

ED 308 149

SP 031 221

AUTHOR Miserandino, Anthony
 TITLE Supervision for Growth: A Practitioner's Perspective.
 PUB DATE 30 Mar 89
 NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Role; Educational Environment; *Moral Development; Professional Development; Secondary Education; *Staff Development; *Student Motivation; *Student Needs; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

A successful program for staff development focused on moral development will view teachers as growing adults who will become more professional and successful as they are provided with a work environment that demands choice, autonomy, dialogue, and reflection. Such a working environment comes from the close collaboration of the administrator, the teaching staff, and the students. This paper describes a staff development effort which moved the faculty closer to the ideal of a new professional culture centered upon student learning. While this model examines policies within schoolhouse walls, it does have the power to effect policy changes outside of the individual school since it seeks to establish a richer understanding of the teaching profession. A case study is given of a faculty workshop, organized around the theme of developing new norms to enhance the professionalization of the teaching staff by attending more responsibly to students' needs. Three dominant areas which needed to be addressed by the faculty were identified: (1) the students thought the teachers were unfair in grading; (2) instructional styles needed to be enhanced and expanded; and (3) the faculty endorsed both short and long term responsibilities for professional development. Within this presentation, supervision by the principal is seen as an obligation which seeks to promote the moral growth of the staff by attending to issues of injustice as perceived by the school community. (JD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED308149

SUPERVISION FOR GROWTH: A PRACTITIONER'S PERSPECTIVE

Anthony Miserandino, Ph.D.
Principal
Sacred Heart High School
Yonkers, New York 10703

Paper presented at the American Educational Research
Association, Annual Meeting, San Francisco, Friday,
March 30, 1989.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Miserandino

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

PO 31881

Supervision for Growth: A Practitioner's Perspective

School faculties are a rich mix of personalities, commitments, and expertise. Encouraging the faculty to tap into this richness is the primary challenge of administrators in general, and of those seeking to promote the moral development of the school community through staff development activities.

The research makes it clear that such a concern is best addressed by those vested parties with the greatest responsibility for teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond, 1988; Liberman, 1986; Timar & Kirp, 1988). Indeed, it is becoming increasingly clear that the current wave of school reform centers about school-based models of improvement in both curriculum and staff development (Orlich, 1989).

The concern for a school-based approach reflects and extends the findings of the effective school movement in the area of staff development (Gall & Renchler, 1985; Lindelow & Heynderickx, 1988). Indeed, perhaps it is best viewed as the humanization of the effective school movement. One of the major criticisms of the effective school movement is that it fails to take into account the specific needs of the teachers and students in an attempt to "control" school variables (Linney & Seidman, 1989). Central to the effective school movement is a concern for the school climate or ethos. It would be unjust to avoid addressing the "moral" nature of this

climate in an attempt to be "value free" in the school community.

Indeed, once teachers and students come together for schooling, and enter into discussion about the "stuff" of the curriculum the moral dialogue has begun (Jackson, 1986). The dialogue becomes both the content and process of the "moral ecology" of the school (Bellah, et al. 1987).

When teachers ask questions of who, what, where or when, they conclude the discussion with "why". If they don't, their students do, albeit in another form: "why are we studying this, for what purpose". At the heart of such questions is the moral issue regarding the values inherent in any course of study. In addition, there is the personal moral dimension implicit in this dialogue: it is the central question of "learning how to be oneself even while responding to the claims others make on us" (Starratt, 1989, p.13).

It is in the midst of this dialogue that moral development actually unfolds. Indeed, such an exchange is at the heart of the movement towards moral development within the Kohlberg perspective (1976). This dialogue must be carried out with a sensitivity to the persons involved if the claims the claims of critics of this approach, who seek to underscore the moral growth of persons through care and compassion, are to be adequately answered (Gilligan, 1981). Of course the "truth" of moral development lies in the tension of both perspectives (Schrag, 1989). By addressing the dual concerns of justice and compassion the school community can more effectively move closer to "truth" as embodied in the formal academic curriculum

and the "hidden" curriculum of social interaction within the school setting.

The Administrator and Moral Development

It is the critical role of the Administrator to insure that this dialogue occurs with a classroom environment and school ethos which is both just and caring, and that the teachers involved are skilled in approaching the task of moral discourse both in the classroom and the halls of the school.

This task is best accomplished through the dual approach of a) supervising teachers based upon the conviction that as adults they are responsible for their own moral and professional development, and that such development will occur in a variety of settings and involve varied pacing; and, b) that programs of supervision for staff development must start from the experience of teachers and students rather than imposed from the outside.

Hence a successful program for staff development focused on moral development will view teachers as growing adults who will become more professional and successful as they are provided with a work environment that demands choice, autonomy, dialogue, and reflection (Glickman, 1985; Sprinthall, Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). Such a working environment comes from the close collaboration of the administrator, the teaching staff, and the students. The programs described below move the faculty closer to the ideal of a new professional culture centered on student learning rather than the current models focused upon faculty deficiency. While this model examines policies within the schoolhouse walls, it does have the power

to effect policy changes outside of the individual school since it seeks to establish a richer understanding of the teaching profession (Darling-Hammond, 1988).

Collaboration: A Case Study

A faculty workshop was organized around the theme of developing new norms to enhance the professionalization of our teaching staff by attending more responsibly to students' needs.. The school is fairly large (N=750) with a varied student body (30% minority; 24% economically disadvantaged). This meeting was held in the context of a school-wide self-evaluation study. Elected class representatives from the Student Government were invited to participate in the discussion. Questions regarding the nature of the education provided at our school were raised: what were teacher concerns about students and the apparent lack of involvement of students in their educational achievement; what impact did students' needs and concerns have on instruction; and lastly, how would we frame a response to the many issues raised in this workshop which was open-ended and inclusive of all sectors of the school community.

It became clear to the teachers that they cared very much about the quality of the education they were responsible for managing. As other researchers have found, the dominant motivation and source of reward for teachers centered about promoting students' growth and development (McLaughlin, et al., 1986).

After initial agreement about shared purposes, a rich discussion unfolded with specific problems emerging which

needed to be addressed by the faculty. Three dominant problem areas emerged from discussion among teachers and among teachers and students together: a) students judged teachers to be too harsh and punitive in the awarding of grades, simply put--students perceived teachers to be "unfair"; b) that instructional styles needed to be enhanced and expanded, and c) the faculty endorsed the ideal of both short term and long term responsibilities for professional development.

It should be made clear that all three issues were judged to be important by both students and faculty and that both groups agreed that there was a shared moral obligation to deal with the injustices that were involved in these three areas of concern. Indeed, students were pleased to see their teachers so concerned about their welfare; in turn, teachers felt that students "listened, really listened" to their frustrations regarding students' failures to take greater responsibility for their learning. It was clear to the teachers that the competence at stake in such discussions concerned not only intellectual gains of students but also the development of moral capacities of students in dealing with the obligations involved in their assuming a greater role in their education.

As a result of this initial phase of reflection, teachers felt the need for more information to evaluate and plan activities to deal with these three central concerns. Building upon the results of action-orientated research for staff development (Boehnert & Moore, 1985; Lieberman, 1986; Sparks, 88), the faculty took responsibility for studying each of the three central needs. They reviewed research on grading and

student evaluation, worked on material dealing with student motivation, and discussed their findings with students. The supervisory role of the principal was one of "researcher and staff facilitator". That is, the principal lead workshops (on themes of staff development, student motivation), supplied research literature for faculty to review, and worked with teams of teachers to statistically evaluate some of their questions.

Results student and teachers can live with

I. Grading and Evaluation: In discussion with student two issues predominated, a) the perceived harshness in awarding grades, and b) a perceived differential treatment of boys and girls in class by "some teachers".

The first issue was explored by a statistical analysis of over-all grading patterns within the school (Appendix A). The data failed to reveal any significant differences in grades between departments. Indeed, there appeared to be surprisingly consistent patterns over the course of three years worth of grades.

After review of this data by students and teachers, the discussion moved to a new level of understanding. What students were most critical about was the way in which "class participation" as a category of evaluation was being "misused" by teachers (the student definition of "harshness"). It appeared to students that many teachers did not a) give clear feedback about what was desirable class behavior, b) did not make it clear how they penalized students for such inappropriate behavior, and c) how they factored class

participation into the final grade for the course.

After discussion of the issue it was decided by faculty and students that they together would decide what were appropriate classroom behaviors and that teachers should make clear a) how a student was progressing in the class participation category, and b) how a grade would be assigned to this achievement. Both teachers and students adopted a generalized form for evaluating class participation (see Appendix B). The form is used on a regular basis (normally once every 3 weeks). The implementation of this form has been received well by all parties involved. Students now feel that they have a say in what is expected of them, and feel that they are now receiving adequate feedback on their performance. There should be an improvement in the academic success rate of students for the future (see Appendix A) since feedback is consistently correlated with school achievement (Belmont, 1989).

Through this discussion both students and teachers have come to realize that more than academic issues were raised. Indeed, the concern for doing the "right thing" was raised by both groups. To this degree, the discussions have moved the school community closer to realizing that academic performance and school effects have moral consequences (Good & Weinstein, 1986).

A second and related issue to the use of grades was the differential way in which teachers awarded grades. It was the student perception that teachers were "easier on the girls than the boys". This complaint was most strongly voiced by students in the honors program. A statistical analysis of the grading

patterns of these students revealed that such a difference did indeed exist (Appendix C). Teachers had to confront the injustice revealed in the data. Upon review and reflection it appeared that teachers were using grades to control boys' behavior in the classroom. A series of workshops led by the principal and teacher volunteers were initiated with an eye on assisting teachers to develop more appropriate behavioral interventions for dealing with student classroom management. At this point in time, it appears that teachers have an increased sense of their options for managing classroom disruptions, and that they feel more in control of their teaching. While such outcomes still need to be formally evaluated, they appear to be consistent with the research on teacher efficacy (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977; Brophy & Good, 1986).

II. Instructional Styles: Teachers were quick to highlight the central difficulty in dealing with students: how to motivate them. In part this appeared to involve varied teaching strategies as well as attending to different motivational needs of students. Again, the model for dealing with this concern followed the action-research guidelines of Liberman (1986) and Sparks (1988). The initial phase was to have faculty read significant literature in the field of achievement motivation (Ames & Ames, 1984, 1985; Brophy, 1987) and to begin to apply key ideas to strategies geared at motivating our students.

This has produced a series of "faculty forums" whereby individual teachers or clusters of teachers from the same department present to the faculty new teaching methods based upon actual classroom use with our students. To demonstrate the

"newness" of the information gained, teachers developed a quiz on motivation which they administered to their peers (Appendix D). This exercise served to a) introduce the faculty to some key concepts, b) illustrated the need to appreciate how different students react to different classroom environments, and c) fostered faculty support to work together on developing a greater awareness to be more responsive to the needs of students. These faculty forums have produced far more change on the part of teachers than would have been possible by administrative dictates. The net result is a faculty more alert to the ways in which their behavior impacts not only on student learning but also on the ways they, individually and collectively, can motivate students to assume greater responsibility for their learning.

III. On-going Professional Development: As can be surmised from the above discussion of faculty involvement in evaluating serious questions dealing with their work, a new faculty culture has emerged through such reflection. The majority of the faculty are committed to examining their performance with an eye on enhancing their skills and competency as professional.

With support from the principal, the faculty developed a series of professional activities designed to meet their needs as growing professionals. It was apparent that many teachers who possessed certification and a master's degree were not about to take graduate courses to enhance their skills or extend their knowledge base. Such courses did not meet their specific classroom or professional needs. Professional

workshops did not always meet their specific needs in either curriculum concerns or specific classroom skills.

As a result, the principal and teachers together forged a program of Continuing Education Units (CEU's). These units would involve teacher initiated activities specifically designed to satisfy a teacher or a group of teacher's classroom needs (examples in Appendix D). The activities would meet criteria for accountability (eg., teacher generated objectives/goals, involve a certain amount of time, the production of results, and a sharing of results with the faculty) and would receive an agreed upon number of CEU's. As a result of the collaborative effort in establishing the CEU Program, the administration and teachers moved one step closer to the ideal of a "community of leaders" described by Barth (1988). These CEU's would be accrued for the purposes of salary increments in awarding teacher compensation.

In its first year of implementation, approximately 25% of the teaching staff were involved in a variety of activities. Most teachers elected some form of collaborative activities. The benefits were increased personal support among teachers and an enhancement of teacher responsibility for the quality of instruction offered students. Administrative support, both personal and financial, cemented new perceptions about the collegial commitments of all members of the school community to enhance the growth of a professional teaching staff.

Conclusion

Supervision by the principal has been conceived of within this presentation as an obligation which seeks to promote both

the individual and corporate moral growth of teaching staffs by attending to issues of injustice as perceived by the school community. It started with the field-based experience of the teacher, was challenged by the insights of research and the larger scholarly community, and returned to the teacher for internalization and action.

The leadership role of the principal was critical to initiating and sustaining this movement towards a new cultural norm for professional development within the school community. The quality of such leadership was important in both its own right and as a critical underpinning of success in academic and personal moral development by all members of the school community.

References

- Ames, R., & Ames, C. (1984). Research on motivation, Vol. I: Student motivation. New York: Academic Press.
- Ames, R., & Ames, C. (1985). Research on motivation, Vol. II: Classroom milieu. New York: Academic Press.
- Barth, R. (1988). School: A community of leaders. In A. Liberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (129-148). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Belmont, J.M. (1989). Cognitive strategies and strategic learning: The socio-instructional approach. American Psychologist, 44, 142-149.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change, 7. (R-1589/7-HEW), Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Boehnert, J.B., & Moore, G.A. (1985). From research to practice: Tying it all together. In J.G. Donald & A. Sullivan, Using research to improve teaching (83-95). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brophy, J.E. (1987). Synthesis of research on strategies for motivating students to learn. Educational Leadership, 45, 40-48.
- Brophy, J.E., & Good, T.L. (1986). Teacher Behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Whittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, third edition (328-336). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Darling-Hammond, L., (1988). Policy and professionalism. In A. Liberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (55-78). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gall, M.D., & Renchler, R.S., (1985). Effective staff development for teachers: a research-based model. ERIC: University of Oregon (EA 017 615).
- Gilligan, C. (1981). In a different voice: psychological theory and women's development. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Glickman, C.D. (1985). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Good, T.L., & Weinstein, R.S. (1986). Schools make a difference: Evidence, criticisms, and new directions. American Psychologist, 41, 1090-1097.

- Kohlberg, L. (1976). "Moral stages and moralization: the cognitive developmental approach". In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior. New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lieberman, A. (1986). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on. Educational Leadership, 43, 28-32.
- Lindelow, J., & Heynderickx, J. (1988). The promise and practice of school-based management. OSSC Report, 29, 1-8.
- Linney, J.L., & Seidman, E. (1989). The future of schooling. American Psychologist, 44, 336-340.
- McLaughlin, Pfeifer, R.S., Swanson-Owens, D., & Yee, S. (1986). Why teachers won't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 420-426.
- Orlich, D.C. (1989). Education reforms: Mistakes, misconceptions, miscues. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 512-512.
- Timar, T.B., & Kirp, D.L. (1988). Managing educational excellence. New York: Stanford Series on Education and Public Policy, Falmer Press.
- Sparks, G.M. (1988). Teachers' attitudes toward change and subsequent improvements in classroom teaching. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 111-117.
- Sprinthall, N.A., & Thies-Sprinthall L. (1983). The teacher as an adult learner: A cognitive-developmental view. Staff development, eight-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (13-26). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Starratt, R.J., (1989). The dramatic consciousness of the principal. Unpublished manuscript. Center for Nonpublic Education, Fordham University.

Appendix: A: Grading Patterns
School Achievement: First Semester Grade

	<u>Jan. '86</u>			<u>Jan. '87</u>			<u>Jan. '88</u>		
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>SD</u>
Art	82	81	4	81	82	2	78	79	3
Business	82	84	5	84	85	4.7	82	82	5
English	75	74	5	77	76	5.3	76	76	5
Health	75	75	5	81	81	2.8	74	74	1.2
History	77	77	4.6	79	79	4.8	79	80	4
Math	82	81	5.4	81	80	5.9	79	77	5.7
Mod.Lang.	79	79	4.5	76	74	5.8	77	79	4.8
Religion	79	79	3	80	78	4.4	79	79	3
Science	81	79	6.6	79	77	6.3	74	73	5

Success Rate: First Semester: Listed below are percentage of students passing a given course. For example, if there are 25 students in a class and 5 fail for the grading period, the success rate is 80%.

	<u>Jan. '87</u>	<u>Jan. '88</u>
Mean	93	92
Median	97	94
SD	9	9.6

Failure Rate: Listed below are the percentages of students who failed one or more courses during the grading period.

	<u>Jan. '86</u>	<u>Jan. '87</u>	<u>Jan. '88*</u>
Seniors	19	24	31
Juniors	28	30	41
Sophomores	28	38	33
Freshmen	24	36	25

*Fewer multiple failures; many more cases of only one failure per student.

APPENDIX B: CLASS PARTICIPATION

Class Participation: Criteria for Evaluation

1. Student asks appropriate questions in discussion:
2. Student follows-up questions of other students/teacher:
3. Student makes reference to material previously studied in answering questions:
4. Student listens actively and attentively as exhibited by posture or writing notes:
5. Student asks clarifying questions on material presented:
6. Student makes references to interdisciplinary material when discussing topic:
7. Student submits written work on time:
8. Student revises work submitted in a draft form:
9. Student seeks additional help as required:
10. Student offers assistance to other students in need:
11. Student submits class assignments ahead of schedule whenever possible:
12. Student seeks out the teacher to review assignments/tests when they have received a failing grade:
13. Student show interest in subject, over and above what is required, by seeking additional assignments/projects:

Students are encouraged to list other criteria which they judge to be valid in evaluating their performance:

14.

15.

Appendix C: Grading Patterns

GPA RECEIVED IN THE HONORS PROGRAM

GRADE	9		10		11		12	
	GLS	BYS	GLS	BYS	GLS	BYS	GLS	BYS
MEAN	90*	83	93*	88	88	87	93*	89
SD	4	5	6	7	9	8	4	7
N	36		38		38		39	

*p<.05

Appendix D: Motivation Quiz
the Quiz

1. Match the following: (Stipek, 1984)

_____ "The teacher said I was a good speller"

_____ "The teacher usually puts an A on my paper"

_____ "I usually get 100% on my spelling test"

_____ "I usually get the highest score in the class"

a: normative feedback

d. objective past performance

b: social evaluation

c: symbolic evaluation

2. True or false:

_____ "Students who lack confidence in their ability credit their success in luck or the task being easy".

_____ "Students who lack confidence credit their failures to lack of ability". (Hill, 1984)

3. Students who lack confidence in their ability show a pattern of:

a. low performance

b. low achievement-motivation

c. high test-anxiety

d. all of the above

(Hill, 1984)

4. Students with learned helplessness can be taught to persist at school-like problem solving tasks by showing them that their failure is due to lack of:

a. ability

b. effort

c. ability and effort

d. all of the above

(Dweck, 1975)

5. True or false:

_____ Test anxiety and success-failure attribution measures correlate decreasingly with test performance across the secondary years for boys and girls from all socioeconomic backgrounds. (Hill, 1984)

6. Which of the following characteristics can help decrease motivational effects on test performance:

a. perceived time limits

b. difficulty of test content

c. instructions about the test

d. none of the above

(Hill, 1984)

7. True or false:

_____ Much of the available research evidence seems to support the hypothesis that rewards that emphasize success or competency on a task enhance intrinsic motivation.
(Harter, 1981; Brophy, 1981)

8. Extrinsic motivation can decrease intrinsic motivation in a student by removing feelings of:

- a. freedom
- b. ownership
- c. choice
- d. none of the above (DeCharms, 1984)

9. Students perception of self competency can be decreased by:

- a. intrinsic motivation
- b. uncritical use of reinforcement
- c. positive reinforcement
- d. none of the above

10. True or false:

_____ A rigidly structured classroom can inhibit student motivation as much as an unstructured classroom. (DeCharms, 1984)

11. Which of the following activities can increase intrinsic motivation in students:

- a. goal setting
- b. allowing students to select means to goal realization
- c. encouraging personal responsibility
- d. all of the above (DeCharms, 1984)

12. True or false:

_____ Research indicates that administrators rather than teachers are essential to increasing intrinsic motivation in the school.
(DeCharms, 1984)

13. What strategies can teachers use to increase intrinsic motivation in their students:

- a. believe that all students are capable of such increases
- b. believe that they are able to assist students
- c. review their class structure to examine its effects

14. Most administrators (under/over) supervise their teachers when it comes to instructional improvements in the classroom.
(DeCharms, 1984)

15. True or false:

_____ Teacher enthusiasm for subject matter can increase both student achievement and interest.
(Morgan, 1984); Murray, 1983)

Appendix B: Sample CEU Activities

Activity A: Workshop Reflections

Approximately five faculty workshops are schedule for the academic year. These workshops will be formal presentations by the Principal or an outside consultant. To receive CEU's for this option at least four reflection papers must be submitted.

Following these presentations, faculty members may prepare a reflection paper (5 typewritten pages) in which the topics presented are:

- a) recognized as new and significant or as a re-affirmation of previously gained knowledge;
- b) suggestions discussed for the application of new ideas for classroom use or departmental review;
- c) statement of what the next step ought to be for either the individual or the school community in moving closed to the goals of the workshop.

Activity B: Academic Discussion Groups

Faculty groups composed of at least five persons and no more that seven, and representing at least two departments may meet to discuss and review critical educational/classroom issues.

The issues may be of:

- a) general concern (ie., texts dealing with educational reform such as A Nation At Risk, Horace's Compromise, A Place Called School, etc.)
- b) specific curricula/instructional issues (ie., independent study models, writing across the curriculum projects, use of media in the classroom, computer applications, etc.)

A group must meet at least five times with each session lasting for at least one hour. Minutes must be kept and submitted after each session. A summary report must be submitted by the group before CEU's will be awarded.