Prerequisites	Function	Tasks	Unification	Product

FIGURE 1.1 *SuperVision for Successful Schools*

manner uniting organizational goals and teacher needs. As the supervisor allows teachers to take greater control over their own professional lives, a school becomes a dynamic setting for learning.

To facilitate such collective instructional improvement, those responsible for supervision must have certain prerequisites. The first is a *knowledge* base. Supervisors need to understand the exception—what teachers and schools can be—in contrast to the norm—what teachers and schools typically are. They need to understand how knowledge of adult and teacher development and alternative supervisory practices can help break the norm of mediocrity found in typical schools. Second, there is an *interpersonal skills* base. Supervisors must know how their own interpersonal behaviors affect individuals as well as groups of teachers and then study ranges of interpersonal behaviors that might be used to promote more positive and change-oriented relationships. Third, the supervisor must have *technical skills* in observing, planning, assessing, and evaluating instructional improvement. Knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical competence are three complementary aspects of supervision as a developmental function.

Supervisors have certain educational tasks at their disposal that enable teachers to evaluate and modify their instruction. In planning each task, the supervisor needs to plan specific ways of giving teachers a greater sense of professional power to teach students successfully. Those supervisory tasks that have such potential to affect teacher development are direct assistance, group development, professional development, curriculum development, and action research. Direct assistance *(A)* is the provision of personal, ongoing contact with the individual teacher to observe and assist in classroom instruction. Group development *(B)* is the gathering together of teachers to make decisions on mutual instructional concerns. Professional development *(C)* includes the learning opportunities for faculty provided or supported by the school and school system. Curriculum development *(D)* is the revision and modification of the content, plans, and materials of classroom instruction. Action research *(E)* is the systematic study by a faculty of what is happening in the classroom and school with the aim of improving learning.

By understanding how teachers grow optimally in a supportive and challenging environment, the supervisor can plan the tasks of supervision to bring together organizational goals and teacher needs into a single fluid entity. The unification of individual teacher needs with organizational goals in "a cause beyond oneself" has been demonstrated to promote powerful instruction and improved student learning.

Figure 1.1, therefore, presents the organization of this textbook in a nutshell. Part II will be devoted to essential knowledge. Part III will deal with interpersonal skills. Part IV will explain technical skills the supervisor needs, and Part V will discuss the application of such knowledge and skills to the tasks of supervision. Finally, Part VI will suggest ways of applying knowledge, skills, and tasks to integrate individual needs with organizational goals to achieve needed change and instructional success.

Supervision and Moral Purpose

SuperVision based on moral purpose begins with the school community asking two broad questions:

1. What type of society do we desire?
2. What type of educational environment should supervision promote in order to move toward the society we desire?

If even part of the answer to the first question involves a democratic society in which all members are considered equal, then the answer to the second question must involve creating an educational environment that prepares students to be members of that democratic society. We can take this one step further and say that the answer involves creating a school that mirrors the democratic society that we desire.

We ground this book in a SuperVision of a good school, one that delivers on the promise of education that promotes a better democracy for all (see Glickman, 2003; Gordon, 2001). To do so, we cannot think of ourselves as first-grade teachers, high school mathematics teachers, middle school counselors, central office specialists, high school principals, or superintendents. These positions are reflections of where we locate our bodies to go to work, but the names don't reflect where we need to locate our minds and our hearts. Educators are the primary stewards of the democratic spirit. The total of our efforts is far greater than the particulars of our job (Glickman, 1998b).

The democratic impulse for renewing education continues to resonate in the thoughts of many local teachers, parents, administrators, and citizens in schools throughout this country—perhaps among more people than ever before. However, schools blessed with such far-sighted people are still in the margin. The challenge to bring an inclusive definition of democracy as the guiding principle into public education is enormous (Glickman, 1998a, 1999; Scheurich, 1998). We have been here before and we might fall short once again. But, whether we succeed or simply keep the spirit alive, we will have let other generations of educators and citizens know that this is the most important fight in which to engage—the democratic education of our students for a just and democratic society.

PRACTITIONER REFLECTION

When Is Collegiality Real?

Edward F. Tobia, *Executive Director, Center for Teacher Renewal*

Early in my career, as a newly appointed middle school assistant principal, I was determined to be as collegial as possible; in my own teaching career I had a "history of being mistreated by supervisors," and I was going to be different. As with many things, the implementation of my beliefs was harder than I thought.

I was responsible for supervising a seventh-grade interdisciplinary team at the school and I had some concerns about the harsh disciplinary tactics being used by an experienced teacher who, in his own words, could have taught me in his seventh-grade class. Mr. Fox was passionate about social studies and wouldn't tolerate students who didn't hold to his high academic standards. I wanted to work out a plan with him that would help integrate his high expectations for academic achievement and behavior with the developmental needs of the "tweens" he was teaching. I had experienced a difficult time with my own son in seventh grade just a year prior to my new appointment and I had read extensively about adolescent development so I thought I knew a few things. However, in the eyes of Mr. Fox, I had three strikes against me—I was young, I was new to the school and the community, and I had just completed my doctorate (I was one of two people in the district with a doctorate at the time). The lessons I learned in working with this teacher were not taught in any course I took or found in any book or journal article I had read.

I scheduled a time to meet with him (that was already out of the ordinary for him). He came in to the meeting with a self-assured air that his years of experience would trump

anything I could possibly have to offer. I opened the conversation with some ice-breaking comments but it was clear that he wanted to get right down to whatever I had on my mind. Looking back on the conversation, he was setting the stage for playing on my naiveté and agreeing with anything I might suggest. I had the sense that what looked like a collegial conversation was in reality just "going through the motions." I did not have the presence of mind to ask, "I'm uncertain why you're agreeing with me. Please tell me what you think." Instead, I ended the meeting as gracefully as I could, determined to find some way of genuinely communicating with this teacher.

Predictably, the teacher did not change his behavior, putting me on shaky ground as his supervisor. If I said or did nothing I would lose all credibility with him, and if I tried to confront him I was sure to face a repeat of the earlier conversation. The solution came by accident when another seventh-grade teacher had to go home and I had to cover her classroom. She was on the same interdisciplinary team, so she and Mr. Fox shared the same students. Teaching has always been my love and I had a great time that day. The fact that I was not shut away in my office and could work well with the same students Mr. Fox had difficulty with seemed to break the ice with him. I can't say that our relationship improved right away, but that opportunity began the process of trust building. He began to see me not as some young kid with little experience and lots of book knowledge but as a colleague who could relate to students and still have high academic expectations. Changes took place in the hallway conversations we had and over time our interactions became more collegial. I never revisited that original conversation with him but something from that meeting must have taken hold. I met with the team often and heard his tone toward students change over time. I'm sure that it had much more to do with his trusting me as a teacher than my knowledge of preadolescent developmental needs.

In their study of trust in school, Bryk & Schneider (2003) found a strong connection between relational trust among stakeholder groups and student achievement. In their words,

> Relational trust is grounded in the social respect that comes from the kinds of social discourse that take place across the school community. Respectful exchanges are marked by genuinely listening to what each person has to say and by taking these views into account in subsequent actions. Even when people disagree, individuals can still feel valued if others respect their opinions. (p. 42)

I had entered the initial conversation with Mr. Fox with the idea that my noble intentions to collaborate would shine through and we would be able to come to agreement on the best way to work with students. However, I came to the meeting with some false assumptions:

- I knew the best way to work with middle school students.
- Mr. Fox didn't care about the students.
- I could enter a new system and on the basis of my credentials pass over the need to build relationships before trying to collaborate.

By entering an adjoining classroom for a day (and other classrooms on other days) I entered into a social discourse with which Mr. Fox could relate. From that point, we were able to listen to one another, even though that listening took place in team meetings, in hallway conversations, and over lunch. Those interactions opened the door to more genuine collegial conversations about teaching and learning.