

How Faculty Supervise and Mentor Pre-service Teachers: Implications for Principal Supervision of Novice Teachers

This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of school administration and K-12 education.



Bret Range
Heather Duncan
David Hvidston
University of Wyoming

The intent of the study was to ascertain university faculties' perceptions, through semi-structured interviews, about supervision and mentoring of student teachers. Findings indicated faculty supervisors' perceived feedback to student teachers about student engagement as important. Additionally, supervisors believed building trust with student teachers was instrumental to the supervisory relationship, yet they believed they did little to intrinsically motivate student teachers. Supervisors mostly used two steps of the clinical supervision model, namely extended observations and post-observation conferences. Finally, faculty supervisors described a directive-control approach when remediating ineffective student teachers and reinforced the idea that effective teacher supervision is a collaborative effort. Implications for principals' supervision of novice teachers are included.

Introduction

Researchers have linked effective teaching to increased student achievement (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Chen, Mason, Staniszewski, Upton, & Valley, 2012; Stronge & Hindman, 2003) and argued teaching is a systematic sequence of events with clear objectives (Marzano, 2007; Watkins, 2005). As with any profession, teachers require opportunities

NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, Vol. 8, No. 2– October 2013
ISSN: 2155-9635 © 2013 National Council of Professors of Educational Administration

This NCPEA Publications manuscript is a contribution to the Open Educational Resources (OER) movement and freely available to the world education community at large. This manuscript may not be used commercially or edited. When quoting portions of this text, attribution to the author/s is required.

for growth if they are expected to get better at their trade, and teachers expect principals to serve as instructional leaders and provide feedback about their efforts in classrooms (Ovando, 2005; Zepeda, 2007). Many argue instructional leadership is the most important duty of principals because teachers need constructive feedback about their strengths and plans for remediation to alleviate weaknesses (Range, Scherz, Holt, & Young, 2011; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

The first time teachers encounter supervision, similar to the kind they receive from principals, is during the semester in which they student teach (Caires & Almeida, 2007; Ediger, 2009). Student teachers are usually supervised by two personnel, namely faculty supervisors and mentor teachers, who use professional teaching standards as grading criteria. Faculty supervisors use approaches to supervision discussed within the educational leadership literature, like clinical supervision, with the most important supervisory step being the post-observation conference. Research has not attempted to compare and contrast the perceptions of faculty supervisors about how they supervise student teachers with the literature concerning principals' formative supervision of practicing teachers. Similar to practicing principals, faculty supervisors are expected to build the capacity of pre-service teachers. As a result, the purpose of this qualitative study was to interview faculty supervisors about how they supervise student teachers and link those findings to the literature concerning effective principal supervision for novice teachers.

Instructional Supervision

Instructional leadership occurs when principals monitor teachers by formally and informally visiting classrooms collecting data about their performance and then meet with teachers to discuss data and align identified teacher wants or needs to professional development (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008; Oliva & Pawlas, 2001; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000; Zepeda, 2012). As principals routinely visit teachers' classrooms to provide coaching and feedback, they engage in formative supervision (Hinchey, 2010; Matthews & Crow, 2010). DiPaola and Hoy (2008) stated formative supervision included "any set of activities planned to improve teaching, it is basically a cycle of systematic planning, frequent observation, analysis of the teaching-learning process, and the assessment of student outcomes" (p. 23). To effectively make this assessment, principals collect quantitative and qualitative data concerning teachers' performance (Range et al., 2011; Zepeda, 2007) and engage teachers in collaborative dialogue affirming their efforts and identifying areas for improvement (Green, 2010). During these conversations, principals attempt to cause teachers to reflect about their practice (Emstad, 2011).

Trust

A powerful precursor to effective supervision is trust between teachers and principals (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008). If principals can build a trusting supervisory culture, teachers are more apt to be collaborative and open with each other, as well as reflective about their need for improvement (Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, & Hoy, 1994; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). To do this, principals must self-assess their leadership style to determine if teachers have confidence in their actions and examine whether they exhibit integrity in communicating

expectations about teaching and allocate resources to support instruction (Zepeda, 2007). A collaborative leadership style is important when building trust because all teachers have a vested interest in assisting with decisions regarding the focus of instructional practices (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Green 2010).

Feedback

Throughout the formative supervision process, teachers expect feedback about their performance that is honest, constructive, and aligned to professional development opportunities (Range, Hvidston, & Young, 2013). Without quality feedback, teachers are unable to reflect about their practice, which in turn decreases their desire to improve (Aseltine, Faryniarz, & Rigazio-DiGilio, 2006; Frase, 1992). Effective feedback should be based on observable data, provide affirmation for positive teaching characteristics, and promote reflection with the intent of molding teachers into self-directed leaders of their own learning (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Hattie (2009) believed effective feedback answered three important questions: (a) where am I going [the goals], (b) how am I doing, and (c) where to next.

Motivation

Because the intent of supervision is teacher growth and development, effective principals understand how their supervisory style is closely linked to teacher motivation (Zepeda, 2007, 2012). Green (2010) defined motivation as the ability of individuals to remain focused and self regulate their thinking to guide their behaviors toward an intended goal. Oliva and Pawlas (2001) described motivation as “the desire of the learner to learn” (p. 158). To nurture teachers’ motivation, principals should adopt a shared, collaborative model of supervision in which teachers are active participants in instructional decisions, experience success more than failure, and feel valued and respected (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008; Oliva & Pawlas, 2001). Zepeda (2007) argued principals must understand how motivation and adult learning are linked because supervision that increases motivation looks different for early career teachers and veteran teachers. Beginning teachers are motivated by administrator approval and are concerned with compliance, while veteran teachers seek out professional leaning to deepen their understanding about effective teaching (Burden, 1982; Zepeda, 2007). In the end, principals who desire school environments that foster motivation must be cognizant of various goals, needs, and desires, both extrinsic and intrinsic, which drive teachers to behave in certain ways (Zepeda, 2007).

Supervision of Student Teachers

Prior to beginning student teaching, pre-service teachers are engaged in coursework that should equip them with skills, knowledge, and understanding to make them successful in the classroom. Nolan and Hoover (2008) suggested the most unique challenge in supervising pre-service teachers is aiding them in transitioning this formal knowledge into practical knowledge, which is knowledge that puts learning into action. As a result, it is the role of faculty supervisors to aide student teachers in translating this learning into

action (Bates & Burbank, 2008; Ediger, 2009). Although the structure of how student teachers are supervised varies based on universities' practices, most use faculty supervisors, who work closely with a mentor teacher, to provide feedback concerning classroom performance. Nolan and Hoover (2008) referred to this supervisory model as a triad, in which faculty supervisors, mentor teachers, and student teachers work together to share decision making about student teachers' field experiences. Caires and Almeida (2007) found student teachers' motivation and self-efficacy increased when they worked with faculty supervisors who were involved, accessible, empathetic, and supportive.

The supervisory method faculty supervisors most commonly use with student teachers looks very similar to clinical supervision methods utilized by principals (Cogen, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969; Nolan & Hoover, 2008). Clinical supervision includes three stages: pre-observation conferences between faculty supervisors and student teachers, extended observations in which faculty supervisors watch student teachers' lessons, and post-observation conferences in which faculty supervisors and student teachers debrief about lessons (Ong'ondo & Borg, 2011; Range et al., 2013).

Prior to the observation, faculty supervisors clarify objectives of the lesson, discuss activities contained within the lesson, and ask questions about how students will be assessed (Ediger, 2009). During the lesson, faculty supervisors observe a wide variety of classroom variables, which include teacher behaviors, student activities with time lines, student engagement, and transitions (Zepeda, 2007). However, the role of faculty supervisors is very different from principals given the fact they also rely on mentor teachers to provide supervision (Ediger, 2009; Nolan & Hoover, 2008). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the strategies faculty supervisors use to supervise and build the capacity of student teachers, and thus gain insight into their supervisory knowledge. Findings are then framed within the formative supervision literature directed at principals who work directly with novice teachers.

Context of the Study

One four-year, public university located in the Mountain West was used in data collection. Total undergraduate enrollment was 9,793 students and the university offered approximately 190 areas of study. The university had a teacher preparation curriculum in which students could receive professional certification to teach at the early childhood, elementary, or secondary levels. In order to become certified, pre-service teachers had to successfully complete 15 weeks of student teaching under the supervision of three individuals: (a) a faculty supervisor, (b) a mentor teacher, and (c) a field supervisor. Due to the rural nature of the state, faculty supervisors could not make weekly visits to observe and provide feedback to student teachers. As a result, the university relied on field supervisors, typically retired teachers or principals, to provide daily support to student teachers in their geographic area of the state.

Method

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of faculty supervisors about their formative supervision and mentoring of student teachers. The following research questions were addressed:

1. How do faculty supervisors rate the importance of various supervisory behaviors?
2. What behaviors do faculty supervisors report using to provide support to student teachers?

Qualitative research methods were applied and used semi-structured interviews with a survey component to collect data from faculty supervisors. Faculty supervisors were purposively sampled by contacting department heads of Curriculum and Instruction (elementary and secondary) to provide names of supervisors who they deemed skilled in providing supervision and mentoring to student teachers. In February 2012, an e-mail was sent to nine faculty supervisors inviting them to participate in semi-structured interviews. Interviews were conducted in faculties' offices and lasted between 30 to 45 minutes. The interview protocol consisted of two demographic questions and nine open-ended questions focused on formative supervisory and mentoring behaviors such as feedback, trust, motivation, and observation.

The interview concluded with 12 Likert scaled items (1=not important to 4=very important) and asked faculty supervisors to rate their importance in providing formative supervision to student teachers. Chronbach alpha coefficient was calculated in order to determine internal consistency for this section of the interview protocol (0.67). Content validity was supported by the correspondence between formative supervision literature and these 12 items, as well as, expert review.

Study Participants

Participants included three male and six female faculty supervisors, all working in curriculum and instruction in one of three program areas: (a) early childhood education (N=1), (b) elementary education (N=5), and (c) secondary education (N=3). Participants' average years supervising student teachers was 11.67, with a range of five to 22 years. For one participant, this supervision experience included three years as a mentor teacher, and for two other participants, this included student teacher supervision as graduate students. Participants' average years working in higher education was 10.67 years, with a range of five to 22 years. Finally, five participants indicated they had received no prior formal training in supervising student teachers. These individuals reported any informal training they received was on the job and provided by colleagues who had supervised student teachers in the past. Four participants received formal training in providing supervision and acquired this training either through graduate school classes or in service trainings offered through professional organizations.

Data Analysis

Semi-structured interviews were transcribed and qualitative data were coded, recoded, and condensed into themes by one researcher (Jones, Torres, & Armino, 2006). Specifically, analysis followed Strauss and Corbin's (1990) three levels of coding qualitative data: (a) open coding, (b) axial coding, and (c) selective coding. That is, participants' answers during interviews were transcribed by hand and then re-typed

immediately. Transcripts were coded descriptively and interpretively, and then moved to pattern identification in later analysis of scripts. Coding was characterized as flexible and expandable as themes emerged (Goldstein, 2005). After initial coding by one researcher, the other authors coded interviews to ensure reliability and authors checked codes until agreement was reached. Responses to the 12 Likert-scaled items were analyzed descriptively and included both means and standard deviations.

Findings

Research question one, which asked how do faculty supervisors rate the importance of supervisory behaviors, was answered with 12 Likert scaled items (1=not important to 4=very important), all of which dealt with formative supervision. Table 1 displays the means and standard deviations for these items.

Table 1
Faculty Supervisors Attitudes about the Importance of Supervisory Behaviors

Supervisory Behavior	M	SD
Feedback on student engagement	4.00	0.00
Brainstorming ways in which student teachers could improve their practice	3.89	0.33
Trust building with student teachers	3.89	0.33
Feedback on instructional strategies	3.78	0.44
Listening to student teachers' concerns	3.67	0.50
Causing student teachers to reflect about their practice	3.67	0.50
Feedback on students' level of thinking	3.56	0.73
Increasing student teachers' motivation	3.56	0.73
Feedback on lesson objectives	3.33	0.50
Feedback on aligning instruction to standards	3.22	0.67
Feedback on curriculum design	2.89	0.78
Connecting student teachers' needs to professional development	2.67	0.50

Note: 1=not important to 4=very important

Faculty supervisors rated all 12 items as important, as all had means greater than 2.50. Supervisors overwhelmingly perceived *feedback to student teachers on levels of student engagement* as a very important supervisory behavior (M=4.00). Other supervisory behaviors faculty perceived as important included *brainstorming ways in which student teachers could improve their practice* (M=3.89), *trust building* (M=3.89), *feedback about student teachers' instructional strategies* (M=3.78), *listening to student teachers' concerns* (M=3.67), *causing student teachers' to reflect* (M=3.67), *feedback on students'*

level of thinking (M=3.56), increasing student teachers' motivation (M=3.56), feedback on lesson objectives (M=3.33), and feedback on aligning instruction to standards (M=3.22).

Research question two asked participants to describe supervisory behaviors they utilized when providing support to student teachers? To answer this question, respondents' answers to the semi-structured interview questions were coded. Findings from the interviews are described below.

Trust Building

Participants were unanimous regarding the paramount importance placed on trust building with student teachers. All participants indicated they built trust during methods classes (math, science, literacy) in which they taught student teachers who they might supervise during field experiences. For example, one participant indicated she had all student teachers in class the previous fall, which in turn provided her an opportunity to forge a personal relationship with each student. Furthermore, participants indicated the primary vehicle for building trust with student teachers was by providing open and candid communication. One participant explained early in the semester, he provided student teachers a calendar detailing the dates and times of his classroom visits. If he knew he would not be able to keep an appointment, he immediately called and e-mailed students to let them know. Another participant stated she gave student teachers her cell phone number, which helped reassure them they could contact her immediately if they had a problem. Finally, two faculty supervisors surmised open communication with student teachers was comprised of simply being honest about classroom problems they observed, even if mentor teachers were reluctant to share criticism with student teachers.

Clinical Supervision

Three semi-structured interview questions dealt directly with each component of the clinical supervision process: (a) pre-observation, (b) observation, and (c) post-observation. When asked to describe this process, responses were similar, yet most did not follow the cyclic format of clinical supervision and left out the pre-observation conference. Five respondents stated they did not have formal pre-observation conferences with student teachers before they observed a lesson. The primary reasons for this were lack of time and geographical distance. That is, because of the rural nature of the state, supervisors could not be present for all student teachers' pre-observations conferences. Those who did conduct pre-observation conferences typically did them through e-mail and focused on lesson planning or determining the focus of the lesson. First, several participants asked to see student teachers lessons plans, including clear objectives they hoped to accomplish as a result of the lesson. One participant stated, "I try to get a sense whether they have planned for [the varied demographics of their students]. New teachers cannot short change the planning of a lesson." Second, participants stated pre-observation conferences served as a way to establish the focus of the lesson. Specifically, this focus would eventually be used to instigate dialogue in the post-observation conference. Supervisors indicated the primary focus they attempted to establish was what student teachers' wanted them to look for during the lesson. A secondary focus included input

from mentor teachers as to what they believed faculty supervisors should look for during observations.

Participants indicated during observations, they looked for two teaching behaviors, namely classroom management and student interactions. Overwhelmingly, supervisors believed they focused on student teachers' abilities to regulate student behaviors with the use of proximity, specific classroom management techniques, time management, and student engagement. Supervisors believed student teachers required constructive feedback on low-level, myopic teaching skills because as beginners, they struggled with simple formalities. One respondent described when documenting management techniques he "did not look for a specific technique, but [student teachers'] expectations and follow through and I'm looking for ways they prevent behavior so they don't have to respond to it." Finally, participants who viewed classroom management as important also believed it was directly connected to levels of student engagement. Specifically, when student teachers had the ability to manage student behaviors in a proactive, positive manner, more students were engaged during the lesson.

Respondents described their observations about affective teaching characteristics, including how student teachers' interact with students and how students respond to those interactions. One participant reciprocated, "The first thing I look for is how they relate to students. Their comfort level should increase as they work with kids. Can they be in the moment with kids?" As a result of student teachers' interactions with students, one supervisor articulated her focus of how students responded to those interactions. "I really watch if the students are resentful of the student teacher. Are they willing to engage with him or her?"

All faculty supervisors indicated they conducted post-observations conferences with student teachers and many participants stated they asked mentor teachers to be present during these conferences. The primary purpose of asking mentors to attend was to ensure all participants (faculty supervisor, student teacher, and mentor teachers) had clear expectations of what was observed, as well as, future professional growth for student teachers. Additionally, because faculty supervisors did not have a deep understanding of the context of classroom routines, mentor teachers could provide feedback specific to classroom norms.

A common theme throughout participants' descriptions was the format of post observation conferences in which participants described a systematic sequence of events, usually in three parts: (a) reflective questioning, (b) constructive feedback, and (c) future growth. First, participants began post-observation conferences by asking student teachers questions about their performance, with the intent of building self-reflection skills. This sequence of questioning and self-reflection was paramount to frame conversations that would encompass post observations conferences. Participants described questions as "lots of what ifs or why questions," "did you notice," and "have you ever thought." For example, one supervisor stated he required student teachers to discuss three things they did well during the lesson and then asked probing questions about explicit and implicit teaching behaviors based on student teachers' responses. Another participant explained she asked student teachers to write personal goals they hoped to achieve throughout the semester and at the beginning of each post-observation conference, she asked questions about student teachers' progress toward these goals.

This attempt to mentor student teachers to be self directed, reflective thinkers was important as participants described post observations conferences. Participants believed self- reflection was arduous for student teachers because they tend to only focus on negative occurrences throughout the lesson, usually student misbehavior. To formulate self-reflection skills, participants asked student teachers to keep personal journals about their experiences, engage in two-way journaling with mentor teachers, and videotape themselves teaching. One respondent stated after the lesson “I ask them to sit down and reflect. They write down their reflections about the lesson.”

The second stage within post observation conferences included faculty supervisors delivering feedback to student teachers about teaching effectiveness during the lesson. Several participants provided student teachers with lesson scripts and one participant provided detail how he distinguished between teacher and student behaviors by using different colors of ink as he took notes. Faculty supervisors described their feedback as positive and constructive yet, upfront when they sensed student teachers would benefit from immediate intervention. More specifically, feedback fit into two categories, namely low-level telling phrasing and higher order questioning. Participants described feedback, usually about novice teaching errors, as direct in nature. For example, one faculty supervisor described this as telling them “do this, but don’t do that again.” Another supervisor stated he attempted to connect direct feedback to student teachers’ prior knowledge, which provided context for his assessment of their performance.

Finally, participants described the last phase of the post observation conference as one in which they and student teachers collaboratively devised a plan to promote future growth. Compellingly, participants believed it was best to focus on only one to three areas of improvement, as student teachers “cannot be expected to fix everything.” Additionally, faculty supervisors encouraged mentor teachers to provide input about student teachers’ future growth because “they see students six hours a day while we only see them a few times with a pre-planned lesson,” meaning mentor teachers have a better understanding of student teachers’ weaknesses and strengths.

Motivation

When asked about how faculty supervisors motivate student teachers, participants stated it was difficult because motivation is highly individual and is typically extrinsic during student teaching because students receive a letter grade for their performance. Participants described student teachers’ motivation as a downward slope, in which motivation is high in the beginning, but begins to dissipate as the semester progresses. One faculty supervisor believed this decline in motivation at the end of their student teaching duties was good because “their motivation starts to dwindle at about week 12 when they are giving back the majority of their teaching duties to their mentor teacher.”

The most prominent way participants believed they impacted student teachers’ motivation was through student teaching seminars. These seminars, conducted one time a month, required all student teachers in geographic areas to meet and discuss their successes and difficulties. One participant believed these seminars provided his student teachers a fresh perspective on their own experience because, as they spoke to other student teachers, they realized their problems were not exclusive. Other methods

discussed were encouraging student teachers to observe other teachers (not only their mentor teachers) in their assigned schools, explicitly advocating the importance of rest, exercise, and eating correctly, and reminding student teachers routinely of what criteria would be used to justify their grade at the end of their field experience.

Remediation

Faculty supervisors believed when student teachers struggled, potential causes revolved around classroom management issues or lack of proper lesson planning. Participants unanimously stated supervision for struggling student teachers was much more laborious, incremental, and compartmentalized. That is, they provided them with more observations and communicated with their mentor teachers weekly. One participant expanded on this by saying, “I tell them upfront, if you see me more, I think you are struggling. I have spent the whole day with teachers who were struggling.” Additionally, supervisors relied on mentor teachers to support student teachers who required remediation. Participants communicated with mentor teachers regularly, asked them to participate in conferences with student teachers, and catechized mentor teachers to document student teachers’ struggles. For example, one faculty supervisor stated he asked mentor teachers to document problems using a journal to pinpoint teaching behaviors for potential improvement.

Participants described remediation plans that were timeline driven, embedded with frequent meetings to provide student teachers’ with accountability, and incremental based on success. Within these remediation plans, faculty supervisors highlighted the need to keep problems to a manageable level, usually two to five, because their intent was to instigate instructional change and not overwhelm student teachers. Finally, participants explained that because they did not observe student teachers every day, it was critical to collect multiple sources of data on their performance. Primarily, this data was collected from a variety of individuals who observed student teachers including mentor teachers, field supervisors, other faculty supervisors, and principals. One participant stated, “We have at least two university faculty observe the student teacher, including the mentor, so we can get multiple eyes on the problem.”

Discussion and Conclusions

This study, limited to both qualitative methods and to one public university in the Mountain West, was conducted to illuminate how faculty supervisors provide formative supervision and mentoring to student teachers and use the findings to inform the literature concerning principals’ supervision of novice teachers. Several significant themes to inform principals’ supervision of early career teachers were discovered with accompanying recommendations. First, faculty supervisors view supervision through a wide lens (Zepeda, 2012) and believed providing feedback to student teachers about levels of student engagement in their classrooms was the most important behavior. Indeed, Quinn (2002) surmised principals who were strong instructional leaders positively impacted student engagement by providing feedback to teachers about how their instruction fostered or inhibited active student learning. More specifically, novice teachers need support in “engaging students in solving real-world problems to make

content more meaningful and exciting” (Chesley & Jordan, 2012, p. 43) including differentiated instruction, constructivist activities, and cooperative learning.

However, our interviews and subsequent research (Meister & Melnick, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007) indicates that although feedback concerning instruction including student engagement is important, novice teachers’ apprehensions revolve more around low level teaching skills, with the focus on classroom management and planning. Specifically, novice teachers struggle with generic teaching issues such as lesson planning, attendance and data keeping, teaching rules and procedures, and arranging the classroom setting (Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Evertson & Smithey, 2000; Kimball, 2003). As a result, as student teachers transition into their first teaching jobs, it can be assumed they will continue to struggle with similar, logistical teaching behaviors (Cuddapah & Burtin, 2012) but without the direct guidance of mentor teachers (Nolan & Hoover, 2008). Effective principals clearly understand novice teachers’ managerial struggles and provide supports, including experienced faculty mentors, to induct them carefully into the profession (Roberson & Roberson, 2009; Watkins, 2005).

Faculty supervisors underscored the importance of trust building with student teachers. They primarily built trust through personal contact with student teachers during coursework, but also relied on open, two-way communication to keep the trust relationship flourishing. The notion of trust between supervisors and supervisees has been discussed at great lengths within the literature (Henson, 2010; Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Zepeda, 2012, 2007). However, it is important for principals to understand how important trust building is with novice teachers. Although an intangible aspect of leadership (Quinn, 2002), effective school leaders must create personal relationships with novice teachers so they understand principals care about their success. Prominent to trust is the ability of principals to create school climates in which novice teachers feel valued and are afforded the opportunity to collaborate with other experienced and early career teachers alike.

In regards to the clinical supervision process, faculty supervisors validated their knowledge about teaching problems associated with student teachers because the focus of their supervision efforts was quite direct (Glickman, 1990; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2005). For example, during pre-observation conferences, faculty supervisors stated they converged on both lesson planning and the observational focus of the upcoming lesson (either student teacher or mentor teacher directed). Clearly, faculty supervisors who engaged in pre-observation conferences understand what Nolan and Hoover (2008) recommended, inexperienced teachers require pre-observations conferences as a strategy to make lesson planning explicit and to uncover novice teachers’ instructional decision making. As a result, effective principals do not circumvent pre-observation conferences and use them to ensure novice teachers understand clarity of lesson objectives, including systematic steps used in constructing the lesson (anticipatory set, instruction, and closure).

During post-observation, because participants highlighted their role in observing classroom management techniques, they understand student teachers’ ability to successfully administer student behaviors is a significant indicator when making judgments about effective and ineffective teachers (Henson, 2010; Stronge & Hindman, 2003; Stronge, Ward, & Grant, 2011). As a result, principals must have this same focus when observing early career teachers; those who have command of their classrooms set the stage for learning. Additionally, university faculty believed how well student teachers

interacted with their students, and students' subsequent reciprocity to these interactions, was an indicator of effective teaching. Likewise, principals should observe affective dimensions of classrooms and their impact on classroom climates (Ross, McDonald, Alberg, & McSparrin-Gallagher 2007).

During post-observations conferences, findings highlight an important concept linked to principals' supervising novice teachers. Faculty supervisors understood student teachers had difficulty reflecting on their practice after the lesson, because reflection is learned through time and experience (Henson, 2010; McIntyre & O'Hair, 1996; Nolan & Hoover, 2008). As a result, they began post observation conferences with a series of reflective questions and frame limited feedback in the form of probing questions. Zepeda (2012, p. 186) referred to these questions as *icebreakers*, in which supervisors invite teachers to reflect about how teaching and learning are connected; in a cause and effect manner. Similarly, principals should acknowledge this reflective shortcoming within novice teachers' metacognition and resist the temptation to interject solutions about lesson problems (Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Zepeda, 2012). In sum, one goal of effective supervision is to transform novice teachers into self-directed learners who depend on supervisory intervention less as they gain confidence. However, because reflection is a skill that should be practiced outside the classroom, requiring novice teachers to journal about their experiences, discussing their experiences with other early career teachers, and videotaping themselves teaching are effective ways to practice reflection skills outside post-observation conferences (Henson, 2010; Hoover, 1994; Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Watkins, 2005; Zepeda, 2012). As a result, school districts should design teacher induction programs that require early career teachers to engage in a variety of reflection tasks. Principals should provide time for novice teachers to routinely reflect with experienced teachers about their planning, instruction, and working with student (Cuddapah & Burint, 2012).

Interestingly, participants believed they had little control over student teachers' motivation and attributed student teachers' desires to succeed to extrinsic factors. Additionally, supervisors believed concrete experiences contributing to student teacher motivation (student teaching seminars, observing other teachers) had little to do with intrinsic rewards. These views support Fuller's (1969) teachers' stages of concern and Zepeda's (2012) discussion concerning career stages of teachers. Specifically, novice teachers are in survival mode, preoccupied by external motivation factors like compliance and acceptance. Nevertheless, supervision literature stresses how important leadership style is to intrinsic teacher motivation (Zepeda, 2012). Due to the rural nature of the state in this study, faculty supervisors had limited direct contact with student teachers, and as a result, probably viewed their ability to influence motivation as restricted. However, principals who have daily contact with novice teachers should internalize their role in creating conditions that attempt to motivate novice teachers. The first step is to develop relationships with novice teachers "marked by trust, mutual respect, and the willingness to work collaboratively to solve problems" (Nolan & Hoover, 2008, p. 28).

Finally, noteworthy findings surfaced in discussions about how ineffective student teachers are supervised. First, participants described remediation processes as compartmentalized and timeline driven. Their descriptions align with the directive control approach, in which supervisors emphasize what must be achieved to reach proficiency, and the supervisory relationship is more autocratic than collaborative

(Glickman, 1990; Glickman et al., 2005; Zepeda, 2007, 2012). Principals who use the directive control approach with struggling novice teachers outline expectations for acceptable performance and use formal plans of remediation to document assistance.

However, describing the directive control process seems to place the burden of confronting ineffective teachers solely on the shoulders of principals. This highlights a second point; supervising ineffective teachers, and teachers in general, should be a distributed process and not the sole responsibility of principals (Goldstein, 2005; Henson, 2010; Spillane, 2005). During interviews, faculty supervisors relied on other university personnel, mentor teachers, and field supervisors to observe student teachers who were struggling. By doing so, they collected multiple sources of data about problems and removed individual bias from conclusions. As a result, remediation decisions about student teachers' future trajectories were collaborative.

As noted, novice teachers struggle with generic teaching problems and expecting principals to provide constructive feedback on these issues daily is an unrealistic expectation. When coupled with other duties of the principalship, instructional leadership is a role receiving limited attention by principals; not because they view it as unimportant, but organizational management issues cut into their time (Hornig, Klasik, & Loeb, 2009; Kersten & Israel, 2005; Range et al., 2011). Principals' ability to influence teachers' instructional decisions is a powerful predictor for student achievement, however, school districts must re-think supervision and evaluation processes to lighten the burden on principals as both supervisors and evaluators, especially with novice teachers. Effective teacher supervision can no longer pivot on the notion principals are solely responsible for teacher growth in schools. Whether it is through differentiated supervision, action research, portfolio supervision, or peer coaching (Nolan & Hoover, 2008; Zepeda, 2012), teachers and periphery school personnel can share supervision duties with principals (Scherer, 2012). School districts that adopt supervision and evaluation procedures that rely on multiple stakeholders to identify teacher effectiveness are more likely to create school climates that have high expectations for teacher performance.

References

- Aseltine, J. M., Faryniarz, J. O., & Rigazio-DiGilio, A. J. (2006). *Supervision for learning: A performance based approach to teacher development and school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497-511.
- Bates, A. J., & Burbank, M. D. (2008). Effective student teacher supervision in the era of No Child Left Behind. *The Professional Educator*, 32(2), 1-11.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Burden, P. (1982, February). *Developmental supervision: Reducing teacher stress at different career stages*. Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators National Conference, Phoenix, AZ.

- Caires, S., & Almeida, L. S. (2007). Positive aspects of the teacher training supervision: The student teachers' perspective. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 22(4), 515-528.
- Chesley, G. M., & Jordan, J. (2012). What's missing from teacher prep? *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 41-45.
- Chen, W., Mason, S., Staniszewski, C., Upton, A., & Valley, M. (2012). Assessing the quality of teachers' teaching practices. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, 24(1), 25-41.
- Cogen, M. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Cuddapah, J. L., & Burtin, A. S. (2012). What all novices need. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 66-69.
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2008). *Principals improving instruction: Supervision, evaluation, and professional development*. Boston: Pearson.
- Ediger, M. (2009). Supervising the student teacher in the public school. *Education*, 130(2), 251-254.
- Emstad, A. B. (2011). The principal's role in the post-evaluation process: How does the principal engage in the work carried out after the school's evaluation? *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability*, 23(4), 271-288.
- Evertson, C. M., & Smithey, M. W. (2000). Mentoring effects on protégés classroom practice: An experimental field study. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93(5), 294-304.
- Frase, L. E. (1992). Constructive feedback on teaching is missing. *Education*, 113(2), 176-181.
- Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-266.
- Glickman, C. D. (1990). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*, Second edition. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2005). *The basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision. Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.
- Goldstein, J. (2005). Debunking the fear of peer review: Combining supervision and evaluation and living to tell about it. *Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education*, 18(4), 235-252.
- Green, R. L. (2010). *The four dimensions of principal leadership: A framework for leading 21st century schools*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analysis relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.
- Henson, K. T. (2010). *Supervision: A collaborative approach to instructional improvement*. Long Grove, IL. Waveland Press.

- Hinchey, P. H. (2010). *Getting teacher assessment right: What policymakers can learn from research*. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/getting-teacher-assessment-right>
- Hoover, L. A. (1994). Reflective writing as a window on preservice teachers' thought processes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(1), 83-93.
- Hoffman, J. D., Sabo, D., Bliss, J., & Hoy, W. K. (1994). Building a culture of trust. *Journal of School Leadership, 4*(5), 484-501.
- Hornig, E. L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2009). *Principal time-use and school effectiveness*. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/1001441-School-Effectiveness.pdf>
- Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. New York: Routledge.
- Kersten, T. A., & Israel, M. S. (2005). Teacher evaluation: Principals' insights and suggestions for improvement. *Planning and Changing, 36*(1&2), 47-67.
- Kimball, S. M. (2002). *Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems*. *Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education, 16*(4), 241-268.
- Matthews, L. J., & Crow, G. M. (2010). *The principalship: New roles in a professional learning community*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McIntyre, D. J., & O'Hair, M. J. (1996). *The reflective roles of the classroom teacher*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Meister, D. G., & Melnick, S. A. (2003). National new teacher study: Beginning teacher's concerns. *Action in Teacher Education, 24*(4), 87-94.
- Nolan, J. F., & Hoover, L. A. (2008). *Teacher supervision and evaluation* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Associates.
- Oliva, P. F., & Pawlas, G. E. (2001). *Supervision for today's schools*. (6th ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Ong'ondo, C. O., & Borg, S. (2011). 'We teach plastic lessons to please them': The influence of supervision on the practice of English language student teachers in Kenya. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(4), 509-528.
- Ovando, M. N. (2005). Building instructional leaders' capacity to deliver constructive feedback to teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 18*(3), 171-183.
- Quinn, D. A. (2002). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*(4/5), 447-467.
- Range, B. G., Young, S., & Hvidston, D. (2013). Teacher perceptions about observation conferences: What do teachers' think about their formative supervision in one US school district? *School Leadership and Management, 33*(1), 61-77.
- Range, B. G., Scherz, S., Holt, C. R., & Young, S. (2011). Supervision and evaluation: The Wyoming perspective. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability, 23*(3), 243-265.

- Roberson, S., & Roberson, R. (2009). The role and practice of the principal in developing novice first-year teachers. *The Clearing House*, 82(3), 113-118.
- Ross, S. M., McDonald, A. J., Alberg, M., & McSparrin-Gallagher, B. (2007). Achievement and climate outcomes for the knowledge is power program in an inner-city middle school. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, 12(2), 137-165.
- Scherer, M. (2012). A conversation with Linda Darling-Hammond: The challenges of supporting new teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 18-23.
- Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 69(2), 143-150.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stronge, J. H., & Hindman, J. L. (2003). Hiring the best teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 48-52.
- Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 339-355.
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). *Supervision that improves teaching: Strategies and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4), 308-331.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944-956.
- Watkins, P. (2005). The principal's role in attracting, retaining, and developing new teachers: Three strategies for collaboration and support. *The Clearing House*, 79(2), 83-87.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2012). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (3rd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2007). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (2nd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.