

2020

Lessons from the Past: Ideas from Supervision Books Published from 1920 through 1950

Stephen P. Gordon

Texas State University, sg07@txstate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/jes>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gordon, S. P. (2020). Lessons from the Past: Ideas from Supervision Books Published from 1920 through 1950. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 3 (2). <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.3.2.4>

This Conceptual is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Educational Supervision by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

Lessons from the Past: Ideas from Supervision Books Published from 1920 through 1950

Journal of Educational Supervision

51 – 82

Volume 3, Issue 2, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.3.2.4>

<https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/jes/>

Stephen P. Gordon¹

Abstract

By understanding its past, a field of study and practice can better understand its present and improve its future, yet the field of educational supervision has done very little to document or contemplate its history. In this paper, 10 books on supervision published from 1920 through 1950 are reviewed, including books by Nutt (1920), Burton (1922), Crabbs (1925), Barr and Burton (1926), Nutt (1928), Kyte (1930), Barr (1931), Rorer (1942), Barr, Burton, and Brueckner (1947), and Wiles (1950). The discussion of each book is organized into three parts. First, the author discusses a concept from the book that he believes should be *retained*, meaning the concept should continue to be discussed and acted upon. Second, the author reviews a concept no longer valued or utilized that he argues should be revived in order to improve present-day supervision. Third, the author describes a concept discussed in the book under review that he maintains should be *reproved* as a negative influence on the field. The reader is urged to review historical literature on supervision and form her or his own perspectives on the value of historical concepts to modern supervision.

Keywords

supervision history; supervision literature; perspectives on supervision

¹ Texas State University, Texas, USA

Corresponding Author:

Stephen P. Gordon (Educational and Community Leadership Program, CLAS Department, Texas State University, 601 University Drive, San Marcos, Texas, 78666, USA)

Email: sg07@txstate.edu

Introduction

In this paper I review 10 books on educational supervision published in the period from 1920 through 1950. By understanding its past, a field of study and practice can better understand its present and improve its future, yet the field of supervision has done very little to document or contemplate its history. By reviewing these books, I hope to make at least a small contribution to a better understanding of the field's history and its relation to the present and future. The books I reviewed for this paper were published during the 1920's when, according to Sullivan & Glanz (2013), democracy in supervision was the most popular supervision model, and from 1930-1950, the first two decades of the model the same authors associate with scientific supervision. The books I reviewed were written by authors highly acclaimed and frequently referenced by other scholars in the field. As in recent history, there were not a great many influential books solely devoted to supervision published during the period in question, and these books represent the state of the art in supervision of their time.

One problem I had in selecting books to review was a dearth of supervision books by women published during the selected time period. I located several chapters written by women for edited books (for example, Ransberger, 1946; Southhall, 1939; Taggart & Evans, 1946a, 1946b) and a number of monographs on supervision written by women and published by local school systems or government agencies. I finally decided to include the book *Measuring the Efficiency in Supervision and Teaching* by Lelah Mae Crabbs (1925). This work was Crabbs' PhD dissertation, however, it was published as a book by Teachers College, Columbia University, and hard copies of the book can be found in university libraries or purchased online. I should note that after 1950 increasing numbers of supervision books authored by women began to be published, and these books would be valuable material for a future paper on supervision texts from that later period.

This is not a traditional review of literature, although it does possess elements of both historical and argumentative reviews. The paper is a series of individual discussions of the 10 books. Each discussion is organized into three parts. First, I discuss a concept from the book that I believe supervision as a field of study and practice should retain. Although these concepts may have been reinterpreted over time and may not hold center stage in the present, they are still part of supervision, and, I believe, should continue to be discussed and acted upon. Second, I review a concept that, while it still may be associated with supervision, is not valued or utilized today as much as it could be or should be. I call for reviving such concepts as a way of improving supervision. Finally, I discuss a concept that I believe should be reprovved and eliminated from supervision.

Why do I believe that this type of review is important? Many ideas in supervision (and education in general) presented as new concepts are not really new at all. Rather, they are old ideas or slight variations of old ideas with new labels. Some of these ideas have not worked well in the past, are a threat to supervision, teaching, and learning today, and should be discredited rather than allowed to cause further damage. Other ideas have moved us forward in the past and hold promise for the present and future but have been de-emphasized for ideological, political, or commercial reasons and need to be welcomed back to the mainstream. By failing to review and critique ideas from historical texts we run the risk of either continuing or readopting ideas that

are not in the best interest of supervisors and teachers, or of failing to value and sustain ideas presented in those texts that can be adapted to enhance supervision. In the words of Jeffrey Glanz (1995), “without reference to past proposals and an explication of how current propositions evolved, we fall prey to reinventing the wheel again and again” (p. 100).

In sharing this paper, I am more interested in bringing concepts from these supervision books from the past up for discussion and reflection than in proving I am right concerning what should be retained, revived, or reproved. I invite you to review these works (available in most university libraries and for purchase online), and based on the your own values and experiences, develop your own positions on which concepts from the books are relevant to supervision’s present, and whether those concepts should be retained, revived or reproved in our efforts to improve supervision.

Analysis of Supervision Books and Selection of Concepts

I first read each of the selected books and took detailed notes on each major concept presented by the author(s). If the author(s) returned to a concept discussed earlier in the book I took additional notes on that particular concept. Next, I classified each concept into one of five categories. One category was “no longer relevant,” indicating the concept was not applicable to modern supervision. For example, discussions on the use of classroom equipment or instructional materials no longer used by teachers was coded as no longer relevant. The three critical codes were used to classify concepts as retain, revive, or reprove, based on the above explanation of those categories. The fifth code was for any concept that was not assigned to any of the first four categories. Typically, these latter concepts were those that were not linked to any recommendations intended to improve the practice of supervision. I cycled back and forth between review of my notes and original passages from the book under analysis as I assigned codes to each concept. Next, for each book, I reviewed all of the concepts coded retain, revive, or reprove and selected one concept from each category for each of the 10 books. I selected concepts that I considered especially relevant to supervision today, based on current supervision literature as well as my own work with teachers and supervisors and relevant research colleagues and I have conducted over the years. The books reviewed include works by Nutt (1920), Burton (1922), Crabbe (1925), Barr and Burton, (1926), Nutt (1928), Kyte (1930), Barr (1931), Rorer (1942), Barr, Burton, and Brueckner (1947), and Wiles (1950).

Hubert Wilbur Nutt (1920): The Supervision of Instruction

Hubert Wilbur Nutt was Director of Teacher Training at the University of Kansas when he wrote *The Supervision of Instruction*. Nutt’s 1920 book is concerned with the supervision of both preservice and in-service teachers. Part I of the book provides an overview of the activities of supervision and Part II, the bulk of the book, is concerned with principles underlying supervision and the application of those principles. Part II is divided into sections entitled “Supervisory Method,” “Devices of Supervision,” and “Technique of Supervision.”

Retain: Principles of Supervision Underlying its Structures and Techniques

Nutt (1920) lamented that supervision in the early 20th century was focused on the devices (structures) and techniques of supervision rather than underlying principles:

...the greatest weakness of supervision is its proneness to be largely a matter of devices and techniques. Definite, recognized principles have been lacking. Such principles are the very foundation of the whole procedure in carrying on the work of supervision... (p. 17).

Nutt proposed a number of principles for supervision. Examples include the need for common knowledge, instructional skills, breaking up incorrect practices, and teacher initiative and independence. It is not that Nutt wanted to downplay supervision structures and techniques, but rather that he wanted their use to be guided by higher-order principles.

Some modern supervision books do present guiding principles for supervision (see for example, Gordon, 2016; Zepeda, 2017), although they are not always in agreement with Nutt's principles. And no doubt the extent to which practitioners adhere to principles of supervision proposed by scholars varies. The key to retaining the concept of supervision guided by underlying principles may be for the supervisor and teachers to first inform themselves of principles proposed by supervision scholars and then to reach consensus on a set of their own principles. This idea relates to Sergiovanni and Starratt's (2002) supervision platform, provided the platform is developed collaboratively by the supervisor and teachers.

Revive: Supervisor Teaching

There is little discussion of supervisors teaching in modern supervision texts, and most of the supervisors I know do little if any classroom teaching. Nutt (1920) believed that supervisors should teach lessons on a regular basis, to demonstrate effective teaching, especially to beginning teachers. But Nutt also argued that supervisors should teach for the purpose of experimentation. For Nutt, the supervisor "must not only be able to see the possibilities of making improvement through modifications in the procedure of teaching, but...must be able to set up experimental conditions and to carry out the actual experiment in a satisfactory manner" (p. 26). Nutt suggested that such experimental teaching by the supervisor be observed by teachers. Another reason Nutt suggested that supervisors teach was so they could stay in tune with the realities of instruction, including the problems students face in learning and the problems teachers face in teaching. Nutt believed that teaching would help the supervisor develop a more supportive attitude toward teachers. Supervisors in the modern school are busy meeting myriad obligations; however, the benefits of periodic teaching to meet the purposes proposed by Nutt seem worth the reprioritizing necessary to make it possible.

Reprove: Directed Teaching

For Nutt (1920), one step in learning to teach is "teaching by following specific directions and instructions in an intelligent manner" (p. 87). Nutt also wrote, "The direction of actual teaching work of student teachers and regular teachers means direction of all the activities that are

involved in preparing for and conducting each daily recitation that the student [teacher] or regular teacher is to hold” (p. 163). Nutt recommended even more explicit direction for the beginning teacher in the form of “definite detailed lesson plans that the teacher is to follow.” The directed teaching described by Nutt brings the current scripted lesson to mind. The use of directive control regarding lesson plans espoused by Nutt is quite different from the use of that approach in developmental supervision, which calls for the use of control only when students are in physical, emotional, or academic danger, and only until the classroom situation has been stabilized. Although Nutt did call for supervisor directives to become more “general” as the teacher develops expertise and for the teacher to ultimately become independent, he also believed that some teachers would always best respond to directed teaching:

Some teachers can carry out detailed directions that have been set for them better than they can set definite directions for themselves to follow. Such teachers will always do their best teaching when they are working under close supervision, or following a very detailed course of study (p. 172).

Such tight control of teachers’ instruction, even for teachers early in their careers, actually inhibits their creativity, reflectivity, and long-term development. Nutt’s call for teachers to eventually be independent in their teaching and his warning that some teachers will always require rigid direction indicate at least some level of contradiction.

William H. Burton (1922): Supervision and the Improvement of Teaching

William H. Burton was Director of Training Schools in the State Teachers College in Winona, Minnesota, now Winona State University, when he wrote this text. The book is divided into four parts: “The Nature and Problems of Supervision,” “The Supervisor and the Improvement of Teaching,” “Other Functions of the Supervisor,” and “The Supervisor as a Personality.” The book includes an extensive appendix of lesson plans and lesson reports.

Retain: Burton’s Call for Active Learning

Burton (1922) urged the supervisor to help the teacher to provide students with what he called “self-activity,” equivalent to the modern term “active learning”:

The principle of self-activity, or the idea that the learner learns by doing, whether it is motor or mental activity, is a primary principle of teaching and yet is disregarded in a tremendous amount of school work. In addition, the participation in doing adds mightily to interest. Many a hard-working teacher is puzzled and sometimes hurt by the lack of interest in the class and by the evident lack of progress, not realizing that by doing all of the work herself she gives them no chance to progress (p. 65).

Burton’s call for active learning is consistent with more recent research finding a high level of active learning in schools where teachers described their principals as strong instructional leaders (Quinn, 2002).

Burton's concept of active learning included promoting students' reflective thinking. For Burton, reflective thinking involved the student acquiring abstract meanings, making generalizations, and applying such abstractions and generalizations to the analysis and solving of problems. Given Burton's advocacy of active learning, reflective thinking, and problem solving, it is no surprise that he also was an advocate of project-based learning:

By organizing school learning into projects the teacher is forced away from emphasis on some particular lesson type or principle of learning and is enabled to view large units of activity that will involve several or all of the principles of learning, each in its proper relation to the whole, each with the amount of time and emphasis that it actually deserves (pp. 222-223).

Burton argued that the projects be based on real-life problems or situations. He also discussed a number of more traditional teaching methods in his 1922 text (for example, he devoted an entire chapter to drill). His calls for active learning, student reflection, and learning based on real-life problems, however, are those that are most relevant to today's teachers and supervisors.

Revive: Principles for Choosing Curriculum Content

Building on the work of Samuel Parker, Burton discussed principles of curriculum development that today's supervisors would be wise to review. Burton believed that the content of the curriculum should be based on current social needs, and further focused on the particular needs of the children to be taught. Burton argued for less breadth and more depth, or, as he put it, "selection of subject matter so that fewer topics are treated intensively as opposed to many extensively" (p. 272). Finally, Burton proposed that curriculum should be student centered—selected and organized in a way that relates to student experiences and interests. The implication here is that the teacher should be allowed the flexibility to adapt the curriculum to a particular group of students or to a changing educational context, and that part of the supervisor's role is to assist the teacher in doing so.

Reprove: Deficit Language

Perhaps the least appealing aspect of Burton's book is the occasional use of deficit language to describe some members of a school community. In discussing levels of intelligence, he commented, "it is extremely difficult to differentiate between some classes, for instance, the remarkably dull normal person from the unusually high-grade moron" (p. 303). In his summary of the uses of intelligence tests, Burton wrote:

The placing of slow or dull children where they can be happier with work within their ability to accomplish and bringing to the bright pupil the ability to utilize his additional mental power are probably the most important contributions the tests will make to the betterment of instruction. (p. 307).

Burton argued for ability groups and suggested labels for such groups such as "A and B" or "slow, medium, and fast" (p.78). He was not in favor of parental input into how students should be grouped:

If parents object to their children being placed in the slow group when intelligence tests, special ability tests, and the opinions of half a dozen teachers and supervisory experts place them there, then the parents must be tactfully educated and made to see that it is more efficient and better for the child. If they cannot be so educated, they will have to be left with their objections. (p. 80-81)

Burton did not spare teachers in his use of deficit language:

A consistently slow or shirking teacher must be told to “get busy or get out.” A whining teacher who cannot see why others are promoted while she remains behind must have the superior work of the others pointed out to her clearly and concretely through a comparison with her weak points or lack of professional interest (p. 413).

In fairness to Burton, this type of language can be found in many supervision and other education texts of the time. It was part of the vernacular of that era. Still, reading these passages reminds us that this type of language is inappropriate and counterproductive, even in casual conversations about students and adults.

Lelah Mae Crabbs (1925): Measuring Efficiency in Supervision and Teaching

This book was based on Crabbs’ PhD dissertation, completed at Teachers College, Columbia University. The study was intended to develop a technique of supervision based on the measurement of student learning. Students in a school district were given a battery of tests—two intelligence tests and five achievement tests across content areas—in October, 1922. The same battery of tests was administered again in October 1923. The measurements derived from the tests were based on a formula that began with an accomplishment ratio (AR), that was derived by dividing the student’s chronological age by her or his “mental age” and multiplying the answer by 100. The two administrations of the battery of tests were necessary to determine the teacher’s efficiency, which was calculated by subtracting the initial AR from the subsequent AR. Results of the tests related to the school district as a whole and to individual schools were shared at a general meeting of all supervisors and teachers. Next, results for individual classes and individual students were shared and discussed at faculty meetings at each school. Finally, presentations were made to the school board and the parent-teacher association. One of Crabbs’ research questions was if the formula used for analyzing the test results provided a valid measure of teaching efficiency (effectiveness). Another research question concerned the extent to which the supervisor could accurately judge teacher efficiency as determined by the testing program. I provide Crabb’s conclusions regarding both of these questions later in this section.

Retain: Analysis of Methods of Teacher Evaluation

In Crabbs’ discussion of “measuring teacher efficiency,” she described different stages of teacher evaluation, from lower to higher stages. In the lowest stage, the “general impression stage,” the supervisor simply observes the teacher and then gives the teacher a single overall rating. Crabbs argued that this type of evaluation has no validity or objectivity. Crabbs’ next stage, the “scorecard method,” is based on a list of traits considered to be essential elements of effective teaching. The teacher could receive checkmarks or points for each element, or the evaluation

instrument could require the supervisor to select from multiple choice responses related to each element. The third stage, the objective measurement method, consisted of a student achievement test. Crabbs pointed out problems with this method, including the failure to consider the student's capacity and the lack of a pre- and post-measure. Finally, Crabbs considered the method applied in her study—use of the AR formula and calculation of the difference between initial and later AR—as a method superior to the other three.

The analysis of the methods of teacher evaluation have continued to the present day, although, of course, in different contexts. For example, Hazi and Arredondo Rucinski (2009, 2016) critique the increasing use of test data, technology that tracks selected aspects of teacher performance, and rubrics to evaluate teaching, and propose that we shift from the “instrument” mode to the inquiry mode, requiring teachers and supervisors to “think deeply and thoughtfully” about what is going on in the classroom. There is still much research to be done concerning teacher evaluation. We need research on the various evaluation methods currently used, including exploring not only their effectiveness in evaluating teaching but also their value in improving teaching and learning, and their unintended effects on teachers and students.

Revive: Analysis of Supervisor Effectiveness in Teacher Evaluation

Crabbs had supervisors of the teachers whose students had completed the battery of tests come together to rank the teachers' effectiveness, then compared the supervisors' rankings with the students' gains in individual subjects and across all subjects tested. Based on this comparison, Crabbs drew the following conclusion regarding supervisor rankings of teacher performance in the teaching of reading: “Assuming the validity of the measure of efficiency used...for all practical purposes, the combined judgments of these successful, experienced, and keenly interested supervisors are just about worthless as an index of the real efficiency of teachers of reading” (p. 55). Crabbs made a similar conclusion regarding the supervisors' overall evaluation of the teachers' instruction: “Teaching efficiency cannot be determined by supervisors accurately enough to be of any practical value” (p. 98).

More recent research on supervisor effectiveness in evaluating teaching also calls that effectiveness into question and indicates the need for continued research in this area. Supervisors have reported that they have not been properly trained in the use of new, complex evaluation systems, and this lack of adequate training can mean a lack of adequate skills to utilize such systems or bias in the assessment of teachers. Supervisors also report that, with their busy schedules, they do not have time to use evaluation systems as they are intended to be used. Many supervisors do not have significant content and pedagogical content knowledge in all of the subjects taught by the teachers they evaluate. Multiple ratings of the same teachers over time as well as ratings of the same teachers by different supervisors have been inconsistent (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2018). Zepeda and Jimenez (2019), in a recent study of a specific evaluation instrument used by supervisors, found that while the interrater reliability for the teacher rated to be of highest quality was high, the overall interrater reliability was marginal, and the interrater reliability for the lowest rated teacher was poor. The researchers concluded that evaluators may have a good idea of what constitutes high-quality teaching but a less developed concept of low-quality teaching. As a result of all of these problems with supervisor evaluation of teaching, the vast majority of teachers do not consider the evaluations they receive

to be useful (Duffertt, Farkas, Rotherham, & Silva, 2008). We need continued research to determine when problems with teacher evaluation are the result of the evaluation system itself and when the problems lie with things like inadequate supervisor preparation for using the system or inadequate time to use the system properly. The use of multiple evaluators and multiple types of evaluation data also need to be further examined.

Regarding supervisory practice, supervisors certainly need adequate professional development for using whatever type of evaluation system they are charged with implementing. School systems need to continuously monitor their evaluation system in order to determine if it is equitable, valid, reliable, and effective, and to make revisions in the system as necessary. If formative and summative evaluation of teaching are kept separate, teachers, students, and parents can share in the process of formative evaluation, which in all likelihood is the type of teacher evaluation that is most likely to improve teaching and learning.

Reprove: Student Testing as the Basis of Supervision or Teacher Evaluation

For Crabbs' study, testing and retesting students was the measure of teacher effectiveness, and the testing along with the sharing and discussion of test results was the supervision program. One of Crabbs' findings, however, was that the tests measured only discreet knowledge and skills learned in specific content areas and did not measure cross-disciplinary or higher-level learning. The tests and testing formula did not provide a reliable indicator of teachers' overall teaching effectiveness. Crabbs also found that, while administrators and supervisors were very positive about the testing program, teachers—those educators most responsible for using test results as the basis for improved teaching and learning—were far from enthusiastic participants in the program:

...a few teachers were openly and defiantly antagonistic to the entire program throughout. Most were willing to follow the various steps decided upon, but did so without particular enthusiasm. None worked as actively for the program as the few worked against it. (p. 18)

The idea of tying teacher evaluation to student test scores, of course, is alive and well today with the emphasis on state-mandated high-stakes achievement tests and the use of test scores for "value-added" teacher evaluation. There are a number of problems with connecting student test scores to teacher evaluation. For example, it is common for one group of students to have much different test scores than another group of students taught the same subject by the same teacher. Also, although all students can learn and teachers should take responsibility for helping all of their students to learn, the fact remains that there are factors other than the teacher that affect student learning (the student's life outside of school, the student's prior learning, the school environment, class size, and available instructional resources, to name a few). Finally, use of test results to determine students' and teachers' fates can cause the teacher to teach to the test and ignore other valuable learning content not covered by the test (Glickman, et al., 2018).

Linking measures of student achievement to teacher evaluation generates different views from different educators, and I close this section with a brief summary of my own thoughts on the issue. First, and most generally, because of the damage they have caused to schools, teachers,

and students, and in particular the damage to students from racial and ethnic minorities and from families of low income, I would eliminate high-stakes achievement tests altogether. Second, for reasons cited earlier, I would not include student test scores (including districtwide or schoolwide tests) as part of the summative evaluation of teachers. Third, student test scores can be one source for formative evaluation of teachers, but should never be the only source. Examples of student work (projects, presentations, portfolios), classroom observations by supervisors and colleagues, videos of classroom teaching, student feedback, teacher portfolios, and reflective self-assessment are all potential sources of formative assessment for the purpose of improved teaching.

A. S. Barr and William H. Burton (1926): The Supervision of Instruction

A. S. Barr was at the University of Wisconsin and William H. Burton had moved to the University of Chicago when *Supervision of Instruction* was published in 1926. The authors stated that the purpose of the text was “to present the problems, principles, and procedures of supervision” (p. v). The authors noted that while some passages of Burton’s 1922 book, *Supervision and the Improvement of Teaching* had been carried over to this text, they did not consider this work to be a second edition of Burton’s earlier text.

Retain: The Need for Research on Supervision

Although research on supervision has been alive and well over the last several years, especially among members of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS), such research has not been extensive. I include this discussion in the paper because the need to expand the research on supervision is as great now as it was in 1926, and because the extensive list of research topics Barr and Burton recommended that year is, for the most part, still relevant today. They recommended 30 different areas of research on supervision. Below I list 15 of those areas for the reader’s consideration:

- The value of supervision
- A study of supervisor activities
- Desired personal and professional qualities of supervisors
- Scholarship of practicing supervisors
- Teachers attitude toward supervision
- The ethics of supervision
- Problems of beginning supervisors
- Supervisor preparation
- Conferences with groups of teachers
- Conferences with individual teachers
- Demonstration teaching
- Classroom observation
- Teacher self-assessment and self-improvement
- Teacher participation in creation of instructional policies
- Supervisor community activities (pp. 608-615)

Modern scholars like Mette (2019) have called for expanding research on supervision across the field's discourse communities, including instructional supervision, leadership for learning, teacher preparation, critical supervision, and policy analysis. Mette calls for research that draws from other social sciences and uses a variety of research methods to chart the future of supervision, a future that connects research, practice, and policy.

Revive: The Distinction Between Formative and Summative Evaluation of Teaching

The debate on whether formative and summative evaluation should be separated has been largely an academic one in recent years, with summative evaluation dominating practice. In state and district evaluation systems that claim to combine formative and summative evaluation, the summative component actually tends to dominate. This is due to a number of reasons, including tradition, a lack of supervisor expertise in formative evaluation, evaluation instruments that lend themselves toward summative rather than formative evaluation, and insufficient time for formative evaluation.

Barr and Burton (1926) never used the terms summative and formative, rather they distinguished between “administrative” and “supervisory” rating of teachers. However, if we examine their definitions of the latter two terms, they are equivalent to summative and formative, respectively. The authors considered the uses of administrative rating to be “the promotion, transfer, and dismissal of teachers” (p. 450) and the purpose supervisory rating “the improvement of teachers in service” (p. 463). Barr and Burton wrote that in the mid-1920s there had been an increased emphasis on administrative rating but “supervisory rating will doubtless remain as the most important feature” (p. 463). They advocated that teacher self-assessment should be an important part of supervisory rating, indeed that the primary purpose of evaluation “should be to stimulate the teacher to an intelligent self-criticism of her work” (p. 486).

Barr and Burton's early differentiation of summative and formative evaluation and advocacy for a focus on formative evaluation were important contributions, but their treatment of these concepts was incomplete in some respects. First, their discussion was focused primarily on the formative *rating* of teachers and scales used for such rating rather than identifying more imaginative ways of assessing teachers' improvement needs. Also, there was no substantive discussion on how to use the results of formative assessment to assist teachers' improvement efforts. A challenge to modern scholars and practitioners is to expand on Barr and Burton's ideas in this area by identifying a variety of formative assessment techniques and linking data gathered through those techniques to improvement strategies.

Reprove: The Notion that Teachers Cannot Plan and Conduct Their Own Research

Barr and Burton were strong advocates of the scientific method and the improvement of teaching through research. In their 1926 book they discussed the application of a variety of traditional research methods to education and called for the establishment of research centers in school districts. Barr and Burton also proposed that teachers become research workers involved in research guided by the district's research center or a supervisor, and engage in applied research in which they “discover adaptations to classroom situations of the results of the educational research now carried on largely in university centers” (p. 388). However, Barr and Burton were

not enthusiastic about teachers conducting their own research, because they did not believe that teachers had the time or expertise to do so. The success of teacher action research over the last several decades has shown that teachers are perfectly capable of designing and carrying out research at the classroom, team, and school levels. Granted, teachers who have not developed action research skills in their teacher preparation program need to participate in professional development on action research before engaging in such research, and a supervisor should be available to facilitate the research, but PK-12 teachers have shown conclusively that they can successfully carry out action research and that such research can improve teaching and learning.

Hubert Wilbur Nutt (1928): Current Problems in the Supervision of Instruction

Nutt was the Director of Teacher Training at Ohio Wesleyan University when this book was published. While his 1920 book cut across the supervision of preservice and in-service teachers, this 1928 text was focused on the supervision of in-service teachers, and intended primarily for superintendents and principals. The book featured the results of research on supervision carried out by Nutt.

Retain: Constructive Supervision

Scholars discussing this book often refer to Nutt's (1928) call to make supervision objective and scientific. However, I found Nutt's discussion of constructive supervision to be more relevant to modern supervision. By constructive supervision, Nutt is not referring to constructivism, but rather to the supervisor providing constructive rather than destructive criticism. Nutt's constructive supervision certainly is related to scientific supervision, in that the classroom becomes a laboratory "in which the teacher is working as a student of scientific education" (p. 505). The supervisor considers the teacher to be a student learning the science and art of teaching through the experience of teaching and with the assistance of the supervisor. In like manner, the supervisor is a student of scientific supervision, learning about supervision through the experience of supervising. The supervisor assists the teacher's learning by gathering and sharing objective observation data, and the supervisor's own learning about supervision is based on objective data. The supervisor is viewed as a "cooperating teacher" rather than a critic. In this role, the supervisor assists the teacher in considering decisions about teaching but allows the teacher to make the final decisions. The supervisor should recognize that—like students—teachers are individuals with different backgrounds, experiences and growth rates, and thus supervisors should differentiate supervision "to meet these differences so that each and every teacher will be helped most constructively" (p. 512). Presently, supervision takes the form of destructive criticism in some schools and constructive assistance in others, however, the arguments for constructive supervision made by Nutt over 90 years ago still ring true today. In a study of principals in high functioning schools, Mette et al. (2017) found that the principals, even when combining supervision with evaluation, assumed the role of instructional coach concerned with helping teachers to improve, and differentiating their assistance based on the level of teacher expertise. The description of principal as instructional coach differentiating assistance in the Mette et al. study is quite similar to Nutt's supervisor as cooperating teacher adapting assistance to meet individual differences in teacher growth.

Revive: Ethical Codes for Supervision

Nutt (1928) recommended that the supervisors and teachers mutually agree upon an ethical code for cooperative supervision. He provided lists of potential supervisor and teacher obligations that could make up an ethical code, with the proviso that these obligations were simply suggestions and supervisors and teachers should collaboratively develop their own code. Space does not allow for listing all of Nutt's suggested obligations, but I will summarize a few here. Suggested supervisor obligations included commitments to developing a helpful stance toward the teacher, sharing responsibility for solving instructional problems with the teacher, gathering and sharing objective observation data, collaboratively interpreting that data with the teacher, keeping the teacher's instructional problems private, working to learn about and improve supervisory performance, and encouraging the teacher to experiment and engage in self-directed instructional improvement. Suggested teacher obligations regarding supervision included being open-minded and cooperative with the supervisor, committing to continuous learning, accepting objective data gathered by the supervisor, and being willing to experiment for the improvement of teaching. Supervisor-teacher collaborative development of an ethical code for supervision certainly is not common in schools today, yet this activity and adherence to the resulting code have tremendous potential for improving supervision in our schools.

Reprove: Conflation of Observation and Judgment

One theme in the Nutt (1928) book was the need for the supervisor to gather objective observation data. Across three chapters he presented a considerable number of observation reports intended to illustrate objectivity. One section of each observation report was divided into two columns, with the column on the left headed Procedures (teacher and student activities) and the column on the right headed Results (of the teaching procedure to the left). Another section, below the first, was headed Analysis, where the supervisor wrote an analysis of the lesson in the form of a numbered list of comments. Throughout the examples, the procedures recorded by supervisors were for the most part straightforward descriptions of what the supervisor had observed. However, the results column of most of the observations included comments that were anything but objective. A few excerpts from comments in the results columns of observation reports are provided below:

- “Questions from pupils were unimportant. Foolish questions were asked. Confusion reigned” (p. 284).
- “This was the best lesson she had presented” (p. 287).
- “Pupils were restless. No interest” (p. 288).
- “The lesson showed more thought and preparation on the part of the teacher than any previous lesson” (p. 290).
- “This lesson was largely a waste of time” (p. 316).

The analysis sections of the observations also were in large part supervisor judgments about the lesson. Some excerpts from these analyses follow:

- “The purpose of the oral reading at the beginning of the recitation was not made clear and it seemed largely a waste of time. It seemed to indicate a lapse into former practices of indefiniteness in doing things” (p. 288).
- “The pupils had no definite goal to be obtained through the study of current events. Each was merely interested in the finding of interesting facts about what was going in the particular country assigned” (p. 343).

The observation reports provided as examples in the book clearly moved beyond objective observation to supervisor judgments on the quality of teaching. This is inconsistent with Nutt’s call for the gathering and sharing of objective observation data. It also is inconsistent with his proposal for the supervisor and teacher to collaboratively interpret observation data in the post-observation conference. It is perhaps best to retain the principals of objective data collection and constructive supervision espoused by Nutt, but to discard the examples of observations in his text.

George C. Kyte (1930): How to Supervise

George C. Kyte was a professor of elementary education and supervision at the University of Michigan when *How to Supervise* was published in 1930. The text is divided into four sections: “History and Philosophy of Supervision,” “Organization for Supervision,” “Techniques in Supervision,” and “Supervising Types of Teachers.” The book was intended for use as a text for students preparing to be supervisors and as a guide for practicing supervisors.

Retain: Supervision as Action Research

Like Barr and Burton (1926), Kyte viewed the classroom as a laboratory for research to improve teaching, but unlike Barr and Burton, he recommended that the teacher take charge of her or his own original research:

The largest growth derived by any individual from educational experimentation or other types of research is attained by the person actively engaged in the investigation. The products of his own experiments influence his further efforts, because such results as are obtained he looks upon with satisfaction (p. 362).

The research process recommended by Kyte is similar to action research in today’s schools: identify a problem to be solved, complete a review of literature on the problem, identify a specific research focus, select research methods, implement the study, and report results. Kyte suggested that research results be reported either through an oral presentation or a written report for publication.

Kyte argued that action research was a vehicle for professional growth for both expert and struggling teachers. Such research would provide expert teachers new areas of interest and allow them to use their ingenuity to solve classroom problems experienced by themselves and others. Action research could help struggling teachers to understand and solve problems they were experiencing and allow them to progress “from the trial-and-error stage to that of the use of sound techniques” (p. 366). Kyte also suggested that action research be used to solve

controversies among educators concerning best practice. He recommended that teachers involve students in action research as a learning tool. Finally, Kyte encouraged supervisors to engage in action research to assess and improve their supervision.

In recent years there has been some debate over whether action research should be considered a function of supervision. Those who argue that such research should be part of supervision can point to Kyte's work as historical support for that argument.

Revive: Collaborative Curriculum Development

Kyte (1926) proposed that teachers and supervisors be involved in collaborative curriculum development, including curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and revision. He considered teacher involvement in curriculum development to be a powerful form of professional development. Kyte recommended the supervisor use a variety of supervisory processes during the curriculum development process:

Every supervisory procedure will be used very many times as the work progresses. Professional reading, intensive study, classroom experimentation, demonstration teaching, group meetings, individual conferences, producing supervisory bulletins, purposeful testing, and even professional writing become motivated activities in which large numbers of teachers will be engaged or by which they will be influenced. (p. 308)

Kyte identified stages of curriculum design that need to be navigated by teachers and supervisors, including developing a curriculum philosophy, scope and sequence, specific learning outcomes, units and lessons, and needed resources. He also pointed out benefits of teacher involvement in curriculum design, including teacher knowledge of the curriculum and the use of teachers who were involved in curriculum design to introduce the curriculum to other teachers. Kyle suggested providing teachers with "leading questions" to answer and "points" to report on as they implemented the curriculum as sources for curriculum evaluation and revision.

Several modern supervision texts call for supervisors to engage teachers in collaborative curriculum development (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2018; Henson, 2010; Pawlas & Oliva, 2008), but in this era of externally mandated curriculum standards and high-stakes tests enforcing those standards, such collaboration is difficult. The current era of external control eventually will pass, but in the meantime the supervisor's task is to work with teachers to develop a curriculum that envelops external standards within a comprehensive curriculum that meets the needs of the students, families, cultures, and communities served by the school (Gordon, 2018).

Reprove: Behavioristic Approach to the Post-Observation Conference

Kyte (1926) proposed a traditional approach to the post-observation conference in which the supervisor commends the positive aspects of the lesson, criticizes the weak points, and ask questions about "doubtful" parts of the lesson that the supervisor does not understand. Kyte gave three reasons for praising the positive aspects of the lesson. First, "All normal human beings are affected by praise. Such recognition of meritorious accomplishment by a professional colleague

is gratifying” (p. 197). Second, the teacher will become more conscious of the positive practices used and thus be more likely to continue to use them. And third, the supervisor can help the teacher to make good practices better. Regarding criticism of teaching the supervisor considers poor, Kyte stated, “In discussing the weak points of teaching, the same type of impersonal frankness and tact should be maintained as is used in dealing with strong points (p. 198). Kyte called for the supervisor to add suggestions for improvement to the discussion of weak points.

I have two objections to Kyte’s approach to the post-observation conference. First, in his approach it is the supervisor (not the supervisor and teacher together) who reviews the observation data and determines strong and weak points of the teacher’s instruction. Second, both the praise and criticism by the supervisor reflect a behaviorist approach to supervision rather than the collaborative inquiry and reflective practice championed by Kyte in other portions of his book.

A. S. Barr (1931): An Introduction to the Scientific Study of Classroom Supervision

Barr (1931) had three related purposes in writing this book. The first purpose was to provide a summary of the research on supervision. The second was to propose an integrated supervision program based on that research. The third purpose, similar to a purpose of his book with Burton five years earlier, was to recommend research on supervision that the field was still in need of. An overarching purpose was to encourage the application of scientific principles to both the study and the practice of supervision.

Retain: Examination of the Conflict Between Testing and the New Education

Barr’s (1931) discussion of what was known in that period as the “new education” is similar to descriptions of progressive education. He describes the new education as espousing learning connected to student interests and experiences, active learning, and holistic learning (concerned with social, emotional, and physical as well as intellectual development). Barr noted that test makers of the time found it easier to measure the learning of organized subject matter than the outcomes of learning activity, and simpler to measure acquisition of knowledge and skills than affective learning.

In the present, the high-stakes achievement test, tendency of many schools and teachers to teach to the test, and sanctions on schools that do not perform well on the test, create a conflict between testing and progressive education (including many progressive teaching practices supported by educational research) that may be even greater than the conflict of the early 20th century described by Barr. His solution was to create new and better tests that measured differed types of learning. The remedy to the current conflict suggested by many of today’s scholars is to eliminate or de-emphasize state-mandated, “one-shot” achievement tests and increase the use of authentic assessment. In any event, the conflict between testing and progressive education and a solution to that conflict needs to remain a concern of today’s supervision scholars and practitioners.

Revive: A Comprehensive View of Supervision

Barr (1931) takes a broad view of the domains to be attended to for the improvement of teaching and learning. Modern supervision has focused on some of these domains but downplayed others. Given the interrelations of the domains discussed by Barr, it may be time to re-emphasize some of these domains. I list the domains below, sometimes using language more familiar to the 21st century reader:

- Student characteristics
- Teacher characteristics
- Subject matter
- Educational objectives
- The teaching process
- The learning process
- The learning environment
- Instructional resources and materials

Any of these domains could be the subject of conferral, observation, and analysis, but the interaction of any of these domains with any of the others also could be an important focus of modern supervision. For example, the teacher and supervisor could focus on the relationship of the teacher's philosophy of education (a teacher characteristic) with the teacher's level of success in using different instructional strategies (teaching process), or they could explore whether cooperative or individual projects (learning process) best helped students to reach different types of educational objectives. Barr's comprehensive view of instructional supervision, if adopted, opens the door to a variety of explorations ultimately intended to improve teaching and learning.

Although Barr's list of supervision is comprehensive in many respects, it is lacking at least one critical area, assistance for the development of teachers who understand and practice culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP). True, CRP could be infused across all of the domains listed above, but it was not an area that Barr attended to when discussing any of these domains. Wiley and Magee (2018) point out that supervision can help or hinder the development of CRP, and that this is an issue that today's supervision is only beginning to address. Wiley and Magee argue that supervision needs to expand its scope to assist teachers to develop racial consciousness and the skills to confront systems of oppression.

Reprove: The Diagnostic-Prescriptive Approach

Barr (1931) clearly equated scientific supervision with a diagnostic-prescriptive approach. His general model of supervision called for first determining learning objectives, then gathering valid, reliable, and objective data to examine "the products of learning...to ascertain the respects in which the products need improving...followed by a search for the probable causes of poor work" (p. 9). The diagnostic phase would lead to an improvement program intended to correct the problems that had been identified:

The supervisor's plan for the improvement of instruction will consist of (1) a set of clearly stated, definite objectives; (2) a clear-cut outline of the means, devices, and

procedures to be utilized in the attainment of these ends; and (3) a clear-cut outline of the criteria, checks, or tests to be applied to the results of supervision, in order to determine the results or failure of the program (p. 15).

Barr's diagnostic-prescriptive approach to supervision is problematic for a number of reasons. First, there is a remedial tone to the approach, with all of its negative connotations. Indeed, Barr also referred to his model as "corrective supervision." Barr argued that there is no conflict between the diagnostic prescriptive approach and democratic supervision, and at times called for teachers to be involved in decision making, yet in other parts of the book he called for reliance on instruments and processes developed by outside experts and the supervisor. Barr continuously pointed to the need to base problem identification, improvement plans, and evaluation of improvement programs on valid, reliable, and objective data, but many of the data collection instruments he presented in his 1931 text seem to require a great deal of subjectivity on the part of the supervisor. Moreover, given the myriad, complex problems in classrooms and schools, it is not realistic to assume that there are—or ever will be—valid, reliable, and objective data collection methods that can adequately describe every classroom problem and its underlying causes.

A more realistic view of examining and addressing problems in complex processes like teaching and learning is presented by Schön (1983): "In real-world practice, problems do not present themselves to the practitioner as givens. They must be constructed from the materials of problematic situations which are puzzling, troubling, and uncertain" (p. 40). Schön calls this problem setting, in which "we name the things to which we will attend and frame the context in which we will attend to them" (p. 40). Schön argues further that in many professions (including education) there are multiple ways of framing professional practice, problem setting, and problem solving, and professionals thus must engage in collaborative, reflective inquiry in order to improve practice. This inquiry is as much an artistic process as a technical one.

The perspective taken by authors from Cambridge Assessment (2018) also calls the diagnostic-prescriptive approach into question. These authors, writing about education, argue that "the complex and constant interaction of factors in the system determines the outcomes which it provides" (p. 10). Because classrooms and schools are complex systems and are continuously changing, a diagnostic-prescriptive approach encompassing previously identified objectives and problems as well as prescribed improvements and improvement measures is not appropriate: "there is no inevitability in educational development, no set pattern of improvement" (p. 25). The complexity of education calls for continuous inquiry, reflection, and adaptive change.

John Alexander Rorer (1942): Principles of Democratic Supervision

Principles of Democratic Supervision was John Alexander (Alex) Rorer's PhD dissertation, and was published as a book by Teacher's College, Columbia University, in 1942. After graduating from Columbia University, Rorer taught at the University of Virginia. The book was republished twice (after Rorer's death in 1969), in 1972 and 2013. The book proposed principles concerning the nature, purposes, organization, and techniques of supervision.

Retain: The Democratic Approach to Supervision

Although democratic supervision certainly is not predominant in today's schools, it is alive and well both in the literature and in some schools, hence I include it here as a concept espoused by Rorer (1942) that we need to retain. Rorer proposed that, "Since we are committed to a democratic way of life, it is the function of schools to serve as instruments in the preservation and evolution of democracy" (p. 216). Rorer discussed how schools should go about developing citizens of a democratic society:

... the schools must provide freedom for the individual to exercise his initiative and gradually become self-directive. They must provide stimulation, encouragement, and guidance [so] that broader interest, more worthy purposes, and more meaningful and significant experiences may enter the pupil's data deliberation.

The goal of education, then, is the development of social individuals capable of solving their individual everyday problems through exercise of self-initiative—individuals who see their own good wrapped up in that of the group, who have a rich and varied background of experiences upon which to draw, who know how to put their whole beings into their pursuits, and who, through development of creative social action, will be able to contribute to the realization of an even better social order (p. 5) .

In the democratic classroom, according to Rorer, the teacher "is the guide, the mature advisor, the means by which the child constructs his own experiences as he selects his activities and pursues his purposeful course" (p. 6).

Rorer argued that students can only learn to be contributing members of a democratic society if their teachers provide a democratic learning environment, and teachers can be democratic only if supervision is democratic. Rorer defines democratic supervision as follows:

The only proper method recognized by democratic supervision is that general method of procedure which allows freedom of individual initiative, presupposes the exercise of individual initiative, stimulates growth, and provides for participation of all in cooperative social purposing, planning, executing, and judging (p. 60).

He proposed that the supervisor should assume that teachers are competent and will grow in competence if provided democratic supervision. The supervisor should facilitate the teacher's self-expression, self-assessment, self-improvement, and self-evaluation of improvement efforts. Supervision should be adapted to the individual teacher's background, current abilities, and interests.

Nearly 80 years after Rorer's book was first published, we cannot say that public education or supervision are democratic. Duncan Waite (2005) comments both on the difficulties of moving toward democratic supervision and the need to continue that movement:

Democracy and democratic supervision are ideal goals: difficult to attain, but worth pursuing. Democracy and democratic supervision are made even more difficult to attain because of the present educational and social contexts in which we find ourselves. The

challenge for those wishing to practice democratic supervision is how to operate more democratically within decidedly undemocratic structures, contexts, and organizations (p. 34).

Revive: Challenging Established Scholarship and Practice

Rorer (1942) challenged long-accepted ideas about supervision, including those espoused by gurus of that period like Barr and Burton. For example, he challenged the scientific approach to supervision, including many of its principle tenets. One of those tenets is objectivity: “The thoroughly impersonal, unbiased, and impartial attitude toward supervision, teaching, and learning reflects a deterministic, mechanistic, and unmoral philosophy (p. 49). Another idea Rorer critiqued was that of “proper method” (the equivalent of today’s “best practice”):

Since supervision is concerned with pupil growth and teacher growth, it cannot proceed upon a basis of prescribed rules or so-called “proper method.” It must proceed upon the basis of a general method which provides for teacher initiative in determining the specific method to be followed in any instance, such specific method to be determined in light of the experience and purpose of teacher and pupils. (p. 52)

In regard to applying educational research to teaching, Rorer advised the following:

... supervision should acquaint teachers with the results of educational research, of which there is a respectful and growing amount. But the findings of science must be used with caution. They are hypothesis to be validated through practice. They must be interpreted in the light of each situation and adapted to meet individual needs (p. 72).

On the other hand, Rorer had no problem with supervisors assisting teachers to conduct action research to solve instructional problems identified by teachers—he considered this type of research to be an example of democratic supervision.

Rorer also challenged the centralization of responsibility and authority, stating that such centralization, borrowed from business and industry, was not appropriate for education:

In education, we do not wish a uniform or a standard product. Education produces human growth; industry produces inanimate material things. Industry seeks financial profits, education does not. Industry passes the raw product from process to process each complete within itself, education is one continuous process. (p. 126).

Rorer proposed that leadership in schools be shared by administrators, supervisors, teachers, and members of the community. He contended that authority for collaborative action in education should reside in “the educational situation as reflected in the needs of children” (p. 149).

Finally, Rorer was opposed to the rating of teachers by supervisors. Commenting on such ratings, he stated, “This sets up an insurmountable barrier between supervisor and teacher. The teacher is careful to hide her weaknesses rather than to ask [for] help in overcoming them. Cooperation is, therefore, seriously crippled or completely thwarted” (pp. 177-178). Rorer was

in favor of teachers rating themselves, if such rating was strictly for self-improvement. He suggested that teachers not only rate themselves but establish their own standards for such ratings.

In challenging undemocratic leadership, Rorer also challenged other scholars who he believed used the language of democracy and collegiality on a surface level while actually supporting top-down supervision. For example, he argued that when Barr and Burton advocated “cooperation” they actually meant the teacher cooperating with the supervisor’s plan rather than true collaboration. And to the recommendation by several authors that supervisors treat teachers “sympathetically,” Rorer responded:

Too often the exhortations for sympathy and kindness in supervision are only the mouthings of benevolent “overseers” who believe their “inferiors” as a matter of decency should be treated as human beings. Teachers are professional people with intelligence and rightly resent any attitude of condescending benevolence from their co-workers. (p. 65)

Rorer was at the beginning of his scholarly career when he challenged many of the prominent authors of his time and their scientific approach to supervision. It must have taken considerable courage to do so.

Reprove: A Lack of Specificity Regarding Democratic Pedagogy

Democratic supervision and democratic pedagogy cannot be separated, and while Rorer certainly refers to democratic teaching, his references to it tend to be quite general (a lack of specificity, of course, is not a concept—the concept in question here is democratic pedagogy, and the reproof in this case is a lack of specificity concerning that concept). Later scholars provided considerably more detail into the requirements for and outcomes of democratic pedagogy. For example, Glickman (1998) describes schools structured for democratic pedagogy as having downsized learning environments; autonomy; curriculum and standards developed by the school and community; authentic assessments developed by teachers, students, parents, and other community members; heterogenous and multi-age grouping; and time for planning and organizing. According to Glickman, having appropriate school structures in place enables democratic learning, which includes active learning, individual and collaborative learning, incrementally increased student choice and responsibility, application of learning outside of school, service to the community, public demonstration of learning and public feedback, and sharing of learning with other students and adults.

MacMath’s (2008) discussion of democratic pedagogy is organized differently than Glickman’s work, but is generally consistent with it. She borrows from Dewey in describing three broad characteristics of democratic pedagogy: equality, intelligent judgment and action, and working together. Under the topic of equality, MacMath includes the need for a curriculum that is constructed by teachers and students and includes student histories and experiences (including histories and experiences related to culture and gender); a safe and respectful environment; and instruction that provides equal participation, student decision-making, critical discourse, assessment involving student reflection and peer feedback, and resource equity. Regarding

intelligent judgment and action, MacMath discusses the need for direct instruction as well as practice in critical thinking and “key habits of mine” (p. 7). She suggests as examples of student practice debates of controversial issues and problem solving requiring both critical thinking and creativity. Finally, for MacMath, working together means collaborative learning among students as well as school-community collaboration in learning, with the latter including both bringing the community into the classroom and taking the classroom into the community.

Although Rorer’s democratic supervision did not include the specificity on democratic pedagogy present in the later work of authors like Glickman, MacMath, and others, his work nonetheless stands out as a strong and consistent argument for democratic supervision. In that respect his book is unique among those reviewed to this point.

**A. S. Barr, William H. Burton, & Leo J. Brueckner (1947):
Democratic Leadership in the Improvement of Teaching (2nd ed.)**

This is the second edition of a text first published in 1938. When the 1947 edition was published, Barr was a professor of education at the University of Wisconsin, Burton was the Director of Apprenticeship at the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, and Brueckner was a professor of Education at the University of Minnesota. In their early works on supervision, Barr and Burton had been associated with a scientific approach to supervision, although they had insisted that there was no contradiction between scientific and democratic supervision. In this book the authors attempt to combine scientific and democratic supervision:

A few individuals still speak, write, and supervise as if science and democracy were antagonistic, or at least not easily combined. The truth is that each is necessary in any integrated theory and practice. Each is a fundamental, necessary, inescapable factor in any mature thinking about anything of importance. (p. 60)

The book is divided into four Parts: “The Background of Modern Supervision,” “Studying the Setting for Supervision,” “Improving the Setting for Learning,” and “Evaluating the Means and Methods and Outcomes of Supervision.”

Retain: Facilitating Teacher Growth

Barr et al. (1947) maintained that teachers have both the desire and capacity to improve and thus the supervisor should be a facilitator of teacher self-directed growth. They discussed six groups of factors that affect teacher growth, including environmental, personal, mental, morale, learning, and leadership factors. Environmental factors for Barr et al. encompassed the school’s personnel practices, community attitudes, and relationships with other educators. Personal factors included health, intelligence, energy and drive, adaptability, ability to develop relationships, and emotional stability. Mental factors were attitudes, knowledge, and “habits” (routinized or creative). The authors’ discussion of morale factors included descriptions of conditions that decrease and increase teacher morale. Barr et al. identified a variety of learning factors that affected teacher growth, including a felt need for learning, interest in the learning activity, satisfaction and success, provision for different teacher needs and learning styles, teacher reflection, and knowledge of progress in learning. The authors’ discussion of leadership

factors addressed a wide range of supervisory behaviors for facilitating teacher professional development, with a few examples including starting at the group's current level of readiness, focusing on authentic problems, providing for active learning, supporting teacher leadership in learning activities, fostering open communication, and encouraging the group to engage in ongoing assessment of their learning. Tschannen-Moran and Gareis's (2019) recent remarks on the supervisor facilitating teachers' professional development are reminiscent of Barr and associates' stance:

Supervision for professionalism puts teachers at the center of their own professional learning. Teachers are granted discretion as to how they want to accomplish the learning necessary to improve their practice.... To facilitate learning, supervisors do more asking than telling, and they enable teachers to find their own way forward (p. 220).

Some of the statements made by Barr et al. were not consistent with their premise that teachers have both the desire and capacity to improve. For example, in their discussion of mental factors in teacher growth, they stated: "Teachers must be convinced of the importance of teaching. Unfortunately, this is not the case for large numbers of teachers today, men and women alike. It is a second, third, or even last choice for many" (p. 592). On the other hand, their discussion of learning factors for teachers is very similar to the conclusions of modern research on adult learning (Merriam & Bierema, 2014).

Revive: Connecting Supervision to the Community

Barr et al. (1947) suggested that supervisors and teachers study the community as a basis for adapting the instructional program to community needs and connecting students' learning to their experiences in the community. The authors recommended studying community demographics, history, occupations, government, health, recreational and cultural assets, housing, and social services. They identified a variety of techniques for studying the community, including individual and group interviews, questionnaires, participant observations, the creation of community social maps, and review of community documents.

Barr et al. also suggested using the community as an instructional resource for students. They reviewed a variety of student excursions into the community to enable students to learn about cultural groups, occupations, transportation, communication, government, recreation, enrichment activities, commerce, and community improvement efforts. They presented ideas for service learning that combine student contributions to the community with student learning.

The authors recommended using the school as an instructional resource for community members. One of their ideas for benefitting the community was the community workshop, in which school staff and community leaders would present innovative strategies for solving community problems and improving community life. Finally, Barr et al. proposed the development of school-community councils for the purpose of improving community life. These councils included educators, leaders of community institutions, and representatives of civic groups. The authors maintained that the school had special obligations to such councils, including making the council a vehicle for community education, assuring the council maintained democratic values, providing expertise for ongoing assessment and adaptation to changing community needs,

making the council aware of the needs of young persons, and the participation of young persons in council activities.

Although some modern supervision texts have addressed connections among supervision, the school, and the community (for example, Glickman, et al., 2018), discussions of this topic have not been extensive. Given the tremendous potential for improving teaching and learning by taking the school and classroom into the community, and bringing the community into the school and classroom, it is time that supervision began to take its role in these areas much more seriously.

Reprove: Contradictory Language Concerning Democracy

Although Barr et al. (1947) support democratic supervision throughout their book, there also are several instances in their text in which their language seems to contradict democratic principles. For example, “all men are created equal” is a basic tenant of democracy, yet the authors state, “The political idea that all men are equal has been carried over by superficial thinkers, demagogues, and the naïve populace itself and has been applied to any and all fields” (p. 48). Barr et al. present a “scorecard” created by another scholar for the purpose of measuring socio-economic status. The scorecard is used during visits to homes in the community to document whether the home has things like a large rug, drapes, a piano bench, and couch pillows, and whether rooms are spotless or dusty, orderly or disorderly, have damaged or well-kept furniture, and so forth. One discussion question under the heading “Methods of Studying the Community” in Chapter 10 asks the reader “How living in a slum area affects the development of pupils as learners and as persons” (p. 495). Superficial observations and inferences like these are based neither on sound science nor democratic principles.

The authors’ contention that there is no conflict between science and democracy is generally true, but particular statements in the name of science or democracy can be problematic. For instance, Barr et al. state, “The rejection of scientific conclusions on the basis one’s “experience” or because one’s opinions are different, is childish” (p. 57). Given the reality that the conclusions of different educational researchers sometimes are in conflict, the issue of whether research from outside is applicable to a particular school or classroom setting, and the evolving nature of scientific knowledge, for a teacher to disagree with a supervisor’s suggestion to apply a “science-based” practice to her or his teaching does not seem to be all that “childish.”

Finally, democratic decision-making in schools considers but does not simply adopt the opinions of outside experts. Yet the authors state, “As our knowledge of complex phenomena becomes more complete, our dependence upon authority increases rather than decreases...” (p. 807). They also argue, “Many teachers resent the idea that an outside observer can analyze events in their classroom more accurately than they can themselves” (p. 824). Truly democratic supervision, however, involves the teacher and observer collaboratively analyzing the lesson. Barr et al. advocate democratic supervision more often than not in their 1947 text. Yet, their occasional slippage into undemocratic language is a flaw in this edition of their book.

Kimball Wiles (1950): Supervision for Better Schools

Wiles' (1950) views on supervision, often referred to as human relations supervision, were presented in a text that included sections on leadership, human relations, group process, personnel administration, and evaluation. The reader should be careful to distinguish the content of this book and its second (1955) and third (1967) editions from the fourth (1975) and fifth (1983) editions, with the latter two editions co-authored by John Lovell after Wiles' death in 1968.

Retain: Teacher Leadership

Wiles' (1950) ideas about teacher leadership were less about developing individual teacher leaders to assist with supervision and more about collective leadership. He considered authority and responsibility to be two sides of the same coin and urged the supervisor to share both with teachers. Authority and responsibility should belong to the group (the supervisor and the teachers together), not the supervisor alone. The group should reach consensus on what instructional problems need to be addressed and plans for solving those problems, and agree on which members of the faculty will assume responsibility for carrying out different parts of the improvement plan. The supervisor, according to Wiles, should assist teachers to carry out their leadership roles in improvement efforts by giving them authority, engaging in two-way communication throughout the improvement process, and encouraging the larger group to recognize the contributions of the teacher leaders. Wiles associated teacher leadership with teacher creativity, and urged the supervisor to remove barriers to teacher creativity such as single instructional models and districtwide or schoolwide tests. Wiles recommended that the supervisor recognize teachers for trying out innovative strategies as well as creative ways of assessing the value of those strategies. He suggested asking the teacher to share innovative strategies with the faculty or parents.

Wiles urged that instructional improvement efforts be coordinated by a school council elected by the faculty, and that a number of committees be established under the council to carry out specific functions, with faculty members choosing to serve on the committee they were most interested in. He also set forth a number of principles for shared governance. For example, the specific structure of the faculty organization, including the committees, would be decided on by the faculty. The structure would be based on problems the faculty chose to address. The structure would be flexible—as problems changed old committees would go out of existence and new committees would be formed. The entire faculty could review routine faculty council decisions if there was a call for such review, and the entire faculty would need to approve new faculty policies. Wiles urged faculty councils to coordinate with other groups, including students, district administrators, and community groups. He also encouraged district-wide governance and study groups, as well as faculty participation on a community coordinating council including representatives of multiple constituencies from across the community. Wiles' rationale for school involvement in community councils was “community problems are school problems” (p. 200).

In recent years, research on collective leadership similar to that described by Wiles has increased our understanding of how it works and its effects. Eckert (2019), for example, conducted a

multiple case study of collective leadership at urban, suburban, and rural high schools. He found that factors of collective leadership included supervisor support, teacher capacity for leadership, relational trust, and professional capital. The supervisors supported teacher leadership by focusing on the change process without claiming to be the cause of resulting change. Teachers also focused on needed change rather than the supervisor as leader, and if teacher capacity for leadership was lacking, it could be developed through collaboration with colleagues, reflective practice, and feedback. Relational trust among teachers and between teachers and the supervisor was promoted through open and honest communication. Professional capital was developed through shared practice, evidence-based decision making, joint responsibility, and collective accountability. Positive effects of collective leadership perceived by educators included increased teacher efficacy, an increased sense of ownership, achievement of common goals, school improvement, and improved student learning.

Revive: Teacher Self-Evaluation

Wiles (1950) did not believe in supervisors reviewing teachers' lesson plans, rating teachers, or using achievement test scores to judge the quality of teaching. What he did believe in was teacher self-evaluation. For Wiles, the purpose of self-evaluation, like the purpose of supervision, was the improvement of student learning. He wrote, "Self-evaluation centers the full attention of the teacher on the learning situation. Time need no longer be devoted to fooling the supervisor" (p. 255). Wiles argued that the teacher should not only conduct self-evaluation, but also should participate in choosing the goals of and criteria for that evaluation. He suggested the teacher invite students to provide feedback as part of the self-evaluation. Such feedback could be sought through the use of student panels, teacher-made student surveys, or student suggestion boxes. Wiles also suggested that the teacher and students collaboratively plan and evaluate lessons together, with the evaluation phase of such joint efforts informing the teacher's self-evaluation. Another method of teacher self-evaluation suggested by Wiles was observing other teachers' classes and comparing one's teaching to the teaching they observed.

Wiles included supervisor observation as one option for teacher self-evaluation but his description of the process was far from the traditional observation for evaluation. First, the observation would be only at the teacher's request. Second, the supervisor would visit the teacher's classroom either as a visitor invited to observe an innovative teaching method or project the teacher was trying out, or as a helper engaged in collaborative teaching. A post-observation conference would be informal, with the teacher considered an equal, either the teacher or the supervisor asking questions about the lesson, and no value judgments made by the supervisor. Wiles suggested that some teachers might prefer to be observed by another teacher rather than a supervisor as part of the self-evaluation process, and believed that, for some teachers, peer observation might be more helpful. Another suggestion by Wiles was that a group of teachers might wish to evaluate its instruction, and that the supervisor could assist the group's self-evaluation.

Reprove: Wiles' Methods of Dealing with Problem Teachers

Given Wiles' pro-teacher stance throughout most of his 1950 book, the labels he used to typecast some teachers are surprising. For example, he recommended methods for dealing with "the lazy

teacher,” “the colorless teacher,” “the older teacher,” and the “undemocratic teacher.” Wiles suggested that lazy teachers be involved in program evaluation, be provided magazines with challenging ideas, and be assigned to committee work. The colorless teacher should be drawn into social experiences (perhaps activities at a staff party), other faculty activities (style shows, plays), and workshops. Wiles admitted that some older teachers are outstanding teachers, but shared ideas for those older teachers just waiting for retirement, such as having them share information, resources, and ideas for solving school problems. Wiles also proposed that the supervisor encourage the older teacher to try out new teaching methods. Wiles advocated that the supervisor assist the undemocratic teacher through in-service training, faculty discussions, review of faculty meeting procedures, and sharing books on democracy with the teacher.

Beyond the issue of assigning such general labels to teachers, examination of the methods Wiles suggested for dealing with each type of teacher do not seem to me to be especially useful. Will “lazy” teachers really wish to be involved in program evaluation or new committee work? Will “colorless” teachers want to be placed in the center of party activities, a style show, or play? Will older teachers coasting toward retirement who have not been sharing ideas or trying out new teaching methods initiate such activities because of the supervisor’s suggestion that they do so? And will undemocratic teachers adopt democratic principles in the classroom and with colleagues as a result of a workshop or faculty discussion? Would such teachers even be willing to read a book on democratic education? The ideas Wiles’ presents in this part of his text do not seem to have the same level of creativity and sophistication as those throughout the rest of the book.

In fairness to Wiles, his discussion of how to deal with “the teacher who disagrees” was a strong one. Wiles held that a teacher disagreeing with the supervisor is not necessarily a negative thing—honest disagreement and debate actually can be steps toward improvement. The supervisor should first seek areas of agreement with the teacher. If the disagreement is over method, it can be resolved through experimentation. Disagreements over values require long and difficult discussion. In any case, the supervisor should never give the disagreeing teacher or others the impression that the teacher is a “problem.” The growth of a teacher should be more important to the supervisor than winning a debate with the teacher. All teachers must be treated as valued members of the school community.

Discussion

Comparing the overall direction of the ten texts to Sullivan and Glanz’s (2013) timeline of supervision models provides some interesting results. In the 1920s (aligned with the democracy in supervision model on the timeline), although Dewey’s (1916) ideas on democratic education clearly were having a strong influence on education in general and supervision in particular (Hosic, 1920), the democratic model did not guide the prominent supervision books of that decade. Nutt (1920, 1928) and Crabb’s (1925) books were more consistent with the previous decade’s dominant model, supervision as social efficiency. Nutt’s books, at their heart, were concerned with the supervisor measuring and increasing teacher efficiency, and the contents of Crabb’s book were entirely consistent with its title, *Measurement of Efficiency in Supervision of Teaching*. This is not surprising, since Taylor’s scientific management, which had become prominent the previous decade, was still very influential in the 1920s. Texts by Burton (1922)

and Barr and Burton (1926), on the other hand, clearly advocated a scientific approach to supervision. Barr and Burton's scientific approach was different from Taylor's efficiency model, with the former focused on using the scientific method to identify and solve problems with teaching. Depending on the value one holds for scientific supervision, it can be said that Barr and Burton were ahead of their time in adopting the scientific model in their 1920's texts.

The period 1920-1950 included the first two decades influenced by the scientific supervision model on Sullivan and Glanz's timeline, and Kyte's (1930) text is generally consistent with that model, although he proposed that teachers have a more participatory role in implementing the scientific model than Barr or Burton, at least in areas like action research and curriculum development. Barr's 1931 book, with its emphasis on the diagnostic-prescriptive approach, remained true to the scientific model. Although scientific supervision remained dominant throughout the 1940's, World War II and the accompanying threat to democracy led to a new emphasis on promoting democracy that transferred to supervision (McNeil, 1982). Rorer's (1942) democratic supervision and his critique of scientific supervision exemplify this re-emergence of the democratic model. Barr, Burton, and Brueckner's (1947) efforts to integrate the scientific and democratic models in their postwar text also reflect the increased attention to democracy brought about by the war. Finally, Wiles (1950) book, with its emphasis on human relations, self-directed growth, and teacher leadership, was antithetical to the scientific model.

While the overall themes of some of the books reviewed here were consistent with the supervision model associated with the historical period in which they were published, others were incongruent with the supervision model generally viewed as the dominant paradigm for that period. In terms of internal agreement, none of these books were entirely consistent. A few examples of this inconsistency include Kyte's (1930) call for teacher action research and involvement in all phases of curriculum development compared to his behaviorist approach to the post-observation conference, Barr's (1931) positive view of progressive education compared to his diagnostic-prescriptive approach to supervision, and Barr, Burton, and Brueckner's (1947) contradictory language regarding democracy. Like all of us, these prominent authors sometimes were inconsistent in their views.

Although it was not my original intent to identify themes cutting across multiple historical texts, several fairly obvious themes did emerge from my review. The themes I refer to typically are present across several but not all of the books reviewed. Regarding concepts that I argue should be retained, one theme is the need to establish broad principles of supervision and to base the supervision program on those principles. I discussed Nutt's (1920) calls for principles of supervision in this paper, but other authors of this period also called for such principles. Specific principles suggested by authors varied from text to text; the real theme was the need to establish principles. There are three other themes within the "retain" category. One is the call for a more constructivist approach, including such ideas as active learning for students and action research for teachers. Another is the call for more research on supervision in general. A final theme in this category is at least some movement toward more democratic supervision, exemplified by calls for more teacher independence, supervisor facilitation of teacher growth, and teacher leadership.

Under the category of concepts that I argue should be revived (these concepts certainly have never entirely disappeared; I am arguing that they should receive much more emphasis), one theme is the call for the supervisor to be a risk-taker. Some examples of supervisor-as-risk-taker are the supervisor teaching and asking teachers to observe, inviting the community into the school, and allowing teachers not just to engage in self-evaluation but also to set the goals and criteria for that self-evaluation.

I am critical of all of the concepts I placed in the reprove category. A general term I would use to describe the primary theme within this grouping is technical supervision, including concepts like directed teaching, student testing as supervision, supervisor conflation of observation and judgment, and a behaviorist approach to conferral.

In my opinion, the themes in the retain and revive categories, taken together, would be excellent components in a platform for the future of supervision—a platform based on broad principles agreed upon by teachers and supervisors and affirming democratic-constructivist supervision that includes supervisors as teachers and teachers as leaders, with supervisors and teachers supporting each other's risk-taking and inquiry about teaching and supervision. There are other components, I believe, that would be necessary for a platform for the future of supervision. For example, the most striking thing about these books was that there was virtually no discussion about the need for supervision to promote equity and social justice, and this surely needs to be part of supervision's future. Finally, it seems to me that those concepts within the reprove category, generally described as technical supervision, would be inconsistent with a supervision platform like the one outlined here.

Conclusion

The authors of the books I reviewed held a consensus view that the purpose of supervision was the improvement of student learning, with a focus on improved teaching as the primary way of meeting that purpose. For the most part, the books I reviewed took a broad view of the specific functions of supervision. In addition to observation and conferral, most of the books considered curriculum development and professional development to be functions of supervision, and other functions, such as action research and school-community development, were discussed by some authors.

Some of the practices, problems, and proposals discussed in these historical books are no longer relevant, but others are as important today as they were when the books were written. We can learn from the past, and that learning can include not repeating the mistakes of the past, but also, in some cases, continuing or reviving ideas from the past and adapting those ideas to the present and future. These 10 books do not represent the entire history of supervision from 1920 through 1950, but they are a big part of that history. I urge my colleagues in supervision to revisit that history and draw their own conclusions on its meaning for the present and future.

References

- Barr, A. S. (1931). *An introduction to the scientific study of classroom supervision*. New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company.
- Barr, A. S., & Burton, W. H. (1926). *The supervision of instruction*. New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company.
- Barr, A. S., Burton, W. H., & Brueckner, L. J. (1947). *Supervision: Democratic leadership in the improvement of learning*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Burton, W. H. (1922). *Supervision and the improvement of teaching*. New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company.
- Cambridge Assessment (2018). *A Cambridge approach to improving assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Author.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Duffett, A., Farkas, S., Rotherham, A. J., & Silva, E. (2008). *Waiting to be won over: Teachers speak on the profession, unions, and reform*. Washington, DC: Education Sector. Retrieved from <https://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/08/WaitingToBeWonOver.pdf>
- Eckert, J. (2019). Collective leadership development: Emerging themes from urban, suburban, and rural high schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(3), 477-509. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18799435>
- Glanz, J. (1995). Exploring supervision history: An invitation and agenda. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 10(2), 95-113.
- Glickman, C. D. (1998). *Revolutionizing America's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glickman, S. P., Gordon, S. G., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership; A developmental approach*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Gordon, S. P. (2016). Framing instructional supervision. In J. Glanz & S. Zepeda, *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice* (pp. 23-41). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gordon, S. P. (2018). Supervision's new challenge: Facilitating a multidimensional curriculum. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes1.2.2>
- Hazi, H. M., & Arredondo Rucinski, D. (2009). Teacher evaluation as a policy target for improved student learning: A fifty-state review of statute and regulatory action since NCLB. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 17(5), 1-19.
- Hazi, H., & Arredondo Rucinski, D. (2016). Teacher evaluation and professional development: How legal mandates encroach on core principles of supervision. In J. Glanz & S. J. Zepeda (Eds.), *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice* (pp. 187-200). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Henson, K. T. (2010). *Supervision: A collaborative approach to instructional improvement*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Kyte, G. C. (1930). *How to supervise*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- MacMath, S. (2008). Implementing a democratic pedagogy in the classroom: Putting Dewey into practice. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 1(1). Retrieved from <https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/cjnse/article/view/30388>
- McNeil, J. D. (1982). A scientific approach to supervision. In Sergiovanni, T. J. (Ed.), *Supervision of teaching*. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Merriam, S. B., & Bierema, L. L. (2014). *Adult learning: Linking theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mette, I. M. (2019). The state of supervision discourse communities: A call for the future of supervision to shed its mask. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 2(2).
<https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.2.1>
- Mette, I. M., Anderson, J., Nieuwenhuizen, L., Range, B. G., Hvidston, D. J., & Doty, J. (2017). The wicked problem of the intersection between supervision and evaluation. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 9(3), 709-724.
- Nutt, H. W. (1920). *The supervision of instruction*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Nutt, H. B. (1928). *Current problems in the supervision of instruction*. Richmond, VA: Johnson Publishing.
- Pawlas, G. E., & Oliva, P. F. (2008). *Supervision for today's schools* (8th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Quinn, D. R. (2002). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 447-467.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230210440294>
- Ransberger, M. (1946). Supervision in the American scene. In *Leadership through supervision* (pp. 17-26). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association.
- Rorer, J. A. (1942). *Principles of democratic supervision*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Southall, M. S. (1940). Supervisory techniques adapted to newer teaching practices. In *Newer instructional practices of promise: 12th yearbook* (pp. 328-350). Washington, DC: The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Educational Association.
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2013). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Taggart, L. A., & Evans, M. C. (1946a). Analyzing our problems. In *Leadership through supervision* (pp. 27-76). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association.
- Taggart, L. A., & Evans, M. C. (1946b). A look at our best. In *Leadership through supervision* (pp. 77-114). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the National Education Association.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2019). Discretion and trust in professional supervisory practices. In S. J. Zepeda & J. A. Ponticell, J. A. (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of educational supervision* (pp. 209-228). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Waite, D. (2005). Standards of democratic supervision. In S. P. Gordon (Ed.), *Standards for instructional supervision: Enhancing teaching and learning* (pp. 31-46). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Wiles, K. (1950). *Supervision for better schools*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Willey, C., & Magee, P. A. (2018). Whiteness as a barrier to becoming a culturally relevant teacher: Clinical experience and the role of supervision. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.1.2.3>

Zepeda, S. J. (2017). *Instructional supervision* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Zepeda, S. J. (2019). Teacher evaluation and reliability: Additional insights gathered from inter-rater reliability analysis. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.2.2>

Author Biography

Stephen P. Gordon is professor emeritus of educational and community leadership at Texas State University. His teaching and research interests include educational supervision, professional development, action research, school improvement, and curriculum development. Dr. Gordon's most recent text is *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* (2018), coauthored with Carl Glickman and Jovita Ross-Gordon.