ABSTRACT
          Findings of a study that examined the processes
involved in facilitating change in a veteran teacher's beliefs are
presented in this paper. Qualitative data were derived from analysis
of interaction between a supervisor and a female third-grade teacher,
who participated in the Delaware County, Pennsylvania, Teacher
Evaluation Plan for 1.5 years. Methodology involved analysis of
audiotaped supervisory conferences and two interviews, a
teacher-researcher dialogue journal, the researcher's fieldnotes, and
supervisory documents. A conclusion is that supportive supervision
involves and fosters mutual trust and collegiality, teacher
ownership, a safe climate for teacher expression, the engagement of
both supervisor and teacher in co-learning and co-reflection, and
listening to a teacher's reflective language. The findings illustrate
a phenomenological view of supervision, which sees supervision as
constructive and teacher-centered. Successful implementation of a
supportive teacher-supervision plan must include reflective thinking,
adequate provision of supervisors and time, a sustained dialogue to
build a trusting school climate, and a constructive social process.
(LMI)

SEEING SUPERVISION DIFFERENTLY: THE PROCESSES OF FACILITATING CHANGE IN A VETERAN TEACHER'S BELIEFS

W.Edward Bureau

Focus of the Research

"Can the improvement of instruction come about through systemic means or, in the last analysis, does it simply occur within individuals acting alone?" That question seems a perpetual puzzle to all those a part of improving teaching - teachers, supervisors, teacher educators, researchers. An emerging alternative to that either/or question is creating within a system chances for a teacher to have her professional growth nurtured by a supportive supervisor. Such an approach holds that the greatest potential for reform is within the rich knowledge and experience of veteran teachers.

Respectful of a teacher's beliefs and practices, such supportive supervision presupposes that a teacher retains ownership of change or of the desire to do so. The supervisor can, at best, facilitate reflection and change in - or confirmation of - beliefs and practices. Acting as a tourguide who shows choices of routes or sights, a supervisor may nudge the teacher into a process of seeing her teaching anew or differently.

Too, the process of reflection occurs within the supervisor engaged in nurturing a teacher's reflection. Within supportive supervision lies mutuality; co-reflection and co-learning occur for teacher and supervisor. Supportive supervisory and reflective processes must occur within a culture that values mutual risk taking and trust building. As part of those processes, a supervisor listens for a teacher's reflective language - a mirror to changes or confirmations in beliefs and practices.

Investigating the assertions and hopes in such a supportive approach to supervision is at the heart of this research project. Simply said, the focusing question for research is, "What is the nature of the processes involved as a supervisor attempts to facilitate changes in a veteran teacher's beliefs?" Using qualitative research methods, the question was investigated by a veteran teacher and me over a period of a year and a half.

Beyond seeking answers to that focusing question, the research speaks to the reform of supervisory practices toward those that enhance teachers' reflection and growth through collaborative processes and shared dialogue, toward those that engender mutual trust, respect. and risk taking. Offering a phenomenologically expansive view of supervision, the research is emancipatory in its hope that supervision can evolve into a process of nurturing teachers' reflection upon and change or confirmation of beliefs and practices. Such an expansive view envisions supervision that is a teacher centered, constructive social process.

Those who are curious about how or believe that teachers' professional growth can be facilitated will find the interpretations arising from the research thought provoking. Practitioners who work where children are learning - teachers, supervisors, and administrators - should find that the research points toward reorienting supervisory processes and behaviors. Those who continue the patient work of research will find points of departure for further investigation into supervision, reflection on practice, and the language of reflection.

Research Contexts and Methods

To fully understand the research, it is essential to glimpse at its surrounding contexts (the teacher and a district's supervision policy), data collection methods, and problematic concerns that arose. Before such glimpses are given, a simple but critical assumption behind the research should be understood. In contrast to much recent research on preservice and novice teachers, the research focused on supervision of veteran teachers. Thus, the research is grounded in the notion that the greatest potential for improving teaching is within the rich knowledge and experience of veteran teachers.

A veteran teacher who participated in the research, Pam had taught third grade for a number of years and was in the process of trying to move her classroom to a reading/writing workshop approach. Prior to teaching third grade, she taught second grade and, prior to that, fifth grade in a more rural school system. As research data shows, her training and early teaching can be typified as "linear sequential" in approach and thinking. Subsequent coursework prepared her for a principal's position and made her a member of the Pennsylvania Writing Project. Pam was an active participant in district staff and curriculum development projects. Partly from her own curiosity about her teaching, Pam expressed willingness to participate in the research.

Research was done with Pam in Springfield School
District in Delaware County, Pennsylvania. Comprised of 180
some certificated staff, the district actively developed
ways to increase teacher professionalism and senses of
efficacy. One such effort has been the development of a
Teacher Evaluation Plan vested in such notions as teacher
decision making about professional objectives and as
supervision that is supportive of progress toward those
objectives.

The Teacher Evaluation Plan includes such features as
Goal Setting, Supportive Clinical Supervision, and
Teacher/Supervisor Planning and Progress Conferences. In
Goal Setting, a teacher chooses up to four long-term goals
identified in a self-evaluation process. Goals, for example,
can range from those related to classroom teaching to
assessment of learning to school/community relationships.
In a Teacher/Supervisor Planning Conference at year's
beginning, the teacher plans activities, timeline, and
resources needed for meeting those goals.

Throughout the course of the year, the two work
together toward achievement of the goals; the supervisor's
role is primarily that of resource person and of coach.
During the year several progress meetings are held during
which the two collaboratively write progress statements; in
a like way, a summary statement is written at year's end
during a Cycle Report Conference. Because many teachers'
goals are long-term in nature, they often are extended into
the second and, perhaps, the third years of teachers' plans
for professional growth.

In Supportive Clinical Supervision, a teacher and
supervisor meet before a classroom observation to discuss
what features of teaching and classroom events should be
subject to data gathering; these features must relate to a
teacher's long-term growth objectives. After focused data
is gathered during a classroom observation, both meet to
mutually analyze the data and cooperatively write a summary
statement. The intent of the process is not only to offer
useful data to the teacher but to encourage reflection and,
if warranted, action upon the results.

Working within the context of the Teacher Evaluation
Plan, Pam was involved in both Supportive Clinical
Supervision and Goal Setting during the research period. As
part of the supervisory process for both Goal Setting and
Supportive Clinical Supervision, informal classroom visits,
conferences, and discussions between supervisor and teacher
became sources of data. Sources, too, were the conferences
at the beginning of the year (Teacher/Supervisor Planning
conferences) and at the end of the year (Cycle Report
conferences).

The systemic contexts, thus, for the research are an
effort within a district to create a plan that offers

chances for a veteran teacher to change or confirm her
beliefs and practices through a process of reflection and
growth. Central to that plan are assumptions about what
roles both teachers and supervisors should play in the
processes of working toward fulfillment of long-term growth
objectives. This research project investigated the nature
of those processes as a supervisor attempted to facilitate a
veteran teacher's changes in beliefs.

Together, Pam and I used our many times for talking as
teacher and supervisor as sources of qualitative research
data. As both a researcher and a supervisor working with the
teacher, my research role was that of a participant
observer. Three means of data collection were used -
audiotaping of supervisory conferences, a dialogue journal
between teacher and researcher, and audiotaping of two
interviews. Together, these methods offered triangulation
of data and interpretations. A fourth device, the
researcher's fieldnotes/reflective log offered further data
not just on instances of teacher reflection but on
contextual overlays and on my own reflections about the
research. As a fifth method, supervisory documents were
collected as we generated them as part of a multi-year
supervisory plan.
    Processes of inductive analysis boiled the rich data
from those five sources down into implications that can be
taken to other contexts. In keeping with the concepts of
generalizability none of the implications to follow is to be
taken as a prescription applicable to all teachers and,
certainly, not to all supervisor/teacher interactions. As
opposed to prescriptions, they are visions of what could be
and challenges to those who would reorient supervisory
practices and behaviors.
    Research that seeks to interpret processes and beliefs
and which uses language as a mirror of changes is not
unproblematic. Pam's reflective language mirrored a series
of successive approximations as she reconsidered classroom
practices, the problems that accompanied them, and the
beliefs that framed them - all messy processes not given to
crisp, linear descriptions. Too, the messiness was at times
compounded by the constructive, social process of a
supervisor and teacher making meaning together, thus mixing
language and ideas. Simply said, the problem in considering
the volume of data was sorting out indicators of changes in
her beliefs and of the nature of facilitative supervision.
Doing so was possible through the combination of five data
sources. Collectively, they also enabled triangulation of
implications as well as setting implications descriptively
in the contexts of classroom and supervisory processes.

5

The Essence of the Data

At the end of the research period, an aggregate body of data enabled answering the research question, "What is the nature of the processes involved as a supervisor attempts to facilitate changes in a veteran teacher's beliefs." To answer that question two primary questions needed to be answered: "How did Pam's beliefs change? What was the nature of the supervisory processes." What this section of the paper does is to give the essence on data that answers those two questions.

Pam's story is bound by and woven in and out of three areas of beliefs, those about student needs, curriculum, and classroom management. In telling the story of how she deliberates and reconstructs beliefs in each area, a thick description unfolds of a veteran teacher changing her classroom and practices. Understanding Pam's story sets the stage for understanding the facilitative supervisory processes intertwined in the story.

Pam's reflective language is captured in a chart organized to show how her beliefs in three major areas shifted during the research period. Major shifts are summarized, keeping them as closely as possible to Pam's intent. Key words, most of which are metaphors, are underlined. Former beliefs are presented in the left column, current beliefs in the right.

BELIEFS ABOUT STUDENT NEEDS

Respond to needs by <u>teaching information</u> or <u>skills</u>.	Respond by <u>facilitating</u> the <u>processes</u> that can be <u>internalized</u>.
Respond to needs <u>en masse</u> with a <u>ditto sheet</u>.	Respond to <u>any person at the right time</u> by <u>diagnosing</u> then <u>troubleshooting</u>, <u>applying the bandaid</u>, and <u>reaching into the bag of tricks</u>.
Children can be <u>taught to write</u>.	Children are <u>emerging writers</u>, <u>cowriters</u> and <u>colearners</u>.
Behaviors during workshop are <u>distractions</u>.	Behaviors can be <u>indicators</u> of needs.

5

BELIEFS ABOUT CURRICULUM

Language arts curriculum is <u>linear</u> and <u>sequential</u>.	Language arts curriculum is <u>process oriented</u>.
<u>Skills</u> are taught in a <u>box necklace</u> that <u>combines</u> <u>linear and cyclical processes</u>.	<u>Skills</u>, <u>strategies</u>, and <u>socialization</u> are taught via <u>patterns</u> that are <u>tools</u> or <u>hooks</u> to be <u>applied</u>.
Curriculum content should be taught <u>directly and explicitly</u>.	Curriculum content should be taught via <u>immersion</u> and <u>implicit learning</u>.
Crosscurricular themes are taught in <u>sideline</u>, <u>supplemental</u>, <u>quasi units</u>.	Themes are <u>global approaches</u> or <u>orientations</u> that reshape entire <u>programs</u>.

BELIEFS ABOUT CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Control of and responsibility for learning is the <u>teacher's</u> exercised through specific direction giving.	Both are the <u>child's</u>, learned via <u>developing</u> a <u>sense of ownership</u>.
The teacher's role is to be <u>purveyor of knowledge</u>.	The role is one of <u>facilitator</u> <u>overseer</u>, or <u>orchestra conductor</u>.
A classroom must be <u>absolutely quiet with no distractions</u>.	A classroom can reflect a <u>constructive</u> or <u>divergent undercurrent</u>.
A teacher maintains control by creating <u>structures</u> that keep children <u>on task</u>.	Children become <u>responsible</u> for their own <u>on and off task</u> behaviors

6

within boundaries,
guidelines, and
expectations.

BALANCING THE THREE BELIEFS

The teacher's role is to achieve optimum balance among the three.	Balance is not necessarily always always going to be achieved.
A structured approach to teaching is to plan based on objectives and to stay with plans during lessons.	Look at the nature of the situation and plan based on the three, but be flexible by responding to the teachable moment and to kids' needs.
Standard operating procedures guide teaching.	Teaching should be flexible, process oriented, and cyclical.

In this last section of the chart, appear Pam's answers
on the right to a question she asked early in the research
period - whether the three areas of belief could be balanced
one against another. As her words show, she moves toward
the belief that balancing cannot always be achieved because
she must respond flexibly to the changing nature of
children's needs. Too, the reflective language shows a
changed view of teaching from one once run by "standard
operating procedures" to one "flexible, process oriented,
and cyclical." This shift in orientation to teaching has
occurred through reflection, represents a major
reconstruction of beliefs, and is linked to facilitative
supervision.

Just as Pam's reflective language evidenced changes in
her beliefs, so, too, was it a path into understanding
supervision that facilitated those changes. A vignette from
the body of the data illustrates both nature of and
procedures that support facilitative supervision.

During the second spring of research, Pam and I go
through the classroom observation process, beginning with a
pre-conference. As part of the procedure, I write out on a
form what Pam says will be occur during the time period:
"Kids will talk, then work through a story map - all as a
prewriting activity." Too, on the form I have written,

"Look at all writers to see who is attending and who is
hesitating (note behaviors)." A procedure has been used to
focus the observation within Pam's goals for the year. By
going through that procedure, the preobservation conference,
Pam and I have worked collegially, creating a level of
comfort that will set the tone for analyzing the data in our
postobservation conference.

On that Tuesday, I take notes on NCR paper so that we
both can have ready made copies. Specific writers'
behaviors are noted in the context of the writing workshop.
For instance, some look contemplative as they write; others
exchange papers with a friend to receive a response to what
is written. Before I leave, I give Pam a copy of the notes
so that she can read and reflect on them before we meet for
the postobservation conference. My role during the actual
observation has been to gather descriptive data in the
fashion and with the focus that Pam and I agreed to.

Several days later, we meet during the postobservation
conference to complete two procedures, co-analysis of the
descriptive data and collaborative writing of a summary
statement. As supervisor, I have read and reflected on the
data but have consciously not drawn final conclusions about
what it means. That I will do with Pam by listening to her
reflections, sharing mine, and coming together with her on a
mutual interpretation. Within the procedures, then, are the
qualities of co-reflection, collegiality, and, most
importantly, trust.

Through co-analysis of the data, we facilitate
reflection, focusing Pam's thought on those three broad
areas of beliefs she is changing, most particularly on her
beliefs about student needs. I begin by reminding us of the
procedural tasks that we must complete.

E: What we want to do is jot in this section what we
   think the data shows about what was going on,
   then just write a summary statement —
   collaboratively written. We were going to look
   at the kids, who's attending, who's hesitating,
   what their behaviors are, the writers' behaviors.

P: I was interested by the writers' behaviors. They
   appear to me to be exhibiting the types of
   behaviors that I hope they would be exhibiting.
   The fact that they were still writing after the
   bell went off is encouraging to me. You want to
   motivate them, but, if you let it go too long,
   they get off task. So, I think that what I have
   been trying to do is, if they need to keep
   writing, to keep writing and, if they're ready,
   they may share. I've been pleased with the way
   they have taken and assimilated the story map we

8

9

did for Chocolate Touch, King Midas, then they developed their own. They really had, I thought, a good feel for it after looking over the notes.

E: I think one of the other indicators was that they were real excited. In the large group sharing, as far as getting ideas together, there was a lot of excitement in there.

P: I felt, in the time period we had, we got a lot of good ideas on the board....I'm pleased with their progress overall. We're working a lot with description now, going into how writers describe characters. I'll be anxious to see their next story and how it carries over.

E: One of the things that I caught at the end, along those lines, was that the kids - you were reading chapter four - were responding to the text as writers. The kids were asking "What is going to happening to this milk?" That's an interesting indicator of story mapping and all that work you have been doing with description is coming in.

P: It's paying off. They amaze me at times with their predictions; they will just blurt it out, which is good that they are thinking and anticipating, which is funny because some of the more reluctant readers that I have had this year are the ones who are starting to take off and make predictions. I am getting a lot of good feedback orally; hopefully it is carrying over.

As we analyze the data together, Pam reflects on her actions, painting pictures from the descriptive data in the notes. From my notes on writers' behaviors, she sees how the children have assimilated story maps into their writing. We share pleasure in the indication that the children are excited about their writing. The focused observation, too, helps Pam see that some of reluctant students are making unexpected progress. That reflection feeds into Pam's continuing reconstruction of her beliefs about student needs.

Capturing her language and thoughts during the co-analysis, I have written our points on the form's section labeled, "Analysis of Data." The document shows that our analysis indicated that, "Writers' behaviors showed kids were actively writing; they wrote after the bell sounded. Kids were excited to share in pairs and in a group; many ideas flowed to the board. Kids responded to reading as writers." Our procedural task now is to

9

summarize what happened during the lesson, again, setting
the summary in the context of Pam's goals for the year.
At the outset of this, we laugh about ourselves and a
common experience in our backgrounds.

E: This is what we have so far. Miss anything?

P: No that summarizes it.

E: Now we get to write a statement. This ought to
be really fun, two Writing Project Fellows going
to collaboratively write a statement! What does
it all mean?

P: What's our focus? Who is our audience?

E: Our subject is...our purpose is who's attending
and who is no. And I think we should also put
down something about the transfer you are seeing
in this writing of the story grammar and all of
the mapping you have been doing. That is
important.

P: I think that the kids have really started to come
into their own as far as feeling comfortable
about themselves as writers. Case in point, now
that we have taken the story a step further into
the drafting stage and the fact that I am
available back there to conference with
them...you know, a couple have come back and
said, "I'm just really stuck; I don't know where
to go to next." And just the fact that they did
not completely fall apart.

E: Sure.

P: They know that there are ways out of it now;
whereas, before when they got a little
frustrated, they just threw their hands up and
said, "enough." But I'm seeing growth in their
writing behaviors.

E: I'm picking up your language here...this is a way
to do collaborative writing. I've got, "Kids are
coming into their own behaviors as writers and
are participating in writing...workshop"...what
do you want to call it?

P: Writing workshop.

10

11

E: "and...in showing...story maps"...Is this all
   right?

P: Yep.

E: How's that? Is it enough?

P: Sounds fine. I don't know.

E: Something else you want to add in there?

P: I'd like to tie in something, you know, a carry
   over from making connections between reading and
   writing.

E: Say more...

P: As evidence...that's not the word...

E: How about if we put a semicolon here?

P: "This shows making connections between reading
   and writing." I think it sounds fine. Great
   collaborative statement there.

E: It's terrific, exciting. 3/1/91

As part of the procedures in supportive supervision,
Pam and I have written collaboratively, producing a
summary statement that is both nonevaluative and mutually
agreeable in content. Again, I have generated phrasing
by gathering pieces of her language, and, as a final
statement, Pam has given me phrases to include. Thus,
the document states, "Kids are coming into their own as
writers in their behaviors, in participating in writing
workshop, and in showing they can use story maps in
writing; this evidences making connections between
reading/writing processes."
    Both the procedures and the qualities in this
supervisory process have furthered Pam's reflection on
and reconstruction of beliefs. The qualities of the
processes are colored with mutuality as we write a
summary statement that we both feel captures what
happened in the classroom. Listening carefully, I
respect Pam's tentativeness at accepting the statement in
its first form. With a question that invites her ideas,
I listen to the phrase that Pam wants to append to what
we have written.
    This vignette is but part of a year and a half long
story of a veteran teacher changing her beliefs about
teaching in the context of supervision that facilitates

11

the changes. Pam's story is a tapestry woven from her
teaching and from the children in her classroom. It is
Pam who is the weaver, the artist seeing patterns in her
reflections, the owner of changes. Yet she shares her
weaving with a supervisor who facilitates reflection and
changing that tapestry of beliefs. With the unfolding of
Pam's story, shifting beliefs become the threads coloring
her tapestry of change - threads showing, too, the hues
of the supervisory processes integral to the story.

With patient examination, those hues paint answers
to the central research question in this study: "What is
the nature of the processes involved as a supervisor
attempts to facilitate changes in a veteran teacher's
belief?" What emerges from the data are two views of the
concept of "nature of the processes." Part of the nature
is qualities of processes; the other is the supervisory
procedures. Both qualities and procedures appear in the
data as responses to the research question.

The qualities of supervisory processes that
facilitate change in a veteran teacher's beliefs, shown
in this research, confirm what those who understand an
expansive view of supervision already know. Supportive
supervision not only is typified by but nurtures:

- mutual trust, collegiality and the freedom to take
  risks

- understanding that leaves ownership of the
  direction of change with the teacher

- a climate in which a teacher can express her
  comfort and discomfort with changes in her
  teaching, classroom, and beliefs, as well as her
  intuitive feelings about accepting or rejecting
  change

- engagement of both teacher and supervisor in
  co-learning and co-reflection.

- listening to a teacher's reflective language for
  evidence of reflection on and changes in beliefs

Procedures in supervisory processes that facilitate
cnange can be written into a school district's policies
but must be part of the context of interactions between a
teacher and supervisor before they can begin to
facilitate changes in a veteran teacher's beliefs. What
the collected data showed was that facilitative
supervisory procedures:

- sustain long-term dialogue focused by the
  teacher's growth objectives.

- focus an observation in the context of a teacher's objectives and gather descriptive data as grist for teacher and supervisor reflection on how a teacher is developing in relation to those objectives

- provide for co-analysis of the data during a post-observation conference, at which time a nonevaluative summary statement is collaboratively written

With the rich contextual descriptions of Pam's story as background, our interactions in facilitative supervisory processes should enhance understanding of a phenomenologically expansive view of supervision. Central to understanding that view is a thoughtful reflection on the language so central to facilitative supervisory processes and to changes in Pam's beliefs. Facilitative supervisory processes and reflective language are points of departure onto a frontier where supervisors, teachers, and supervisory processes are seen differently.

Implications from the Research

"What is the nature of the processes involved as a supervisor attempts to facilitate changes in a veteran teacher's beliefs?" That question has focused this research project. Showing the way, a medium for investigation, the source of implications that have arisen is reflective language shared by a teacher and a supervisor. Simply said, the implications support a phenomenologically expansive view of supervision. In this sense, the implications are another season's promise put in the ground, perhaps frontiers for the brave to venture forth upon.

The broadest implication from the research is that the processes of supportive supervision can facilitate changes in veteran teachers' beliefs. The nature of those processes shared by a teacher and supervisor are both qualitative and procedural in nature. The nature of the processes within the teacher, herself, are those of a recursive, constructive process of reflection on action, reconstructing beliefs, and deliberating between beliefs. Whether within the teacher or shared with the supervisor, processes are typified by mutuality and by recognition that the teacher owns changes in her beliefs. Finally, the research points to a seemingly little explored frontier in school reform - that it begins with the veteran teacher in the contexts of her classroom and of

13

reflective supervision that enhances rather than inhibits growth.

What follow are select implications that arose from the research, those that apply directly to the notion of supportive supervision. After an implication is stated, short discussion clarifies, using, of course, words to show us the way.

Implication: A supervisor can facilitate a veteran teacher's reflection upon and change in or confirmation of beliefs.

Facilitation can occur through nudging a teacher into seeing her teaching anew or differently bv showing options, ideas, or research.A nudge is an encouragement to try on a variation of an existing or an entirely new teaching practice, such as an alternate way to assess children. By doing so, a supervisor may help a teacher to see her teaching differently. Or the supervisor may help her to see her teaching anew by highlighting those facets of her teaching which have become second nature during years of daily practice. In either way, the supervisor becomes a coach who nudges and, then, is there for support and feedback, sometimes in the form of descriptive data gathered as part of a focused classroom observation. What that means, realistically, is that the supervisor must become a resource person who listens for what the teacher needs, then provides options, ideas, or access to research.

Implication: Supportive supervision is a constructive, social process of reflecting on practices and changing or confirming beliefs about teaching. Ownership of change is the teacher's.

Supervisors can take a stance toward supervision that leaves ownership of change with a teacher. The supervisory process of facilitation may include raising consciousness of ownership; laying out divergent beliefs or practices; or encouraging reflection on how beliefs or practices are being changed or confirmed. Ownership of change simply means that a teacher retains responsibility for changing, growing, or learning. This is particularly so when beliefs, the foundations of a teacher's practice, are involved. Perhaps in her mind, a supervisor needs to see herself saying to a teacher, "Whether or how you change your beliefs and practices is yours. I can serve as a tourguide who shows you options or resources. Too, I'd like to reflect with you on how and why changes are occurring in your teaching."

The problems here are that some supervisors may not believe that teachers are willing or able to accept ownership; other supervisors may not be able to nurture ownership; and some teachers may not wish to acknowledge ownership of change because it carries with it potential

upheaval as teaching beliefs and practices are confirmed or changed. Without a stance of leaving ownership of change with the teacher, supervision rides on the assumption that teaching and teachers can be "fixed" or "educated" through such typical practices as inservice days. Most school district's staff development histories are littered with topics and programs that had a moment of attention but sadly faded away, leaving only a residue of impact.

Implication: A supervisor can hold a mirror to a teacher's beliefs during the classroom observation process by collecting descriptive data focused by the teacher's growth objectives, analyzing it with the teacher, then collaboratively writing a summary statement.

Focused descriptive data collection, co-analysis, and collaborative writing should be integral parts of the classroom observation process. As a consequence of co-analysis, the teacher may find new meanings in the context of classroom, students, and curriculum. Such interactions, ultimately, are a process of the teacher and supervisor making meaning together.

The process of collecting data and co-analysis does require more time spent between teacher and supervisor. What must be asked is how that investment of time weighs against the growth of a teacher and, ultimately, the benefits to children. Too, enacting this entire process that uses descriptive data for co-analysis will require teachers and supervisors alike to readjust their beliefs and behaviors regarding classroom observations. Doing so may mean creating and sustaining dialogue about the process, to include a close examination of actual examples of descriptive data, supervisory behaviors, and dialogue during co-analysis.

Implication: Reflective language mirrors changes in beliefs.

To support changes in beliefs supervisors can listen to and analyze teachers' reflective language as a mirror of how, if, or in what ways beliefs are changing. Also apparent in the language can be the desire to change beliefs and affective dimensions of making such changes. Again, if supervisors can listen to teachers' reflective language over an extended period of time, they may find patterns of reflection in response to changing classroom practices. Patterns that emerge indicate that beliefs do exist in systems or schemata of interconnections that may not be balanced but do, indeed, impinge upon one another. Too, these patterns show a stance toward reflection: Is the teacher receptive to reflection? resistant? actively involved?

15

16

Implication: Co-reflective conversations between a teacher and a
     supervisor appear to foster reflection on practice and
     reconstruction of or deliberation between beliefs.

     Supervisors who wish to enable a teacher's reflection
on and reframing of beliefs should encourage co-reflective
conversations during supervisory processes. By adding the
prefix 'co' to the term 'reflective conversation', the
interpretation suggests that both teacher and supervisor are
engaged in reflecting, sometimes for the same and sometimes
for different purposes. For example, both a teacher and a
supervisor can reflect on descriptive data after a classroom
observation. The teacher may reflect on a particular
technique, the supervisor on the success of the supervisory
process, and both on the data in relationship to the
teacher's long-term growth objectives. Implied is that
extended dialogue engages both parties in reflection - with
potential reframing of beliefs for both. Too, the process
of co-reflection builds qualities essential to supportive
supervision, such as mutuality and trust.

Implication: A dialogue journal kept between a teacher and
     supervisor can be a preeminent means of encouraging reflection
     and of capturing the reflective language that mirrors beliefs
     being changed or confirmed.

     The dialogue journal has potential for building
collaborative efforts between a teacher and a supervisor.
Part of that collaboration is creating a reflective
conversation. Entries in a dialogue journal kept over an
extended period of time will develop that reflective
conversation and will enable the teacher and supervisor to
examine and reshape beliefs about teaching.
     To actively participate in the dialogue journal, a
supervisor might mirror a teacher's reflections by asking
questions, framing problems, or summarizing ideas. What
impact might this have on a teacher's beliefs? How will it
effect the processes of reconstruction of or deliberation on
beliefs? How can it create a metacognitive awareness in the
teacher of her patterns of thinking? Because keeping a
dialogue journal does require a commitment of time, it is
not feasible as a method for a supervisor to engage in with
all teachers. Determining its use might be such factors as
teacher need, desire to participate, and matters of access.

About the Realities of Supportive Supervision

     What the implications from this research are about is
seeing supervision differently - a phenomenologically
expansive view that sees supervision as nurturing,
constructive, and teacher centered. The research question,

16

17

itself, arose as I wondered if a school system could create
a plan within which there would be opportunities for
supportive supervision.

Even given the thick description presented in this
research and principles of generalization, the question from
practitioners might be, "Is this all realistic in contexts
other than those of the research?" What the research
implications offer in reply is a resounding, "Yes." The
implications, realistically, can be transferred to other
contexts, but success will depend upon the willingness and
ability of participants to capitalize on or reshape their
own cultural and systemic contexts to support a
phenomenologically expansive view of supervision.

The implications are visions of what could be, visions
based upon what occurred between Pam and I as represented in
the aggregate body of research data. If they can be
generalized to other schools, the question is, "In practical
terms, what can be done to begin to implement some of the
implications?" The point of discussion here is not about
the implications themselves but about what qualities and
processes will foster their implementation.

Obviously, willing individuals, teachers and
supervisors, can work toward implementation of any of the
implications; they could, for instance, co-analyze
descriptive data and collaboratively write an interpretation
of it. They could, time permitting, use a dialogue journal
as a means of promoting reflection and change. They could
listen to a veteran teacher's reflective language. Yet, the
real challenge is for a school or a school district to work
toward implementation of the implications. In practical
terms, then, what qualities and processes at a systemic
level would foster implementation of the implications?

Teachers, supervisors, administrators, and school
directors who would answer that question might consider
that:

- reflection on action that reshapes beliefs may bring
  reconsideration of one's role as a teacher, comfort
  or discomfort with change, and intuitive feelings of
  acceptance or rejection of changes in beliefs.

- a seeing differently view of supervision connotes
  that there are enough supervisors to support teachers
  who would grow.

- existing supervisors cannot be relegated to a host of
  competing duties and responsibilities if supporting
  teachers is, indeed, a priority. Perhaps the most
  critical ingredient in successful implementation is
  time. A phenomenologically expansive view of
  supervision assumes that teachers and supervisors are
  worth not only the effort but also the time; thus,

17

the allocation of time to support implementation of any of
    the implications must be a priority.

- cultural contexts of the school or district must
  promote and not thwart - trust, ownership of
  professional growth, collegiality, risktaking,
  mutuality, and safety. Conscious efforts must be
  made to break down the barriers of power
  relationships, perhaps by using sustained dialogue as
  a preeminent means of doing so.

- a supervisory plan or policy that fosters
  facilitative supervision can be devised but should be
  done through a constructive social process in which
  teachers and supervisors shape it from available
  research, local contextual features, general staff
  input, and their own professional knowledge.

- a plan must include procedures centered on the notion
  that continued, focused dialogue between a teacher
  and supervisor can lead to reflection upon and
  changes or confirmations of beliefs about teaching.

- opportunities for supervisors to learn should, also,
  be constructive processes of learning new supervisory
  behaviors and practices, as well as reflective
  processes of closely examining existing supervisory
  behaviors and practices.

- supervisors can learn to use the tools that promote
  reflection, such as a dialogue journal, but that
  those tools are to be used discriminately as a
  teacher needs them - not uniformly with all teachers.

Not an exhaustive list, these suggestions for
realistic implementation emerged from the research data and
from the context of one school district's implementation of
a staff evaluation plan that opened up opportunities for
supportive supervision. Can a complex social system like a
school district implement what this research has shown is
possible? Yes, though the critical bywords for
implementation are "time, training, and support." All three
must be priorities and must be provided within a school if a
systemic implementation of the implications is attempted.
The implications are visions; they are another season's
promise put into the ground. The challenge for realists in
schools is, then, to nurture the visions with patience and
persistence.

18

19

Final Thoughts

From the words collected during research arose Pam's story of how a veteran teacher's beliefs changed and how a supervisor facilitated those changes - both yielding answers to the research question. Turned about, that research question is posed in the title of this piece - "Seeing Supervision Differently: The Processes of Facilitating Change in a Veteran Teacher's Beliefs." Collectively, the implications from the research do forward a phenomenologically expansive view of supervision by describing how facilitative supervisory processes can be emancipatory for a teacher.

By reflecting upon and changing or confirming beliefs, the teacher may open frontiers to explore within her own teaching practices and beliefs. Too, in the act of facilitating changes in a teacher's beliefs, a supervisor may experience emancipation by going out on a frontier on which his or her beliefs are confirmed or changed (The effects on the supervisor involved in this research make another story to be told). Those notions are points of departure for further exploration of the frontiers of interactions between teachers and supervisors.

In a larger sense, this research is about radical reform of the contexts and structures of schools. It's about time - time needed for teachers to reflect and grow, to engage in the recursive process of reflection, to be active learners just as supervisors and children can be. It's about social structures - those that tend to isolate teachers, engaging them in dances more concerned with managing them than supporting them. It's about social contexts - the qualities in schools that mitigate against taking risks, building trust, and seeking mutuality. What the research calls for is building social settings that value, protect, and nurture the potential and preciousness within all individuals - teachers, supervisors, and children alike.

Going out onto the frontier of what supervision can be, the research has found but a road back home again. Though supervisory procedures may vary from context to context, the qualities remain in a home to which facilitative supervision returns, a home full of mutuality, trust, risktaking, and respect. In it romps the notion that all members of an educational community can be active learners who reflect on and change or confirm their beliefs. By learning together, a teacher and supervisor, ultimately, reach the children whose frontiers are no smaller nor less magnificent than ours.