Welcome to the Spring edition of our newsletter.

Message from the Chair

I was honored to serve the SIG in a board leadership position during the past four years. As I end my service as chair, I wish to sincerely thank the SIG board members who served with me. I am deeply grateful for their collective leadership, support, wisdom, and guidance. We have much to celebrate at our business meeting as we recognize our board members and honor Steve Gordon, the recipient of the Distinguished Achievement Award. Please join us as we continue to focus on the key work of the Supervision and Instructional Leadership SIG.

Thank you to the outstanding SIG executive board for service above and beyond.

With warmest regard,

Mary Lynne Derrington SIG Chair 2015-2017

SIG Board Members
Chair-Mary Lynne Derrington (term ends 2017)
Geert Devos (Chair 2017-19)
Secretary-Treasurer- Yanira Oliveras-Ortiz (2017-19)
Awards Chair -Rebecca Burns (term ends 2018)
Board member -Vivian Shulman (term ends 2018)
Board member -Susan Sullivan (term ends 2018)
Program Chair - Ian Mette (term ends 2020)
Program Chair Assistant Teresa Starrett (one year)
Program Chair -elect Election 2018
Newsletter Editor - Helen Hazi (term ends 2018)
Membership Chair - Jim Brandon (term ends 2018)

Promotions, Moves and News

In the summer of 2016, Jim Brandon was appointed Associate Dean, Professional and Community Engagement at the University of Calgary’s Werklund School of Education. With a population of 1.4 million, Calgary is Canada’s fourth largest city and is located in the foothills of the Canadian Rockies in the province of Alberta.

Brandon Butler, PhD was recently granted tenure and promotion to associate professor in social studies education at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, VA.
Areas of interest include: are student teaching supervision, supervision/training of emerging teacher educators, and teacher leadership. Email: bmbutler@odu.edu

**Articles and Books of SIG Members**


Wafa Hozien, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, MI 48859  Hozienw@cmich.edu had written a book: Improving Instructional Leadership (2017), published by Rowman & Littlefield in June, 2017. 

This book constitutes a collection of case studies that explore issues faced by school principals as related to instructional leadership. The scenarios allow students to gain a more thorough understanding of the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL, 2015) and their performance competencies. These scenarios are designed to develop new school leaders by improving instructional leadership practice. These real life cases provide opportunities to create meaningful learning experiences for courses, professional development programs, and the mentoring of new school principals, giving them exposure to the kinds of dilemmas they will encounter as they take on their leadership roles or start supervisory positions.

Jóhannes Miðskarð, Assistant Professor, University of the Faroe Islands (Europe), produces a monthly podcast on instructional leadership called "Research in Leadership in Schools, Early Childhood Settings and Social Care Settings." They include: Philip Hallinger, Michael Abel and Ionna Palaiologou and Cheng Yong Tan. The easiest way to hear the podcast is to join this Facebook group:  
https://www.facebook.com/groups/166339847079023/  or on the following:

https://itunes.apple.com/dk/podcast/research-in-leadership-in/id1102905542
http://www.enfeedia.com/see/midskard/Leadershipresearch.php
http://www.subscribeonandroid.com/www.enfeedia.com/see/midskard/Leadership research.xml
http://feeds.feedburner.com/ResearchInLeadershipInSchoolsEarlyChildhoodSettin gsAndSocialCareSettings


New Texts in the field……


Under increasing pressure in the face of teacher evaluation systems and accountability measures, schools must focus on those teachers that exhibit marginal to incompetent teaching behaviors in their classrooms. This book is a vital resource for educational leaders who are responsible for instructional programs and teacher evaluation. Zepeda’s tried-and-true strategies will help you take the necessary steps to support and mentor struggling teachers by detecting underperformance, developing strategies to help teachers, engaging in difficult conversations to enact plans of improvement, and following legal requirements. The practical tools found in this book will help teachers improve their instruction, assessment, classroom management, and teamwork.


Translations of Research

Into Turkish
Calls for Reviewers

The Excellence in Education Journal
ISSN 2474-4166

The mission and goal of The Excellence in Education Journal (EEJ) is to promote scholarly writing about practices in education of children and adults worldwide and to share this writing in a free, open access, online journal format. Articles are double-blind, peer reviewed. Ann Gaudino <ann.gaudino@yahoo.com>

For information about becoming a reviewer, go to http://www.excellenceineducationjournal.org/Reviewers.html

Notes from the Program Chair

There has been a lot of activity in the SIG Supervision and Instructional Leadership since the start of 2017! For starters, there has been some change in leadership. As she moved forward with her new role as Dean of Education & Human Services at the University of North Florida, Diane Yendol-Hoppey graciously transitioned Ian Mette from the University of Maine into the role of Program Chair. This transition vacated the Program Chair-Elect position, which allowed Teresa Starrett of Texas Woman’s University to step into the position on a one year interim basis. Additionally, the SIG has a new Secretary-Treasurer as Yanira Oliveras-Ortiz from The University of Texas at Tyler was recently elected. Finally, at the close of this year’s conference, Mary Lynne Derrington from the University of Tennessee will transition Geert Devos of Ghent University into the role of Chair.

Despite the movement in leadership positions, the SIG operated in a very smooth manner this year. The preparation for the AERA program was made easier by the fact that there were so many high quality submissions. This year we had 20 total submissions, and the peer-review process was high-quality and transparent. As a result of the number of submissions, we received additional sessions from AERA, and more submissions in the future can help us ensure our work is shared annually at AERA.

In addition to the high-quality sessions, the SIG Supervision and Instructional Leadership Business Meeting will address important items. We will review the future of the SIG and discuss the possibility of starting an online journal, specifically how this outlet might encourage our members to get out their research on supervision and instructional leadership. This has been a topic of conversation for years, so please come with your input on how you believe we could make this a viable option for current and future scholars.

Program Chair - Ian Mette
2017 AERA Program

Developing Instructional Leadership Across a Continuum: Voices From the Field (Paper Session on Thursday, April 27 at 2:15 PM) Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Meeting Room Level, Room 217 B

- Models of Influence on Mathematics Instructional Coaches (Sue Brown, University of Houston - Clear Lake; Scott Dennis Harrell, University of Houston - Clear Lake; Sandra Browning, University of Houston - Clear Lake)
- Reciprocal Teacher and Leader Learning Jim Brandon, University of Calgary; Sharon Friesen, University of Calgary; Candace Saar, University of Calgary)
- Teachers' Perceptions of Instructional Supervision: Lessons Learned From Chinese Teachers' Authentic Voices (Chang Liu, Pennsylvania State University; Chiau-Wen Jang, Pennsylvania State University; Bernard J. Badiali, Pennsylvania State University)
- "Multiple Layers": Conceptualizing the University Supervisor's Role (Colleen Horn, Teachers College, Columbia University; Kelsey Keturah Darity, Teachers College, Columbia University; Laura Vernikoff, Teachers College, Columbia University; A. Lin Goodwin, Teachers College, Columbia University)

Thinking About the Field: Supervision Scholars Think About Its Past, Present, and Future (Symposium on Friday, April 28 at 8:15 AM) Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Meeting Room Level, Room 217 B

- 10 Important Ideas About Supervision Put Forward by Members of the Supervision and Instructional Leadership SIG (Stephen P. Gordon, Texas State University-San Marcos)
- Teacher Education as Instructional Supervision (Frances O. Rust, University of Pennsylvania)
- Authentic Co-Generative Engagement: Reclaiming the Pedagogy of Supervision in Clinical Practice (Bernard J. Badiali, Pennsylvania State University)
- The Commodification of Instructional Improvement in an Age of High-Stakes Accountability (Helen M. Hazi, West Virginia University)
- What Literature Is of Special Interest in the Supervision and Instructional Leadership SIG, Exhaustion or Replenishment? A 35-Year Commemorative (Noreen B. Garman, University of Pittsburgh)

Developing Principals to Become Instructional Leaders (Roundtable Session on Friday, April 28 at 2:15 PM) Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Ballroom Level, Hemisfair Ballroom 1

- Are We Adequately Preparing Principals for the Role? A Principal Preparation Practicum Program Review (Margaret A Scott, University of Colorado - Colorado Springs)
- Supervision and Preservice Administrators: Using Technology (TeachLivE) to Strengthen Student Understanding (Teresa Martin Starrett, Texas Woman's University)
- Understanding How Principal and Teacher Interactions Affect Teacher Professional Growth in an Era of Reform (Molly Funk, Core School Solutions, LLC; David Anderson, Eastern Michigan University)
• **SIG Business Meeting on Friday, April 28th, at 6:15 PM** Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Meeting Room Level, Room 217A. Steve Gordon winner of the Distinguished Achievement Award will present:

• "Making Connections: Recognizing the Interdependence of the Various Purposes, Providers, and Formats of Instructional Supervision.” Supervisors need to be leaders, teachers, and learners, and encourage teachers to assume all three of these roles. Together, supervisors and teachers need to focus on what is taught as well as how it is taught. And supervision formats like clinical supervision, professional development, and action research need to be integrated in coherent efforts to enhance teaching and learning.

• A cash bar will be available and the business meeting follows with this agenda:

**Business Meeting Agenda**

Introductions
Presentation of the Award followed by comments from recipient
Discussion of the need and possibility of a journal dedicated to supervision
Reports: Minutes, financials, membership

---

**Considering Various Methodologies in Developing Supervision and Evaluation Skills (Roundtable Session on Saturday, April 29 at 8:15 AM) Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Ballroom Level, Hemisfair Ballroom 1**

- Developing a Personal Pedagogy of Instructional Coaching: An Autoethnographic Self-Study of Reflection-for-Action (Charlotte Greene, Norfolk Public Schools; Brandon M. Butler, Old Dominion University)
- Evaluating Low-Performing Teachers: Are Raters Able to Be Consistent in Classroom Observations? (Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia; Albert Manuel Jimenez, Kennesaw State University)
- Exploring Fieldwork Experiences: Telling Our Unique and Collective Stories (Melody Elrod, University of South Florida)

**Instructional Leadership and Supervision in the Age of School Reform and Accountability (Paper Session on Saturday, April 29 at 10:35 AM) Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Meeting Room Level, Room 217 B**

- Does Leadership Matter in Adverse Circumstances? Findings From a Three-Year Study (Maria A. Flores, Minho University, Portugal)
- Examining Factors That Impact Retention and Attrition of Instructional Coaches (Amy Lancaster, University of Houston - Clear Lake; Denise M. McDonald, University of Houston - Clear Lake; Sandra Browning, University of Houston - Clear Lake)
- Principals' Use of Teaching Effectiveness Rubrics in a Race to the Top Evaluation System (Douglas M. Wieczorek, Iowa State University; Brandon Clark, Iowa State University; George Theoharis, Syracuse University)
Thinking About the Field: Supervision Scholars Think About Its Past, Present, and Future (Symposium on Friday, April 28 at 8:15 AM) Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Meeting Room Level, Room 217 B

Stephen P. Gordon
This essay provides a brief overview of a full-length paper for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Associations, April 2017.

In the paper I review 10 seminal ideas about supervision put forward in the literature on instructional supervision by scholars who have been members of the American Educational Research Association’s Supervision and Instructional Leadership Special Interest Group. “Ideas” in supervision are broadly defined to include proposed supervision philosophies, concepts, functions, and approaches. The ideas reviewed reflect a wide range of theoretical perspectives and epistemologies. The 10 “big ideas” are presented in alphabetical order, by the author’s last name, and in the case of multiple authors, by the first author’s last name.

Big Idea 1: Costa and Garmston’s Cognitive Coaching
Costa and Garmston proposed that teachers follow cognitive maps when they are teaching, but are only partially conscious of those maps, and that the aim of cognitive coaching is to help them become fully conscious of, analyze, and further develop their maps. They identified four “stages of instructional thought,” including preactive, interactive, reflective, and projective stages. Four supervisory objectives, auditing, monitoring, validating, and consulting, parallel the four stages of instructional thought (Costa & Garmston, 1985). Eventually Costa and
Garmston (2016) moved beyond their primary emphasis on autonomy as the goal of cognitive coaching and shifted their emphasis to holonomy, with a holonomous person defined as a self-directed individual who functions well both individually and as a member of a group.

**Big Idea 2: Garman’s Clinical Approach to Supervision**

Noreen Garman (1982) clarified and expanded upon the construct of clinical supervision developed earlier by Cogan and Goldhammer. She proposed four interrelated concepts as key to understanding clinical supervision: collegiality, collaboration, skilled service, and ethical conduct. In her discussion of collegiality, Garman described four “frames of mind” along a continuum from low to high levels of supervisor collegiality: the alienated critic, the neutral observer, the connected participant, and the organic member. She also discussed four levels of collaboration: nonworking involvement, working acceptance involvement, involvement with genuine participation, and involvement with organic reciprocity. Regarding skilled service, Garman described five inquiry skills: discovery, verification, explanation, interpretation, and evaluation. She urged supervisors to consider clinical supervision as “a metaphor as well as a method” (p. 9).

**Big Idea 3: Glickman’s Developmental Supervision**

Carl Glickman’s (1981) model of developmental supervision was based on the premise that teachers function at different levels of adult and professional development, and thus should be matched with different supervisory approaches. He recommended the directive approach for “teacher dropouts,” different versions of the collaborative approach for “unfocused workers” and “analytical observers,” and the nondirective approach for “true professionals.” Eventually, Glickman distinguished between directive control and directive informational supervision, and also suggested that supervisors should assess a teacher’s levels of development, expertise, and commitment when deciding which of the four supervisory approaches to apply. He also recommended that, over the long term, the supervisor should assist the teacher to grow toward higher levels of development, adjusting the supervisory approach accordingly.

**Big Idea 4: Hazi’s Teacher Evaluation-Supervision Dilemma**

Helen Hazi has established a body of work on the relationship of school law, teacher evaluation, and instructional supervision, and the inherent quandary presented by that relationship. Hazi (1994) argued that, while supervision scholars and supervisors differentiate supervision from evaluation, teachers do not. She added that attempts by those in the field to differentiate between supervision and evaluation through “linguistic maneuvering” (e.g., informal vs. formal, formative vs. summative) only lead to additional entanglement. In her own writing and her work with other authors, Hazi critiqued the expanding federal and state control of supervision and evaluation, the increasingly ritualistic nature of evaluation, the escalating use of technology and test data to track teacher performance, and the emphasis on evaluation instruments such as rubrics. As an alternative to all of these trends, Hazi and Arredondo Rucinski (2016) argued for supervisor use of reflective inquiry to promote inquiry teaching.

**Big Idea 5: Holland’s Interpretive Approach to Clinical Supervision**
Patricia Holland (1988) encouraged a “maturing” of clinical supervision by expanding upon data gathered in the classroom observation through the collaborative interpretation of that data. She argued that a collegial relationship between the supervisor and teacher is the foundation for dialogue in which the supervisor and teacher seek to construct the meaning of classroom events. She suggested that the ultimate purpose of an interpretive approach to clinical supervision is for teachers to understand their own classroom actions and implications for changes in classroom practice. Holland (1990) also applied the “hermeneutic perspective” to supervision scholarship, arguing that, through conversation, a shared understanding of the work under study as well as a shared language for expressing that understanding develops, which can lead to a community of supervision scholars.

**Big Idea 6: Pajak’s Honoring Diverse Teaching Styles**
Edward Pajak (2003) first grouped various models of clinical supervision into four families, including original clinical models, humanistic artistic models, technical/didactic models, and developmental/reflective models. He matched each family of supervision models with one of Jung’s four paired functions (S-F, N-F, N-T, and S-T) and also matched specific clinical supervision models to eight paired Jungian dialects in which one member of each Jungian pair was emphasized over the other. Next, Pajak identified four types of teachers and two subtypes for each teacher-type: inventing teachers (discovering and problem solving), knowing teachers (law-giving and organizing), caring teachers (orchestrating and care-giving), and inspiring teachers (idealizing and liberating). He then matched teacher types and subtypes, Jungian dialects, and clinical families with one another. Finally, Pajak went into considerable detail about how different supervisory languages (languages of the different supervision families) can be applied to particular teaching styles (inventing, knowing, caring, inspiring).

**Big Idea 7: Sergiovanni’s Community Theory of Supervision**
At the foundation of Thomas Sergiovanni’s (1994) community theory of supervision are the concepts of gemeinschaft and gesellschaft. Gemeinschaft means community, in which people are tied together through relationships, place, and mind. Gesellschaft is characterized by rationality, policies and rules, conditional acceptance, competitive relationships, and self-interest. Sergiovanni proposed that modern organizations, including schools, represent gesellschaft. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) argued for a shift from professional isolation to community in schools. They saw community and professional norms as intermingled in a commitment toward exemplary practice, agreed-upon social ends, the teaching practice itself, and an ethic of care. Sergiovanni and Starratt called for the professional and moral authority of community to replace bureaucratic and personal authority. Indeed, they urged that all forms of external control be displaced by the values, norms, collegiality, and interdependence of community.

**Big Idea 8: Smyth’s Critical Approach to Clinical Supervision**
John Smyth (1984) critiqued traditional approaches to supervision (including some models of clinical supervision) as variations of the same scientific management that had been adopted by business early in the 20th century, characterized by accountability, inspection, and control. According to Smyth, a critical approach is needed in order to liberate teachers from embedded
assumptions and develop “the capacity to understand, challenge, and ultimately transform their own practices” (p. 426). Indeed, Smyth argued that teachers themselves should be “clinicians of their own and each other’s teaching” (p. 431). Smyth (1991) saw clinical supervision as a means for teachers to become empowered and to transform teaching by engaging in both explanation and criticism of classroom practice. He suggested that critique of teaching “involves teachers intervening into their ‘life worlds’ and asking pointed questions about the historical, social, and political nature of what it is that they do in teaching, and how they might operate differently” (p. 324).

**Big Idea 9: Zeichner and Liston’s Reflective Supervision**

Kenneth Zeichner and Daniel Liston (1987) presented a comprehensive approach to the supervision of student teachers that has served as a model for progressive teacher education programs across the nation. The purpose of reflective supervision, according to Zeichner and Liston, is to develop reflective teachers, defined as teachers who “reflect on the origins, purposes, and consequences of their actions, as well as the material and ideological constraints and encouragements embedded in the classroom, school, and societal contexts in which they work” (p. 23). Student teaching in the University of Wisconsin model described by Zeichner and Liston included curriculum development, inquiry projects outside of the classroom, seminars jointly planned by the supervisor and student teachers, reflective journal writing, and clinical supervision. In clinical supervision, observation notes were narratives, with attention to teaching patterns and critical incidents that reflected larger trends and issues. Conferences included an analysis of teacher beliefs as well as the school and larger social contexts and how all of these affected teaching practices. Conferences also involved collaborative critique of lesson content, the hidden curriculum, and unintended consequences of the curriculum and taken-for-granted teaching practices.

**Big idea 10: Zepeda’s Job-Embedded Supervision**

Sally Zepeda (2015) defined job-embedded learning as what teachers do in their daily work “that signals collaboration, joint problem-posing, problem-solving, and a sincere desire to improve practice from the lessons learned on the job from teaching and interacting with peers” (p. 35). Zepeda (2017) argued that supervision should be “woven into” job-embedded learning, and proposed that supervisory functions like clinical supervision could enhance such learning. Zepeda (2011) suggested that teachers establish a learning goal for the school year, and that clinical supervision focus on that goal throughout the year. Additionally, she suggested the learning goal and clinical supervision could be integrated with portfolio development. She believed that the supervisor and teachers should be equal partners in job-embedded learning, and that teachers should be leaders of learning for students and one another.

**Conclusion**

I invite colleagues reading this overview to read the full paper of the same title, which provides a much more complete picture of each of the 10 big ideas. Additionally, I invite readers to consider which ideas they would include in their own list of seminal contributions to the field. I also encourage colleagues to identify new ideas proposed in recent years by emerging scholars and ponder whether those new ideas will pass the test of time and eventually be included on a future list of big ideas in supervision.
References


Teacher Education as Instructional Supervision

Frances Rust – University of Pennsylvania, GSE
francesrust49@gmail.com

Teacher educators have a complex set of tasks. They must teach content about human development, instructional practice, learning theory and more; they must model pedagogy; they must demonstrate how theory and practice come together; they must support, guide, coach—all with individuals who are just beginning to dig into the complexity of teaching. Each of these tasks involves some form of instructional support but rarely is this aspect of the work of teacher educators addressed. Thus, there is little information available about what aspects of teacher educators’ work carry on into teachers’ practice and lead to student achievement. The absence of such knowledge understandably leads to questions about whether teacher education actually makes a difference in new teachers’ practice. For example, Lortie’s (1978) finding that teachers generally draw on their apprenticeships of observation rather than on their teacher education programs has been confirmed many times over. Further, there are debates and questions about how to assess teacher education (see Gallagher, Smith, & Anderson, 2016; Pecheone & Chung, 2006; Pecheone & Stansbury, 1996).

Research on teacher education like that of Darling Hammond (2010), Feiman-Nemser (2001), Rust (2009), and others suggest that, at its best, preservice teacher education programs unpack like a time-release capsule over the first five years and beyond. The key to such integration is the opportunity to reflect on and consider one’s practice; and research by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009), Feiman-Nemser (2001), Moir (1999) and others suggests that this is best done within a community of practice and over time. Hence, teacher education becomes not just a preservice experience but extends, in fact, across the professional life of a teacher; and the critical questions surrounding preservice teacher education relate to how preservice teachers are
supported in bringing theory and practice together, and whether new, potentially transformative understandings of teaching and learning emerge to guide the teacher’s practice. The question, then, becomes, not how to evaluate preservice teacher education but how to determine ways in which preservice education works to support teachers’ on-going professional learning. From this perspective, the practice of teacher educators, now understood to be those engaged in the professional learning of teachers in both pre-and in-service milieus, becomes critically important.

In this paper, we define teacher educators as program faculty, classroom mentors, and university-based mentors whose work is intended to bridge course- and fieldwork. Our focus is on the roles played by these teacher educators in three cohort-based programs—all conducted at the same university—that position teacher inquiry as a core practice of learning to teach (see Kumar, Pupik-Dean, and Bergey, 2012). Following on the extensive work of Shulman Pechone and Chung (2006) on performance assessment in teaching, Lyons (1998) on inquiry portfolios as lenses for understanding, and others such as Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) and Hubbard and Power (2003) on teacher inquiry, our data are drawn from 52 digital portfolios developed by elementary, middle school, and high school preservice students to document their professional learning over the course of their teacher education program. As well, we draw on interviews of 15 program graduates and their mentors who participate in a professional learning community. Using textual analysis framed by grounded theory, our intent is to determine those core practices of teacher educators—curriculum design, key assessments that scaffold students’ learning, mentoring relationships, etc.—that are cited and built upon by new teachers as essential to their bringing theory and practice together in their teaching. To program designers, such information is critical to understanding which aspects of their programs carry weight with preservice students and, in doing so, can show us how the conversation of practice is developed. Information like this can help to move debates about the efficacy of teacher education toward genuine consideration of ways to enable teachers’ professional learning so as to support student achievement.

The Programs

The three programs are considered in this study: They are the Urban Teacher Education Programs (Elementary/Middle School and Secondary) at the University of Pennsylvania and the Penn Residency Masters in Teaching Program. While two of the three programs considered here are focused on urban schools and embrace a firm commitment to equity and social justice, all three share the same essential design components of reflective practice and inquiry-oriented curriculum design. Each positions teachers as thoughtful, creative, knowledgeable educational leaders. Each program is developed around the understanding that teaching is best done in a collaborative, learning-oriented environment; hence, the design of these programs is cohort-based with each cohort of students progressing through its program as a unit simultaneously engaging in the same curricula, courses, and field experiences. The programs, particularly those on the secondary level, share many of the same faculty who work from the same basic curriculum requiring very similar assignments. These assignments are aligned with field experience and are intended to support students’ growing knowledge of teaching and learning. They are also intended to serve as a scaffold for preservice
students’ developing skills of inquiry around practice and so, to buttress their inquiry portfolios. A final assignment that stands in lieu of a master’s examination, the inquiry portfolio is intended as a study of practice in which each student addresses a question that they have developed and pursued over their time in the program.

The Urban TE programs are 10-month programs beginning in July and finishing in May.

The PRMT program is a two-year program of residency. Thirty PRMT students from 11 different boarding schools come to the Penn campus twice a year – one week in the summer and a long weekend in January. There are two other long weekends of course work: one in late Fall and one in early Spring. These rotate among the boarding school campuses. In the time between meetings, students come together as a cohort on line for conversation and interaction with invited speakers, in small content area groups for class with methods course instructors, and in affinity groups for support regarding their inquiry projects with one of the course instructors.

Discussion of Findings

Among the most striking aspects of our inquiry was discovering the powerful impact of the methods course instructors: on line for the PRMT program and in person for both the elementary/middle school and secondary urban TE programs. In all cases, the inquiry conversations around mathematics instruction seemed extraordinary for their nuance about learning, the student teachers’ efforts to develop learning communities within their classrooms, and the breadth of the research literature consulted by these preservice teachers. However, the content areas of English Literature, Social studies, Literacy (for elementary), and science, art, and dance were similarly strong and in similar ways.

Another striking aspect of the inquiry was seeing the differences that the formats of a web-based portfolio or the more traditional paper plus attachments seemed to make in the ways in which students were able to trace the narrative of their learning and provide evidence of their growing skill and understanding.

We note, too, the role of time and place in these students’ developing confidence about their capabilities as teachers and their ability to work with and through difficulties around classroom management, following the prescribed curriculum, developing appropriate assessments, and even contemplating next steps – to teach or not to teach. For PRMT students, two years with small classes in the same setting seemed to provide time to think . . . deeply, critically; time not available to the elementary/middle school and secondary students.

As in most teacher education programs, the field was a critical element of the program. Mentors—were critical to both groups. For the TEP cohorts, both the classroom mentor and the Penn mentor figured importantly but in different ways. Generally, where the classroom mentor had been a Penn student, there was greater ease between the student teacher mentor and there was greater support of the teacher education curriculum. In the PRMT, mentors from the schools rarely co-
taught with their mentees. Instead, they served as observers, coaches, and supporters of these new teachers. Where this worked, it worked very well.

Despite the differences in the instantiation of the programs, the similarity of the curriculum of these programs, the fact of so many of the faculty being the same in each, and the cohort design—all seem to work together to suggest something of a “Penn” ideology among these teachers who think of themselves as reflective practitioners and potential leaders in the field.

**References**


Reclaiming the Pedagogy of Supervision in Clinical Practice
Bernard J. Badiali, Pennsylvania State University

Objectives: To recast the role of supervision, especially in clinical experiences
To emphasize one condition necessary for supervisions’ rebirth in clinical experiences
To argue for reciprocity in learning from practice and practitioners

Perspective: Consistent with the redefinition of supervision (Sergiovanni & Starratt 2014), as “role free,” this paper emphasizes the tasks and functions supervisors perform outside the bounds of evaluation and accountability. Drawing on ideas of situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991), the underlying principles in this paper emphasize the notion that all learning is social and that communities of practice are essential for learning to teach and to teach better.

Approach: The paper draws on the literature in supervision, communities of practice and teacher development.

Conclusion: In order to reassert itself as the “glue” that binds good teaching with student learning and good schooling, supervision as a field must reclaim its place in schools by reemphasizing its pedagogical role. Supervision as a field and as a practice has been appropriated by administrative bureaucrats on the one hand who fell victim to the accountability movement or to instructional coaches on the other hand who have narrowed the role to “training” and inspection. Socializing new teachers to the ideals of schooling begins with rich clinical experiences during the preservice phase of their education. That is where new teachers learn (or relearn) the rules, roles and relationships that enable healthy communities of practice. We cannot prepare teachers for settings and relationships that do not exist. Teacher preparation is where new teachers learn that supervisors can play a critical role in their development. Authentic co-generative engagement is one of several
conditions necessary for acculturating new teachers into the profession.

Scholarly Significance: Supervision as a field must strengthen its place as an integral part in supporting teacher development that leads to student learning and growth. The field must emphasize the pedagogical role “supervisors” play using this theme as a basis for future inquiry. The field needs studies that investigate the effects of supervisor’s pedagogy on practice. It needs evidence of the impact supervision has in clinical settings and by extension, it needs to prepare new supervisors to see their role as pedagogue.

It seems appropriate at the beginning of this paper to thank Dr. Helen Hazi for organizing this session for the Supervision SIG of AERA. My remarks here come as a result of 46 years in education, ten years in a high school classroom, three years as an instructional supervisor and more than 30 years teaching, practicing and studying supervision at the college level. Considering this is my forty-sixth year as an educator, my thoughts have turned ever increasingly to the role of experience in the field. I am pleased to share some of those thoughts here. I confess that there are some days when I feel less relevant, other days when I feel that longevity has enhanced my ability to connect my own students to a past they do not know and perhaps could not even imagine. So being asked to offer my thoughts on the field of supervision comes as an honor. The request was made even more gratifying considering that I was included with colleagues whose work I hold in high regard. In the constellation of scholarship in supervision, their stars shine brightly.

When the symposium was proposed, I was in the midst of researching publications that emphasized the “pedagogical” aspects of supervision. Over the years, I have grown weary of the word supervision being used only as code for teacher evaluation. Against the strong currents of contemporary practice, I have labored to help my students understand that supervision, observation and evaluation are related, but not synonymous terms. So in this retrospective, I want to focus on the less attended to function of supervision, its pedagogical aspects. I want to comment on the field of supervision by tracing where the theme of pedagogy for teacher development has emerged and re-emerged over time. This paper presents what so many of our colleagues have said to us about the art and science of instructional supervision for decades that seems to be hidden in plain sight. To conclude, I want to argue that supervisors are and should continue to be very much like clinical educators in the field of medicine. Because good supervisors are first good teachers, well grounded in theory, but also quite capable of putting that theory into practice as role models and resources for those learning the craft.

References
The Commodification of Instructional Improvement in an Age of High-Stakes Accountability

Helen M. Hazi, Ph.D., West Virginia University
For the full paper: Helen.Hazi@mail.wvu.edu

The purposes of this paper are to examine Danielson’s beliefs about teacher improvement and to question whether improvement should continue to be an espoused purpose of instructional supervision. In this paper, I critically analyze the Danielson 2016 book Talk About Teaching: Leading Professional Conversations to unpack her beliefs about teaching and its improvement. I also place her Framework with its web-based platform in the marketplace of instructional improvement. Instructional improvement delivered by technology is being commodified, i.e., turned into a product that can be bought and sold and that promises quick and simple means to change teacher behavior.

From this critical analysis, Danielson’s beliefs about improvement are as follows:

- Improvement is necessary because teaching is never perfect.
- Improvement is about providing teachers feedback.
- The needs of new teachers differ from experienced teachers.
- Feedback is provided when teacher work “falls short.”
- Feedback comes through teacher evaluation.
- The evaluator dispenses feedback.
- The evaluator also holds a conversation with a teacher.
- When teachers act on the feedback, this will result in improvement.

These beliefs can be woven together to reveal a message about teaching and its improvement: Teaching, an imperfect practice, is improved through teacher evaluation. Someone external to the classroom provides feedback when the teacher falls short. The evaluator, trained and accurate in an instrument derived from research, dispenses the feedback, which if followed, will result in improvement.

This is a behavioral view of improvement, where feedback is the stimulus and teacher change is the response. This research reveals that Danielson sells teachers and administrators “quick expertise” about improvement: Improvement is simple and within their grasp.

Teachers and administrators welcome such a message in these stressful and uncertain times of accountability, where teachers are blamed for poor student performance and they experience adverse employment actions. In this high-stakes climate teachers have lost jobs, pay, tenure, and career advancement (Hazi, 2016). But is improvement simple? Or is it a mirage?

Quick and easy prescriptions that are fast and within their grasp do not match the realities of classrooms where success is measured by increases in student performance on standardized tests.
Prescriptions for teacher change, delivered with a mix of 76 Framework elements, questions, 4 big ideas, and reflection, have to be applied to a whole class of 25 or more students whose individual scores must increase. Prescriptions are delivered regardless of student age or ability, and regardless of subject or purposes of the lesson. However, improvement is messy, complex and varies per subject, teacher and class. Findings of research may apply to teaching skills in an elementary reading or math classroom, but not to other classrooms. Prescriptions may conflict with what experienced teachers may have learned from their own practice. These expectations about teacher improvement echo traditional views of teaching and learning as described by Nolan and Francis (1992).

Danielson and other vendors of improvement can either encourage teachers and supervisors to think about the complexity of teaching in its context, or portray it as generic. Vendors can encourage teachers and supervisors to think more deeply about teaching, or promote the values of teaching as found within their tools. They can teach them to think that teaching and its improvement are complicated and contested, or easy and simple. The messages, presented in written material or delivered through training, can be seductive.

Scholars in the field of supervision have much to consider. And it begins with whether we should reclaim the ground of instructional improvement, instead of letting entrepreneurs commodify and sell it. Instructional improvement has been one of the long-established purposes of supervision. But much of the field has been silent about it of late, since it is associated with the formative purpose of teacher evaluation. At the very least, we should be a voice of its critique in these desperate times of accountability.
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I was fortunate to be in a place to facilitate the establishment of the Instructional Supervision SIG, along with Helen Hazi. It is a story tinged with struggle and irony. From a personal experience, I briefly narrate the quirky story of the birth
of the SIG. In telling the story, including the dominant discourses of the time, I show that the Instructional Supervision SIG in AERA signaled the birth of supervision as a field of study and, as such, added to the ecology of supervision knowledge that continues to form. Although no formal criteria exist for defining a field of study, academics continue to assume significant consequential results when such a group is formed and named. (Pinar, 2004.)

In studying supervision, I attempt to demonstrate that memory work, which includes remembering and forgetting our own educational experiences, shapes every aspect of our profession as teachers, supervisors, researchers, and activists, committed to public schooling. As Judith Butler suggests, “There is no ‘I’ that can fully stand apart from the social conditions of its emergence” (p.7). I further show that the “I” of this study is embedded in various discourses and histories that become the ebb and flow of my own scholarship.

In attempting to speculate about the future of scholarship in the SIG, I worry about the current school climate, suggesting that we are struggling, among other issues, with an epistemological and ontological deficit as we bend to the political and social demands of the U.S. cultural surround. I mention the ways in which cultural narratives have focused on shallow educational issues in an attempt to create a normative collective mindset about school reform. In addition, I address challenges that I’ve experienced in working with novice researchers regarding the epistemological and ontological deficits that they experience in their attempts to address persuasive truth claims (Edwards, et.al., 2013).

My hope is that, as we contribute to the ecological space of supervision knowledge, we recognize what, in the retro-scholarship, is still vital and what is problematic. I suggest that much retro-scholarship can contribute to an impoverished “literature of exhaustion” (Barth, 1984). And, again turning to Barth, I speculate about the possibilities inherent in a “literature of replenishment,” positing that a post-modern mindscape is vital in order to imagine a richer body of knowledge. In addition to Barth, Calvino, in Invisible Cities (1972), provides aesthetic literary devices to help us see that it is humanity who pays the ultimate price for impoverished schooling if we continue as modernist educators. We need to proceed with wisdom and commitment because that price may very well be the future of our children.
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