perform that's it.

This administrator stressed the fact that not all administrators had bought into the model. His view was certainly supported by another administrator:

[Central Office personnel] have tried something very positive here when you think about other districts out there. Nobody's doing it district-wide. But I think as the old guard goes by the board and younger people come in, it will have much more effect.

Summary Comments by Participants

All interviewees were asked if they would like to make general comments, to give them an opportunity to reiterate important points or to introduce additional information. Not all participants chose to do either; there were however some interesting and diverse points made.

We need extra teachers right now and we don't have the dollars and cents. They are throwing this project at us. It's nice, but they don't have the dollars and cents. Now this is the problem we have. So then how are we going to see this project as being extremely successful. We've introduced the idea to

our system and we'll say that Medicine Hat is one jurisdiction in all of Alberta that has instituted this program. When you talk about its being effective, then you'd like for us to go into classrooms X number of times per year and this is not going to happen because of money and time. You've got so many programs to teach and so few teachers. So there's not much room to manoeuvre in and [my principal] says 'I can't help. We'll have to make the best of it'. Well if that's the answer you get, then I wonder (department head).

I'll simply say one thing about [the project] and that is that we have not finished. I know I'm not. For example, report writing. I don't know if we are well trained enough to write the kind of report that would terminate a teacher. I, honest to God, couldn't write you a report that terminated a teacher. But don't broadcast that (principal).

The biggest thing about the project is time. It is generally felt that more time is needed to do the project. This needs to be thought out by the powers that are going to make the decisions. We have to be patient and not expect miracles to happen. If we are convinced that this is a good thing, we should be willing to do the things necessary to make it work (principal).

[In the training sessions], I thought there was too much time spent on view tapes of pre and post conferences. I would have liked to observe more teaching situations (elementary teacher).

I feel very strongly that teachers in this school district who have expertise or talents or experiences in other school districts are not being used. Female teachers are often not considered for roles where decisions are being made. I really feel that there has been a lot of unfairness in that area particularly (female elementary teacher).

I think we should have another district meeting to explain what has gone on (involved elementary teacher).

I'm thrilled that [the project] is going on here and that we are starting on it because it's going to have lots of positive results. I am sure that it will help many of us to perform better and [that will result in] a whole chain of reactions along the way (elementary teacher).

I think perhaps I'd like to have a meeting again at the team teaching centre to explain what has gone on. [Dr. Townsend] explained what was supposed to happen and we all wondered. Now that something has happened, I think it would be helpful if we had a meeting (uninvolved elementary teacher).

This project takes away from the isolation teachers feel. It is causing attitudinal changes that are subtle. I hope not too much focus is placed on the evaluation bandwagon. Training must continue so there are trained people in every school. The importance of this project to staff development is critical. Usually most curriculum changes stop at the classroom door. But

with the kind of interaction between teachers that this [model] promotes, changes could really happen. We must be careful that we don't try to measure the model through statistics. It's most important effect will be philosophical (secondary teacher).

Summary Statement

Writing as I am from the vantage point of 1988-89, I must concur with the teacher last quoted. The project has caused and continues to cause attitudinal changes that are subtle. As shown here, it is also directly responsible for a lessening of the negativity that has typically accompanied supervisory practices.

The very act of involving district staff in the development of the model reflects the basic principle of collegiality inherent in it. It is possible that the level of acceptance apparent from the first year of inception stems from this sense of involvement, even though its imposition was based on the top-down procedure. It is even likely that the positive perceptions recorded in these voluntary interviews were in part due to the pleasure of being asked at all. As Kauchak, Peterson and Driscoll (1985) say:

At a pragmatic level, the views of teachers on the validity of various teacher evaluation practices influences their acceptance of these practices and ultimately their levels of support for the total system (p.32).

Thus, the inherent democratic nature of the model, once acknowledged by participants, leads to a paradigm shift that has many ramifications. Empowerment, trust building, and collegiality emerge as new realities in the professional lives of teachers and administrators, contrasting sharply with Blumberg's (1980) 'cold war'. There is also a new emphasis on the obligations of supervisors in the professional development of teachers.

This study shows there are also many valid concerns, both about the model and its implementation. Teachers and administrators are concerned with that precious

commodity 'time' and how best to utilize it on a daily basis. On a broader perspective several participants know that such changes as Medicine Hat is trying to incorporate will take years to manifest themselves and must be allowed time to develop. Long range district plans must reflect this. Change and innovation in education is rarely successful, and then only slowly.

Other concerns include the practicality of the model at the school level, the reliability of certain administrators and emphasis on student outcomes. The interviews show a lack of consensus on these issues.

Despite the concerns, my investigations show that perceptions in the first year of the projects moved from the tentative, the cynical or the anxious to attitudes that were hopeful or clearly positive. Support for the potential of the project was unanimous for those involved in it. All but one of the uninvolved teachers indicated a willingness to become involved in the future; the dissenter offered personal reasons.

These perceptions auger well for the continued success of the model. It is my contention that this success will have an impact on everything we do in this district, from policy making to professional relationships.

If we are consistent in our adherence to the vision that this model reflects, its impact on the education system will be profound.

References

- Alfonso, R. J. (1977) Will peer supervision work? *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 594-601.
- Arth, A. A., Cave, B. & Johnston, J. H. (1980). Evaluation paranoia: an examination of the examiner. *The Clearing House*, 53(5), 220-223.
- Bishop, L. J. & Firth G. F. (1977) New conceptions of supervision. *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 572-579.
- Blumberg, A. (1980) *Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war* (2nd ed.). Berkley, CA.
- Bohnert, D., MacNaughton, R. & Rogus, J. (1978) Individualizing teacher evaluation. *Contemporary Education*, 1978, 49(2), 96-101
- Brody, J. A. (1977) A good teacher is harder to define than find. *The American School Board Journal*, 164(7), 25-28.
- Bryant, G. & Haack, F. (1977) Appraisal: peer centered and administrator-centered. *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 608-612.
- Cawelti, G. & Reavis, C. (1980) How well are we providing instructional improvement services? *Educational Leadership*, 38(3), 236-240.
- Denham, A. (1977) Clinical supervision: what we need to know about its potential for improving instruction. *Contemporary Education*, 49(1), 33-37.
- DeWitt, W. (1977) Instructional supervision. *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 589-595.
- Dow, I. I. (1981) Participatory supervision in education: a must for the eighties. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 27(4), 375-386.
- Eckard, P. J. & McElhinney, J. H. (1977) Teacher evaluation and educational accountability. *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 613-618.

- Ellett, C. D., Capie, W. & Johnson, C. E. (1979) Assessing teacher performance. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 219-220.
- Fagan, M. & Ponder, A. (1981) Measuring teacher effects on student performance. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 27(1), 46-55.
- Feldvebel, A. M. (1980) Teacher evaluation: ingredients of a credible model. *The Clearing House*, 53(9), 415-420.
- Grimmett, P. P. (1981) Clinical supervision and teacher thought processes. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 6(4), 23-39.
- Harris, B. (1977) Altering the thrust of supervision through creative leadership. *Educational Leadership* 34(8), 567-571.
- Heichberger, R. L. & Young, J. M. (1975) Teacher perceptions of supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 57(3), 210.
- Kauchak, D, Peterson, K. & Driscoll, A. (1985) An interview study of teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 19(1), 32-37.
- Koehn, J. J. & Goens, G. A. (1977) The talent we nourish: a word for supervisors. *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 585-588.
- Levin, B. (1979) Teacher evaluation-a review of research. *Educational Leadership*, 37(3), 240-245.
- Lovell, J. T. & Phelps, M. S. (1977) Supervision in Tennessee as perceived by teachers, principals, and supervisors. *Educational Leadership* 35(3), 226-229.
- McGee, J. C. & Eaker, R. (1977) Clinical supervision and teacher anxiety: a collegial approach to the problem. *Contemporary Education*, 49(1), 24-28.

- McGreal, T. L. (1982) Effective teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Leadership*, 39(4), 303-305.
- Raths, J. & Preskill, H. (1982) Research synthesis on summative evaluation of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 39(4), 310-313.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1977) Reforming teacher evaluation: naturalistic alternatives. *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 602-607.
- Simon, A. E. (1977) Analyzing educational platforms: a supervisory strategy. *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 580-584.
- Stow, S. B. (1979) Using effectiveness research in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 55-58.
- Sullivan, C. G. (1982) Supervisory expectations and work realities: the great gulf. *Educational Leadership*, 39(6), 448-451.
- Townsend, D. (1987) Components of a model of teacher evaluation. *Education Canada*, 27(2), 24-43.
- Unruh, G. G. (1977) Instructional supervision: issue and trends. *Educational Leadership*, 34(8), 563-566.
- Zahorik, J. A. (1977) Supervision as value development. *Educational Leadership*, 35(8), 667-669.

APPENDIX A

Date : April 21, 1986

Copies: H. Storlien
L. Omatoni

Memorandum: Supervision Project

To : Teachers and Administrators

From : Sandy Umpleby

Re: Research into the on going Supervision Project

On behalf of School District #76, I will be conducting a number of personal interviews with current participants in the Supervision project directed by Dr. David Townsend. There is also interest in learning the perceptions and views of teachers not currently involved with the project.

Your name has been chosen at random as a possible participant in the research project. Should you be willing to participate in a 15 minute interview on the above topic at a time convenient to you, kindly indicate by telephone message (527-8571) by May 2, 1986. Questions to be asked during the interview will be available ahead of time.

Information obtained will be used in a strictly confidential, anonymous manner.

Thank you for your assistance.



MEDICINE HAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

School District No. 76
ADMINISTRATION OFFICES
601 First Avenue S.W.
MEDICINE HAT, ALBERTA
T1A 4Y7

TELEPHONE 526-1323
AREA CODE 403

March 14th, 1986

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: SANDRA UMPLEBY,
PROJECT TEAM MEMBER FOR THE
MODEL FOR TEACHER SUPERVISION
AND EVALUATION

Sandy Umpleby, as a member of the project team for the above project, will be carrying out selected interviews with district personnel, both project participants and others, in order to be able to describe the attitudes and perceptions held by the teachers and administrators about the project in general, and the training process specifically. She will also be interested in the kinds of activities in which the participants are engaged.

The data collected will be used to help direct project planning for the future.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. Storlien'.

Dr. Harold T. Storlien
Assistant Superintendent
Administration and Personnel

HTS/11b

APPENDIX C

INVOLVED TEACHERS-SUPERVISION PROJECT

Demographic Information

- length of teaching experience with the present board - elsewhere
- length of tenure
- grade levels taught
- number of times evaluated in the past

Interview Questions

1. How did you become involved in the Medicine Hat School District #76 Supervision Project?
2. How do you define supervision? How do you define evaluation?
3. How did you feel about the supervision you received before this project began?
4. Have there been any changes in the behaviour of your supervisors since the project began?
5. What is your opinion of the district's supervision model at this stage of your training?
6. How do you feel about continuing in the project next year? Explain.
7. How do you feel about the methods and qualifications of school-based supervisory personnel?
8. How do you feel about the methods and qualifications of district-based supervisory personnel?
9. What, in your opinion, would constitute an ideal supervisory situation?
10. Have you observed any changes in student behaviour or achievement as a result of the Supervision Project this year?

11. Have you any general concerns you would like to voice? any comments to make about the Project?

APPENDIX D

NON-INVOLVED TEACHERS-SUPERVISION PROJECT

Demographic Information

- length of teaching experience with the present board - elsewhere
- length of tenure
- grade levels taught
- number of times evaluated in the past

Interview Questions

1. Are you aware of the Medicine Hat School District #76 Supervision Project?
How did you become informed?
2. How do you define supervision? How do you define evaluation?
3. How have you felt about the supervision you have received in the past?
4. Have there been any changes in the behaviours of your supervisors since the Project began?
5. What is your opinion of the district's Supervision model as you understand it?
6. Would you be willing to become involved with the Project in the future?
7. How do you feel about the methods and qualifications of school-based supervisory personnel?
8. How do you feel about the methods and qualifications of district-based supervisory personnel?
9. What, in your opinion, would constitute an ideal supervisory situation?
10. Have you observed any changes in student behaviour or achievement as a result of the Supervision Project this year?
11. Have you any general concerns you would like to voice? any comments to make about the Project?

APPENDIX E

ADMINISTRATORS - SUPERVISION PROJECT

Demographic Information

- length of teaching experience with the present board - elsewhere
- length of tenure
- grade levels taught
- number of times evaluated in the past

Interview Questions

1. How do you feel about your involvement in the Medicine Hat Supervision Project?
2. Do you perceive any changes in your supervisory practices because of your involvement this year in the Project?
3. Have there been any changes in the behaviours of your teachers since the Project began?
4. What is your opinion of the district's Supervision model at this stage of your training?
5. How do you feel about the Project continuing formally in the coming year?
6. What are your perceptions of the feelings of the teachers involved in the Project this year? the uninvolved teachers?
7. How do you feel about central office involvement in the Project?
8. What, in your opinion, would constitute an ideal supervisory situation?
9. Have you observed any changes in student behaviour or achievement as a result of the Supervision Project this year?
10. Have you any general concerns you would like to voice? any comments to make about the Project?