DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 615 EA 026 340

AUTHOR Patrick, Edward M.; Dawson, Judith A.
TITLE A Description and Analysis of Five Teacher Supervision/Evaluation Systems: Summary of Case Studies, Findings, and Recommendations.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE Oct 85
NOTE 57p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Program Implementation; School Districts; Staff Development; *State Departments of Education; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

During the 1984-85 academic year, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) initiated efforts to reform school districts' teacher supervision/evaluation (TS/E) procedures. The goal was to improve the quality of classroom instruction and develop more consistent, meaningful teacher evaluations. This paper describes a study conducted by Research for Better Schools that examined the teacher-evaluation systems in five Pennsylvania school districts. Data were obtained through: (1) interviews with a total of 20 central office staff, 37 administrators and/or trainers, and 194 teachers; (2) analysis of district records; and (3) followup contacts with a sample of district officials. The following critical elements in designing and implementing new TS/E systems were identified--introduction and generation of staff support, system design, training, and implementation/continuation. Key issues include the relationship between supervision and evaluation, the selection of trainers, and system monitoring. Alternative modes of supervision/evaluation and centers for teacher training are two promising innovative practices. Findings indicate a definite and continuing support role for the PDE in districts' TS/E improvement efforts. Several recommendations are made for improving PDE's role. (LMI)

EA

A Description and Analysis of Five Teacher Supervision/Evaluation Systems: Summary of Case Studies, Findings and Recommendations

October 1985

A Study Conducted in Cooperation with the Pennsylvania Department of Education

Authors:

Edward M. Patrick
RBS State Leadership Assistance Program

Judith A. Dawson
RBS Field Studies Program

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

In the 1984-85 school year, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE), at the governor's behest, began to actively encourage Pennsylvania school districts to reform their teacher supervision/evaluation (TS/E) procedures. Its goal was to improve the quality of classroom instruction and make teacher evaluation more consistent and meaningful. As an initial step, PDE in cooperation with the state Intermediate Units, sponsored a series of 29 regional two-day workshops to familiarize school staff with the components of an effective TS/E system and staff skills required to implement them (McGreal, 1983). In 1985-86, PDE plans to provide districts with more specific models and how-to-do-it information based on existing TS/E systems in the state. This will be followed by technical assistance in the development and implementation of similar TS/E systems.

To obtain some of the data necessary to this effort, PDE commissioned RBS to design and conduct this study of five school district TS/E systems. The five districts were selected by PDE after a questionnaire and phone survey determined which districts in the state had TS/E systems either in place or evolving. An attempt was also made to include urban, suburban, and rural sites, among the districts selected. In the end, Abington Heights, Pittsburgh and Upper Perkiomen were selected because they had Madeline Hunter-type instructional improvement/supervisory models in use. Suburban East Penn and rural Tamaque were selected for their evolving alternative TS/E systems.

Method

The study took a case study approach. Separate interview protocols for district central office staff, administrators/trainers and teachers were developed and pilot tested. These were based in part on the protocols used in a recent Rand Corporation study of effective teacher evaluation practices (Wise, et al., 1984, personal communication). The interviews also addressed some 25 how-to-do-it type questions posed over the past year by Pennsylvania school officials in TS/E related meetings and conversations.

In addition, the terms "supervision" and "evaluation" were defined at the beginning of each interview to ensure a common understanding among participants and researchers. Supervision was defined as that cycle of activities between a teacher and an administrator or supervisor that is intended to improve the teacher's ability to perform in the class. It is primarily improvement oriented and can focus on instructional techniques, class management, planning, implementation of the distruct curriculum, etc. It can focus on teacher improvement goals and/or district goals. Evaluation was defined as the culmination of the supervision cycle wherein the administraor or supervisor makes a summary judgement or evaluation of the teacher's classroom performance for personnel or accountability purposes--usually on an annual basis.*

A three-phase study procedure was devised. First, descriptive TS/E system background and policy information (e.g., policy manuals, training

*In Pennsylvania, the annual evaluation of teachers and other professional employees is mandated (c.f. Pennsylvania Education code, Chapter 351, 351.21 Rating Form). The state form for this purpose, the Temporary Professional Employee/Professional Employee Rating Form, is referred to here as DEBE-333.

materials, observation instruments, budget data) was solicited from each of the five districts. A brief pre site-visit background information questionnaire was also used. Second, in the spring of 1985 two researchers spent three days on site at each district (six person days per site) interviewing school staff. At each site they interviewed central office staff and district trainers for approximately three hours, administrators for one-and-one-half hours, and teachers (separately or in small groups) for a half-hour. In the four smaller districts, Tamaque, Upper Perkiomen, Abington Heights, and East Penn, the number of administrators (including central office staff) and teachers interviewed ranged from 7 to 10 and 31 to 43, respectively. In Pittsburgh, the largest district, 22 administrative staff and 51 teachers were interviewed either separately or in small groups. Across the five districts, a total of 20 central office staff, 37 administrators and/or trainers, and 194 teachers were interviewed.

Interviews with central office staff touched upon development processes, system designs and operations, and outcomes, strengths, and weaknesses. Interviews with administrators focused primarily on their specific roles in supervision and evaluation, the utility of the training they received, their perceptions of their impact, perceived system strengths and weaknesses, and recommended changes. Interviews with teachers focused primarily on their perceptions of the utility, impact and fairness of the training/supervision and evaluation procedures, the specifics of the procedures, perceived strengths and weaknesses, and recommended changes. Several questions were asked of all staff to determine if they shared common perceptions of the goals, procedures and impact of the TS/E system.

Lastly, follow-up contacts with select district officials were made for further clarification of the information collected. In essence, district staff verified the accuracy of the program descriptions and implementation procedures cited in the report.

Related Research

Two recent publications address factors related to effective teacher supervision/evaluation systems. McGreal (1983) identified nine factors shared by effective teacher evaluation systems: (1) focus on instructional improvement as opposed to accountability; (2) correspondence between the major purpose(s) of supervision/evaluation and procedures and instrumentation; (3) separation of evaluation of teaching (supervision for improvement purposes) from teacher evaluation; (4) use of some form of goal setting procedures (individualization of supervisory procedures); (5) a narrow focus on teaching and a common understanding among administrators and teachers of the teaching act; (6) use of a modified clinical supervision format; (7) use of alternative sources of data; (8) different requirements for tenured and non-tenured teachers; and (9) in-depth training or staff development for both administrators and teachers.

The second publication was a recent Rand study (Wise, et al., 1984) of teacher evaluation systems in 32 school districts. Four of the districts were studied intensively. Researchers found well-developed supervision and evaluation systems in only a few of the districts. The problems most frequently cited in the districts were: (1) lack of sufficient resolve and competence on the part of principals to evaluate accurately; (2) teacher resistance to and lack of support for district evaluation programs because of apathy and perceptions of inconsistent criteria and subjective

variability in the evaluation process; and (3) lack of credibility in cases where generalists (principals) evaluated specialists (high school and/or special subject area teachers). The most commonly cited benefits, even in less well-developed teacher evaluation systems, were: (1) improved administrator-teacher communications; and (2) increased teacher awareness of instructional goals and classroom practices, due in part to the use of modified clinical supervision procedures.

The characteristics which distinguished the more successful from the less successful districts were: (1) provision of top-level leadership and resources for the evaluation program; (2) provision of training for evaluators in the skills required to evaluate effectively; (3) teacher-evaluator goals and procedures; and (4) development and implementation of evaluation procedures and support systems that are integrated with the district's overall goals and organizational structure.

The Report

This report consists of brief summaries of the five case studies. It also presents a discussion of findings and issues critical to the effectiveness of TS/E systems, and includes recommendations for other districts considering the development or revision of TS/E systems and implications for organizations planning assistance to these districts. A separate document contains a detailed case study of each of the five districts.

Study Findings

Analyses of the data generally indicate that the study results provide support for many of the characteristics of effective TS/E systems identified by the Rand study and McGreal's publication. The study also identified

over 20 specific process factors/issues critical to the initiation, design, start-up, implementation and maintenance of effective TS/E systems.

Summary of Case Study 1: Abington Heights School District

The Abington Heights School District includes seven schools, four elementary, two middle, and one high school. It employs 16 administrators and 223 teachers for its 3,364 students. The district uses a modified DEBE-333 evaluation procedure. In 1979, the district also instituted a Hunter-based instructional/supervisory improvement program (Program for More Effective Teaching-PMET).

TS/E Program History and Philosophy

PMET involves instructional-model training for administrators and teachers, and clinical supervision training for administrators. It was initiated in the district by a confluence of events that occurred in 1977-78. First, the superintendent developed an interest in Long Beach, California's application of the Hunter model; second, a teachers' association survey revealed discontent with current supervisor/evaluation procedures; and, third, initial district attempts to self-train staff in TS/E fell short. Subsequent visits to an exemplary TS/E District (Newport News, VA) by a special representative committee resulted in the district taking a number of actions, including: (1) hiring a consultant from Newport News; (2) selecting and training a district trainer; (3) pilot testing a similar program; (4) developing and refining the PMET program; and finally, (5) implementing the program.

District administrators view PMET as a process to upgrade the quality of teaching and supervision. The MET philosophy is one of helping staff increase skills through training and supportive follow-up supervision. Administrators see PMET/supervision and teachers' DEBE-333 annual evaluation as related but not formally connected.

Staff Development

Most district administrators received at least ten days of training in Hunter's elements of effective instruction and clinical supervision procedures. From the second to the fourth year of the program, they also received periodic follow-up coaching in observing/conferring by the district trainer. For teachers, training consisted of five days of sessions on Hunter's model over a five- or six-week period. Between each session, time was provided for practice, and coaching by the district trainer. Training was followed by regular observations and reinforcement by administrators/supervisors. Four or five small groups of teachers were trained each year from 1979-80 through 1982-83. Elementary school staff were trained first and secondary school staff last.

TS/E Organization

The supervision and evaluation process is carried out by principals, assistant principals, and eight subject area coordinators/supervisors. Principals and their assistants generally observe in their own buildings while supervisors observe across buildings.

The district requires two formal observations of tenured teachers, and four of untenured teachers each year. These observations may be announced or unannounced, and generally last a class period. Observations involve anecdotal note-taking, lesson diagnosis, post-conferencing and a formal write-up. The focus is largely on PMET instructional concepts as well as on other aspects of teaching as needed. All formal observation reports are shared with central office staff. Principals' annual evaluations of teachers are based on their observations and other interactions with teachers. Staff are expected to spend about 20 percent of their time on TS/E.

Monitoring/Evlauation

The superintendent and his assistant monitor implementation of the TS/E system by periodically reviewing observation and evaluation reports, and by sitting in on one teacher observation/conference with each administrator each year. System evaluation has also involved formative evaluation of training.

Project Costs

Project costs were approximately $40,000 the first year and $20,000 per year thereafter. The major expense incurred was salaries for substitute teachers called in to replace staff taken out of class for training.

Administrators' Perceptions

All staff found their training in PMET and clinical supervision valuable and effective. Most also expressed a need or desire for more training either in additional supervision process skills and/or other content areas related to teaching. Administrators, in particular, indicated that PMET helped teachers improve their instruction and increased their awareness of effective teaching. They cited the common language of instruction and the common observation-expectations of what comprises good teaching as the major strengths of the system. The annual DEBE-333 teacher evaluation, on the other hand, was viewed as somewhat of a pro forma exercise that had little impact on teacher improvement. The one problem that administrators reported was the need to periodically renew attention to the implementation of TS/E to prevent it from reverting to a pro forma process.

Teachers' Perceptions

Almost all teachers commented favorably on the usefulness of their PMET training. One-third cited specific examples of how they had changed their teaching practices as a result. Twenty-five percent reported that administrators' observations were helpful, while close to 60 percent attributed 20 percent or more of their teaching expertise to participation in the PMET program. Teachers generally agreed with administrators that the DEBE-333 evaluation was a pro forma exercise.

Teachers cited several program strengths. They said that it: helped them to systematize and organize instruction; provided a common language of teaching; increased communications between teachers and principals; and clarified TS/E expectatioha. The most commonly cited problem, mentioned by about 25 percent of the teachers was that the PMET program was misrepresented. It was sold as a program to help them but later was used to evaluate them. At least a third of the teachers also felt that the TS/E system had no teeth to it. Above average teachers were not recognized and marginal teachers continued to exist.

Central Office Staff Perceptions

Central office staff cited the common language of instruction, increased administrator supervisory skills, increased communication and trust, positive reinforcement and help for teaches, and the modified DEBE-333 as prevailing program strengths. Major problems perceived by central office staff included traces of continued staff resistance to the program at the secondary level, the need for more systematic follow-up for teachers requiring assistance, the need to formally relate DEBE-333 to PMET, and the need to refocus attention on TS/E.

On the basis of this experience, the major advice offered to other districts contemplating a similar program was to involve all levels of teachers from the beginning in program planning and conceptualization, thoroughly train a district trainer, plan for at least a five-year commitment, and develop the program alsowly to build staff trust.

Overall Program Significance/Implications

The Abington Heights School District program was one of the first programs in the state to address instructional improvement through a systematic staff development/supervisory program. With a program that incorporates many of the features recommended by McGreal (1983), the district achieved many of its goals in this area. Several implications can be drawn from this school district's experience. Among them are: (1) the importance of using a represetative group process; (2) engaging in site visits of exemplary programs; (3) conducting a pilot test during the program selection phase of a new instructional supervisory program effort; (4) the importance of clearly defining the relationship between instructional supervisory improvement efforts and a district's annual teacher evaluation procedure; and (5) paying attention to continued long-term follow-up, including emphasis on district resources for the program so that it continues to be perceived as a priority.

Summary of Case Study 2: East Penn School District

The East Penn School District consists of 12 schools, nine elementary, two junior highs, and one high school. It employs 20 administrators, 300 teachers and 5,800 students. The district instituted a modified DEBE-333 evaluation procedure in 1981 and trained administrators in Dick Manatt's supervisory model. The district also recently initiated Project ProCEED (Professionals Committed to Excellence in Education) to broaden teachers' instructional skills.

TS/E Program History and Philosophy

Discontent with the quality and consistency of teacher evaluation led to the formation of a Teacher Evaluation Committee in 1980-81. This committee modified the DEBE-333 and produced Tips for Teachers, a compendia of instructional guidelines for school staff. Administrators were also trained in Manatt's model of teacher supervision in the summers of 1981, 1982, and 1983. Continued district interest in teacher staff development resulted in Project ProCEED, part of the district's 1982-83 long-range plan. Project ProCEED consists of six district developed and taught instructional modules. The modules address brain development/learning styles, teacher expectations and student achievement, Bloom's taxonomy, students with special needs, time and classroom management, and student motivation. Staff instruction in Project ProCEED content commenced in February 1984.

In order to coordinate and integrate the district's evolving TS/E and staff development activities, the new district superintendent (October 1983) hired an external consultant, Harvey Silver, to work with administrative and Project ProCEED staff in the summer of 1984 and during the 1984-85

school year. District efforts to the above end are still underway. Closure is expected in the 1985-86 school year. The district views supervision and evaluation as part of the same overall process. Supervision is viewed, however, as a process intended to help teachers improve, and to support their professional and personal development. Evaluation is the summative rating reached after a series of observations.

Staff Development

To date, approximately 65 teachers and 15 administrators have participated in the six days of training involved in Project ProCEED. Administrators received several one-half days of training each summer (1981-1983) in Dick Manatt's model of teacher supervision. In the summer of 1984 they received five days of consultant-led training in both leadership and learning styles as well as exposure to Hunter's instructional model. In addition, several small groups of administrators each engaged in a day or two of TS/E-related problem solving with the consultant in the 1984-85 school year. Teacher training involves one day of class instruction in each of the six instructional modules. Application-related homework assignments are required for each module. These are discussed in subsequent training sessions

TS/E Organization

The district requires two observations of tenured and four of non-tenured teachers each year. Teachers are observed for the entire lesson or period. At least one observation per year must involve a structured pre-conference using guidelines established by the district. All observations are followed by a post-conference. Observation reports are routinely shared with central office staff. Tenured teachers are rated once, and

non-tenured staff twice, per year. Ratings are based on the observation reports and administrators' judgments of teachers' total performance during the rating period.

Tenured secondary staff are observed at least once each year by an administrator and once by a curriculum supervisor. Tenured elementary staff are also observed by their respective administrators. Under the current plans, elementary staff will also be observed by the curriculum supervisors. Individual teachers may be observed only once every two or three years by the curriculum supervisors due to their observation loads.

Monitoring/Evaluation

The superintendent monitors the implementation of the district's TS/E system by reviewing all of the formal observation and evaluation reports submitted by administrative staff. He provides feedback to individual administrators at regularly scheduled goal setting/progress report meetings three times per year. Project ProCEED has been evaluated through post-training questionnaires soliciting participants' reactions and suggestions.

Project Costs

The district's recent efforts to improve teachers' performance via Project ProCEED appear to be running about $30,000 per year. Half of these monies support a half-time project director. The other half covers salaries for substitutes used to replace teachers taken out of class for training. Consultant fees for administrator training were $5,400 over the past year.

Administrators' Perceptions

The most common program strength perceived by administrators was that, in comparison to past procedures, some standardization had been introduced

into the TS/E process. Conversely, administrative staff made a number of other comments that indicated that even more standardization was needed. That is, teachers need to be trained in a single model of instruction to bring their expectations and understandings in line with those of administrators.

Most administrators spoke positively of the training that they had received and indicated that it caused them to change their behaviors. All were receptive to more training. Several desired more expertise in conferencing and helping teachers to improve.

Administrators shared mixed perceptions of the impact of supervision. About half felt that it did help teachers improve. Others perceived a variety of problems both in teachers' receptiveness to the process and in the clarity of the district's TS/E policies. Administrators also saw the district's evaluation process as an improvement over past procedures. No strong comments were made, however, regarding the degree to which it helped teachers improve.

Teachers' Perceptions

The program's major strength, according to teachers, is the common perception it has produced among staff that the district is supporting the professional development of teachers. Almost all teachers valued the Project ProCEED training that they had received. Many also perceived that the district was attempting to upgrade the TS/E system. They saw the current system as an improvement over past procedures.

There were mixed perceptions of the impact of teacher observations. The great majority of the teachers saw them as being pro forma in nature. Teachers newer to the district and those less experienced reported that the

observations had greater utility and influenced their teaching behaviors. To a large extent staff were indifferent to the end-of-year staff rating. The project ProCEED training, however, was viewed quite favorably. Close to half of those staff who experienced ProCEED attributed 20 to 25 percent of their current teaching skills to their participation in the program.

The major problem in the program is that a third to one-half of the staff perceive that there is variability among and between schools and administrative staff, and from year-to-year, with regard to the focus and rationale of the observations.

Central Office Staff Perceptions

Central office staff perceived the program's major strengths as the training administrators had received, the help provided to some teachers, the positive reaction to and effects of Project ProCEED, and the general awareness on the part of all staff of the district's efforts to improve the TS/E system and instruction.

They also cited several problems. Among them were continued inconsistencies in implementation of the TS/E system, the failure to clearly communicate the district's expectations regarding effective teaching to teachers, the need to clarify the relationship between the district's training program for teachers (Project ProCEED) and teacher supervision and evaluation, and the need to train both administrators and teachers in a well defined model of instruction.

As a result of their experience, central office staff would advise other districts planning a TS/E program to have a clear vision of what the TS/E program will look like at the end, communicate clear expectations to

all staff, involve all staff in planning, train all staff, and work toward commitment and not just simply compliance.

Overall Program Significance/Implications

East Penn has made definite strides in its attempt to upgrade administrators' TS/E skills and set up a quality staff development program for teachers. The district's Project ProCEED is an example of the planning, resource allocation, and commitment required to establish a quality professional improvement program. Several implications can be drawn from East Penn's efforts. First, all staff require training in a common instructional model if a TS/E program is to experience optimal success. Second, the relationship between new staff development programs and supervision programs needs to be clearly specified to all staff. Finally, staff require time to practice and absorb discrete parts of new instructional models. Coaching and feedback are required. Districts should avoid placing too much content before staff in too short a time. Otherwise, mixed signals regarding expected content applications and observation expectations may result.

Summary of Case Study 3: Pittsburgh Public Schools

The Pittsburgh Public School District comprises 88 schools (53 elementary, 17 middle [6-8], 15 high schools and 3 special education centers), 253 administrators, 977 elementary school teachers, and 2,089 middle, secondary, and special school teachers. The district recently adopted a modified DEBE-333 teacher evaluation procedure which incorporates instructional language and criteria derived from the district's Madeline Hunter-based, Pittsburgh Research-based Instructional Supervisory Model (PRISM).

TS/E Program History and Philosophy

The PRISM program was initiated by the superintendent, who assumed office in September 1980. A needs-assessment study commissioned by the superintendent established staff evaluation as a key district priority. An instructional leadership committee subsequently recommended that a district staff development team (SDT) be formed to conceptualize and implement an improvement effort. That effort came to be known as PRISM. The five member staff development team, formed in June 1981, received in-depth training from national consultants, developed training materials and procedures, and began implementation of the PRISM program in September 1981.

PRISM is designed to make good teachers and administrators better while at the same time identifying those who need significant improvement. The program has three goals: (1) to foster effective teaching through staff development programs designed to upgrade the observation and evaluation skills of principals; (2) to establish a common language of instruction and a set of standards for personnel evaluation; and (3) to provide clinical teaching experiences for both principals and teachers.

The intent is to place professionals in a helping relationship with one another to bring about positive improvements. If teachers and administrators are unable to improve their performance after careful role clarification, reasonable observation and feedback, and specific training, then appropriate due process actions will be taken. A five-year timeline was proposed for the program with the intent that PRISM would become the standard for the formal evaluation of teacher performance once it was disseminated district-wide.

Staff Development

Administrator training commenced in September 1981. Principals and supervisors were the first to be trained in the district's incremental, multi-year, staff development program. Most assistant principals and deans were trained in 1982-83. All received: (1) five days (30 hours) of PRISM I, Stage 1 training in Hunter's instructional theory and clinical supervision model; and (2) five days of PRISM I, Stage 2 PTOC training (practice in lesson planning, teaching, observing and conferring). They also received 30 hours of supplemental staff development each summer since 1983 in PRISM II. The goal of PRISM II is to enhance the instructional leadership knowledge, attitudes and skills of administrators (mini-workshop sessions addressing both district and individual improvement goals). In addition, they have: (1) received follow-up coaching at least four times per year since 1981 from SDT members who have co-observed and analyzed a lesson with them, observed them post-conference the teacher and provided them with feedback on their conference; and (2) participated in support networks which have met 3 or 4 times a year for one-half day since 1983-84 to air TS/E implementation practices/problems.

Training teachers in PRISM I instructional theory by principals, vice-principals, and supervisors, with the back-up support of SDT members, began in the 1982-83 school year and has continued to the present. Inservice was accomplished through training activities taught and coordinated by administrators, and through principals' required twelve-a-month teacher observations and conferences. Training took place during the district's five, one-half day inservice sessions and, in some cases, during those teacher preparation periods allocated for instructional improvement. The total number of hours of training per year has varied in schools. The average has been approximately four hours of PRISM I each year over the past three or four years in addition to an average of four or five observations/conferences per teacher per year.

Pittsburgh initiated the Schenley High Teacher Center (SHTC) program, PRISM III, in the 1983-84 school year. The program's goal, in brief, was to provide an in-depth eight-week renewal program for all of the district's secondary teachers. To date, half of the district's secondary teachers have completed the program. During the eight weeks at the teacher center, the visiting teacher: (1) observes exemplary teaching in an ongoing school setting; (2) practices new instructional techniques and skills; (3) receives detailed feedback and analysis on that practice; (4) applies instructional theory to practice; (5) receives an update in the content of his/her subject area(s); (6) reviews and discusses recent research on effective teaching, classrooms, and schools; (7) studies adolescent behavior and its implications for effective teaching; and (8) researches a chosen topic for personal growth. The program also involves a follow-up support structure and liaison with high school principals to assist

teachers in applying what has been learned at the teacher center. The district plans to open a similar Elementary Teacher Center, PRISM IV, in 1985-86. This would provide four weeks of in-depth clinical teaching experience to all of the district's elementary school staff.

Requirements and Organization

District administrative staff are responsible for carrying out the district's TS/E system. They are expected to spend approximately 20 percent of their time on supervisory related activities. The observation load ranges from 19 to 25 teachers in elementary schools and from 100 to 200 teachers in some secondary schools. Principals have the final responsibility for annual staff ratings.

The district has required school administrators (principals, assistant principals and supervisors) to conduct 12 PRISM-related supervisory observations (10-15 minutes) and conferences (10-15 minutes) per month (1982-1985). When the district shifted to longer "refinement-type" observations and conferences, the requirement was reduced to six per month. The number of times teachers have been observed each year has ranged from 3 or 4 to 10 or 12 depending on the size of a school's faculty and the number of assigned administrators. Records of supervisory observations have not been shared with central office staff. In the first year or two of the program, observations focused primarily on providing positive support and reinforcement for what teachers were doing well. As the program matured, they broadened to also address areas that impeded lesson progress.

The district also requires that tenured teachers be observed/rated once per year and non-tenured staff twice per year. Observations for rating purposes are announced as such and employ rating observation forms

and report formats that differ from those used in PRISM supervision. As planned, however, the district recently modified the DEBE-333 to include PRISM terminology. The new form will be used in the 1985-86 school year.

The five-member staff development team is organized to carry out three basic roles, each of which occupy approximately one-third of their time. Specifically, they: (1) engage in follow-up coaching of administrators; (2) teach PRISM content and conduct observation clinics at SHTC; and (3) are responsible for separate coordinator roles, each of which involve planning, liaison and materials development activities. The project director coordinates the administration of the SDT. The other staff coordinate activities related to research and evaluation, system-wide implementation/follow-up, inservice training, and administrative growth and development, respectively.

Monitoring/Evaluation

The district has employed an extensive monitoring system to track the implementation of PRISM. Principals have been required to submit monthly reports to SDT staff on the number, type and focus of observations/conferences conducted. They have also been required to submit mid-, and end-of-year progress reports on PRISM staff development plans/activities carried out in their schools. They also describe their PRISM activities in their annual MBO report to the deputy superintendent. Members of the SDT have also maintained confidential staff development coaching logs to document their coaching activities with principals.

From the inception of the PRISM program, the district incorporated systematic evaluation procedures to monitor, adjust, and evaluate the effectiveness of all aspects of PRISM. Evaluation work has been carried out primarily by the district's Office of Testing and Evaluation with

assistance from the Learning Research and Development Center in Pittsburgh. Comprehensive evaluation activities have focused on: (1) program documentation (e.g., action plans, field notes, materials); (2) formative evaluation (e.g., post-training surveys); and (3) impact studies (e.g., assessment of attitude and teaching behavior changes). Evaluation results to date have shown positive results or changes developing in the intended direction.

Project Costs

The PRISM program has been included as a line item in the district budget since its inception in 1981. Approximate costs since that year through 1985 have been $130,000, $352,000, $684,000, $508,000, and $532,000, respectively. These monies have gone primarily to staff development team salaries, and teacher inservice salaries (i.e., salaries for staff associated with the Schenley High Teacher Center [SHTC] during training). Additional monies from the Ford Foundation ($445,000 over five years) and local corporations/foundations ($1,000,000) have been used to provide supplemental support for ancillary aspects of the SHTC program.

Administrators' Perceptions

Without exception, principals praised the utility and quality of their PRISM training. They generally reported increased confidence in supervising teachers to improve instruction and were receptive to additional SDT training in new areas. Perceived program strengths, in addition to quality training, were the common language of instruction, strong/sustained district commitment, SDT coaching, slow introduction of the program, large number of observations, positive reinforcement of teachers, and the teacher center.

All of the principals felt that PRISM inservices and related supervisory observations have had a positive impact on teachers' instructional

behaviors. They also perceived improvement in their rapport with teachers and increased support for teachers. Although they still saw evaluation as somewhat of a pro forma exercise, several principals noted that this was changing due to the superintendent's modeling of personnel evaluation standards. Major problems still to be resolved were finding time for observations, and the amount of paperwork required. Some also mentioned that the district was approaching the overkill point regarding PRISM training.

Teachers' Perceptions

Most teachers viewed PRISM as a definite improvement over the DEBE-333 observations conducted in the past. They perceived that since a common language and expectations had been established, the observations and annual evaluation were more objective. They also cited increased communications between teachers and administrators regarding instructional improvement as a plus. Nearly all teachers reported that PRISM had helped their teaching performance. At least half named specific changes in their teaching behavior. Some noted, however, that some principals had introduced PRISM more thoroughly and effectively than others.

Most teachers said they were observed 4-6 times during 1984-85. When asked about the percentage of their teaching knowledge and skills that they would attribute to PRISM inservice/supervisory experience, they responded as follows: forty percent of the teachers attributed 10-15 percent of their teaching knowledge and skills to PRISM, 20 percent attributed 20 percent to PRISM, and 40 percent attributed 25-35 percent to PRISM. Regarding evaluation, most viewed the DEBE-333 as a pro forma exercise. Perceived problems included variability in how thoroughly different

administrators had introduced PRISM and differences among teachers in the frequency and scheduling of observations.

Central Office Staff Perceptions

Central office staff cited many program strengths. Among the most salient were: (1) the development of the SDT; (2) use of an R&D-based staff development model which employed extensive coaching; (3) use of principals to train teachers; (4) numerous observations; (5) omission of "official observation write-ups"; (6) use of positive reinforcement in teacher conferences during the first two years to build trust; and (7) the formal connection of PRISM and DEBE-333 four years after program introduction.

Major problems, according to central office staff, were in training the SDT, developing materials, using principals to train staff, the time factor regarding principals' observations, and various stresses at the SHTC regarding the roles of PRISM support staff that had resulted in some teacher burnout.

Based on their experience, Pittsburgh central office staff would advise other districts planning a TS/E program to have a clear vision of desired TS/E goals and procedures, involve teachers in planning and use their input, choose a single instructional model, train all staff in depth, provide for much initial positive reinforcement and follow-up coaching, and be flexible. Staff also noted that the Hunter model is not the end-all-be-all of instruction. They consider it a common foundation or frame of reference for effective instruction. It should be used to build staff skills toward more subject-matter specific instructional skills.

Overall Program Significance/Implications

In many ways the TS/E improvement efforts in Pittsburgh Public Schools over the past four years speak for themselves. Overall, the improvement effort can be characterized as being well planned, designed, implemented and evaluated. The district's efforts are noteworthy for their clarity of purpose, comprehensive nature, use of intense and sustained staff development, R&D-base, use of systematic monitoring and follow-up procedures, and even for the superintendent's modeling behavior. Many implications regarding TS/E program planning/startup, design, training, and implementation/continuation can be drawn from Pittsburgh's experiences. Three are particularly significant. First, Pittsburgh's experience appears to offer a compromise approach to a fundamental TS/E dilemma. Namely, how to present a program to teachers as "improvement oriented" and then "tie it to evaluation." Pittsburgh's solution was to incorporate a four-year phase-in period to build staff skills and trust before making the formal connection between their supervisory (helping) and evaluative (rating) procedures. Second, Pittsburgh's decision to involve principals in training staff initially resulted in resistance. It appears, however, to have paid off in the end in increased administrator supervisory skills and confidence. Finally, changes in staff behavior (principals and teachers) are not going to occur overnight. Sustained, long-term staff development, follow-up coaching, positive support and reinforcement, and systematic monitoring and follow-through are required if real improvements are to occur.

Summary of Case Study 4: Tamaqua Area School District

Tamaque Area School District has five schools, three elementary, one junior high, and one high school. There are 7 administrators, 140 teachers, and 2,450 students. The district has an evolving observation system (with no official label) and uses the DEBE-333 for end-of-year evaluations.

TS/E Program History and Philosophy

The TS/E system was initiated by the current superintendent when he assumed that position in 1978-79. Before that, the district had no formal supervision/evaluation procedure. The superintendent identified seven components of a successful lesson (e.g., providing for readiness, stating objectives, and evaluating student learning), and used them as observation criteria in a modified clinical supervision format.

District administrators view the observation system as a more useful form of evaluation than the DEBE-333 because of its management and supervision features. In their opinion, it helps them establish expectations, acknowledge good teaching, assist individual teachers, and identify common staff development needs.

Staff Development

Training for administrators and teachers has not been extensive or formalized. Administrators have become knowledgeable about the system through tutoring by the superintendent, discussing it during administrative staff meetings, and attending relevant workshops (e.g., sessions conducted by PDE and IU 29). Teachers have learned about the system through reviews of their observation reports, presentations by principals at faculty meetings, and descriptions of observation criteria.

TS/E Organization

Generally, elementary teachers are observed every two years and secondary teachers every year. The supervision process includes observing a classroom during an entire period; preparing written reports that include a timed record of events, a statement about teacher preparation, an evaluation of the lesson observed, and recommendations; and conducting post conferences. The district does not have an official, standardized set of observation criteria; each observer uses a variation of the successful lesson components list developed by the superintendent.

Supervision/evaluation in the three elementary schools is primarily the responsibility of the principal, although the superintendent and assistant superintendent observe some teachers. Junior high and high school TS/E responsibilities are organized by department. The superintendent, assistant superintendent, secondary principal, and assistant principals are each assigned to one or more departments. (They also serve as chairpersons of those departments.) Each secondary school administrator is expected to conduct a minimum of 10 observations per year. Minimums have not been established for other administrators, but they reported conducting 15-20 per year.

Monitoring/Evaluation

The system has not been evaluated formally, but the superintendent monitors it closely. He receives copies of all observation reports, reviews them, and then confers with individual administrators. He also maintains records showing the dates when each teacher was observed and the number of observations conducted by each administrator.

Program Costs

The TS/E system requires little additional funding and is supported out of the district's budget.

Administrators' Perceptions

Administrators considered the opportunity to increase communication with teachers and to work with them to improve instruction to be the system's major strength. Most indicated that the observation system has helped them improve teaching performance, and some said that it has helped them relay their expectations to teachers or has prompted curricular changes such as discontinuing a reading series. Other positive outcomes are increases in administrators' knowledge of classrooms and the development of observation criteria and guidelines. Several administrators noted, though, that teachers' reactions to the system were generally negative. For example, teachers resented the time spent on conferencing, perceived recommendations as negative evaluation statements, and looked upon the criteria as nothing new. Also, all five administrators expressed a need for additional training, primarily in conferencing skills, in helping teachers overcome weaknesses, and in using the observation criteria. Other problems included lack of time for observation, inadequate training for teachers, and too few observations and pre-conferences.

Teachers' Perceptions

Teachers' exposure to the observation criteria varied, depending on their principal. Some received lists of the criteria, without definitions; some heard oral presentations of them; some never saw or received a complete list of them. Some learned of the criteria through conferences, deduced them from observation reports, or learned about them from other teachers.

Some said that the system has helped slightly or has the potential to help--by allowing administrators to give teachers constructive criticism and by keeping teachers on their toes. Also, they liked the fact that it increased administrators' knowledge of their teaching.

The strength that teachers mentioned most frequently was the opportunity for communication with administrators during conferences. Other strengths included the system's fairness, its comprehensiveness, and its non-threatening nature. Most teachers, however, said that the observation system did not help improve their teaching performance. They said that observations failed to identify weaknesses, were not taken seriously because reports would include recommendations even if the lesson observed was perfect, were too infrequent, held them accountable for criteria that had not been communicated to them, and were conducted by administrators who were not trained in their subject area or who did not know them on an informal, daily basis.

Central Office Staff Perceptions

District administrators said that the system's strengths included the amount of time required for each observation, the needs assessment utility of the information produced, and the improvement of instruction--although the impact on the latter might be greater if observations were more frequent and more teachers accepted the system. Problems have included administrators' tendency to remain in their offices rather than conduct enough observations, lack of time for observation, deficiencies in administrators' skills in helping teachers overcome weaknesses, and ·hers' lack of knowledge and acceptance of the system. Central office ·dvised districts who adopt new TS/E systems to obtain input from tors

during system development and to make deliberate efforts to sell the system to staff.

Overall Program Significance/Implications

With little external assistance or expenditure of funds, Tamaqua adopted an alternative TS/E system that is similar to much more expensive systems used in other Pennsylvania districts. Among the elements found in the Tamaqua system that are also in these other systems are: (1) classroom observations by administrators who make anecdotal records; (2) criteria based on nationally-known research/theoretical knowledge on the process of instruction; (3) written reports rather than checklists; and (4) post-observation conferences between administrators and teachers.

While Tamaqua has demonstrated that alternative TS/E systems can be introduced at relatively low cost, it has also illuminated some potential limitations that should be addressed. If training for teachers, usually a major expense, is restricted, districts need to find other ways to give teachers as much information as is possible about the system. Alternatives to intense training include distributing printed materials, holding inservice sessions, making presentations or conducting discussions during faculty meetings, giving credit for participating in relevant courses or workshops, and tutoring during pre- and post-observation conferences.

Summary of Case Study 5: Upper Perkiomen School District

The Upper Perkiomen School District has three elementary, one middle, and one high school. It is administered by four central office staff members, five principals, and two assistant principals. The district has approximately 165 teachers and 3,000 students. Ninety-eight percent of the students are white, and enrollment is stable. The district has a staff development program (Utility-Based Professional Staff Development-UPSD) that is based on the work of Madeline Hunter and others. Staff select from five alternative modes of S/E; one alternative employs only the DEBE-333, which is also completed annually for all staff.

TS/E Program History and Philosophy

The program was initiated by the superintendent in 1977. During the process of adoption, staff and others were involved extensively--in trips to the Newport News, VA school district, in a pilot workshop, in inservice sessions, and in presentations by administrators. The subsequent developmental process included additional trips by the superintendent and the TS/E trainer to both coasts to consult with experts (Hunter and Stachowski) and observe the Newport News program, visits to Upper Perkiomen by Newport News staff members, and consultation of literature on TS/E. The overall district philosophy is that teachers' instructional skills are critical and that all teachers are satisfactory. However, administrators also believe that the TS/E program can help improve the skills of even above-average teachers.

Staff Development

Administrators received extensive training on the content of the Hunter instructional model and various clinical supervision procedures.

The training process included trips to Newport News, a one-to-two week training session conducted in Upper Perkiomen by a Newport News administrator, a four-day workshop led by the director of Pittsburgh's TS/E program, and meetings with various consultants.

Teachers were trained in the instructional model. Training topics included teaching to an objective, set, closure, task analysis, and monitoring the learner and making adjustments. Training was conducted by a former high school reading specialist who, upon the recommendation of a committee of teachers, was given a five-year assignment as program trainer. Training lasted 6-8 weeks and consisted of cycles of one day of group instruction followed by four days of practice and observation while teaching.

All administrators and 80 percent of the teachers were trained during the program's first four years. Administrators were trained first and then 20-40 teachers received training each year.

Requirements and Organization

Teachers have the option, each year, of choosing one of five supervisory modes, subject to the approval of their building administrators. Four of the five modes vary according to their focus and who conducts the clinical supervision. Teachers have the following options. They may engage in a clinical supervision process conducted by the principal; or engage in a peer-clinical observation process with one or two of their peers--to focus on select aspects of general instructional improvement. Alternatively, they may engage in a clinical observation process with either the reading supervisor (K-4) or the language arts supervisor (5-12); or engage in a clinical observation process with the writing program specialist--to increase instructional skills in those specific content

areas. Lastly, they may engage in a supervisory process that is strictly evaluative and which employs the DEBE-333 as the basic observation/reporting instrument. All non-tenured and new teachers are assigned to the latter mode.

Teachers' selection of alternative modes helps determine the distribution of responsibilities for conducting the TS/E process. Principals are responsible for teachers who select two modes--the one in which the principal is the supervisor, and the evaluative mode. The reading supervisor and the writing program specialist are each responsible for one mode. The district supervisor of curriculum, instruction, and personnel observes non-tenured teachers and helps oversee the collegial supervision mode. The superintendent and assistant superintendent manage the process and help conduct observations.

The number of observations required varies according to mode, but is not less than one per year. The supervision process is flexible: pre-conferences are not always held; formal reports may be prepared before or after post-conferences; several alternative report formats are used, including a checklist; and principals may decide to delay reports and post-conferences until after several observations. Only the reports of non-tenured teachers are sent to the district offices.

Monitoring/Evaluation

District administrators have used several approaches to monitor the process: requiring principals to submit all reports to the district offices (used initially only); participating in principals' and teachers' (collegial mode) observations and conferences; videotaping observations and conferences; and including TS/E tasks in administrators' accountabilities.

The program was formally evaluated in 1981 by researchers from Pennsylvania State University. They found that staff were very supportive of the program and said that it gave them an increased sense of competence and professionalism. The researchers raised questions about the program's integration into the district's ongoing practices and about resistance of some staff to it. In addition to this evaluation, at the end of each training cycle the staff development trainer surveyed teachers' acquisition of knowledge and skills, along with their reactions to training. Generally, teachers reported that they had acquired the knowledge/skills necessary to the program and reacted positively to the training experience.

Program Costs

The TS/E program cost the district approximately $10,000 per year during adoption and conceptualization and $30,000-$40,000 per year during training. Sources of funding included a federal grant (Title IV-C), the school board, and staff development funds from PDE. The largest expense was the salaries of teachers during training.

Administrators' Perceptions

All administrators said that they thought the program plays an important role in helping teachers improve their performance. Among its strengths, for example, are that the existence of alternative TS/E modes encourages more people to become involved; the flexibility of reporting requirements enables administrators to convince teachers that the program's purpose is to supervise rather than evaluate; and the changes in the administrative role make it less threatening and more helpful. The program has improved communication among teachers and between teachers and administrators. Among other effects, it has helped focus teacher discussion more

on instruction, established expectations, and improved lesson planning. Administrators considered their program training extensive and effective, raising questions only about a few consultants whose sophistication in TS/E was less than the district's. All but one expressed a need for further training in, for example, conferencing, note taking, peer observation, dealing with experienced teachers, and additional elements of Hunter's description of teaching.

Teachers' Perceptions

Teachers mentioned several program design strengths--among them, the availability of alternative TS/E modes, particularly the collegial mode; the opportunity for practice and immediate feedback during training; and other features that reduce the program's threat. Other strengths named by teachers included the staff development trainer; administrators' assurances that the program was not intended to reduce their individuality; and the district's allocation of time for the process.

Many teachers reported that the program had an impact on their teaching, but many others tried to minimize that impact. The effects named by teachers included increased understanding of how and why their own teaching behaviors affect student learning; improved planning and questioning behaviors; a common vocabulary; increased awareness; and a new terminology for old behaviors. Some viewed the latter as useful, saying it helped keep them on their toes; others questioned whether it justified the time and money spent on the program. Several teachers reported impacts from the collegial mode of supervision, including benefits derived from observing other teachers as well as from having others observe them.

The major need that teachers expressed was for follow-up and review. Teachers also described two problems--the time required for training, and inconsistency between administrators' initial messages (that the program was voluntary and non-evaluative) and later behaviors (persuading teachers to participate, mandating the program for new teachers, and using program terminology on DEBE-333 reports).

Few teachers commented explicitly on the adequacy or quality of the training itself. However, some who described the program's impact referred more to training than continuing TS/E experiences. Many found the training useful; others considered it redundant with their prior knowledge. Many teachers expressed appreciation of the trainer, saying that his coaching was helpful and non-threatening. Some teachers also said that the training required too much out-of-class time and that the district has provided relatively little follow-up or refresher training.

Central Office Staff Perceptions

District administrators seemed pleased with the TS/E system's design, but when they talked about strengths they referred primarily to impact--such as establishing common language and expectations, increasing staff knowledge and ability to recognize teaching effectiveness, and improving the effectiveness of principals as supervisors and of teachers as instructors. One administrator did describe the strengths of extensive teacher involvement and of the availability of alternative TS/E modes.

The problems that administrators described included creating readiness for the program (for example, building trust with teachers and convincing principals of the program's value); obtaining funds for training; finding time; developing teachers' skills beyond a rote level; and maintaining the system.

District administrators advised others in their position to make a commitment to the program and get the board to do the same, perhaps including signing a 5-year employment contract for the superintendent; create readiness for the program; understand the program concepts thoroughly before training teachers; and give teachers sufficient training.

Overall Program Significance/Implications

Upper Perkiomen's TS/E system was carefully planned and implemented, with many opportunities for staff to participate in the adoption decision, visit similar programs, consult with many scholars and educators, and extensively train for the program. The system is flexible and provides many options for teachers and administrators--for example, selecting among alternative modes of supervision and flexibility in preparing observation reports. It was also significant that a capable and trusted insider was the primary trainer of teachers.

Upper Perkiomen's TS/E system provides many guidelines for other districts that decide to adopt their own TS/E systems. Although most of its experiences were positive, these were a few instances of what districts should avoid in implementing TS/E systems--for example, telling teachers that participation is voluntary and later persuading them to participate or mandating the program for new teachers; telling teachers that a program is non-evaluative and later using program terminology on evaluation reports; and not providing sufficient follow up or refresher training.

Findings and Recommendations

This study of teacher supervision/evaluation systems was limited to only five districts and did not examine program effectiveness from an outcome or summative evaluation perspective. Nonetheless, it did produce extensive descriptive and perceptual information for administrators to use in adopting new TS/E programs. Moreover, it enabled researchers to identify key components or characteristics of the TS/E adoption and implementation process. The presence or absence of those characteristics frequently helped explain why successes or problems occurred. Many are compatible with the findings of other researchers (e.g., Darling-Hammond, et al., 1984) or the advice offered by staff development experts (e.g., Joyce and Showers, 1984).

This section describes some critical elements in designing and implementing new TS/E systems. Then it discusses several key issues in greater depth. Following that, there is a description of several promising innovative practices used in the districts studied. Finally, it identifies external assistance needs.

Critical Elements of TS/E Systems

Critical elements of TS/E systems are discussed here according to four phases of program development/implementation. The four phases are: (1) introduction/generation of staff support, (2) system design, (3) training, and (4) implementation/continuation.

Introduction/generation of staff support. TS/E systems are not likely to improve teaching unless teachers are willing to change their classroom behavior. Therefore, it is particularly important that teachers accept TS/E systems and consider them legitimate sources of guidance. Specific

characteristics, when included in the introduction phase, can promote such acceptance.

- Strong district commitment to a long-term improvement effort. Commitment in the form of strong leadership, repeated public endorsement of the system, and allocation of substantial resources--particularity staff time--not only spurs development and implementation but also conveys the sense that the district considers TS/E an important, long-term priority. Commitment also involves providing sufficient financial resources for consultants, visits to exemplary TS/E programs, materials, etc. Once a commitment was made, all the districts studied, even the smaller ones, found ways to allocate monies for planning and staff development.

- Extensive planning phase. Adopting a new TS/E system is a major undertaking and requires substantial planning and preparation. Consequently, an extensive planning phase, with data-based program planning, is another characteristic that generates staff support. The planning process may include examining exemplary programs, hiring credible consultants (these are often administrators of the exemplary programs), and/or conducting limited pilot tests of TS/E-related staff development. Consultants are often rich sources of information and advice on program design. They may also help legitimate the effort and motivate staff.

- Adequate representation. All parties--teachers, union representatives, principals, other administrators, and perhaps community members--should be represented in the planning phase. Participation may relate to either establishing district TS/E goals, and/or operationally defining them. The important thing is that participation be genuine. A negative effect can occur if people believe that decisions have already been made or that their opinions carry little weight.

- Clarification of the relationship between training/supervision and evaluation. The relationship between supervision and annual teacher evaluations must be clearly communicated to everyone early in the process. Subsequent procedures must then be consistent with that intent. Teacher support and trust is jeopardized when administrators initially state that supervision and evaluation will be separate activities but later allow the former to influence the latter.

- Adequately portraying the proposed program's impact on teacher behavior. Similarly, administrators should avoid trying to make the system more tolerable to teachers by claiming that it simply requires their putting new labels on what they already do. This establishes an expectation that training/observation will not influence teacher behavior and that the district's adoption of the system was politically motivated or an otherwise empty formality and a waste of resources.

- Clarification of the status of teacher participation. District expectations regarding whether all staff will eventually be required to participate in the program should be clearly communicated early in program introduction. Staff trust in administration declines if they are told that a system is voluntary but are later pressured to participate.

- Emphasis on the long-term/ongoing nature of the program. School staff are all too often subjected to quick-fixes and cosmetic staff development. As a result, "this too shall pass attitude" prevails in many districts. One site administrator reported regret that the program had initially been sold to staff as a three-year project because some staff were willing to wait three years for it to terminate. He recommended that TS/E programs be sold as ongoing and developmental.

System design. Districts will need to develop comprehensive, written plans that describe the major elements of the TS/E system. This documentation helps guide system users, standardize implementation procedures across schools, and convince teachers that the district is attempting to implement the program systematically.

- Specific model of teaching and observation criteria. A model of teaching--and, from that, observation criteria--should be selected and then described clearly so that all staff (administrators and teachers) have thorough, shared understandings. The model and the criteria should be derived from research and/or applied knowledge about effective teaching. Ideally, they should be appropriate for or adaptable to a variety of classroom situations. The strengths and the limitations of the model chosen should also be clearly communicated to staff. No one model is a panacea.

- Suggested observation schedule. The program design should also recommend a schedule of observations. Generally, teachers should be observed at least twice each year, and more frequently if possible, especially during the first year or two that they use the model. This helps the observer understand a particular classroom situation, increases his or her credibility with teachers, and provides teachers with more coaching and feedback. However, observers should have the flexibility, as the program matures, to focus their attention on teachers who need assistance. This may mean spending less time with teachers who have long-term records of excellence. These latter teachers may be used, however, as models for peer observation or to assist with staff development.

- Modified clinical supervision format. Districts should consider adopting a modified clinical supervision model. In its ideal form clinical supervision involves: (1) pre-conferencing/goal setting, (2) classroom observation/data collection, (3) data analysis, and (4) post-conferencing (most districts studied did not use pre-conferencing). It may also involve beginning-of-the-year goal setting and should also include follow-up observation cycles where needed. The district model should involve script- taping (verbatim notes) as the primary mode of classroom observation data collection, and should also provide for different types/levels of conferences (e.g., Hunter, 1980). Conferences can vary in terms of: (1) whether the focus is on either positive or negative findings, or both; (2) who identifies the findings, the teacher or the observer, or both parties; and (3) who suggests solutions for identified problems and/or desired areas of teacher growth/extension. Districts would also be advised to emphasize positive feedback conferences during staff training and for some time after that (one year or more), to afford time for staff practice of the discrete components of the model.

- Structured but flexible reporting procedures. Districts should provide guidelines/formats that observers can use in writing up observation findings and communicating them to others. These guidelines should indicate whether observation reports are to be sent routinely to the district office or maintained in school files. Sending reports to the district office is definitely more threatening to teachers. Districts should strongly consider using informal reporting systems, particularly during training and for the first year or two after training until both teachers and observers have had sufficient time and practice to internalize their skills. Districts should also consider introducing some flexibility into the system so that observers can use the system as needed--for example, to observe a classroom informally without writing a report, to write up only a partial report when following up on a previously identified weakness, or to observe a teacher several times before writing a report.

- Incorporation of the observation criteria into the end-of-year evaluation. If a district decides that the model of teaching should be considered in end-of-year evaluations, it should adopt an evaluation form (a modified DEBE-333) that explicitly includes the observation criteria.

- Coordination of the TS/E system with the staff development program. Despite extensive initial training in a TS/E system, teachers need periodic follow-up and an opportunity to meet in support groups to discuss their application of the model. Also, districts may want to extend that training or to modify aspects of the teaching model. Staff development time provides an excellent opportunity for such activities. In addition, districts should avoid inservice sessions that appear incompatible with the model of teaching.

Training. Whatever TS/E system is selected, districts will need to provide extensive training for administrators and teachers. Otherwise, they cannot be expected to carry out the system appropriately. Initial training will help teachers acquire the skills required of them. Subsequent observation and conferencing will help refine and maintain those teaching skills. Effective training programs have several characteristics in common.

- Use of effective training strategies. Training programs should incorporate techniques that experts have identified as effective. For example, Joyce and Showers (1984) described providing theory, demonstration/modeling, guided practice and feedback, follow-up coaching, and periodic review/support as essential steps in training. These techniques are applicable to administrators learning to be observers/conferrers and to teachers learning to use the instructional model.

- Multi-year phase-in period. Districts should allow one or more years from the beginning of teacher training until teachers are held formally accountable for following the teaching model. There are two reasons for this: (1) it is likely to take several years to train all teachers, and (2) after training, teachers need time and feedback to develop and refine their skills. During that period, observation reports should not be placed in teachers' permanent files or sent to the district office--they are best kept in a non-permanent file by the principal. This significantly reduces teachers' fears that they will be prematurely held accountable. At one site in the study, observers turned their observation/conference notes over to teachers during training and post-training follow-up.

- Development and use of local trainers. Using local personnel (particularly principals but also district staff and administrators) for training strengthens a district's instructional leadership, and improves communication and relationships between staff and administrators. Also, an internal training capability assures that teachers who enter the district after the initial training period receive adequate training and that everyone receives follow-up review and assistance.

- Use of volunteers to advocate the system. Some districts may find it helpful to train volunteers to become informed program advocates. These volunteers can promote the system among their colleagues. In addition, by making teachers program advocates administrators can avoid becoming directly embroiled in whatever internal tensions the new system might create.

- Cross-grade training programs. It may be appropriate, at times, to train teachers from different grade levels in the same group. This helps increase communication and breaks down political units. On the other hand, teachers may be more receptive to training if they have the support of familiar colleagues and continuing contact with them. One solution might be to create cross-level training groups with two or three teachers from each of several elementary and secondary schools.

- Formative evaluation of training. Formative evaluation can provide information for improving a training program and identifying further training needs. To maximize its utility, each session should be evaluated and the results used. The credibility and effectiveness of the training program are enhanced when participants' suggestions are used to make improvements.

Implementation/continuation. After the training phase has ended and the TS/E system has begun operation, district support will still be needed to make the system function effectively. There are several aspects to this support.

- Time for observation and conferencing. After the enthusiasm and commitment that often accompany the early stages of a new program begin to wane, other priorities may take over and interfere with time originally set aside for observing and conferencing. To prevent this from happening, districts might consider assigning some of the principals' duties to others. Another possibility is time management training for administrators and instituting procedures for systematizing/delegating routine administrative duties.

- Follow-up training. Teachers are likely to need periodic follow-up training to refine and extend their skills, review the teaching model, and renew their enthusiasm. Although inservice time may be used for this, districts should ask themselves whether that is sufficient, particularly during the program's initial years. Teachers could be given additional released time for improving their instructional skills.

- Support groups. Both administrators and teachers can benefit from sustained support networks. These might meet two to four times a year and be organized by grade level, subject area, role group, etc. Support groups allow staff to share ideas and problems and can assist the district in monitoring implementation, identifying needs, and making system adjustments.

- Sustained monitoring and program adjustment. Districts should monitor program implementation and make adjustments whenever necessary. Monitoring could be as simple as keeping records of which teachers are observed when, and the kinds of conferences

that are conducted. Preferable, however, is a monitoring plan that includes procedures for assessing the quality of observations and conferences. Districts should be aware, though, that program monitoring has several potentially undesirable side effects--for example, reducing flexibility that helps increase the system's effectiveness and encouraging pro forma implementation--that should be considered when monitoring plans are designed.

Key Issues

People who design TS/E systems must make a variety of decisions. For example, they must select a model of teaching, decide how to train administrators and teachers, identify observation criteria and a process for conducting and following through with observations, and develop a strategy for enlisting staff support and cooperation. Generally, options exist but each with its own strengths and limitations. Moreover, decision makers have less than perfect knowledge of the likely consequences of various alternatives. The study particularly illuminated three issues which will be discussed in some depth here. They are (1) the relationship between supervision and evaluation, (2) the selection of the trainers, and (3) system monitoring.

The relationship between supervision and evaluation. This issue is encountered by all districts that adopt new TS/E systems. On the one hand, common wisdom holds that teachers are more receptive to assistance that is non-threatening and, therefore, non-evaluative. On the other hand, observations often produce data that are much more valid and useful for evaluation than some evaluation systems. Consequently, administrators may be tempted to use data collected for supervisory purposes evaluatively. A major cause of tension between teachers and administrators in the districts studied was the influence of the new TS/E system on teachers' annual evaluations. Although teachers were told that the new TS/E program was intended to help and not to

evaluate them, some still considered administrators' observations evaluative. Moreover, teachers took note of the fact that new TS/E terminology was used in their annual evaluations and that central office administrators were sent copies of their observation reports. Teachers' perceptions that administrators had deceived them probably created more tensions than if administrators had initially said that, after a reasonable phase-in period, observation criteria would be used in teacher evaluation.

The best alternative may be to modify evaluation procedures to incorporate the TS/E system's observation criteria. Before using the new observation criteria evaluatively, however, districts should give teachers several years to acquire the necessary teaching skills. During that time, administrators should carefully avoid using program terminology in evaluation reports, or, if it is used, it should only be used to commend positive performance.

In short, the district's position on supevision and evaluation should be that: (1) new teaching skills and expectations will become part of the supervisory teacher observation process; (2) an adequate training and phase-in period will be provided for both teachers and administrators, during which time teachers will not be held formally accountable for the new expectations; (3) during the phase-in period district and teacher union officials will negotiate how the new expectations will be related to teachers' annual evaluation; and (4) following this lengthly phase-in period, teachers will be held formally accountable for demonstrating the district's instructional expectations via their annual performance evaluation.

The selection of trainers. One set of decisions facing TS/E program designers concerns who will conduct the training. The first question may be whether to use internal or external trainers. External trainers may have more expertise and credibility than local staff. However, they are likely to cost

more, be unfamiliar with the district and staff, and be available only at selected times and for limited periods. Internal trainers, on the other hand, may lack expertise but will probably cost less, understand how the district functions, and be more available.

Even if a district opts for internal trainers, it must still decide who those trainers will be. Principals might be responsible for training teachers in their schools. Perhaps other personnel might be relieved of their duties, either on a full or part-time basis, to serve as trainers. Assigning training to principals is a low-cost option that has the additional advantages of helping develop their instructional leadership skills and improving their relationships with staff. However, training responsibilities substantially increase time demands on principals. And, as one district in the study learned, the extent and quality of training, as well as teachers' attitudes toward the program, are likely to vary across schools, depending on principals' knowledge, skills, commitment, and rapport with staff. In districts where this might be a problem, it may be preferable that training be conducted by a team that consists of the principal and a district trainer.

Among the criteria used to select trainers are interest, the ability to acquire thorough knowledge of the teaching model and the observation criteria, teaching ability, and credibility and rapport with teachers. Since the trainer's role will be to work with teachers to improve their instructional skills, the latter attributes are particularly important. Trainers who lack experience or whose credibility is otherwise suspect may increase rather than decrease skeptics' resistance to the program. For that reason, districts should be wary of selecting vocal program advocates or ambitious personnel who have the right knowledge and incentives but lack credibility with staff.

Districts might also be advised to select two trainers, one with elementary level and the other with secondary level credentials.

System monitoring. Monitoring may be conducted for several different purposes. Districts may want to verify that observations and conferences are conducted at the expected frequency. Or, they may want to assess the quality of those observations/conferences and provide feedback to administrators. They might also use monitoring to identify program adjustments or individual assistance needs. The districts studied employed several different kinds of monitoring activities:

- Keeping records of observations. At the most elementary level, this may simply involve recording which teachers are observed and when. At a more complex level, a district may decide to track not only who is observed when, but also the subject area observed, the type of post-conference employed, and the teaching model content areas most frequently discussed in the post-conference. Such records can be used to ascertain whether teachers are observed at the expected frequency, whether administrators are conducting enough observations, the subject areas observed, and the nature of feedback provided teachers.

- Reviewing observation reports. District administrators may review all or selected observation reports to assess the quality of both the reports and the observations.

- Sitting in on observations and conferences. District administrators and/or trainers may sit in on observations and conferences between principals and teachers. This allows them to judge the quality of observations/conferences and provides opportunity for feedback to principals. Disadvantages to this are that it is time consuming and threatening to teachers.

- Establishing a minimum number of observations for principals. This can help ensure that the expected number of observations are actually conducted. However, establishing minimums can be tricky. Minimums can easily become maximums for principals in a time bind. If they are too high, they can lead to hasty and pro forma use of the system, or to other unintended effects such as principals neglecting other duties or not being availabile when needed.

- Videotaping observations and conferences. Videotaping produces objective, lasting records that can be used to assess the quality of observations and conferences. Such records may be especially useful for tutoring both observers and observees. However, the procedure is expensive, time consuming, intrusive, and may be very threatening to both teachers and principals.

- Requiring principals to submit periodic reports. Districts can ask principals to prepare annual or semi-annual reports describing their TS/E activities (e.g., observations conducted, assistance provided, training sessions held), assessment of the program, recommendations, and needs. This procedure can produce useful information if it is designed to be more than simple meaningless paperwork.

When developing monitoring plans, districts should first identify the purposes that monitoring will serve. They should then consider alternative monitoring procedures and weigh the potental benefits and undesirable effects of each. One rule of thumb is to establish more systematic, detailed monitoring systems in the first few years of a program and then reduce monitoring as staff growth and program implementation is achieved.

Promising Innovative Practices

The TS/E systems in all of the districts studied included elements that merit duplication in the design of new programs. Two, however, stood out as particularly innovative.

Alternative modes of supervision/evaluation. Upper Perkiomen allows teachers to select from different supervision/evaluation approaches. Supervisors and activities vary according to mode. Alternative modes are:

- Principal-Teacher. The principal is the clinical supervisor. (In the high school, this responsibility is shared by two assistant principals.)
- Collegial Mode. Teachers observe each other. Participation in this mode requires administrative approval. Informal criteria for participation are five years of experience and demonstrated competence.
- Writing Program Specialist and Teacher. The writing specialist functions as the clinical supervisor.
- Staff Development Coordinator-Teacher. The staff development coordinator serves as the clinical supervisor.
- Evaluative Mode. This mode is viewed as "strictly evaluative." It employs as the basic instrument, the DEBE-333. Non-tenured teachers must use this mode. Others may choose it if they desire.

This existence of alternative supervision/evaluation modes has several advantages. First, it reduces principals' observation responsibilities (and, thus, time demands). Second, teachers who want to participate minimally in the new TS/E system have an option--the evaluative mode. (Districts could adapt the DEBE-333 to incorporate the TS/E observation criteria, thereby encouraging teachers to use the teaching model, but still require only annual observations and no post-observation conferences.) Third, the collegial mode increases teachers' sense of professionalism and their perceptions that administrators trust and respect them. In addition, this mode gives teachers an opportunity to visit other classrooms and obtain ideas that they themselves can use.

Centers for teacher training. Pittsburgh Public Schools established the Schenley High School Teacher Center in September 1983. Quarterly cycles of approximately 48 teachers each have been scheduled for the program each year since the center opened. Teachers visit the center for eight-week periods to receive in-depth training in a clinical setting. During that time, their home school classes are taught by replacement teachers. The center, which is a fully functioning school in all respects, is staffed with teachers recruited because of their effective teaching abilities. Staff members, who teach a reduced class load and work with visiting teachers, have been trained in the district's staff development program. While at the center, teachers:

- observe exemplary teaching in an ongoing school setting
- practice new instructional techniques and skills
- receive detailed feedback and analysis on that practice
- apply instructional theory to practice
- receive updates in the content of their subject areas

- review and discuss recent research on effective teaching, classrooms, and schools
- study adolescent behavior and its implications for effective teaching
- research chosen topics for personal growth.

Teachers also engage in a follow-up program when they return to their home schools.

The school district plans to open an elementary level teacher center in September 1985. Four weeks of intense clinical teaching experience and follow-up will be provided to each of the district's elementary school staff over the next four years.

Establishing centers for teachers, to provide them with in-depth training and opportunity for renewal in a clinical setting is an extremely innovative concept. The centers in Pittsburgh have enabled the district to address both district goals (e.g., subject area content updates) and individual teacher improvement goals (e.g., practice of new instructional techniques and individual research topics). Evaluative data from the Schenley High School Teacher Center indicate that the program has contributed significantly to an increased sense of professionalism among secondary teachers.

External Assistance Needs

Central office staff from each of the sites studied indicated that they could have used and would have used assistance with TS/E program design and administrator training. Specific reference was made of the need for: (1) more well-developed and/or grade-level appropriate materials for training administrators and teachers; (2) video tapes of effective teaching; and (3) more state and/or intermediate unit leadership and assistance in

TS/E. Regarding the latter, one superintendent suggested that PDE provide skills academies for administrators in effective teaching and clinical supervision procedures. In effect, this would be a trainer of trainers program that would save districts the expense of hiring external consultants.

All of the districts who did engage consultants were forced to seek out-of-state assistance. Trainers from these districts are now acting as TS/E design/training consultants for a number of other districts in the state, primarily during their less busy summer months.

The findings of this study suggest that there is a definite and continuing support role for PDE in districts' TS/E improvement efforts. For example, PDE could:

- continue to provide and consider increasing instructional improvement monies to districts in order to support TS/E efforts
- disseminate select aspects of this study report to Pennsylvania school district officials to give them a perspective on a number of critical TS/E program initiation, planning, design/development, implementation and maintenance factors
- serve as a clearinghouse for TS/E instructional models and staff development materials (e.g., training manuals, materials/handouts; observation and evaluation forms/formats; program monitoring and evaluation materials; and, videotapes of effective teaching)
- bring in out-of-state national consultants and conduct centralized and/or regional trainer-of-trainers executive academies for PDE, intermediate unit, and/or local district staff
- provide on-site design, training and implementation assistance through trained PDE staff, arrangements with PDE sponsored turnkey-trained intermediate unit staff, and/or arrangements with exemplary TS/E districts to free up existing in-state trainers to work with other districts in a more systematic fashion than is now occurring
- make arrangements for several exemplary TS/E districts to serve as model demonstration sites (they do this to some extent already at their own expense--time and money). PDE might provide some financial support to these sites and to potential visitors to facilitate the process (e.g., staff time, materials duplication, travel costs).

Some of the above alternatives obviously may be more feasible than others. Given the findings of this study and PDE's recent summary of the 1984-85 Supervision/Evaluation Executive Academies, it appears that there is a broad market among Pennsylvania school districts for continued assistance with TS/E improvement efforts. Districts need to visit exemplary sites, have access to trained consultants, and have access to quality training for their own trainers. In addition, there is a continued need for state level financial support of districts' TS/E improvement efforts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfonso, R. J., & Goldsberry, L. (1982). Colleagueship in supervision. In T. J. Sergiovani, (Ed.). Supervision of teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cawelti, G., & Reavis, C. (1980). How well are we providing instructional improvement services? Education Leadership, 38 (3), 236-240. Also in E.E. Grimsley, & R.E. Bruce (Eds.) (1982). Readings in educational supervision. Arlington, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Champagne, D., & Hogan, R. C. (1981). Consultant supervision: Theory and skill development. Wheaton, IL: C. H. Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53 (3), 285-328.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. D. (1981). Developmental supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers inprove instruction. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H., & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Goldsberry, L. F. (1984). The realities of clinical supervision: Polaroid snapshot or star wars movie? Educational Leadership, 41 (7), 12-15.

Hunter, M. (1978). A clinical theory of instruction. El Segundo, CA: Tip Publications.

Joyce, B. R. & Showers, B. (1984). Power in staff development through research on training. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGreal, T. L. (1983). Successful teacher evaluation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sergiovanni, J. J. (Ed.). (1982). Supervision of teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Berstein, H. T. (1984). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.